

**Minutes for the University Enrichment Committee Meeting  
Thursday, October 4<sup>th</sup>, 2012**

**Present:** David Andresen, Sunil Kukreja, Danny McMillian, Wayne Rickoll, Justin Tiehen, Carl Toews, Ben Tromly, Stacey Weiss

Tiehen is selected to keep minutes for the meeting. Minutes for the previous meeting (9/6/12) are approved with minor revisions.

**Announcements:** (1) George Tomlin will be presenting the Register Lecture on November 15<sup>th</sup> at 7:30 p.m. (2) We briefly review recent decisions the committee has made regarding various funding proposals.

**Old Business:** (1) We review past recommendations for the different Subcommittees. For the Student Subcommittee, the recommendations are that 3 subcommittee members be assigned per proposal, with 1 member taking on a primary role. Also, a write-up for each proposal should be made, giving students feedback on the strengths/weaknesses of their proposals. (2) For the Faculty Subcommittee, the recommendations are that the proposals should be reviewed with the Phibbs Award criteria in mind, selecting the top 2 Phibbs candidates each semester. (3) The Committee decides that the final meeting of the year will be held on Thursday, 12/6.

**New Business:** (1) Chairs for the two Subcommittees are selected. Tromly is selected as chair of the Subcommittee on Faculty Grants. McMillian is selected as chair of the Subcommittee on Student Grants.

(2) Weiss mentions that Puget Sound students are participating in an Environmental Challenge Competition. Two teams of 5 students each give oral presentations in a debate-like format with other schools. The faculty advisor of the teams has asked whether it is appropriate for the teams to apply to the UEC for funding. The committee agrees that it is appropriate.

(3) The Senate Charges to the UEC are reviewed. The committee especially focuses on Charge 4:

Determine if a faculty research award could be established for junior faculty, much like the Phibbs award serves the established faculty member.

and Charge 5:

Discuss and implement ways to promote visibility and awareness of UEC funds, deadlines, opportunities and awards amongst students and faculty.

The committee discusses the possibility of using a “Wednesday at 4” session to promote faculty research. The committee ultimately rejects this plan, largely because the format of the Wednesday at 4 sessions does not perfectly fit what we are looking for.

Instead, the committee turns to the idea of creating a Faculty Research Award and building it in as a condition of the award that recipients of the award give a public presentation on their research.

Various questions regarding the Award are considered. Which faculty members would be eligible? (One possibility mentioned is that it would be just those faculty members being reviewed by the FAC anyway.) Whose task would it be to select the award winner? (The committee presumes that it would be the FAC.) What channels would the committee pursue to establish the award in the first place? (Kukreja suggests that we should begin by taking the matter up with Dean Bartanen rather than directly with the FAC.)

Tromly volunteers to write up a draft of a proposal regarding the award, which the committee can then discuss at a later meeting.

The meeting then adjourned.