Minutes for the University Enrichment Committee Meeting Thursday, January 24th, 2013

Present: David Andresen, Danny McMillian, Wayne Rickoll, Justin Tiehen, Sarah Moore, and Molly Brown.

Tiehen is selected to keep minutes. Minutes for the previous meeting are approved.

Announcements: None.

New Business: (1) The Faculty and Student Subcommittees are chosen. McMillian is selected to chair the Student Subcommittee. Dawn Padula is selected to chair the Faculty Subcommittee.

(2) Andresen reminds the committee that several deadlines for applications that will come before the committee are approaching. This includes deadlines for the Trimble Asian Studies Professional Development award, course releases, and cultural currency applications. Moore reminds the committee that the Trimble award contains a cultural currency component that is distinct from the Cultural Currency Travel Funding Awards—a point that might lead to confusion. The applications for the Trimble award and for release time will be reviewed by the entire committee and decisions about the awards will be made at the next meeting of the UEC.

(3) The planned schedule for meetings for the remainder of the semester is quickly reviewed.

Old Business: (1) Andresen reports that Dean Bartanen is interested in pursuing the UEC's suggestion of creating a research award, and that she will talk with the Faculty Advancement Committee about how the winner(s) of such an award would be selected. Andresen also reports that Bartanen asked the committee to craft criteria for selecting the winner of the award. McMillian volunteers to write up something, perhaps together with Brown, who had expressed thoughts on the matter at the previous UEC meeting.

(2) Andresen reports that he has been in touch with the university's website contacts regarding how the webpages devoted to the awards the UEC oversees might be improved—how they might be made easier to navigate. There is talk of inviting Lisa Hutchinson to attend a future UEC meeting in order to discuss the

practicality of website revision. Moore mentions that pursuing this point may be difficult for now, given all the time and effort presently being devoted to the university's shift from Cascade to PeopleSoft.

(3) The committee discusses the idea of standardizing grant ratings, so that grant proposals that come before the committee in the future can be judged by criteria that are constant from one committee member to the next, and from year to year. The need to word such criteria in a way that is neutral with respect to academic discipline is emphasized. Rickoll suggests consulting the criteria used by Andreas Madlung in his work reviewing grants by science students.

(4) In connection with the previous point, the committee returned to the fact that student grant applications were up significantly in the fall, due in large part to increased applications by graduate students in occupational and physical therapy. This is because these graduate students have seen outside sources of funding that they had access to in the past be cut. Moore suggests that if this marks a relatively permanent change to grant application patterns, the university might be able to allocate more money for such applications in the future.

The meeting then adjourned.