

Minutes for the University Enrichment Committee Meeting Thursday, March 14th, 2013

Present: David Andresen, Danny McMillian, Wayne Rickoll, Carl Toews, Sunil Kukreja, and Molly Brown.

Minutes: Minutes for the previous meeting were approved. McMillian recorded minutes for the current meeting.

Announcements:

1. Student research grants are due 9 April. The student subcommittee will present their recommendations at the 18 April meeting.
2. Future UEC meetings: 18 April and 3 May.
3. Currently there are no nominations for the Register Lecture. Sunil will send all faculty another call for nominations.
4. The Trimble Award will remain open until 31 March. If nominations are received, the committee will receive those electronically and return their vote electronically as soon as possible.

New Business:

1. The faculty subcommittee reports the following:
 - a. Nine applications were received
 - b. Seven were approved (denials were due to application format errors or faculty with remaining UEC funds)
 - c. The awards have a total value of \$10, 447.
2. Regarding the Phibbs Award, there is one eligible faculty member from the fall applications and two from this spring. The full committee will receive those files electronically and select for the award at the 18 April meeting.

Old Business:

1. Feedback from FAC regarding the proposed Faculty Scholarship Award
 - a. The FAC expressed the following concerns
 - i. They don't have the expertise to make value judgments.
 - ii. They need more guidance on the timing of the award.
 - iii. Should there be one, two, or more awards to reflect the breadth of scholarly activity?
 - b. With regard to the FAC's first concern, Sunil explained that they already make value judgments with files that come before their committee. He suggested, with agreement from members present, that the FAC should strongly consider the relative departmental support for the scholarship award files.

- c. Consensus was that at least some of the work cited in support of the scholarship award nomination should be completed at UPS, and this work will be weighed more heavily in making award decisions.
- d. Regarding timing and number of awards, consensus was for 1) a pre-tenure award that fits with the existing schedule for FAC review of files, and 2) a post-tenure award that reflects a nominee's most recent review. It is recognized that the FAC evaluation for the post-tenure award involves an additional look at files that have already been reviewed as part of the normal review cycle. However the committee feels the value in recognizing post-tenure scholarship is worth any additional review.
- e. These notes along with previously discussed criteria for the scholarship award will be sent to Dean Bartanen for review.