University Enrichment Committee minutes

Meeting called to order at 15:35, Wednesday November 19, 2008.

Present were:
William Barry <bbarry@ups.edu>,
Randy Bentson <rbentson@ups.edu>,
Jane Brazell <jbrazell@ups.edu>,
Suzanne Holland <sholland@ups.edu>,
Renee Houston <rhouston@ups.edu>
Michael Johnson <mjohnson2@ups.edu>,
Sarah Moore <smoore@ups.edu>,
John Rindo <jrindo@ups.edu>,
Amy Spivey <aspivey@ups.edu>,
Matt Warning <mwarning@ups.edu>,
Paula Wilson <pwilson@ups.edu>, and
Rand Worland <worland@ups.edu>

(1) Minutes for Oct 29, 2008 were approved.

(2) Graduate research sub-committee will meet at Tue 3:30 in Matt Warning's office

(3) Discussion will be limited to 10 minute episodes.

(4) Regarding Bill Barry's proposal: Suzanne Holland asked for confirmation that there was one addition and one deletion. Randy Bentson commented on the anachronism "typewritten". The term will be deleted. Future discussion may address electronic submission. The term "particularly" will be replaced with "especially". Sarah Moore discussed how this document fits with the defining documents, such as evaluation criteria, etc. The committee' consensus supported the document as amended.

(5) Regarding the open issue, research funds to faculty in last year of a contract: there was discussion of language changes, but discussion was redirected to determining the committee's sense of the problem. Some concerns have been raised regarding someone who decided to leave the university, with funds committed to research by that person. The policy in place seems to require faculty to surrender unused funds at the time of departure. Does the committee consider funding as establishing a contractual obligation for completing research goals and submitting a report, or is it in support of maintaining the university

academic environment?

The sense of the committee was to avoid constraining language changes, because of unintended consequences, yet somehow ensure the funds are wisely distributed. Spivey volunteered to draft a change which would best skirt this concern.

Further discussion addressed other evaluation criteria such as other funding for research. Such criteria are enumerated, but there doesn't seem to be requirement to report this in the application. The cover page seems to cover funding, but it may not be complete with respect to other support. (The biggest gap is with respect to other university support such as release time.) All of this addresses fairness. Bill Barry reports this is a recurring theme for the committee. It may be best to review all criteria to see if this should be restructured or revised to better capture current practice and intent. Suzanne Holland enumerated three points "if you have received support one year, next year's support is unlikely", "what's the university position on getting external funds for release time", and "require CVs in submissions". Matt Warning thinks we need better methods to view the record of past awards. Amy Spivey suggested we just need more space in the application to gather more information. There was some support for Suzanne Holland's point "you can't get ask the year after you receive an award", but there was countervailing view that UEC may need to support project completion in a second year.

Meeting was adjourned at 16:38

Submitted by Randolph Bentson