

University Enrichment Committee End of Year Report 2015-2016

MEMBERSHIP:

Faculty: Roger Allen, Terry Beck, Erin Colbert-White, Mark Martin, Dawn Padula (chair), Rachel Pepper, Jess Smith and Randy Worland

Students: Chili Johnson and Alex Plant

Ex Officio: Sunil Kukreja (Associate Dean)

Senate Liaison: Siddharth Ramakrishnan

MEETING DATES:

Fall 2015: September 2, October 1, November 5, December 3 and December 10

Spring 2016: January 25, February 15, March 21, April 11 and April 25

REPORT ON REGULAR UEC DUTIES AND ACTIVITY:

The UEC successfully completed all of the regular yearly duties assigned, including evaluating and awarding Student Research Award applications in the fall (October and November) and spring (April), evaluating and awarding Faculty Research Award applications in the fall (December) and spring (March), hosting the Register Lecture (November), evaluating and awarding Release Time Awards for faculty (February), determining the recipient of the Dirk Andrew Phibbs Award (April), and the evaluation of applications for the purpose of selecting the 2017 Register Lecturer (April).

SENATE CHARGES:

The Senate Charges to the 2015-2016 University Enrichment Committee were as follows:

- 1.) Create a standardized rubric for evaluation of Faculty Research Award applications and reflect any changed wording the Faculty Research Award application itself.

Rationale: UEC Self-Charge from 2015 year-end report. Such a rubric would mirror the newly established and adopted rubric for evaluation of Student Research Award applications.

- 2.) Determine whether there is a need to establish a guideline for funding on-line public access publication fees. If a guideline is deemed necessary, create and publish the guideline.

Rationale: UEC Self-Charge from 2015 year-end report (see report, item #4 under the sub-category "Other Noteworthy UEC Activity" of the 2014-2015 Final Report for further clarification).

- 3.) Work with the ASUPS Finance Committee to assist them in determining allotments for student travel.

Rationale: Charge requested by ASUPS President. The work of the ASUPS Finance Committee is similar to that of the UEC. ASUPS would like suggestions as to how to better coordinate and streamline their process for determining student travel allotments.

UEC ACTIONS IN RESPONSE TO SENATE CHARGES:

1.) *Create a standardized rubric for evaluation of Faculty Research Award applications and reflect any changed wording the Faculty Research Award application itself.*

Similar to our work last year in creating and adopting a standardized rubric extracted from the current published guidelines in the Student Research Award application, the UEC successfully created a rubric extracted from the current published Faculty Research Award guidelines. Mark Martin volunteered to devise the initial draft of the new rubric in January and the committee worked in subsequent meetings to edit it further in time for it to be given a trial run during the spring round of Faculty Research Award applications in March.

Following the trial run, it was determined that the rubric worked well and helped greatly in thoroughly evaluating the applications. The committee then worked to revise the Faculty Research Award application itself to better match the wording exactly with the verbiage used in the new rubric.¹ The amended guidelines and the new rubric will be available online for the fall round of applications.

2.) *Determine whether there is a need to establish a guideline for funding on-line public access publication fees. If a guideline is deemed necessary, create and publish the guideline.*

The UEC was successful in beginning the conversation surrounding this Senate Charge, though it is still, as of yet, to be determined whether a guideline is necessary as still more research/information is required to flesh out the issue. As of our final meeting in April, members were reaching out to various constituencies, including our own librarian, Jane Carlin, to gather information pertaining to trends in this area of publication. Due to the time required for the committee's regular duties in addition to the meeting time spent creating and editing the aforementioned Faculty Research Award rubric, the committee agreed that this discussion could continue next year (refer to "Suggested Charges for Next Year's Committee" below).

3.) *Work with the ASUPS Finance Committee to assist them in determining allotments for student travel.*

On November 5, 2015, the UEC invited members of the ASUPS Finance Committee to join our meeting in order to work through this Senate Charge. Ken Avianada, ASUPS Director of Business Services, represented the ASUPS Finance Committee at this meeting. Avianada asked questions of the UEC about our policies and evaluation procedures, and the UEC, in turn, provided insights and suggestions. Avianada concluded that the conversation was helpful, and that he would report his findings back to the ASUPS Finance Committee for future discussion surrounding reevaluation of their processes pertaining to student travel allotments. Details from the discussion can be found in the minutes from the November 5, 2015 UEC meeting.

¹ We also made similar adjustments to last year's Student Research Award application so that it coincided with the rubric.

OTHER NOTEWORTHY UEC ACTIVITY:

1.) This was the first year that we implemented an early fall (known as the “early bird”) Student Research Award deadline for those students wishing to pursue fall projects. As expected, the applicant pool for this deadline was small. However, it seems, thus far, that adding this deadline serves well the purpose of allowing for fall projects to take place versus students having to apply for retroactive funding in the late fall.

2.) Upon last year’s committee’s recommendation, this year, the UEC did not split into subcommittees for evaluating Student and Faculty Research Award applications. Instead, all members participated in evaluating both types of applications.² This allowed the discussion of applications to be more productive and to include the entire committee rather than having small subgroups report their decisions to the rest of the committee. In addition, we believe that full member participation in both types of application evaluations will allow committee members to have better insight as to awarding precedencies and processes from year to year.

3.) Finally, as a follow up to our work last year, the committee found that using the Student Research Award rubric (created last spring) for all three Student Research Award deadlines this year worked very well and added much needed clarity, as well as a standardized scoring system, to the evaluation process.

It has been suggested that we add an addendum to the Student Research Award rubric next year pertaining to those applications that we accept “as is” in the spring from the Summer Research Grant in Science and Mathematics applicant pool. As a reminder, last year’s committee decided that adding a “check box” to our application would signal to the UEC that an application was also submitted for a Summer Research Grant. If a student selects “yes,” then this informs the UEC members that they are reading an unmodified Summer Research Grant proposal.

However, since spring of this year was the first time that the “check box” was utilized, it became clear that there were a few additional and slight differences between our applications. For example, in addition to length and budget discrepancies, there is a reporting of findings element required of UEC proposals that is not explicitly required of the Summer Research Grant applications (because it is already a requirement of receiving the Summer Research stipend). To help clarify things, if we compile a list of the accepted differences between our two proposals and add that list as a point of reference to the rubric itself, then the committee members will have an easier time keeping those differences in mind when evaluating a proposal that came to us, unmodified, from the Summer Research Grant pool.

Also, in conversation with faculty advisors to Summer Research Grant applicants, it became clear that we should make a small, additional modification to our application that would signal to applicants and advisors that no further edits are required of their Summer Research Grant applications when submitting identical proposals to the UEC. Currently, the following sentence is present on our application coversheet: “Have you submitted this exact proposal to the Summer

² Student members traditionally only participate in evaluating Student Research Awards. They do not evaluate applications that involve faculty (Faculty Research Awards, Release Time Awards and Register Lecture determination) for the sake of maintaining confidentiality pertaining to faculty members’ professional work.

Research Grant in Science and Mathematics? ___yes ___no.” For next year, we will add the following statement to this: “If ‘yes,’ then no application modification is required.” This information should provide the necessary clarity on the part of the students and the students’ advisors that we are accepting the Summer Research Grant applications “as is” if “yes” is checked.

SUGGESTED CHARGES FOR NEXT YEAR’S COMMITTEE:

- 1.) Determine the need to establish a guideline for funding on-line public access publication fees. If a guideline is deemed necessary, create and publish the guideline.

This would indicate to next year’s UEC the need to continue our work on this past year’s Senate Charge.

In addition to any Senate Charges, this year’s committee requests that next year’s committee:

- 1.) Add an addendum to the published Student Research Award rubric per Item #3, paragraph #2 under subsection “Other Noteworthy UEC Activity” above.

CONCLUSION:

The work of the committee this year was extremely focused and productive. This year’s UEC successfully created and implemented a Faculty Research Award rubric and edited the Faculty Research Award posted guidelines to coincide with the rubric, hosted the Register Lecture, read and evaluated two sets of Student Research Award applications in the fall and one set in the spring, read and evaluated Faculty Research Award applications in the fall and spring, read and evaluated Release Time Award applications in the spring, determined the Dirk Andrew Phibbs recipient from the pool of Faculty Research Awardees, and chose the 2017 Register Lecturer.

It was both an honor and a pleasure to lead for the second year this dedicated group of faculty colleagues and students in supporting faculty and student scholarship, creativity and innovation.

Respectfully submitted,

Dawn Padula, DMA
UEC Chair 2015-16
Associate Professor
Director of Vocal Studies
School of Music

APPENDIX I³

**Scoring Criteria for Faculty Research Awards
UEC – University of Puget Sound**

Assign a whole number score (e.g., 1, 2, 3) in each of the areas. Note that “research” is broad and includes all University-recognized forms of scholarly inquiry.

Relevance of Study to Enhancing Applicant’s Professional Expertise: Score: _____

- 1 – Unclear relevance to enhancing applicant’s professional expertise.
- 3 – Clear relevance to enhancing applicant’s professional expertise.
- 5 – Very clear relevance to enhancing applicant’s professional expertise.

Likelihood of Publication, Performance, or Exhibition: Score: _____

- 1 – Unclear likelihood of scholarly outcome.
- 3 – Possible scholarly outcome.
- 5 – Strong possibility of scholarly outcome.

Time Frame for Proposed Research: Score: _____

- 1 – Unclear time frame for completion of work in two years.
- 3 – Clear and feasible time frame of completion of work in two years.

Budgetary Considerations: Score: _____

- 1 – Budget is unclear.
- 3 – Budget is appropriate and well justified.

Research Plan/Proposed Process: Score: _____

- 1 – Proposed plan/process is unclear.
- 3 – Proposed plan/process is clear.
- 5 – Proposed plan/process is very clear.

Other Considerations:

- Award requirements are met: _____ yes _____ no
If “no,” please note the requirement(s) that has not be met (e.g., no IRB review).
- Prior University funding received by applicant? _____ yes _____ no

Holistic Evaluation: ___ Do not fund; ___ Fund if possible; ___ Definitely fund

Comments/Questions:

³ Newly created Faculty Research Award rubric, spring 2016