

Minutes of University Enrichment Committee Meeting
Wednesday, 10 December 2011

Present: David Akers, David Andresen, Sunil Kukreja (for Sarah Moore Fall 2011), Brendan Lanctot, Danny McMillian, Heidi Orloff, Dawn Padula, Carl Toews, Benjamin Tromly, Jennifer Utrata, Stacey Weiss, Wayne Rickoll; Student Members: Allison Schoening, Rachael Mallon

The meeting was called to order at 8:01 a.m.

1. Approval of Minutes

- a. The minutes from the 16 November 2011 meeting were approved.

2. Announcements

- a. The Register Lecture held on 17 November 2011 was a huge success. Congratulations and kudos went out to Nancy Bristow for an enlightened event.
- b. The UEC meeting schedule for next semester is still TBA dependent upon members' schedules.

3. New Business

- a. Update on Faculty Research Grants:
 - i. The Faculty Research subcommittee met prior to the general meeting to review the grant applications. The subcommittee reported that all five of the applications met the criteria for funding and were approved.
 - ii. A brief discussion arose concerning the small number of applications submitted for this round of consideration as compared to other years. There was mention that deadlines could be mentioned in venues such as *Open Line* and faculty meetings in the future to help bolster submissions.
- b. Update on Standardization of Student Research Transcription Fees:
 - i. More information from George Tomlin was reported, lending firm support for students utilizing skilled, professional transcription services for their projects. Further, he justified the variation in transcription service prices, since they are dependent upon the time and/or skill set needed to handle the project.
 - ii. The report from Tomlin went on to say that though standardization might be problematic, there would not be any issue with limiting the amount of funds allotted for transcription fees.
 - iii. It was decided that the Student Research subcommittee would take note of what kind of numbers are contained in the next round of applications pertaining to transcription fees with the intention of coming up with a suggested cap.
- c. Continuation of Discussion Regarding Interpretation of Phibbs Award Memorandum Of Understanding (MOU):
 - i. There was a report from Development explaining that the way the award has been determined historically (i.e., with no monetary attachment and utilizing the guidelines outlined in the MOU) has been in line with the Phibbs' intentions. Therefore, the UEC has been correct in following the guidelines outlined in the MOU in order to choose the recipient every year.
 - ii. The decision was for the Faculty Research subcommittee to use the Phibbs Award MOU criteria to evaluate the applications each semester in order to establish a short list of the top two applications eligible. Then, the entire UEC will read the top four applications in order to determine the Phibbs Award recipient.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:52 a.m.

-Respectfully submitted by Dawn Padula