

Faculty Senate Minutes
April 22, 2013
McCormick Room

Faculty Senate Members Present:

Kris Bartanen, Bradford Dillman (chair), Kathryn Ginsberg, Zaixin Hong, Judith Kay, Brendan Lanctot, Amanda Mifflin, Ann Putnam, Elise Richman, Maria Sampen, Mike Segawa, Shirley Skeel, Amy Spivey, Ariela Tubert, Nila Wiese

Guests:

David Andresen, Suzanne Holland, Bruce Mann

Call to order: Chair Dillman called the meeting to order at 4:05pm

Announcements:

Ginsberg reported that a new ASUPS team has been assembled.

Richman announced the upcoming Race and Pedagogy Event on Thursday.

Tubert announced the upcoming Philosophy Undergrad Conference Friday and Saturday.

Dillman and Spivey gave an update on their presentation at the last faculty meeting. During the meeting, the Senators gave an overview of bylaws and committee structure. They also described the process by which committees are set-up. Attendees asked a lot of questions and the presentation seemed useful for the general faculty.

Dillman congratulated Kathryn Ginsberg for a recent award.

Approval of Minutes:

M/S/P to accept minutes from April 8 with minor corrections.

Updates from Liaisons:

Hong reported that the Diversity Committee unanimously endorsed a proposed revised version of the campus definition of social diversity. The revised version reads as follows:

Characteristics that could cause groups or individuals to be systematically excluded from full participation in higher education, including age, disability, gender, race/ethnicity, national origin, religion/spiritual tradition, sexual orientation, job status or socioeconomic class, citizenship/documentation status, personal appearance, and political beliefs.

It would replace the current version which reads as: Characteristics that could cause groups or individuals to be systematically excluded from full participation in higher education, including age, disability, gender, race/ethnicity, religion/spiritual tradition, sexual orientation, job status or socioeconomic class, personal appearance, and political beliefs.

<http://www.pugetsound.edu/about/diversity-at-puget-sound/diversity-strategic-plan/glossary-of-terms/>

Bartanen clarified that the campus definition is contained in the university's Diversity Strategic Plan and that the Diversity Committee's proposed revised definition of diversity is for updating the strategic plan.

Student Life Committee Final Report:

Bruce Mann, Student Life Committee Chair presented the final report (see attachment).

Mann stated that he and fellow faculty and staff members were very appreciative of the students who served on the committee. He described the students as “articulate, bright, engaged and somewhat combative.” He encouraged the Senate to continue to put students on university committees. He stated that their perspective is often different from that of the staff and is much appreciated.

Mann highlighted the following points from the final report:

- The committee worked understaffed during the second half of the year
- The committee worked through the Senate charges; it also fulfilled an additional assignment of having its committee members serve on the Integrity Board. Mann suggested that this worked well but that this may have been due to the fact that there were very few hearings this year. He suggests continuing this assignment next year to determine how well it works in the long term (and whether a typical year—with more hearings—is still feasible in terms of workload).
- The committee advised and consulted with the Dean of Students in response to events happening on campus
- The committee toured the new dorm. Students on the committee were very impressed with the structure. They were especially pleased with the spaces in the building that would be open to the public. Students commented that currently there aren't enough quiet, cohesive study spaces on campus (with particular emphasis on quiet). Available study spaces on campus fill up very quickly so students were pleased with the potential of extra rooms for study in the dorms. The committee recommends that the university pay more attention to the issue of providing additional adequate (and quiet) study spaces on campus.

- The committee met with Czarina Ramsay, Director of Multicultural Services. Student committee members report that things are “moving forward in this area.”
- The committee met with Linda Everson, Director of CHWS. Everson reported that there were no greater incidents of illness on campus this year. This was the first year of a fee for service at CHWS (\$20 copay). According to Mann, student committee members expressed concern that this might drive down usage. During their meeting, Everson stated that CHWS has not seen a change in numbers and that the fee is waived in cases of financial need. This was also the first year in which the university did not provide a student insurance program. Additionally, there is no institutional requirement that students are insured (however, the university does provide emergency service regardless of insurance). Mann commented that both students and faculty on the committee thought that this was an issue. The committee encourages the Senate to look into reinstating a student health insurance program if it is within the budgetary means of the university. Students on the committee felt that CHWS could do a better job of informing students of available services. They also felt that CHWS should work to reduce the wait time for appointments.
- The committee met with Gayle McIntosh. They discussed branding and the 125th Year Celebration. Students talked about what the University of Puget Sound meant to them and what the phrase “to the heights” meant to them. Students/faculty on the committee were very pleased by how the university was being promoted and represented.
- The committee spent quite a bit of time reviewing the Campus Climate Change Survey. They noted improvements since 2006. According to the survey, students seem more comfortable, report fewer problems, and report hearing fewer statements that were inconsiderate or hurtful. The biggest issue discussed by the committee was the concern for the lack of economic diversity on campus. The committee discussed how to include students from lower income families on a campus like ours. Students on the committee feel that there is a division between students who are at the upper income bracket and students who are at the lower end of the economic spectrum (“Students who could, quite bluntly, afford to do anything they want versus students who don’t have that choice”).
- The committee discussed issues of social media, particularly with regard to the Puget Sound Confessions page. Puget Sound monitors the page through the Office of Communication (and when appropriate, the university sends objections to the moderator of the page, though, Mann noted, often these objections are met with no response). ASUPS also tries to monitor this. Many committee members feel that some of the comments posted on the page are really calls for help (i.e.: things that the Counseling Center could or should help with). Mann noted that students are feeling quite a bit of angst with regard to this webpage. He also stated that the university should look at how this might affect recruiting and the university’s public image.

- Mann concluded by pointing to the suggested committee charges listed in the report.

Kay asked what was meant by the phrase “cohesive study space.”

Mann responded by saying it was a “place where 3-5 or more students can gather to study.”

M/S/P to receive the report. Received unanimously with no objections.

Faculty Advancement Committee Final Report

Suzanne Holland, FAC chair, presented the report (see attached document).

Holland began by stating that the FAC completed 43 evaluations this year. During the 2013-14 academic year the committee will review 66 files. The committee met as a group three hours a week from October through December 2012 and 3.75 hours a week for the Spring 2013 semester. The committee formally requested 2 release units for 2013-14 but this is not financially feasible at this time.

Holland highlighted the following charge: In order to maximize efficiency and save money the FAC recommends that the Senate charge the Professional Standards Committee and Library, Media and Information Services Committee to collaborate in recommending to the faculty the standard use of electronically administered instructor and Course Evaluation Forms.

Holland stated that this would help the FAC’s work tremendously.

Holland also suggested that costs would be saved if files were given to the FAC in digital formats.

Holland stated that the FAC has begun discussing the possibility of establishing guidelines for writing letters. She stated that this might help address the issue of “length creep.”

Holland suggested that the Faculty Senate charge the Professional Standards Committee to consider whether an evaluatee may limit the number of visitors to a single class session. She suggested that head officers should facilitate advanced scheduling of colleague observations. She also noted that some departments call for class visits to occur in the same courses for which student evaluations are collected for a file but not all faculty colleagues necessarily follow these guidelines.

Spivey asked if the FAC planned to include in the buff document the suggestion of submitting digital formats of files.

Holland stated that there were no current plans but hopes that this may be something that happens in the future.

Bartanen clarified that the Professional Standards Committee is in charge of the buff document.

Kay asked if the FAC discussed the possibility of enlarging the committee.

Holland replied by saying no and that perhaps this was a structural matter.

Bartanen stated that the committee size is set in the Faculty Bylaws.

Wiese confirmed that the bylaws state that the FAC should be comprised of five faculty.

Holland noted that there are 14 tenure cases coming up in the fall. She added that this plays out down the line as well and that the workload is pretty daunting.

Kay stated that the committee could recommend new bylaws.

Bartanen commented that the PSC has begun discussion of plans for further streamlining the evaluation process.

Wiese noted that in the past, her department had inquired about sharing evaluation materials in electronic form and that they had been discouraged from doing so. She asked if this was based on a formalized procedure or customary practice.

Holland stated that the FAC does have some electronic documents and added that the FAC had to set up a special confidential shared drive for its own reading of materials.

Bartanen added that they are trying to look at some other options that would enable electronically-submitted materials to remain confidential. Concern about confidentiality is the primary reason for not using online materials at present.

Mifflin asked what were the historical reasons behind not doing student evaluations on line. She stated that at her previous school she couldn't get her grades until she submitted her online evaluation. She added that this would save 30 minutes of wasted class time and insure that every student has a chance to complete his or her course evaluation.

Bartanen said that there were concerns among some faculty about separating the qualitative comments from the numbers [on the evaluations]. However, software now exists that can do this. She added that evaluatees and evaluators spend time making "frequency charts" (very time consuming), and that software could easily

help with this task. Bartanen added that she hopes that we can move forward with electronically-administered student evaluations.

Tubert asked how to limit the number of observation visits in a day. She noted that an evaluatee might feel hesitant to tell her colleagues that only three people can visit on a given class day.

Mifflin stated that having so many visitors in a small class can really influence the class dynamic.

Holland said that she feels that this clustering of visits by faculty colleagues is not really fair to the evaluatee. She stated that it is adequate but not fair. She added that the FAC really bends over backwards to insure fairness. The committee tries to do everything it can to respect the integrity of the process.

M/S/P to receive report. Received unanimously with no objections.

University Enrichment Committee Final Report

Chair, David Andresen presented the final report (see attached document).

Andresen stated that the UEC reviewed 100 requests for faculty travel. He noted that the number of requests for travel is increasing every year but the allocation from Budget Task Force is not going up.

Andresen noted that the UEC funded 16 proposals for research at an average of \$1500 per proposal. He added that once the Phibbs endowment changes the research funding budget will decrease by \$5000.

Andresen reported that funding for student research and travel is beginning to “not match” the volume of what the students are doing. The UEC had to cut back considerably on the research funds for students this year. For some projects “partial funding” was equivalent to “no funding.” He added that there were a lot of student travel requests this year and that the UEC hopes to continue to support these requests in the future. The UEC was forced to cut research funding in order to support travel funding (this was justified by the fact that, generally, students who are travelling have already done the research to necessitate the trip).

Andresen stated that there are 5 nominations for Register award and that this will be discussed and decided upon at their next meeting.

Andresen outlined the UEC’s progress with regard to the 2012-13 charges (please see attached report for detailed list of charges). With regard to the first charge he stated that PeopleSoft has made it hard for the UEC to collect the appropriate data. With regard to the second charge (the university P-Card system), again PeopleSoft

has delayed progress. Charge #5 (updating the UEC webpage and making it more user-friendly) is also on hold because of PeopleSoft. The UEC was able to address charge #4 (the addition of a faculty research award) and have taken steps to put this into action. The committee discussed the possibility of both a pre-tenure and post-tenure research award to be decided upon by the FAC. More discussion will continue in the fall.

Andresen noted that the recommendations for the 2013-14 UEC are listed in the report.

Dillman asked if the committee discussed the issue of when/where the bulk of the work occurred [with regard to the faculty research awards].

Andresen stated that this would be an issue particularly with the pre-tenure award, because often research will have begun prior to employment at Puget Sound. Tenure awards would be considered more with regard to work done on campus.

M/S/P to receive report. Received unanimously with no objections.

Senate Election Results:

Wiese announced the results of the recent Senate election. The following faculty were elected to the Senate:

Derek Buescher
Maria Sampen
Jonathan Stockdale
Andrew Gardner

Alternates who will fill in for senators on sabbatical during 2013-14:

Amanda Mifflin
Robin Jacobson

The following faculty were elected to the Faculty Salary Committee:

David Sousa
Doug Cannon

Dillman commented that he was very pleased with the willingness of all the nominees to accept their nominations.

The Walter Lowrie Award was discussed and decided.

Segawa suggested that the Senate might, in the future, consider establishing more specific criteria for the Walter Lowrie Award.

Meeting adjourned 5:32pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Maria Sampen

To: The Faculty Senate
From: Bruce Mann, Chair of the Student Life Committee
Re: Report for the year 2012-2013
Date: April 16, 2013

The Student Life Committee (SLC) met throughout the fall and spring terms, most often on a bi-weekly schedule. The members of the committee this year were: Katy Appleby (student), Ryan Del Rosario (student), Lisa Ferrari (Associate Academic Dean, staff), Ian Latimer (student), Bruce Mann (faculty, chair), Jennifer Neighbors (faculty, fall term) Mike Segawa (Dean of Students, staff), Ben Tucker (Library liaison), John Wesley (faculty), and Lisa Wood (faculty). Amanda Mifflin and Amy Odegard were the Senate liaisons during the year.

The committee operated this year with a full complement of faculty appointments during the fall, but had less than a full complement during the spring term. The Senate was notified, and permission was given to proceed. Ben Tucker, upon the advice of the Library Director, accepted the position of library liaison, following the tradition of having a representative from the library staff attend and participate (but not vote) in committee affairs. We recommend this continue as the library, through a number of programs, is strongly tied to student life and the campus intellectual climate.

The Senate provided the SLC with the following charges for the 2012-13 year:

1. Continue to assess issues and programs regarding campus diversity.
2. Review plans for the two year residential requirement and the new residential facility.
3. Review plans for the renovation of the Wheelock Student Center.
4. Review the Student Affairs ad hoc committee role of committee members.

As the charges suggest the primary purpose of the committee is to provide guidance, counsel, and advice to the Dean of Students. Hence, other items considered by SLC were at the request of the Dean.

This year an additional assignment was placed on the committee by Dean Bartanen and the Senate. Each member of the committee would serve (on a rotating basis) for Integrity Board, Honor Court, and Sexual Misconduct Board hearings. The assignment of committee members to panels and the administration of the hearings was under the direction of Krystle Cobian (Conduct Coordinator, Dean of Students Office). The process, while cumbersome, appeared to work fairly well. Not many hearing board/panels were needed, so the burden on individual committee members was minimal. This may not be the case in subsequent years. The Senate, in consultation with appropriate offices, should review whether this is an appropriate way to staff hearing boards/panels.

The committee reviewed the construction and program plans for the new residential facility. The committee was impressed with the inclusion of many “open” spaces and public facilities in the hall. Student members of the committee noted that one continuing problem for students was an inadequate amount of “private, quiet, cohesive” study spaces on campus. The hope is that some of the rooms in the new facility can ameliorate, to some extent, this problem. In addition, the allocation of the “suite living” design to affiliate groups (interest groups and academic programs) was applauded. At the last meeting of the year, the committee toured the facility and discussed the design and timing of completion with facilities staff.

Czarina Ramsay, Director of Multicultural Student Services, explained the current plans and operations regarding multicultural services and engagement for the campus. She reported on the Logger Diversity Summit with students, faculty, and staff. Based on the positive responses, a second summit was conducted in the fall term. As noted in last year’s report, Ms. Ramsay continues her outreach efforts, with a particular focus on coordinating activities and information across students groups involved in diversity issues. The prevailing sense of the committee is that addressing diversity issues and multicultural programming remains important for the campus, and the plans that are in place seem appropriate.

Linda Everson, director of the Counseling, Health, and Wellness office, presented a report on activities. She noted that the office had not seen any unusual increase in activity due to flu or upper respiratory illnesses. Most likely, the availability of flu shots contributed to preventive action by students. In response to student concerns, she noted that there was only a small reduction in the number of appointments since the inception of the twenty dollar co-pay fee for the provision of health services (no fee for just a nurse visit) initiated this year. The rationale for the fee was purely budgetary, with a waiver for financial considerations. Also new this year, the university, due to escalating costs, did not renew its student insurance program. It is the student’s responsibility to provide health insurance coverage. The hope is that an institutional sponsored program can be re-established.

Everson discussed the way in which CHWS will be restructured due to her retirement. Her administrative responsibilities will be divided among the current staff and a new consulting nurse will be hired. Service continuation should be seamless. Student committee members did express the concern that the office do a better job of a) informing residential students of the programs and services that are available and b) reducing wait times (a continuing source of complaint). The ability to treat mental health problems continues to be scrutinized.

Gayle McIntosh, Executive Director of Communications, discussed the university’s plans for branding and visibility. The plan has been designed to complement, and be part of, the 125th anniversary of Puget Sound. She reported that research by her office and consultants provided a coherent theme for the university’s purpose,

mission, and campus life. This “positive branding” will also help the university reach the “next tier” level for prospective students and university supporters.

The committee spent considerable time reviewing the results of the 2012 Campus Climate Survey with Dean Segawa and University Chaplain David Wright. The analysis considered the responses by faculty, students, and staff regarding the current state of diversity, inclusion, understanding, and acceptance of differences. The presentation also allowed the committee to see how these results compared to the last Campus Climate Survey (2006).

Committee members agreed that, by and large, the climate on campus had improved from 2006. However, not unexpectedly, there are still some issues for consideration. The campus remains predominantly white, upper income, and Protestant. Minority community members reported some incidents of “lack of understanding,” “dismissive” attitudes, or “insensitive” comments. The committee expressed some concern about the lack of economic diversity impacts campus life, and if this created a feeling of entitlement by some community members and exclusion by others. Student committee members noted that while the Student Affairs staff has increased programming to encourage removing barriers, students still tend to socialize and form groups homogeneously. The committee felt that the university was moving in the right direction, but more needs to be done.

The committee discussed issues about, and surrounding, the use of social media. Sarah Stall reported that the university’s Office of Communication does monitor web sites that present information about the university. The most problematic site, currently, is the UPS Confessions page (many other colleges also have pages in this domain). The university works to protect its intellectual property, since the site is not affiliated with Puget Sound. Rachel Borsini and Santiago Rodriguez (ASUPS) reported that they also monitor the content of the Confessions page. The issue is that comments on the page are sometimes offensive, incorrect, or present personal problems. The university cannot intercede on this page, it has no official monitoring status, and it can only remain aware of the content. A second issue is whether individual comments really do raise a safety issue for the individual (“calling for help”) or for the campus community. At this point the only response is to monitor and provide any pre-emptory aid possible.

One theme that did emerge from the discussions of regarding diversity issues and social media is the question of “free speech” on campus and within the community. While this is not a significant current issue, the committee did consider how limitations (if any) on speech could impact campus life.

During its deliberations this year the committee identified the following issues that should be put on next year’s Charges to the Committee:

- A. Evaluate the way in which the university addresses the issue of work-life balance for students. Do we have adequate support for students in making these decisions?
- B. Review the amount and availability of private, cohesive study spaces on campus. What spaces are available, especially during the evening, for student use – outside of residential facilities and the library?
- C. Evaluate the efficacy of Counseling, Health, and Wellness Services, including ways by which the university promotes good health practices. Issues to consider are a) the impact on access due to the co-pay fee, b) the provision of university sponsored health insurance, and c) the adequacy of staffing for mental health services.
- D. Begin a discussion regarding economic diversity on campus. Are there issues that need to be addressed?
- E. Explore the question of how to address the issues related to appropriate speech and social media message. Is a university policy needed?

In addition to these specific suggestions, the committee should continue its role in advising and providing counsel to the Dean of Students at his discretion.

April 22, 2013

TO: Faculty Senate

FR: Suzanne Holland, Chair of the **Faculty Advancement Committee**
On behalf of Cathy Hale, Fred Hamel, Kent Hooper, Alexa Tullis, and Kris Bartanen

RE: **2012-2013 Annual Report**

The Faculty Advancement Committee this year will have completed 43 evaluations:

Type of Review	Number and Status of Evaluations
Tenure	3 (all closed)
Tenure and promotion to associate	2 (all open)
Promotion to associate	1 (open)
Promotion to professor	8 (5 closed and 3 open)
3 year assistant	3 (2 closed and 1 open)
3 year associate/clinical associate	9 (8 streamlined, 1 open)
5 year professor	10 (4 open, 6 streamlined)
3 year instructor	7 (1 closed, 3 open, 3 streamlined)
Total	43

The committee has forwarded evaluations for tenure, tenure and promotion, promotion to associate, and promotion to professor to the President. Some of these cases were considered by the Board of Trustees at the February 2013 meeting; some will be considered at the May 2013 meeting. At present, **66** evaluations are scheduled for 2013-2014. The committee will need to make some modest adjustments in due dates in order to complete that number of files in a single year.

The Advancement Committee met 3 hours per week from October through December 2012, and 3.75 hours per week for the Spring 2013 semester. Committee members formally requested 2 release units each for 2013-2014, but that is not financially feasible (without cancelling five scheduled courses and raising enrollment limits in others to accommodate the students) at this time.

Members of the Advancement Committee have been attentive to ideas about time- and cost-saving in our evaluation process without reducing the quality of the formative and summative reviews of faculty. One change is to move to electronically-administered Instructor and Course Evaluation Forms. We understand LMIS is considering this topic. We observe that evaluation candidates are spending time creating various “frequency” charts and graphs to summarize numerical information on the forms, and such summaries are also helpful to some FAC members in discerning patterns (not “scores”) of student response. It seems increasingly odd to us that multiple persons are spending much time creating such charts and graphs when a computer could do so readily. “The numbers” and comments need not be separated in this process (as some faculty fear), but rather software can produce the kind of output that our faculty would want to see. Other

schools are using electronically-administered evaluation forms successfully; we could save the cost of paper, staff time spent in collating (and retyping student comments), and faculty time by joining the 21st century. **We encourage the Faculty Senate to charge the Professional Standards Committee and the Library, Media and Information Services Committee to collaborate in recommending to the faculty standard use of electronically-administered Instructor and Course Evaluation Forms.**

We also believe that time and resources could be saved if faculty members being reviewed made more of their file materials available in digital format(s). For example, we observe that faculty members are printing out large notebooks or file boxes full of materials (perhaps only for the Committee) that could be readily available on Moodle, either by creating a “course” in Moodle in which enrolled members are department colleagues and members of the Advancement Committee or by providing non-editing teacher status to this same group of persons responsible for reviewing materials. We have also successfully received and accessed course materials, scholarly papers, presentations and the like on CD-rom disk (and appreciate when six copies of a disk are provided). **We encourage the Faculty Senate to charge the Professional Standards Committee to outline guidelines in “the buff document” for submission of evaluation materials in electronic form.** (We note that scanned Instructor and Course Evaluation Forms are very hard to read, so do not encourage that practice. We need to receive evaluation statements, curriculum vita, and letters in hard copy for archiving.)

In order to address “length creep,” the Committee has also begun discussion of possible guidance for evaluatees preparing statements and colleagues writing letters.

Members of the Advancement Committee also observe some gaps in practices regarding patterns of class visits. We see documentation of groups of colleagues visiting the same class sessions in the days prior to the due date for letters. Our sense is that more than two colleagues attending a single class session can change the dynamic of a class session. **We encourage the Faculty Senate to charge the Professional Standards Committee to consider whether an evaluatee may limit the number of visitors to a single class session.**

Furthermore, given the importance of colleague observations – along with review of teaching materials – in interpreting (rather than merely summarizing) student evaluations, department chairs/head officers are informed of evaluations one-year (and in the case of tenure, two-years) in advance of those scheduled evaluations; we encourage head officers to plan a schedule of class visits with colleagues in order to achieve a pattern that occurs across multiple class sessions, multiple courses, and the period under review. Some departmental guidelines even call for class visits to occur in the same courses for which student evaluation forms are collected for the file, yet we do not observe that faculty colleagues necessarily following these guidelines; we suggest that faculty follow departmental guidelines or change them.

The FAC consulted with the PSC about the following:

1. Expectations about junior faculty participation in evaluations and the necessity of their recommendations in a change of status review. The committee looks forward to PSC's response in that committee's year-end report.
2. Whether a letter sent directly to the Dean/FAC in an open file may be read by an evaluatee. We confirmed that all materials in an open file may be read by an evaluatee.

The Faculty Advancement Committee will discuss other ideas after it finishes with the 2012-2013 evaluations and reserves the opportunity to provide an addendum to this report to the Faculty Senate at or after semester's end.

University Enrichment Committee Final Report 2012-2013

2012-2013 UEC Membership:

David Andresen (chair Spring 2013), Sunil Kukreja (ex officio), Danny McMillan, Dawn Padula, Wayne Rickoll, Justin Tiehen, Carl Toews, Stacey Weiss (chair Fall 2012). Student Members: Molly Brown, Gabe Davis

The Senate Charges to the 2012-2013 University Enrichment Committee in addition to the committee's regular business were:

1. Examine the existing allocation structure for UEC funding (particularly faculty research and conference participation) and if necessary, consider reallocating funds or making a Budget Task Force proposal for increased allocations.
2. Determine how the UEC might shift its role in providing oversight of faculty conference travel requests in light of the university's move to a P-card system.
3. Investigate the logistics of going to a per diem for food during travel for the university.
4. Determine if a faculty research award could be established for junior faculty, much like the Phibbs award serves the established faculty member.
5. Discuss and implement ways to promote visibility and awareness of UEC funds, deadlines, opportunities and awards amongst students and faculty.

Committee Actions Regarding Usual Duties Related to Travel, Research, and Release Time Awards

1. Faculty Travel Funding

As of April 19 2013, the UEC has received a total of 94 travel requests for a total of \$101,309 in total. Note that this total does not reflect total amount actually reimbursed as some approved and completed trips are still pending submission of paperwork. The allocation for the faculty travel funding is \$93,000 from BTF plus \$10,000 carry-over from last year for \$103,000 total.

2. Faculty Research Funding

The committee received 16 applications this year (9 in the fall and the remaining 7 in the spring) and all were funded fully or in part for a total of \$21,832. The mean award per grant was \$1485. The faculty research funding available was

\$20,756: \$16,000 from the yearly allocation from BTF and \$4756 from the Phibbs endowment earnings.

3. Release Time Requests

The committee received 10 applications and awarded six release units for the 2013-2014 academic year.

4. Student Research and Travel Funding

The committee received a total of 103 applications for student research and travel funding, up again this year from 97 applications last year, 94 the year before, and prior years' averages of 60-70.

The committee received 47 travel grant applications to date, which is nine more than last year and cost an additional \$4,500 of our student budget that was not expected. A total of \$23,120 was awarded (average award: \$491).

The UEC also received 56 student research grant applications this academic year. The 32 fall research awards totaled \$10,341 (average award: \$323), whereas the 24 spring applications totaled \$7,400 (average award: \$352). The UEC had to cut the budgets of the Spring requests considerably to accommodate our budget of only \$7,500 (given the unexpectedly high number of student travel grant costs).

We are allocated \$27,500 from BTF, and with a \$10,000 carry-over from last year we had \$37,500 total to allocate for student research and travel awards.

5. Cultural Currency Travel Funds

No applications for travel related to cultural currency were received.

6. Trimble Asian Studies Professional Development Awards

The committee received four applications and all were funded. The budget for the Trimble Awards is \$25,000.

7. Selection of the Register Lecturer for 2013

Five nominated candidates turned in materials to be considered for the 2014 Register Lecturer. The committee is currently reviewing these materials and the selection of Register Lecturer will be completed during our May 3, 2013 UEC meeting.

8. Selection for the Dirk Andrew Phibbs Memorial Award

The committee is currently reviewing candidates for the Phibbs Award and selection will be completed during our May 3, 2013 UEC meeting.

Committee Actions Regarding Senate Charges

- 1. Examine the existing allocation structure for UEC funding (particularly faculty research and conference participation) and if necessary, consider reallocating funds or making a Budget Task Force proposal for increased allocations.**

With the steady increase in faculty and student travel and research grant applications, the UEC has solicited UEC funding data covering the past several years to develop a proposal for increased allocations from the BTF. However, the acquisition of this data has been significantly delayed due to the current transition to PeopleSoft and this item is part of our recommendations for next year's committee.

2. Determine how the UEC might shift its role in providing oversight of faculty conference travel requests in light of the university's move to a P-card system.

Again, the transition to PeopleSoft has made discussion on this matter difficult until we learn how the new software will allow us to handle reimbursement versus P-card approach to travel expenses.

3. Investigate the logistics of going to a per diem for food during travel for the university.

The UEC feels that a per diem food allowance is preferable to a receipt-based system. However, the transition to PeopleSoft financials has made progress on this issue difficult without knowing the details of how the new software will handle travel expenses.

4. Determine if a faculty research award could be established for junior faculty, much like the Phibbs award serves the established faculty member.

The UEC made significant progress with respect to a Faculty Scholarship Award. The UEC envisions at least one scholarship award for pre-tenure and at least one award for post-tenure faculty. Currently, no money is available for these awards, but the UEC hopes to see a monetary component associated with these awards in the future. The UEC sent a proposal for the Faculty Research Award to Dean Bartanen who forwarded the proposal to the FAC. The UEC then received feedback from the FAC suggesting more concrete criteria, and the UEC drafted more specific criteria for the award and are preparing to forward this again to Dean Bartanen and the FAC. The UEC had hoped to have this award be part of the Fall Faculty Dinner in 2013, but realistically the awards would not be presented until Fall 2014.

5. Discuss and implement ways to promote visibility and awareness of UEC funds, deadlines, opportunities and awards amongst students and faculty

The UEC had several discussions regarding this charge and thought that the Faculty Scholarship Award was a particularly effective way to increase visibility of the work of the UEC.

In addition, we are planning to meet with those involved with the CWLT to incorporate the faculty research grant awardees into “Wednesday at 4” activities such as the scholarship celebration.

Finally, we discussed updating the UEC webpage to be more user-friendly for those seeking forms and deadlines for UEC funding opportunities, as well as to list funded projects. Again, the transition to PeopleSoft has made it necessary for staff in charge of university web pages to work on more critical matters at this time. We will place this item back onto the recommendations for the UEC next year.

Recommendations for Next Year’s Committee:

1. Develop a request for increased funding from the BTF given the increase in both faculty and student research and conference travel requests. Thus far, faculty travel data shows that the \$93,000 from BTF has only covered the travel expenses in two academic years of the last 6, the average shortfall is \$19,000, and the trend in conference travel expenses is clearly increasing over time (roughly \$3000 increase per academic year given a simple linear model). Additional data is needed for other aspects of the request such as faculty and student research grants.
2. Investigate the logistics of going to a per diem system for food during travel for the university and how this may be implemented with current and future versions of PeopleSoft.
3. Determine how the UEC might shift its role in providing oversight of faculty conference travel requests in light of the university’s move to PeopleSoft and a P-card system.
4. Continue to develop and implement the UEC Faculty Scholarship Award. The FAC asked for more specific criteria for evaluation of scholarly activities, and the UEC has written a response to these concerns and should be forwarded to them again (through Dean Bartanen) for additional feedback.
5. Work to promote UEC grants, deadlines, and vision of promoting faculty and student scholarship. Schedule a meeting with those in the CWLT (such as Julie Nelson Christoph and Eric Orlin) to discuss effective ways to promote UEC funding opportunities and scholarship, such as having a Faculty Research Grant “Wednesday at 4,” or make the Scholarship Celebration be less about publications and more about current research and involve recipients of Faculty Research Grants. Continue to consider a more effective UEC webpage that serves to provide grant and deadline information, as well as promote scholarship through abstracts or summaries of UEC-funded student and faculty research.
6. Investigate ways to streamline UEC student research grant application submission for students who already apply for summer research funding.

Math and Science student summer research applications are very similar to the application used for the UEC student research grants. Andreas Madlung (current Math & Science grant supervisor) suggested that summer applications that are funded be forwarded directly to the UEC instead of the usual slight re-formatting and printing out of the entire application before submitting to the UEC for up to \$500 of research funds. The UEC should discuss how to implement this system with Andreas. The UEC should also consider whether the AHSS summer research grants might be able to use a similar system.