

Present:

David Andresen, Molly Brown, Sunil Kukreja, Danny McMillan, Dawn Padula, Wayne Rickoll, Justin Tiehan, Carl Toews, Ben Tromly, Stacy Weiss

Rickoll was selected to take minutes. Previous minutes were approved without modification.

Announcement:

No response received from Communication Department about their advertising the work of the Enrichment Committee.

Old Business:

Our memo to Dean Bartanen was reviewed. The only comment was to change Faculty Research Award to Faculty Scholarship Award. Weiss will sign on behalf of the entire committee.

Report of faculty grant subcommittee's decisions: We received seven applications. We were advised by Kukreja to cap total disbursement at approximately \$10,000. The subcommittee ranked proposals as follows: 5 of the 7 to receive full request, 2 of the 7 at 80%, 1 request should be considered under the guidelines for conference funding. Total award amount recommended was \$10,195.

One request was for indexing costs of a book publication. Kukreja said there was a history of indexing costs being provided. However, it would still remain up to the judgment of the Enrichment Committee. Tromly argued that indexing was not research. Toews asked where else would the money come from; McMillan pointed out that dissemination is a part of research.

A question was raised about a proposal for paying recent graduates to participate in research. Kukreja indicated there was precedent for this. Motion was made to accept subcommittee's decision on faculty research awards recommendation; motion was passed unanimously.

New Business:

A consideration of new ways to evaluate proposals was discussed. It was suggested that scoring from 1 to 5 works well; why not continue to determine full funding by ranking level. McMillan said the top percentage should get full funding. Tiehan asked if this should also apply to student proposals. Kukreja said it was not clear where original criteria originated, but new criteria should be consistent with old criteria. Rickoll emphasized quality of research and clarity of presentation. Toews asked what federal agencies do—how to they evaluate proposals and determine impact of partial funding. Weiss asked if research could be done with only partial funding. Kukreja added there was a need for

proposers to make the case for full funding themselves. Tromly suggested something specific should be done about this now; Weiss suggested that these ideas should be in place for discussion in spring. Kukreja noted that on page 24 of evaluation criteria, quality should lead to publication or presentation and that this could be added to a criterion for full funding. Weiss said our summer science program uses a scoring of 1-3 for proposals with a 0.5 scale and that this criteria for summer science projects could be a good starting point. It was then added that the ranking is based on quality, clarity, faculty support, significance, and opportunity for new scholarship. Weiss then asked how do we proceed from here. Andresen said he would take the lead and added that George Tomlin has indicated the agency that funded OT projects was going away, and we decided to invite George to present the details of this situation to UEC.

The faculty proposal subcommittee stated that only one of the proposals was evaluated to be appropriate for the Phibbs Award.

The committee moved to adjourn.