

UEC Minutes

February 1, 2010

Present: Jennifer Utrata, John Rindo, Peter Greenfield, Matt Warning, Tamiko Nimura, Leslie Saucedo, Renee Houston, Sarah Moore, Heidi Orloff, James Evans, Brendan Lanctot (minute-taker)

1. Minutes of prior meeting (11/20/09) review and approved

2. Organization of Subcommittees

Meetings on subcommittees reminder.

Logistics of subcommittee loads discussed. RH mentions dividing reading load of apps for undergraduate proposals.

The due dates for applications are as follows:

April 9th for grad and undergrad.

Release and Trimble today (Feb 1st)

March 1st for other faculty funding applications

Release time to be discussed next meeting.

3. The Regester Lectureship

Call for nominations sent out. Last year was Suzanne Holland, this year David Lupher, Mar. 15th is the deadline, then a couple of weeks to gather materials. UEC committee members will go to Dean's office to read materials (such as books, etc.)

The description of criteria for candidates is reread (by LS).

Thus far, according to SM, there is only one nomination.

Several people declined nominations last year, only 4 accepted of roughly 10 nominated. Sarah noted that the decision is made some 18 months before the talk, so some balk given the timing. It is a recorded lecture of certain prestige, a community event, as PG notes. A talk for a broad audience, which may prove to be intimidating and hence the need to nominate a number of people.

HO asks about the protocol of nominating people - do you ask or you go right ahead and propose?

Procedure – LS will contact nominees.

JE suggests sending out a reminder about a week before the deadline.

3. Continuation of discussion on caps for conference travel

As discussed in our prior meeting, the committee debated if there might be a more efficient and/or equitable way to distribute money for conference travel, particularly given the rising cost of travel and, for certain disciplines, of registration fees.

Discussion begins with idea of gauging / surveying faculty interest re: possible models.

SM suggests that 2 potential scenarios are: retain current system or simply have an unrestricted lump sum of, say \$1100.

This second model would seem to benefit those disciplines with higher registration fees, but put those who travel internationally at a disadvantage.

JE wonders if registration fees – as they cannot be controlled by individual frugality – could be covered by the University.

This lead to a discussion on the allocation of funds. MW wondering how different departments use their funds for conference travel. SM replies that it varies quite a bit more department to department: some divide money among individuals, whereas others group it.

Following an extensive consideration of possibilities of abusing the new model, another idea is proposed: perhaps travel funds divided according to 2 categories: registration fees and all else.

JE suggests asking the University that funding for conference travel be increased.

LS proposes collecting data to help identify best possible alternatives and suggests that doing so is necessary prior to sending any kind of survey to measure faculty interest.

SM suggests offering no more than two alternatives and proposes forming a subcommittee to discuss issue further.

In summary, the alternatives for conference funding models are: status quo, single limit, or multiple, specific caps on spending (lodging, food, registration, etc).