

## University Enrichment Committee Minutes April 16, 2002

Karl Fields (chair) convened the meeting of the University Enrichment Committee at 10:05 a.m., Tuesday, March 12, 2002 in the McCormick Room of the Library.

**Present at the meeting were:** committee members Joel Elliott, John Finney, Karl Fields, Martin Linauts, Paul Loeb, Jeffrey Matthews, Janet Pollack, and Roberta Wilson, and guest Juli McGruder.

The following items were on the meeting's agenda:

- Item #1. Approve minutes from the February 26th, 2002 meeting;
- Item #2. Announcements
- Item #3. Review transcription costs for student research projects;
- Item #4. Select the 2003 Register Lecturer;
- Item #5. Consider proposed revisions to student research application form and memo based on wording concerning the proposed budget;
- Item #6. Discuss funding of undergraduate and graduate research.

The items were dealt with in the above order.

Item #1: Karl Field moved to approve the minutes from February 26th, 2002. The motion was seconded and approved by all.

Item #2: There were no significant announcements.

Item #3: The cost of transcriptions for student research projects was reviewed. This discussion was a follow up to Julie McGruder's presentation on the continued need for funding for transcription services to the UEC on February 26, 2002. After a brief discussion and additional clarification, it was determined that although interview hours could go as high as 100 (requiring 300 hours of transcription), five hours of transcription was average and reasonable for a typical student project. The transcription fee of \$35 per hour was accepted as a "fair market" estimate of the cost but no absolute rate would be fixed by the UEC. The UEC would continue to monitor transcription rates year-to-year to insure that funding was fair and equitable.

Item #4: The committee then selected the 2003 Register Lecturer, using the following criteria:

- she/he must be a distinguished scholar whose research has earned wide recognition and respect
- she/he must be an eloquent speaker
- she/he must have made a significant contribution to the university community
- she/he must be an excellent teacher

Jeffrey Matthews pointed out that it was unclear whether "recognition" entailed international, domestic, and/or internal. Other ambiguities included the definition of excellence in teaching, what constituted "contribution" to the university community, and how one was to judge eloquence in speech. Although it was agreed that all candidates had much to commend them, Bob Beezer was selected to be our 2003 Register Lecturer.

Item #5: Proposed revisions to the student research application form were reviewed based on the February 26th discussion. Significant amendments were:

1. amendment to the application form (p. 1): the original passage "As the project advisor, I **have reviewed** the student's application, including the proposed budget" was

altered to read, "As the project advisor, I **approve** the student's application, including the proposed budget." (The terms in black font are mine and serve to emphasize the modification.) The substitution of "approve" for "reviewed" suggests a the more active role of the advisor.

2. amendment criterion #2 (p. 3): the phrase "accuracy and completeness of the proposed budget" was added.

3. amendment to criterion # 3 (p. 3): the clause "Be explicit" was added to the beginning of the second sentence, and the sentence "Be sure to identify in the proposed budget all the anticipated research expenses, even if this brings the total to more than the maximum \$500 that can be awarded" was added at the end.

Item #6: The funding of graduate and undergraduate research was the final topic discussed. This was prompted by the concern that relatively few undergraduates received funding. Roberta Wilson wondered if the more polished (i.e., graduate) application received greater attention. In answer John Finney supplied a comprehensive statistical analysis of the distribution of funds (63% of the funding went to undergraduates), which led to the UEC's conclusion that graduate applications were not displacing undergraduate and that all worthy applications—graduate and undergraduate—were considered. Based on these findings, the decision of the UEC was to continue monitoring the distribution of research grants as before with ever a watchful eye towards future inequity.

All business for the year thus concluded, it was decided that the March 12th meeting was to be the last full UEC meeting of the 2001-2002 term.

The meeting adjourned at 9:50 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Janet Pollack