

**2010-2011 UEC membership:**

Jim Evans, Peter Greenfield (Chair, fall), Cathy Hale, Brendan Lanctot, Danny McMillian, Sarah Moore (ex officio), Heidi Orloff, Dawn Padula, Benjamin Tromly, Jennifer Utrata (Chair, spring)

**The Senate charges to the 2010-2011 University Enrichment Committee in addition to the committee's regular business were:**

1. Reconsider the category caps in the conference travel reimbursement scheme, with an eye to increasing fairness across disciplines without impacting the total budget.
2. Draft a request to the Budget Task Force to increase support for conference travel.
3. Consider making it possible for applicants with pending sabbaticals, whose projects will require IRB approval) to apply for funding before IRB approval has been granted. IRB approval often cannot be obtained so early. Disbursement of funds would still be contingent on IRB approval.
4. Consider adjustments to student research and travel award criteria to "spread the wealth".
5. Standardize reimbursement for mailing and printing costs (similar to mileage reimbursement) for student research grants.

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

**Usual duties**

**1. Faculty travel funding**

As of May 2, 2011, the UEC has received a total of 88 travel requests. Of these, 74 were funded, 3 trips were initially funded but later cancelled, 1 request was denied, and 10 are pending second trip requests that will be considered after May 15. This is fewer than the 100 or so requests the committee typically receives each year. A total of \$84,381 has been allocated to cover the 74 trips (mean = \$1,140.28) against a total budget this year of \$116,577. (Note that total funds this year included \$93,000 yearly allocation, \$15,298 from unused departmental funds, and \$8,280 rolled forward from the previous year.) Assuming that the committee does not receive a high number of proposals in the next 13 days, the remaining \$32,196 will cover all second trip requests this year.

**2. Faculty research funding**

The committee received 12 applications this year (8 in the fall and 4 in the spring) and all were funded fully or in part for a total of \$16,050 allocated (\$22,842.69 was requested) in 2010-11. The mean award per grant equaled \$1337.50. This was similar to previous years. As a reminder, the faculty research budget equaled \$21,000 this year -- \$16,000 from the yearly allocation and \$5000 from Phibbs endowment earnings.

**3. Release time requests**

The committee received 7 applications for teaching release units, and 6 faculty members were granted a one-unit release. (Five release units are usually awarded each year and one of this year's grants was funded from an external grant).

**4. Student research and travel funding**

The committee received a total of 94 applications for student research and travel this year, a significant increase from past year's averages of 60 to 70. The committee received 37 student travel applications (35 granted) and 57 student research applications (54 granted), for a total of \$36,292 allocated. Of these 57 research applications, 36 were received at the spring deadline.

This demand represents a significant challenge for the committee as it had budgeted \$29,938 for the entire year and used some \$6,000 from savings to cover the requests (in most years, some 15% of the allocated money is not spent, so conservatively, some \$5000 will likely be reclaimed.) In part, the high number of applications in the spring made it difficult to allocate the money evenly over the year, to stay within budget, and not to put spring applicants at a disadvantage over fall applicants. Anticipating that demand will remain high, next year's committee will need to address this issue.

**5. Cultural currency travel funding**

No applications for travel related to cultural currency were received.

**6. Trimble Asian Studies Professional Development Awards**

The committee received 4 applications for the Trimble Professional Development Awards. Since all applicants met the award guidelines, all 4 faculty members were granted their requests for a total of \$19,225, leaving \$10,775 unspent. Sarah Moore notified Dave Beers of the unspent funding so that he could discuss this with the Trimbles as it might relate to how they divide their gift between Short Term Study Abroad and Faculty Research.

**7. Selection of Regester Lecturer for 2012**

Several candidates were nominated for the Regester but then did not submit materials to the UEC. After reviewing the work of the outstanding nominees who submitted materials for the UEC's consideration, the Committee concluded that George Tomlin's scholarly contributions and teaching excellence made him an exemplary representative of the University community. George Tomlin was chosen as Regester Lecturer for 2012. This is the first time the Regester Lecture

will be given by a faculty member from the Schools of Occupational and Physical Therapy.

#### **8. Selection for the Dirk Andrew Phibbs Memorial Award**

The committee reviewed proposals from faculty for UEC research funding and decided that Patrick O'Neil's proposal most closely fit the spirit of the Memorandum of Understanding for the Phibbs Award (especially the Phibbs's desire that the recipient use the funds to "learn through travel" and "gain new perspectives" in another culture).

### **Senate Charges**

#### **#1 and #2: Reconsider the category caps in the conference travel reimbursement scheme, and draft a request to the Budget Task Force to increase support for conference travel.**

In the fall, the committee decided that there was insufficient time to pursue a solid, convincing request to the Budget Task Force by mid-October for increased conference travel funds. Instead, the UEC discussed this issue in the spring in light of the university-wide changes underway with the P-card system. Since the P-card system does away with the feasibility of category caps for various categories related to conference travel, there was discussion of potentially revamping the way in which the UEC provides oversight for faculty conference travel. Currently the UEC reimburses faculty members for expenses and we have a rather labor- and paper-intensive system, whereas the move to a P-card system allows people to spend money without a lot of prior approval. The committee also discussed the idea of getting out of the business of tracking final reports by making the submission of a participant's final report to the UEC a requirement for getting any future conference travel grants approved. Several new issues will arise with the extension of the P-card system, and the UEC will not be able to be accountable entirely in terms of final reporting from faculty members.

The committee also discussed modifying the form for requesting conference participation travel funding in order to gather better data in support of the faculty's need for increased conference funding. Although this year thus far has had 78 first trip requests and 10 second trip requests for conference funding, as opposed to the more typical number of 100 or so requests, in general faculty report a difficulty in keeping costs within the limits of the category caps. Yet even though the category caps will be eliminated with the P-card system, the form as it currently exists does not encourage faculty to report the additional, often significant, expenses they frequently incur. The form also does not capture expenses such as internet use and printing/poster production which may be incurred during conference participation. Sarah Moore volunteered to revise the form for the upcoming fiscal year, in light of the need to better capture the reality of actual faculty expenses. The information gained from faculty on a revised form will allow the UEC to better make their case for increased conference funding in next year's planned request to the Budget Task Force.

#### **#3. Consider making it possible for applicants with pending sabbaticals, whose projects will require IRB approval) to apply for funding before IRB approval has**

**been granted.**

Although there was much discussion of this issue in the fall, as well as collaboration with the IRB Chair at a subcommittee meeting, in the spring the committee learned that it would be sufficient to require applicants for leaves and release time to sign a form stating that they understood the requirement of IRB approval for any work with human subjects, and would agree to obtain that approval before beginning work. Therefore, the UEC decided to allow applicants for grants to do research involving human subjects to apply without IRB approval if the work is to be done during leaves or release time, and if they sign to indicate that they understand the requirement of IRB approval and will not begin work until such approval is obtained. The committee directed the Associate Deans' office to add the necessary statement and signature line to the application form. Other faculty research requests will still have to document IRB approval on application.

A related IRB issue was much discussed by the UEC this year, involving the challenges that OT/PT students experience in procuring IRB approval by the fall deadline. Very few of the students applying for research funding this year had an IRB in hand at the time of application. Although there was much discussion of how to handle this issue, at the UEC's final meeting of the year on April 25<sup>th</sup>, the committee approved new language requiring that a copy of a submitted IRB be attached to each student application and that if the application was approved by the UEC, funding would not be released until the Associate Deans' Office had been notified of IRB approval. In addition to this change, Sarah Moore and George Tomlin developed a system internally for handling the competing pressures of the UEC needing students to have IRB approval, OT's scheduling being such that students often aren't able to secure IRB approval in accordance with the UEC's deadlines, and the difficulty for the Associate Deans' office and Accounting of managing and tracking student research award letters in different stages of approval. With the approval of new language related to human subjects research on student research applications and this new internal system to meet the needs of OT/PT, the UEC feels confident that it has at least diminished the challenges many OT/PT students face in this area while still maintaining proper IRB approval standards.

**#4. Consider adjustments to student research and travel award criteria to "spread the wealth".**

The committee discussed this charge thoroughly but the consensus was that there is too much variation – between individual student requests and from year to year – to make it possible to find some formula for figuring the size of grants. The most difficult problem is anticipating in the fall how much to reserve for spring applicants, but we are doing the best we can, and all well-constructed student applications have received significant funding.

**#5. Standardize reimbursement for mailing and printing costs (similar to mileage reimbursement) for student research grants.**

The committee decided to set a limit of two dollars per subject for mailing costs for surveys, and to include that figure, as well as the university standard figures for mileage and per diem, in the guidelines for applying for student research funding. The \$2 per person figure agrees well with the estimates made by a fall subcommittee and students will continue to be reimbursed for their actual costs – up to a limit of \$2 a head and \$500 for the project as a whole. Students will now be expected to break costs down by categories, such as stationery, postage, etc.

### **Recommendations for next year's committee:**

1. Consider reallocating the amounts for student research and travel, potentially shifting categories for student reimbursement. The committee might consider decreasing the award for student travel, for example, since the current policy usually awards \$500 per request.
2. Develop more specific guiding criteria for determining recipients of the Phibbs Memorial Award each year. Currently each year's UEC is considering candidates based on the Memorandum of Understanding, faculty research award recipients from the past two years, and awardee lists, but the process of determining awards could be streamlined significantly with the development of specific guiding criteria for yearly use.
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 a P-card system. The P-card system makes the use of category caps impossible, requiring some changes to the UEC's past "reimbursement" role, but it still needs to be determined which changes to UEC requirements -- such as final reporting requirements -- are advisable, in order to create a less labor and paper intensive process overall while ensuring proper oversight.
4. Determine whether the costs for reimbursing transcription can be standardized for student research grants. Students have submitted widely varying estimates for transcription and cost-savings might be found in this area.