UNIVERSITY ENRICHMENT COMMITTEE
Minutes
February 14, 2011

PRESENT: Jennifer Utrata (chair), James Evans, Peter Greenfield, Cathy Hale, Danny McMillian, Sarah Moore, Heidi Orloff, Dawn Padula (secretary), Ben Tromly

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** Utrata called the meeting to order at 1:04PM.

2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES: M (McMillian)/S (Orloff)/P to approve the minutes of the January 31, 2011 meeting as distributed.**

3. ANNOUNCEMENTS: McMillian reported on his meeting with George Tomlin pertaining to the committee's discussion (refer to Minutes from January 31st) surrounding the problems facing OT/PT students applying for fall research grants in meeting the November 15th student research application deadline with IRB approval. It was mentioned that though previous discussions surrounding this topic implied that the class project timing was a temporary issue, McMillian's information indicated that this was not the case. Further discussion arose, including the how to justify pushing the deadline date back any later than it is at present, the proposition of implementing differing deadlines for undergraduates and graduates, the fact that more issues would arise from those projects needing full IRB approval versus from those for which an expedited process would be sufficient, in addition to other issues of timing and logistics that will make coming to a solution complicated. Referring to the meeting's already full agenda, Utrata tabled the issue for further discussion to be held during future meetings (time permitting).

4. **CONSIDER TRIMBLE APPLICATIONS AND DETERMINE AWARDS:** It was reported that funding was adequate considering the number of applications. Further, the consensus of the committee was that all of the applications were well within the parameters set forth by the guidelines. **M (Hale)/S (Greenfield)/P to award all applications.**

Utrata then dismissed the committee member who was among the applicants for the awards to be discussed next.

5. **DISCUSS RELEASE TIME APPLICATIONS AND DETERMINE AWARDS:** Utrata began the discussion by asking if any of the proposals seemed largely problematic. The committee agreed that one application conflicted with the published award guidelines in such a way that it could not be funded. Moore announced that the UEC could fund five of the remaining six applications. With that, the committee agreed upon four applications that should be funded without question. The committee vote to rank the remaining two applications resulted in a tie. Moore noted that a sixth application might be able to be supported via CSI funds. She continued on to state that she would take the committee's recommendation to the Academic Dean and Associate Deans. Should there not be sufficient funding to cover all six applications in the aforementioned manner, she will consult the UEC regarding how to proceed with the final two applications. Otherwise, all of the applications will be awarded either via UEC or CSI funds.

6. **ADJOURNMENT:** Utrata adjourned the meeting at 1:52PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Dawn Padula