

**University Enrichment Committee  
Meeting Minutes  
Wednesday April 22, 2015 - 8:00-8:50 AM  
Collins Memorial Library - Misner Room**

**Attendees:** Dawn Padula (chair), Sunil Kukreja, Jess Smith, Kabir Jensen, Aaron Pomerantz, Randy Worland, Erin Colbert White, Roger Allen

**Call to Order:** Chair Dawn Padula called the meeting to order at 8:00 AM

**Approval of Minutes:** Minutes from March 15, 2015 were approved as submitted by unanimous voice vote without revision.

**Announcements:**

- 1.) Student research award recommendations will be reviewed and approved at the final meeting of the year on April 29 instead of today.
- 2.) The 2016 Register Lecturer will be decided at the final meeting of the year on April 29th. Faculty members of the Committee asked to visit the Associate Dean's office to read the files in anticipation of the discussion. After reviewing nominee's files, UEC members were charged with ranking them from 1-5 ("1" being the highest) and forwarding decisions to Padula before noon, Tuesday April 28.
- 3.) Erin Colbert-White announced that the deliberation meeting for spring semester student research applications will take place Monday April 27, 1:00 PM in WEY 318e. Subcommittee members for student research agreed to have Padula and Sunil Kukreja also attend the deliberation meeting.

**Agenda Items Discussed:**

**1.) Discussion of Faculty Senate charge #5 - *With respect to the work of the committee during 2014-2015, indicate in your end of year report whether the size of the committee was appropriate and identify any committee work that seemed superfluous.***

Jess Smith expressed that more committee members would be very helpful to handle the increasing load of student research proposals needing review.

Roger Allen suggested that rather than increasing the committee size we consider having the load for both student and faculty research applications shared by the committee of the whole instead of dividing into subcommittees, considering that the number of faculty applications has been fairly modest.

Kukreja suggested that this approach would help pass on historical knowledge of how proposals are reviewed to future committees, if all faculty committee members participate in all processes (student members would serve solely on the student research award committee as in the past).

There was general agreement that we not report back to the Senate a request to increase committee size and have a trial next year of having all faculty committee members participating in all review processes.

Regarding the second aspect of Senate charge #5, Smith indicated that none of the work we have conducted seemed superfluous. There was informal consensus that all work the committee was engaged in this year had been substantive, relevant, and useful to the university.

**2.) Begin discussion of Faculty Senate charge #2 - *Continue to pursue the implementation of a Scholarship Award that directly parallels the existing Teaching Awards.***

Padula shared the document from the UEC that currently is in possession of Dean Kris Bartanen and the FAC—"Criteria for Scholarship Award" (attached to these minutes). She mentioned that at the last annual faculty dinner, Dean Bartanen recognized a junior and a senior faculty member's scholarship (per the current criteria) as a result of this ongoing conversation with the UEC, though no official award has been established.

Kukreja shared the history of discussions with the FAC regarding creation and/or implementation of the award. He also noted that the impetus for the award was that the UEC wishes for scholarship to be recognized as teaching is currently (via the Tom Davis Teaching Awards), but that the UEC does not have access to the annual (or evaluation year) data on individual faculty scholarship that would be necessary to make decisions or recommendations regarding annual recipients. Allen agreed, emphasizing that the FAC is the logical body to determine recipients by singling out the work of those faculty under review (similarly to the Tom Davis teaching awards).

Kukreja suggested that a next step could be for the UEC to reach out to the Faculty Advancement Committee (FAC) via Dean Bartanen once more on this topic, reiterating the UEC's endorsement of implementing such an award and the use of the established criteria.

**Additional Items Discussed:**

**1.) UEC funding of on-line public access publication fees.**

Padula introduced for discussion the topic of how we might, in the future, handle faculty research proposal requests to cover fees for open-access on-line publication. Although this topic is not covered in our Senate charges, it is one that we anticipate will be a growing issue in the near future since open-access and online publications become more prominent. She indicated that we already do not cover "vanity press" publication charges, per our guidelines, but do not have any specific criteria for handling these types of publication cost requests.

Colbert-White indicated that she has been giving thought to this issue since it came up at the last meeting and shared with us three criteria for consideration that she feels might be applicable for evaluating future requests. These include the following:

- Does the journal offer a waiver for fees under any stated circumstances? If so, has the faculty applicant demonstrated to the UEC that they are ineligible for such a waiver?
- Has the faculty applicant indicated to the UEC why the journal charging a publication fee is the appropriate venue for dissemination of the work?
- Will the work be published without paying the fee?

Smith suggested that, as was the case this year, we could consider making a publication fee award up to an established cap. Preference may be given to works that could not otherwise be published.

Kabir Jensen shared that the same issue came up with student research proposals also requesting funds for publication.

Aaron Pomerantz suggested giving priority to actual research start-up or direct expense funds with consideration of publication fees if funds remain. There was general consensus that this would be an appropriate prioritization of limited funds.

Kukreja offered that we may gain some insights and ideas on the subject by investigating trends and current practices pertaining to this phenomenon in the literature and perhaps by looking into how other institutions are handling this.

There was consensus that it would be useful and appropriate to continue this discussion next year with the possible goal of developing a guideline to this effect if necessary.

**2.) Discussion of Faculty Senate charge #1 - *Continue to pursue ways to showcase creative and scholarly work that is supported by UEC funding.***

As a final item, Padula brought our attention to Senate Charge #1 regarding promoting faculty scholarship that is funded or otherwise supported by the UEC.

Kukreja shared that information regarding particularly noteworthy or significant projects is forwarded to the Communications Office already.

There was discussion that the UEC itself may not be the most effective or appropriate entity to disseminate information on supported work. For example, our UEC webpage is not where other scholars or the interested public might ever go to find out about noteworthy Puget Sound creative and scholarly work. Kukreja emphasized that dissemination of noteworthy projects happens when we support work on a publication, travel for a student or faculty member to present at a conference, or award funds to help support ongoing research that turns either into a publication or a conference paper.

Allen suggested that one thing we could strive to promote would be the annual recipient of the Dirk Andrew Phibbs Award. At this time, the award carries no monetary value, and the recipient simply receives a letter of congratulation from the UEC. It was suggested that few people outside the UEC and the recipient may ever know that the faculty member received it or that the award exists. It was suggested that we pass on the name of the recipient and project title to the Communications Office for Open Line. Padula also suggested that we email Dean Bartanen to ask if she would announce the recipient annually at the August faculty dinner.

**Adjournment:**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:50 AM. No one in attendance objected.

**Next Meeting (final scheduled meeting of AY 2014-15):**

Wednesday April 29, 8:00 AM - Misner Room in Collins Library

Respectfully submitted,

Roger Allen, PhD, PT  
Secretary of the day

## **Criteria for Faculty Scholarship Award**

The following shall be used as selection criteria for the faculty scholarship award. The selection committee is encouraged (but not required) to consider departmental support for the scholarship as a means of differentiating relative merit.

- Quality of the nominee's scholarly or creative achievements, with emphasis on originality, imagination, and innovation.
- Scholarly work should be validated and communicated through peer review, such as: published articles (e.g., peer-reviewed journal articles, technical reports, book chapters, and essays) contributing to a body of knowledge; books (e.g., original works and textbooks, researched compilations, edited books); grant support (e.g., competitive, peer-reviewed research grants; foundation grants.) Extra weight should be associated with work that has been initiated and completed after the faculty member has started working at UPS.
- Creative work should be validated and communicated through peer review and scholarly critique, such as: production, exhibition, or performance of creative work (e.g., visual or performing art, or literature presented in the form of peer-reviewed publications, juried exhibits, noteworthy performances, readings or recordings, solo exhibits); commissioned or collected works (e.g., commissions for creative work; works collected by public and private museums and galleries); development of new technologies, materials, methods, or educational approaches (e.g., patents, inventions, new statistical techniques.) As with scholarly work, extra weight should be associated with work initiated and completed subsequent to joining the faculty at UPS.
- Impact on the nominee's discipline or field of study.
- Contributions to the university, profession, and wider community.
- National and/or international peer recognition of scholarly contributions.