University Enrichment Committee End of Year Report
2014-2015

MEMBERSHIP:

Faculty: Roger Allen (spring Faculty Research subcommittee chair), Terry Beck,
Erin Colbert-White (spring Student Research subcommittee chair), Mark Martin (spring only),
Dawn Padula (chair), Sara Shapiro (fall only—fall Student Research subcommittee chair),
Jess Smith (fall Faculty Research subcommittee chair), and Randy Worland
Students: Kabir Jensen, Aaron Pomerantz
Ex Officio: Sunil Kukreja (Associate Dean)
Senate Liaison: Maria Sampen

MEETING DATES:

Fall 2014: September 9, October 7, November 4 and December 2
Spring 2015: January 28, February 18, March 11, March 25, April 22 and April 29

GENERAL UEC ACTIVITY:

The UEC successfully completed all of the regular yearly duties assigned, including evaluating and awarding student research proposals in the fall (November) and spring (April), evaluating and awarding faculty research proposals in the fall (December) and spring (March), hosting the Regester Lecture (November), evaluating and awarding Release Time Awards for faculty (February), determining the recipient of the Dirk Andrew Phibbs Award (March), and the evaluation of applications for the purpose of selecting the 2016 Regester Lecturer (April).

SENATE CHARGES:

The senate charges to the 2014-2015 University Enrichment Committee were as follows:

1. Continue to pursue ways to showcase creative and scholarly work that is supported by UEC funding.
2. Continue to pursue the implementation of a Scholarship Award that directly parallels the existing Teaching Awards.
3. Investigate the feasibility and desirability of implementing three separate application deadlines for three separate funding periods.
4. Formalize and publicize rules for a streamlined application for UEC summer student research support.
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.

UEC ACTIONS IN RESPONSE TO SENATE CHARGES:

1. Continue to pursue ways to showcase creative and scholarly work that is supported by UEC funding.

The consensus of the UEC is that there are already actions in place to disseminate and showcase the creative and scholarly work supported by the UEC. Sunil Kukreja reported to the committee that his office is in the habit of forwarding information regarding particularly noteworthy or significant projects that come to the UEC for funding directly to the Office of Communications. In addition, all members are in agreement that dissemination of noteworthy projects happens as a result of the committee supporting publications, travel for student or faculty presentations, or ongoing research that results in a published paper, project or presentation. It was also agreed that the UEC itself (in particular the UEC webpage) is likely not the most effective or appropriate venue to disseminate information on supported work.

The committee did agree, however, that an additional way of showcasing work supported by the UEC would be to reach out to Dean Bartanen in the hopes of her announcing at the fall faculty dinner the annual recipient of the Dirk Andrew Phibbs Award. The UEC chooses the recipient of this award from the pool of faculty research proposals received throughout the year.[1] The UEC has reached out to Dean Bartanen for this purpose, and have provided her with the award MOU for more background and context.

2. Continue to pursue the implementation of a Scholarship Award that directly parallels the existing Teaching Awards.

The committee learned that the latest version of the document entitled, "Criteria for Faculty Scholarship Award," revised by last year's UEC, was in the possession of the FAC and Dean Bartanen.[2] The consensus amongst the committee was that it was worthwhile to reach out to Dean Bartanen and the FAC once more to reiterate the UEC's endorsement of implementing such an award. Similarly to the sentiment of last year's committee, this year's UEC agreed that the FAC has a more comprehensive view of faculty scholarship and would be the appropriate body to identify awardees.

The UEC followed-through on reaching out to Dean Bartanen about this, and she responded positively, stating that the FAC plans to recommend a junior and a senior research award recipient for recognition at the Fall Faculty Dinner.

---

[1] The recipient is notified of this distinction in the form of a letter from the UEC. There is no money, as of yet, associated with this award. Though, the understanding is that eventually, there will be. The faculty members of the UEC choose the recipient from the yearly pool of received faculty research award proposals in accordance with the guidelines outlined in the provided award MOU.

[2] The document "Criteria for Faculty Scholarship Award" is attached to this report.

3. Investigate the feasibility and desirability of implementing three separate application deadlines for three separate funding periods.

After consulting with faculty members in the sciences about the desirability of a third application deadline, the committee learned that there are indeed students who would benefit from a third, early deadline that is designed for research to be completed in the fall semester.[3]

It was also suggested by those faculty members consulted that the best time for a third, early deadline would be somewhere in the third week of the term.

The committee approved to implement a new deadline in the third week of the semester, effective fall 2015—the caveat being that the efficacy of the specified deadline could be reviewed after the first year of implementation.

4. Formalize and publicize rules for a streamlined application for UEC summer student research support.

To gather more information about this topic, Sunil Kukreja and Dawn Padula met with Leslie Saucedo in the fall to talk about how to go about streamlining the UEC Student Research Award application to better facilitate those also applying for the Summer Research Grant in Science and Mathematics. The issue in the past has been that there is a quick turnaround between a student finding out the status of their Summer Research Grant proposal and then meeting the spring UEC deadline, if needed.[4] Streamlining would allow those applying to the latter to quickly and efficiently also apply to the UEC for support.

At that meeting, it was determined that the primary difference between the UEC application and the Summer Research Grant in Science and Mathematics application was the length (the application length is shorter in the former). The proposed solution would allow students applying to both to use the same application.

The UEC decided to add the following question to the UEC Student Research Award application in lieu of asking those applying for both for a new cover letter (as suggested by last year's committee):

"Have you submitted this exact proposal to the Summer Research Grant in Science and Mathematics? ___yes ___no"

---

[3] The established deadlines for student research are currently in November (typically for work to be completed in the spring semester) and in April (typically for work to be completed in the summer).

[4] Some students who receive Summer Research stipends often also then apply to the UEC to receive support for project supplies. Others may also apply for a UEC award if they did not receive a Summer Research grant.

It would be understood that those who answered "yes" could submit longer proposals to the UEC without penalty. The committee approved this change and the new question will be included in the applications effective fall 2015.[5]

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.

The consensus of the UEC is that none of the work is superfluous and that the size of the committee (seven faculty members, including a chair, two student members, and the Ex Officio member) was ideal.

In this discussion, it was noted that due to the growing number of student research award applications received every semester (there were 32 in the fall and 49 in the spring), that next year's committee could try having all members read all of the applications for both faculty and student research—this is in lieu of breaking into faculty and student research subcommittees. This way, the workload of the smaller subcommittees would be divided more evenly, and that by having all members of the committee participate in all processes, the passing on of historical knowledge and precedence in terms of process from committee to committee would become more fluid.

As for the work of the committee on the whole, the UEC members all agree that work related to reading proposals and awarding money for support of faculty and student travel and research in both the fall and spring, granting the available Release Time Awards to faculty, selecting a Dirk Andrew Phibbs Award recipient and selecting a Regester Lecturer is both valuable and essential work.

OTHER NOTEWORTHY UEC ACTIVITY:

1. Proposal to the Budget Task Force

In October, the UEC submitted a proposal to Dean Jackson, Dean Bartanen and the Budget Task Force for a total increase to the budget of $50,000--$35,000 of which would be added to the faculty travel budget, and $15,000 of which would be added to the student research and travel budget.

2. Addition to the Student Research Award Application Regarding IACUC Approval

In the fall, UEC member Erin Colbert-White noted that while our current application for student research awards does ask students to indicate whether they have applied for IRB approval, if necessary, it does not ask if students have applied for IACUC (Institutional Animal Care and Use

---

[5] Point of information: Sunil Kukreja reached out to Leslie Saucedo this past spring, letting her know of the approved change, and informed her that the UEC would accept student research applications in the spring semester that were also used for the Summer Research Grant applications without further editing.

Committee) approval. Wording to this effect was created and then approved by Alyce DeMarais who oversees the university IACUC.

The committee approved to add the new verbiage to the existing application effective this past spring, 2015.

3. UEC Response to Memo Submitted from OT to the Senate and the Creation of a Standardized Rubric for Evaluation

It is our understanding that our liaison, Maria Sampen, reported to the Senate about the content of a meeting with George Tomlin from OT on January 28, 2015. This meeting was in response to the OT faculty memo to the Senate dated December 23, 2014 in regard to UEC awarding practices. In addition, note that the minutes from our January 28, 2015 meeting also provide a clear overview of the conversation that took place between OT and the UEC.[6]

As a result of the conversation with OT, the UEC felt it beneficial to explore streamlining the process for determining student research awards by creating a standardized rubric extracted directly from the current published guidelines in the Student Research Award application. Such a rubric could further solidify the process, and would provide all current and future members of the committee a standardized form to use for evaluation.[7]

UEC Member Terry Beck devised a rubric for this purpose and brought it to the committee for review. After much discussion and fine-tuning, the approved rubric was tested this past April. Student research subcommittee members filled out the rubric and used the newly approved scoring system. They then provided additional feedback to help fine-tune the rubric further.

In the final meeting of the year, the UEC approved to adopt the rubric for the use of Student Research Award evaluations in the future noting that, in the fall, the committee could return to the rubric for further refinement, if needed. It was also noted that any wording in the rubric should be a direct reflection of the wording in the published guidelines. Due to this, the committee also approved to amend the printed application guidelines in the fall to directly reflect the wording used in the amended rubric so that both remain completely in line with one another.[8] The committee also discussed publishing the rubric once finalized.

---

[6] Point of information: Yvonne Swinth wrote another e-mail to Padula on March 24 asking for more information about changes to the published UEC guidelines ahead of the student research deadline and for specific feedback on fall OT applications not funded since those same students would be seeking retroactive funding. In the response, Padula reiterated that the UEC guidelines had not changed in any way and echoed the sentiment of the committee that the UEC is unable to provide individual feedback on applications. UEC Senate liaison, Maria Sampen, was sent a copy of this correspondence.

[7] Though no standardized/printed rubric had been used, it is important to note that everyone evaluating student research proposals to this point have been instructed to score them using an agreed-upon numeric system, and to base their evaluation upon the criteria outlined in the printed guidelines. The process also involves discussion of applications whose scores differentiate greatly from reader to reader. The process has always been objective, but the consensus of the committee is that a printed rubric and a revised scoring system would further streamline and solidify the process.

[8] The most recent version of the rubric is attached to this report.

4. Discussion Surrounding UEC Funding of On-Line Public Access Publication Fees

During our evaluation of faculty research proposals this year, it was noted that there were requests to cover fees for open-assess on-line publications. After further discussion, the consensus was that this is a growing issue since open-access and online publications are becoming more prominent. Our current guidelines stipulate that the UEC will not cover "vanity press" publication charges, but there is not any established criteria published for handling these types of publication cost requests.

Discussion surrounded this issue, including potential ways of handling the issue in the future if necessary. The outcome of the discussion was that next year's UEC could perhaps determine the need for establishing a guideline to this effect and if one was deemed necessary, fleshing it out and publishing it.

SUGGESTED SENATE CHARGES FOR NEXT YEAR'S COMMITTEE:

1. Create a standardized rubric for evaluation of Faculty Research Award applications and reflect any changed wording in the Faculty Research Award application itself.

Such a rubric would mirror the newly-established and adopted rubric for evaluation of Student Research Award applications.

2. Determine the need to establish a guideline for funding on-line public access publication fees.

Please refer to Item #4 under the sub-category "Other Noteworthy UEC Activity" of this report. In addition, the minutes from the meeting on April 22, 2015 can provide further insight into the discussion on the topic thus far.

In addition to Senate Charges, this year's committee requests that next year's committee:

1. Utilize and revisit the attached rubric for evaluating Student Research Award applications for fine-tuning, remembering to reflect any wording changes in the published application.
2. Ask that all committee members read all applications for faculty and student research (in lieu of splitting into subcommittees), thus divvying up the work more equitably amongst members.
3. Consider adding the same IACUC wording added to the Student Research Award application this past year to the Faculty Research Award application if deemed necessary.

CONCLUSION:

The work of the committee this year was extremely focused and productive. In addition to handling the regular duties assigned (which included evaluating 71 student research proposals), this year's UEC also submitted a substantial proposal to the BTF for increased funds, handled all of the Senate charges for the year, hosted the Regester Lecture, responded in a timely manner and comprehensively to a memo written to the Senate by OT questioning UEC Awarding practices, and created and established a rubric for standardization of Student Research Award applications.

It was both an honor and a pleasure to lead this dedicated group of faculty colleagues and students in supporting faculty and student scholarship, creativity and innovation.

Respectfully submitted,

Dawn Padula, DMA
UEC Chair 2014-15
Associate Professor
Director of Vocal Studies
School of Music

APPENDIX I

Criteria for Faculty Scholarship Award[9]

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 pubic 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.

---

[9] This was formulated by the 2013-2014 UEC.

APPENDIX II

Scoring Criteria for Student Research Awards
UEC – University of Puget Sound

Name(s)
Proposal Title:
Amount Requested: Total Score:

Assign a whole number score (e.g., 1, 2, 3) in each of the areas.

Student's Background/Preparedness   Score:
1 - Award proposal gives little evidence of writer's preparation
3 – Award proposal provides evidence that the student is prepared
5 – Award proposal provides evidence that the student is exceedingly well prepared to conduct this research.

Research Purpose, Significance and Rationale   Score:
1 – Research purpose lacks significance or the provided rationale is not directly related to the proposed research
3 – Research purpose is significant and the rationale is clearly related to the proposed research
5 – Research purpose is highly significant and likely to generate new knowledge in the field. The rationale is tightly focused on the proposed research.

Methods of Study   Score:
1 – Study methods are not clearly defined or are inappropriate for this project, **or** their appropriateness to the stated purpose is not articulated.
3 – Study methods are defined and appropriate to the stated purpose.
5 – Study methods are sophisticated and directly address the project's purpose.

Communicating Findings   Score:
1 – Communication plan is vague
3 – Communication plan is specific, doable, and focused.

Budget   Score:
1 – Budget expenses lack justification or fall outside of UEC guidelines
3 – Budget expenses are justified and fall inside UEC guidelines. For requests that exceed the $500 UEC maximum, the proposal explicitly and convincingly notes how the applicant will complete the project if it is not fully funded.

Award requirements are met: Yes   No
If no, please note the requirement(s) that has not be met (e.g., no IRB review).

Holistic Evaluation: Do not fund   Fund if possible   Definitely Fund

Comments: