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Lectures Committee
The Lectures Committee works with the Office of the Provost to fund events (including lectures, seminars and symposia), addressing topics that are of interest to the campus-wide community and that address campus-wide priorities, including reviewing applications for the Chancellor's Distinguished Visitors Program.

The Lectures Committee makes two types of allocations:

- **Standard** - funding to support lectures, seminars and symposia of value to the campus community.
- **Chancellor's Distinguished Visitors Program** - funding to bring in prominent scholars to participate in academic programs, research and engagement with the campus community.

Members
Megan Moore, Chair and Associate Professor, French
Moises Arce, Professor, Political Science; Beth Brendler, Assistant Professor, Information Science & Learning Technologies; Julia Crim, Professor, Radiology; Carl Stacy, Assistant Professor, Clinical Pathology & Anatomic Pathology; Ashley Granger, Library Specialist Sr, MU Libraries; Barbara Wills, Business Support Specialist Sr., Conference Office/CE; Maxwell Cook, Student; Monica Madden, Student, Journalism; Mary Mertes, Student, Economics; Eryn Adams, Graduate Student, Psychology
Michelle Marsden, Administrative support

# of times committee met: 4

The Lectures Committee was charged with reviewing applications for both Standard Lectures Applications (for which the maximum award was $750) as well as the Chancellor’s Distinguished Visitors Program (maximum award $5000). The committee worked over the course of the academic year to use the new procedures put in place by the committee last year to evaluate applications. We circulated evaluation guidelines by email and introduced the committee to its charge before the first submission deadline so that these newly-developed procedures and criteria for evaluating applications would be clear over the four subsequent meetings, once for each of the application deadlines. During the year, we reviewed our application evaluation procedures and revised the application form to bring it up-to-date.

This committee met in person approximately ten days after each of the four deadlines for 1 ½ hours. Before each meeting, committee members provided the Administrative Assistant with a non-binding rating of 1-4 for each of the applications, with 4 being the best rating. In the meeting, the Administrative Assistant provided committee members with a chart summarizing ratings for the relevant deadline. The sum of each committee member’s ratings for each application was used as a starting point for discussion. When an application had a strong total rating, we discussed that application more quickly, if at all (and mostly to norm criteria for decisions about funding allocation). This allowed us to focus our discussion time on the applications that had lower ratings (and/or more disparate rankings) and spend less time discussing applications for which there was already broad support from the committee for funding. This helped the meetings to be more efficient.

I am providing a brief summary below of the number of applications for each deadline and the proportion of applications that were fully funded, not funded or partially funded. The committee agreed that passing
along this data could help future committees in making judgements about how much funding to allocate in a given quarter, in order to allocate all available funds in a given academic year, but not run out of money before the last deadline. In most cases, we rejected applications either because the department or unit had previously received lectures funding in the academic year or because there was no evidence of broad campus appeal for the event.

September 1 deadline:
- Chancellor’s Distinguished Visitors Program (CDVP): 5 applications  
  Outcome: 4 fully funded, 1 rejected
- Standard Lectures (SL): 8 applications  
  Outcome: 5 fully funded, 1 partially funded, 2 rejected

November 1 deadline:
- Chancellor’s Distinguished Visitors Program (CDVP): 5 applications  
  Outcome: 1 fully funded, 2 partially funded, 2 rejected
- Standard Lectures (SL): 1 application  
  Outcome: 1 fully funded

February 1 deadline:
- Chancellor’s Distinguished Visitors Program (CDVP): 6 applications  
  Outcome: 1 fully funded
- Standard Lectures (SL): 1 application  
  Outcome: 1 fully funded

April 1 deadline:
- Chancellor’s Distinguished Visitors Program (CDVP): 1 application  
  Outcome: 1 fully funded
- Standard Lectures (SL): 2 applications  
  Outcome: 2 fully funded

Annual Budget for 2017-18:
- CDVP: $28,000   (amount remaining end of year $0)
- SL: $7,500    (amount remaining end of year $0)

Recommendations for next year:
To better serve our funding allocation, we recommend that we move from four to three deadlines. We recognize that in the past two years, the majority of requests for funding have come in the fall semester, with fewer requests being made in February and still fewer in April. This year, there were only three requests for funding in April. The general consensus of the committee was that we would prefer to have more funds at our disposal three times a year than have the fourth deadline, which often falls after Spring semester programming has already happened. To that end, we propose maintaining the first three current funding deadlines, but eliminating the fourth one. We propose the following dates:
  September 1   November 1   February 1

Throughout the year, committee members were pleased to play a role in supporting the enrichment of culture on our campus. It was a pleasure to chair this committee.

Megan Moore  
Chair, Lectures Committee and Associate Professor of French