FACULTY SENATE COMMITTEE ON STUDENT & FACULTY HONORS
December 13, 2002

MINUTES

105 Hullihen Hall 1:00 – 2:30p.m.

Members Present: Claudio Spiguel, Bob Davis, Katherine Kerrane, Ken Campbell, Steve Hastings, Vic Kaliakin, Shelly Provost-Craig, Linda Gottfredson (Chair)

I. Approval of the Minutes of November 22, 2002 – Approved as written

II. Proposals to MIS Students – Claudio Spiguel reported that the MIS Department faculty from the College of Business and Economics welcomed the proposals from the Honors committee but cautioned that students will be able to select from multiple proposals. However, he thought that it would be likely that students will choose to work on the committee’s proposal because it is an on-campus project.

III. Progress Report on Database and Website – Linda Gottfredson reported that she is working with Joy Lynam of Information Technologies, MIS, to improve one aspect of the web nomination process for the Excellence Awards. Specifically, they will get a computer file from HR of the names of all fulltime faculty and graduate students in order to create some sort of pull-down mechanism for entering a nominee’s name on the web form. This will eliminate the very time-consuming task of verifying the eligibility and actual name and status of all persons nominated.

IV. Progress Report from subcommittee on University Honors Day Booklet (Bob Davis, Katherine Kerrane, Pablo Huq, Ken Campbell, Shelly Provost-Craig)
Bob reported that the subcommittee had met and proposed that the Honor’s day booklet be modified in the following manner:

a. University awards first
b. College awards that require institutional endorsement (Truman, Goldwater etc.). Also include the Alison award, provided timing of Alison award is changed to a Fall award (currently it is awarded too late in the spring to be included).
c. Take Intercollegiate awards and place them in the appropriate College
d. Move Department awards to an insert

Each subcommittee member was assigned 1-2 Colleges to meet with to ascertain the significance and nature of the awards given by the Colleges.
V. **Welcome to Alison Professors:** The Committee welcomed Alison professors Wayne Craven, Art History, and Stanley Sandler, Chemical Engineering.

Drs. Sandler and Craven proposed that past Alison professors be included in the selection process for the Alison award. There are @ 20 Alison professors from a variety of disciplines that could assist the committee. They commented that they could sift through the majority of the applicants and select the top three candidates.

Linda Gottfredson stated that the committee typically receives only 3-4 applications annually. This is despite that fact that each College may forward one candidate and Arts and Sciences may forward three. In addition, many nominators submit an incomplete file. Often times they don’t provide evidence of excellence as a “schoolmaster”. In addition, there is a need for the Arts and Science Dean to rank the candidates from that college. Drs. Sandler and Craven stated that they would be happy to help in the recruiting more nominations for the Alison Award.

Dr. Sandler referred to the University’s Board of Directors resolution creating the Alison award, which stated that it only required that the candidate “make notable contributions to his/her field of study,” that is, to scholarship. Both Drs. Craven and Sandler didn’t feel teaching should be a significant part of the award and that this needed to be clarified.

Linda Gottfredson indicated that the research component outweighs the teaching component but that an earlier investigation of the history and nature of the award indicated that there does need to be evidence of meritorious teaching, either by having an impact on students entering the field or on UD’s own educational programs. Bob Davis commented that there is only a slight emphasis on teaching (15-20%) versus an 80-85% emphasis on scholarship. Linda also clarified what it means to make a “contribution to the field of study.” In this instance, “contribution to the field of study” was meant to include teaching and research, not just scholarship, because Francis Alison had a reputation as both a schoolmaster and scholar in his field. Linda also explained that the candidates’ files are confidential and therefore it would be inappropriate for the Alison faculty to review them. In addition, the committee’s composition is subject to Faculty Senate ruling. Thus, additions to the committee could only be made by the Faculty Senate.

VII. The committee thanked the Alison faculty representatives for attending and offering to assist the committee in recruiting more and better nominations, and the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully Submitted,
Michelle Provost-Craig