Minutes  
Faculty Senate Committee on Student and Faculty Honors  
8.30-10.00 a.m., April 16, 2004

Members Present: Linda Gottfredson (Chair), Shelly Provost Craig, Pablo Huq,  
Bob Davis, Katharine Kerrane, Christina Smiraglia, Phillip Flynn, Diane Wright, Jim  
Scarborough

I. Selection of day's recorder.  
II. Minutes were approved after correcting one mistake.  
III. The committee welcomed Jim Scarborough as its new member.  
IV. Review/preview of committee’s work: The committee reviewed accomplishments for the  
last few years and tasks for the coming year. Linda will draft an annual report to reflect  
both.  
V. Honors Day Booklet and Awards Notifications:  
   a. Bob reported that a review of the 400 awards listed in the University Honors Day  
program identified 4 race-based awards. The 3 involving funds co-mingled with UD  
funds will be excluded per the new University policy, and the sponsor of the 4th has  
decided not to make that award on Honors Day. The criteria for approving new  
awards for inclusion in the University Honors Day program, which are  
posted on our website, will now read “Awards may not be restricted by race or  
ethnicity.” When queried about gender, Bob said it is not an issue, and that the  
few awards once restricted to women no longer seem to be.  
   b. Christina reported that students who are notified of winning an award often do not  
know what the award is, or even what department has given it to them. Couldn’t the  
notification letters that the colleges send to awardees routinely provide some  
basic information about the award? Bob strongly agreed.  
   c. Bob went on to say that there has long been a need for someone to coordinate  
such information of awards and scholarships across units, and that the University  
is hiring someone for a new “donor relations” position. The Honors Day Program  
should include a line or two about the history of each award and the person it is  
named after. It should also have an index.  
   d. Linda and Jim confirmed that even recipients of the Excellence Awards are told  
little to nothing about their awards, when they will be conferred, and the like. This  
committee has wrongly assumed that someone else provides them this  
information. The committee agreed that it should determine what celebratory  
rewards and duties recipients have, make brief reference to them in the letter  
notifying individuals they have won, and advise awardees in that letter to contact  
their dean for further detail.  

VI. Alison Award:  
   a. The committee will be selecting the Alison Award recipient at its next meeting, so  
it reviewed the criteria for the award (posted on the website) and the schedule for  
when and where the dossiers would be available. Linda will notify everyone when  
they become available.
b. There was also a discussion about whether the committee should state more specifically the forms of evidence nominators should submit (number of doctoral students supervised, etc.). The sense of the committee was that its call for nominations might point nominators to highly useful forms of evidence by saying that it welcomes documentation from national and international sources, but that individuals are eminent in different ways. It is also up to the committee (and perhaps someone in the dean’s office) to separate the glitter from the substance.

VII. Criteria for Excellence Awards:

a. The committee had a long discussion-debate about whether the traditional criteria for the awards continue to fulfill the original intent of the awards, and whether they even should, now that the definition of “faculty” has changed in fundamental ways. The committee therefore tabled a draft motion, based on the sense of the committee at its last meeting, that would restrict the majority of the awards to tenure-track faculty. It decided it needed more information about the workload and tenure status of faculty at UD.

Respectfully submitted,
Linda S. Gottfredson