

# Faculty Senate

[Faculty Senate](#) » [Committees/Councils](#) » [Faculty Recognition & Awards Committee](#) » [Faculty Recognition & Awards Committee](#) » Annual Report 2006-2007

## Faculty Recognition & Awards Committee

### Annual Report 2007-2008

To: Lynda Ciuffetti, Faculty Senate President  
From: Steven Ortiz, Chair  
Subject: Faculty Recognition and Awards Committee Annual report

The members of the 2006-2007 Faculty Recognition and Awards Committee were George Keller, Alex Sanchez, Michelle Mahana, Vreneli Farber, and Kris Rosenberg.

Responding to the committee's recommendations in last year's annual report, we met on November 27, 2007, to address the overall consistency, reduction of confusion, and simplification of information in the criteria sheets and nomination forms, and reviewed all of the awards before the call for nominations. Other recommendations were addressed in this year's nomination and evaluation process.

We undertook our usual review in May 2008 and selected fourteen award recipients. As a result of this year's nomination and evaluation process, the committee has identified a number of recommendations, and suggested that a fall orientation meeting (2008) would be beneficial for the new committee in addressing these recommendations and other related issues.

Generally, in an effort to minimize and decrease confusion, these suggestions are recommended:

- Additional changes should be made in the wording and in parts of the formats in the criteria sheets and nomination forms in some of the awards.
- Specify in the nomination packets that all submitted materials will not be returned.
- Because some of the recommendation letters were not signed, it was strongly suggested that the signature issue be addressed.
- In view of the large number of letters submitted, it was suggested that the number of letters should be standardized and limited to three.
- Given the different levels of specialization and expertise of some of the applicants for certain awards, it was suggested that changes in wording may be necessary to more accurately evaluate their qualifications, or to possibly consider creating more specific categories within the same awards or to create new but related awards.
- In light of the minimal number of nominations in some of the awards, it was suggested that an effort be made to proactively generate more interest in the awards, and to make the nomination process itself more user-friendly.
- After the nominations are completed and the award recipients are identified, it was suggested that a procedure be instituted to ensure that there is a follow-up to inform all nominators of the results, to thank them for their participation in the nomination process, and to recommend that some of the applicants (who were not selected) be nominated again next year for the same awards or—because they may be more qualified—for other awards.

After meeting with Meagan Thomas, student member of the Committee on Committees, during a five-year review of the Faculty Recognition and Awards Committee, it was suggested that the Standing Rules page be revised and meeting minutes be provided. In addition, regarding the Faculty Recognition & Awards Committee web page contained within the Faculty Senate website, it was suggested that a new link be created and titled Internal Guidelines or Internal Policies. This link would provide additional information and a current and informative list of all awards.