

# Awards for Excellence

## MINUTES

OCTOBER 6, 2008

3:00 PM

POLYCOM: TRF 545 EGF 106

MEETING CALLED BY	Norma Konschak & Hank Roehrick
TYPE OF MEETING	Meeting to review applications for Collage Faculty Awards for Excellence
NOTE TAKER	Renne Kringlen
ATTENDEES	Kent Hanson, Hank Roehrick, Norma Konschak, Jennifer Dahlen, Terry Wiseth, Jack Haymond, Becky Lindseth

## Agenda topics

### 1. AWARDING OF FUNDS

DISCUSSION	\$142,704.00 total allocation to Faculty Awards for Excellence.
CONCLUSIONS	Committee will limit awards in 1 <sup>st</sup> round (October) to \$75,000.

### 2. MULTIPLE APPLICATIONS

DISCUSSION	Committee discussed how to work with multiple applications.
CONCLUSIONS	Committee determined that each application would be evaluated on its own merit without regard to whether the author had submitted multiple applications.

### 3. APPLICATIONS OF COMMITTEE MEMBERS

DISCUSSION	Committee discussed how to fairly evaluate the applications that were submitted by members of the committee.
CONCLUSIONS	Committee determined for fair, unbiased treatment, when the applications submitted by members of the committee were reviewed, the author would leave the meeting and the remaining members of the committee would evaluate and recommended to accept, reject or make suggestions to improve the proposal.

### 4. COMMITTEES POSITION ON AWARDS FOR EXCELLENCE

DISCUSSION	Committee discussed guiding principles for applications.
CONCLUSIONS	Committee agreed that the following criteria would be considered in reviewing the applications. <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The application must be an original proposal, not a repeat or continuation of a prior award for excellence project.</li><li>2. Proposals for the development of study guides and lab manuals will be given a lower priority; committee is concerned that the benefit to students should be more than the monetary benefit of saving on the cost of the textbook.</li><li>3. Proposals for new program development will not be considered; the awards are to provide an impact on student learning in the fiscal period expended.</li><li>4. Proposals that appeared to substitute faculty activities for the work currently assigned to student services will not be considered.</li></ol>

5. RESULTS OF COMMITTEE REVIEW OF APPLICATIONS

DISCUSSION	Committee review 18 applications
CONCLUSIONS	3 applications approved, 13 applications rejected, 2 applications returned with suggestions for improvement.
One application that was returned with suggestions for improvement was withdrawn by author.	
Second application that was returned with suggestions was given an Oct. 24 <sup>th</sup> due date to resubmit application.	
<b>AI Swanson’s resubmitted proposal was denied by email vote 11/12/08.</b>	

SPECIAL NOTES	The grid that details the applications and their approval/rejection status is included.
---------------	---