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I. University Awards

1. After a lean year in nominees in 2014-2015, the Honorary Degree and Awards Committee (HDAC) promoted a greater information blitz in December and January, including more announcements from the Faculty Senate office, more university wide memos from the chair, and more appearances and announcements by HDAC members at their department meetings and faculty assemblies. The result was over 101 nominations this year, a near doubling of the number of nominations over the previous year.
2. The committee implemented criteria from the previous year for all the awards, both with respect to requests by nominators and the items requested of applicants.
3. Distributions of applications came from the following categories:
* Teaching – 32
* Librarianship – 2
* Advising & Mentoring – 15
* Service – 9
* Engagement – 5
* Research – 38.

We evaluated all these files according to the criteria and have made recommendations to the Provost for the successful candidates for awards. When these are approved, we will send letters to the unsuccessful nominees.

1. In the meantime, HDAC members took notes during the application and review process to make recommendations for university awards for 2016-17. The HDAC named the following themes to be discussed and reviewed ahead of the next cycle of university awards:
* Revisions with respect to the kinds of artifacts we request
* The questions we ask of nominees
* The allocations of awards within categories
* Rubrics for how we make decisions, which are to be shared with the university
* How submission materials are communicated to the faculty on the Faculty Senate website
* Beta-testing of the materials submission website.

 The HDAC left this process with 2 concerns to be addressed in 2016-17:

* The distribution of awards across colleges
* The allocation of research awards without such skew toward the Sciences.
1. A key regular point of discussion has been the Service and Engagement awards, as these seem difficult for committee members to tease out as different. As a result, the HDAC recommends to both the Faculty Senate and the Provost’s Office that these be conflated into a single award. The leftover award may be added to the list of research awards

II. Honorary Degrees

 We have received three nominations for honorary degrees. We forwarded two to the Faculty Senate, both of which were approved. We have one more to be acted upon at a date beyond this report.

 Additional nominations have come to the committee from outside the university, including one self-nomination. As honorary degree nominations are to come from the Faculty, these nominations are sent to committee members to be addressed with their departments, colleges, or units. One has already been rejected, and the other two will go for review this summer.

III. Additional Awards

 The HDAC was contacted with respect to developing a teaching award for instructors of Gateway courses. As the workload intensity nearly doubled from that of a year ago, the HDAC voted not to address this award at this time. As a result, at least for now, both the Adjunct Award and any Gateway Award will be handled outside the HDAC.

IV. Conclusion

 This year was a learning and growing year for the committee. It is comprised generally with members with no more than 2 years on the committee, including its chair. Nevertheless, we are pleased with the assertiveness and commitment of the committee to offering timely results.

 Issues arising from handling university awards, honorary degrees, and additional awards have yielded a thick and challenging agenda for the following year.

 A key result of our work is that we have the opportunity to learn about the numerous contributions of our coworkers in ways we could never imagine. We have discovered that we really enjoy and appreciate the efforts of our colleagues and have much to be proud of at our institution.

 As chair, I am pleased to work with fine colleagues across our campuses, who engage seriously and dedicatedly toward positive results.

 I therefore thank Patrick Cassidy, Lynne Farber, Angelique Ortega Fridman, Hector Fuentes, Juan González, Sarah Hammill, Richard Palmer, Karen Paul, Jeremy Petitt, Leslie Richardson, and Marcia Varella for their kindness, their attention to detail, their fine questions, and their expeditiousness in communication.