



Honorary Degree and Awards Committee

ANNUAL REPORT 2016-2017

I. University Awards

A. The following goals were named at the end of the 2015-2016 academic year with respect to the Honorary Degree and Awards Committee (HDAC) processes:

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 principal concerns to be addressed:

- The distribution of awards across colleges
- The allocation of research awards without such skew toward the Sciences.

HDAC then engaged in the fall to design and put forward rubrics for all awards such that nominees might have access to judgment criteria ahead of their application composition and subsequent to award decisions, should they request feedback from the committee.

Rubric design, upload to the Faculty Senate website, beta testing (which was a substantial task), and implementation necessitated two months extra time this year, thereby pushing back the application dates for awards for the academic year. As a result, application packages deadlines came in March this year.

With the new material in place, we expect the timeline for nominations and application materials to return to the December to February timeline of previous years in the 2017-2018 academic year.

B. In spite of the lateness of the process this year, 91 nominations were taken for awards, only a decrease of 10 from the previous year.

C. Distributions of nominations came from the following categories:

- Teaching – 25 (down from 32)
- Librarianship – 3
- Advising & Mentoring – 23 (up from 15)
- Service – 6 (down from 9)
- Engagement – 6
- Research – 28 (down from 38).

We evaluated all these files according to the rubric 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. Unlike previous years, though, applicants will have the opportunity to request feedback relative to scoring with respect to the rubrics.

II. Honorary Degrees

We received eight nominations for honorary degrees. We forwarded four to the Faculty Senate, all of which are 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. Two nominations have been

declined, and two more have been tabled with respect to requests for additional information.

III. Conclusion

The process of putting forth new criteria and scoring levied an extensive amount of time in composing rubrics, beta testing, and revision. The information going to faculty is not yet perfect, as we have received feedback regarding conflicting information. We shall take steps to make appropriate revisions and welcome further feedback to assert that info on one page is copacetic with that on another.

We also shall place on our agenda for the following year an effort to compose an initial set of by-laws for the committee.

As chair, I am pleased to work with fine colleagues across our campuses, who work tirelessly to bring forth key decisions.

I therefore thank Erica Caton, Hector Fuentes, Sushil Gupta, Sarah Hammill, Leslie Richardson, Victor Uribe, Jorge Valdes, Marcia Varella, and Barbara Watts for their kindness, their attention to detail, their fine questions, and their expeditiousness in communication.