

**Faculty Awards Committee
Annual Report for 2006-2007**

Completed work:

Following the procedures in the Faculty Policies and Procedures Manual, nominations and supporting materials were obtained for the awards listed below.

Junior Faculty Award: 6 people nominated (with one person receiving 3 independent nomination letters and another receiving 2 nomination letters)

Starke Award: 3 people nominated

The committee thought that the evaluation criteria in the Faculty Manual were rather vague and left room for a variety of interpretations. We wanted to decide ahead of time how we were going to evaluate the nominees in a consistent manner and how we would attempt to weight the three areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. The summary of the meeting where we decided this is provided as an addendum to this report, for reference for future members of this committee.

After independent review and evaluation of the nomination files, the committee then met to discuss the nominations. The committee made recommendations to the Provost for these awards which will be presented at Commencement 2007.

The committee felt that it would have been helpful to see a scholarship example for each nominee. It is recommended that next year the chair of this committee suggests to each nominee that it would be appropriate and helpful to submit one scholarship example, if possible, as additional support material for the nomination file. While there were some complaints from previous years about the volume of information that was required to be submitted, the committee felt that all this information was helpful and necessary to fairly evaluate the nominations. We do not recommend reducing the required materials, even though we do understand that the preparation of these materials may require a lot of time on the part of the person who was nominated.

Pending business:

The committee met to discuss a proposal for new awards to be given at convocation, to replace the Fuqua Teaching Excellence Awards. Before finishing the follow-up details for our proposal, we learned that there were concerns about the selection process of previous awards. We were advised by the Provost to take the necessary time to get all the information and to develop a better plan, aiming to first begin awards in Fall 2008. Several members of the committee recently met with the Provost to discuss this (April 16), and we have not yet had sufficient time to work on any more details for this. We now understand that the Maude Glenn Raiford Teaching Award could be continued beginning in Fall 2008 and plan to draft a proposal requesting continued funding of this award, in lieu of the creation of new teaching awards. Also, it was discussed that a good plan for the future would be to move the awarding of the Starke and Junior Faculty awards to convocation, instead of at graduation. More details regarding this proposal will be forthcoming. Information about any further progress towards a proposal will be passed on to next year's committee so that they may continue this work and hopefully submit a proposal next year.

Faculty Awards Committee Addendum to Annual Report (2006-2007)

Summary of discussion regarding the criteria for evaluating the nominations for the Starke and Junior Faculty Awards:

We agreed that all three areas of teaching, scholarship, and service should be considered for both awards. Even though one could interpret the reading in the Faculty Manual to say that only one or two areas of excellence would be sufficient, we decided that the awards should go to people who are able to exhibit excellence in all three areas. We also ended up concluding that we should weight the three areas on approximately equal footing (i.e. 1/3 each), to look for the “all-around package deal.” We decided not to assign the bulk of the weight to teaching only because we will be proposing the new convocation awards that we decided should be specifically focused on teaching.

While it is probably not possible to have all of us use a common rubric for scoring, you may do so for each of the three areas, if you feel it would help you to attain the appropriately equal weighting. For example, you may wish to rate each area on a scale from one to five, and then add up the score for each of the three areas to get a total score for each person. This is just one possibility and you may devise whatever method you feel helps you to achieve an overall rating that considers all three areas.

It is inevitable that we will all have different opinions on the quality of scholarship, service, and teaching and we each need to make our own judgement calls. However, we did discuss several points that we thought should be considered as we attempt to evaluate and compare candidates. These points are listed below in no particular priority order.

Teaching:

- evidence of successes, innovations, etc.
- evidence of being engaged and good at teaching
- teaching evaluations should be good, with no seriously low numbers of concern
- evidence of high academic standards

Service:

- evidence of active committee participation – served as chair or other evidence of accomplishments
- higher value if includes something outside of just departmental committees (this could be university committees, but could also be working with student groups, professional societies, special projects/events, etc.) – we noted that especially within the College of Arts and Sciences, there are not enough university committees for everyone to be assigned to participate in one of these, so it shouldn't be held against someone for not being on a university committee, as long as they are involved in something else

Scholarship:

- evidence of ongoing and significant scholarly involvement (presentations are one possible line of evidence, but other indicators are also possible)
- we thought that even for the junior award there should be evidence of publication (at least in press/accepted)