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|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **AGENDA ITEM** | **DISCUSSION** | **ACTION TAKEN** |
| Graduate Student Research Awards | F. Sansosti chaired the meeting in N. Barbour’s absence.  The main focus of the meeting was the review and awarding of the Graduate Research Awards. He shared there were only two master’s students that had been nominated. Of the two one nominee clearly surpassed the other as evidenced by the evaluations.    **Master’s Award: Mandy Ulicney**  The group discussed the issues with the review process and the evaluation system used. With the scoring system used it was impossible to use the total scoring or total percentage to determine a winner. The following were the two top and were basically equal:  Emily Fickes  Stephanie Burns  There was discussion on both of these submissions as far as quality, publications and quality of publications. Their dissertations were also discussed. The top three nominees were very close in points.  There was a unanimous decision on an award:  **Doctoral Award: Stephanie Burns**  Suggestions for improvement for the next award:   * Define the requirements more clearly * Nominee definitely needs to have been published (would be nice to know the level of involvement in the publication). There was discussion that there may be students that have not been published. It was suggested that it could be a helpful process for the student to apply for the award. * Would be helpful if the person nominating them (the advisor) have a discussion with the student regarding publishing and research productivity. This would also help the student. * May be helpful to require the student have one independently done paper. * Minimums – should actually be maximums. This would help the student to choose their best work. * Vitas should be evaluated and scored * Should stress independence as a researcher. * Submissions weren’t really labeled * Difficult lining documents up. Next time need to setup a different section for submission and review of each type of artifacts requested as separate pieces. (Reviewers had difficulty figuring out which document was meant for which portion. * Suggested it be setup as though they were applying for a position. Use of a cover letter. * Need to stress brevity. * Room for comments on the scoring sheet. Scoring methodology was difficult. * Discussion that comments could help students, but this may lead to problems with why advisor is not making these suggestions.   Would like to see all applicants congratulated for applying. Also suggested that a letter be sent to the student that they had been nominated to be added to their vita.  Students not submitting the appropriate documentation will not be evaluated. Committee would also like to see them receive a letter that this was why they were not evaluated. |  |

The meeting was adjourned at 10:04 am

Next meeting: April 23, 2012, 9:30-10:30 am, WH-Rm 507M

Respectfully submitted

Luci Wymer, Recorder