

UNIVERSITY SENATE ANNUAL COMMITTEE REPORT

Committee Name: *University Scholarship* 2016-17

Number of Meetings Held this Year: _____ 3 _____

Committee Chair: _____ Douglas Mann _____

Committee Members: (list here)

Gina Gondos	Nadia Rahin	
Melanie Alverio	Joy Wiltenburg	
Mildred Rodriguez		
Nancy Buhner		
Greg Biren		
Bethany Gummo		
Laurie Ann Haines		
Charalampos Papachristou		

Purpose of/Charge to Committee:

Awarding of foundation scholarships

Summary of Activities this Year:

We met in the fall to introduce ourselves, talk about the charge of the committee and to show the process of awarding scholarships. We also discussed the grading rubric. Work was done with “awardspring” to finalize all of the applicants. We met again in early spring to discuss the process and then in late spring for deliberations.

UNIVERSITY SENATE ANNUAL COMMITTEE

SUGGESTIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

University Scholarship Committee

2016-17

SUGGESTIONS:

lets separate out the points for grammar and for content rather that have them combined initially and then we can put back together for total score—maybe 1,2,3 for grammar and 1 through 7 for the content and substance of the essay

1) Recommendation letters: It would be important to collect information as to who is the person who wrote the recommendation and what is their relationship to the applicant. I had couple application where I was not given even

the name of the recommender and some where the recommender mentioned that they were the candidates mother, uncle, etc.

2) Extracurricular activities:

- a. Can we come up with a more concrete guiding lines? Are we looking for volunteering type of activities? Many applicants mentioned things like their work and or watching TV etc.
- b. Also, a clearer grading rubric would be great! I had applicants who said they worked at a store, to which I gave 1/5, while the same student received 4/5 by the other reviewer. Given that a lot of time the recipient was no more than 1-2 points away from the runner ups, I think consistency is important!
- c. What are the criteria for leadership in this rubric? Does being a member of a club suffice?

3) Obviously, as you pointed out, there is a need about a better rubric on the essay.

4) GPA rubric:

- a. Can we clarify what ranges get 10, 9, etc? For example 3.9-4.0 is 10, etc. Right now it says 4.0 is 10, which I took it to literally mean 4.0 not 3.99...
- b. Do we want to give that much weight to the GPA (about 25% of the score)? Just was wondering...

5) Clarification of what happens with the money. Does it go towards the Tuition/fees of this current academic year or next? Since we award them that late in the academic year, what happens to those students who already paid their bills? Do they get reimbursed? Do they carry a surplus to the next year? If the latter is the case, how does it work with Seniors? Is it even worth awarding them to Seniors? Should we flat out tell seniors that they do not qualify?

I would suggest that we schedule our meetings in a computer lab to deliberate scholarships. This way everyone can be in front of a computer. Depending on the room (I recommend the lab on the second floor or James), your screen could be projected for all of us to see while also having the board space.

I would also like to know where exactly Award spring is pulling it's information on the students' profile, specifically their GPA. Does it accurately connect ty Banner?

RECOMMENDATIONS: