

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 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. While reviewing a number of applications, I noticed that some applicants were very similar in their responses.