

2-28-2019

Functions and Awards minutes 02/28/2019

Functions and Awards

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/fawards>

Recommended Citation

Functions and Awards, "Functions and Awards minutes 02/28/2019" (2019). *Functions and Awards Committee*. 22.
<https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/fawards/22>

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Campus Governance at University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well. It has been accepted for inclusion in Functions and Awards Committee by an authorized administrator of University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well. For more information, please contact skulann@morris.umn.edu.

Functions and awards
Feb 28 2019, 11:40am-12:40pm
Welcome Center 210

Members present: Kellcee Baker, Lisa Bevevino, Andrew Brichacek, Brandon King, Elena Machkasova (chair), Steven Morgan, Michelle Schamp.

Members absent: Bonnie Gulbrandson

In these minutes:

- 1. Scholar of the College recommendations (includes some follow-ups done by email discussion and vote).***
- 2. Summary of subsequent email discussion and vote for decisions on the nominations for which more information was required.***

There were 31 nominations submitted, of which two were for the same student. 29 students were discussed by all present committee members listed above, 1 was discussed by all present members except Elena Machkasova who is closely related to the nominee.

Prior to the committee meeting all committee members marked all nominations as “recommended”, “not recommended”, “conditionally recommended” (based on submitted work for which an acceptance decision is pending), and “more information needed”.

Committee members who were nominators for a student or had close connections to a student participated in the discussion, but abstained from voting.

1. The motion was made to **recommend** for approval all the nominations (16) which all members marked “recommended”. The motion passed.
2. A motion was made to **conditionally recommend** four nominations based on submitted work for which acceptance is pending (3 CSci, 1 CMR). The motion passed.
3. Three Theatre Arts nominations were discussed. There were many students participating in a theatre production that was performed at a juried American College Theatre Festival. Some of them were nominated for SoC. The committee discussed individual contributions of each student to the play and the basis for considering this student’s work as outstanding. All three students under discussion have been singled out by the jury for specific creative contribution to the play; the nominations clearly listed these contributions. The motion was made to **recommend** the nominations for approval; The motion passed.
4. A nomination from Math didn’t make it clear whether the student’s work was accepted at a regional mathematical conference. It’s been moved to **request more information** from the nominating faculty. The motion passed.

5. A nomination from biology didn't make it clear whether the student's poster was accepted at a conference. It's been moved to **request more information** from the nominating faculty. The motion passed.
6. A nominations of three students by a faculty based on the work done in different majors didn't make it clear whether the students had any work in venues reviewed by non-Morris faculty. It was also noted that the nominating faculty didn't list co-nominators individually (just referred to them as "the XXX discipline") and didn't have a first-hand knowledge of the students' accomplishments. It's been moved to **request more information** from the nominating faculty. The motion passed.
7. A nomination from CMR based on two media (film) productions - the student's work was screened at UMMys and was included into Prairie Light festival and New London Film festival. It's been moved to **request more information** about the student's role in the film production and about the process by which the film was selected for the festivals. from the nominating faculty. The motion passed.
8. The nomination for which Elena Machkasova was not participating in the discussion was approved to be **recommended**.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:40pm

Summary of the follow-up and results of email approval on **March 25th**:

All four students in item 2 had their pending work accepted. The nominations were recommended for approval.

Students in items 4 and 5 and one of the students in item 6 had their work accepted at a conference or a similar event with acceptance based on review by experts outside of UMN-Morris. Their nominations were recommended for approval.

The nominator from CMR (item 7) has provided additional information, including resumes of some of the jurors at UMMys and the description of the process of selection for the festivals. The film was invited to be included based on one of the UMMys juror's recommendation. Based on this information the nomination was recommended for approval.

As of March 25th, there has not been more supporting information for the other two students in item 6. Elena contacted faculty/staff who would have had knowledge of the students' work; in some cases it was difficult to figure out who that was based on the information in the nomination. It's been moved and approved to **not recommend** these two nominations.

Minutes submitted by Elena Machkasova
Approved May 9th 2019

