During the 2010-2011 academic year, the Committee on Scholarships and Honors met four times and accomplished the following:

1. At the October 7, 2010 meeting, the Committee:
   a. Reviewed and made minor changes to last year’s Conflict of Interest statement, adopting the revised statement.
   b. Reviewed the Committee’s bylaws and approved an end to voting rights for ex-officio members; the Committee then revised the wording of the bylaws to reflect that and make clear that the student representative does not have voting rights. The Committee also approved a change in the number of times it reports to the academic senate from twice a year to once a year.
   c. Discussed the selection criteria, ranking formula, number, value, and acceptance rate of the Regents and Chancellor’s Scholarships, which the Committee oversees, with ex officio member Sheryl Hayes. The Committee decided to continue the conversation at the second meeting, with more data and input from another ex officio member, James Sandoval.
   d. The Committee voted unanimously against making a detailed formal response to the “Post Employment Benefits Report” it had been asked to discuss because the impact of implementation of any of the changes outlined in the Report is not within the Committee’s charge except in the general ways the campus and system would be affected by them.

2. At the November 9, 2010 meeting, the Committee:
   a. Continued the discussion of the selection criteria and ranking formula for the Regents and Chancellor’s Scholarships with additional information from ex officio members Sheryl Hayes and James Sandoval. The Committee agreed with Sandoval and Hayes that it made sense to go deeper into the pool of students even if it meant reducing the award amount in order to increase the overall academic profile of students at UCR. The Committee suggested a number of ways to improve our competitiveness with other UCs for these students, including advising, peer mentoring, and more information on our web site (virtual tours of the campus and city, information about priority registration, information about the Honors program, interviews with current and alumni winners, a list of awardees, a Facebook group, and information about the greater accessibility of labs for undergraduates at UCR than at other UCs).
   b. Voted to ask Division Chair Mary Gauvain to request that the Executive Vice Chancellor consult the Chancellor about changing the name from the Chancellor’s Awards for Excellence in Undergraduate Research to the Chancellor’s Awards for Excellence in Undergraduate Research and Creative Achievement to better reflect the nature of the award; the Committee also requested that Chair Gauvain ask that the number of student awards be increased from one (to which it had been
reduced in the wake of budget cuts) to two, even if it meant reducing the amount of the cash awards, so that there would be two awards each for faculty and students.

c. Reviewed the Call for Nominations for the award, recommending adding the URL for the Committee’s Senate web page, detailing the selection criteria after reviewing criteria for similar awards at other universities, and making it more visually engaging. The Committee agreed to continue the discussion of revisions at the next meeting.

3. At the November 30, 2010 meeting, the Committee:
   a. Voted to reduce the cash awards for faculty in order to have two faculty awards and two student awards, rather than two faculty awards and one student award, when it learned from Chair Gauvain that it likely would be impossible to secure additional funds for another student award though the Committee might be able to alter the cash amounts of the awards.
   b. Continued the review of the Call for Nominations for the Chancellor’s Awards for Excellence in Undergraduate Research and drafted a new call with the proposed changes to the name and number of awards, as well as new formatting, a border, and a picture of the trophy as a watermark for the flyer.
   c. Reviewed and revised the email to accompany the Call for Nominations, making changes to its subject line, content, and distribution list.
   d. Revised the award process timeline so selections could be completed early in spring quarter.
   e. In mid-January, after the November 30 meeting, but prior to the dissemination of the Call later in January, the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education approved the committee’s proposed award name change to the “Chancellor’s Award for Excellence in Undergraduate Research and Creative Achievement.” At about the same time, the Executive Vice Chancellor approved an increase in the Committee’s budget to allow the addition of another student cash award and crystal trophy so that the number of awards given to faculty and students would be equal, but he did not approve the request for parity in the cash awards to faculty and students, asking instead that the faculty awards remain $1,000 each and student awards $500 each. This information was added as an addendum to the minutes and was reflected in the final version of Call for Nominations.

4. At the April 6, 2011 meeting, the Committee:
   a. Agreed to further discussion next fall of selection criteria for the Chancellor’s Awards for Excellence in Undergraduate Research and Creative Achievement and of the materials accompanying the Call for Nominations so as to ensure better and more similar nomination packets and thus make the ranking process easier.
   b. Selected the following faculty and students as the recipients of the 2010-2011 Chancellors’ Awards for Excellence in Undergraduate Research and Creative Achievement:

   Faculty: *Quan Jason Cheng, Professor of Chemistry
Quan Jason Cheng: Over the past decade, Professor Cheng has mentored two dozen undergraduates, often for much of their undergraduate careers, rather than just a few quarters; fifteen of them are from groups underrepresented in the sciences. His mentees actively participate in weekly discussion groups about the lab’s work, and as one recommender notes, they clearly “have ownership for their research and are not merely following the directions of a graduate student or postdoc.” The success of his mentoring can be measured not just by praise for him but by the fact that nearly half the undergraduates he has mentored have been admitted to graduate school, a quarter have co-authored publications, one has presented at a professional conference, and one was the recipient of the 2008 Chancellor’s Awards for Excellence in Undergraduate Research. Especially noteworthy are the mentoring networks he has fostered, so that students new to his lab work with postdocs and graduate students while they gain experience.

Sharon Walker: In the short time she has been here—just five and a half years—Professor Walker has mentored an astonishing 32 UCR undergraduates. Not content with that, through her participation in a grant she has mentored more than half a dozen Riverside Community College students and as PI for a continuation grant will mentor another half dozen over the next few years. She also oversees all the NSF MY BEST grant students, meeting with them regularly, and is involved in high school outreach in the area, presenting awards at the Riverside Unified School District’s annual Science Fair. Almost all the students she has mentored are from groups underrepresented in the sciences, and nearly half are from minority groups underrepresented in university populations generally. Their completion of an undergraduate degree is as much a measure of her success as are the numbers of her mentees who have been admitted to graduate school (ten), who have co-authored publications (two), and who have presented at professional venues (four).

Ricardo Zamorano Baez: His faculty nominators sing the praises of Mr. Baez, one of them identifying him as among the top three students he has ever had at the three institutions at which he has taught and a better critic and poet than the students in the department’s graduate program. His accomplishments are impressive, as witnessed by his receipt of the “Ann Gregor Young Poets Award” through the California International Young Artists Competition; his publications in five literary journals, including one of the most distinguished journals of poetry in the country; his near perfect GPA; and early admission with a full fellowship to a prestigious M.F.A. program. They are dumbfounding when one considers he began learning English just seven years ago, when he moved to this country from
Mexico. So recently a new student of the language, he is now clearly a master of it, having overcome that and other challenges by which many others would have been overwhelmed.

Philip Kratz: Mr. Kratz is described by his faculty nominators as “the best student in the recent history of our undergraduate program,” “functioning more or less like a graduate student,” to which his stellar accomplishments testify. He already has co-authored three articles, two in top journals in physics, and has three more in press, two of them also in a top journal; he has presented his work four times, one of them at a professional venue; he has innovated experimental technique in the field of graphene studies. He also has a near perfect GPA despite a demanding double major and has received an astounding nine awards here, including a Regents Scholarship. Not surprisingly, he has been admitted to a number of graduate programs in physics, among them the best in the country. He is clearly a vital member of his lab team, already making real contributions to his field.
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