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1991 SEAALL SCHOLARSHIP COMMITTEE

Report of Activities

The Committee received applications from eight chapter members and was able to make awards to each of the applicants. Attached are the names of the recipients, their affiliations, the amounts of their awards and the activities being funded.

This year, the chapter Board made $3,000 available for scholarships. In a departure from recent practice, the amounts of the awards varied. In determining the award amounts, the Committee considered the actual costs of the activity and the amount of support available from the applicant's employer.

Seven of the eight recipients are "new" members of the chapter (3 or fewer years in SEAALL). Six work in academic law libraries, one in a law firm library and one in a court library. Five will use their scholarships to attend the 1991 SEAALL Annual Meeting and/or Institute, one to attend the 1991 AALL Annual meeting, one to attend a government documents seminar in Washington, D.C., and one for tuition for an MLS program.

Recipients are being asked to submit brief reports on their experiences, which will be forwarded to the editors of the Southeastern Law Librarian for possible publication, at the editors' discretion.

The Committee considered a suggestion from Tim Coggins that we award a travel stipend for the SEAALL Annual Meeting to a library school student interested in pursuing a career in law librarianship. The Committee liked the idea, but decided to recommend that a separate scholarship be established with separate funding to eliminate competition between our members and library school students for the same amount of money.

The scoring grids were once again revised to reduce the points allocated to "potential for staying in the profession." This suggestion originated with last year's committee chair, Mary Johns, who noted that it is difficult to ascertain the criteria for determining staying potential, and if based on past experience might discriminate against newer members or those who have changed careers. Total elimination of this factor appears to require a vote of the membership, and the Board might wish to consider recommending its elimination.

We also removed letters of recommendation as a separate evaluative criterion on the grids, with the suggestion that information and opinion from such letters be incorporated into the points awarded in other categories. (One member of the committee suggested eliminating letters of recommendation from the process entirely, feeling that they do not serve any useful purpose.)
One problem we had was in interpreting what some of the applicants told us was their employer’s policy of financially supporting professional development activities. We suggest that, in the future, applicants be asked to submit a statement signed by their employer stating clearly the institution’s reimbursement policy.

Attached are copies of forms and memos used by the committee in our activities this year.

Respectfully submitted,

Wes Daniels, Chair
Herb Cihak
Marguerite Rey Florent
Hazel L. Johnson
Deborah Shaw
Sally Wiant