



University of Kentucky  
UKnowledge

---

Scholarship Committee

Committee Materials

---

12-13-1991

## Letter to Scholarship Committee members regarding scholarship applications, December 13, 1991

Jean Holcomb

Follow this and additional works at: [https://uknowledge.uky.edu/seaall\\_sc](https://uknowledge.uky.edu/seaall_sc)



Part of the [Law Librarianship Commons](#)

[Right click to open a feedback form in a new tab to let us know how this document benefits you.](#)

---

### Repository Citation

Holcomb, Jean, "Letter to Scholarship Committee members regarding scholarship applications, December 13, 1991" (1991). *Scholarship Committee*. 322.  
[https://uknowledge.uky.edu/seaall\\_sc/322](https://uknowledge.uky.edu/seaall_sc/322)

This Correspondence is brought to you for free and open access by the Committee Materials at UKnowledge. It has been accepted for inclusion in Scholarship Committee by an authorized administrator of UKnowledge. For more information, please contact [UKnowledge@lsv.uky.edu](mailto:UKnowledge@lsv.uky.edu).

---

# NORFOLK LAW LIBRARY

---

TO: SEAALL Scholarship Committee members;  
Herbert E. Cihak  
Georgiana Gekas Wellford  
Pamela D. Williams

FROM: Jean Holcomb, chair 

RE: scholarship applications

DATE: December 13, 1991

Enclosed you will find the report on our evaluation of the 16 scholarship applications. In talking with several of you this week I could sense how uncomfortable you were working within the guidelines established for the committee. Perhaps after the dust has settled from this set when can step back and take a look at the scoring procedure, guidelines and funding with the idea of making recommendations to the Board. Let me know how you feel.

Back to the job at hand. Some observations as I look at how we scored the applicants:

1. in trying to find a cut off place for making awards--three hundred points looks like a possibility since most who fell below were those who asked for the AALL annual meeting and have the Grants process as a fall back
2. one member chose to abstain on the application [identified on the following chart by an \*] of a co-worker which is an issue we didn't address--the practical result of this is to throw that individual out of the pool--unless we figure that their number then is based on a possible 300pts instead of 400.
3. I have tried to balance the amounts recommended and the votes with the guidelines to come up with amounts to award that reflect both what the applicant requested, and our consensus guesstimate of the actual cost for this individual with distance and institutional support where available factored in. Please don't hesitate to call me today to let me know how you feel. If I don't hear from you by 4:30, I'll take it that you are willing to go along with this draft.
4. Because of the limited funding, we were not able to grant anyone the full amount they requested. I think the letter I send on Monday to all the applicants to whom we grant awards should have a date by which they must notify me if they will not be able to accept the award, so that their money can go back into the pool to either be added to the total amounts of the other winners or to be given to the next highest vote getter. Please let me know how you feel on this.