

AwardU Committee Charter

The AwardU Committee has been formed to support the governance, continuity, and effectiveness of the AwardU Employee Recognition Program.

Responsibilities:

The general responsibilities of the Committee include:

- Evaluate the program and the chairperson
- Ensure the Committee is representative of ITS
- Review and recommend roles and responsibilities of and expectations for members and the chairperson
- Conduct succession, election, and re-election planning process for members and the chairperson
- Conduct Judge, member, and chairperson orientation
- Review Human Resources' policies annually in order to better recommend any needed changes to the program
- Oversee the program's self-assessment and improvement process on a regular cycle

Meetings:

The Committee meets at least quarterly or when necessary at the call of the Committee chair. Meeting dates and times should be specified in advance when possible.

Members:

The following is a list of the currently identified Committee members and their roles and more specific responsibilities. The size of the Committee should be limited whenever possible, and it should never exceed 20 individuals.

Role	Responsibilities	Participant(s)	Term
AwardU Committee Members	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Provide project direction through all phases including project issue resolution and changes to project scope, budget, and schedule ● Obtain support for the project from various WVU units ● Attend urgent issue meetings and updates as well as Committee and resolution meetings ● Review status reports ● Attend and present special presentations ● Act as a project liaison as needed between WVU divisions if conflicts arise ● Review and redefine awards as needed ● Evaluate the effectiveness of the program and the Committee and make recommendations for needed changes ● Develop an orientation program for new Judges, members, and chairperson ● Perform an audit of its members 	Mike Rozycki Susan Walker Brandi Shafer Steven Marra Ashley Mulligan James Dunlevy Stacey Kearns Terry Nebel Terri Sobel Vicki Smith Lisa Bridges Deborah Sartin Audrey Holsclaw Jennifer Bennett James Simmons Joshua Cook	2 years
Chairperson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Attend and plan Committee meetings ● Prepare and distribute meeting minutes and informational materials such as agendas ● Voice objective opinions on issues 	Mike Rozycki (Temporary. Election after first quarter.)	2 years

Administrator	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage anonymity of nominees for the benefit of the AwardU Committee • Director of Communications (or comparable Senior ITS Leadership title) 	Vicki Smith	Permanent
Lead Developer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure developers on the AwardU Committee adhere to software quality standards • Collaborate with other developers and business analysts to plan, design, develop, test and maintain web- and desktop-based business applications. 	Ashley Mulligan	2 years
Lead Editor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cross-check facts and edit spelling, grammar, writing style, and page design • Rejecting writing that appears to be plagiarized, ghost-written, previously published elsewhere, or of insufficient interest to the readers of the publication • Conduct team meetings on a regular basis, to keep the team members updated 	Vicki Smith	2 years
Design Lead	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lead a Content Design group • Create designs that are original pieces of artwork • Decide the color, layout, and overall graphical appearance while working with the Lead Developer and Lead Editor. 	Lisa Bridges	2 years
Content Manager(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create content including written descriptions of awards, FAQ, the program documentation, and the award process • Ensure consistency of content before it is submitted to the Lead Editor 	Audrey Holsclaw Steve Marra	2 years

Reports:

The Committee will receive and review the following reports:

- A participation summary to include an annual review of program participation by each unit within ITS
- Committee member service report
- HR review of the program

Voting in General:

When the Committee assembles for voting on various matters, they should follow a blind voting method whenever possible. A simple majority wins. Simple majority is defined here as the majority of members present and voting. As all members may not be available at all times, all members do need not to be present to vote on an issue. To conduct a vote, three members must be present.

Elections:

Each year, the Committee performs an audit of its members. The following restrictions apply:

- No member of any role can serve longer than a 2-year term without re-election.
- No member of any role can serve longer than 5 years consecutively.

Re-elections:

With regards to re-election, if a position becomes vacant or a member is up for re-election, the Committee follows a blind voting method and submit ballots to the chairperson. As with voting in general, a simple majority of present members wins. The chairperson acts as tiebreaker if needed, except in the case of his/her own re-election. In the case of a tie for the re-election of the chairperson, a third party tiebreaker should be appointed.

General Elections:

With regards to general elections, if a position becomes vacant or is newly created, general elections are held. A group of qualified individuals, including Committee members and representative of ITS units, are selected by the Committee. The Committee follows a blind voting method and submits ballots to the chairperson. As with voting in general, a simple majority of present members wins. The chairperson acts as tiebreaker if needed, except in the case of his/her own re-election. In the case of a tie for the re-election of the chairperson, a third party tiebreaker should be appointed.

Dismissals:

Service on the Committee is strictly voluntary and any member, with the exception of the permanent Administrator, can relinquish their seat at any time. Dismissal from the Committee may be a result of unexplained failure to attend 3 or more Committee meetings, any behavior that violates WVU ethics policy, belligerent or abusive behavior to other Committee members, and defamation of the AwardU program or its associated rewards. Dismissal from the Committee is decided according to the rules as defined in the section

Voting in General.**Change Management:**

Any changes to the AwardU Committee or Employee Recognition Program, such as additions or deletions of award categories and creation of new member roles, should be submitted to the Committee in writing. Once the Committee has reviewed the change, a vote is held. Change management is decided according to the rules as defined in the section **Voting in General.**

AwardU Recognition

How it Works and Who it is:

The nomination period is open quarterly based on the University's fiscal year calendar. ITS employees may log into the recognition application to nominate another ITS employee for an Outreach, Innovator or Role Model Rock IT award. Once the nomination period closes, entries are scrubbed and made anonymous by the Administrator, sent to the Judges to be ranked, and awardees and runners-up are selected. This process repeats each quarter. Please see AwardU Processes for more detailed information.

AwardU Committee Members:

Please see the AwardU Committee Charter for information regarding specific membership responsibilities and roles of the AwardU Committee. The AwardU Committee, as a whole, provides project direction through all phases, including project issue resolution and changes to project scope, budget, and schedule, determining priorities for project execution, obtaining support for the project from various WVU units, attending urgent issue meetings and updates as well as resolution meetings, reviewing status reports, attending and presenting special presentations, and acting as a project liaison as needed between WVU divisions if conflicts arise.

Judges:

The first quarter's Judges are selected from volunteers from the members of the AwardU Committee. After awardees are selected for the first quarter, the awardees become Judges for the next quarter. This process of the previous quarter's awardees becoming the present quarter's Judges repeats.

If any awardee declines the by-default judgeship, volunteers from the members of the AwardU Committee may be sought and offered judgeship. If no volunteers are available from the AwardU Committee, volunteers from ITS employees may be sought and offered judgeship.

Administrator:

One permanent Administrator, as a member of the AwardU Committee as well as Director of Communications (or similar title), acts as a portal between the Nominees, Senior Leadership, and Judges. The Administrator is responsible for anonymizing the nominations, as well as other duties outlined in the AwardU Processes.

Restrictions: The Administrator is ineligible for nominations while they hold their Administrator position as they can view the names associated with nomination within the application, defeating anonymity and objectivity.

ITS Human Resources Representative:

An ITS Human Resources representative reviews all AwardU Disqualification Forms and logs a copy in the Employee Recognition Program Human Resources file. The ITS Human Resources representative is also responsible for communicating any disqualifications, regardless of the reason, to the Administrator to inform the Judges. Legal scenarios may prevent the ITS Human Resources representative from disclosing the reason behind the disqualification, but they will confirm that the award should be rescinded or upheld.

Chief Information Officer:

Though he is not a member of the AwardU Committee, the Chief Information Officer can be called on as a tiebreaker in the event of a tertiary, but highly unlikely, three-way tie.

Evaluation of Nominations by Category:

Each quarter's nominations are reviewed by three Judges. The Judges review and rank nominations. As guidelines, listed below are the standard definitions for our three categories of Innovation, Role Model, and Outreach.

Innovation:

The innovation award is designed to showcase and recognize creative thinking in all areas of management and operations, whether you've come up with a clever solution to a problem or found a way to save ITS time, money, or both. At a time when everyone is exploring new options, it's a great source of both ideas and recognition for your achievements. The Innovator award is given for projects or initiatives that represent "innovation" in the true sense of the word; that is, the development of a new, more creative, more effective, or more efficient approach to any aspect of management or operations.

Role Model:

The importance of having a role model can never be underestimated. Role models help inspire us and drive us. They can help us to focus, to define and achieve goals, and to constantly redefine and strive for success. A role model can be a coach/mentor, teacher, supervisor/manager, or colleague. The Role Model award honors people who embody qualities considered critical to the success of ITS: positive attitude, collaboration, leadership, initiative, and imagination.

Outreach:

The purpose of this award is to recognize outstanding individuals whose outreach embodies WVU's mission to enhance the well-being and quality of life of West Virginians. The outreach award honors significant contributions to the community, whether locally, regionally, or nationally. Exceptional service to civic, and charitable groups may be considered as well as other contributions that enrich a community's quality of life. This activity may but does not have to support the University's strategic goals for outreach, such as delivering lifelong educational opportunities and stimulating economic growth. Works nominated may support WVU's research mission, empower faculty, support student success, reach out to underrepresented populations, or improve the integration of specific groups of students, professionals, or scholars.

Restrictions:

The following restrictions apply to the program, employees, Judges, and the Administrator:

1. No more than three awardees, one per category, are recognized each quarter.
2. No person may receive an award more than once per fiscal year.
3. No person may win more than one category per quarter.
4. In the event a Judge is unavailable or position is vacant, AwardU Committee members may serve as Judges or Administrator while serving on the Committee.
5. ITS Senior Leadership may request a disqualification. This is expanded on in AwardU Processes.
6. Any person may decline to have his/her name, award, picture, or any other identifying information posted in news articles or on the AwardU website.
7. Judges are ineligible to nominate or be nominated.
8. The Application Developer, and any employee with access to confidential program data in the AwardU application, may not be a Judge.
9. The Administrator is ineligible for nominations while holding an administrator position.
10. The following nine positions, comprising ITS Senior Leadership, are ineligible for nominations:
 - Business Relationship Management (chief)
 - Chief Information Officer
 - Communications (director)
 - Enterprise Applications (chief)

- Enterprise Architecture (chief)
- Enterprise Infrastructure (chief)
- HR Representative
- Information Security Services Director
- Project Management Office Director

Governance:

- The AwardU Committee, with ITS Senior Leadership given disqualification power, oversees the Employee Recognition Program.
- The Chief Information Officer, in the unlikely event of a tertiary tie, is the deciding vote.
- The Judges and ITS Director of Communications, as the permanent AwardU Administrator, manage the award process.

AwardU Disqualification Form

Winners of the Rock IT Awards under the Information Technology Services Employee Recognition Program are nominated by colleagues, reviewed anonymously, and chosen by a rotating panel of Judges to ensure there is neither bias nor favoritism. In the final step of the process, the Judges submit their selections to the ITS Senior Leadership team, whose members may request a reconsideration in rare circumstances and for limited reasons.

Any senior manager who wishes to request that a winner be reconsidered must complete the form below, and return it to the ITS Human Resources representative, who will investigate the objection to protect both the employee's privacy and the employer's liability interest.

The HR representative will inform the Judges and the Employee Recognition Committee of the findings if the wrong person has been credited for the work. In any other scenarios, HR will only confirm that the award should be rescinded or uphold the Judges' decision.

Award Type:

- INNOVATION
- OUTREACH
- ROLE MODEL

Candidate Name _____ Date / /

Challenger Name _____ Date / /

Reason(s) award should be reconsidered:

- WRONG PERSON IS CREDITED FOR THE WORK.
- WINNER IS CURRENTLY IN A PROGRESSIVE PERFORMANCE PROCESS *that is in conflict with the nature of the award.*
- A PERSONNEL MATTER THAT, BY LAW, MUST REMAIN CONFIDENTIAL.

HR Representative _____ Date / /

- YES
- NO

AwardU Processes

Process for Entry and Cataloging of Nominations for Employee Recognition Program:

1. Entries are submitted via the ERP nomination website.
2. Nominations are reviewed by the Administrator for legitimacy.
3. The Administrator scrubs nominee names from the submission forms.
4. Anonymized submissions are passed on to the Judges.

Process for Administrator to Remove Identifying Information from Submissions:

1. The Administrator copies and pastes the nominations from submissions in to the Nominees' Template.
2. All specifically identifying information, such as first, last, and nicknames are removed.
3. The Nominees' Template is updated with the following:
 - a. Administrator name.
 - b. Date of completion and forwarding to Judges.
 - c. Quarter of the current award.
4. The Administrator emails a copy of the Nominees' Template to the Judges for review.

Process for Judges to Rank Nominees on Nominees' Template:

1. Next to each entry on the Nominees' Template is a space to enter a number (1 through 5).
2. The process for choosing a number, and its importance, is as follows:
 - a. With 1 being the lowest and 5 being the highest, Judges each (on their own, without input from the others), rank each nomination.
 - b. Within 2 days of receipt of the Nominees' Template from the Administrator, the Judges share their ranked copies of the Nominees' Template.
 - c. The Judges tally the rankings, with the highest in each category being the Firsts, and the second highest in each category being the Alternates.
 - d. Alternates are a back-up in case the Disqualification process removes a First from contention.
 - e. However, if no worthy Alternate is available in a category, Judges shall not nominate someone only to fill the slot. Only deserving, agreed-upon nominees shall be selected.
3. Directives for ranking nominations:
 - Be fair and unbiased. A goal of this program is to be as objective as possible.
 - Rank the nominations honestly, based on your gut feelings. This sounds vague and leaves the decision to you, on purpose. When you read the nominations, as a member of the ITS and WVU communities, which ones stand out to you as particularly deserving of praise and recognition?
 - This, ultimately, is a personal decision on the part of the Judges. You are expected to uphold the spirit of the program and help recognize the best ITS's staff has to offer.

Process for Selection of Firsts and Alternates:

1. The Judges review the nominees individually, using these guidelines to select up to one recipient and up to one second for any of the three categories.
2. If no deserving nominees exist for an award, the Judges shall not choose a recipient.
3. If no deserving seconds exist for an award, the Judges shall not choose a recipient.
4. When the Judges finish reviewing nominations and make their picks, they submit their choices to the group for discussion and grading.
5. Judges may make any concerns known to each other about the nominations in the pool.
6. Judges then score all the selected nominations.

7. Judges tally the scores, and order nominations. This sets Firsts and Alternates.
8. The list of Firsts and Alternates is sent to the Administrator.

Process for Tiebreakers for Nominations:

1. After tallies are complete, any ties in a category must be addressed.
2. Judges are to discuss amongst themselves the merits of the tied nominations.
3. If there is no consensus between the Judges as to a definitive First, an anonymous vote is submitted to the Administrator.
 - a. Upon a hung nomination, the Judges report to the Administrator.
 - b. An anonymous vote is taken by the Administrator. This vote may be via paper ballot or email.
 - c. The Judges are not told by the Administrator who voted for which nominations.
 - d. The Administrator alerts the Judges to the decision.
4. In case of a 3-way hung nomination (if there are 3 or more tied nominations, and each Judge votes for a different one), the Chief Information Officer casts the deciding vote.

Process for Validation or Disqualification of Firsts and Alternates by ITS Senior Leadership:

1. The Administrator adds the names back to the anonymized nominees.
2. The Administrator emails ITS Senior Leadership the collection of firsts and alternates.
3. ITS Senior Leadership uses the guidelines on the challenge form to determine if any of the selections should be disqualified of their intended award. This action should only be used in rare circumstances as the reasons for disqualifying a selection are specific.
4. ITS Senior Leadership has 2 days to voice objections to selections via the group email.
5. If there are no objections to the selections, the Administrator emails the approved list back to the Judges.
6. If there is an objection, it will be noted in the group email by the Administrator to ITS Senior Leadership.
7. ITS Senior Leadership is encouraged to discuss amongst themselves, if appropriate, within the strictures of privacy policies at WVU, the suggested disqualification.
8. If the disqualification stands amongst ITS Senior Leadership, or is an issue that can not be discussed due to legal or privacy reasons, the AwardU Disqualification Form is submitted by the objecting member(s) to the Administrator.
9. The Administrator sends the said form to the ITS Human Resources representative.
10. The ITS Human Resources representative reviews the disqualification and logs a copy in the Employee Recognition Program Human Resources file.
 - a. If it is valid, the ITS Human Resources representative sends the form noted as such back to the Administrator.
 - b. If it is invalid, the ITS Human Resources representative sends the form noted as such back to the Administrator.
11. The Administrator alerts ITS Senior Leadership to the decision of the ITS Human Resources representative.
12. The Administrator re-anonymizes the selections.
13. The Administrator notes any disqualified selections and send the list back to the Judges.

Process for Multiple Nominations of One Person in a Category

These are treated as separate entries, scrubbed accordingly, and submitted to the Judges as any singular nomination. They will not be combined in to a single document of multiple entries for one nominee. This would introduce unwanted, weighted bias.

Process for a Nominee Chosen as a Winner in Multiple Categories

1. In the unlikely event a nominee is chosen as the recipient in more than one category, the Administrator alerts the Judges to the problem. The Administrator must note which categories to address.
2. The Judges decide which category the First keeps, and from which category he/she is removed.
3. When removed, the Alternate becomes the First. The results are sent back to the Administrator for verification.

Process for Choosing Alternate Judges

(forthcoming)

Process for Elections of New Committee Members

(forthcoming)

AwardU Nominees' Template (example)

Nominee #1

Award Type:

- INNOVATION
- OUTREACH
- ROLE MODEL

Scrubbed Nomination:

Judges' Rank (scale of 1 to 10) _____