

Rollins College

Rollins Scholarship Online

Faculty Research and Development Committee
Minutes

College of Liberal Arts Minutes and Reports

9-12-2019

Minutes, Faculty Research and Development Committee, Thursday, September 12, 2019

Faculty Research and Development Committee

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_rd

Faculty Research and Development Committee (FRDC)
Meeting Minutes: 9/12/19
12:30-1:45 p.m., Bush 123

Attendees: Katie Sutherland (Chair), Denise Cummings, Nick Houndonougbo, Shan-Estelle Brown, Jenn Manak, Robin Gerchman, Nancy Chick, Devon Massot (meeting minutes taker), Jie Yu

Katie Sutherland calls meeting to order at 12:30 p.m.

1. Introductions.

2. Review of FRDC Fall 2019 plan, Grant Reports. As noted in the FRDC Fall 2019 plan, the first committee task is to review final grant reports submitted last month (last year's grant awards). This has not formally been done before. Since there are 18 final reports to be reviewed, Katie suggests we split into two groups and each group review 9 reports. Katie also suggests splitting grantee groups and reviewer groups alphabetically (switching to avoid need for committee members to recuse themselves from their own submissions). Committee members should review final reports in Canvas as follows:

- Barnes to Kodzi: Katie S., Jenn M., Jie Y., Devon M.
- Libby to Teymuroglu: Nancy C., Denise C., Nick H., Shan-Estelle B., Robin G.

Katie explains the primary purpose of reviewing is to determine if progress has been made. She suggests a simple scoring scale of 0-3 (0=unacceptable/no progress achieved, 3=high level of progress achieved). Refer to the Dean of Faculty's [website](#) (under faculty resources>grants) for the form and list of report questions.

Jenn asks if any rubrics are in place to review and score reports and proposals. Katie responds that nothing has been in place. In the past, the Dean has briefly reviewed the reports and filed them away. Jenn and others voice concern regarding objectivity if rubrics are not in place.

3. Review Grant Proposal Guidelines. Katie refers committee members to the bylaws description of the FRDC and mission document, which lists each type of internal grant the committee is responsible for reviewing. It is unclear how the RIG review will work and whether we are the appropriate body to review FITI and OER grants as these run through Classroom Tech and IT (not represented on our committee).

Katie states that we may want to reevaluate the requirement for blind vs. non-blinded submissions at a later date. Shan-Estelle states, having served on FAC, that often times there would be information provided in what is technically a blinded proposal that inadvertently makes them easy to identify, especially if faculty members have submitted proposals to both FYRST and Critchfield. The FAC would review both (one blinded, one not) and could then easily identify the faculty member based on the similar content of the two proposals. Katie agrees that this is something we should consider before the spring review but does not feel we should change anything at this time. It was also noted that the requirement for a blinded review process was voted on by the faculty.

Katie asks if there are any questions or recommended changes to the existing FYRST Guidelines and the Grant Proposal Guidelines. Nick asks question re: FSAR timing and eligibility. In addition to general updates/corrections to language (i.e., changing FAC to FRDC as reviewing body) and the addition of page numbers, the following changes recommended to the Grant Proposal Guidelines document:

- Nancy: top of last page (under Application Guidelines section I.F.): “If full funding of all acceptable proposals is financially impossible, those meeting the following criteria will likely receive a higher percentage of requested funds...” This implies that all of the following criteria must be satisfied. Suggestion is to add “any of” or “one or more” to clarify. Further, use of #s in the list of criteria implies prioritization. Suggestion is to replace #s with bullets.
- Katie: suggested to clarify language (under Application Guidelines section III) from “Future funding for your research is contingent upon completion and transmission of a Final Report to the Dean of the Faculty using the form provided on this webpage, unless the research is in progress in which case the Mid-Year Progress must be included.” to “Future funding for your research is contingent upon submission of a Final Report to the Dean of the Faculty using the form provided on this webpage. If the research is in progress, then the Mid-Year Progress Report must have been submitted to the Dean of the Faculty.”

Nancy asks if we could consider the option of a course release from a grant instead of a monetary award, since faculty in the humanities often need time rather than supplies or other items. It was stated that the grant form may actually allow a faculty member to check whether a course release is requested or not. It was not clear whether this portion of the form is actually used. Devon suggests that the cost of one’s replacement for a single course (i.e., adjunct) could be covered through grant funds, but the decision as to whether course releases would generally be allowed through these grant programs would be a question for administration. Katie agrees and says she does not feel we should pursue this at this time.

Katie shares the total amount of funds available for all grants for the year and number of faculty intending to take sabbaticals next year, as reported by the Dean’s office.

- 4. Selection of Secretary.** Katie states the need for a committee member to serve as secretary. Devon Massot volunteers for the role.

Based on concerns about objectivity in the grant review process, Jie, Jenny, and Nancy offered to share and/or develop a rubric for grant proposals and reports. They will provide these at the next meeting, and we will review and decide which to use. Katie states that we can use the first round of FYRST submissions (due to the Dean by end of the week) to review and determine how we want to use a rubric and what it should really look like.

Katie reminds committee members to review their assigned slate of grant reports in Canvas ahead of our next meeting.

Meeting adjourned: 1:40 p.m.