

Rollins College

Rollins Scholarship Online

Faculty Research and Development Committee
Minutes

College of Liberal Arts Minutes and Reports

10-10-2019

Minutes, Faculty Research and Development Committee, Thursday, October 10, 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: 10/10/19
12:30-1:20 p.m., Bush 123

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

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

1. **Approval of meeting minutes.** No concerns noted for meeting minutes from 9/12/19 and 9/26/19. Both are approved.
2. **RIG Grants.** Katie reminds the committee that we need to have a representative serve on the RIG grants subcommittee. Their next meeting is 10/28 @ 2:30 p.m. Katie asks if anyone is able to attend. All members in attendance have conflicts. Katie will ask if Nick is available and if not, Katie will serve.
3. **Rankings/Review of Grant Proposals**
Katie provides an Excel spreadsheet listing the 3 FYRST proposals and 6 proposals reviewed by the committee with individual rankings noted. Denise states that ranking was challenging as differences were slight. Members are in agreement. Shan Estelle notes that those receiving the lowest score from her were mainly due to concern as to whether the faculty member was qualified or experienced enough to take on the methodology outlined in the proposal (i.e., an individual plans to conduct interviews, but the markers weren't there to show they knew qualitative research or what was needed). Details or a summary of qualifications wasn't included in the methodology. Katie felt that all proposals submitted for Critchfield, Ashforth, and Individual Development were sound, and faculty put thought into them. Devon and Denise expressed some confusion about why the proposal form didn't include information on previous grants received. There seemed to have been a default response included for that question for all of the proposals, even though some have received previous funding from the program in the past.

Katie informs the committee that there is plenty of money to fund all 3 FYRSTS, but it's not clear whether funds not used are able to roll over for use next year. In the past, per Chris Fuse, weak FYRSTS were funded if the money was there, but the FAC would inform the applicant that if more proposals had been considered, it's likely his/hers would not be been recommended.

All committee members shared concerns over recommending funding for FYRST proposal #3. The following specific reasons were cited:

- Qualms for providing funding to have time to write a blog.
- It feels dashed.
- I feel it was lacking.
- No timeline was included.
- There are bodies of research that could have been included. The proposal could then explain how this project expands on that.
- FYRST #1 and #2 had very specific, detailed plans, compared to FYRST #3.
- Commitment seemed lacking. This leads to some concern that the project might not get done.

- Details regarding a potential partner school (where all proposed work will be done) are not included at all. This major detail won't be explored until funding is received. One committee member didn't feel this was entirely acceptable.

Devon asks if we can suggest funding be contingent on providing additional details or plans, but Katie informs us that each proposal has to be recommended or not. We are not able to recommend reduced funding or place contingencies or request additional details. Katie reminds the committee that we are able to apply a new approach to reviewing and recommending these grants (vs. simply recommending funding because there were only 3 proposals submitted and funds are available, as has been done in the past). It's also true that in previous years, the FAC had to review a higher number of proposals with the same total pot of funds to be awarded, which made the process more competitive. Therefore, some proposals weren't funded. We happen to only have 3 proposals submitted this year, but should we recommend them all just because we have the funds, even though we feel one proposal was lacking? Denise and Shan-Estelle point out that the competition for these funds will get tighter if the pot of funding isn't getting any larger but yet groups of faculty going up for tenure at the same time are getting larger, which will deplete funds more quickly.

Jenn asks if a FYRST award requires that the faculty member come back to share knowledge/research findings with the College community. Katie responds that it's not completely clear. She believes it's a requirement but not sure if it's actually being fulfilled.

Denise suggests Institutional Advancement should be tasked with helping to raise funds for these issues and not just capital projects. The fact that we may have faculty in the future who put forth strong proposals and aren't able to take advantage of full sabbaticals due to lack of funding isn't really acceptable, and this will trickle down and impact other departmental and administrative issues. Denise is concerned if we don't begin to address this, as it could lead to a crisis in the future.

Katie is unclear why we had so few proposals this year. Shan-Estelle shares, anecdotally, from others that a semester is more feasible for some.

Vote

FYRST #3: 0/6 recommend for funding; 6/6 not in favor of recommending for funding

FYRST #2: 6/6 recommend for funding; 0/6 not in favor of recommending for funding

FYRST #1: 6/6 recommend for funding; 0/6 not in favor of recommending for funding

Jenn asks if we should give faculty who applied for FYRSTs priority for Critchfields. Shan-Estelle reminds us that these are technically blind, so no. Denise share that forms may not be adequate or detailed enough to determine, for example, qualifications/expertise with qualitative research proposed.

There is some confusion about whether we should judge based on previous funding awarded to an applicant (i.e., someone is continuously asking for/receiving funds from these programs – should that factor in to the decision process?). Denise also suggests that similar to what the College has recently done for tenure and promotion materials, we should offer examples of successful proposals. Katie states that these are available on the Dean's website.

Vote

All 6 Critchfield, Ashforth, and Individual Development grants are recommended for funding at requested funding levels.

Katie will send the Dean an email that we recommend all but 1 proposal (FYRST #3).

Katie reminds the committee that our next meeting is Nov 7. Chris will be here to talk about SFCS. She will ask him to provide those guidelines ahead of time. We should review those to see if there should be more clarity to some of the language or program requirements. For example, it's unclear whether the requirement is to publish *or* present with students, or if presenting is a requirement.

Jenn states that she and Chris met this morning, and she provided him with the rubric and discussed it with him. There may be some revisions as a result.

Katie confirms that we will be voting on the SFCS proposals in the spring. There are roughly 60 proposals that get initially screened by Chris, and 40 or so that require review/recommendation. Shan-Estelle states that faculty may need to be reminded that students should be writing these proposals, not the faculty member.

Jenn asks if faculty are required to formally report on outcomes from these grant projects to the campus community and suggests the College invite the funders to something like this, to potentially solicit additional funding for these grant programs and celebrate their commitment to funding faculty scholarship.

Meeting adjourned: 1:20 p.m.