

Rollins College

Rollins Scholarship Online

Faculty Research and Development Committee
Minutes

College of Liberal Arts Minutes and Reports

11-9-2020

Minutes, Faculty Research and Development Committee, Monday, November 9, 2020

Faculty Research and Development Committee
College of Liberal Arts, Rollins College

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

Recommended Citation

Faculty Research and Development Committee, "Minutes, Faculty Research and Development Committee, Monday, November 9, 2020" (2020). *Faculty Research and Development Committee Minutes*. 9.
https://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_rd/9

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the College of Liberal Arts Minutes and Reports at Rollins Scholarship Online. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Research and Development Committee Minutes by an authorized administrator of Rollins Scholarship Online. For more information, please contact rwalton@rollins.edu.

Faculty Research and Development Committee (FRDC)
Meeting Minutes: 11/9/20
1:00 p.m. via WebEx

In attendance: Jie Yu (Chair), Katie Sutherland (Past Chair), Jenny Cavenaugh (Dean), Nancy Chick, Robin Gerchman, Jenn Manak, Devon Massot, Sheryll Namingit, Mari Robertson

Jie Yu calls meeting to order at 1:05 p.m.

1. **Approval of minutes.** Due to delay in getting minutes out to the group, Jie gives the committee a few minutes to review. Robin makes motion to approve. Jenn seconds. No further discussion. Minutes approved.

2. **Discussion of revised grant report guidelines.** Jie share Google doc she provided to the committee for updating. Katie discusses her edits: she added a statement that FRDC will be reviewing or evaluating the reports, and she added the fact that two reports are required: mid-year and final. Jenny asks where the evaluations will be stored. The process is currently quite informal. Jenny hasn't been evaluating the reports to date and appreciates the committee doing this and feels it would provide helpful feedback to faculty. She states that we have the ability to create a new process or system to do this effectively and efficiently. Katie suggests that our goal with this should be to improve reports so our committee can have more information. In many cases, we just aren't getting much info. There are no specific details of what faculty have done or outcomes. The goal is not to be punitive. We also want to make sure our evaluation rubric is available to faculty (included in the report guidelines) so they can write their reports to the rubric. Katie shares that her additions to the report guidelines were intended to match the rubric. The committee agrees to the following changes:
 - Add a note to both the report guidelines/template and rubric that a response to impact on teaching is optional for research grants, but that the committee still encourages faculty to consider and discuss how their research or scholarly work might impact their teaching.
 - Adding rows to the itemized expenditures table in the budget section of the report guidelines/template to make it clear that specific line-item details are expected there.
 - Add mid-year or final report check box at top of the new report guidelines/template to clarify for reviewers.
 - Add phrase "Upon completion of project or" to Final Reporting deadline section so faculty know they can submit their final reports early if the project has ended, and they do not need to wait a year to submit, as the language currently suggests. Nancy asks if the grant guidelines state these deadlines, and if so, we need to make sure that language is updated to match.

Jenn suggests providing a thank you letter to faculty after receipt of a report that would offer feedback, with copy to all members of the committee. Jenny agrees that giving faculty substantive positive feedback and suggestions for improvement is a great idea, if the committee is able and willing to take this on. If faculty want additional info, we could provide them with the rubric/raw data.

The question is posed: how/where do faculty get info about the committee members and meeting dates so they can understand when their reports or proposals will be reviewed and by whom? Jie suggests we add this timeline information to our grant proposal guidelines and to web pages.

3. Discussion of revised report rubric. Jenny suggests we see if we can somehow link proposals to rubric so basic project information is automatically there. She suggests reaching out to Amy Sugar to see if this can be done through Canvas. For now, we will keep Description of Project in the rubric so faculty have to provide this information again for reviewers. Additional questions posed:

- Do we want to set minimum word counts or limits?
- In grant guidelines, are faculty required to provide important milestones (or should they be)? If so, this will be easier to provide progress to date. It's hard to determine otherwise.
- Is it helpful or necessary to have the 3 categories for the reporting rubric? Some feel it is a helpful way to rank.

Jie will create two more Google docs for the committee to finalize proposed changes to the rubric and report guidelines. We can then determine if we need to go back to grant proposal guidelines. We likely need to update those to reflect changes in these documents.

4. Grant proposals to review. 3 FYRST grant proposals plus 8 Critchfields = 12 proposals total to be reviewed this cycle. Jie is checking with Karla to see if there are more. Jie suggests each committee member reviews and makes recommendations/rankings for all 12. Send review results to Jie by Saturday, 11/21. No rubric will be used to review or rank the proposals this cycle. Question posed: should we be looking to reduce their budgets, given limited pool this year? Jie is unsure.

The committee's next meeting is 11/23.

Meeting adjourns at 2:05 p.m.