

Rollins College

Rollins Scholarship Online

Faculty Research and Development Committee
Minutes

College of Liberal Arts Minutes and Reports

11-11-2021

Minutes, Faculty Research and Development Committee Meeting, Thursday, November 11, 2021

Faculty Research and Development Committee

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



APPROVED MINUTES

College of Liberal Arts' Faculty Research & Development Committee Meeting

Thursday, November 11, 2021

1:00 p.m. – 2:00 p.m.

<https://rollins.webex.com/meet/esmaw>

ATTENDANCE

The following colleagues were present:

Pamela Brannock (*Science & Mathematics Division Rep, Note Taker*)

Nancy Chick (*Non-Voting Member*)

Serina Haddad (*At-Large Rep*)

Kip Kiefer (*Business Division Rep*)

Devon Massot (*Non-Voting Member*)

Mari Robertson (*Social Sciences Division Rep*)

Eric Smaw (*2021-22 Committee Chair & Humanities Division Rep*)

Kara Wunderlich (*Social Sciences Applied Division Rep*)

Eric Zivot (*Expressive Arts Division Rep*)

Christopher Fuse (*guest- SFCSP*)

James Patrone (*guest -SFCSP*)

The following colleagues were absent:

Jennifer Cavanaugh (*Non-Voting Member*)

CALL TO ORDER

Eric Smaw called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m.

OLD BUSINESS

- I. Approval of minutes from 10/28/21 meeting
 - a. Vote of approval from all voting members was received

NEW BUSINESS

- I. Introduction of Eric Zivot as the new Expressive Arts Division Representative
- II. James Patrone and Chris Fuse discussion about the Student-Faculty Collaborative Scholarship Program (SFCSP)
 - a. SFCSP is different
 1. Not a grant, is a program
 - a. Susan Singer's program- she has the ultimate say.
 - b. Patrone/Fuse work closely with Susan Singer and any changes needs to be done through her.
 2. Not only faculty, it is a student and faculty collaboration
 3. Has been reviewed by different entities over the years
 - b. New this year to the program
 1. There has been an update to the guidelines programs
 - a. Attempted to better outline what is needed when
 2. Update to the application guidelines
 3. Both 1 and 2 are an attempt to clarify what is necessary where and who is responsible for what parts (between faculty and student)
 4. Inclusion of what happens if the faculty member does insure necessary final documents are returned
 - a. They are ineligible to apply for this program for 1 year.
 - b. Faculty are notified of this late in the fall semester so they are aware
 - c. In the new guidelines it explicitly states that it is the faculty's member's responsibility to hand in the end of program report.
 - c. Update in compensation
 1. This upcoming cycle there will be an increase to the stipends (faculty and student) as well as material budget increase
 2. They are hoping to fund more participants as well
 3. Material budget used to be \$500 and now is going up to \$600
 4. Question pertaining to conference limit came up
 - a. No limit as long as it is within reason
 - d. General application components
 1. 15 page proposal
 2. Includes information pertaining to the project
 - a. Including references

- b. This should be the student's responsibility
 - 3. Needs timeline
 - a. Student and professor's responsibility
 - 4. Needs budget
 - a. Student and professor's responsibility (maybe more faculty)
 - 5. Student contract
 - 6. Faculty letter
 - a. Should present any information pertaining to previous participation outcomes
 - 7. Will give an info session as requested by the Student Government Association.
 - e. Other program responsibilities
 - 1. All students present during the summer
 - 2. All students present during family weekend
 - 3. Some students present to the Board of Trustee's and Alumni Weekend
 - 4. Final report due in Fall semester after
 - f. Other SFCSP information
 - 1. Mentoring or publication
 - a. Which one is more important/valuable?
 - 2. Outcomes
 - a. It is expected that the collaboration would lead to some sort of publication/performance/conference
 - i. This expectation might be easier in some field than in others
 - ii. Field might not allow undergraduates to actually attend conferences
 - iii. Publications might take many years
 - b. Deviations from this expectation can be easily explained in the faculty cover letter. Patrone/Fuse look at this letter in part to determine if explanation of why a certain outcome cannot be completed.
 - g. How Patrone/Fuse look at the applications
 - 1. Mainly for completion of packet
 - a. They do not feel as though they can appropriately comment on the merit of the proposals given the wide range of the fields they are coming from

- b. Will provide them a color based on completion
 - i. Red, yellow, green
 - 1. Yellow's missing one item/item not in the correct locations
 - 2. Red's are rare
 - a. An example of it being evident that the faculty wrote the proposal was given.
 - c. Most issues are for yellow is where the pieces of information are located
 - i. This is a fairly new thing that they are trying to address with the updated guidelines
- 2. Fund as many as possible
 - a. Hope to fund all the proposal
 - b. Try to do all the green and yellow
 - c. Normally do all green
 - i. Historically this has never been an issue
- h. Timing of applications
 - 1. They are due during the Spring semester the Friday before Spring Break
 - 2. Questions were asked about whether the FDRC could have more time with the proposal's came up from members that have been on this committee for more than a year.
 - a. Students/faculty need time to compose the application
 - b. Students need to know whether they have received it or not to determine summer plans.
 - c. Patrone/Fuse stated that they go through all the proposals in a week once they are received
- i. Other FRDC members' questions
 - 1. What about not working in a lab? Heard only science students get these
 - a. Historically it has been about 50% science and 50% non-science proposals that are funded
 - i. Not necessarily 1 faculty = 1 student
 - ii. Theatre department normally applies
 - 1. 1 faculty =12 students
 - 2. What about working off campus?

- a. That is potentially a possibility. Faculty members conduct research with student off campus, therefore, if the student does not need to be on campus and the faculty member explains in the cover letter how this collaboration will work
 - b. The example of Matt Forsyth came up
 - i. He and his students write pieces and collaboratively (not in the same room) revise the piece in real time
 - c. It should not just be students working independently- needs to be a large interaction portion.
 - 3. What about Holt and Masters students?
 - a. They are eligible as well.
 - b. Any student on campus is eligible as long as they are a student the Spring prior to the summer they want to do the research and the fall after.
- j. What is the role of the FRDC?
 - 1. Do we get all the proposal?
 - 2. Do we need to look through all the proposals?
 - a. If Patrone/Fuse do first pass, do we really need to look at them all?
 - b. Maybe we just look at the yellow and red flagged ones
 - i. Maybe double check Patrone/Fuse in case they missed anything.
 - 3. Can we do a division of labor?
 - a. Maybe we can each take a subset of proposals?
 - 4. Do we have a rubric?
 - a. Yes. The previous committee made one.
 - b. In Canvas page
 - c. Might need to be modified if we decide to use it
 - 5. What part in this program do we want to have?
 - a. We ran out of time and will discuss this next meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

Eric Smaw adjourned the meeting at 1:50 p.m.