

Rollins College

## Rollins Scholarship Online

---

Faculty Research and Development Committee  
Minutes

College of Liberal Arts Minutes and Reports

---

3-31-2022

### **Minutes, Faculty Research and Development Committee Meeting, Thursday, March 31, 2022**

Faculty Research and Development Committee

Follow this and additional works at: [https://scholarship.rollins.edu/as\\_rd](https://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_rd)

---



**APPROVED MINUTES**

**College of Liberal Arts' Faculty Research & Development Committee Meeting**

**Thursday, March 31<sup>st</sup>, 2022**

**12:15 p.m. – 1:25 p.m.**

**Online WebEx (Dr. Eric Smaw's webex room)**

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

**ATTENDANCE**

---

The following colleagues were present:

Serina Al-Haddad (*At-Large Rep*)  
Pamela Brannock (*Science & Mathematics Division Rep- stand in chair*)  
Kip Kiefer (*Business Division Rep*) (Came in at 12:30pm)  
Mari Robertson (*Social Sciences Division Rep*) (Left early at 1:00pm)  
Eric Smaw (*2021-22 Committee Chair & Humanities Division Rep*)  
Kara Wunderlich (*Social Sciences Applied Division Rep-stand in secretary*)  
Eric Zivot (*Expressive Arts*)

The following colleagues were absent:

Devon Massot (*Non-Voting Member*)  
Nancy Chick (*Non-Voting Member*)

**CALL TO ORDER**

---

Eric Smaw called to order at 12:20pm

**OLD BUSINESS**

---

- I. Internal Grant Review
  - a. Proposal #3- continuation from the March 24<sup>th</sup> meeting discussion. Members stated this is a development grant, and there is no development without these funds.
    - i. At least one committee members would like to applaud the author's interdisciplinary aspects, and the social impact this proposal is setting forth
    - ii. The committee voted 5 to fund and 2 not to fund
  - b. Proposal #6- the Committee was torn on this proposal and discussed several aspects of this proposal.
    - i. Some committee members felt as though the methodology was not well written and was weak in several locations.

- ii. One committee member inquired about what is the impact of the first book? However, others in the committee brought up the fact that this first book would not be out until July of 2022, so they cannot tell the impact.
    - iii. The overall vote was 5 to fund and 2 not to fund.
  - c. Proposal #7: Again another discussion pertaining to this proposal took place
    - i. Committee members asked why this grant was just being used for travel. The question of whether travel was absolutely necessary and why couldn't the collaboration/communication happen virtually.
    - ii. The committee would suggest faculty asking for only travel funds to explicitly state why those travel funds are important and why solely travel funds cannot be asked for by other means. The committee suggested this be a something to be discussed in the fall and potentially added to the grant requirements .
    - iii. The overall vote was 5 to fund and 2 not to fund.
  - d. Proposal #9:
    - i. A majority of the committee felt as though this proposal needed clarification on the methodology and outcomes/contributions of this research.
    - ii. The committee felt as though this proposal was not as well constructed/thought-out as the other submitted proposals. The committee overall feeling is that this submission might have been rushed.
    - iii. Question pertaining to requirement of IRB approval came up.
      - 1. Even though the author is a clarinet player themselves, work with ANY human subject needs IRB approval. Therefore, if the goal of this research is to compare an artificial mouth ability to a human mouth, then IRB approval is required.
    - iv. Question of why Vienna came up by one committee member, it was just touched on later on in the proposal but not as justified as it could be.
      - 1. One committee member did provide insight that there are only a couple of these artificial mouths worldwide. This was a piece of information that the committee felt as though should have been emphasized in the proposal to make the author's case stronger of why Vienna.
    - v. The whole committee strongly encourages the author of this proposal provide a more fleshed out and provide a more detailed explanation of their methodology as well as their outcomes/contributions of this project. The whole committee highly recommends once this is completed the author resubmit to the next round of solicitations.
    - vi. The vote on this proposal was 1 to fund and 5 not to fund.
  - e. Proposal #13:
    - i. Some discussion on this proposal came up in reference to the information (or lack of information) in the proposal
    - ii. Ultimately the committee felt as though the courses were already on the books and the funds would go to attend a conference and to collaborate, obtain

information (lack of what that means) would be important to the development of the courses presented.

iii. Vote was 6 to fund and 0 not to fund.

## II. Student-Faculty Collaborative Scholarship Program

- a. Eric Smaw went through all the proposals and also reviewed the co-directors comments about their feelings about the proposals
- b. Pamela stated she did look over the proposals in reference to reviewing the ones the co-directors had as they were not going to fund, to see if there was something that was missed.
- c. There were a couple of proposals that Eric S. have questions on about being outside of timeline on a these couple of proposals.
  - i. Eric mentioned that a couple of the proposals were outside the window timeline (either starting in May or continuing into the next semester- especially for conferences). Pamela mentioned that sometimes, especially in science, things do not work on a set schedule. She provided an example of how her own research would need to begin right after graduation and how conferences do not always happen in the summer.
- d. There was one proposal that requested items \$150 greater than the amount funded by this scholarship
  - i. Pamela mentioned that just because they state that the cost is \$150 more does not mean that they are expecting the program to pay it. Maybe the faculty has other sources to pay for that.
- e. One proposal did raise some issues by the committee.
  - i. This proposal does not in fact have IRB approval. The IRB approval letter is for a different professor and according to a member on the FRDC who is also on the IRB is not the same student. Therefore, the student and the professor would need to request the transfer of the IRB approval to them
  - ii. The IRB approval provided does state that it must be with 12months of the approval date. The approval date was back in 2020. Therefore, an extension would need to be applied for but no indication of if that in the application
  - iii. The proposal states that the student will work 15hours per week, where the SFCSP guidelines state that it is expected that the student work 30-40 hours per week, therefore, not meeting the requirements
- f. Eric asked if the committee approve the SFCSP proposals
  - i. A committee member stated that they do not feel comfortable stating this since they did not look at all the proposals
  - ii. Eric S. stated that we previously approved of him looking at the proposals and him giving us a summary of them
  - iii. Eric S. stated that Pamela also read some of proposals, so the committee has two individuals reading them

1. Pamela reiterated that she only looked at the couple that the SFCSP co-directors deemed as non-fundable
- iv. Eric S. did ask if the rest of the committee would vote on whether they would approve the recommendations put forth by the Chair of the FRDC. The committee felt comfortable doing this.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

---

Eric Smaw moved to adjourn the meeting at 1:25 PM.