

9-27-2011

## Minutes, Arts & Sciences Professional Standards Committee Meeting, Tuesday, September 27, 2011

Arts & Sciences Professional Standards Committee

Follow this and additional works at: [http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as\\_ps](http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ps)

---

### Recommended Citation

Arts & Sciences Professional Standards Committee, "Minutes, Arts & Sciences Professional Standards Committee Meeting, Tuesday, September 27, 2011" (2011). *Professional Standards Committee Minutes*. Paper 33.  
[http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as\\_ps/33](http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ps/33)

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the College of Arts and Sciences Minutes and Reports at Rollins Scholarship Online. It has been accepted for inclusion in Professional Standards Committee Minutes by an authorized administrator of Rollins Scholarship Online. For more information, please contact [wzhang@rollins.edu](mailto:wzhang@rollins.edu).

## PSC Minutes 9/27/11

Present: Joan Davison, Julie Carrington, Julia Foster, David Charles, Dorothy Mays, Emily Russell, Bob Smither, Barry Levis, Robert Vander Poppen, Mike Buck and Nick Vason. Chris Fuse and Pedro Bernal also attended the meeting.

We welcomed Mike Buck and Nick Vasone, who will be the student reps this year.

- 1) **Grants.** Joan reminded the committee we will be reviewing grant proposals at our next meeting on October 4<sup>th</sup>, and asks that everyone review the proposals on Blackboard before the meeting. Once logging in to Blackboard, you should see a Professional Standards folder. Open the folder and there is a “Content” link on the left column where the grant proposals are stored.
- 2) **Discussion of the policy on Research & Scholarly Misconduct.** Federal law mandates that any college receiving federal grant money must have a policy in place for dealing with misconduct in scholarship or research. We approved a boilerplate policy in the Spring of 2010, but the policy was never taken forward to the Ex Com or approved by the faculty. Subsequently, Carol B. was concerned that we didn’t have an approved policy, and she worked with Joan to modify the document for the Rollins community. Among the changes are a tightened timeline, the right of the accused person to have an advisor, clarified the appeal process, and added procedures should the accused be a dean or president. We will review the document and vote at our next meeting.
- 3) **Discussion of Student-Faculty Collaborative Research.** Each year we typically have funding for around 26-30 students. Administration of the program was moved to the Dean of the College, but PSC will still review the grant applications. Chris Fuse attended the meeting to answer questions about the purpose and process of how the grants have been administered in the past.
  - a. There are concerns that last year’s batch tilted heavily to the sciences. Chris acknowledged that last year’s pool of science students was larger than normal due to the renovation of the Bush building.
  - b. There was discussion of travel. Students may receive travel money as part of this grant, but we prefer Faculty to use their Faculty travel money to fund their travel. This hasn’t always happened. Some faculty have already used their funding for faculty travel, others pay their own way, others use their annual faculty travel allotment. Joan would like to fund as many students as possible, and perhaps we should consider a cap on travel funds for students, comparable to the \$1200 cap which exists for faculty travel. Admissions currently uses these grants as a selling point for the college, and don’t talk about how competitive these grants are.
  - c. In the past, proposals that were pedagogical in nature were frowned on. Chris says this is still the case, because the purpose of the grant is to do research. Chris

says the reasoning was they didn't want the faculty using the time to create new course material. The intent is to collaborative research, and pedagogical work does not lend itself well to this.

- d. There was a lengthy discussion of a possible limit on the number of times a student could take advantage of this grant. Perhaps no more than two summers? Chris Fuse reported that last summer we had 21 students, and 8 had received grants before. Mike commented that he likes the idea of more students participating, rather than having lots of repeat players. Nick agreed. He likes students traveling to conferences for the experience and the reputation of the college. Barry suggest we preference first-time students. Joan wonders if we should limit this to two summers. Wouldn't students who have done it several times have a better shot putting together better proposals? David and Julia are leery of this, as there may be really exceptional students who are using this for a launching pad into graduate school. Chris suggests that the committee has the ability to consider these factors when looking at a student coming up for the 3<sup>rd</sup> time. Bob V. and Barry want to see the cut-off after one summer. They acknowledge students who get 2 or 3 shots at the apple may learn to do really terrific research.....but there is tremendous value in that collaborative and mentoring process. We ought to spread it out as widely as possible. We did not reach a conclusion on this issue.
- e. Clarification of Type I and Type II grants. Type II grants are the long-form proposal. They are up to 10 pages, include a comprehensive lit review, a description of what the research will be. The grant must result in a manuscript for publication. It is often, not always, paired with an independent study. Type I grants can be as short as a single page, and simply describe a proposed project. David said this doesn't mean that the students don't have a viable research project, because the knowledge will be amassed through the collaborative research process over the summer. He gave the example of his collaborative ensemble work. His students would not be able to complete a Type II proposal.
- f. The existing process favors Type II applicants, as PSC ranks all the Type II proposals, then grants them funding down until the point at which the proposals are not considered worthy of funding. If there is money left over, PSC ranks and awards funding to the top Type I proposals.
- g. We have heard rumors that Type I proposals are going away. Chris suggested that PSC might consider doing away with Type I proposals, but changing the rules to make the Type II applications a little more flexible and less detailed to accommodate disciplines outside the sciences. The proposals should only require information that is appropriate to each discipline.

- 4) **Hiring new Faculty in the Sciences.** Pedro Bernal visited the meeting to discuss the hiring of a Chemistry professor. Because Bush will be under construction, this new faculty member will be at a disadvantage in terms of their tenure clock. The current non-tenured faculty have been granted research space, but the new person will not have this privilege. Incoming science faculty get generous funding to set up a lab, but since this person will be in limbo, we need to consider their needs in reference to their tenure clock. FEC did not want to discuss this, but does PSC have that power? Bob Smither doesn't know, but he reports that when UCF had a similar situation, their Dean tacked on a year end of a person's tenure clock. Pedro wants a decision now, rather than figuring it out as we go along. He thinks we need clarity from the outset and during the hiring process. Bob Smither: Who controls the rules of mid-course? Joan: The rules are in the by laws, but the Dean offers the contract, so it seems that it would be within the purview of the Dean to put such language into the hiring contract. Barry believes that the EC should have the ability to sign off on this. Joan suggests that PSC should make a recommendation to EC about our feelings on this. Pedro states that there will be other departments in the sciences that will be hiring later in the year, and he believes the policy should be consistent across all new hires. Joan asked what happens if the Bush renovation takes longer than projected? Should we then include language that the tenure clock start upon completion of the building? Joan suggests that some people may not WANT the year delay. Our language should give the candidate the chance to decline the offer at the mid-course review. Bob Smither suggests any proposal gets bounced off the college employment lawyer to insure everyone is being treated fairly. Joan will bring our proposal to EC for approval.
- 5) **Eligible leaders of field study courses** (a question from Giselda Beaudin from International Programs). Can non-tenure track teaching staff lead field study coursework? There is currently a policy that Staff shall not teach any more than 1-credit courses that are pass/fail. So, can these people lead a field study class? Current policy says they may co-teach or team teach with another faculty member if their course will be for a grade or more than one hour of credit. We did not have time to fully discuss the matter, and will need to get clarification on this in a future meeting.

Meeting concluded at 1:45.

Dorothy Mays