

10-18-2011

Minutes, Arts & Sciences Professional Standards Committee Meeting, Tuesday, October 18, 2011

Arts & Sciences Professional Standards Committee

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ps

Recommended Citation

Arts & Sciences Professional Standards Committee, "Minutes, Arts & Sciences Professional Standards Committee Meeting, Tuesday, October 18, 2011" (2011). *Professional Standards Committee Minutes*. Paper 35.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ps/35

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.

Present: Joan Davison, Julie Carrington, Julia Foster, David Charles, Dorothy Mays, Emily Russell, Barry Levis, Robert Vander Poppen, Mike Buck and Nick Vason.

- 1) Faculty Misconduct Policy. Joan asked if there was any additional suggestions to the revised version. We re-visited the issue of confidentiality of the accuser, but the entire committee is comfortable with granting the accused the right to know where the accusation is coming from.

We moved the adoption of the revised document as distributed. It will be sent to EC, and then on to a faculty vote.

- 2) FYRST Grants. Joan reiterated the principles behind the FYRST grant, which is to supplement the salary of a faculty member who is taking a full-year sabbatical (and thus receiving only 50% of their base salary). If the faculty member is being paid from an outside source (such as teaching at another college or other grant funding) the FYRST grant will top-out at the faculty member's base salary.
 - a. We have \$130,000 of FYRST money to distribute, and based on this year's pool of applicants, we have requests for \$105,000. Are there proposals that are not hefty enough to warrant a year's worth of research? After some brief discussion, we voted to accept all the proposals.
 - b. We discussed the issue of filing reports for past awards of FYRST grants. The language on the FYRST guidelines is more casual than in other grants such as the Critchfield. In recent years there has been much greater importance stressed on getting reports for grants submitted before the candidate may receive another grant. Faculty members have been denied grants due to failure to submit timely reports, therefore, we think it appropriate to specify exactly what is expected of people asking for FYRST grants:
 - i. The current language in FYRST guidelines merely ask for a "description of the results of previous sabbaticals." Some faculty members have submitted a formal, multi-page report outlining their work, while others merely took a sentence or two to summarize their last FYRST grant within the text of their current application. Joan suggests we change the language in the checklist for the FYRST application to remove "description of the results of previous sabbaticals" to "a report submitted to the Dean's office detailing the activities from previous sabbatical."
 - ii. There was some confusion about how far back candidates are required to have grant reports on file with the Dean's office. Emily looked up minutes from last year's PSC meeting to verify that last year PSC required candidates to have all missing reports back to 2005 filed before they would be eligible for another grant. We will use that date going forward.
- 3) Other Grants. For the other grants (Critchfield, Ashforth, and Individual Development), there is only 85K in the budget for the entire academic year. 49K has been requested this semester by

the people going on sabbatical. Based on past performance, we anticipate requests for about 170K in the Spring. Claire said that in the past, around 30% of the grant money was given to people going on sabbatical who apply in the Fall. Joan asked if we should set a target for how much money should be awarded this semester. She suggested around 20%, meaning 17K of the requested 49K. A couple of questions arose:

- a. If an applicant is an endowed chair, is it appropriate to consider money they get for research purposes? Some people felt with so little money to go around, it seemed fair to consider all sources of research funding, and most agreed with this.
 - b. What if someone is denied all or part of their grant in the Fall....can they reapply in Spring? Last year we did not permit this, and we agreed to keep this rule.
- 4) We agreed to review Critchfield and other grant applications at our Nov. 1 meeting. Joan asks that we use the rubric to assess the grants and email her the results a few days before the meeting. She requests that applications be listed in order of quality, and send the ranking to Joan. Please take notes about budget items that can be trimmed and justifications for denial of funding.