

10-19-2010

## Minutes, Arts & Sciences Professional Standards Committee Meeting, Tuesday, October 19, 2010

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, October 19, 2010" (2010). *Professional Standards Committee Minutes*. Paper 56.  
[http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as\\_ps/56](http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ps/56)

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 Meeting Minutes: October 19, 2010**

### **Attendance:**

- Members: Claire Strom, Dorothy Mays, Steven St. John, David Charles, Richard James, Marc Fetscherin, Emily Russell, Joshua Almond, and Carlee Hoffman
- Dean of Faculty Representative: Interim Dean Deb Wellman

**Meeting Convened: 6:30pm**

### **New Business:**

- Consideration of Appeals:
  - Information about the FYRST grants was brought to PSC's attention. The need for reports is listed on the other grant forms but not on the FYRST checklist. Therefore, discussion began with the consideration of the following: that PSC should reconsider their position on the FYRST grants but stand firm on the Critchfield and Independent Development grants. In addition, PSC will ask the Dean of Faculty's office to follow through with the collection of all reports to ensure that this does not happen again. We will also ask Emily [Russell] to work on rewording the grant application requirement forms and make sure all the forms, as well as the information listed on the website, is aligned and consistent.
  - Point of clarification: concerning the two appeals in question, we will consider the FYRST grants but not the Critchfields?
  - Can we consider the two issues separately?
  - [Concerning Applicant #1] What was the nature of his delinquent submission?
  - He didn't submit a report from 2000. This brings up a question, how far back should we go? 5 yr? 10 yr?
  - As we move forward we should probably clarify that.
  - I am inclined to go back on 5 years. How much do we really want to penalize? This was 10 years ago?
  - I think we need to go all the way back. We need to account for any delinquent forms we have record of, if nothing else than just to avoid situations like this in the future.
  - Most [of those delinquent] are not aware that they have reports that are outstanding. The 5 or 6-month thing seems overly penalizing.
  - I've looked at the delinquencies. There are 46 if you go back to 2001. But if you go back just to 2005, there are only 9.
  - What if we send out a communication to all those who are delinquent to tell them they need to submit their [overdue] reports? They get one time only, a chance to get caught up. After that we enforce the rule.
  - I'm fine with the six-month amnesty idea but [concerning the two immediate appeals] they should be

considered in this cycle. Putting them off to January is misleading. If everybody else gets amnesty, then these two should, as well and they should be considered with this cycle.

- One of the candidate's timelines would not work if they got bumped from this cycle, as well, so there is a repercussion on what they can do on their sabbatical.
- This isn't a bureaucratic box check. It's a decision based, in part, on the quality of the past reports.
- I think we can all agree that we need to everyone to get in their past due reports.
- I like [x's] point that this is not bureaucratic box checking step but rather an honest assessment of their work. A good effort made to help the committee evaluate the prior grant. We need to emphasize that in a competitive pool of quality research proposals, these past reports are important.
- Are we concerned that if we send out this call for late/overdue reports, that we'll get quick reports submitted solely to satisfy the bureaucratic box checking? How can we differentiate between good and bad reports?
- I agree but at least we get them to turn them in.
- I think if we implement amnesty, then we have to include the two applicants in question
- Exactly. We get to uphold the rules, and solve the crisis.
- How can we make this up to the third applicant who lost a grant opportunity last year for similar reasons?
- Is that sourced from a different pool?
- FYRSTs are funded from a different pool.
- If we award [this third individual] a grant, we need to offer some form of reparations, not just an apology. We fundamentally altered [his/her] plans, I think we owe [him/her] more than just an oops, sorry.
- I don't feel as though we should just give them money. That doesn't sound like a good precedent to start.
- What if we offer a sabbatical grant for the spring and the fall? Make it a full year, just like the other FYRSTs?
- Where are we in considering first two applicants?
- They have filed their final rep?
- Again, I think if we are go to do amnesty, then they have already fulfilled that requirement. I think they should be considered in this cycle.
- I agree with the point [x] raised. Without the ability to be considered for these other grants, it would make the FYRSTs kind of irrelevant. Although there should be some consequence for missing reports, I am sympathetic about the idea for amnesty. [X] made some good points about the quality of the reports.

- o Keep in mind, we might decide to deny [the applicants] their grants anyway, which will put back in the same position.
  
- o Steven proposed that we accept the appeals in question and consider their grants alongside the rest of the applicant pool based on their merit under the auspices of an amnesty period; That we send out a call for overdue final and midcourse report; That these overdue reports be submitted to the Dean of Faculty's office by Dec 15; That we emphasize the need for quality reports; and that we ask Emily, Claire and Interim Dean Wellman to work to revise the content on the grant application forms. David seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

**Meeting Adjourned:** 7:45pm for deliberation on grants.