

Rollins College

Rollins Scholarship Online

Faculty Research and Development Committee
Minutes

College of Liberal Arts Minutes and Reports

3-5-2020

Minutes, Faculty Research and Development Committee, Thursday, March 5, 2020

Faculty Research and Development Committee

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

Faculty Research and Development Committee (FRDC)
Meeting Minutes: 3/5/20
12:30-1:45 p.m., Bush 123

In attendance: Katie Sutherland (Chair), Robin Gerchman, Jie Yu, Jenn Manak, Denise Cummings, Nick Houndonougbo; Shan-Estelle Brown, Devon Massot (meeting minutes taker), Dan Chong, Chris Fuse, James Patrone.

Katie Sutherland calls meeting to order at 12:30 p.m.

1. Discussion with Dan Chong about the Social Innovation Track for SFCSP proposals.

After discussions with Chris Fuse, a new track has been developed to ensure at least one project designed toward social innovation will be part of the pool. Last year there were 5 submissions that qualified, as categorized by Chris. Dan has no role in the actual selection of proposals; scoring and ranking takes place as normal. This process offers a fast-track to more easily identify projects as eligible (i.e., a social innovation-themed proposal) vs. the director having to make the determination. As long as at least one of the submitted proposals hits above the funding line, they will be funded under the track. The committee had no further questions. Dan departs.

2. Discussion with Chris Fuse and James Patrone about review of SFCSP proposals, including finalizing new review rubric.

Katie welcomes James as the new co-director of SFCSP and asks for input on the new review rubric. Katie clarifies that this is a test run. James asks how we will rank certain things (e.g., reference page) as 1, 2, or 3? Chris confirms some disciplines don't have a standard method of organization for references (alphabetical, numerical, etc.). Jenn offers that the point of this is to confirm that students have identified relevant references. Katie also offers that the point of this is to score based on something other than vague categories. Chris confirms that in the past, letters were sent to applicants that stated that "your proposal was not funded because it lacked a required item." Chris also wants to know why justification is needed for the \$500 for supplies. Chris confirms that when working with students, faculty don't always know what's needed or what the project will take. This leads to a discussion among the group about proposal budgets and justification and whether students should be required to include a full justification for the \$500 for supplies, as would typically be required for a competitive external grant proposal. Chris states that in the past, not including budget details beyond stipends has only moved proposals down in rank but not thrown them out completely. Chris also confirms that unused funds get rolled over into the next year's program. The committee decides to remove "justification" of budget as a requirement. Basic itemization of the budget is still expected.

Katie will ask Karla to add Chris and James to Canvas to upload proposals.

Reference page: Katie suggests we remove the AAVG (3) score for this line and keep 0, 1, and 2. A missing reference page will indicate an incomplete proposal. The committee agrees. This change makes 50 the total possible points to be awarded.

Chris wonders if the weight for the faculty cover letter is too high. Jie points out that the language in the guidelines requires more than what we've included in the rubric, so we might want to make them match.

Katie asks for input on a spreadsheet we can all use to compile scores. James thinks this can be done through Canvas. Jenn will send a sample spreadsheet to Katie, who will work with Chris and James to finalize, add names, and upload to Canvas.

All proposals should be submitted in rank order to Chris by 3/24. Our next meeting on 3/26 @ 11:00 will be a long meeting to review these in Bush 274. Chris and James depart.

3. **Review/approval of lost proposal.** Katie sent the committee documents for a proposal that was accidentally misplaced by the Dean's office and had asked for the committee to review. The committee unanimously approves this proposal.
4. **Approval of meeting minutes.** No concerns noted for meeting minutes from January 30, 2020. Minutes are approved.
5. **Reminder of April 9th meeting.** Meeting was not originally scheduled but is necessary to discuss FITI and OER grants.

Katie asks the group if there are any final questions. Denise asks how many SFCSP proposals don't get funded. Katie states we don't know this without Chris. We are under the impression that there's not enough money to fund all proposals.

Meeting adjourns at 1:45 p.m.