Rollins College

Rollins Scholarship Online

12-5-2019

Minutes, Faculty Research and Development Committee, Thursday, December 5, 2019

Faculty Research and Development Committee

Attendees: Katie Sutherland (Chair), Robin Gerchman, Jie Yu, Denise Cummings, Nick Houndonougbo; Shan-Estelle Brown, Devon Massot (meeting minutes taker)

Katie Sutherland calls meeting to order at 12:35 p.m. It is noted that Nancy and Jenn are at conferences and won't be in attendance.

1) **Approval of meetings.** Minutes from 11/7/19 meeting are approved with Katie's change to remove reference to a specific faculty member's name.

2) **Dates for Spring 2020 FRDC meetings.** Jie and Nick have conflicts with proposed second (late afternoon) meeting times. It is suggested the committee meet earlier in the day on these dates and have one extended meeting (11:00-1:45) instead of two meetings. Katies notes that SFCS proposals are now due two weeks before spring break to allow adequate time to read and rank so Chris can have recommendations by 3/26 and inform applicants of funding decisions by 3/27. Katie also notes that the 2/20 meeting conflicts with a faculty meeting. Members present vote to move this meeting to 3/5. Meeting dates and times are now (pending Nancy and Jenn's availability) as follows:
    1/30: 11:00-1:45
    3/5: 12:30-1:45
    3/26: 11:00-1:45
    4/23: 12:30-1:45

3) **Revisions to rubric for evaluating Student-Faculty Collaborative Scholarship Proposals.** Jenn has developed a draft rubric, which she sent to Chris Fuse for edits. One item to note: Chris removed the *Literature Cited* category, and Jenn put it back in. It was not clear why Chris chose to remove it; it is a required component, so it seems it should be in the rubric. Jenn also reordered the categories to match the order in the guidelines so it's easier to use. Katie emailed this version out to the committee for review and input earlier this week. Jie asks if we will share the rubric with faculty once it's finalized. We assume Jenn intended we share it for clarity of the process. Shan-Estelle recommends it should be a page within the application in the future. Katie suggests and the committee members agree that we are testing this version for this round, so we won't be posting it for this particular round of proposals. The goal right now is to make it easier for us to score.

    Katie asks for thoughts from the committee on changes and projects the revised rubric on screen during the meeting for live edits. Katie notes her proposed changes: at the top, adding "Student Applicant" and "Faculty Applicant" instead of just "Applicant." Under *Description of Proposed Work*, she adds the bullet point "states expected outcome(s) of the project" to match wording in the guidelines. Under *Timeline*, she removes the bullet point "gives details of the project plan," as this is redundant.

    Jie proposes changing *Completion of Application* category to "*Contract*", which is a required component in the guidelines but not reflected in the rubric. Jie also proposes adding the statement that only complete applications will be reviewed. Nick agrees with this strategy

versus assigning points to a complete application. Shan-Estelle agrees, but cautions that Chris ran into this issue. Perfectly fine applications were kicked out for a technical error like this.

The committee discusses 1) whether to allow students to resubmit materials if they fail to include a required piece (e.g., the contract) or simply state that incomplete proposals will not be reviewed, and 2) whether the program director should pre-screen for completion, as has been done in the past, or if we should review all proposals, even those missing required components? It is decided that proposals must be complete with all required components, as this is what would be expected of any other grant proposal. A checklist is currently provided in the application to help students ensure this. However, the committee prefers to review all proposals against a rubric versus having them pre-screened. The following changes are made:

- Katie recommends removing the *Completion of Application* category and replacing it with "*Student-Faculty Contract*" and copying the language required for the contract as stated in guidelines: "Lists objective goals that the student will achieve before the end of the summer." Shan-Estelle does not agree that this category should be in the rubric. All other committee members agree that it should.
- The committee agrees with changing the term "Aspect" to "Category."
- The committee recommends clearly stating that incomplete proposals (i.e., those that do not include one of the required components, as listed in the checklist and reflected in the categories of the rubric) will be disqualified. Nick recommends reflecting this in the rubric by assigning the score 0 for any required component not included and noting that if any project receives a 0 in any category, that proposal is disqualified.
- Shan-Estelle recommends changing INADEQ to "MISSING." Katie adds "**" next to the Score 0 column with the following footnote "A MISSING Score 0 for any category indicates an incomplete proposal and thus disqualifies the proposal for funding."

The committee discusses point values assigned. All members agree to the following changes:
- *Non-Technical Summary* is reduced to 2x, as it shouldn't be valued the same as the *Description of Work*.
- *Literature Review* is increased to 3x.
- *Personal Statement* is reduced to 1x. It's not clear how necessary this component is, but Katie note that it is required for independent credit.
- The newly added *Student-Faculty Contract* category is set at 1x.

Nick recommends and the committee agrees with adjusting the overall scoring from 1=Average; 2=Above Average, and 3=Exceptional to 1=Below Average; 2=Average, and 3=Above Average, since 0 is no longer Inadequate (now 0=Missing).

Lastly, the committee recommends adding "*Quality of Proposal*" as a final category with the bullet point description "is well written and proofread" at 1x point value. The total is now 51 points.

Katie will send this revised rubric to the committee for proofreading and then send to Chris Fuse. Katie will also send out the final list of spring 2020 meeting dates.

Meeting adjourned at 1:45 p.m.