

Rollins College

Rollins Scholarship Online

Faculty Research and Development Committee
Minutes

College of Liberal Arts Minutes and Reports

3-24-2023

Minutes, Faculty Research and Development Committee Meeting, Thursday, March 24, 2023

Faculty Research and Development Committee

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



Approved Minutes
College of Liberal Arts' Faculty Research & Development Committee Meeting
Friday, March 24, 2023
2:30 p.m. – 3:45 p.m.
Olin 319

Committee Members

The following colleagues were present:

Kara Wunderlich (*Social Sciences Applied Division Rep, fill in chair*)
Pamela Brannock (*Science & Mathematics Division Rep, fill in notetaker*)
Serina Haddad (*At-Large Rep, virtual through TEAMS*)
Devon Massot (*Non-Voting Member*)
Janette Smith (*Non-Voting Member*)

The following colleagues were not present:

Mike Gunter (*2023 Committee Chair At-Large Rep*)
David Caban (*Business Division Rep*)
Ashley Kistler (*Non-Voting Member*)
Pavielle Haines (*Social Sciences Division Rep*)
Nancy Chick (*Non-Voting Member*)
Eric Smaw (*Humanities Division Rep*)
Amy Armenia (*Non-Voting Member*)

CALL TO ORDER

Kara Wunderlich called the meeting to order at 2:30 PM

OLD BUSINESS

- I. There were only 3 voting members were present at the meeting.
 - a. did not have quorum to vote on the minutes from 2/24/23 or 03/03/2023.
 - i. The committee will vote on these during the next meeting.

NEW BUSINESS

- I. Preparing the FRDC's recommendations on the Student-Faculty Collaborative Scholarship (SFCS) proposal
 - a. 41 total proposals
 - b. Some proposals had issues viewing the whole application.
 - i. Pamela thought she re-uploaded the full proposals, but this was not the case for proposals numbered 38, 39, and 40. These were all sent as PDF portfolios and committee members had difficulty accessing all the files. (actually needed to click on certain files off to the left hand side in Adobe)
 - ii. Therefore, the three present voting members re-looked at all three of these at the end of the meeting and individually submitted their recommendations to Pamela to make sure they all got a proper review.
 - c. The three voting members present came up with a game plan to get through all 41 proposals.
 - i. Decided to look at the first two columns and see who received no's for both columns first and then go to examine individuals who just had one no in both columns.
 - ii. Due to the fact that all proposals were examined by 3 voting members (to break up the work) not all the members present looked at all the proposals. Therefore, it took time to look back through some since explanations or justifications to no's were not always present.
 - iii. After the three members went through all of these, they scan the reviews for proposals with multiple poor ratings. Again, since all three voting members present did not look at all the proposals and the lack of explanations or justifications to poor rating, we had to spend some time going back through some of the proposals.
 - iv. The majority of voting members felt as though not having a detailed timeline (might be different for different departments/divisions) or the faculty letter missing previous SFCS information was minor.
 - v. A majority of the FRDC present voting members thought that all should be funded but the following,
 1. NOT FUND: proposals #18 and 19 due to the fact that missing the student-faculty contract, no IRB approval, the budget did not include any conference cost even though they discussed going to a conference.
 2. Ranked proposal #1 as middle priority funding. This came from the proposal missing the amount of time spent on the project per week in general, no start and end date, and missing IRB approval.

3. Ranked proposal #7 as low middle priority funding, this stems from no discussion of the type/depth of collaboration, no indication of the number of hours of collaboration between student and faculty member, budget does not equal up, and proposal was not detailed enough.
 4. These recommendations were sent to Chris Fuse and James Patrone later this afternoon.
- vi. One member brought up the fact that the proposals missing one thing should be categorized differently than the proposals who had everyone and submitted a well written proposal. Does not necessarily mean that they will not get funded, but shows that there was something missing/wrong with the proposal even minor.
1. A majority of the present committee did not feel as though minor things should mean it goes down to the next level.
- II. Devon did mention that for future years it might be a good idea to discuss what is considered a “good” or “acceptable” component. She noticed there was some discrepancies between individuals and their view of what was a good/acceptable timeline. Or what individual members were marking between no and yes on the first two questions.

ADJOURNMENT

Kara Wunderlich adjourned the meeting at 3:45 PM.