

Committee on Faculty Scholarship, Research, and Professional Development

Minutes

Date: May 22, 2002

Time: 8:30 AM - 10:00 AM

Place: Horvitz Building, LaBonte Board Room

Present: Ronald Chenail (Academic Affairs), Barbara Packer (FGSEHS), Laurie Dringus (GSCIS), Gary Gershman (FAR), Marianne Janssen (HPD/CAH), Billie Jo Kaufman (LAW), Leonard Levy (HPD/COM), Ed Keith (OSC/IRB), David Loshin (HPD/OPT), Harvey Mayrovitz (HPD/CMS), and Josephine Shallo-Hoffman (HPD/OPT)

Absent: Nathan Azrin (CPS), Elizabeth Brennan (UNS), *Mary Collins (FGSEHS), *Bill Hardigan (HPD/COP), *J. Preston Jones (HUIZENGA), Ed Lieblein (GSCIS), Fred Lippman (HPD/Exec. Offices), Peggy Loewy Wellisch (Student Financial Services), *Andres Malave (HPD/COP), Joel Munson (I/A), *Appu Rathinavelu (HPD/COP), *Kimberly Shaw (FAM. CTR.), Keith Sherwood (HPD/CDM), *Mahmood Shivji (OSC), *Barbara Sterry (OGC), and Hamdesa Tusso (GSHSS)

Guests: Luigi Cubeddu (Pharmacy)

* Emailed to report scheduling conflict

Committee Charge: The purpose of the Committee on Faculty Scholarship, Research, and Professional Development is to assist with the development of goals and expectations for scholarship and research and to define the policies and procedures needed to support these activities in a high-quality manner.

1. Approval of Minutes from April 16, 2002

The minutes were approved unanimously without revisions. They can be found online at <http://www.nova.edu/cwis/vpaa/facres/forms/facres041602.pdf>.

2. President's Faculty Scholarship Awards Update

Dr. Chenail reported President Ferrero approved the awarding of 19 President's Faculty Scholarship Awards for fiscal year 2002-2003. The awards, totaling \$89,719, were distributed to 46 faculty members from 13 academic units. An attachment was distributed that detailed the winning faculty scholars and their proposals. Combined with the matching funds from the deans, the grand total of awards this year was \$179,438. In the three-year history of the awards, 89 faculty members have shared \$341,984 in financial support of research and scholarship at NSU. Dr. Chenail announced that the names of all Award winners along with their project titles and abstracts would be posted on the Academic Affairs website. The information regarding the previous year's winners can already be found online at

<http://www.nova.edu/cwis/vpaa/facres/index.html>.

Dr. Chenail noted that the dollar amount for this year's Awards exceeded the sum available from the principle for the Awards. He shared that President Ferrero approved the increase in funding because he felt that there were many deserving projects this year.

This year's winners will be honored at a ceremony to be held May 28, 2002 in the Hull Auditorium, located in the Terry Building at the Health Professions Division. Members of the Committee are asked to RSVP to Ms. Roma Hagler-Olson (haqlerr@nova.edu or ext. 7056).

Dr. Chenail asked for suggestions regarding the feedback given to the faculty participating in this year's competition. Members of the committee suggested that besides giving the participants their mean score, that we also include the following items:

- Individual Scores from Reviewers
- Standard Deviations
- Range of Scores (Overall)
- Score for Funding Cut-off
- Overview of Scores and Review Process
- Reviewers' Comments

Committee members expressed concerns that there may be many factors that lead to certain academic units being over-represented and others being under-represented. Possible factors suggested were

- Lack of financial support in the academic unit,
- "Competing" funding in different academic units that already served as a source of seed money for faculty research,
- Lack of awards awareness of faculty members,
- Lack of fit between faculty members' funding needs and eligible funding categories,
- and Lack of fit between the format of the RFP and various research approaches.

Regarding this last point, Dr. Levy suggested the Committee consider the creation of two different RFP's-one for social sciences/arts/liberal studies and one for natural/clinical sciences.

Dr. Chenail suggested the Committee conduct a review of proposals from the past participants to discern any patterns in the awardees and their budgets. Dr. Chenail asked for volunteers to help with such a review. Dr. Janssen said she would participate in the analysis. She also suggested we contact faculty participants and non-participants to learn their perceptions of the awards. She also added that we consider collecting qualitative and quantitative data in these efforts.

Members agreed that marketing the Awards would be a constant issue for the Committee to monitor. Dr. Keith added that each Committee member had an obligation to "get the word out" on the awards and to "take the pulse" of the centers when it came to the Awards.

3. Sub-committee on Best Practices and Benchmarking: Graduate Student Scholarship Program

Dr. Chenail reported that he had not finished collecting the information President Ferrero had requested at last month's meeting regarding the individual center's policies on tuition waivers and scholarships to graduate students. Dr. Chenail did distribute a recent report from the Council of Graduate Schools in which member schools shared their policies regarding tuition waivers and scholarships for graduate students. Dr. Chenail acknowledged that the survey information was primarily from state schools and that we would need to collect comparable information from private schools, beginning with the State of Florida.

Committee members suggested that besides requesting information on waivers and scholarships, Dr. Chenail should also ask whether or not NSU academic units also offered graduate students teaching and or graduate assistantships. Members also noted that these positions should be differentiated from hourly positions held by graduate students such as administrative/clerical positions.

4. Research Day

Dr. Chenail and Professor Kaufman presented an update of the proposed Research Day information that was posted in last month's minutes. Besides having the workshops in the morning and afternoon, they proposed having a mid-day session that would be open to outside interested parties. They shared the names of potential speakers including Dr. Arthur Caplan, Director of the Center for Bioethics at the University of Pennsylvania, for this session.

Committee members suggested that other parts of the Research Day could also be opened up to faculty from other universities. Dr. Keith offered the possibility of having some sessions that featured research presentations by faculty members. These sessions would contrast with the "how to" ones suggested previously and would attract those faculty members interested in results-oriented presentations. It was also suggested that the Research Day have a theme.

Dr. Janssen suggested the Committee look into funding for the conference. She said the National Institutes of Health had such a funding program (<http://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/notice-files/not98-151.html>).

Dr. Chenail noted that there were many South Florida regional efforts to build collaboration between the local universities. Two such efforts were the Internet Coast

(<http://www.internetcoast.com/>) and the South Florida Consortium for Higher Education that is sponsored by the Greater Miami Chamber of Commerce (<http://www.greatermiami.com/gmcc/index.asp>). By opening up the proposed Research Day, NSU could help to further the collaborative mission of these groups.

Dr. Chenail said the sub-committee would continue to work on the proposal over the next few months. Professor Kaufman encouraged other members of the Committee to join the sub-committee in these efforts.

5. Other Items of Discussion

a. Committee Retreat

Dr. Chenail noted that it might be time for the Committee to conduct a retreat. He noted that the New Program Review Committee, the Council of Deans, and the Board of Trustees all recently held their own retreats. He said that research might be a topic for next year's retreats by the deans and the trustees. If this were to occur, this Committee could play a role in developing those agendas. As was noted in the earlier discussion regarding the President's Faculty Scholarship Awards, it is important to be able to show groups like the deans and trustees that there has been a good return on their investment in faculty scholarship and research.

Dr. Chenail also suggested that the timing was right for a retreat given the increased emphasis on scholarship and research at NSU. He pointed out that the Committee had done a fine job of championing the President's Awards. He went on to say that it would be good for the Committee to work towards a plan of action that supported the university's strategic plan as well as creating a course of action that worked in concert with the Council of Deans.

b. The Role of Time, Space, and Money in Research and Scholarship

Discussion took place about the issue of time and its importance to the research process. As the university's interest in promoting and performing research continues, creative ways to assure that faculty are provided with adequate time to plan and engage in scholarly activity need to be discussed, while recognizing the importance of balancing other priorities that are addressed in the mission of NSU.

Committee members acknowledged the growth of interest in scholarship and research at NSU and pointed out some of the recent accomplishments by faculty members and administration that demonstrate that the university was beginning to distinguish itself in a number of academic areas. They also noted that the university needed to address resources it would take to sustain and grow research and scholarship at NSU. The members said it came down to creating a balance of people, time, space, and money. Each of these factors has its controversial components, and like any limited resource, they come with their own patterns of conflict.

Committee members agreed that it would be important for university personnel to continue the dialogue about these topics. They cited President Ferrero's willingness to engage in such a conversation as was seen at the last meeting of the Committee as a positive step in this direction. They also were adamant in saying that any program that was created to support research at the university needed to be held accountable for its mission.

Dr. Chenail said NSU has already taken many positive steps towards increasing research, especially in the areas of grant writing and other income generating scholarship. The university has a productive and supportive Office of Grants and Contracts that provides pre- and post-award services such as grant writing workshops. The President's Faculty Scholarship Awards have already become an integral component in the university's efforts to foster a culture for research and scholarship. The award winning projects also reflect the high degree of collaboration we already have among our faculty researchers. This trend bodes well for these

faculty members if and when they seek extramural funding.

Committee members also noted that NSU is engaged in an evolutionary process of changing university culture to encourage more faculty members to participate in extramural funding and other forms of research and scholarship. Resources will always be limited so the university needs to be careful in how it expends its social, fiscal, and physical capital. It will also be important for the university to be able to demonstrate qualitative and quantitative productivity and to put in place a system of accountability for all programs and personnel engaged in research and scholarship.

Committee members agreed to continue this conversation. They also reaffirmed their interest in working with the president to find ways to further the research mission of the university.

6. Next Meeting: Tuesday, June 18, 2002 at 8:30 AM in the Horvitz Administration Building's LaBonte Boardroom

7. Adjournment

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 10:20 AM