

Committee on Faculty Scholarship, Research, and Professional Development

Approved Minutes

Date: October 20, 2004

Time: 8:30 AM - 10:00 AM

Place: Horvitz Building, LaBonte Boardroom

Present: Ron Chenail (PRO), Arthur DeCarlo (HPD Research Committee), Franklin Garcia-Godoy (HPD/ EXEC.OFCS), Joe Grohman (LAW), David Loshin (HPD/OPT), Gina Peyton (OGC/PFDRG), and Josephine Shallo-Hoffman (HPD/OPT)

Absent: * Jaime Arrango (IRB), Nathan Azrin (CPS), Elizabeth Brennan (UNS), Mary Collins (FSE), *Laurie Dringus (GSCIS), *Gary Gershman (FCAS), Charles Golden (IRB), *J. Preston Jones (HUIZENGA), Ed Keith (OSC), Harold Laubach (HPD/CMS), Leonard Levy (HPD/COM), Ling Li (HPD/CDM), Ed Lieblein (GSCIS), Fred Lippman (HPD/EXEC.OFCS), Peggy Loewy Wellisch (FIN.AID), Maryellen Maher (FGSE), Harvey Mayrovitz (HPD/CMS), Appu Rathinavelu (HPD/COP), Kimberly Shaw (MSIECS), Keith Sherwood (HPD/CDM), Mahmood Shivji (OSC), *Barbara Sterry (OGC), and Hamdesa Tusso (GHS&SS)

* 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. Welcome and Introductions
2. Approval of Minutes from September 21, 2004

The minutes of the September 21, 2004 meeting were approved and will be posted at <http://www.nova.edu/cwis/vpaa/facres/forms/facres092104.pdf>.

3. Sub-committee on Best Practices and Benchmarking: Graduate Student Tuition Waiver Program – Ron Chenail

Dr. Chenail reported that Ms. Barbara Sterry emailed him to say that she was still working on the draft procedures and would have a version to him before the next meeting of the Committee.

4. President's Faculty Research and Development Grants (PFRDG) and Quality of Life Awards Update – Ron Chenail

Dr. Chenail announced that the PFRDG web site had been updated and the new PFRDG Grant Application Guidelines and Procedures had been completed and was available online at

http://www.nova.edu/cwis/vpaa/facscholar/forms/PFRDG_Guide.doc. He also

shared that the meetings with various groups of faculty were well underway.

Ms. Gina Peyton reviewed the following new changes to the PFRDG awards:

- A. **Eligibility:** All full-time faculty members are eligible to apply. Faculty members who have received a PFRDG in past competitions are eligible to apply. However, all investigators who have a current active award that has been extended beyond June 30, 2005 are not eligible to apply for the current competition. Should a principal investigator be awarded a grant and has an open account, the new grant will be disqualified. Additionally, if a faculty member is serving as a reviewer for the competition, he or she is also eligible to submit an application.
- B. **Eligibility:** Faculty members should not submit their application for funding to **both** the PFRDG and the NSU/Coordinating Council of Broward Quality of Life Community Based Applied Research Grant, but should select the program that best fits the nature of their research.
- C. **Collaborative Projects:** A project identified by the applicant as a collaborative project must demonstrate a true collaboration, e.g. the narrative must include a description of the role of all collaborators on the project. Collaborative projects with entities internal and external to the university are encouraged and will receive the additional five points.
- D. **Required Academic Unit Dollar Match:** Faculty submissions must be endorsed by the dean(s) of the academic unit(s) in which the project will be administratively housed. Every academic unit participating in the collaboration must receive the respective dean's signature on the Dean's Commitment Form, regardless if the academic unit is providing dollar or resource support. The form must include the principal investigator/co-principal investigator's name, title of the proposal, and type of commitment (if applicable).

Committee members raised issues whether all investigators as opposed to only principal investigators should be prohibited from submitting a new proposal before the previous award was completed. Dr. Chenail asked if Committee members would be willing to put their concerns in writing for presentation to the president and Dr. Arthur DeCarlo said he would prepare the report.

Dr. Chenail announced that based upon preliminary recommendations coming from the Research Task Force, President Ferrero would be willing to entertain a prospectus from the Committee for pilot project for multi-year grant proposals. Members of the Committee agreed that the Committee should draft a proposal for the president's review and Drs. Josephine Shallo-Hoffman and Franklin Garcia-Godoy volunteered to be members of the drafting sub-committee. Dr. Chenail said he would also ask Committee members who were unable to attend today's meeting if they also wanted to volunteer. Committee members also agreed that it would be difficult to launch the pilot project in time for this year's competition, but thought that it would be a good idea to announce the pilot project in May to coincide with the PFRDG and Quality of Life Awards ceremony.

Lastly, Dr. Chenail distributed some suggested language changes to the

PFRDG guideline for proposals that had been drafted by Dr. Gary Gershman. These proposed changes had resulted from concerns from faculty from the Farquhar College of Arts and Sciences that the current language appears to favor certain research projects and methodologies. Dr. Chenail asked the Committee to review the following proposed changes and send him comments:

Under the first section: the issue is the word data -- as noted below either expand the terms, or find another term that is more all encompassing

V. Proposal Narrative (not to exceed 8 pages)

- A. Title page (not part of the 8 pages; should include the names of all faculty participating in the project and their respective center / college)
- B. An abstract or structured summary of the proposed work not to exceed 300 words, with emphasis on need/background, rationale, methodological design and data analysis, and significance of the study (not part of the 8 pages)
- C. Statement of need / Importance for the proposed work / Objectives
- D. Methodological design / Data analysis ***[This section seems to focus on data – I would take out data analysis and make it more generic – either just leaving methodological design as the term – Methodological Design / Data Analysis / Document Analysis – Instead of using word data – how about analysis of research]***
- E. Statement regarding feasibility of implementation of the work including:
 1. Work start date
 2. Time line of activities
 3. Work completion date
 4. Statement regarding where work will be administratively placed; in what center / college / department? etc.
 5. Anticipated challenges and resolutions
- F. Description of how work is to be evaluated / How data will be interpreted / ***How Documents are to be reviewed / How interviews are to be conducted***

Collaborative Projects

A project identified by the applicant as a collaborative project must demonstrate a true collaboration, e.g. the narrative must include a description of the role of all collaborators on the project. While collaborative projects with entities external to the university are encouraged, they are not eligible for the additional five points. ***[Is it fair to consider something in place of collaboration - since those in the non-sciences or those not using hard data rarely do collaborative efforts. Perhaps use of a new set of documents that have never been explored – I know this is a reach.]***

Activities Eligible for Funding through the President's Faculty Research and Development Grant

The following activities are examples viewed to be acceptable expenditures for

the President's Faculty Research and Development Grant:

- Work Study assistance
- Other temporary employee assistance
- Equipment to be university property
- Instruments, including test materials or other specialized materials
- Incentive payment to human subjects involved in the research
- Special promotional activities (i.e., advertising for special clients or students participation, special seminars or conferences to promote activities, etc.)
- Focused faculty travels for specific consultations / collaborations
- Travel for formal presentation of scholarly work in professional venues
- Travel to collect data
- ***Travel to conduct interviews, oral histories, etc.***
- ***Travel to examine documents and archival materials [This is important that it does not rest with consultation, etc., because often times, materials in archives are reviewed without any consultation required, etc.]***

Hi Ron,

Hope all is well. I would like to volunteer for the new task force to draft a proposal for the pilot project. Additionally, I reviewed the "suggested language changes" to the PFRDG proposed by Dr. Gary Gershman and would offer the following input:

- Change the Methodological design/Data Analysis heading to Methodology: Design and Analysis
- Change "Description of how work is to be evaluated/How data will be interpreted" to "Evaluation Plan"
- Collaborative Projects – no change
- Travel to collect data – no change as the proposed "travel to conduct interviews, etc." would be included in the more generic statement already in place.

Ron, I'm flexible if others feel more strongly. Hope this helps.

Maryellen

5. Protection of Human Subjects System / IRB Accreditation Update – Ron Chenail

Dr. Chenail said the university was continuing to work with Partnership for Human Research Protection (PHRP) in preparation of NSU's efforts to seek accreditation. He noted that Ms. Barbara Sterry and Mr. Jaime Arrango were in Chicago attending a workshop on accreditation being presented by staff from PHRP.

As part of the preparation for accreditation, Dr. Chenail observed that NSU needed to address some concerns in the area of faculty and student training regarding IRB and the protection of human subjects. To this end, Dr. Chenail

reported that the deans voted to recommend the purchase and use of the Collaborative IRB Training Initiative (CITI) (<https://www.citiprogram.org>) Course in The Protection of Human Research Subjects at NSU. He said NSU was currently working with the CITI group to prepare the program for use via the web for NSU faculty and students.

He went on to say that the individual academic units would need to identify the CITI modules they wanted faculty and students to complete successfully in order to be certified. Members of the Committee also pointed out the importance of each unit to identify who within that organizational structure would review and approve research protocols in relationship to investigators' protection of human subjects training.

6. Research Task Force Update – Franklin Garcia-Godoy

Dr. Garcia-Godoy reported that he and co-chair, Dr. Maryellen Maher, were in the process of completing a draft of the task force's preliminary report for President Ferrero. Upon completion of the draft, the preliminary report will be circulated to the rest of the task force for their review and feedback. Once that process was completed, the preliminary report will then be presented to the president. Dr. Loshin suggested that report also be sent to the Committee members for their input once the president has had an opportunity to read and review it.

7. Potential Initiatives

Dr. Chenail suggested the Committee table the potential initiatives until President Ferrero has had an opportunity to review the Research Task Force's recommendations and has made his preliminary decisions on future directions.

8. Other Items of Discussion: There were no new items for discussion

9. Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 10:15 A.M.

10. Next Meeting: Tuesday, November 16, 2004