

**Senate Research and Scholarship Council**  
**Raubinger Hall – Graduate Admissions, Conference Room**  
**Tuesday November 13, 2012**  
**12:30 p.m.**  
**MINUTES**

<p><u>Members Present</u>  David Gilley (S&amp;H) - Chair  Sandra Alon (COE)  Lourdes Bastas (Co-Administrative Liaison)  Jorge Arevalo (COB)  Martin Williams (Co-Administrative Liaison)</p>	<p><u>Excused</u>  Sheetal Ranjan (HSS)  Sue Sgro (Professional Staff)  Robin Schwartz (A&amp;C)  Jane Bambrick (Library)</p>
--	---

**MEETING CALLED TO ORDER AT 12:40**

An agenda covering 5 points was distributed to the group.

1. The committee was asked to review and edit minutes for the Oct. 11, 2012 meeting. We spent time on Point 10 of these minutes, rewrote the point and then approved the minutes. The minutes were accepted as written by David and seconded by the group.
  
2. We then spent time on Standing Charge 1 to the R&S council by going over Bullet 2 and 3 of Goal 1 which reads: *Offer Academic Programs of the Highest Quality* (handed out by David), from a meeting he attended the previous Thursday prior to our meeting. David proceeded and read out the actual charges which dealt with faculty support etc. and it became evident that ‘development’ was not making too much sense to the group. It seems a vague term to use in the charges. He also noticed that perhaps a point was either left out/ or bullet left out in the way that these were re-written by the Senate. He will be readdressing this issue in his next meeting.
  
3. Martin then addressed some of these concerns by discussing ‘incentives’ for faculty who are currently active in research. He brought up the points of faculty being at different levels in their tenure; therefore, they have different needs and would require different incentives i.e. actual summer support, where ART is the current system being used as an incentive. He recommended we would look into additional incentives/programs in addition to what we have.
  
4. Sandra then brought up the issue with the UNION, but since this is a charge coming to us from the Senate, the idea is to provide them with more information and feedback to address these faculty issues. We discussed alignment here between the council and the senate on faculty research. In reply, Martin read out a section on special issues from his magic book, Sponsored Research Administration (page 2305). Basically, every college currently has summer funds for academic research, how each college promotes it, disperses it, or even applies it, is up for each of us to find out.
  
5. Martin then suggested that we run an inventory of current practices in every college. It would help the group know what for example is available for junior and senior faculty in every college.

We could do this in the form of making an inventory, surveying faculty about their suggested incentives/issues with what is currently available, and once this information is available, identify the gaps. Once we identify these, we can then make recommendations to the senate, in our efforts to find this alignment.

6. We then moved on to Point 3 of the Agenda. Sandra and David brought up the idea to ‘center stage’ faculty research on banner and also to consider news and flyers. The idea to work with a searchable database of faculty research was mentioned. This point could also be added to the charges so that the school can attain more recognition for the work that the faculty is actually doing.

7. We then revised the R& S Flyer by making some edits to last year’s flyer. In preparation, we also had a discussion on how to best reach the Dean’s this year, as it proved a bit challenging last year. The strategy here will be for David to present R&S day at the next Dean’s Council meeting, and the plan is to do this right away in January, as getting on the Dean’s meeting could be quite quick.

8. We again discussed the calls for abstracts and decided on Mid-January for the first one. We all agreed that we need to use as much PR, advertising, and buzz for the R&S day so that we could increase attendance and the relevance of the faculty and students’ research. Given the meeting was only attended by 5 members, we left Point 4 and 5 for the next meeting’s discussions.

**MEETING ADJOURNED: 1:41 P.M.**

Respectfully Submitted,  
JORGE AREVALO, COB