

**William Paterson University  
Research and Scholarship Council  
Meeting Minutes**

Date: 3/11/2014

Location: Raubinger Hall, Room 309 Conference Room

**Present**

David Gilley (COS&H, co-chair)  
Lourdes Bastas (Co-Administrative Liaison)  
Pam Theus (Library)  
Lynne Rogers (COA&C)  
Jorge Arevalo (COB, co-chair)  
Susan Sgro (COS&H)

**Excused**

Sheetal Ranjan (COHHS)  
Sandra Alon (COE)  
Martin Williams (Co-Administrative Liaison)

1. The meeting came to order at 12:34 pm. The minutes from the 2/25/14 meeting were discussed. Lynne suggests that in 5B the wording in the survey be changed to include creative work along with research. Jorge said that we would continue to work on changing this, as the survey is still a work in progress. Lynne moved to accept the minutes, Susan seconded, all agreed unanimously.
2. David introduced the topic of Open Access Publishing and asked if this was something that the University should have and also if it is something that should become a new charge for our council. David also explained the 2 forms of open access: Gold open access (anybody can access) and Green open access (somewhat limited access – the University maintains a repository). All council members are encouraged to attend the **Tuesday, April 15<sup>th</sup>** forum on Open Access.
3. Lourdes discussed information about R&S Day that she had received from Martin:
  - a. There are 93 presentations total. 40 of the abstracts are for posters which will require the use of one of the ballrooms.
  - b. Martin will need to know which abstracts pertain to the common hour sessions for COB, COSH and COHSS. He has sent out e-mails in order to receive this information ASAP. David supplied information to Lourdes about COSH.
  - c. The COAC session has too many people in it (6), 4 or 5 would be better. Lynne said she didn't have to present at this time and that there may be a conflict due to the Cross-cultural arts festival which is running at the same time.
  - d. Martin is working on room assignments. Some presenters will be using Macs and he may put all of these people together in one room.
  - e. Confirmations will go out to the lead presenters and/or faculty sponsors of student presentations no later than Friday, 3/14/14.
  - f. Posters and programs will be handled shortly. The poster will sent to the print shop on Thursday, 3/13 and can then be posted on Friday or the following week. The program will go to the printer the last week in March.
  - g. Webpage will be updated on Thursday or Friday (3/13 or 3/14) to show the poster and the preliminary program/schedule.

4. David and Jorge distributed a draft of the survey to be presented to the Senate. David established a basic timeline of approvals and execution: Senate approval (executive committee), Union approval, Administration approval (coordinated with Jane Zeff), Senate final approval (esp. if changes were made), and distribution of survey. Jorge stressed that this survey needs to come from all the colleges from the feedback we have received. He needs all members to review the draft (take the survey) and provide him with ideas for any changes that should be made. Jorge thinks this as a great way to see how well the University is doing research now (implementation of the strategic plan) and also as a means to see how well we have improved, when compared to a future survey. Suggestions for survey changes were as follows:
  - a. Pam asked that in Part 1, question 1 that Library services be removed. It was decided that questions 1 – 3 should be omitted and that “F. Library” be added to the choices in question 4.
  - b. Jorge will check with the Senate and Union to see if this survey would only be for full time faculty (this eliminates the need for questions 1 – 3).
  - c. Lynne suggested that question 5 be removed and that 7 be rewritten to state, “Your focus at the University” followed by lettered choices specific to each College. It was decided that this question would best be moved to the college specific section.
  - d. In the “Your Current Research...” section, Lynne noticed there was nothing in the survey about presenting with a colleague – only with students. David thought it should be included in question 1. Lynne thought it might be better to omit the word “published” so that other choices can be included here, such as “musical compositions”. “Published” can be at the start of choices A – C. “Professional writings” should probably be omitted.
  - e. David thought that question 3 of the “Current Research” section and question 2 of the following section are too similar and that they should somehow be combined.
  - f. Jorge needs to hear from everyone with feedback before March 25<sup>th</sup>!
  - g. David noted that Sandy Alon has sent in feedback from the COE on the survey

Meeting adjourned at 1:48 pm.

Respectfully submitted,  
Susan Sgro