

**William Paterson University  
Research and Scholarship Council  
Meeting Minutes  
Thursday, October 16, 2014  
Raubinger Hall, Room 309 Conference Room**

**In attendance:** David Gilley and Jorge Arevalo (Co-Chairs)  
Sue Sgro, Annette Baron, Lisa Warner, Lucia McMahon, Maureen Peters

**Meeting called to order:** 12:43pm

**Approve of previous minutes - Approved unanimously with the following amendments:**

- September 23, 2014 meeting was called to order at 12:35pm
  - Delete item #1 - There were no minutes for previous meeting
- Notes:** Jorge Arevalo added email communications to the minutes for clarification  
Sue Sgro moved to approve, Lucia McMahon seconded. All in favor  
Jorge will correct, circulate, save and have minutes posted as instructed.

**Research Needs Survey - Post-Approval Discussion:**

**1. Survey Deployment** - Members in the know are impressed with Qualtrics, but admit that it is a complicated program. Group feels it is important to keep survey deployment responsibilities within the senate. The senate will host the survey because they have a Qualtrics license. Jason Wicke (kinesiology) offered to help deploy the survey because he is familiar with Qualtrics. David suggested we establish a sub-committee to meet with Jason...Jorge will take the lead to connect with Jason and will include Lisa and David in the communication. Our self-imposed deadline to meet with Jason next week in order to have the survey ready to deploy in November 2014 for a target release date of December 1, 2014, which is in advance of license expiration. The Council feels that deployment target date of December 1, with 14 - 30 day deadline to complete would encourage participation. The group feels that an aggressive, yet attainable goal is to deploy on or about November 15th. Question: Do we need the license for the analysis? Also, what can we download if we can't work within Qualtrics after the license expires? Jorge and Lisa will ask colleagues about this....will ask the trainer from COB.

**2. Survey Promotion** - The council was in agreement about talking-up the survey in college level department meetings. Pres. Waldron offered her help because she is interested in repositioning the University to be research driven. We need to engage the entire community from Pres to Provost to Dean to faculty through their chairs. We discussed a few ideas and where the push should come from. We agreed that Pres. Waldron could help by talking directly to the Deans at Deans' meetings...contact promotion. Lucia pointed out that this survey was designed by faculty for faculty; we need to keep that point front and center in our promotion efforts. So it would be beneficial to also promote the survey through the Senate. David and Jorge will follow up with President Waldron and the Provost. Dave will approach Sue Tardi (President, AFT Local 1796) to make an announcement through the union as it is generally

accepted that the survey benefits the members of the union. He will suggest that she makes announcements, forwards emails, etc. The committee decided to start with our own Deans and Dept chairs today by informing them about the time line and plans.

**Additional Details:** Jorge is willing to help (Jason) enter the survey next week...even Wednesday, 10/22, if possible. David would like to be in on the initial meeting and will participate as needed and pending his availability. Members of the Research and Scholarship Council need to take the survey to test the input. We need time for that. We agreed that at latest, we would begin promoting the survey by November 15th. We may be able to achieve our aggressive time line and open the survey earlier than December 1 if we can get this done.

### **Continued review and discussion of 2014 - 2015 charges:**

David said we have addressed all the charges except charge #5:

*"Study guidelines for documenting research on curriculum vitae in various disciplines, and that the best practices for documenting research (according to college or discipline). Expectations, parameters, or college commitment, for R&S for promotion, tenure and advancement?"*

The Council agreed that there are challenges in identifying universal language, timelines, eliminating vagueness, etc. Susan Dinan has communicated that she is wondering if there are best practices in this regard. David suggested that each Council member do some research to determine if this is discipline specific, or if other universities have posted guidelines. We acknowledge that this is of lower priority.

We articulated our priorities in the following order:

- 1) Survey
- 2) Open Access
- 3) Research and Scholarship Day
- 4) Addressing other charges without time constraints like charge #5

### **Open Access - Discussion:**

We acknowledge that the Council is on the October 28, 2014 agenda to present at the Senate meeting about Open Access. Charge #6 states:

*"Share more information with the faculty on open access publishing. Make recommendations to the university about accepting open access publishing in retention and promotion decisions. Also suggest models for funding such publications."*

David provided the following outline to start our thinking on this charge -

What is open-access publishing?

- Gold Open Access
- Green Open Access

What are the benefits and potential costs of open access publishing?

### **Gold Open Access**

- Benefits/Advantages
  - Increased citation rates
  - Article specific metrics accurately quantify authors' impacts
  - Public access to research and scholarship
  - Decrease in subscription fees over the long-term
- Disadvantages
  - Cost - Model is funded by a fee charged to each publication

### **Green Open Access**

- Benefits/Advantages
  - Public access to research and scholarship
  - Low maintenance cost; requires little financial restructuring
- Disadvantages
  - Smaller increase in citation rates than Gold Open Access
  - Potential citations confusion
  - Article specific metrics will be unavailable or unclear

How should Gold Open Access publishing be considered in retention and promotion decisions?

- General Considerations
  - Reputable publishers will separate their financial decisions from their editorial decisions, but evaluators cannot be expected to make this distinction unaided
  - Disciplines may differ in criteria upon which editorial decisions are made
- Discipline specific considerations
  - Natural sciences
    - Peer review is key criteria distinguishing valid open access journal from "pay-to-publish" journal; also a concern in traditional publishing models
      - Candidates for retention and promotion should be required to designate all publications as "peer reviewed"; designation of peer-reviewed publications as "open access" is not required nor suggested
    - Publishers will differ in their selectivity and rigor of peer-review process (as in traditional publishing), and these differences can be important for assessing the quality of candidates' research and contributions, but

article specific metrics should trump journal specific metrics as more accurate indicators of impact.

- Candidates for retention and promotion should be encouraged to include available article specific metrics as well as journal specific metrics for both open access and closed access peer reviewed articles. These metrics should not be used by evaluators to create composite indices or ranks for candidates, but only allow evaluators to assess the validity and relative impact of publications outside their field of expertise.

We need input from the following disciplines as well:

- Health Sciences
- Social Sciences
- Humanities
- Arts
- Communication
- Education
- Business
- Library

Suggested Models for Funding Gold Open Access Publication

- Sample Publication Fees
  - Public Library of Science (PLOS): \$1,350 - 2,900 per article
  - BioMed Central: \$730 - 2,505 per article
  - Springer Open Journals: \$20 - 1,525
  - Springer "Open Choice": \$3,000
- Publication fee models
  - Ad-hoc model
    - Individual author external grant funds (open access fee budget line item)
    - Distributions from discretionary funds via faculty request form (similar to RTI process; department to college to university)
  - Institutional comprehensive model
    - Institutional dedicated Open Access fund (usually through institution library)
  - Institutional discipline specific model
    - Institutional subscriptions to open access publisher
      - Example: PeerJ (Life Sciences): onetime fee of \$199 per person, up to two peer reviewed publications per year

Meeting adjourned at 1:38PM • Next meeting Thursday, November 6 @ 12:30pm

Respectfully submitted,  
Annette Baron, CCOB