

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

Date: 4/22/2014

Location: Raubinger Hall, Room 309 Conference Room

**Present**

David Gilley (COS&H, co-chair)

Pam Theus (Library)

Lynne Rogers (COA&C)

Jorge Arevalo (COB, co-chair)

Susan Sgro (professional staff)

Martin Williams (Co-Administrative Liaison)

**Excused**

Sheetal Ranjan (COHHS)

Sandra Alon (COE)

Lourdes Bastas (Co-Administrative Liaison)

1. The meeting came to order at 12:35 pm. The minutes from the 3/11/14 meeting were discussed. Lynne moved to accept the minutes, Pam seconded, the motion passed unanimously.
2. David proposed an additional final meeting of the council in May to complete work on the survey and agree on the contents of the year-end report. Tuesday, May 13<sup>th</sup> was agreed upon.
3. Jorge and David reported on their 4/15 meeting with the Senate Executive Council regarding the 2014 survey of research and scholarship. Members of the executive council were supportive of the survey and gave constructive feedback with respect to several points.
  - a. Outcomes of the survey should be clarified in the survey introduction. These outcomes should be consistent with the mission of the Senate and this Council to promote faculty success; it is not the Council's charge to ensure that the strategic plan is implemented. During discussion after the 4/15 meeting, Jorge and David came up with the following two outcomes:
    - i. Outcome 1: report to Senate and recommendations to University and College Administration regarding usefulness of existing programs
    - ii. Outcome 2: report to Senate and recommendations to University and College administration regarding faculty needs for strategic plan implementation.
  - b. The survey can be hosted by the Senate itself, which has a license for a Qualtrics web-based survey system until the end of 2014. This means of implementing the survey is more consistent with the intended outcomes of the survey despite the mention of the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment in the Senate's original charge to this Council.
  - c. It was suggested to present to the Senate only the introduction of the survey at the 5/1 Senate Meeting along with a report on the survey's purpose and timeline, with a vote on adopting the survey to be made in Fall 2014.
4. Revisions to the survey introduction were discussed
  - a. Lynne suggested changing the title to reflect that fact that this is a survey of "needs", and also suggested shortening or revising the language of the intro to be clearer. She agreed to provide a draft revision along these lines via email.

- b. Martin suggested adding a statement of “informed consent” to assure the participants that the survey is anonymous and voluntary.
  - c. David agreed to circulate a revised version of the intro with these changes prior to presentation to the Senate.
5. Council members commented on Research and Scholarship Day, held April 3, 2014
- a. There were 131 presentations (86 talks, 45 posters) by 186 participants.
  - b. Martin noted that some colleges/sessions had excellent participation, particularly when students were somehow encouraged to attend, but other sessions had poor attendance. He proposed a set of significant changes to the event, summarized in the attached document, to be considered an addendum to these minutes.
  - c. Communication and coordination problems with the Cross-cultural Arts Festival were noted, the responsibility for which has never been with the College of Arts & Comm representative to the Council.
  - d. Lynne suggested more encouragement for participants to attend their entire session and proposed moving from a “moderator” model to a “session chair” model similar to that used for many professional conferences.
  - e. Pam noted issues with the quality of student presentations.
  - f. Jorge suggested using the photos taken at the event this year to publicize the event on WPU websites.
6. David reported on the open-access publishing forum held on 4/15, which was co-sponsored by the Council together with the Cheng Library. A summary of the event, including recommendations for the Council, is included as Addendum #2 to these minutes.

Meeting adjourned at 1:47 pm.

Respectfully submitted,  
David Gilley

## Addendum 1

### **Restructuring Research and Scholarship Day 2015 (April 2)**

MBW, 4/21/2014

Based on the comparative success of the College of Science & Health sponsored sessions as compared to the sessions “simply” featuring faculty and students from identified colleges, along with the attendance success in those spaces where students were strongly encouraged to attend by their professors, I propose restructuring University Research & Scholarship Day as follows:

- I. Every session with individual and small group presentations will be specifically sponsored by a College or Committee/Program, and related sessions will be presented in the same room throughout the day. For example, these seven spaces would be assigned/used for morning, Common Hour and afternoon individual and group presentations:
  - a. Ballroom A College of Arts and Communication
  - b. Ballroom B College of Education
  - c. Ballroom C College of Humanities and Social Sciences
  - d. UC 168 A/B College of Science and Health
  - e. UC 171 A/B Committee sponsored: i.e.: Cross Cultural Arts Festival
  - f. SC 216 Cotsakos College of Business
  - g. Atrium 125 College of Humanities and Social Sciences
  
- II. Participants will be accepted for inclusion in the day by both the Research & Scholarship Council and the sponsoring college/program based on (a) quality of the presentation topic and (b) commitment to encourage students and faculty to attend. We should also firmly limit number of all presenters during a session to 4 and allow for one student presentation/session to be included.
  
- III. Split submission of abstracts for posters and oral presentations. Move abstract submission for oral presentations to fall semester and acceptance to just after January break so that promotion can begin and include information on presentations. Keep abstracts for posters in January/February and integrate names/topics into promotion as they are submitted and accepted.

### **Individual and Small Group Oral Presentations**

- IV. Sessions sponsored by a College
  - a. Prospective faculty presenters submit abstracts in October/November that include current information and two additional questions: What will you do to involve your classes and encourage your students to attend? What will you do to encourage your colleagues in your department and College to attend?
  - b. Prospective Doctoral, Master’s and Undergraduate Students submit abstracts in October/November that that includes the current information and two additional questions. For the presenter(s): What will you do to encourage your peers to attend? For the faculty sponsor: What will you do to encourage your colleagues and other students in your department and College to attend?

- c. Selections for College-sponsored sessions
  - i. Abstracts are reviewed by the Research and Scholarship Council based on a rubric that looks at the topic, the number of participants, the type of presentation, type and importance of support received for the activity, and the plan for encouraging attendance. Selection plan:
    - 1. Faculty: Up to 12 faculty presenters are selected, 3 per session
    - 2. Students: Up to 3 student presenters are selected, 1 per session
  - ii. Selections are forwarded to the Colleges for confirmation or modification and for grouping of the sessions.
  - iii. The Research and Scholarship Council will group sessions as needed.
- d. If presentations are pre-selected by a College, they will be reviewed by they will be reviewed by the Research and Scholarship Council. Additional information may be requested, especially if submission is received in the format used for other presentations.
- e. Flexibility will be provided when a College recruits an outside speaker for a “special” session or when a presentation will be a longer, such as for the full screening of a film.

V. Sessions sponsored by a Committee

- a. Selection for Committee-sponsored sessions
  - i. If abstracts are submitted individually, they will be received in October/ November and reviewed by the Research and Scholarship Council based on a rubric that looks at the topic, number of participants, type of presentation, type and importance of support received for the activity, and the plan for encouraging attendance.
  - ii. If presentations are pre-selected and submitted by the Committee, they will be reviewed by the Research and Scholarship Council. Additional information may be requested, especially if submission is received in the format used for other presentations.
  - iii. Sessions may include up to 4 presenters.
  - iv. The Research and Scholarship Council will group sessions as needed.

VI. The Research and Scholarship Council will have from November 14 to December 14 to select presenters. Selections will be sent to Deans/Committees by December 20 with request to provide confirmation of selections by January 9.

VII. Faculty and students who are selected to present will be notified by January 15.

VIII. Individuals who are not selected will be encouraged to present a poster.

**All Poster Presentations**

- 1. The Poster Session will be arranged and managed as in previous years.
- 2. Abstracts are submitted by faculty and students in January and February that include the currently requested information.
- 3. Confirmation will be returned immediately.

4. Poster Presentation space will be the long hallway from Speert Hall to the Student Center elevator/balcony area
5. Easels for posters will be pre-determined to group colleges, departments and/or programs together.

### **Printed Program**

1. Schedule section will include more information for each individual or group presentation, possibly including photograph(s) of the presenter(s). The abstracts will be similar to past years.
2. Preliminary Program will be available January 15
3. Final Program will be available online by March 13

### **Promotion and Calls for Abstracts**

1. Promotion will begin the first week of October with announcement of the new format and selection process. Flyers will be distributed to faculty for their own use as well as for sharing with their students.
2. Call for Abstracts for Individual and Group Presentations will be released on October 20 with a submission date set for November 14. A possible extension date will be November 21.
3. Confirmations sent to presenters by January 15, including the preliminary schedule of all presentations and a copy of the R&S Day poster.
4. OSP/R&S Day webpage updated and R&S Day Posters posted around campus by January 15.
5. Announcement of the names of faculty and students selected for individual and group presentations will be by January 22.
6. Announcement of the Call for Poster Presentations will be released on January 27 with a submission date set for February 27.
7. Full program released by March 13.
8. Campus announcements as frequently as allowed from March 13 to April 1. Frequent College- and Department announcements by members of the Research and Scholarship Council and the selected presenters.

## Addendum 2

### Report on Open Access Forum April 15, 2014

Submitted as addendum to minutes for 4/22 meeting of Research and Scholarship Council  
David Gilley, co-chair

#### Sponsors:

Cheng Library and the Senate Research and Scholarship Council (R. Kearney and D. Gilley presenting)

#### Attendance:

Almost 40 faculty and several administrators representing all five Colleges and the Library

#### Resources mentioned or distributed:

- Cheng Library web guide on open access publishing (<http://guides.wpunj.edu/openaccess>)
- Rutgers open access policy document ([http://www.libraries.rutgers.edu/researchers/open\\_access](http://www.libraries.rutgers.edu/researchers/open_access))
- Costs and Benefits of publishing in open access journals (D. Gilley)

#### Sample of issues brought up by participants:

- How do institutional OA repositories relate to services such as ResearchGate and Academia.edu
- How can publication in OA journals ("gold OA") be funded at WPU?
- How does OA publishing affect decisions of promotion committees?
- Do institutional OA repositories create citation confusion?
- Can self-archiving be done without adoption of institutional OA policy?
- Is it feasible for journals run by professional societies or departments to convert to OA?
- How does the process of manuscript submission and acceptance differ with an OA policy, with an institutional repository?

#### Recommendation to Research and Scholarship Council:

Open-access publication is actually a set of related issues rather than a single issue and this, together with the discipline-specificity of professional publishing, potentially confuses discussion and thereby prevents progress. The issue most directly under Senate control is whether WPU adopts an open-access policy for self-archiving ("green OA") as a growing number of universities have done. I suggest the Senate Research and Scholarship Council be charged next year to seek feedback from the faculty of each college regarding adoption of an open-access policy for self-archiving ("green OA") and make a recommendation to the Senate about whether WPU should adopt such a policy. The actual text of such a policy is quite well established and varies little among universities, so a policy could be brought to the Senate floor for a vote soon after a recommendation to adopt an OA policy. More useful for many disciplines than an institutional repository would be financial support for open-access journal publication ("gold OA"). While it is less clear how the Senate might promote such financial support, the issue will be one of many addressed by the survey of research and scholarship planned for Fall 2014.