

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

Date: 2/25/2014

Location: Raubinger Hall, Room 309 Conference Room

Present

Pam Theus (Library)

Lynne Rogers (COA&C)

Jorge Arevalo (COB)

Maureen Peters (representing Martin and Lourdes as co-administrative liaison)

Excused

David Gilley (COS&H, chair)

Sheetal Ranjan (COHHS)

Lourdes Bastas (Co-Administrative Liaison)

Martin Williams (Co-Administrative Liaison)

Susan Sgro (COS&H)

Sandra Alon (COE)

1. The meeting started at 12:30 pm with the first item in agenda to review and revise items in the minutes for Jan 28, 2014. After a few revisions Lynne moved to approve minutes of previous meeting. Pam seconded and the minutes were approved unanimously.
2. We confirmed that the Revised IRB Policy was taking place on the same day and time and that Martin and Sheetal had prepared a PPT for the senate review.
3. Poster updates for R&S Day were discussed. We asked Lynne to send a kind reminder to Tom about PDFs being forwarded to the different constituents for further handling. Lynne agreed to do so.
 - a. Once we find out where posters are, the library gets a PDF, as well as Martin, Lourdes and the team.
 - b. Maureen shared with the team that there were approximately 36 submissions as a result of the second extension for abstracts (listing was distributed outlining 1 college, 16 orals, 1 performing arts, and 18 posters respectively). Jorge noticed that there were none submitted from the COB, so he will send out a reminder.
4. Jorge proceeded to discuss the stages of the Faculty Research Needs survey development.
 - a. So far for **Stage 1**, we have collected survey items from external sources, discussed those external sources (HERI and University of Maine items), and have also received specific feedbacks from ONLY THREE colleges i.e. COS&H, COA&C, and CCOB.
 - b. In order to proceed to the drafting of questions, we still need feedback from COHHS, Library, COE, and any other stakeholders we may be missing. We also discussed that we need to iron out what number of portions to include i.e. University section, which should align with the strategic plan, and a specific college portion. This is why we need to include feedback from every constituent of the college who engages in published research and recognized creative work, and those engaging summer activities and support for creating this knowledge and creative work.
 - c. Jorge and David are going to create the first draft of the survey –for **Stage 2**. They will schedule a meeting once all colleges and constituents have submitted their feedback. David will send out another reminder for this feedback.

- d. Stage 3 will be to seek approval of survey by our administration, conduct a review with our deans and seasoned faculty as well as running it by Jane Zeff and Hillary Wilder. We are targeting a first draft to present to the senate by 3/25.
5. A conversation and discussion took place about some specifics towards survey development:
- a. Jorge shared with the group about his communication to the entire faculty about the survey. For example, he asked the faculty what three areas they felt they would like to address when asked about faculty research needs. He will bring these feedbacks to the next meeting.
 - b. Lynne reported that she has not received any feedback from her college. She also brought up the point that ‘creative work’ was a key concept to be used in her college’s survey – not so much ‘research’. To this, we openly read the two goals of the strategic plan which does in fact address/recognize creative work. Therefore, her college portion of the survey has to be specific.
 - c. Pam also suggested that we contact/discuss the survey development with Jane Zeff as we need to be better informed as the budget process, needs, and funding opportunities. The faculty will more than likely ask for more financial support. We need to learn how these budgets are allotted and how much is geared towards scholarship/knowledge building support.
 - d. Also discussed was the idea of what has been researched in these areas, for example: what drives research and scholarship – tenure? What hampers research – lack of funding?
 - e. Jorge pointed out an awareness section for the survey as many faculty will not know what actually is available to support our research. Also, try to measure to whom research is of value and of importance.

Meeting adjourned at 1:35 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Jorge A. Arevalo