

MINUTES OF THE RESEARCH SUBCOMMITTEE
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, FRESNO
5200 N. Barton Avenue, M/S ML 34
Fresno, California, 93740-8014

Office of the Academic Senate
Ext. 8-2743

October 6, 2016

Members present: Tamás Forgács, Jenna Kieckhaefer (over phone), N. P. Mahalik, James Marshall, Fayzul Pasha, Helda Pinzon Perez, Vang Vang

Members excused: Liu Lubo (sabbatical), Song Lee, Samina Najmi

- (1) Committee approved the agenda (PM/FP 7-0) and the minutes for the meeting (FP/PM 7-0).
- (2) T. Forgács communicated that the Claude Laval Jr. Award competition is set to have its deadline 11/15, and that the committee will review the applications using InfoReady. J. Marshall conveyed that InfoReady is a system bought by the chancellor's office, and our campus will also use it for the competitions for RSCA awards. T. Forgács reported that S. Najmi met with the leadership of CAH, and will consolidate the information she gathered, to be included in our report.
- (3) F. Pasha brought the deficiencies of APM 503 to the committee's attention, especially with regards to the lack of any stipulation on how indirect costs are to be shared between PI and co-PI(s). The committee identified several stakeholders in the ICR and distribution process, such as GRAB, and the individual colleges/dean's offices, and feels that it should have a representative on GRAB in addition to J. Marshall (who serves on GRAB ex-officio). While there might be journal entries/informal agreements between various units regarding the sharing of recovered indirects, the RC would like to see a policy in place governing these situations, especially since collaborative research projects are highly likely to lead to participation of faculty from different colleges, or even different universities. H. Pinzon-Perez also noted that faculty on sabbatical at other institutions may be in a situation where they have to name the host institution as a co-PI, and it would be beneficial for Fresno State faculty to have a document to point to when determining how recovered indirect costs should be distributed between institutions and co-PIs. The discussion of this item concluded with F. Pasha taking the charge to form an ad-hoc committee to clean up APM503, and to include language addressing this issue.
- (4) The committee addressed the issue whether page charges for publications could be paid for by the library. V. Vang reported that she has talked to Dean McDonald about the issue, and they feel that the first step would be to make a list of high impact journals (per discipline) that charge for publication, in an effort to distinguish them from 'predatory journals', which also charge, but are disreputable. J. Marshall noted that some deans have started to look at the journals their faculty publish

in, and require that such journals be indexed for example (if the paper is to count towards promotion/tenure). V. Vang informed the committee that the library cannot commit to paying publication fees at this time. She also noted that there are two basic ways to publish open access:

- (i) gold: send work directly to the journals, who take care of the peer review process and they may charge large sums (thousands) to make the work open access. High impact factor journals may charge a lot, but they also have high impact on the ongoing research
- (ii) green: put the paper in Fresno State's repository, where it is freely available to the research community. However, in this route there is no peer review process involved. While the work published this way could have a high impact, the lack of the peer review process is likely to render such works untrustworthy in certain disciplines. P. Mahalik noted that the high publication fees may prevent faculty from publishing otherwise qualified research in high impact factor journals, having to opt for more affordable options.

The committee recognizes that more and more journals are moving towards charging for publications, and that publication fees don't necessarily equate to a journal being disreputable. V. Vang and the library will work on developing the above mentioned lists while soliciting inputs from the various departments.

- (5) The committee started to discuss issues related to faculty workload and research. We find it a fundamental dichotomy that research is required for tenure and promotion, but beyond support in the initial years of an assistant professor, there is no systematic support for research. The committee mentioned San Diego State and San Francisco State as examples of CSUs where the teaching load is 9 WTUs per semester. J. Marshall noted that a systematic reduction in teaching and increase in research is likely to result in a change of the culture at Fresno State. The committee decided to gather some information on the number of publications per department, and the number of WTUs per faculty to get some idea on how teaching workload may or may not reflect research production. The discussion of this matter shall continue.
- (6) The meeting adjourned at 1:30p.m.