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

April 21, 1:00 p.m.

**Members present**:, Sankha Banerjee, Rhett Billen, Tamás Forgács, Jonathan Pryor, Martha Vungkhanching, Cliff Yu

**Members absent**:, Carey Higgins-Dobney, Joy Goto,Jenna Kieckhaefer, , Keith Story, Vang Vang,

(1) Approval of agenda (MSC).

(2) Approval of the minutes of 3/24/22
(3) Communications and Announcements

(a) Forgács reported on the progress on APM 505, and that the APP has expressed its appreciation to our committee for turning the new version of the APM around expeditiously.

(b) The committee expressed its gratitude to Carey Higgins-Dobney, who is leaving Fresno State and will no longer serve.

(c) Officer elections are under way – 2 week nomination period (anyone can nominate anyone including self) until 5/5/2022, at which point election ballots will be distributed.

(d) The committee decided to take up the rewriting of APM510.

(4) Discussion items

(a)  APM510: The committee discussed the matter of predatory journals/conferences in relation to the matter of academic integrity We noted that paying for a publication doesn’t necessarily mean that the outlet is predatory, there could be open access fees even at reputable peer reviewed journals. Perhaps a question to ask whether assessing the predatory nature of a journal is whether one *must* pay for publication, or if it is merely an option, and whether the journal is a peer reviewed outlet. S. Banerjee reminded the committee that there is a list of predatory journals to be found at [www.bealslist.net](http://www.bealslist.net), and the committee thought that maybe the library could take this list as a starting point, and manage it to keep it up to date. Perhaps annual reports of departments regarding publications can be checked against this list, and be deemed acceptable/non-acceptable for scholarship purposes depending on whether the outlet appears on the list. The committee also thought that the probationary plan template could be changed to require publications in peer reviewed indexed journals as a baseline. M. Vungkhanching brought up the question of enforcement of the policy, whether it would be up to departments. The committee noted that UBORT may not be the right body to enforce, since they would only see binders if there is a dispute at some stage of the review process before the university level. Also, tenured faculty would not be routinely reviewed. S. Banerjee also noted that RSCA award recipients don’t have to *a priori* identify journals they would publish their work in, and there doesn’t seem to be any checking after the fact on whether or not the publication ended up in a predatory journal. T. Forgács brought up whether state funds used to support publication in a predatory journal or at a predatory conference could be required to paid back by the faculty member. The committee also discussed that it may be difficult to distinguish between cases when a faculty member is victimized by a predatory journal, and when a faculty member is unethically sidestepping the review process in order to publish, using a predatory journal.

Forgács will reach out to Dean Hornbuckle to see whether the library is willing to assist, and will also start an editable document on google drive for the new APM510.

(5) Adjournment 1:55 p.m.