

**Approved**  
**Research and Studies Committee Meeting Minutes**  
January 29, 2010

Present: Nancy Crevier, Patti Herman, Jackie Carattini, Julie Keown-Bomar, Mary Wood  
Guest: Nancy Brooks  
Absent: Marilyn Kooiker

Crevier called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m. Roll call was taken. Crevier certified that the meeting was posted on January 15.

Motion by Carattini to approve the minutes of November 12, 2009, second by Keown-Bomar; motion carried. Wood was designated as the recorder; Herman took notes until Wood was able to join the meeting. Wood joined the meeting at 9:10 a.m.

Herman and Brooks provided an update on the proposed professional development series on Preparing and Writing for Publication. Possible "Writing for Publication" professional development topics were outlined. Four topics per year were suggested, delivered via one-hour Wislines. Program Director, Laurie Boyce, will support the cost of Wislines. The committee favored archiving them for greater accessibility.

The committee discussed creating a blog to accompany the archived Wislines. A decision was made that, at this time, we will not employ the use of a blog but retain it as a future possibility. Carattini proposed that a list of common questions and answers be posted. The committee agreed to develop a FAQ page, based on common trouble spots that reviewers identify. All members will contribute to the "question bank" by taking notes on what things tend to come up on papers.

Keown-Bomar suggested that we address the credibility of reference sources, and make efforts to "demystify and give clarity", so that colleagues are clear about the purpose of writing. This can be done by raising awareness of six different types of papers that can be submitted. Herman agreed that addressing organizational structure would be useful. Brooks suggested a case study from Youth Financial Education to use as one example. Keown-Bomar and Herman will develop topics for the web page.

Having papers reviewed prior to submission is an important component of scholarship and creates a higher quality product for the committee to review. Discussion about ways to emphasize prior review included: providing a (suggested) list of colleagues available as readers, changing the submission form to identify readers, have readers sign verifying that they had read the paper, and creating an insertion which details "What makes a good reviewer?" Wood noted that the underlying expectation is that the work is reviewed by other readers prior to submission. Keown-Bomar and others stated that multiple readers, as well as readers other than Extension colleagues are valuable and should be encouraged.

After discussion, a decision was made to emphasize the importance of multiple reviews prior to submission on: the form, spoken contact with co-chairs, the webpage, and on the checklist for submission. Wood and Carattini relayed recent comments that showed frustration and possible misunderstanding about the process made by a colleague who had submitted a paper. Co-chairs will make a statement to submitting colleagues about the process and, again make expectations clear at the beginning at each meeting.

Wood offered to draft a final checklist to bring back to the committee, which will include a stronger statement about following the guidelines outlined in appendices F.1 and F.2. and the need for multiple reviews. Keown-Bomar identified that the lack of intellectual rigor shown in submitted papers is problematic. The committee agreed that a statement about intellectual rigor should be included on the checklist.

Herman suggested that taking on much more than developing professional development wislines and enhancing resources at this time may be too much for the committee. A decision was made to wait on other pieces.

Action taken on Appendix F.1:

- #7 "The committee will recommend one of **four** actions: accept, **accept with minor revisions, return for revisions**, or reject." *is changed to* "One of **three** actions: accept, accept with minor revisions, reject."
- #11 *Eliminate.*
- #1 *Herman will revise and return to the committee.*
- #4 *Herman will clarify wording about what to expect from the meeting.*

Action taken on Appendix F.2. No major changes. Herman will make discussed changes to F.1 and F.2 and send out for committee review.

Crevier raised the topic of how we record meeting discussion and reporting back to authors. After discussion, the committee agreed that one note-taker be designated for each paper. It is important to share comments from the whole committee about major areas of concern. Submitters will be encouraged to tape record the meeting and take notes. As recorders, we will focus on the big ideas presented in the review and write a summary on each section of Appendix F.2.

The next meeting is set for February 10<sup>th</sup>. Committee members should plan to take action at that meeting on Appendices F.1. and F.2. Thank you all for good input and discussion.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Mary Wood