### Meeting: September 7th, 2022 at 9:00am PST via Zoom

### Members Present:

* Haley Traini – Chair – terms ends 2023
* Courtney Gibson – Vice Chair - term ends 2024
* Kasee Smith – term ends 2022
* John Rayfield – term ends 2022
* Rob Terry – term ends 2023
* Michelle Burrows – term ends 2024

### Others Present:

* Scott Burris
* Dustin Perry
* Shannon Norris

### Minutes:

1. Haley opened the meeting and welcomed all in attendance.
2. Haley began by sharing the 2021 meeting minutes with the group and stated that we need to approve the minutes.
	1. Michelle Burrows moved to approve the minutes, Courtney Gibson seconded. Motion passed unanimously.
3. Haley began discussing the Western Region Research Abstract Review Process
	1. Haley reviewed the process of the 2022 panel recruitment
		1. Haley and Courtney shared the difficulty in getting a review panel in April. Dustin mentioned that recruiting folks during WR conference is a good tactic as it involves face-to-face appeals. Asking prior to Spring may also be helpful because a lot of people have plans solidified during the review time period.
		2. The group discussed if the need for a repeat member was necessary now that we’ve been doing this format for a few years and the process has become more automated with the use of the poster site for submissions. The group decided that the repeat panel member was not necessary.
		3. The group also discussed the difficulty in completing reviews in just two weeks and how this lift may be a deterrent when recruiting reviewers. Rob Terry motioned to move the submission deadline to May 1st. Michelle Burrows seconded. Discussion involved pros and cons of a new submission (e.g., it would be before AAAE, at the end of the semester, or before vacations start). After discussion, the committee voted and the motion passed unanimously.
		4. Action items:
			1. Haley will revise the abstract protocol document to reflect the changes in the panel members and deadlines.
			2. Shannon will make adjustments to the submission deadline in the paper call for next year.
	2. Haley reviewed the abstract submission data
		1. 52 submissions, 1 withdrawn, 1 duplicate, 33/50 accepted (64%). 1 paper withdrawn last week, leaving 32 papers on the schedule for presentation. 32 of the 52 (73%) of the papers submitted contained metadata with an author’s name. However, in some cases the name in the metadata was not the actual paper author. Two submissions contained the author’s name in the filename.
		2. The group decided that to address this, we need to add a line in the paper call to remind reviewers to remove metadata from their document and add a link to instructions on how to do it.
		3. Action Item: Shannon will add in a line about metadata to the paper call.
	3. Haley, Courtney, and Shannon discussed the review process, shared the revisions to the abstract protocol document & offered suggestions for 2023 Research Committee and Conference Chair
		1. There was vagueness in what else should be included in disqualifiers as many of the papers had tracked changes, comments, names in the file name, or other identifying information (e.g., name of university, grant or course number, IRB information). The group decided that adding clarifying language and additional examples to the paper call is important and should help.
		2. The group discussed the protocol for “scrubbing” papers (i.e., making sure papers meet the call). During this discussion, John Rayfield asked about the role of the Submission Manager. Haley said that because we moved to the poster submission site, we did not use the Submission Manager. Instead, Shannon (the Research Conference Chair) worked with Mike Spiess on the poster site and web management side of things. Mike declined the offer of a $500 compensation for his work. John mentioned that if that’s the case, perhaps the compensation of the Submission Manager should be reconsidered as this is a part of his/her job. Rob Terry suggested we email the AAAE board to address this matter. Haley mentioned that we could continue to work with Mike Spiess for the time being and/or bring the previous Conference Chair together with the upcoming Chair to discuss the poster submission site and accompanying logistics.
		3. There was ample discussion about self-plagiarism that emerged in a few of the submissions. Rob, Dustin, Kasee, and John shared historical perspectives on this problem, stating that it isn’t anything new and perhaps there are a few “repeat offenders” that need to be spoken to directly. Folks mentioned that this is a bigger conversation that needs to occur. There were a few recommendations for how to address this:
			1. Add a self-plagiarism statement to the paper call
			2. Email individuals who submitted nearly identical papers this year and give them a gentle reminder about self-plagiarism and why their submissions were disqualified
			3. Connect with the professional development committee and suggest they host a workshop (or something) about self-plagiarism
			4. Remind the membership about self-plagiarism during the Research Committee Conference report
		4. Action Items
			1. Haley emails AAAE board to ask about role of Submission Manager (or lack thereof)
			2. Haley clarifies the process for disqualifying papers in the abstract protocol document.
			3. Shannon adds clarifying language about self-plagiarism to the paper call
			4. Courtney reminds the membership about self-plagiarism and requests PD to organize a workshop about this during the committee report.
4. The group did not discuss all items on the agenda and will pick up during the committee meeting at the conference.
5. Haley adjourned the meeting at 10:00am.