Workshop Series for Junior Faculty  
1203 East Building, Hunter College

Workshop Agenda  
Friday, April 4, 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10:00 – 10:10 a.m.</td>
<td>INTRODUCTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:10 – 11:10 a.m.</td>
<td>DEPARTMENTAL GOVERNANCE: ENSURING A VOICE FOR WOMEN AND MINORITIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Read – “Power, effectiveness, and gender” (Valian, 2006) and “Ensuring a voice for minorities” (GEP 2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-workshop Activity: Come prepared to the workshop to talk about the areas and/or activities in your department where you think the most gender and/or minority issues occur, backed by specific examples (with names etc. omitted so as not to identify anyone), along with productive strategies to deal with the issues raised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:10 – 10:40 p.m.</td>
<td>Presentation: “Departmental governance” by Haydee Salmun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:40 – 11:10 p.m.</td>
<td>Group Discussion – Large group discussion based on the readings and presentations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:10 – 11:55 p.m.</td>
<td>NEGOTIATING AUTHORSHIP CREDIT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Read – “Unethical practices in authorship of scientific papers” (Bennett &amp; Taylor, 2003) and “A few words on authorship credit” (Miarmi, 2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-workshop Activity – Ask a fellow colleague for a “war story” regarding authorship credit. Have you ever been a victim of or a spectator to authorship abuse? If so, was it an instance of “gift authorship,” where an individual who does not meet authorship criteria is included in the by-line, or an instance of “ghost authorship,” where an individual’s name is left off the list despite substantial contribution to the research or writing of the article? How was the situation handled? Can you think of alternative ways the issue could have been dealt with?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If you have a personal experience in which you were required to negotiate authorship with a colleague, please come prepared to discuss it. What were some of the issues at stake? For example, was it clear who would be the principal author? Did you have difficulty determining whether certain work on the project (e.g., data analysis, editing and revising the paper) merited authorship? With your current knowledge about negotiation, how would you handle the situation differently now? Come prepared to discuss your stories with the group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:10 – 11:25 p.m.</td>
<td>Presentation – “Negotiating authorship credit” by Steven Suib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:25 – 11:55 p.m.</td>
<td>Group Discussion – Discuss lessons learned from pre-workshop activity and presentation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11:55 – 12:05 p.m.  
**Break**

12:05 – 12:50 p.m.  
**STUDENT AND ASSISTANT MANAGEMENT**

Read – “Setting up your lab and beginning a program of research” (Zacks and Roediger, 2004)

Pre-workshop Activity – If, at the beginning of your work with a student, you discuss you and your student’s expectations and responsibilities, you may be able to avoid some common management problems. Writing down everyone’s expectations and responsibilities at the beginning of a project should help you determine ahead of time where expectations could be in conflict. By reviewing that document periodically, you should be able to address issues before they get out of hand. You may want to put this in writing or even have a contract. Although a contract may be hard to do with graduate students, it might help you choose serious undergrads and could be the basis for an independent study syllabus. Create a list of concrete expectations and responsibilities for a student or research assistant, such as: hours per week, flexibility of hours, working during exam periods, nature of final product, basis for the grade and that it won’t necessarily be an A or B. Please bring the list to the workshop and use it as a guide for the discussion.

12:05 – 12:20 p.m.  
**Presentation** – “Student and assistant management” by Steve Suib

12:20 – 12:50 p.m.  
**Group Discussion** – Discussion based on pre-workshop activity and presentation.

12:50 – 1:50 p.m.  
**Lunch Break**

1:50 – 2:45  
**PUBLISHING AND HANDLING REJECTION**

Read – “Dealing with the rejected article” (Guillou & Earnshaw, 2000) and “Handling journal articles that receive a revise-and-resubmit or rejection decision” (GEP 2007)

1:50 – 2:15 p.m.  
**Presentation** – “Successful publishing and handling rejection” by Lynn Francesconi

2:15 – 2:45 p.m.  
**Group Discussion** – Recall the most recent paper or grant proposal that was rejected or received a revise-and-resubmit judgment. Then consider the following:

1. Were the comments made by the reviewers constructive? If so, what made them constructive?
2. Were any of the comments made by the reviewers particularly unhelpful? If so, what made the comments unhelpful?
3. In the materials you read for the workshop, which suggestions were particularly useful?
4. Imagine that a respected colleague received the rejection or reviews that you did. What suggestions would you give him or her?
2:45 – 3:45 p.m.  BALANCING WORK AND PERSONAL LIVES

Pre-workshop Activity – Talk with at least one colleague whose personal life is similar to your own. Ask about strategies he or she uses to balance work and personal lives. Your goal here is not to find someone you can emulate. It is to learn what strategies others use to have a happy and productive work and home life so that you can devise your own strategies. Come prepared to discuss what you learned with the group.

2:45 – 3:25 p.m.  Presentation – “Balancing work and personal lives” by Margaret Chin and Erica Chito Childs

3:25 – 3:45 p.m.  Group Discussion – Discussion will be based on lessons learned from pre-workshop activity and presentation.

3:45 – 3:55 p.m.  Break

SELF-PRESENTATION AND BUILDING A NATIONAL REPUTATION


Pre-workshop Activity – Ask a colleague 5-10 years ahead of you who you consider to be successful, well-known, or a good self-presenter for a copy of his or her CV. This should be a person who has achieved a position, award, or status that you aspire to. Think of this CV as a guidebook for self-presentation and compare it to your own. What suggestions for you does it have to offer? Are there particular professional activities you should be engaging in (e.g., organizing conference panels, running for an elected position in your professional society)? Are there particular agencies or organizations you should be seeking grant money from? What concrete ideas can you gather from comparing your CV to your colleague’s? Bring a copy of this colleague’s CV as well as a copy of your own CV to the workshop.

3:55 – 4:10 p.m.  Presentation – “Self-presentation and building a national reputation” by Virginia Valian

4:10 – 4:25 p.m.  Activity – Work with a partner to construct a concrete plan to increase or improve your self-presentation based on the ideas you collected from your colleague’s CV. Your plan should include at least one goal that is both tangible and feasible and enough details so that you could actually make significant progress toward the goal over the next 6 months.


4:40 – 5:00 p.m.  Questionnaire – please complete before leaving.

Evaluations – Please complete evaluations before leaving.