

FACULTY SENATE MEETING MINUTES
Tuesday April 25, 2017

PRESENT: Abbas, Agud, Ahmadian, Allnutt, Anderson, Bairaktarova, Baker (Ruoniemi alternate), Barney, Billingsley, Brown, Bush, Campbell, Corl, Dalloul, Etzkorn, Ferris, Geyer, Gilmore, Hawdon, Hicok, Kaufman, Leon, Lyon, Mackey, Martin, McGrath, Noiro, O’Keefe, Olson, Puckett, Richey, Rinehart, Robinson, Schenk, Shadle, Sirgy, Smith, Sultan, Tegarden, Vogelaar, Watson, Wemhoener, Young.

ABSENT: Al-Haik, Amacher, Ashley, Balci, Brewster, Ducker, Gabbard, Gaskill, Gindlesberger, Good, Guynn, Hopkins, Hosig, Jordan, (with notice) Luttrell, Matheson, Merola, Nappier, O’Rourke, Patterson, Reed, Rosenzweig, Safaai-Jazi, Savla, Seth, Skaggs, Spotila, Stauffer, Stivachtis, Tavera, Tracy, Trogdon, Viehland, Zhang.

I. HOUSEKEEPING

The meeting was called to order at 5:19PM. The agenda was approved, as were the minutes for the April 11, 2017 meeting (after Julie Speer’s presentation).

II. JULIE SPEER, ASSOCIATE DEAN, ON DRAFT OPEN ACCESS POLICY (COR/LIBRARIES)

Speer reminded us of definitions of OA, for archiving and publishing. OA gives a citation advantage and increases research visibility. It is also becoming a requirement with some funding agencies. She then shared a timeline of when peer institutions and other universities instituted Faculty OA policies in the past decade. Fifty institutions have such a policy as of now.

VTech Works is our institutional OA repository. It is accessible through Google Scholar.

The Commission on Research (COR) was charged last year to prepare a policy, making sure ease of submission remains a priority. They now have a draft Open Access Policy. The Provost Office and University Libraries have agreed to monitor compliance. The publisher’s version or the submitted versions will typically be the one(s) uploaded. Waivers and embargo periods are allowed. This is not a retroactive policy. The exact wording of the current draft policy will be shared on the Senate’s Canvas site. A Google site with related resources will soon be shared as well.

A direct link to the **Elements** E-FAR system is already in place. (Secretary Note: as is, that system is highly dysfunctional and therefore *not* supported by Faculty Senate; see February 2017 E-FAR Report.) Direct submission to **VTech Works** or submission to the OA committee/office will also be enabled.

Discussion: Could there be issues of liability for copyright infringement? You can always request a waiver; this is an opt-out policy. Plus only some kind of pre-print version will be available. Harvard has never had an issue, in multiple years of implementation. Another concern is that it places excessive burden on the faculty. The library should be checking all publishers’ copyright policy, not the faculty. If it is policy, and therefore required, then publishers need to accept that

it supersedes their own policy. But embargo periods, which many publishers explicitly mention already, can and will be respected, Ben Corl pointed out.

III. 2017-18 OFFICER ELECTIONS

Hans Robinson, currently Vice-President and Chair of CFA, was nominated for President. **John Ferris**, who has served on CFA for the past two years, was nominated for Vice-President. **Bob Hicok**, leader of the taskforce on benchmarking and evaluation, was nominated for Secretary. Three separate elections were conducted. Robinson was elected President; Ferris was elected Vice-President; Hicok was elected Secretary-Treasurer. Their term begins August 1, 2017.

IV. FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTION ON FACULTY INCLUSION & ACCESS TO OPPORTUNITIES

President Abbas presented the draft version, which he has discussed with several Deans, who expressed their approval with some reservations – mostly so as not to sound confrontational in the wording. Discussion and group editing ensued.

A motion passed to adopt the amended resolution (with two abstentions).

V. PIBB TASK FORCE REPORT: FELICIA ETZKORN AND BOB HICOK

Performance funding is already widespread nationwide. We do not yet have evidence that it improves student experience. It may even worsen rising inequalities. It has also been shown that **accountability and collaboration** with the faculty can help improve performance-based budgets. Research shows that there are fundamental problems with this kind of budgeting and that faculty involvement is crucial for optimal implementation. The main purpose of budget models like the PIBB is to have **political leverage** (with legislators, etc.), the other is to create **competition**, hence the premiums vs. cuts announced, perhaps with some program being terminated down the road.

Eight principles for the assessment of metrics and benchmarks were formulated by the taskforce. (See document on Canvas.) Only one major change was made since the version shared for the survey last month. The principles are summarized below. The rationale for each are available on Canvas. Among the principles spelled out are: Faculty oversight; Diversity of Assessment; Quality; Transparency; Administrative Assessment

More discussion ensued. A motion passed to send the report/letter to upper Administration. Further conversations with faculty at large on the topic should be conducted in the Fall.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:03PM.