Faculty Senate Minutes
March 8, 2019
NCB 160, 2:30 - 3:45

Senators in Attendance
Monty Abbas, Masoud Agah, Diane Agud, Susan Anderson, Richard Ashley, Charles Calderwood, Leandro Castello, Virgilio Centeno, Harry Dorn, John Galbraith, Ellen Gilliland, James Hawdon, Kathy Hosig, Eric Kaufman, Bradley Klein, Jake Lahne, Chang Lu, Paul Marek, Amy Nelson, Marie Paretti, Robin Queen, Todd Schenk, Durelle Scott, Richard Shryock, Ryan Speer, Jim Spotila, Jim Tokuhisa, Diego Troya, Bruce Vogelaar, Layne Watson, Anthony Wright de Hernandez

Guests
Anita Puckett (Alternate), Kira Dietz, Laurel Miner, Ginny Pannabecker, Trudy Riley, Theresa Mayer

1. Approval of Agenda
The agenda was approved.

2. Approval of Minutes
- The minutes of the Feb 22, 2019 were approved.

3. Topic: Open Access Policy: Ginny Pannabecker
- The Commission on Research has a Working Group focused on a faculty open access policy. The working group plans to present a resolution on the policy to the full Commission at the beginning of the fall 2019 semester; this resolution will likely come through governance in the fall.
- To help faculty understand the issues surrounding open access, there will be 5 NLI sessions this semester and 5 more in the summer; moreover, any department or college may request a presentation. The working group's website is http://bit.ly/vtoapolicy. They will also share the proposal with the Commission on Faculty Affairs this semester.

Presentation Notes
- The presentation is available on the working group's web site: http://bit.ly/vtoapolicy .
- The working group was charged Nov. 10, 2016 and includes both library staff and faculty.
- Their goal is to present a policy resolution in the fall of 2019.
- The critical problem is global access to research; without such access, we are falling short in our mission as a global land grant university because so many people cannot access our work.
- The policy will provide the legal right to share accepted manuscripts, even if copyright is transferred to the publisher.

- The policy simplifies and expands existing rights; it is faculty initiated and faculty led.
- The push toward open-access publishing of faculty research was started by Harvard in 2008, and is increasing among many of our SCHEV peers.
- Open Access (OA) work has more citations and broader impact.
- An OA policy helps create a level playing field with both SCHEV peers and other peers who have enacted similar policies.
- The policy can also help us meet funding agency requirements.
- OA provides faster, more efficient sharing of research.
- The goal is to create an institutional repository of all faculty scholarly work.
- The policy covers scholarly articles, not creative work or books.
- The proposed policy grants non-exclusive rights to the university; authors retain the copyright to their work.
- The policy provides the legal right to deposit accepted manuscripts in VTWorks.
  - Note that this policy addresses the post-peer review accepted version, before copy-editing or other enhancements by a journal (typesetting, etc.).
- The university will notify publishers of the policy.
- This transfer overrides subsequent transfer to the journal.
- Additional details are available in the presentation (see link above).

Comments from the Senate
- What about submission portals that ask about funder OA policies? Is that part of what publishers mean?
- What happens if an author transfers copyright to the journal before the final peer review?
  - Pannabecker will look into this question.
- The process of depositing manuscripts can happen through Elements, and the university is working to better support that process.
- How will this policy impact professional societies that depend on downloads of articles as part of their annual budgets?
- Is this approach comparable to sites such as ResearchGate? Pannabecker notes that such sites are for-profit and do not have the same kinds of policies proposed by the institution, which invokes different legal issues.
- How do we best make our scholarly research accessible?
- Note that in the current model, authors, reviewers, and journal editors supply labor for free and publishers profit.
- The proposed OA policy seems to impose an additional burden on faculty; it is one more step faculty have to do.
- A key question is the sequencing of copyright transfer. Pannabecker will raise the question with her committee.
- Elements already provides some information and lists what journals allow OA archiving of accepted versions.
- Pannabecker noted that "take-downs" of articles at publishers' requests are the responsibility of VTechWorks, not of the article author.

- It is appropriate for faculty at a land grant to have an expectation of OA; it's part of the whole mission of the university and what it means to be at a land grant.

4. Topic: OSP Contracts: Theresa Mayer and Trudy Riley
Abbas provided a summary of survey responses regarding faculty experiences with contracts through OSP.
- The survey received 160 responses.
- The experiences with OSP represent a more or less normal distribution, but skewed negative. Key problems include the following:
  - Loss of contracts
  - Salary escalation concerns
  - Lack of staffing in OSP and low salaries that lead to high turnover
  - The need to terminate OSP staff who are not performing well

Responses from Mayer and Riley
- They thanked the Senate for engaging the faculty in providing feedback and requested the results.
- Mayer introduced Riley as the new AVP for OSP. Riley started at VT on Jan. 1 and comes to us with 20+ years at the University of Delaware, with more recent experience at Georgia Tech.
- Dave Schabdack oversees all animal care and use issues – also started in January.
- With respect to salary, VT is definitely not at benchmark standards for OSP personnel.
- Mayer has to put forward budgets, and if this is a big bottleneck and priority, then the faculty can help to elevate it in terms of priorities. The more we say about what our concerns are, the better administration can allocate budget to match the priorities.
- The current budget is fully tapped out in terms of salary commitments. They are tapped out right now, but faculty say we are understaffed, and the benchmark comparisons show that in fact that is the case relative to other institutions.
- The high staff turnover is in large part connected to salary issues.
- OSP staff do put in long hours and are very committed, but we need to make sure the university is aware of the need.
- Mayer wants to know where the biggest problems are because that's how the budget decisions get made. The Senate needs to continue to make sure its concerns and priorities are clear to the upper administration because it's not just Mayer's decision; the Research Division's budget comes from the upper administration.

Riley then provided some introductory comments and shared her background. She looks forward to working with the Senate to move the research enterprise forward.
- She knows that a key issue is challenges with contracts. She spoke with Associate Deans earlier in the week to get a sense of the challenges.
- She noted that contracting teams handle all acceptance of awards – not just contracts, but acceptance of all funding.

- She will follow up with the individuals who provided names on the survey to get full details on issues and concerns.
- She highlighted some key new initiatives:
  - OSP has hired a new contracts negotiator.
  - They are focusing on adding quality, not just more people.
  - The new negotiator has two decades of experience in international negotiations, and also has experience in clinical trial negotiations, which is very specialized work.
  - They are in negotiations for another federal negotiator, which will add to our ability to do better with those contracts.
  - The key is adding qualified people. They are trying to recruit purposefully and get the right staff in critical areas that support where the university is and where it's growing.
  - A key issue for Riley is helping the OSP staff understand that they are facilitators, not just compliance regulators. She wants her staff to communicate more effectively with faculty, keep people informed, and make sure that they are supporting us, not just holding up the rules (though compliance is also part of their job).
  - Riley provided stats on the number of the negotiations we've done so far this fiscal year, including federal flow-through, nonprofits, and industry.
  - A key bottleneck is negotiation over contracts. A key problem in the past has been things going into a black hole. A key problem for them is loss of staff, and the challenge of communicating while negotiating. Riley is hoping to put an agreements tracking system into Summit because the current system does not easily provide information on how many contracts are in the process of negotiations.
  - Riley needs a burn rate for negotiations so that she can see what's happening, how many things are in negotiations, and where they are to ensure that contracts don't get stuck or lost. One problem can be the response rate back from industry/funder – they can sit on things.
  - She emphasizes the need for communication.
  - Negotiators need to talk with faculty about importance about IP.

Comments from the Senate
- Attitude is critical: faculty need support, not just policing. We need to establish a relationship of mutual goodwill.
- There is a lack of phone responsiveness from OSP. They do not respond to internal VT phone calls, but will respond to external calls (e.g., from a cell phone). Faculty want more responsiveness and willingness to talk by phone.
- We need to establish personal relationships, with face to face meetings.
  - Riley noted that one thing she has done at other institutions is have OSP staff sit in departments for certain periods.
  - Riley values and emphasizes the phone and face-to-face interactions; she values having her staff get out of building and meet people.

- We need to create a more dynamic situation at OSP where people are able to cross boundaries and back each other up.
- OSP needs to be able to more dynamically respond to things. Contracting right now has been a very flat hierarchy. Riley noted that there hasn't been enough cross training across the staff, and there are no opportunities to move up. For example, some NDAs are more basic than others, and we can create more hierarchy and levels so that people can both cross-train and move up. She is trying to create a more responsive and flexible staff.
- We need to avoid going back and forth on the budget with OSP.
- Is it possible to have a cloud-based platform for budgets that would let us work more effectively with budgeting? It became clear that some faculty receive editable budget spreadsheets from OSP and some do not.
- SCRUM is one potential development tool.
- Riley noted that one of the efficiencies will be in the post-award group that provides a dashboard for OSP. They are working on a system that will provide the ability for management to look at not just the number of the awards, but also the level of complexity. They also want to be able to put that information out to departments for the post-award so that Summit can also provide post-award tracking.
- OSP currently doesn't have the capacity in Summit to do some key things and Riley doesn't currently have easy access to information that would support better management.
- Riley also wants to do a better job evaluating risk and making good choices around low risk situations.
- Riley also wants her staff to know when they can/should escalate a negotiation; individuals at higher levels can often make a choice to accept certain risks.
- Riley is open to hearing specifics about different cases to help her better understand needs, and she wants faculty to feel comfortable reaching out to her.
- She is happy to come to faculty meetings and talk at the department level.
- One option for pre-award work is to consider having OSP experts not just by department, but by types of awards or types of agencies. Riley talked about the differences between constituency-based and sponsor-based OSP staffing. Universities tend to swing back and forth. Riley hopes to have a mix: predominantly constituency based, but with some level of sponsor-based expertise.
- Abbas had a number of suggestions for Riley.
- One key problem for all faculty is that Summit does not notify faculty when there are comments from OSP.
- Mayer also noted that we need better support for electronic research administration. They do have a new person on board to help lead tool development and meet critical development needs.
- Mayer notes that these conversations with the Senate are very helpful because they help identify priorities.
- We need to use Summit as a core central tool; the goal is to keep everything in Summit to provide a single platform for research administration.
- Can OSP do regular surveys with faculty to see what's working and what's not working? They do want to do some faculty focus groups and they need to get

feedback from faculty to understand where the bottlenecks are. Maybe the Associate Deans for Research in each college can facilitate discussions around these issues. Can Faculty Senate help to facilitate discussions? We need ways to get faculty input around critical issues.

- Riley and Mayer should return at a later date to talk about what's happening and to tell us what's changing.

5. New business
Library Faculty Association Continued Appointment Process (Anthony Wright de Hernandez)

- As detailed in Chapter 4 of the Faculty Handbook, review of Continued Appointment (CA) faculty has only 1 level prior to university.
- The critical problem is that review of CA faculty requires a very specific committee make-up, but since extension has not hired anyone on a CA appointment since 2007, we now have only 2 people to serve the 2 slots on the review committee. We have to change the faculty handbook, which means going through governance.
- They request that the committee include 2 faculty with tenure across the 9 colleges on staggered 2 year terms.
- Finney supports the proposal.
- The 1st reading was at CFA on April 5; the 2nd reading will be April 18, with the goal to send the proposal to University Council on 4/22, and then send it on to the BOV on June 3.
- They would like the Senate to support the resolution and to support service on the committee. The Senate agreed.

Pathways revision proposal

- A number of the pathways indicators seem fairly discipline-specific, but they are being taught by faculty who are not trained and certified in those areas. The current pathways model may be violating the SACS and SCHEV guidelines (i.e., the requirement for 18 hours post undergraduate coursework in the discipline in order to teach at the undergraduate level).
- There seems to be no check on the quality of the courses being taught or the quality of the material within those courses.
- Note that the argument that faculty are interdisciplinary is not sustainable because courses don't belong to faculty and a single faculty member doesn't own each course.
- The Senate will put this on the agenda for a later time.

6. Adjourn
The Senate adjourned at 4:10 p.m.