

## **Minutes from the General Faculty Council Meeting**

**Wednesday, December 9, 2009**

12:00 noon – 1:30 pm  
Newcomb Hall Room 481

**Representatives Present** – Otilie Austin, Beth Blanton-Kent, Penny Bowles, Ryan Carter, David Glover, Anne Ingram, Aaron Laushway, Pam MacIntyre, Barbara Millar, Peter Norton, Ricky Patterson (Chair), Ellen Ramsey, Wendy Sewack, Jeff Sitler, Colleen Smith

**Representatives Absent** –, Barbara Kessler, Catherine Leslie, Teresa Lockard, Marshall Pattie, Michael Smith, Steven Warner

**Guests** – Jim Baker, Susan Carkeek, Craig Decker, Ruei-Jen Fan, Joseph Gilbert, Wayne Graham, Penelope Kaiserling, Bill Keene, Donna Klepper, Diddy Didi Morris, Bethany Nowviski, Jane Penner, William Ferraro, Wynne Stuart, Lynda White

Preliminaries

1. 12:00 **Gathering of Members**

2. 12:10 **Call to Order**

Ricky Patterson, Chair, welcomed the members and guests and everyone introduced themselves.

**Business**

3. 12:15 **Presentation**

**Open Access**

Ricky Patterson, Chair, introduced Faculty Senate member and former General Faculty Council member Bill Keene, who provided an overview and update of the Faculty Senate's work on the Open Access publication policy. This policy has caused concern among some members of the University community who are involved in scholarly publishing.

One concern with Open Access is the copyright issue. The National Institutes of Health (NIH) spearheaded the Open Access effort (PubMed). This was largely an effort to ensure that tax-payer funded research was available to the public (without having to pay for it a second time). The result was the initiation of guidelines, which in turn inspired institutions to develop an open access policy for publications. [In terms of what we do, Open Access doesn't have much effect.] Currently when you submit a journal article that is accepted, you sign away the copyrights to that piece of work; Open Access is an attempt to leave the copyright with the scholar. UVA's draft Open Access policy is modeled after

Harvard's and MIT's. and would keep the copyright with the author, and would call for the preprint version of the article to be posted in a open access archive one year after the article is published. The University Library would manage this archive.

One concern is that the Open Access document would be a preprint and not the final published article. For scholarly purposes, the final, edited article is what should be referenced. However, for those with no access to the journal, the preprint would be better than nothing.

Smaller journals have a unique set of concerns. Some professional organizations rely on subscriptions for a large amount of their funding revenue. If you have Open Access, many potential customers would simply wait a year and download the article from the free archive. This in turn would drive the small journals out of existence, and can harm the professional societies. However, many societies have already realized they can't rely on this funding stream with the way the publishing world is changing (and heading to Open Access), and have restructured their fees.

The UVA draft has an opt-out provision. As of right now, compliance is voluntary (as with any Faculty Senate resolution). Bill Keene believes that at this time, Open Access has no impact on us. It is fine in the abstract, but it's the nuts and bolts that create problems. The Faculty Senate has not made any final decision about this issue, and continues to discuss it with all faculty. The goal is to pass this resolution by consensus, rather than a simply majority, so that nearly everyone is on board.

The GFC and guests inquired if this was limited to journal articles and not to books. The Faculty Senate draft, in keeping with the Harvard model, applies only to journal articles. More and more is going to Open Access. Many science disciplines already use the Open Access model (i.e., arXiv.org). Each discipline is different, and that is part of the problem.

Keene noted that an institutional repository would not be easily findable. You don't search for a preprint of an article, but search for the published article. You also don't search for scholarly work by institution, but rather by field of research. If the repository goes forward, it would almost certainly need to link to both the published version of the article as well as the pre-existing external Open Access databases (grouped by field of research, such as arXiv.org).

NIH has made this a requirement of federal funded research, and the NSF is probably heading in this direction as well. Humanities is observing this closely

Ricky Patterson noted that the Open Access opt-out process is simply the act of sending an email. A response is not needed; once you've sent the email, you've opted out.

Other questions raised were what was the progress in the implementation of a

database. The biggest concern is that this does not come down as a mandatory repository.

Bill Keene noted that Open Access provides minimal benefit as to how most of us conduct our work. The question is, what is the cost benefit of how this is going to serve us?

[It was stated that in the Humanities, a group worked to bring open access to lots of repositories to provide metadata and full text searching. It has galvanized that field. Not so much in the sciences, and the sciences have been clamoring for these repositories.] (I am not sure I remember this discussion. I know in Astronomy we have the metadata/full text searching ability already. It was noted too that the costs of the journal subscriptions are prohibitive.

Beth Blanton-Kent stated that journal publishers are watching the Open Access movement very carefully. It is impacting what they charge libraries – it is out of control. You produce the research and libraries have to buy it back, and it is now reaching the point where we can no longer afford to buy it all back. We have limited resources. There must be a compromise to providing research to scholars.

### **Effort Reporting and Faculty in Grant Funded Positions**

Bill also provided some information on a policy under review by the University's Policy Committee on Effort Reporting. There are several concerns here, especially for those who fund all or part of their salary from federal grants. It focuses on reporting for sponsored employees who are on grants and contracts. It means that all professional effort of every ilk is considered holistically by UVA, and all should be reported as coming under these grants and contracts. These grants and contracts are very specific, and specifically disallow some of the effort to be charged to them.

Some of the issues related include:

- The management of temporary disability leave, how do you bill time to a grant or contract if that person is not working on the project,
- Accounting issues relating to benefit distribution of classified staff,

### **LEAD@UVA and A&P Evaluations**

The GFC continued a discussion about concerns raised by Administrative and Professional (A&P) Faculty, including the use of LEAD@UVA for evaluations. Peter Norton summarized how we got to this point. It is time for A&P faculty to conduct their own investigation to define their issues.

There was concern about transition to LEAD as it relates to performance evaluations, and how good of a fit that is to NTTF. Susan Carkeek, Vice President for Human Resources, reviewed the process of how the decision was made to include A&P faculty in the LEAD@UVA process. There was discussion about whether or not applying LEAD@UVA to A&P faculty was an afterthought to the extensive process of developing the new tool. Susan also explained that LEAD@UVA has many bells and whistles that have not yet been activated, and that once activated it may more fully meet the needs of everyone.

A major problem that was expressed about LEAD@UVA was that the inclusion of A&P faculty appeared to be an afterthought.

The GFC tasked the A&P faculty on the council to meet to determine if they had issues that needed to be resolved. Then a course of action can be identified. This could be analogous to the Report of the Faculty Senate's Task force on the Non-Tenure Track Faculty. This will address the questions that A&P faculty are still having doubts about informal practices, leading to anxiety about potential inequities.

Susan Carkeek reviewed LEAD@UVA and the yearlong process that the Task Force underwent to formulate it. The resulting body of work should not be ignored. Performance evaluation for A&P faculty was a concern. There were inconsistencies and the attempt to integrate the recommendations of the A&P Task Force. By design, Carkeek attempted to include the GFC (several GFC A&P members were included in the task force which considered this).

There was disagreement from members of the GFC about whether or not the LEAD@UVA was intended to include A&P faculty. Someone has made a decision that does not reflect the effort of the task force.

Carkeek reminded the GFC that there were five or six task forces working together at a time. Cross conversations occurred between the chairs of all committees. If there was a breakdown between design and implementation, she accepts that.

LEAD is software tool. Generically designed with goals and development. Its structure is generic. Can we accommodate the majority? We are anticipating that over time more people will use it.

Beth Blanton-Kent asked who would have said A&P faculty would be required to use it? It was noted that Leonard Sandridge expected everyone under him would want to use it. It was less directive on the academic side than on the administrative side.

There was much discussion about this topic. Darden is now putting goals into LEAD@UVA so that it could be used next year. The Library has had robust evaluations for a very long time. LEAD@UVA is a tool for evaluations, and it is in

everyone's interest for everyone to be evaluated. It is important that its value be recognized. There are measurable outcomes. Do you meet your goals?

Job descriptions are not in the system yet, so there is a disconnect.

Susan Carkeek acknowledged that she appreciated the feedback. The software has a lot of functionality; the complete functionality is not turned on for the initial implementation. We can build on this software over time.

There is an Advance date – 12/18 – for this year, but the date will be going back to October date next year, which is the normal time for Classified Staff and now University Staff to be reviewed. However it is possible to open up the time frame to a several month long window, which should alleviate the concerns that some A&P faculty have about being forced to abandon their previously established evaluation schedule and adopt the October time frame. The time frame can be set by each organization.

It was noted that some positions do not have a career path for A&P faculty. It was felt that it is insulting to make the A&P faculty think in these terms. No carrot is needed [and this is not an unusual point of view]. It might have more meaning for University Staff people, but it is unfortunate that it has been emphasized across the board. It gives the impression that not a lot of thought went in to it.

There is not possibility of opting out of LEAD@UVa. Carkeek stated that the goal is to have every person be evaluated every year.

When UVa gets back to a merit world, the consistent rankings could be very helpful.

#### **4. 1:30 Committee Reports**

Ricky Patterson, GFC Chair, stated that we would dispense with committee reports today due to the length of the discussion.

#### **5. 1:30 Adjournment**

Next meeting: Wednesday, January 13, 2010, Newcomb 481 at noon.