

Executive Council meeting
January 12, 2010, 2:00 to 4:00 p.m.
Newcomb Hall Room 481

Present: Bob Bloodgood, Ann Hamric, Chris Holstege, Bob Kemp, Susan Kirk, Ed Kitch, Pam Norris, Marti Snell, Chip Tucker, Alf Weaver, Gweneth West

1. Welcome Resolution for Dr. Sullivan

The Council discussed the idea of a Faculty Senate resolution to welcome President-Elect Teresa Sullivan and express pleasure in the hire, which would then be presented to Faculty Senate members for approval.

The Council expressed the desire to have an active Faculty Senate in place when she gets here. Gweneth suggested surveying five or six faculty senates across country to see how they collect their senators. This might involve going to look at various faculty senates to see how we might want to restructure.

When Ken Schwartz was chair, he looked at a number of faculty senates, including their bylaws and how they were constituted. All University of Michigan bylaws were revised a year ago, and Dr. Sullivan probably had a hand in that. Michigan has a university senate, not a faculty senate. According to its bylaws, anyone can propose an agenda item provided the motion or resolution is supported by two other senate members. Ann Hamric pointed out that people are raising questions not necessarily to have them become senate agenda items. Should we say that these questions should first be directed to the person's senator, and only then would the senator bring item forward?

We can still question our structures and look at what other options there are.

There has been an orientation for new senators in the past; Ken and Ricardo did it several years ago. The materials are all available on the Senate website.

It was decided that minutes would be sent to all Executive Council members for review before posting them.

The Council discussed the possibility of having a weekly Collab conversation, with a set of items that all would respond to and see each others' comments. This would be a good option to having more frequent meetings, and would reduce the burden on the chair. A time frame could be agreed on when a discussion topic would be posted each week. Ann Witkower would send a weekly reminder to check Collab for that week's material. It would be stressed that this site preserves the privacy of participants.

Gweneth and Ed are going to write a thank-you note to the presidential search committee with help from Chip.

In addition, the Executive Council will draft a welcome resolution to Dr. Sullivan, which will then be sent to the senators for their endorsement. How many senators endorsing it would pass it? This resolution would be read at her first meeting in the fall.

A group is already working on the resolution for President Casteen, to be adopted formally at the next meeting, sent to Senate members for feedback, then presented at the final Senate meeting. It was proposed that Ann Hamric tell Senate members at the working meeting,

“We are presenting this to President Casteen at the final Senate meeting.” Copies of the draft would be available on the table. We would ask for an email response from senators.

Work on the resolution for Dr. Sullivan will wait until the other two documents are completed.

In summary, three documents will be prepared: a thank-you note to the search committee for their work from the Executive Council; a resolution to thank President Casteen for his contributions to the University, from the full Senate; and a welcome resolution and endorsement for the new president, also from the entire Senate.

2. U.Va. Leadership Initiatives

Six different leadership initiatives are going on at U.Va., and it is important for the Executive Council, as the leadership body of the Senate, to know about them. We will keep the discussion on the agenda until Tim can be here.

3. Dissertation-Year Fellowships (DYF)

The School of Engineering and Applied Science has said it won't fund any DYFs; they aren't viewed as necessary. But three of five inquirers about the fellowships are from SEAS. Currently we have only four DYFs – two from Provost, one from Arts & Sciences, and one from Curry if they approve. We need in-place funding for these so we don't have to start over asking each year.

Some on the Executive Council see it as a bad deal; it requires a great deal of faculty vetting applications, for limited resources. A request was made to return to this issue for further discussion and decisions.

4. Honor Discussion

Bob Kemp, Chip Tucker, and Ann Hamric met yesterday (January 11) with a professor to follow up on honor concerns. Bob Bloodgood suggested in an email to follow up on issues raised in the 2004 honor report. After the professor has, as agreed, re-done his complaint, met with Pat Lampkin, then reported back to the Executive Council about that meeting, the issue would go to the Academic Affairs Committee, which would look at the honor report. After that, there's a series of recommendations for changes that would go to the Honor Committee. It was asked if we could go with four recommendations from the 2004 report. The Faculty Senate wants restoration of the non-toleration clause, which failed in a student referendum. (Look at documents Ann sent around.) Almost all of the faculty who commented on the 2004 reports wanted an alternative to the single sanction.

How should we follow up on these concerns? **The Honor Committee needs to be responsive; we can hold them accountable.** Did we send a time-line for closure? The professor is eager to proceed.

5. Program Closures

We need to know when program closures should be scheduled for a vote. We need to ask Clo Phillips for documentation.

6. Open Access Resolution

A revised resolution has been drafted by Madelyn Wessel, restating the original resolution as a recommendation rather than a mandatory policy. It was recognized that a long time may be necessary for a consensus to emerge among the faculty. Arguments to make in building consensus are: 1) Articles posted on the web get much more notice than printed ones, an advantage for scholars. Brian's suggestion to increase the involvement of the Senate is a follow-up mechanism through the Library. The Library has invested significant funds in infrastructure for digital reproduction. Their concept of a repository of faculty scholarship would be some portion of that. The Library's central claim is that the cost of doing that, given this infrastructure, is very low. 2) Work with particular departments that show interest, finding ways to routinize the process of making materials available. Then let it spread to other departments.

Should the revised resolution be presented at the next Senate meeting? Ann suggested one change: Make the judgment that of the Executive Council of the Senate, not of the Chair.

The Faculty Senate would still vote "yes" or "no," but the resolution states that certain faculty retain rights; before it was a policy, from which one would have to opt out. The current resolution takes the teeth out of the Library's original desire. Even before, it was in a sense a bluff, because waivers can be obtained by asking. But it does seem like the Library's original intent has been lost. Ed Kitch and Brian Pusser, members of the Task Force on Scholarly Publication and Authors' Rights, want to open a dialogue with the Library to say, "No it's not as dramatic, but it's a step in the desired direction."

Once the resolution is strictly voluntary, legal issues drop out. In the future, Madelyn Wessel, who is a legal advisor and negotiator of contracts for publishing rights, shouldn't be asked to play a central role, but to communicate directly to University Librarian Karin Wittenborg. The process will take longer using persuasion and demonstrating how it works. We need to figure that out before bringing it back to the Senate. Karin needs to look on this as a marketing issue; the Library needs to make this option so attractive to scholars that they will want to do it. There has been confusion on the part of the faculty, but at the same time the resolution needed not to be a one-size-fits-all document. Some people would have been hurt, while others would have welcomed it. We need cooperation, not a closely contested vote that will breed contention.

Journals may start to hold copyright but allow a document to be posted on an institutional repository or wherever the author wants; that's is what our resolution was asking for. Ed Kitch was asked to have conversation with Library, to see if they will authorize this new resolution. Second, forms will be created for those who want to retain a license to publish. Those who have voiced strong opinions about the original resolution should be asked to read the new resolution and provide feedback. These could include Adrienne Ward, David Vander Meulen, and Siva Vaidhyanathan. Then we could say that we've let a few select people take a look at this. We're slated to vote on this in February; we will vote it up or down. We want to notify senators of the February vote far enough in advance to save the date: send an email with documents, letting them know they need to be there for the vote.

7. Senate Voting Discussion

Do we want to revise bylaws to enable an electronic vote? Or to lower the quorum? It can be any percent. If we calculate what the usual attendance number is, we can choose a percent of that. If electronic voting is instituted, how can we make sure senators are well informed on the issues? But this could be a way to handle the fact that more and more faculty are away, in

meetings, etc. **Susan was asked to investigate what is entailed in setting up electronic voting.** Our preference is still for people to vote in person at the meeting; but if we don't have a quorum, we can send the issue around electronically. This would avoid having to schedule a second emergency meeting. Susan will look for bylaws language on this subject.

Ann Witkower was asked to add an electronic voting back-up option to the bylaws consideration folder.

8. University of Texas Faculty Senate Resolution about Coach Salary

The UT Faculty Senate resolution was introduced for discussion. Big salaries for athletic coaches when budgets are tight seem to be a distortion of priorities. Money given to athletics may be taken out of money that would have been donated to academic programs. Discussion ensued about a proposal to issue a similar Faculty Senate resolution at U.Va., to express collective professional dismay to a situation that we object to. Craig Littlepage will be at the Executive Council meeting next month, prior to his address to the full Faculty Senate. We could raise the issue then of compensation and disproportional funding of athletics in times of budget concerns. It was decided to have a Collab discussion on this topic.

A suggestion was made to ask Bob Sweeney to address the Executive Council and provide information about how athletics programs affect giving toward academic programs.

The meeting adjourned at 4 p.m.

Submitted by Kevin Lee, Secretary of the Faculty Senate