

Faculty Senate Working Meeting
October 29, 2009 – 3:00 – 5:00 p.m.
Alumni Hall Ballroom

Meeting minutes

Ann Hamric, Senate Chair, called the meeting to order at 3 p.m. She reported on James Hilton's presentation to the Executive Council about the rollout of the new Help Desk. James will join the Faculty Senate at the first meeting next semester when all rollouts will have been completed. In response to requests by the Executive Council, James has put a new link on the Help Desk website inviting feedback and suggestions. Ms. Hamric asked senators to let faculty constituents know that ITC is eager for their feedback so they can correct problems [<http://itc.virginia.edu/helpdesk/>]. The ITC website also now has an invitation for feedback. [A link is included instead of a screen image: <http://www.itc.virginia.edu/> - at bottom of page under the heading "Technology Roadmap," a link can be found to the Foundation Documents concerning changes now underway. At the bottom of each Foundation Document page is a heading, "Your Feedback is Welcome," linking to a form reading, "Feedback to ITC Customer Communications."] It is important to provide feedback to the ITC where it can make a difference.

Ms. Hamric, Ed Kitch and Gweneth West had a productive meeting with Craig Littlepage and Carolyn Callahan. It has been decided not to join the Coalition On Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA), but we will try to encourage feedback on these issues. Craig will attend the Senate meeting at the first of the year. If you have issues regarding athletics, please link to the Athletic Advisory Council – type in "athletics" in the A-Z Website Index and you'll see it. Go directly to the group with feedback. Gweneth West also serves on this group, as well as Rachel Most – she is charged in the College with working directly with athletics issues. It is important for those of you in the College to ensure that your constituents know that they can contact her with concerns regarding student athlete academic performance issues.

We are looking for an interested person to serve as the Senate representative on the Council for Diversity, which meets on third Thursday of the month from 9 to 11 a.m.

Susan Carkeek, Vice President and Chief Human Resource Officer, presented information about the University's health care plans. She explained that we do not have health insurance, but health care. The University uses the pool of employees' funds to process claims. Southern Health is contracted to handle claims and gets the same amount of money whether a claim is processed or not.

Ms. Carkeek presented a PowerPoint to explain the differences between the low- and high-premium plans and the increase in cost of the high-premium plan for 2010. The cost of employee health care is paid 80% by the University and 20% by the employee. Costs will rise next year because new services have been added, and because there has been an increase in high dollar claims.

A question was raised, pointing out a seeming discrepancy in the figures Susan presented. She agreed to research that.*

A study conducted in 2005 benchmarked our plan to six peer institutions. We ranked second to highest in benefits. A 2009 study comparing our benefits to peers showed we are putting in more money than others, buying more benefits. No increases will be seen in the cost of the low-premium plan, only the high-premium.

A series of forums will be held in conjunction with the Fall Resource Fair at Newcomb Hall on November 12.

A question was raised about the role of the Benefits Committee. Benefits Committee members look at comparisons to peer institutions and at types of care – they help prioritize various services that could be offered.

Brian Pusser, member of the Task Force on Scholarly Publication and Authors' Rights, spoke about the upcoming Senate vote on Open Access. Comments made at the working meeting today will go back to Task Force where deliberations will take place. Further comments should go directly to Professor Pusser. Senate members have an obligation to be as informed as possible and to communicate information to all faculty. Meetings have taken place in many schools/departments. If anyone else wants to schedule one, Task Force will be glad to come.

The waiver process was intentionally designed into the resolution to allow faculty to opt out who aren't allowed to or don't want to participate. In general, three types of waiver policies exist: none (NIH), voluntary systems (but none like that have been implemented so far); and the middle ground that we have taken – a waiver option.

We will not spell out in advance every detail of implementation. Please discuss with your colleagues and think about what we need to carefully specify. We have made a small change in the resolution's language, and will make more based on the comments we receive.

Ed Kitch, Past Chair of the Faculty Senate and also member of the Task Force, said that a theme of some comments is, Why bother with this? Technology is changing, the Congress is acting; whatever happens, we should just endure it. Mr. Kitch views this as an opportunity for this faculty to assert a role in this process as we adjust to new technologies and regulatory pressures. If we say nothing, we create a void where others make decisions and impose them on us. These matters are at the interface of scholarship and its creation. We should make a collective decision.

Mr. Kitch reported on his conversation with David Vander Meulen, the editor of bibliographical studies that are available online to be downloaded, in addition to making volumes available through Muse AND selling printed volumes. Mr. Vander Meulen is concerned about how journals will adjust to new technological realities. He also presented the views of other concerned individuals like the president of the American Historical Association. Many journals grant permission for authors to self-archive on their own websites, etc., but only if they ask. One can't be sure what will happen to copyrights assigned to these journals, especially if they are in

financial trouble and sell their journals to commercial interests. If the author has sold all his rights to the journal, they can then be sold to someone else. There is no reason to think that the subsequent owner will be fair-minded. This resolution offers protection against that possibility.

A question and answer period followed. One question was, What about someone who just sends in copyright agreement and ignores this? The answer was that it is unclear whether we have any enforcement for compliance. The Task Force has yet to decide about that.

Karin Wittenborg, the University Librarian, said that while many disciplines have become increasing digital, participation is not rising in a smooth line in many disciplines. The Library is interested in preserving institutional assets. If most people decide to preserve copyright rights and put assets in this repository, we will have them. Harvard and MIT already have institutional policies that came out of their faculty senates. We're not breaking new ground.

Anyone with further questions or comments may email these to Mr. Pusser at bp6n@virginia.edu.

The Senate discussed whether to delay a vote. But it is probable that the deadline has encouraged a high level of discussion and interest.

Susan McKinnon, chair of Faculty Recruitment and Retention Committee, introduced roundtable discussions about the most important issues uncovered in the Faculty Survey conducted in 2007. The six discussion groups were tasked with deciding what are the most important issues to address in terms of faculty recruitment, retention, and welfare.

*This is Ms. Carkeek's researched response to the question she was asked: "I write to follow up with additional information in response to the question about the impact of "high dollar claims" on the health plan rate increases. The question related to the inconsistencies in the arithmetic of my report: that the total health plan costs of \$130m represented a 17% total increase and that without the \$3m increase in high dollar claims the increase would have been 7.7%. My error is that the 7.7% reflected the impact only on the medical expense portion of the plan, not all the components of the entire \$130m plan.

"What I left out in this shortened version of the health plan data is that the \$130m total health plan includes several components – medical, prescription drug, mental health, dental, etc. The "medical" component of the plan was approximately \$70m. The portion of the 17% total increase attributed specifically to increases in the medical portion of the plan was 12.4%. Removing the \$3m increase from the medical portion of the plan (i.e. \$67m) would have represented a 7.7% increase.

"I trust this clarifies the confusion and is responsive to the Senates questions. Please let me know if there is any additional information or clarification that would be helpful."

The meeting was adjourned at 5 p.m.

Submitted by Kevin Lee, Secretary of the Faculty Senate