

## Faculty Senate Meeting November 16, 2011

**In attendance:** Jean Albrecht, Paul Anderson, Doug Beets, Daniel Bourland, Sheri Bridges, James Cotter, Carol Cramer, Debbie DeHeck, Paul Escott, Miki Felsenburg, Mary Friedman, Candelas Gala, Laura Gammons, Michael Green, Michael Hughes, Sarah Jones, Kevin Jung, Molly Keener, Judy Kem, Hank Kennedy, Greg Kucera, Ken Middaugh, Ellen Miller, James Schirillo, Cathy Seta, Gale Sigal, Susan Smith, Ahmed Taha, Mark Welker

### Topics:

- COIA (Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics) recommendation to support Knight Commission statement on financial transparency in Athletics: Report from Jane Albrecht, Wake's COIA representative, and Senate Response
- Faculty Senate Response to Hateful Graffiti on Reynolda Campus
- Berlin Declaration on Open Access Publishing: Report from Molly Keener and Senate Response

### COALITION ON INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

<http://wfu.me/cms/coia/index.php/Home>

The Steering Committee of the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA) has voted to endorse recommendations of the Knight Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics for strengthening accountability of college athletics by requiring greater financial transparency and maintaining academic integrity and refers these proposals to its member senates for affirmation.

The Knight Commission is widely recognized by universities, the National Collegiate Athletic Association, and the national media as a leading voice for intercollegiate athletics reform and is a long-time ally of COIA. At COIA's 2010-11 annual meeting, Amy Perko, Executive Director of the Knight Commission, presented selected recommendations from the Commission's recent report Restoring the Balance: Dollars, Values, and the Future of College Sports (2010) and requested coalition endorsement. COIA representatives present at the meeting informally but unanimously voted to support the commission's recommendations and asked COIA's Steering Committee to prepare a document articulating that endorsement. This is that document.

Both COIA and the Knight Commission believe that clear, comparable and complete financial data must be publicly accessible to improve accountability in intercollegiate athletics and foster meaningful, long-term reform. Therefore, the COIA Steering Committee voted to endorse the Knight Commission recommendations that **all Division I institutions should: 1) make NCAA financial reports public, 2) publish additional information about long-term debt and capital spending in athletics, and 3) report annually on growth rates in academic and athletic spending.** Further, COIA Steering Committee seconded the Knight Commission's call for the presidents serving on the NCAA Board of Directors to adopt rule changes to implement these recommendations.

Also endorsed by the COIA Steering Committee were specific Knight Commission recommendations designed to reward practices that make academic values a priority: 1) strengthen the standards for post-season

eligibility by requiring teams to be on track to graduate at least 50 percent of their players in order to be eligible for postseason competition, and 2) incorporate an academic component in the revenue distribution formulas for football and basketball postseason revenues. (U.S. Secretary of Education Arne Duncan endorsed these recommendations on March 17, 2011.)

Details of the recommendations can be found at [http://www.knightcommission.org/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&id=503&Itemid=166](http://www.knightcommission.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=503&Itemid=166)

The COIA Steering Committee believes that these Knight Commission recommendations are consistent with and further the coalition's guiding principles and deal with matters of importance to the university faculties that COIA represents. Consequently, the Steering Committee asks COIA member senates to consider these recommendations independently and to discuss ways to enhance greater financial transparency and academic integrity in intercollegiate athletics at their local campuses. To the extent that it is locally appropriate, member senates are encouraged **to affirm the Steering Committee's endorsement** and to communicate their support for the recommendations to their presidents, faculty athletic representatives, and athletics directors. (Within COIA, the official vote of each member senate shall be cast by either the senate president/chair or the institution's COIA representative. While consideration by the full senate or its appropriate committee is desirable, it is not required under COIA's by-laws for this affirmation.)

Questions may be directed to John S. Nichols ([jsn2@psu.edu](mailto:jsn2@psu.edu)) or Kenneth A. Struckmeyer ([kast@wsu.edu](mailto:kast@wsu.edu)), COIA Co-Chairs, or Amy Perko ([aperko@nc.rr.com](mailto:aperko@nc.rr.com)), Knight Commission Executive Director.

JSN 4-5-11

**Jane Albrecht**, Professor of RL and COIA representative, presented resolutions adopted by COIA in 2011 (see above). COIA has 58 member senates (of 115 Division I schools).

- Already approved but asked to submit to senate to ask to consider, vote or study and decide if want to endorse.
- Since Senate is the only body on campus (Senate Resource Committee) that could urge the WFU Athletics programs to align with Knight Committee.
  - Make financial reports public
  - Growth
  - Report annually on athletics spending

Strengthen standards: 50% eligible players on track for graduation to play in post-season; revenue distributed according to students who are graduating in good academic standing (not on who's winning).

### **Q&A:**

- Does COIA want Senate to approve? Not required, up to Senate what to decide.
- Could Senate ask/endorse Resource Committee to follow up on this?
  - Endorse and follow up. There are schools in ACC who would not qualify; this is minimal stuff
  - Strikes as quite reasonable, but would like to hear input from athletics if they agree or the reason why if they disagree
  - Tried to lobby NCAA to put into practice
  - Most useful aspect to gain access to NCAA financial reports; especially debt service; make Athletics transparent
  - Not among its charges: not to gather or receive financial information; this must come from Senate Resource Committee.
  - Needs to hear impact from Athletics. Ron Wellman came previously and gave stats but would want to hear them again and know the impact.

At this point we want to ask the Resource Committee for response from Ron Wellman, table this discussion to our next meeting. None opposed. Asked Hank Kennedy to follow up. Asked Jane Albrecht to post on Website.

### **Hateful Graffiti on Reynolda Campus**

Last Thursday/Friday, hateful graffiti was painted on dorms. Old Gold and Black published articles from President Hatch and heads of campus. Some have asked Senate for a statement too.

If taking a stand, our article would come out almost a month after the event; may not be appropriate for the Senate to take a position on this issue at this time.

- Any precedent? Not sure.
- May set a president for future issues and resolutions
- Recently revised statement against harassment; feel Senate has done that and approved by Board of Trustees.
  - 1 in favor – does not set precedent and how does it hurt after President Hatch made comments.
  - Frivolous use of our time
  - Where would this be published? OG&B and the Senate website.
  - Does faculty have any other voice? Not sure the Senate is the right way. This is the voice of the faculty for the university as a whole. That said, we should join voices to say we condemn this behavior.

Motion to proceed: motion failed, vote 9 to 7.

### **Berlin Declaration on Open Access**

Report from Molly Keener (ZSR Library) and Senate Response.

Where this came from: Drafted in 2003, at a conference organized by the Max Planck Society in Berlin. Sites need for distribution of scholarship to be freely and readily accessible; made possible by the Internet. Most recent Berlin Conference held last week in Washington D.C. (first time in North America); last year in China and next year in Africa.

Aspirational not binding; further support of efforts already established at WFU to support open access. ZSR co-founded fund to explore open access when researchers don't have funds to help pay. WakeSpace – faculty can archive work if retained right to do so. Join 33 other North American signatory institutions – acknowledges open access viable.

First presented by Interim Provost Welker at Dean's Council:

Open access covers both publishing and archiving – making work available, repository examples include arXiv, SSRN, PubMed Central, our own WakeSpace

Support Statement – open access does include both archiving and publishing pieces

Q: Tenure and promotion review pressure; non-peer review to have more weight?

A: No. Open access publishing shifts cost of production from subscription supported to article processing fee model, or support from institutional endowment or grants.

Q: Thoughts on impact with publishers – conflict of interest and non-profits – libraries held captive by publishers.

A: Best thing to say as library “Springer” (traditional publisher) purchased BioMed Center (open access publisher); would not have purchased if did not feel open access is viable – most publishers now offer hybrid option where authors can elect to have that article available.

Comment: Non-profits publishers – how to figure out costs – author pays – article to article

- Not a policy – does not bind
- Declaration of support

Q: Embargos

A: Declaration does not address; increasingly, articles are available in 6-24 months, many journals allow authors to make work available after an ‘x’ amount of time.

Q: Solution to provide 2 ways or transitional?

A: Most likely transitional.

Q/Comment: When I write an article I lose my copyright

A: Most journals allow archiving rights after some amount of time allow archive openly. 65% of publishers grant post-print archiving right to authors and 90% allow submitted version; mechanisms author can use to retain copy right – attach addendum. If you push a little they may only take the first publication rights – can make work available.

Q: Invitations to publish in open access journals – written informally – any way to find out (if scam,) how to discern reputation?

A: Little hard given way open access has evolved – less reputable practices come out more quickly – open access and traditional different ways – common sense and website reviews.

- DOAJ.org: they list open access journals. If not listed they may either be new or not reputable.
- SHERPA/RoMEO: collects publisher archiving allowance policies
- Email me (Molly Keener) and I’ll check into it for you

33 North American institutions have endorsed, including: Duke, Grand Valley State University, Harvard, Kansas State, Oberlin College, Oregon State, Purdue, Concordia, Tulane, UCLA, University of Connecticut, Kansas, University of New Mexico, University of Oregon, University of Utah, Utah State, Wesleyan, SPARC (Scholarly Publishing & Academic Resources Coalition), Association of Research Libraries, Association of College & Research Libraries.

Of these, only 7 have int. open access policies requiring faculty to make scholarship available – not top down implemented, but adopted by faculty.

Aspirational Declaration – Not Binding.

Comment: Contacted Parks Welsh at the Medical School and he is in favor of it.

Since drafted in 2003, understanding has become much more nuanced and more complex.

Comment: Sent this around and Provost has asked us to approve this.

Purpose of approval: another instance to support faculty, fund and WakeSpace and ZSR Scholarship. If you pursue Open Access, we are here to help.

Q/Comment: Negative Feelings – pay to publish issues.

A: don’t pay and then review; not vanity publishing; goal is not to make money but is to make research available and remove subscription costs.

PLoS (Public Library of Science, open access publisher) only became sustainable last year; endowment funding to get them through.

Have funds to help pay fees when no grants are available. This is only for Open Access, not traditional publishing costs; established to help bridge the gap.

Q: If down the road, guarantee this fund will be there – if not, department or faculty to pay?

A: Dean Sutton committed resources for this and Provost Welker is supporting it.

If wholesale shift to Open Access through author charges, then the library will have money in the system; if overnight shift, money enough for every author for an article.

Q:/Comment: In Anthropology, PLoS, known for publishing articles really “out there”, outrageous and not street credible. They go by how many clicks and that’s not so good.

A: Open Access has its issues. PLoS One: short and broader articles. PLoS Medicine, and PLoS Biology journals have impact factors, but still count how many access. Take PLoS One experimentation for a new model journal – little different. BMJ; Wellcome Trust, Howard Hughes Medical Institute, & Max Planck; others launching competitors to PLoS One.

Comment: Big Problem; university paying for research and then university having to buy it back. Bad and good subscription based.

Comment: This is the way things are going – vote yes

Comment: Elsevier Publishing, widely known as The Evil Empire, profits were increasing 33% per year at some points.

Comment: Hope publishing moving toward this and set the tone.

Asked by the Provost to approve. None opposed – passed unanimously.

### **Other Business:**

V.P. Terry Baker has asked to resign to address other demands. In the past we rotated from President of College and Business School; should add Divinity School, Law School and Medical School – expand base of V.P. in training for next year. Mike Hughes will send an email requesting nominations (not college). Nominating Committee will make nomination from those.