Minutes
Monday, December 19, 2022
On Microsoft Teams 3:00 – 4:30 PM

The meeting was called to order by Faculty Senate President, Thomas Borchert at 3:02 PM

Senators in Attendance: 62
Absent: Senators Vacant (Anesthesiology Rep2), McDowell (Art & Art History), Ikeda (Asian Languages & Literatures), Vacant (Chemistry), Conroy (Counseling, Human Development & Family Science), Ramirez-Harrington (Economics), Bomblies (Engineering, Civil & Environmental), Callahan (Extension), Calkins (Family Medicine Rep2), Terrien (Medicine Rep1), Diehl (Microbiology & Molecular Genetics), Saia (Pediatrics Rep 1), White (Physics), Lach (Radiology Rep1), Ali (Radiology Rep 2), Smith (Rehabilitation & Movement Sciences), Lopez-Vicuna (Romance Languages)

1. **Faculty Senate President’s Welcome Remarks** – Thomas Borchert recognized the end of the semester and applauded the faculty for their work. He also expressed gratitude for the retiring colleagues for their time and service to the university.

2. **Approval of Minutes of the November 2022 Faculty Senate meeting.**
   **Motion:** Anthony Julianelle moved to approve the minutes of the November 2022 Faculty Senate meeting. The motion was seconded.
   **Vote:** 44 approved, 0 opposed, 0 abstained. The motion carried

3. **Proposal to establish Institute for Agroecology (discussion)** – Thomas Borchert stated that the proposal for the Institute for Agroecology was circulated to the faculty for comment, and is being reviewed by the Research, Scholarship, and the Creative Arts Committee (RSCA) of the Faculty Senate. Upon completion of their review, the RSCA will make a recommendation to the Senate, and the Senate will vote on the proposal at the January meeting. President Borchert recognized Ernesto Mendez to provide an overview of the process for developing the proposal and the goals of the Institute for Agroecology. The proposal was included with the agenda for this meeting. The floor was opened for comments. Ernesto Mendez responded to the one comment received and confirmed that topical areas would include the fungal kingdom. Additional comments and questions for consideration in the review of the proposal should be emailed to Thomas Borchert.

4. **Proposal to create a School of World Languages and Cultures (discussion)** – Thomas Borchert reminded the Senate that the proposal to create a School of World Languages and
Cultures inside the College of Arts and Sciences is being reviewed by an ad hoc committee. Upon completion of their review, the ad hoc committee will make a recommendation to the Senate Executive Council, and the Senate will vote on the proposal at the January meeting. President Borchert recognized Abigail McGowan to provide a brief overview of the goals of the proposal. The proposal was circulated to the faculty for comment and was included with the agenda for this meeting. The floor was opened for comments and questions. Discussion topics included the difference and similarities between a school and a department, confirmation that literature courses will be included, RPT voting procedures and the desire for a side-letter with United Academics, the change in the apportionment of Senate representation, and the administrative service burden and workload of program directors vs. chairs.

5. **HELIOS Discussion** – Mary Cushman, co-chair of the Research Scholarship and the Creative Arts Committee (RSCA) presented information about the Higher Education Leadership Initiative for Open Scholarship (HELIOS). The presentation slides are attached to the minutes and included the concept that scholarly work should be freely available, definitions of open access, benefits, and areas to consider. The floor was opened for comments and questions. Discussion topics included protections against misuse of information, concerns about how the publishing field is going to develop to make money, open access for scholarly books vs. articles, and issues surrounding incentivizing the practice and eliminate the penalty that junior faculty might face by publishing in a lower impact journal. Thomas Borchert stated that the conversation will continue in the RSCA and the Senate.

6. **Reports that do not require a Senate vote**
   - The Student Affairs Committee approved a change to Final Exam Policy to add clarity around lab exams. The current policy states that “No course may conduct more than one in class exam or test during the last two weeks of the semester (week prior to finals week and the week of finals).” The following phrase has been added to that statement: “*except lab exams with specific lab sections and practical exams associated with non-lab courses.*”
   - The Curricular Affairs Committee provided a report of actions taken by the CAC that does not require a Senate vote. The Curricular affairs committee approved the change in prefix from CE (Civil Engineering) to CEE (Civil and Environmental Engineering) for the College of Engineering and Mathematical Sciences.

7. **New Business – none at this time.**

The meeting adjourned at 4:31 PM.
Higher Education Leadership Initiative for Open Scholarship

https://www.heliosopen.org/
What are we asking?

A discussion by faculty senate on the concept that our scholarly work should be freely available

If we agree, how would we encourage and promote this?
Colleges Should Reward Efforts to Make Research Open

SEPTEMBER 12, 2022

To the Editor:

We applaud the August 25 memorandum from the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP) on Ensuring Free, Immediate, and Equitable Access to Federally Funded Research that calls on federal agencies to develop policies that will provide immediate open access to the outputs of federally funded research ("‘A Historic Moment’: New Guidance Requires Federally Funded Research to Be Open Access," The Chronicle, August 25).
## Some Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Green Open Access</td>
<td>Self-archiving – author posts on a server like UVM ScholarWorks or MedRxiv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid Open Access</td>
<td>Traditional subscription journal where authors may choose to publish open access at cost to author aka Silver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold Open Access</td>
<td>Fully open access journal with no subscriptions – available to all at cost to author</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond Open Access</td>
<td>Fully open access with no fees to readers or to authors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preprint</td>
<td>Penultimate version of a work, posted pre-publication; freely available to all; critiques can be provided by readers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Print</td>
<td>Unformatted version posted in an archive (like pubmed) by the published (i.e., for fed funded research)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article Publication Charge</td>
<td>Fee paid by author to publish open access</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Some Definitions

**Open Data**
- Posted research data that can be freely used and redistributed, sometimes requiring attribution to source

**Open Materials**
- Research instruments and materials in a publicly-accessible format, providing sufficient information for researchers to reproduce procedures and analyses of published research studies

**Preregistration**
- Preregister research plans (design and data analysis plan) prior to engaging in research and closely follow the preregistered design and data analysis plan in reporting their research findings
Benefits of open-access

- Improve **rigor & reliability** prepints, open data / materials, preregistration
- Hasten dissemination
- Broaden **availability** of information (including the public)
- Reduce global inequities in publishing of, and access to, research and scholarly output
- Open Data
  - Increases **reuse** of data to ask new questions
Researchers and their institutions benefit from having the widest possible audience.

Research benefits when the latest techniques can be easily accessed.

Breakthroughs often come from unexpected places (anyone with internet).

Rapid return on investment for funders.

Even the best ideas are just ideas until they are shared, and can be utilized by others.

https://sparceurope.org/
UVM became a member of HELIOS in 2022, with >80 other colleges and universities

Reflects a desire to participate in open access practices

*How might we increase open-access publishing in our departments, colleges, and centers?*
Four areas to consider:

- Broaden Faculty/Chair/Dean knowledge of open-access repositories & copyright rules
- Provide ongoing training
- Provide incentives to make publications and data open-access
- Adopt an open access resolution
Four areas to consider:

- Broaden Faculty/Chair/Dean knowledge of open-access repositories & copyright rules
  - How do we disseminate this information to new faculty and remind existing faculty?
  - Does this go through Chairs & Deans?
Four areas to consider:

- Provide ongoing training
  - Who does this?
    - UVM libraries can provide personal assistance.
    - Additional workshops?
  - What is the burden?
Four areas to consider:

- **Provide incentives to make publications and data open-access**
  - *Count open-access practices in faculty annual reviews as a component under equity and inclusion?*
    - Departments have different review procedures
  - *RPT process could encourage open-access?*
    - Which section – scholarship, DEI, service?
    - Will this reduce participation of Full Professors, non-tenure-track faculty?
Four areas to consider:

- Broaden Faculty/Chair/Dean knowledge of open-access repositories & copyright rules
- Provide ongoing training
- Provide incentives to make publications and data open access

These areas might differ by discipline
Four areas to consider:

- **Adopt an open access resolution**
  - **Craft an open access policy along the lines of Harvard U.?**
    - [https://osc.hul.harvard.edu/policies/](https://osc.hul.harvard.edu/policies/)
    - Many institutions have done this: [https://roarmap.eprints.org/](https://roarmap.eprints.org/)
Four areas to consider:

- **Adopt an open access resolution**
- **Craft an open access policy** along the lines of Harvard U.? [https://osc.hul.harvard.edu/policies/]
- Many institutions have done this: [https://roarmap.eprints.org/]

---

**Open Access Policies**

In 2008, Harvard's Faculty of Arts & Sciences voted unanimously to give the Harvard a nonexclusive, irrevocable right to distribute their scholarly articles for any non-commercial purpose. In the years since, the remaining eight Harvard schools voted to establish similar open-access (OA) policies, and several research centers have joined their number.

In the words of OSC Director Peter Suber, author of *Open Access*, "The basic idea of OA is simple: Make research literature available online without price barriers and without most permission barriers."

Scholarly articles provided to the university are stored, preserved, and made freely accessible in digital form in **DASH**, Harvard University Library's open access repository. The repository has the institution of Harvard standing behind it to ensure its availability, longevity, and functionality.
Discussion