



Illinois Wesleyan University Digital Commons @ IWU

Chapter Activities

IWU AAUP

2012

Newsletter, September 2012

IWU Chapter of the AAUP, Illinois Wesleyan University

Stephanie Davis-Kahl

Illinois Wesleyan University

Jim Matthews

Chapter President, Illinois Wesleyan University

Joerg Tiede

Illinois Wesleyan University

David Bolivar

Illinois Wesleyan University

Recommended Citation

IWU Chapter of the AAUP, Illinois Wesleyan University; Davis-Kahl, Stephanie; Matthews, Jim; Tiede, Joerg; and Bolivar, David, "Newsletter, September 2012" (2012). *Chapter Activities*. Paper 12.
http://digitalcommons.iwu.edu/iwuaaup_act/12

This Newsletter is brought to you for free and open access by The Ames Library, the Andrew W. Mellon Center for Curricular and Faculty Development, the Office of the Provost and the Office of the President. It has been accepted for inclusion in Digital Commons @ IWU by the faculty at Illinois Wesleyan University. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@iwu.edu.

©Copyright is owned by the author of this document.



Illinois Wesleyan Chapter of the AAUP

SEPTEMBER 6, 2012

NEWSLETTER

VOLUME 2, NUMBER 1

Chapter Executive Committee:

*James Matthews
(president)*

*Rebecca Roesner
(vice-president)*

*Joerg Tiede
(secretary-
treasurer)*

In this issue:

*The Open Road
by Stephanie
Davis-Kahl*

*Some Thoughts
on the University
of Virginia
Imbroglio by
James Matthes*

*IWU Chapter
Newsletter
Receives
Newsletter
Award by Joerg
Tiede*

*Attending the
2012 Summer
Institute by
David Bolivar*

*Upcoming
Events*

The Open Road

By Stephanie Davis-Kahl, member, IWU AAUP

The following is first in a series exploring key aspects of scholarly communication. This piece focuses on open access, defined as scholarly literature that is "digital, online, free of charge, and free of most copyright and licensing restrictions." (Suber, 2004, <http://www.earlham.edu/~peters/fos/overview.htm>)

Last week, a colleague shared a great story with me – a faculty member was looking for a book for a research project, and a search of our catalog and the extensive I-Share catalog was unsuccessful. My colleague found a copy of the book that the author had posted in her institution's repository, openly accessible to anyone and free to download. The faculty member was thrilled, my colleague satisfied, and I got a good story out of it.

Another great story about open access comes from the Alliance for Taxpayer Access, a non-profit organization that advocates for open access to federally funded research (IWU is a member of this advocacy organization). This particular story was submitted in response to a call for stories about how citizens have benefited from the National Institutes of Health Public Access Policy, which recently had its fourth anniversary:

"As a librarian at a small rural hospital, we rely on Pubmed and Pubmed Central every day to round out our limited journal collection. Electronic journal prices have soared in recent years. PubMed, Pubmed Central, and the journals opened up by the NIH Public Access Policy are more important than ever before. Beyond Pubmed's central role for supplementing meager library funds, our health professionals turn to Pubmed first because it is the best. Pubmed offers a clear demonstration of the excellence that can be achieved through publicly-funded research."
(http://www.taxpayeraccess.org/issues/nih/nih_action/callforstories.shtml)

The NIH Public Access Policy ensures that any product from research funded by the NIH will be deposited in PubMed Central (PMC), a medical/health information database, within a year of publication. As of today, the NIH is the only federal agency that requires researchers to make their research openly accessible.

If you're new to the phrase (and if I haven't given you my spiel in person yet – don't worry, you're on my list), here are the major tenets of open access from *Open Access Overview*, by Peter Suber, (<http://www.earlham.edu/~peters/fos/overview.htm>):

- Open-access (OA) literature is digital, online, free of charge, and free of most copyright and licensing restrictions.
- OA is compatible with copyright, peer review, revenue (even profit), print, preservation, prestige, quality, career-advancement, indexing, and other features and supportive services associated with conventional scholarly literature.
- OA is compatible with peer review, and all the major OA initiatives for scientific and scholarly literature insist on its importance.
- OA serves the interests of many groups – authors, funders, students, and readers within and outside of academia, among others.

Chapter website:

<http://www.iwu.edu/~iwuaaup>

In the past year, there have been several events and calls for reforms that have helped to spotlight open access to scholarly published research in particular. A huge catalyst was the Research Works Act, introduced into the House of Representatives in December 2011. The open access community responded swiftly, with a firm stand taken by researchers with the Cost of Knowledge online petition (<http://www.thecostofknowledge.org>), several public statements against the Research Works Act by university presses, and finally, with the introduction of the bipartisan Federal Research Public Access Act (FRPPA) in mid-February 2012 into the House and the Senate. FRPPA would expand on the NIH public access policy to require 11 additional agencies with over \$100 million in annual extramural research expenditures to provide online, public access to journal articles stemming from research funds by those agencies. By the end of February 2012, its sponsors officially withdrew the Research Works Act, shortly after the publisher Elsevier withdrew its support. In May, an online petition was launched on the White House's We the People site. The site allows citizens to post petitions and in order for the petition to be taken to White House staff, 25,000 signatures must be posted in 30 days. The petition for public access to scientific research exceeded the minimum in record time with over 30,000 signatures. Next stop: the White House.

As a librarian, I believe that knowledge can change people's lives for the better in countless different ways. As a faculty member, I believe that we must share our scholarly and creative works beyond the boundaries of our disciplines and beyond the paywalls that impede access to our work - to connect with our communities (both local and global), to demonstrate our value to civic discourse, and to illustrate the often-misunderstood but vital reciprocity between teaching and research at a liberal arts institution. Open access is a path to achieve all of this, and more.

Some Thoughts on the University of Virginia Imbrogio

By James Matthews

Imagine you are the President of a university with a \$2.5 billion budget and your school is ranked #2 in its category by *U.S. News & World Report*. As a public institution you are increasingly undermined by a fractious state legislature that has lost any sense of the meaning of "for the public good." You have been hired as an agent of change, and in spite of in-state and campus politics, you have put together a plan of slow, incremental change that has garnered much favorable reaction. You have even managed to teach a course in your presidential office complete with office hours despite your innumerable duties. Income to the university has declined in part due to the dysfunctional nature of the legislature, though you have managed to find seats for 1000 more students. You earn \$680,000 per year, commensurate with your sterling qualifications and the salaries of your peers. Your faculty respects and follows your leadership. By most standards of measure in higher education, you would appear to be enjoying a successful presidency.

Imagine then the shock of Teresa Sullivan, President of the University of Virginia when she received a phone call from Helen Dragas, Chair of the Board of Visitors at UVA informing her that she no longer had a job at the University. Dragas told the President that there were enough votes on the Board to oust her, and that she would be afforded the opportunity to resign, which she announced on June 10th. Those of us who were here during the presidency of Wayne Anderson can well imagine this shock as it ran through the campus community. As happened here, those shocks can be long lasting, despite in UVA's case, the restoration of President Sullivan to her position within two weeks. Teresa Sullivan is back in her job, her policies and approach somehow validated, but the feeling of having been seriously threatened will remain with the faculty and staff for some time.

So what happened? It seems to me that there were several factors that led to this debacle. First, the sixteen members of the Board of Visitors are appointed by the governor and have no accountability to anyone on campus. The Board is

Joining the
AAUP:

<http://www.aaup.org>

able to act autonomously, and state law does not require that they even meet to vote on a particular issue; polling by the Chair is sufficient. In the case of UVA, Helen Dragas polled the members of the Board beginning with those most likely to oppose Sullivan, and stopped when she had nine votes. Three members of the Board, supporters of Sullivan, were not even contacted until the "resignation" was underway. Our own Board of Trustees here at IWU meets regularly face to face, and the Executive Committee thoroughly discusses issues and policy changes before they come up for a vote. Anything is possible, of course, but I find it hard to imagine a single Board member hijacking our Board as happened in UVA.

Which leads me to my second point. It seems clear in hindsight that a combination of panic and opportunism drove the Board to act so precipitously. The panic undoubtedly stemmed from the fact that income for the University was falling. The traditional way to increase funding for state services is to raise taxes. In a Republican-led state, this was not going to be possible. "For the public good" and "public service" do not generate income. A member of the Board, Peter Kiernan, described as an "investor", was infatuated with what he referred to as "strategic dynamism", a leadership style that features nimbleness and multiple entry points for data. A corporation following this style of leadership is tailored to respond quickly to rapid dramatic changes in its environment, though at increased risk. In the case of UVA, it was believed by members of the Board that Sullivan was dragging her feet on long distance education and the marketing of UVA classes on line, seen to be a sure-fire way to generate more income. The opportunity to charge citizens of Virginia multiple times for the same course content seemed like a no-brainer to Kiernan and his allies, and so Sullivan had to go.

The problem, recognized by almost everyone on campus, is that universities (or even small liberal arts colleges) cannot turn on a dime because at heart they are and they are meant to be conservative institutions. Universities conserve old truths even as they welcome those that are newly discovered. Universities study concepts like "strategic dynamism" as academic subjects, measure their strengths and weaknesses, and report the findings ultimately to the general public. All of this takes time, energy, and money and as intended by Thomas Jefferson, was meant to better the lives of the people of Virginia. Not to spare the legislature from making the hard choice to raise taxes or support a dramatic tuition increase. On-line education is a subject to be studied over time to determine its value. Not a cure all for a public university whose leaders lack faith in the very values that make it a national leader.

And what of the faculty? To their credit, the Faculty Senate acted boldly in support of President Sullivan. Its first two moves were to issue a vote of no confidence in the Board of Visitors and to send a request to AAUP to investigate the University for significant breaches in university governance. The AAUP, meeting in convention in June 2012 issued a statement on the matter that included the following sentence from its AAUP statement on *Faculty Participation in the Selection, Evaluation, and Retention of Administrators*: "All decisions on retention and nonretention of administrators should be based on institutionalized and jointly determined procedures which include significant faculty involvement." Specifically related to the incident at UVA, the AAUP added this statement: "We join in the Senate Executive Council's dismay that due process for President Sullivan and the legitimate interests of the UVA faculty have been ignored in the precipitate action taken by the Board of Visitors." AAUP investigations are intended to be methodical and exhaustive and require time, energy, and money. There will be no "strategically dynamic" response from our organization. Truthiness comes easily; finding the truth is much harder and takes longer. But even before the report comes out, and whatever their intentions, the Board of Visitors have provided students at UVA with valuable life lessons. Radical, precipitous decision making often leads to radical unintended consequences. Universities are not and should not be corporations. The goals of the two are too different and the governance systems developed in each are intended to accomplish different ends. Universities require sound financial management but their bottom line is not measured in dollars and cents. It is measured in the quality of the education delivered and the service rendered to the wider public.

IWU AAUP Chapter Newsletter Receives Newsletter Award

By Joerg Tiede

The IWU AAUP Chapter Newsletter received the award for outstanding chapter newsletter given by the AAUP's Assembly of State Conferences (ASC). I accepted the award on behalf of the chapter at the ASC business meeting in Washington, DC, this June. The chapter received a certificate and \$100.

Attending the 2012 Summer Institute

By David Bolivar

During the 2012 AAUP Summer Institute, I attended a series of sessions focused on analysis of institutional finances. It was a very enlightening and useful set of sessions that gave me a greater understanding of how to read the financial reports regarding our institution and also to assess the health of our institution by learning how the financial information is used to determine our bond rating. The summer institute was also a great opportunity to meet with colleagues from a variety of different institutions. It reinforced the observation that the hard work of our faculty colleagues at IWU has resulted in a very strong faculty voice in the appropriate areas of decision making. Hearing the stories of faculty from other institutions and their struggles leads to a greater appreciation the strong faculty governance we have here at IWU.

Upcoming Events

September 20: First chapter meeting, at 4pm in CNS E104.