

LIBRARY COMMITTEE
MINUTES OF MEETING

March 7, 2012
238A Morrill Hall

[In these minutes: author-pay fund for publication; future challenges and opportunities for libraries; discovery system; research works act; federal public access act]

[These minutes reflect discussion and debate at a meeting of a committee of the University of Minnesota Senate; none of the comments, conclusions or actions reported in these minutes represent the views of, nor are they binding on, the Senate, the Administration or the Board of Regents.]

PRESENT: Neil Olszewski (Chair), Jennifer Alexander, Bradford Clemens, LeAnn Dean, Mary Ford, David Fox, Michael Hancher, Monica Howell, John Logie, Wendy Lougee, Evan Roberts, Mary Beth Sancomb-Moran, Bill Sozansky, Suzanne Thorpe (for Joan Howland), Heidi Wagner, Owen Williams

REGRETS: Phil Buhlmann, Michelle Englund, Elizabeth Fine, Ronald Hadsall, Vickie Graham

ABSENT: Ted Higman, Robert Muellerleile

GUESTS: John Butler, Associate University Librarian for Information Technology; Cody Hanson, Website Architect and User Experience Analyst, Libraries Information Technology

Professor Neil Olszewski called the meeting to order, welcomed those present, and called for introductions.

Proposal to Establish Open Access Publishing Fund

Professor Olszewski thanked University Librarian Wendy Lougee and the Libraries for their work on the proposal to establish an open-access publishing fund. He then opened the floor for discussion of the proposal (below).

Proposal

The Senate Library Committee proposes that University of Minnesota establish an institutional fund to underwrite authors' costs in making their published works openly accessible. The fund would be supported by both the Office of the Vice President for Research and the University Libraries, and would be overseen by a review panel comprised of sponsors and faculty.

We recommend the following standards and principles.

- Content eligibility
 - Funds are available for peer-reviewed journal articles, scholarly monographs, conference proceedings, and data sets.
 - Funds may be used to cover only publication and submission fees, not author fees associated with inclusion of illustrations, color printing, or other page charges.
 - Author fees for open access journals (as determined by listing in the Directory of Open Access Journals, membership in the Open Access Scholarly Publishers

Association, or adherence to Open Access Scholarly Publishers Association Code of Conduct) will be covered in full. Author fees for “hybrid” journals will be covered up to {50%}.

- Funds may not be used for publications that do not make works fully openly available immediately upon publication.
- Author eligibility
 - All faculty, researchers, post-docs, graduate students, and staff may apply for funds for their publications that otherwise qualify.
 - Authors receiving funds should deposit a copy of the publication in the University Digital Conservancy (the University of Minnesota’s institutional repository.)
 - In the case of joint authorship, support for author fees will be pro-rated.
 - Authors may receive up to {\$3,000} in institutional open access support annually.
- Effects of external fund availability (grants, etc.)
 - Authors with no external funding will be given priority, but authors who have external funding that cannot be used to underwrite open access fees will also be eligible.
 - Authors who *could have* applied for grant coverage of open access fees but failed to do so will not usually be eligible for institutional open access support, unless their grant application was made before the institutional open access fund existed.

We recommend that the fund be piloted with no less than {\$20,000} of available support to authors, and that funds be distributed on a rolling basis. The program’s effectiveness should be evaluated as funds are exhausted or at the end of the first year, whichever occurs sooner. OVP and the University Libraries will partner to raise awareness of this new support for the wide dissemination of the research of University of Minnesota scholars.

Professor David Fox stated the proposal lacked adequate provisions to protect academic freedom. He noted the proposed review panel should ensure the eligibility of the requests for funds, but should not evaluate the content of the scholarship for which funding is sought. He also stated that the content eligibility criteria regarding which fees may be covered is overly restrictive.

Ms. Lougee responded the intent of the content eligibility requirements is to ensure that the fund is only paying for publication in open access journals or hybrid journals. Professor Olszewski asked if there was a different way to define this, and Ms. Lougee suggested eliminating the references to illustrations, color printing, or other page charges and stating, “Funds may be used only to cover open access publications and submission fees.”

Professor Jennifer Alexander asked about the adequacy of \$20,000 for the fund. Ms. Lougee responded that this level of funding was within the range of other similar funds. She stated further that this is a pilot program, and it would be necessary to first gauge the appetite for this type of fund, but the fund would likely need to grow.

With respect to the need for the fund, Professor Olszewski noted that the Open Access Subcommittee recently met with an associate dean from the College of Liberal Arts who reported his office had been approached by several faculty seeking funds to support publishing in open access journals.

Professor Fox noted it might take time for awareness of the fund to grow and publishing in author-pay journals would require a cultural shift. In response, Professor Olszewski suggested the program be evaluated at the end of two years rather than one year.

Mary Ford suggested some type of fundraiser to create awareness of the fund and increase contributions to it. Ms. Lougee noted the overhead costs of investing in a development campaign.

Professor Olszewski raised the issue of joint authorship and questioned how author fees would be prorated under the proposal. He suggested funds might be prorated on the basis of the portion of the work done at the University of Minnesota. This sparked a conversation about what constituted work “done” at the University. Ms. Lougee suggested changing the language to state, “ in the case of joint authorship, support for author fees will be pro-rated based on the proportional contributions of the University of Minnesota author.”

Suzanne Thorpe suggested adding Minnesota under the first author eligibility bullet point.

Professor Olszewski asked whether the proposal allows for funding where publication is no longer funded by a grant. The committee discussed the circumstances under which grant funding may end before publication, and agreed the proposal should allow for fees occurring after the closure of the grant.

Professor Alexander asked who makes the determination of whether to provide funding. Ms. Lougee responded that the Office of the Vice President for Research and the University Libraries are the sponsors referred to in the proposal and the review panel would be composed of representatives from these areas and faculty members. Professor Heidi Wagner noted that professional and administrative employees with principal investigator status should be included on the review panel. Professor Olszewski agreed that the proposal should not just refer to faculty, and should be classification “agnostic.”

Professor Fox stated the proposal should state that the panel’s role is not to evaluate scholarship. Ms. Lougee suggested the language, “the panel’s role is to review for eligibility not content.”

Professor Fox asked who makes the decisions about how much money authors can receive and at what level to fund the fund. Professor Olszewski responded that the Senate Library Committee can make a recommendation, but the Office of the Vice President for Research (OVPR) and the Libraries will make the determination.

Bill Sozansky asked if the fund would be system-wide or only available to Twin Cities’ scholars. The committee discussed whether the coordinate campuses should be included. Ms. Lougee noted that the OVPR covers all campuses. It was agreed that the proposal should state the fund covers all campuses.

Professor John Logie asked how large a panel would be needed to administer the requests for funds. Committee discussion followed. The general sense of the committee was that only a small panel would be required and that it might be able to meet via e-mail. Ms. Lougee noted, however, that the report on the evaluation of the effectiveness of the program might require more involvement.

Professor Wagner asked how wide the launch of the proposal would be. Ms. Lougee stated the associate deans for research would be identified and the fund would be announced in Brief.

Professor Logie suggested that the bullet point stating authors receiving funds “should” deposit a copy of the publication in the Digital Conservancy should be changed to require the deposit of the author’s publication in the Conservancy. Discussion followed regarding the most durable means of archiving and concern about different versions of publications being placed in repositories. The SLC agreed that the proposal language should be changed to require authors receiving funds to deposit a copy of the publication in an approved digital repository such as the University Digital Conservancy.

Professor Evan Roberts asked if applications would be rolling or if there would be a fixed date for applications. Ms. Lougee stated the program would start in July so that allocations could follow the fiscal year.

Professor Olszewski stated the next step for the proposal would be for the SLC to vote on the revised proposal. It would then be forwarded to the Senate Research Committee, the OVPR and the Libraries.

Future of Libraries

Professor Olszewski stated that prior to the meeting the SLC received two documents regarding future challenges for libraries. He asked if after reviewing these documents, committee members had suggestions for topics the SLC should consider. Professor Michael Hancher stated he would like to send three articles for the committee to review and discuss at its March meeting, one regarding the preservation of original documents, one on the uncertain future of 19th century books, and a British Libraries report on whether digitized books are surrogates for the originals. He noted further that the Provosts’ Report received by the SLC did not address conservation and accessibility of the hard copies of materials. Professor Olszewski noted that the SLC had previously received a report on this issue by Ms. Lougee.

Professor Hancher noted that books being digitized often include graphic illustrations and the quality of the originals surpasses the digital copies. He asked that the SLC pay special attention to this issue. Professor Evans noted further that inserts and foldouts present particular problems for digital preservation. Ms. Lougee stated that there is currently a quality assessment being done of the digital preservation of documents in the HathiTrust. She stated that when the University digitizes books a copy of the original is kept.

Professor Logie raised the issue of whether typography is being considered in the digitization of collections. Ms. Lougee responded that it is, and discussed the difference between books that are “born” digital and those that go through the digitization process.

Professor Fox asked for a description of the digitization process. John Butler, Associate University Librarian for Information Technology, described the process. He stated that archival scanning is used for objects that require color calibration or treatment for size such as maps. This is done with an overhead camera. For other documents, flatbed and sheet bed copiers are used. The pages are turned by hand and there is a quick quality check done by monitor.

Professor Hancher stated that his concern is with the preservation of books. Ms. Lougee shared that the University Libraries requests for funding long-term collection storage and improved facilities for rare books are being addressed in part by the Capital Plan. Funding has been approved for additional storage in 2016 and renovation of Wilson Library is approved for 2018.

Professor Olszewski asked if there is coordination between libraries on the number of copies of materials that are maintained. Ms. Lougee responded that this is addressed when materials are catalogued and there is coordination between the members of the Committee on Institutional Cooperation.

Discoverability Update

John Butler and Cody Hanson, Libraries Information Technology, provided the SLC with a PowerPoint update on the work underway to procure a new information discovery system for the Libraries. They began the presentation with background information on discovery expectations of users and the market of available products. Mr. Hanson stated that expectations and successful research behaviors are influenced and informed by web searches and what is available in the marketplace. Usage statistics show the importance of external systems such as Google and Google Scholar in information discovery. The 2009 MNCAT survey, one of three investigations the Libraries made into user behavior and trends around information discovery, showed University users’ desire for broadened discovery via the Libraries’ catalog.

Mr. Hanson discussed some of the market advances in discovery products that are designed to address historic shortfalls between user search expectations and discovery realities. Some of these include powerful indexing and relevance algorithms and massive data aggregations. He also discussed user needs to traverse content areas, and new products capable of a single query search across multiple sets of metadata and full-text sources that can be filtered and ranked by relevancy.

Professor Olszewski asked if the discovery system would learn the users research preferences. Mr. Butler responded that it would do so at the institutional level but not at the individual level, although the technology to accomplish that might be coming.

Professor Logie asked if the EBSCO interface would still be available. Mr. Hanson explained that EBSCO (a specific database) would still be accessible and that the new system would “sit on top” of the Libraries’ collections, EBSCO, the University Digital Conservancy, WorldCat, HathiTrust, Netlibrary, ArXiv, and numerous other specific resources. Mr. Butler noted that filters could be applied after the search, or the data sources (that are the targets for a unified search) set could be scoped ahead of the search.

Mr. Hanson explained that the searcher receives a relevance ranked set of search results similar to the result from a Google Scholar search. Mr. Butler went on to explain the benefits of the new discoverability technology. He stated it provides a broader search with more precise results. It provides a cross-discipline and cross-format search. It also provides large-scale aggregation for information discovery. For example, the University of Minnesota records can be conjoined with the WorldCat records in one search.

Professor Logie asked about the investment of resources in improving local search capabilities and the exclusion of an overarching search by Google.

Mr. Hanson responded that the Libraries must make certain that the University collections are discoverable through outside searches and that they have a marquee discoverability tool tuned for the University. Ms. Lougee noted further that one of the reasons the Libraries cannot rely on Google Scholar is that Google has never revealed how it works. Google does not necessarily harvest everything and currently excludes some content. The Libraries’ planned discovery system will provide more certainty.

Mr. Butler stated that in 2013 the legacy library management system would be replaced, and MNCAT Classic would be retired by the end of 2013. The procurement process for the new discovery system (separate from the management system) is underway, and one of the requirements is that the new system must work with both the current and next generation library management systems.

Professor Logie noted the difficulties with using the MNCAT search system, and stated he had a better understanding of MNCAT Classic. Professor Fox noted the problems the MNCAT search system has with “known item” searching and asked how the new discovery system can preserve the features of MNCAT Classic.

Mr. Hanson responded that the Libraries are aware of the current system’s failures in the area of “known item” searching, but stated that it is more useful for broad topical searches than MNCAT Classic. Mr. Butler stated that system is focused on keyword searching and the vendor is moving to incorporate browse behavior that will help with known item searches. He noted further that the 2011 summer upgrade to MNCAT has helped to address some of the problems.

Professor Alexander expressed her concern about knowing what items are being missed when using MNCAT to conduct searches. Mr. Butler responded that it would be helpful for users to track problems they encounter with MNCAT and report them.

Mr. Hanson noted the difficulties with trying to support distinct research behaviors with a single system and stated he is hopeful the new generation discovery system will allow the catalog to meet researchers' expectations.

Professor Fox noted that when in the discovery mode he almost always uses Google Scholar because he likes the "cited by" capability and the ability to reach what he is searching for in one click. Mr. Butler responded that two of the vendors the Libraries are considering for the discovery system have "cited by" capability in the catalog.

Professor Olszewski thanked Mr. Butler and Mr. Hanson for their presentation.

Old/New Business

Professor Olszewski reported that:

- The Research Works Act, which the SLC had written a letter opposing, had been withdrawn.
- The Open Access Subcommittee is continuing its work.
- The SLC would conduct an e-mail vote on whether to sign on to a letter from the University Libraries supporting the Federal Research Public Access Act.

Hearing no further business, Professor Olszewski adjourned the meeting.

Dawn Zugay
University Senate Office