

**LIBRARY COMMITTEE**  
**MINUTES OF MEETING**  
December 11, 2013

[In these minutes: Trends in publishing and collections; Conservatism in publishing discussion.]

[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:** Jennifer Alexander (Chair), Michelle Brasure, Phil Buhlmann, LeAnn Dean, Michelle Englund, David Fox, Judith Garrard, Wendy Lougee, Neil Olszewski, Luke Plutowski, Evan Roberts, Matthew Rosendahl, Mary Beth Sancomb-Moran, Marlo Welshons

**GUESTS:** Joy Kirchner

**OTHERS:** Connie Lenz (for Joan Howland)

**REGRETS:** Brandon Adams, John Butler, Mary Alice Ford, Vicki Graham, Bo Hu, Daniel Pesut, David Schulist, Owen Williams

**ABSENT:** Ronald Hadsall

**WELCOME**

Professor Alexander called the meeting to order and asked for introductions.

**TRENDS IN PUBLISHING AND COLLECTIONS**

Joy Kirchner, Associate University Librarian for Content and Collections, attended the meeting to present and discuss trends in publishing and collections. She used a PowerPoint to discuss the following topics:

- Economics (journals)
- Who is publishing scholarship?
- Scholarly Publishing Market
- To maintain profit margins, prices must rise
  - Trends have not shown a consistent increase in the cost of production, however, there has been an increase in the return to shareholders.
- Unsustainability of the Economic Model
  - Typical Economy
  - Gift Economy
    - The author is supported by a different economy: grants, prestige, promotion, etc. In this sense there are two different economies at work; the library has one relationship with the publisher, while the

- author has a relationship with the publisher. This has created a barrier for activism in this economy.
      - Publishers have a “captive economy” of academics due to credentialing and promotion and tenure.
- Efforts to Sustain Access to Scholarship
  - SCOAP 3
    - An example of a positive relationship to create a sustainable model.
  - Unglue.it
    - Crowd-funding model.
  - Collectives to Support Stewardship of Unique Assets
    - Hathi Trust
    - eLIFE
    - PeerJ
- Rise of the Mega Journal
  - Plos One – Submission is not by editorial control, it is based on a set of criteria by subject area. It is an aggregator that is gaining attention, though members noted that it takes time to establish an impactful reputation.
  - Biology Open
  - Sage Open
- Access to open data is an area of development to watch in the future.

Professor Alexander closed the discussion by noting that possibilities are expanding with the use of these new models and formats.

#### DISCUSSION OF SCHOLARLY “CONSERVATISM”

Professor Fox provided an overview of the article and pointed out that the tie of publishing to promotion and tenure is a factor to be considered throughout this discussion. He then outlined the following points from the article.

- There has not yet been a shift in scholarly publication practices in response to changing technology. This leads to the idea that scholarly publishing is conservative.
- Traditional forms of publication remain the dominant mode of dissemination, despite the growing availability of alternative open access resources.
- The impact of discipline, traditional publishing continues to be the primary criterion for scholarly review.
- Most scholars need more filters and fewer sources for publishing.
- The conservative approach of scholarship ensures rigorous filtering of ideas and promotes sound progress.

Members discussed the following points:

- Professor Buhlmann agreed that filters are necessary for discerning meaningful resources of data and information.

- The traditional model restricts access of information to those that can afford it. The open access model allows for the global community to have access to content.
- The more reliance that is placed on “impact factor” for promotion and tenure, the greater chance that reliable submission filters will be overwhelmed. Other members noted that there is also emphasis on the journal name, not just the “impact factor.”

Professor Alexander summarized that the conservatism of publishing is valuable, despite the issues created within the financial model.

Hearing no further business, Professor Alexander adjourned the meeting.

Jeannine Rich  
University Senate Office