

## **SENATE LIBRARY COMMITTEE**

**March 9, 2016**

### **Minutes of the Meeting**

*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*

**[In these minutes:** Open Access Publishing Fund; Discussion of New Developments in the Libraries in Digital Scholarship]

**PRESENT:** David Fox (chair), Michelle Brasure, John Butler, Joseph Deters, Bo Hu, Wendy Lougee, Neil Olszewski, Evan Roberts, Matt Rosendahl, Mary Beth Sancomb-Moran, Marlo Welshons, Owen Williams

**REGRETS:** Theresa Beaulieu, Vicki Graham, Andrea Johnson, Ronald Hadsall, Reilly Ruechel, Nicholas Mandal, Daniel Pesut, Jill Trites

**ABSENT:** LeAnn Dean, Bomin Kim, S. Douglas Olson

**GUESTS:** Nancy Sims, copyright program librarian; Claire Stewart, associate university librarian for research and learning

**OTHERS:** Michael Hannon for Joan Howland

Chair David Fox convened the meeting and members introduced themselves.

#### **1. Open Access Publishing Fund –**

Nancy Sims, copyright program librarian, joined the committee to present information about the Open Access Publishing Fund. She explained that Open Access is defined as free access for readers to published research literature, primarily journal articles but there are other publications as well. She provided PowerPoint slides to demonstrate the following different approaches to providing the material:

- Open Access Archiving or “Green” - a sustainable way to provide the material that is in the hands of the scholars. A copy of the work is made available in an open access archive, other than where it was originally published. Sometimes it is the version of record, sometimes not. Usually it is the text of the version of record. Two examples of archives are the University’s Digital Conservancy and Archive.org, which is a disciplinary site.
- Open Access Publishing or “Gold” - a work is made available open access in its original locus of publication. Sometimes it involves fees, sometimes not, it depends on the discipline. This is a path that is undertaken by traditional publishers. At the moment the University is not supporting open access publication if there is a fee for authors.

- Open Access “Hybrid” - access to a publication that is normally closed to members only, but publishers will make an article open if a fee is paid. This model is primarily used by traditional publishers.

Members asked the following questions:

- If a faculty member publishes an article in an Elsevier journal, when the rights statement is signed, what should they negotiate?
  - Ms. Sims explained that sometimes people are able to deposit articles in repositories depending on the negotiations and the policies of the publishers. For example, most Elsevier journals allow self-archiving but not without paying a fee or waiting 2-4 years. Personal websites are not under a uniform policy and some companies distinguish between archiving in repositories and personal websites.
- In response to a question, Ms. Sims explained that the distinction of “green” or “gold” has been used unclearly. The Budapest definition states that an article is only Open Access if it is freely accessible and has reuse rights. Hybrid models are free to access, but most do not carry reuse rights.

Ms. Sims then explained the following points and displayed them in the PowerPoint:

- The Open Access Publishing Fund pays “APC” (Author Publication Charge) fees for UMN-affiliated authors. These fees may be for all open access publications or hybrids.
- Intended as fund of last resort - only eligible if no other non-personal funds are available. The fund is only for the support of University faculty/employees/students, so if there are authors from another institution on a publication, the fund will only support a proportional amount of the fee.
- Hybrid publications are only eligible for a maximum of 50% of the fee. The University is likely paying to subscribe to the same publication.
- The fund is not the only option for paying APCs, it can be written into grants or paid out of development funds.
- Articles can be made open by self-archive, by retaining rights or following publisher policies, which might require picking the right publisher. There are some journals however, for which the only “open” option requires a fee.
- The University’s Open Access policy does not require authors to make the works available, or to publish in only 100% open access publications, it merely provides a broader array of options for doing so.
- Fund Background
  - Two-year pilot, starting in 2012
    - \$20K/year, from Libraries and OVPR
    - Reviewed in 2014
    - Instituted \$2,000 per applicant/year cap
  - Reopened for applications in March 2015

- \$40K total available, intended for 2-3 years
  - On track to spend this sum by the end of March 2016
- Current Fund Users
  - 27 applications since March 2015, 21 approved
  - Average amount paid out per application: \$1,432.95 - this is constantly increasing
  - Smallest total fee: \$862.77; Largest: \$5,200 (Hybrid for-profit publisher)
  - Several applications hit the \$2,000 cap
  - Users that were unable to make their articles open because of the fees have all been graduate students.
- Issue: Questionable Publishers
  - “Predatory” publishers exist; many of them run open access publications
  - Fund eligibility criteria does address this issue. Two organizations are helpful to identify such publishers: Directory of Open Access Journals and the Open Access Scholarly Publishers Association (OASPA). If a publisher is not listed with these two groups, the “third way” they can be substantiated is to provide a letter that says they subscribe to all ethical principles endorsed by the OASPA.
  - This “third way” is needed to support new publications and those changing their model.
- Proposal: Questionable Publishers
  - Publishers who are eligible via “third way” will be reviewed according to criteria on evaluating questionable publishers.
  - If all reviewers still have concerns, Ms. Sims is proposing that a discretionary denial of funding be made possible.
- Issue: Speed of Disbursement
  - Pilot spend \$40K in two years, more likely to spend this amount in one year.
  - Both Libraries and OVPR have increased funds to support \$40K/year for next 3 years.
  - Average payout per applicant and number of applications are increasing each year.
- Proposals: Speed of Disbursement
  - Cease to support hybrid and for-profit publications
  - Limit fund disbursement per quarter
  - Institute eligibility limit that was mentioned in pilot: if you were eligible to apply for grant funds, but didn’t, you are not eligible for OA Fund

Members had the following discussion in response to the proposal:

- Professor Olszewski commented that there could be issues of academic freedom with the questionable publisher proposal.
  - Professor Fox recalled that the committee was previously weary of having OVPR determine whether or not something is publishable

scholarship. Ms. Sims responded that this is not to question the scholarship, it is to determine how to deal with this problem. Many academic departments have these questions as well.

- Ms. Sims explained that in regard to slowing the disbursement of funds, it is difficult to determine if applications truly have no other funds to utilize.
- Ms. Sims responded to a question by saying that there are a number of publishers that accept articles from pre-print servers, but others do not. Most authors are not interested in having their draft versions accessible. It is difficult to track citations to articles in different locations as well as different versions.
- Ms. Lougee noted that publishers with hybrid publications require authors to opt-out of the institutional open access policies. Ms. Sims said that publications that require the opt out ask for evidence from the author. Elsevier, for example, officially requires this opt-out.
- Members discussed the following:
  - Articles might not be difficult to discover, however the open version could be difficult to obtain.
  - Possible future trajectories of open access in relation to federal policies and outside factors. They agreed that the fund will need to be continuously monitored because the landscape is constantly changing.
  - The importance of Open Access for readers, not only for the author.

In the interest of time, the open discussion closed and Professor Fox asked what is needed from the committee:

- Ms. Lougee commented that the committee can make a recommendation to be reviewed by the Libraries and OVPR. Professor Fox suggested that this discussion be tabled for the next meeting so a vote can be taken and a solid recommendation made.

## **2. Discussion of New Developments in the Libraries Digital Scholarship –**

Claire Stewart, associate university librarian for research and learning, joined the committee to obtain feedback on issues related to digital scholarship. She presented the following background information in a PowerPoint:

- What is digital scholarship? Applying emerging digital tools and methods to research, teaching, and scholarship. There are questions around how to maintain and promote these efforts, as interest is growing. She then displayed examples of digital scholarship and resources used and created at the University.
- Characteristics and outcomes
  - Collaborative (usually)
  - More likely to produce digital and open outputs
  - Active and problem-based
  - Develops transferable skills

- What are the challenges of digital humanities or digital arts scholarship?
  - Getting access to the tools and technology
  - Finding collaborators
  - Funding
  - Where to focus?
  - How to evaluate and reward this work?
- Models for digital humanities or digital scholarship programs
  - A dedicated center and funding
  - An alliance/federation of campus organizations - this is the current model at the University
- History at UMN
  - Various efforts across campus began in 2011.
- 2014 Recommendations
  - Form a DASH (Digital Arts Sciences and Humanities) Steering Group in fall 2014
  - Invest in a formal DASH service/operation team in early 2015
  - Develop a digital scholarship space in late 2015
- (Proposed) Tiered Model
  - Dash as incubator - incubating skills, utilize existing expertise for workshops
- Tier 2: Consultation and Pilot Projects
  - Carefully scoped, match user to needs, connect to existing capacity/service
- Tier 3: Large Scale Projects
  - Resource-intensive, requiring dedicated resources, commitments to sustain and preserve
- Underway
  - DASH Domains - will not serve the entire university but does not require new servers to be established for experimental sites.
  - Actively searching for a DASH coordinator, it would be a continuous appointment.
- Current DASH Partners
  - Libraries
  - LATIS (CLA: Liberal Arts Technologies & Innovation Services)
  - Center for Educational Innovation (CEI)
- SPACES
  - Embracing the notion that this will not be centered in one location.
  - Currently considering using a space in Wilson Library as a flexible space for collaboration. This could be a prototype for the redesigning of library spaces.
- Questions and Discussion
  - Coordination and steering: how should faculty be represented? Who are other partners?
  - Should we specialize, or should we serve all? What networks to tap/develop beyond UMN?

- What (physical) spaces are needed to support students and faculty?  
Adjacency to expertise?
- How will we fund and sustain this work?
- Does this work have value?

Members had the following questions and comments:

- A clarification of the Libraries role was provided: Providing space, expertise, finding and hosting technologies, and finding content.
- Ms. Stewart explained that choices need to be made in regard to what technology is obtained and supported.
- Members discussed the varying relationship between information technologies and library functions.
- Professor Fox commented that there could be issues tying discipline expertise to digital scholarship, as disciplines are constantly changing. All disciplines will likely involve digital scholarship in some way.
- Ms. Lougee mentioned that each campus will need flexible spaces and the Libraries will need help in the redesigning.

In the interest of time, Ms. Stewart said that it would be helpful to be able to return after the director of DASH is hired, potentially fall 2017.

Hearing no further business, the committee adjourned.

Jeannine Rich  
University Senate Office