

Minutes\*

**Senate Consultative Committee  
Thursday, September 18, 2008  
3:00 – 4:30  
Room 238A Morrill Hall**

Present: Emily Hoover (chair), Jeffrey Anderson, Susan Cable, Nancy Carpenter, Carol Chomsky, William Craig, Shawn Curley, William Durfee, Janet Fitzakerley, Marti Hope Gonzales, Michael Hancher, Jeffrey Kahn, Karen Lovro, Miriam Maiga, Michael Oakes, Nelson Rhodus, Becky Yust

Absent: Gary Balas, Katie Best, Jason Einertson, Judith Martin, Pamela Stenhjem

Guests: Professor Jay Hatch (Chair, Library Committee); Christopher Schwebler

Others: Rebecca Hippert (Senate Office)

[In these minutes: (1) motion from the Senate Library Committee; (2) snacks and beverages at committee meetings; (3) University Senate docket]

**1. Motion from the Senate Library Committee**

Professor Hoover convened the meeting at 3:10 and welcomed Professor Hatch to discuss a motion adopted by the Senate Library Committee. The motion read as follows:

\* \* \*

The University's mission articulates a commitment to sharing knowledge through education for a diverse community and application of that knowledge to benefit the people of the state, the nation, and the world. In this spirit, the University encourages faculty and students to exercise their interests in ownership and use of their copyrighted works in a manner that provides the greatest possible scholarly and public access to their work.

- From the new Board of Regents policy on Copyright (Dec. 14, 2007)

During the 2007-2008 academic year, the Senate Library Committee engaged in lengthy discussions regarding the changing landscape of scholarly publishing in a digital age, copyright ownership issues, and open access to scholarly works created at the University of Minnesota. These are complicated and interdependent issues that have the potential to affect:

- 1) the institution's goal to become one of the top three public research institutions;
- 2) the ability of faculty and other academics to publish works in critical venues for purposes of tenure, promotion, and professional development;

---

\* 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 represents the views of, nor are they binding on, the Senate, the Administration, or the Board of Regents.

- 3) the ability of the university community to have access to and use scholarly works and teaching materials (including their own) in the course of their teaching, learning, and research; and
- 4) the scope of services offered by the University Libraries.

In 2007, the University Senate endorsed the CIC authors' addendum, drawing attention to the options authors have in assigning all or part of the rights associated with copyright.<sup>1</sup> Other institutions also have taken similar stances, affirming principles of "open access" to scholarly content and institutional policies that support or enable more liberal management of authors' rights. Recently there have been notable actions taken by several top-tier institutions, creating technology infrastructure to share scholarly works and policies to support new models of sharing intellectual assets. Further, a number of studies have provided useful data concerning the positive impact on institutional visibility and individual recognition brought about by such practices.

The Senate Library Committee sees potential non-complementary outcomes that could arise from University policy if these issues are dealt with individually instead of holistically. The trends toward more open models for disseminating and managing scholarship raise important institutional questions. For example, in its bid to position itself more competitively and increase national rank, will the University constrain creative ways of making scholarly works publicly available? In its attempt to provide broader access to scholarly publication, will the University also make it easier for scholars to retain the necessary rights to re-use their work in their professional activities? Can open access be handled in ways that do not detract from the research, educational, and operational efforts of scholarly societies? How do we balance the needs of junior faculty for publication in core journals to attain tenure with the needs of scholars here and elsewhere for broader / deeper access to the research output of academia? How will the University inform and involve its community of scholars regarding the issues above?

Several committees and *ad hoc* task groups are discussing these issues surrounding scholarship, publication, and copyright, and University Libraries maintains the *Transforming Scholarly Communication* webpage (<http://www.lib.umn.edu/scholcom/>), which touches on many of the issues and provides links to important resources. Yet, no **holistic** institutional strategy to guide and inform individuals and units in this rapidly changing milieu is emerging.

The Senate Library Committee presents the concerns noted above to the Senate Consultative Committee (SCC) and respectfully requests that it seek from the Provost the development of such a holistic strategy during the 2008-2009 academic year, or that the SCC articulate that strategy to the University Community in the event that it already exists.

\* \* \*

Professor Hatch commented that this is a digital age, one that has brought a lot of changes, including issues of copyright, making scholarly works available digitally, and demands for services from the libraries. The Library Committee kept returning to this topic, over and over, and it was clear that there is widespread ignorance about copyright. Are people giving up too much in order to publish in the best journals? Is copyright driving costs up for the libraries because they are trying to make material widely available? What got the Library Committee going on these issues was that it learned there were

---

<sup>1</sup> Authors may retain rights to use their own works in teaching and research, to deposit a copy in an open access repository, or to allow other scholars to make educational uses without payment of royalties.

four groups discussing various aspects of them but that no one was riding herd on the process. The Library Committee was asking that the Provost do so—or that if it is being done, that the rest of the University community be informed.

Professor Curley noted that there is an administrative copyright policy being considered at present. Professor Hatch said that if it is similar to the Regents policy on copyright, it does not put faculty in a position to insist on non-exclusive use of materials. If one tries to do so, the journal will suggest the individual seek to publish elsewhere.

Professor Hancher asked how the proposal would lead to a policy change. Professor Hatch said he did not have an answer, but junior faculty will publish in SCIENCE whether or not they can get non-exclusive rights to use.

Following some discussion about who should do what in terms of what the Library Committee proposed, it was agreed that the Library Committee should take the issues to the Provost, and that this Committee would be available to provide assistance as needed. The Committee voted unanimously to charge the Library Committee to develop, in consultation with the Provost, a holistic approach to the issues outlined in the Library Committee's resolution.

## **2. Snacks and Beverages at Meetings of University Senate Committees**

Professor Hoover next noted that the Faculty Consultative Committee had voted that there would no longer be snacks and beverages at meetings of committees of the Faculty Senate. The reasons for the decision included reducing the amount of bottled water used, reduction in the amount of high-fat, high-fructose-corn-syrup foods, and reduction in the cost to the Senate budget. She urged that the Senate Consultative Committee adopt the same rule for committees of the University Senate.

Mr. Schwebler reported that the Student Senate Consultative Committee had agreed to eliminate the use of bottled water and would not have Coke products, but they decided to retain the snacks and students can refrain from eating them if they don't like them. They also left up to each committee the decision about snacks and beverages. This Committee does not have to issue a mandate and can leave the option open for each committee.

Professor Hancher said it would help if there were healthy foods in the vending machines in Morrill Hall for those who come to meetings directly from class. At present one must go to the Nolte Cafeteria to get good food.

Professor Durfee moved that the Committee decide that University Senate committees not have snacks and beverages at their meetings.

Mr. Schwebler said that the healthy food issue is moot because people can bring their own but that he agreed with the issue of packaging (i.e., bottled water) and the hassle for the Senate staff. Professor Gonzales said it is a time for sacrifice and she agreed there should not be snacks and beverages at meeting. Mr. Craig reported that CAPA is struggling with this issue, but has agreed to get rid of bottled water. They have three-hour meetings, however, so the demands are a little different, and said he was not sure how he would vote in this Committee.

The Committee voted 12-2 in favor of Professor Durfee's motion, with one abstention.

**3. University Senate Docket**

The Committee voted unanimously to approve the University Senate docket.

Professor Hoover adjourned the meeting at 3:50.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota