

LIBRARY COMMITTEE
MINUTES OF MEETING

December 12, 2011

238A Morrill Hall

[In these minutes: libraries update; committee business; author pay model for publication; subcommittee on future challenges and opportunities for libraries]

[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), Wendy Lougee, Jon Binks, Bill Sozansky, Mary Beth Sancomb-Moran, LeAnn Dean, Evan Roberts, John Logie, Michelle Englund, Monica Howell, Elizabeth Fine, Jennifer Alexander, Phil Buhlmann, Ronald Hadsall, Suzanne Thorpe (for Joan Howland),

REGRETS: Susan Geller, Mary Ford, Joseph Spanjers, Bradford Clemens

ABSENT: Ted Higman, Owen Williams, David Fox, David Zopfi-Jordan, Robert Muellerleile, Vicki Graham

GUESTS: Professor Mark Davison

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

University Libraries Update

University Librarian, Wendy Lougee, provided the committee with a brief update on University Libraries' events. Highlights include:

- The Libraries are in the process of an organizational restructuring. Two new divisions will be created. One will coalesce units that support and sustain content and collections. The second will bring together resources and functions that enable intellectual access to content (e.g., cataloging) and technology infrastructure for access. Greater coordination of Libraries programs in support of research and instruction will also be emphasized in Libraries' divisions that support academic programs in all disciplines.
- The Libraries, working with the University's Office of Institutional Research, launched a research project to address the question: *Does student use of library collections, services, tools, workshops correlate with student success (grades, GPA)?* Library use data were collected throughout fall 2011 for an in depth analysis to be completed in spring 2012.
- The Physical Science and Engineering librarians have been developing a Professional

Skills Portfolio Program for College of Science & Engineering students, to which they can opt in to improve their “soft skills” and showcase them for potential employers.

- Planning is underway to migrate the University---wide library enterprise system “to the cloud” in 2014. This involves extensive data preparation and workflow review. Ultimately, efficiencies and enhanced service features are anticipated.
- The Friends of the Libraries organization is sponsoring a student video contest to be announced in January.
- In 2010, the Libraries launched a visiting scholar program honoring Governor Elmer Andersen (a major benefactor to the Libraries). The SLC was provided a list of the 2011 awardees selected by a faculty panel.

Professor Olszewski asked Ms. Lougee to further explain the Libraries migration to the cloud, and asked if SLC input was needed. Ms. Lougee responded the migration would provide some enhancements to the University-wide library enterprise system for managing operations, but the user experience would not be significantly impacted. There is also work underway to license a new search tool that would enhance the “discovery” functions of library systems.

New Business

Professor Olszewski reported on three items of new business.

- The SLC charge requires a representative from the SLC to be an ex officio member of the Senate Committee on Information Technologies (SCIT). Professor Olszewski has been filling this role, but will be unable to in the spring semester. He asked for a committee volunteer to take on this position. He noted SCIT meets the first Tuesday of each month, and stated he would e-mail SLC members
- There will be a change in the SLC meeting time for the spring 2012 semester. The SLC will now meet from 11:15 to 12:45.
- The Open Access Subcommittee was constituted and had its first meeting. The committee members are John Logie, Phil Buhlmann, Monica Howell, Karen Williams, Anna Clark, Michael Hancher, and Neil Olszewski.

Author Pay Model for Publication and its Impact on the Libraries and University Community

Professor Olszewski thanked the Libraries for gathering several articles on the author pay model for publication and proving them to committee members prior to the meeting. He then noted that other institutions and publishers are exploring the author pay model for publication, and that Professor Mark Davison, had recently e-mailed him with concern about the topic. He stated Professor Davison was previously the associate editor of a society-owned journal, now edits a publisher-owned journal, and would be joining the SLC meeting to provide some information on the publisher’s economic model.

Professor Olszewski then provided the committee with a brief background on the three predominant economic models for publishing serials and journals.

- Library subscription model
 - Traditional model
 - Publishers generate revenue from journal subscriptions purchased by libraries. There may or may not be additional charges to authors.
 - Problems with this model are that institutions are a captive audience, must be responsive to end-users requests for journals, end-users are unaware of the costs, and publishers are continually increasing the costs of journal subscriptions
- Author pay model
 - Driven by the open access movement
 - Publisher's revenue generated by charging authors fees upfront
 - Author is charged about \$500 to \$4,000 per article
 - All costs are born by the author and the article is immediately open access
 - Article goes through the typical review process
 - Model raises concerns about "vanity publishing"
- Hybrid model
 - Combines subscription and author pay models
 - An additional charge is paid for immediate open access
 - May include a buy-out of the embargo period
 - Referred to by some libraries as "double dipping"

Professor Olszewski went on to indicate some of the publisher questions/uncertainty about the author-pay model.

- Will authors actually pay to publish their articles?
- How will author-pay journals compete?
- What is the impact of an increase in author pay journals? Large publishers, Springer and Wiley, recently entered the author pay market.

He also noted some results of open-access driving the author pay model.

- Under open access, libraries do not need to subscribe to journals
- Research funding agencies may mandate universal open access
- Universities are establishing open-access repositories and archives

Ms. Lougee clarified there are two forms of open access:

- Wholly open access – something other than a subscription based funding model where articles are made available to everyone
- Open access archiving – authors publish through their traditional subscription publishing venue and also deposit a copy of their article in a University's open-access archive. The majority of publishers allow some form of archiving, but often the article that is archived is not the final published version.

Professor Olszewski stated that from a University point of view, the author pay model might have some positive results such as:

- Decreasing the cost of publishing because it makes the author the consumer, and as a consumer authors would be aware of and take into consideration the cost of publishing

- Causing an increase in the number of publishers

Professor Davison commented that publishers see the author pay model as economically advantageous because there is a growing number of assistant and associate professors at Universities that need to publish in order to advance their careers. Professor Logie noted publishers should be careful in this assumption because many of professors in that demographic are targeting creative commons publishing.

Professor Olszewski stated the important question raised by the author-pay model is how should the authors' fees be paid. Some possibilities are:

- Publishing fee paid by the granting agency
- Publishing fee paid by the University if the research is not supported by grants
 - Pilot projects have been established by universities to create funds for publishing in author-pay open-access journals
 - University must consider methods for distributing funds, the source of the funds, and whether funds should cover hybrid-publishing models

Professor David Fox noted that the author-pay model of publishing raises issues of academic freedom.

Bill Sozansky stated that based on the number of papers published per year at the University (approximately 7,200), the cost of publishing would be significant.

Professor Olszewski asked the SLC to consider whether the University of Minnesota should set up some type of author-pay fund. Professor Davison noted there is already a set of open access journals purely financed by subscription. The main goal of these journals is to increase access to information in developing countries. These journals are using tiered pricing. Charging full subscription fees to libraries and subscribers in developed countries and charging lower or no subscription fees to libraries in developing countries. Professor Davison suspects this increases the University's subscription costs to journals and is possibly decreasing users access to journals. He suggested the SLC look at the subscription costs for open-access journals versus non-open access journals.

Ms. Lougee pointed out the distinction between open access journals and open access archiving. Under the gold standard of open access there are no subscription fees; the journals are generally either author pay or institutionally supported. The green standard is a journal that has an open-access archiving policy that allows authors to post a copy on the web or deposit a copy of the article in a discipline, institutional, or federal archive.

Professor Davison stated that several of the large publishers want to increase access to publications for libraries, large corporations, and small businesses in developing countries. They propose to do this by charging author fees or member fees to join the open access project. The fees would be tiered and there would be a fund for authors unable to pay the fees. To demonstrate this, Professor Davison walked the committee through a handout regarding the Springer Open Access Project. He noted the author pay fees range from \$600 to \$2000 per article and stated that this type of system raises

concerns about what it would cost authors, particularly those from developed countries, to achieve tenure. He further indicated this model raises questions about trade-offs between developed and developing countries, and reader and author access to publications.

Professor Olszewski summarized Professor Davison's comments into two questions: 1) "How do authors afford the new system of publication?" and 2) "How are publishers funding their grant programs?" Professor Davison stated the SLC should also consider discouraging the author-pay method of subsidizing subscriptions for developing countries.

Ms. Lougee stated that subscription fees are not related to developing countries access to journals. The bigger issue is the transition from a subscription model to an author-pay model. Professor Logie stated the foundational problem is crafting an institutional policy that can cover all disciplines, and noted the differences in funding availability for sciences and the humanities. He believes that many authors would be willing to trade society prestige for a streamlined model for publishing, and expressed alarm that Pfizer Corporation was underwriting the Springer's open access project.

Karen Williams stated that creating a new publishing model is a "mucky" issue and there is no agreement about how to move forward. The only agreement is that the old publishing model is not sustainable. The author-pay model and University archive repositories are experiments, and the end result will not likely be one model or the other. Ten major institutions have set aside funds to try the author-pay model, but they have not set aside sufficient funds to publish every paper. They are "buying into an experiment." she stated.

Professor Fox stated that he is very leery of a publishing model that requires authors to pay to publish their scholarship in order to achieve tenure particularly if the authors are in a department that does not have access to funds or if they are working on an innovative topic. In response to the issue of publishing innovative work, Professor Ron Hadsall gave the example of the successful open access journal, *Innovations in Pharmacy Practice*. He stated it is a volunteer run, peer-reviewed journal published by the social administrative sciences to promote innovations in pharmacy practice.

Professor Jennifer Alexander stated it is important to consider why the current publishing model is not sustainable and how this varies from one discipline to another and noted the differences between publishing in history and engineering.

In response to concerns expressed about integrity and innovation in the publishing, Professor Olszewski commented that as long as there are many journals available for publication it would drive the integrity of the process.

Professor Logie suggested that rather than experimenting with an author-pay fund, it might be more cost effective and sustainable for the University to establish an infrastructure for high reputation journals to migrate to the University. The University

could house the authors' work and make it directly available. Mary Beth Sancomb Moran brought up the issue of impact factors and the difficulty of overcoming authors' bias for publishing in journals recognized as prestigious.

Mr. Sozansky noted that some publishers are making as much as 30% profit, and expressed concern about setting up an author fund that would continue to pay publishers high profits.

Professor Olszewski summarized the suggestions from the SLC's discussion:

- Professor Logie suggested the University should enter the publishing business
- Professor Olszewski recommended establishing a pilot author-fee fund
- Several committee members expressed concern about the principle of the author pay model and suggested the University should "push back" against this
- Professor Davison suggested discouraging the use of the author pay-model to subsidize open-access for developing countries

Professor Olszewski then asked for the committee's sense on how to pursue the issue. Professor Fox stated he is interested in the question of whether or not to advocate for an author fund and whether or not to pushback against the author-pay model. But he believes the issue of international subsidies is outside the purview of the SLC. Professor Olszewski suggested the SLC could collect and analyze information on author funds at other institutions. Professor Logie stated it is possible to disagree with the current publishing model, and create an author fund in light of the current publishing circumstances. But he would like a mechanism to evaluate whether providing author fees is maximizing author access or just paying into the current model.

Professor Alexander asked if there is a way to gather more information about who is publishing in the author-pay journals. Ms. Williams stated she could access the PLoS (Public Library of Science) data on this but she was unsure about the commercial publishers' data.

Professor Fox stated it might be helpful to have data about the relative impact factors of the journals in different publishing models because this relates to the metrics used to determine promotion and tenure.

Professor Evan Roberts suggested creating a generalized open-access support fund that could be used to support efforts such as saving society journals from institutional publishers in addition to funding authors.

Forming Subcommittee to Consider Future Library Challenges and Opportunities

Due to time constraints, Professor Olszewski stated he would send an e-mail asking for volunteers to serve as a subcommittee that would read through other University libraries' strategic planning documents in order to help shape the SLC's future agenda.

Hearing no further business, Professor Olszewski adjourned the meeting.

Dawn Zugay
University Senate Office