

LIBRARY COMMITTEE
MINUTES OF MEETING

February 8, 2012
238A Morrill Hall

[In these minutes: libraries update; establishing author-pay fund for publication; subcommittee on future challenges and opportunities for libraries; Research Works 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), Phil Buhlmann, Bradford Clemens, LeAnn Dean, Elizabeth Fine, Mary Ford, David Fox, Michael Hancher, Ted Higman, Monica Howell, John Logie, Wendy Lougee, Evan Roberts, Mary Beth Sancomb-Moran, Bill Sozansky, Suzanne Thorpe (for Joan Howland), David Zopfi-Jordan,

REGRETS: Jennifer Alexander, Michelle Englund, Susan Geller, Ronald Hadsall, Owen Williams

ABSENT: Robert Muellerleile, Vickie Graham

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.

Budget FY2013

The University Libraries preliminary budget allocations include \$683,000 toward collection cost increases, including sustaining core content licenses for e-content. In addition, \$336,000 for an anticipated 2.5% salary program is projected. These are all recurring allocations totaling \$1,019,000. One-time support (\$200,000, with internal matching) will enable expansion of collection storage space in Printing Services.

The Libraries have been included in the University's Six-Year Capital Plan to address long-term collection storage, improved facilities for rare books, and a potential renovation of Wilson Library.

Organizational Structure

The Libraries are engaging in an organizational review of its structure. The restructuring plan will coalesce components of the organization to create four divisions (tentative names): Content & Collections, Research & Learning, Health Sciences, and Data & Technology

Natural Resources Library

In light of budget reductions, use patterns, and interdisciplinary interests, a plan to consolidate two libraries with lower use was proposed in 2010. The plan will create a Natural Resources Library out of the separate Forestry and Entomology/Fisheries/Wildlife Libraries. Planning included consultation with relevant academic programs and surveys of user communities. The consolidation will bring together high use resources in a Natural Resources Library in Hudson Hall. Relevant collection resources will be relocated to McGrath Library or, if lesser used, to storage with ready access to the Libraries' delivery service, *Get It*. The new Natural Resources Library will be launched in May with a grand opening in fall 2012.

Ojibwa People's Dictionary Launched

The Libraries collaborated with the Department of American Indian Studies and Minnesota Historical Society to develop and release the Ojibwa People's Dictionary.

Professor Olszewski asked where the Libraries requests stand on the Capital Plan. Ms. Lougee responded that phase one, long-term collection storage needs, are listed for 2016 and phase two, the potential renovation of Wilson Library, are targeted for 2018. Professor Michael Hancher asked if a third storage-cavern is part of the phase one request. Ms. Lougee stated that it could be one of the storage options. She also noted potential space next to Anderson Library. The SLC then briefly discussed issues arising from cavern storage.

Professor David Fox asked if the collection storage space in Printing Services is interim space until cavern space is available. Ms. Lougee responded that it might be longer term. She also noted, in response to a committee members question that the materials stored at Printing Services would be low-demand materials. Additionally, the Committee on Institutional Cooperation is developing capacity for shared storage of science journals at Indiana University. She stated further that the Libraries are currently, considering which materials are kept in open stacks, which are in closed access storage, which materials should be available digitally, and which go to other Universities for storage.

Establishing an Author-Pay Fund

Professor Olszewski introduced the topic of author-pay open access publishing funds, and noted that prior to the meeting, the Libraries had provided committee members with background materials. He asked the SLC to consider whether the University should invest in an author-pay open access fund and if there is support for the fund, how it should be designed and implemented.

Professor Fox noted that the background materials did not discuss the impact of author pay funds on academic freedom and emphasized that if such a fund is implemented, it must have a system in place and explicit statements to safe guard academic freedom. Professor Olszewski noted that the fund would not make judgments about content.

Professor Phil Buhlmann stated that the fund should be sustainable and this would require a substantial investment. Professor Olszewski stated that some funds are funded at low levels because they are designed to be exploratory.

Professor Hancher questioned the applicability of author pay funds across disciplines. He noted that some disciplines are not externally funded and author pay funds might promote the spread of author-pay publishing fees.

Professor Evan Roberts shared Professor Hancher's concern and asked if there is departmental support of author-pay funds.

Ms. Lougee responded that purely open access journal funding occurs in two ways: 1) institutionally supported (e.g. university-based publishers) or 2) author's pay for the publishing. She stated that in the last two years she has been approached by approximately ten faculty members who either wanted the University of Minnesota to host their journals or wanted to discuss launching or sustaining journals.

Professor Fox noted the success of the open access paleontology journal that he edits.

Elizabeth Fine stated that Biomed Central offered a model whereby institutions could establish a fund to subsidize author fees. The Libraries supported this fund with an initial pool of about \$9000.00 and it was rapidly depleted. She stated in order for open access funding to be sustainable there must be a change in faculty attitudes and behavior toward publishing. She suggested a pilot project would be the way to begin, because it would help authors understand open access publishing, and it is too overwhelming to attempt to change the entire publishing system.

Professor Buhlmann stated the fund must address the issues associated with writing publishing fees into grants.

Professor Fox asked if there was a method for determining how many papers authored by University of Minnesota individuals are published in open access journals. He thought this might be helpful in determining the level of funding. Ms. Lougee responded that she could provide data on Public Library of Science publications, but data for other publications is not readily available.

Professor Olszewski stated the fund would create visibility for and education about the topic of open access publishing. Professor Buhlmann responded that there must be a large pool of funds available if there is going to be a switch to an author pay publishing model, otherwise it will result in investigators paying for publishing out of their grants, and having fewer funds to hire graduate students. Professor Olszewski remarked that the intent of the author pay fund is not to change the publishing industry, but to assist authors that need to publish their work but lack funding. Professor Buhlmann pointed out that there are a large number of papers that need to be published but can not be paid for from a grant, and currently these are typically published in the society journals.

Professor John Logie asked two clarifying questions of the SLC, 1) “Do you think that the author-pay model will be the future method of publishing?” and 2) “Do you like it and think it is functional and fair?”

Ms. Lougee noted that alternatives to author-pay open access models have associated problems. It is important to consider the open access archiving model and the parallel universe of publications that it is creating. Under this model, author’s publish in a subscription journal and reserve sufficient rights to post a copy in an institutional or discipline open archive, but the majority of the archived articles are not the final published version so it creates a parallel universe of publication and consequent citation issues.

Professor Olszewski commented that commercial publishers are starting to experiment with author pay journals, and this will create a need for author-pay funds.

With regard to whether committee members like the author pay model, several responded that it is better and more fair than the current system. Professor Logie stated that if committee members agree that author-pay model is a suboptimal system, they must realize it is only a band-aid on the problems of the current publishing system, and that the author-pay fund should have a sunset provision, and be used to assist those who cannot pay for publication.

Ms. Lougee noted that the migration from the current publishing model to an author-pay model would take time, but eventually it will help bring down library subscription costs. This could result in a cost-based rather than a profit-based model.

Professor Roberts stated the long-term question is how to move away from a system where the publishers are capturing the value being created by authors. But he agreed that in the short-term, an author-pay fund would assist faculty members who do not have other sources of funding their publishing.

Professor Hancher asked if it would be possible to measure the demand for a pilot project that creates a new source of funding. Ms. Lougee stated demand could be measured based on the need expressed at other institutions with funds in place.

Professor Olszewski asked whether the SLC wished to continue exploring the possibility of establishing an author pay fund. The SLC voted to continue exploring the issue.

Ms. Lougee indicated the Libraries could create an initial draft document with the core substance of the proposal for an author-pay fund. The committee could then define the principles and the criteria for the fund. The proposal would eventually need to be presented to the Office of the Vice President for Research and the Libraries for consideration. Professor Olszewski stated the draft from the Libraries would be distributed to the SLC for comment, and then a smaller subcommittee would be recruited to work on the principles and criteria.

Mr. Logie stated the application should have a place for applicants to articulate the advantages of author pay publication versus alternative publishing methods. Professor Olszewski cautioned that this type of requirement might impact academic freedom.

Suzanne Thorpe noted it would be important to articulate the goals of the pilot project and why it is needed.

Mary Ford asked why the open access movement began. Ms. Lougee explained there were several motivating factors. Initially, there were concerns about access, journal costs, and rights. Some communities such as physics, developed mechanisms to deposit papers in digital archives. Open access issues are closely allied with authors retaining sufficient rights for distribution.

Professor Fine stated that education and awareness of the publishing issues is the most important aspect of establishing the author-pay fund and will drive change over the long term whether or not the fund is successful.

Formation of Subcommittee to Consider Future Library Challenges and Opportunities

Professor Olszewski stated he would like to form a subcommittee of SLC members to consider future library challenges and opportunities. The goal would be for the committee to be more forward looking rather than reacting to issues of the day. The Libraries would provide the subcommittee members with two documents to assist in the process of identifying potential issues, the University Libraries Strategic Plan and a consultant's report commissioned by several provosts. Ms Lougee explained that the consultant's report, aggregates data, is national in scope, and is geared toward academic libraries in general (vs. research libraries).

Committee discussion followed about the origin of the consultant's report. Professor Logie asked if there are any red flags in the document. Ms. Lougee responded that one strong trend is the growth in digital use and the decrease in use of physical journals.

Professor Hancher asked how the Libraries are making decisions about buying electronic books versus print books. Ms. Lougee responded that this is a large and complicated issue, and Professor Olszewski suggested bringing it back for a more full discussion at a future meeting.

Professor Olszewski stated he would e-mail the committee members the Strategic Plan and the consultant's report. Rather than establishing a subcommittee, he asked members to read these documents and e-mail him with ideas for future SLC agenda items.

The Research Works Act

Prior to the meeting, the SLC received a copy of the Research Works Act (H.R. 3699). The Act states in relevant part:

No Federal agency may adopt, implement, maintain, continue, or otherwise engage in any policy, program, or other activity that -

(1) causes, permits, or authorizes network dissemination of any private-sector research work without the prior consent of the publisher of such work; or

(2) requires that any actual or prospective author, or the employer of such an actual or prospective author, assent to network dissemination of a private-sector research work through the Internet or by a closed, limited, or other digital or electronic network or arrangement.

Ms. Lougee explained that the bill would repeal the National Institutes of Health Public Access Policy, and that the Association of Public and Land-grant Universities (APLU) had written a letter to the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee opposing the legislation. She stated that the University of Minnesota was a signatory to the letter. She noted that there were no Minnesota legislators on the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee. She suggested that if the SLC wanted to respond to the bill, it could send a letter commenting on it. Ms. Lougee also summarized some comments from the bill's supporters such as the Association of American Publishers (AAP) and the publisher Elsevier.

Bradford Clemmens asked what value publishers add to journal articles. Ms. Lougee discussed the history of society journals migrating to for-profit publishers, and explained that many society journals are now reliant on the funding stream provided by the publishers. She stated that editors do a lot of the work mostly in an unpaid capacity. But most publishers manage the copy editing, and subscription process, and provide "added value" systems around publication.

The committee further discussed the need to articulate the SLC's opposition to the Research Works Act and the best method for conveying this. Professor Michael Hancher suggested the committee review the letter from the APLU and vote on whether or not to endorse it. He also suggested the SLC draft a statement seeking University Senate endorsement of the APLU letter. The SLC agreed to this.

Professor Olszewski suggested committee members contact the Societies they are connected with, determine whether they are members of the AAP, and communicate their opposition to the bill.

Hearing no further business, Professor Olszewski adjourned the meeting.

Dawn Zugay
University Senate Office

Follow up: Following the meeting, the SLC voted via e-mail to endorse the APLU letter. The SLC did not follow up with a recommendation to the University Senate for endorsement of the letter because there was insufficient time prior to the deadline for endorsing the letter.

The letter follows:

February X, 2012

Dear Members of the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee:

The undersigned organizations and institutions write to express our strong concerns with H.R. 3699, the Research Works Act, which has been referred to your Committee. This bill would impede public access to valuable research results from work funded by federal agencies.

Most immediately, H.R. 3699 would repeal the successful National Institutes of Health (NIH) Public Access Policy, which currently ensures that the public receives timely, free access to articles reporting on the results of our nation's \$29 billion annual investment in medical research. Besides cutting off access to this crucial information, the proposed bill would prohibit all other federal science agencies from enacting similar policies, unfairly restricting the public's ability to access the results of our collective investment in scientific research.

The current NIH policy, with its 12-month delay in public access, has a proven track record of delivering positive benefits to U.S. taxpayers, while holding the government accountable for public investment in scientific research. It provides access to more than a half million individual users each day, including health care professionals, patients, caregivers and their families. People rely on the accessibility of this information to improve their understanding of the medical conditions they are facing as well as their quality of care.

As of today, the PubMed Central database contains more than 115,000 articles on hypertension research, 150,000 on diabetes research, and more than 110,000 on heart disease research. U.S. citizens whose tax dollars underwrite this research, believe that crucial details of the most recent medical advancements in these areas should be available to them, and to the doctors and caregivers whose responsibilities are the health and long life of all Americans. Access to up-to-date, health-related information plays a crucial role in ensuring that patients are as educated as possible about their individual situations, including the latest therapies. PubMed Central ensures that access, after a 12-month delay, for patients, as well as students, physicians, and others who do not have ready access to the exclusive publications.

H.R. 3699 will affect access to not only these vital biomedical research results stemming from NIH funding, but also scientific research underwritten by **all** other federal agencies. Access to critical information on energy, economics, computational science, engineering and hundreds of other areas that directly impact the lives and well being of the public would be unduly limited by this proposed legislation.

Taxpayers fund research with the expectation that the resulting ideas and discoveries will propel science, stimulate the economy and improve the lives of all Americans. Public support for science is enhanced when the public can directly see the benefits from our investment in scientific research. Scientific progress depends on the broadest possible dissemination of knowledge, and the ability to build upon the work of others.

The NIH Public Access Policy is supported by the patient advocacy, higher education, library, and research communities – including dozens of Nobel Prize winners – as a means to address the costly barriers that have impeded so many from accessing vital information, and as an opportunity for all communities to benefit from access to publicly funded information in an equitable, timely and affordable manner.

Given the success of the NIH policy and the potential for other similar programs, we urge your opposition to H.R. 3699, the Research Works Act. We look forward to working with you to ensure that the NIH Public Policy continues to serve science, the research community, and the public, and that similar policies can be enacted across other federal science agencies.

Sincerely,