

Minutes*

**Senate Research Committee
Monday, April 9, 2012
2:15 - 4:00
238A Morrill Hall**

- Present: Linda Bearinger (chair), Alvaro Alonso, Margaret Catambay, Jerry Cohen, Marc Dunham, Maria Gini, Greg Haugstad, Seung-Ho Joo, Frances Lawrenz, Tucker LeBien, Federico Ponce de Leon, LaDora Thompson, Thomas Vaughan, Kyla Wahlstrom, Karen Williams, Lynn Zentner
- Absent: Melissa Anderson, Arlene Carney, Anna Clark, Paul Cleary, Robin Dittman, Demoz Gebre, Jennifer Linde, Timothy Mulcahy, Kola Okuyemi, Alexander Thorkelson
- Guests: Mark Bohnhorst, Arnold Fishman (Office of the General Counsel), Professor Chris Cramer (chair pro tem, Research Openness Subcommittee); Associate Vice President Pamela Webb (Sponsored Projects Administration); Russ Straate (Office of Technology Commercialization), Nan Wilhelmson (Human Resources)
- Other: Jon Steadland (Office of the President)

[In these minutes: (1) request for exemption from the Openness in Research policy; (2) Research Openness Subcommittee; (3) "Principles Governing Private Sponsorship of Research"; (4) letter on the Federal Research Public Access Act of 2012; (5) establishing an open-access publishing fund; (6) entrepreneurial leave program]

1. Request for Exemption from the Openness in Research Policy

Professor Bearinger convened the meeting at 2:20 and welcomed Professor Cramer to present the recommendations of the Research Openness Subcommittee on a request for an exemption from the Board of Regents policy Openness in Research (the policy can be found at http://www1.umn.edu/regents/policies/academic/Openness_in_Research.html).

Professor Cramer reported that the subcommittee, established in 2004, meets on the rare occasion when there is a request for an exemption from the Regents' policy. The Board policy provides that the University will not accept research funding that includes restrictions on publication of the research results or that restricts access to students who may participate in the research. The subcommittee makes a recommendation to this Committee, which in turn makes a recommendation to the Vice President for Research, who makes a final decision on whether to grant the exemption.

The subcommittee received the request on April 3 and was asked to have a recommendation for this meeting, Professor Cramer said, so it did not have time to meet in person. Its deliberations were conducted by email.

* 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.

The gist of the request is that a consortium of Texas semiconductor companies want a University of Minnesota professor to look at computer chip design, but the semiconductor design kit that will be used to construct that chip is export-controlled, so the research will not be accessible to students from Iran, North Korea, Syria, Cuba, and Sudan. None of the students in the research group are from any of those countries, but the subcommittee was unimpressed with that argument because it is opposed to such restrictions in principle. The subcommittee learned, however, that the Department of Commerce has issued licenses to the University in the past to permit students from those countries to participate in analogous research, and that the sense of the Office of the General Counsel is that the Department of Commerce is quite receptive to such applications. The subcommittee asked for a license request to be submitted on a "blanket" basis, but was told that Commerce requires a license to be specific to an individual or individuals.

The subcommittee considered the present request and the past history of similar research in the department and recommends approving the request for the exemption because the PI and the department chair are willing to sign off on a plan that says that access to the research will not be restricted. They trust their colleagues to do what they say they will, Professor Cramer commented, and given that there is precedent for requesting and receiving a license from the Commerce department when needed, they are willing to recommend an exemption in this case, noting that the subcommittee also took seriously the issues of academic freedom (permitting the PI to pursue research directions freely) and the benefits to graduate students involved with respect to working on problems of practical interest to the semiconductor industry.

Without further discussion, the Committee voted to recommend to Vice President Mulcahy that the request be approved. Professor Bearinger thanked Professor Cramer and the members of the subcommittee for their prompt and thoughtful work.

2. Research Openness Subcommittee

Professor Bearinger asked Committee members to look at the charge to the subcommittee. The intent is that the subcommittee members serve relatively long terms in order to develop expertise around these cases and the policies. This Committee appoints the members of the subcommittee.

Professor Cohen suggested that the appropriate student governance committee be consulted about the selection of the student member. Mr. Dunham observed that the five-year term for subcommittee members could be a problem for students. It may be that a student on this Committee should serve when occasions arise that call the subcommittee into action.

Associate Vice President Webb said that the language of the charge needed revising. It was agreed that Professor Bearinger, Mr. Bohnhorst, Dr. Haugstad, and Associate Vice President Webb would serve as an ad hoc group to review the charge and bring recommendations back to the Committee.

3. "Principles Governing Private Sponsorship of Research"

Professor Bearinger next took up the *Principles Governing Private Sponsorship of Research*, a document adopted by the University Senate and approved by the administration in 2001; it reads as follows (between the * * *):

* * *

External support for faculty research and scholarship has become increasingly important in recent years, and will likely remain important for the foreseeable future. Faculty, departments and colleges should be encouraged to seek private support, as well as public support, for their research endeavors. Private support for research and scholarship at the University of Minnesota should be guided by these principles:

- Acceptance of private support should be the prerogative of, and according to the policies and procedures of, the University, not of the individual units or faculty;
- The University must exercise care when accepting funding from private sources that it is not unduly burdened to provide support for the infrastructure that the privately supported research will require;
- The University must exercise care in negotiating contracts with private entities to assure that academic freedom is preserved, particularly with respect to the faculty's right to interpret the findings and to publish new discoveries in an appropriate timeframe, with appropriate consideration of the sponsor's proprietary information, and with the faculty's right to choose the area of scholarship s/he wishes to pursue;
- The University must exercise care that the receipt of private funds does not adversely affect distribution of University resources or alter University priorities in areas that are not able to generate private support.

* * *

The "Comment" in the University Senate minutes that accompanied the docket item read as follows:

The Senate Research Committee believes that these principles must be adhered to when accepting money from private sources. The Committee discussed over several meetings the potential implications for the University of Minnesota of private funding of university-based research. The Committee recognizes the importance and necessity of non-public research funding, especially in areas in which federal, state, or University sponsorship is not readily available, but also recognizes the need to preempt or at least mitigate conflicts and negative consequences that might accompany it. Any erosion of academic freedom and "disinterested inquiry" must be rejected, and public trust in the research process and products of the University, and in its adherence to its public mission, must be safeguarded.

Professor Bearing explained that this is one of very few "policy" documents left on the University Senate website. All policies are now to be in the University policy library website, so the Faculty Consultative Committee has asked this Committee to consider what disposition should be made of these principles. The document is not policy, Professor Bearing observed, so one possibility is that the principles simply be repealed. She asked if Ms. Webb or Ms. Zentner had any comments.

Ms. Webb said she believed existing University policies and procedures cover the issues raised in the Principles and that she is unaware that there are any problems. They try, in Sponsored Projects Administration, to be consistent in how they treat funding sources, and they treat private sponsors just like they treat federal sponsors. She said she was not certain there was any reason to retain the Principles. Moreover, she said, there are parts of the document she could not understand, such as the second bullet.

(Professor Cohen said it refers to indirect-cost funding.) In that case, Ms. Webb said, the University now has policies governing indirect costs that establish a consistency that did not exist when the Principles were adopted. It is left to faculty discretion where they will seek funding for research; her office will support whatever makes sense. In the case of the third bullet, she said it is up to the faculty member to decide if certain funding will affect the direction of his or her research. Sponsored Projects Administration, however, does not care if the source of funding is federal, foundation, corporate, and so on.

The document establishes guidelines for the University as well as the faculty, Professor Vaughan pointed out. The University has in the past signed contracts that are not good for the faculty. Companies often dislike publishing the results of research; the University could agree that some intellectual property is exclusively protected and prevent a faculty member from working at another institution or a company on the same topic.

Ms. Webb said that the Openness in Research and intellectual property policies cover Professor Vaughan's points. Agreements with private-sector organizations are all reviewed by the faculty member and by her office. The only time the faculty would not review an agreement is when it is a standard contract, but any unusual terms are reviewed.

Professor Bearinger said she knows that there must be policies and a customary way to do things, but it is still valid to have principles written down. If policies address what the Principles cover, however, then perhaps they can be dispensed with. Ms. Webb responded that the Openness in Research policy ensures the right to publish; there is always language about intellectual property. But these principles do no harm, she agreed; the question is only whether they are needed. There are no risks she can see to retaining the Principles. She commented that she did not know the Principles even existed until they came up at this meeting.

Professor Cohen said that the last part of the third bullet is about the faculty's right to choose their areas of scholarship. That is a timely issue when a number of institutions have taken money from the Koch brothers for funding a chair in economics to hire someone to advance radically-conservative economic views. Most institutions have not accepted such funding.

If this statement is meant for faculty members, it is invisible, Dean LeBien observed. There is also nothing new in the Principles, Professor Alonso said. A declaration of principles is useful, Dean Ponce de Leon responded. What is different about private and federal funding, Professor Alonso asked? He said he could see no difference. Dean Ponce de Leon said that some faculty members feel that there is a difference. The document reinforces the view that there are principles the University stands for irrespective of policy changes.

Professor Cohen said that there is a difference between a Board of Regents' policy and the sense of the faculty from the Senate—the Principles do not carry a University mandate but they are the sense of the faculty. Whether the Board of Regents chooses to incorporate the Principles in its policy is up to them. But this is a set of principles, guidance to the Board on what the faculty wants. That the policy may mimic the Principles is an endorsement and compliment to the Principles. It is not always true that faculty-endorsed principles and Board of Regents policy are in concert. The question is whether anyone can find the Principles, Professor Bearinger commented. That is true of anything from the Senate, Professor Cohen said. The Principles could be referred to the Board for action and the Board can agree or

not. To have a document with guiding principles, however, does raise the question of whether the faculty still believe what they say. But if they are to be repealed, there should be a reason for doing so.

Professor Alonso repeated his question: Why such principles for privately-funded research and not from public sources? He said he did not see the need for a special set of principles for privately-funded research. The principles should be the same for both. Professor Gini took exception to Professor Alonso's view and said they should not be the same. Dean Ponce de Leon agreed and said that private sources often seek to exercise a lot more control of the results of research.

Ms. Zentner said that she had little to add to what Ms. Webb had said but commented that sometimes it is helpful culturally to have a set of over-arching principles in place. Professor Cohen said that he worked in a federal agency, and while it tried to influence university policy in terms of involving teaching and research, the assumption is that the federal government is interested in the common good and that private dollars are interested in private goods. So the rules would be different. One can argue about them, but those are the premises.

What is the problem with the Principles, other than that they may be redundant, Professor Vaughan asked? Nothing, Professor Bearinger said, it is just a matter of cleaning up. Professor Vaughan said he would like to see a comparison between the Principles and other University documents to determine the degree of redundancy in the Principles. Ms. Webb said that her office could try to map the Principles to University policies. Mr. Dunham said it is his sense that the Principles congeal the policies into one relevant document.

Professor Cohen moved that the Committee leave the Principles as is as a statement from the Senate. The motion passed 11-1.

Professor Bearinger said she would report the Committee recommendation to the Faculty Consultative Committee.

4. Letter on the Federal Research Public Access Act of 2012

Professor Bearinger turned to two matters from the Senate Library Committee (SLC) and asked Ms. Williams, from the Libraries, to speak to them.

The first is a letter to the Minnesota Congressional delegation from the Senate Library Committee about the Federal Research Public Access Act of 2012, Ms. Williams said. The Act would (quoting from the letter) "require that any federal agencies with annual extramural research budgets greater than \$100 million provide public access to the published records of funded research within six months of publication." SLC asked if the Senate Research Committee would endorse the letter. The Act essentially means that publications resulting from research receiving federal funds would be available to the public through open access, often after an embargo period. The Act continues current practice in some federal agencies—most notably the NIH—which has worked quite well, Ms. Williams said.

Professor Thompson asked what effect the Act would have on professional societies that have journals, the income from which is used to support the society. Some have such journals, Ms. Williams agreed, but the law would allow an embargo period. But if the research involves public funding, it must

be made available to the public. She said she did not believe the Act would have much impact on professional societies because it is immediate open access that could have the effect.

Some societies are releasing publications after a year, some do so for a fee, Dean Ponce de Leon said. But if one takes federal funds, the publication would have to conform to the federal rule. Professor Cohen said that in his field, private subscriptions yield virtually nothing for the professional society; it is the library subscriptions that produce revenue. The library subscriptions have nothing to do with open access. He said he did not know about the humanities, but open access in his field has not changed much.

The principle of open access is different from the implementation, Professor Gini commented. The letter speaks to the principles; the next item on the agenda, a fund to pay author fees, is implementation.

Professor Bearinger asked for a vote on the letter; the Committee voted unanimously to endorse it.

5. Establishing an Open-Access Fund

Ms. Williams next explained the open-access-fund proposal (the text of the proposal is appended to these minutes.) There are scholars who like to submit articles to open-access journals where there is no embargo period, but the funding model for some of those journals is to charge author fees. The practice varies by discipline. Sixteen institutions have become part of COPE (Compact for Open Access Publishing Equity), which wants to encourage open access and not hinder publishing.

Professor Gini inquired how much the fees are. From \$2000 to \$3000, Dean LeBien reported; Ms. Williams said that these rates are common, but some are lower, in the \$200-\$300 range. Of the universities that have signed on to COPE, none have completely spent their allocations yet. One of the best examples of an open access publisher is the Public Library of Science (PLOS), which is where a number of University faculty submit articles.

Dean LeBien asked how many papers from the University of Minnesota are in PLOS; Ms. Williams said she did not know but the Libraries has the number and will provide it. They would not easily know about other journals. Professor Cohen commented that other journals will impose a charge if an author wishes to choose an open-access option.

Professor Bearinger said that eligibility for the funds would provide access to the proposed \$20,000 to a broad range of faculty members; it seems like a remarkably small amount of money. About six faculty members per year, Dean Ponce de Leon commented. Dean LeBien said that PLOS has a series of journals, in different fields, that have similar author charges. Ms. Williams agreed and added that some of those PLOS journals have a very high impact factor, and thus are attractive for our scholars. Not all articles require full funding; there are criteria for determining how much each article would receive. This proposal is partly a statement of principle and encourages the faculty to think broadly about access and what they do with their rights.

What is done about quality control, Dr. Wahlstrom asked? What about a start-up journal that a faculty member wants to use some of the money to publish in? That could be problematic. Ms. Williams said the Library Committee decided not to get into that question. There are a handful of journals that are

vanity publications and they are springing up around the world. The Library Committee decided to let faculty judgment about the quality of journals guide where they choose to publish, and the traditional peer review process will determine which articles are accepted.

Professor Gini said that given the number of faculty members who would be eligible to request funding, \$20,000 makes it seem like a lottery. Six or seven papers from 2000 faculty members is ridiculous. And if the funding is made available to everyone, it could cost a lot of money. But if there is federally-required open access, the problem is solved.

These are alternative business models that journals are trying out, Ms. Williams explained. Professor Gini said the University would be better off putting articles on the University's website, if the journal would agree. That is not in a journal business model, Professor Cohen said.

Ms. Williams said that she could provide more information about COPE and the amount of money involved at other institutions. Professor Bearinger suggested, and the Committee agreed, that the chair of the Senate Library Committee should be invited to a future meeting of this Committee to discuss the proposal.

Professor Bearinger thanked Ms. Williams for the discussion.

6. Entrepreneurial Leave Program

Professor Bearinger now welcomed Mr. Straate and Ms. Wilhelmson to provide a report on the proposed Entrepreneurial Leave Program.

Mr. Straate, from the Venture Center in the Office for Technology Commercialization, explained that over the last three years the University has made significant strides in commercializing research. One highly-visible part of that effort is start-up companies; last year they sponsored 9 start-ups and this year there have been 10 so far, which is a record, so there is a lot of momentum. Over the last 24 months they have been working with Ms. Zentner to keep up that momentum and to reduce the barriers to faculty entrepreneurship.

The entrepreneurial leave program proposal comes out of discussions between the Office for Technology Commercialization and the Compliance Office (Ms. Zentner's office) and provides a way for faculty members to take a leave to develop technology. They have also worked with Human Resources to establish the details of how such a leave would work.

The proposal would "facilitate [a] temporary leave for faculty inventors who want to help an external organization commercialize a product or service that uses UMN-IP, knowledge, or information," Mr. Straate said, using a slide. The benefit to the institution would be that such a leave would increase the potential for successful translation and commercialization of research, increase faculty knowledge and experience for teaching, improve the commercial research focus, and increase University public engagement.

Professor Bearinger commented that the leaves would also provide a great opportunity for students through internships and would put faculty in settings where they can bridge the gap between the academy and start-ups and broker opportunities for students.

Mr. Straate enumerated several reasons why they believe this program is important. The President "is committed to a culture of entrepreneurialism and innovation," "faculty inventors are a key ingredient in [the] successful commercialization of UMN research," there is "increasing pressure to demonstrate ROI and drive economic development from research" (such as from the federal government), and "there is a need to increase public engagement and industry relationships" (because the University is looked at as a key part of the state economic environment).

Mr. Straate reviewed a list of institutions that have an entrepreneurial leave program and some of the University's peers that do not. Those that do include Louisville, Ohio State, the National Cancer Institute, Northwestern, and Michigan Tech. Those that do not include Stanford, Utah, Columbia, and Wisconsin. He has talked with people at the institutions that have the leaves and incorporated elements of their programs into the proposal for the University; the people at the institutions that do not have such leaves think they are a good idea.

The proposal is to work within the program rules that the University has already established, so an entrepreneurial leave would be an option, along with a sabbatical or a single-semester leave. The leave would be available to faculty members working with University-licensed intellectual property or when there is a substantial demonstration of benefit to the University (e.g., Carlson School faculty members working with business); it will be important to show a benefit to the University, Mr. Straate said. The University would provide no salary support but would also impose no limit on the amount of outside compensation a faculty member could receive. Operational details have yet to be fully developed, but there would be coverage to offset the cost of health-care benefits. The leave would be limited to one year and would require a 100% leave (in special circumstances, the proposal would allow for an additional six months of leave). A faculty member would be eligible for an entrepreneurial leave every four years. The proposal would require a monthly "check in" with the faculty member's department chair/head or dean and with a representative from the Office for Technology Commercialization.

They want to keep things as simple as possible, Mr. Straate summarized, and keep the leaves within the current framework of rules—and adopt it as quickly as possible.

Dean LeBien recalled that when he was asked about the proposal, they talked about the impact on the PI who has an NIH R01 grant—must someone step away from the grant if taking an entrepreneurial leave? That is a question to be addressed, Ms. Webb said; if one has a 100% leave from the University, does that mean the person cannot do any University work? Or will the leave be more flexible? It is not unusual for people to continue to work on projects while they are on sabbatical and her office makes arrangements for such work. It comes down to whether the person is actively managing the grant or contract and meets basic standards. She said she did not know the answer but knows the process that must be followed. Does NIH have a position, Dean LeBien inquired? If the institution authorizes someone to devote time to a project, she would not anticipate an objection from NIH, Ms. Webb said. But if one is on a 100% leave, is the assumption that the person is working 100% time? A more common approach is to appoint a substitute PI or reduce the effort. There are tools that can be used to adapt to leaves. But the fundamental question is whether the person can do University business while on entrepreneurial leave.

Professor Alonso asked if there is any option to take an entrepreneurial leave that might be between 75% and 100% time. Mr. Straate replied that they believed there would be concern about such an option.

Ms. Wilhelmson spoke to the matter of fringe benefits. For a 100%-time leave, the University would provide a taxable lump sum that could be used to help offset the cost of benefits including medical, dental, basic life, and retirement. This would allow the University to be in compliance with IRS regulations when no compensation is provided. If someone wanted to have a 50%-time leave, that would be similar to a sabbatical and the University could subsidize benefits. They would need to consider the proposal further to determine if the entrepreneurial leave must be 100% time. The initial discussion was that this proposal would be for faculty members who want to take a 100%-time leave, Mr. Straate said, because there are mechanisms for someone to take a leave of less than 100% time. This proposal is for those who want to be away 100% of the time.

Professor Cohen said that the lack of a limit on outside compensation is great—but this is a public university, and in cases when a faculty member is dealing with patients, the outside income could be astronomically large. Business people may hold information or ways of operation that could be of immense value; could one take such a leave every four years and download all the information one possessed to a corporation? That can be done now, Professor Alonso said. This would be more wholesale, Professor Cohen said; how would this fit in working with companies rather than start-ups? Would limiting compensation fix the problem, Mr. Straate asked? Professor Cohen said he did not know but that it might partially relieve the public perception problem.

Professor Gini said, apropos of the institutions that have or do not have entrepreneurial leaves, that it seems strange that Stanford does not have them. Stanford generates a large amount of intellectual property, and some of the institutions that offer these leaves are second-order places. Does the University want to be in that group? Who pays for health care? (The departments.) So this adds nothing to an unpaid leave, she said. Ms. Wilhelmson responded that no benefits are provided under the unpaid leave policy. Professor Gini said that this proposal allows someone who wants a leave to get dollars from the department; Ms. Wilhelmson said there are no provisions for an unpaid leave in which the department provides funds for benefits. So this just gives someone leverage with the department chair, Professor Gini concluded. Professor Cohen disagreed and said there is some value in having the title of such a leave, even if it could be fitted into current programs. The more the University encourages this activity, the more it says to the world that faculty want to be entrepreneurial.

Dr. Haugstad commented that he represents P&A staff on the Committee; some P&A staff have PI status, so would this leave cover them? Ms. Wilhelmson said the proposal only covers tenured and tenure-track faculty and falls under faculty development leaves. Professor Bearinger asked if there is a way to bring P&A staff into the discussion; Ms. Wilhelmson said she would raise the issue. This affects Research Associates and Senior Research Associates, Professor Bearinger said, who are an important part of the research engine on the campus and there should be ways to help them as well. There are some P&A staff who work with equipment companies, for example develop software or hardware, Dr. Haugstad said, and the University arguably could benefit from having these staff take a leave as well.

Where potentially applicable, Dr. Haugstad added, a full year of leave might be very hard for the unit to accommodate. Shorter entrepreneurial leaves (say 3-6 months) could be enough to get the entrepreneurial work off the ground, if in collaboration with a larger entity such as an equipment

company, rather than starting a new company. One would hope that the development of such a close interaction with an equipment company would reap lasting benefits to the P&A staff member's unit.

Professor Thompson said she was excited about the possibility of the leaves but wondered if they had considered the potential burden on a unit when a faculty member could be gone every four years. Mr. Straate reported that when they talked to institutions that have entrepreneurial leaves, they learned that there are not a large number of faculty members who take them, perhaps two or three per year. His experience with the faculty here is that the number would be about the same and did not see that there would be a big burden financially or to fill a teaching gap. Moreover, he pointed out, department heads have to approve the leaves.

Professor Vaughan said there seems to be an inconsistency: If one leaves the University, one can be paid, but if one stays at the University and works with a company, the University discourages pay as a conflict of interest. If someone is working on intellectual property, the University should want to reward them to stick around, not leave. Mr. Straate said there are faculty members at the University working in labs who want to have a financial relationship with a start-up. This offers that opportunity.

Dr. Wahlstrom wondered about the public-relations impact of this program on the taxpayer; might this be seen as not a good value? Mr. Straate said that the view of the team that considered the proposal, including Vice President Mulcahy, is that this is almost something the University would be expected to do and would provide the resources to help. There is a cost to the program, because fringe benefits are paid for, but the potential licensing income and return, making the faculty member a better teacher and researcher, and an improved link to the community outweigh the costs. If jobs could be created, that will be positive, Professor Cohen observed.

Dean Ponce de Leon said he supports the idea in principle but worries about the effect on teaching programs and on the sabbatical and leave programs. Those concerns must be addressed. And there also has to be funding for the program or no one will leave, Professor Alonso added.

Professor Bearinger thanked Mr. Straate and Ms. Wilhelmson for joining the Committee and said the proposal would be back on the Committee's agenda later in the month. She adjourned the meeting at 4:00.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota

* * *

Establishing an Open-Access Publishing Fund at the University of Minnesota

Scholarly publishing has long served to facilitate communication and collaboration among researchers and to disseminate ideas and knowledge. Providing open access to published research greatly increases the speed and efficiency of communication among researchers, and disseminates ideas far more widely than ever before – but embracing the advantages of new technologies also requires developing new approaches to key issues such as management of intellectual property rights and sustainable models.

Open Access Options

Researchers who wish to make their works openly accessible have an array of options. Some closely resemble long-established journal publishing processes; others are more innovative. Common open access options include:

- Authors retaining the right to distribute copies of their works online, via personal websites, institutional repositories, and/or subject-related repositories.
- Authors choosing to publish only in fully open access publications, in which all contents are freely publicly available.
- Authors publishing in a “closed-access” journal that allows individual articles to be made openly available (so-called “hybrid” open access).

Fully open access publications and hybrid publications are often supported through institutional funds via grants, hosting or service provision, membership fees, or subscriptions. But authors also often have to pay significant fees to make their works openly accessible in these venues. Individual authors’ access to funds that can be leveraged for open access fees varies widely, imposing unequal burdens on authors.

Open Access Funds at Other Institutions

Many leading institutions have addressed these challenges by creating funds to help authors meet the new costs of open access publishing. The sixteen signatories of the Compact for Open Access Publishing Equity (COPE), for example, have established “durable mechanisms for underwriting reasonable publication charges for articles written by [their] faculty.” Other institutions have developed their own policies and procedures.

Most institutional open access funds include principles and criteria related to:

- **Eligible Submissions**– which types of publications are eligible (hybrid/full OA; articles/monographs/data/proceedings)
- **Author eligibility** – which individuals are eligible to apply for funds
- **Effects of external fund availability (grants, etc.)**
- **Appropriate and sustainable administration of the open access fund**

Proposal

The Senate Library Committee proposes that University of Minnesota establish an institutional fund to underwrite University of Minnesota authors’ costs in making their published works openly accessible. The fund would be supported by both the Office of the Vice President for Research and the University Libraries, and would be overseen by a review panel comprised of sponsors and faculty, with a role of reviewing eligibility (not content). The fund would cover all scholars on all campuses.

We recommend the following standards and principles.

- Eligible submissions
 - Funds are available for peer-reviewed journal articles, scholarly monographs, conference proceedings, and data sets.

- Funds may be used only to cover open access publication and submission fees.
- Author fees for open access journals (as determined by listing in the Directory of Open Access Journals,¹ membership in the Open Access Scholarly Publishers Association, or adherence to Open Access Scholarly Publishers Association Code of Conduct)² will be covered in full. Author fees for “hybrid” journals will be covered up to 50%.
- Funds may not be used for publications that do not make works fully openly available immediately upon publication.
- Author eligibility
 - All scholars (faculty, researchers, post-docs, graduate students, and staff) at the University of Minnesota may apply for funds for their publications that otherwise qualify.
 - Authors receiving funds must deposit a copy of the publication in an approved open access repository, such as the University Digital Conservancy (the University of Minnesota’s institutional repository.)
 - In the case of joint authorship, support for author fees will be pro-rated based on the proportional contribution of the University of Minnesota author.
 - Authors may receive up to \$3,000 in institutional open access support annually.
- Effects of external fund availability (grants, etc.)
 - Authors with no external funding will be given priority, but authors who have external funding that cannot be used to underwrite open access fees will also be eligible.
 - Fees occurring after the closure of a grant are eligible.
 - Authors who *could have* applied for grant coverage of open access fees but failed to do so will not usually be eligible for institutional open access support, unless their grant application was made before the institutional open access fund existed.

We recommend that the fund be piloted with no less than \$20,000 per year of available support to authors, and that funds be distributed on a rolling basis. The program’s support levels and effectiveness should be evaluated as funds are exhausted or at the end of two years, whichever occurs sooner. OVPR and the University Libraries will partner to raise awareness of this new support for the wide dissemination of the research of University of Minnesota scholars.

Appendix: Further information

Article Processing Fees (from SPARC) <http://www.arl.org/sparc/publisher/incomemodels/guide2-1.shtml>

This explains the different variations of article processing fees, the rationales for the fees and the transition for some publishers to the hybrid model.

Campus-based Open Access Publishing Funds (from SPARC)

<http://www.arl.org/sparc/openaccess/funds/>

This page includes the pdf of the guide “Campus-based Open Access Publishing Funds: A practical guide to design and implementation” by Greg Tananbaum (Feb 2010), as well as templates for FAQ and fund applications.

¹ Directory of Open Access Journals <http://www.doaj.org/>

² Open Access Scholarly Publishers Association and Code of Conduct: <http://www.oaspa.org/>

Compact for Open Access Publishing Equity (COPE)

Overview: <http://www.oacompact.org/>

List of signatories: <http://www.oacompact.org/signatories/>

OA Journal Funds (in the Open Access Directory)

http://oad.simmons.edu/oadwiki/OA_journal_funds

More comprehensive than the SPARC list, includes European and Canadian institutions and links to the web-sites for the funds.