

Senate Library Committee (SLC)
March 27, 2019
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 reflect the views of, nor are they binding on, the senate, the administration or the Board of Regents.

[**In these minutes:** Welcome and Introductions; Discussion of Open Access Policy; Recap of Open Access Fund and its Continuation; Reframing the Statement on Affordable Content]

PRESENT: Irene Duranczyk (chair), David Brown, John Butler, LeAnn Dean, David Goldfield, Anup Joshi, Bo Hu, Connie Lenz, Wendy Lougee, Anna Milone, Gautam Ray, Joanne Richardson, Matthew Rosendahl, Mary Beth Sancomb-Moran, Tim St. Claire, Marlo Welshons, Rhiannon Williams, Keri Youngstrand

REGRETS: Rodney Williams

ABSENT: Adrienne Jadric, Peter Marchetto, Paul Myers, Richard Nho

GUESTS: Allison Langham-Putrow, scholarly communications and engineering liaison librarian, and Nancy Sims, copyright program librarian, University of Minnesota Libraries

OTHER: Bobbie Erichsen, senate associate, University Senate Office

1. Welcome and Introductions

Chair Irene Duranczyk called the meeting to order and asked for a round of introductions.

2. Discussion of Open Access Policy

Allison Langham-Putrow, scholarly communications and engineering liaison librarian, University of Minnesota Libraries, briefly reviewed [slides regarding](#) the Open Access Policy at the University of Minnesota.

- The definition of open access is “free immediate online availability of research articles coupled with the rights to use those articles fully in the digital environment.”
- Two paths to open access include:
 - The green path - publishing an article in a traditional subscription journal and placing a copy in an open repository so that anyone who wishes to use it may.
 - The born open path - either publishing an article in a fully open access journal which may or may not require Author Processing Charges (APCs), or publishing in a hybrid journal for which there would be a fee to make the single article openly available within that subscription journal.

In 2017, Langham-Putrow explained, roughly 18% of the articles published from University of Minnesota authors followed the born open path with 5% being placed into hybrid journals and 13% into fully open access journals. Seventeen percent followed the green path meaning they

were published in a subscription journal and a copy was made available in a repository. Langham-Putrow described a third option, sometimes referred to as bronze: a pdf version of an article is made available at no cost. Reuse rights are not necessarily tied into it, and many times it is because of the goodwill of the publisher that the article is available at no cost. Lastly, she added, a little over 50% of the articles produced at the University of Minnesota were closed, meaning available only with a subscription.

Nancy Sims, copyright program librarian, University of Minnesota Libraries, explained that all of these policies were about making a copy of an article available *somewhere other than* on the publisher's website. She then shared slides showing the various places where an author may choose to place their article, and noted that the choice to use these options was that of the author; the University could not make that decision for the author.

Committee members had a number of questions regarding the various publishing options, licensing procedures, the University of Minnesota's policies in comparison to publishers' policies, and consequences for publishing without a publisher's consent. Sims noted that she was not aware of a publishing company sanctioning an author, but rather the host site of where the author's article was published. There were many questions fielded as to how copyrights work, who, in a group of authors, holds the copyright, must all the authors agree on where the work will be published, and whether an author may retain any of the four rights generally given to the publisher (the right to disseminate, the right to edit, the right to make derivatives, and the right to perform.)

Wendy Lougee, dean, University Libraries, suggested that the question to be addressed for the purpose of the comprehensive policy review is: Does the Open Access Policy advance article publication as the University intends? Marlo Welshons, assistant to the provost, Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost, and SLC member, reminded the committee of the questions to be answered by a policy review. These include:

- Is the policy still needed?
- Is the purpose and goal of the policy still being met?
- Are changes required to improve the effectiveness or clarity of the policy?
- Is appropriate, on-going monitoring of the policy occurring?

Welshons recalled from the February 20, 2019, SLC meeting, that the committee agreed that the policy was still needed, but that there was an appetite for exploring some procedural changes, especially around automatically "harvesting" articles produced by University authors.

John Butler added that there were tactical considerations to be made such as how to move the institution toward fuller acceptance of the culture shift into open access publishing, and educating faculty and staff around the importance of accepting that shift.

David Brown recommended a set of overarching mindfulness points, perhaps a deliverable that would have key points for faculty and students to refer to. Sims noted that ethics training requirements might be a place for outreach and potential investment.

Welshons then asked if the committee was comfortable with the Open Access Policy statement language remaining the same with one deletion:

“The policy will be reviewed after three years and a report presented to the faculty.”

The committee voted unanimously to strike the above-listed sentence from the policy statement.

3. Recap of the Open Access Fund and its Continuation

The committee reviewed its discussion from the [February 20, 2019, SLC meeting](#) regarding how the Open Access Fund was currently being used, and considered whether or not the return on investment warranted continued use of the fund in the same manner. Lougee suggested that committee members list alternative ways the fund might be used. Suggestions included:

- Education and outreach to authors about how to get the same results with publishing their articles, but without having to pay APCs
- Education around self-archiving options and departmental funding options
- Directing the funds toward changing to a culture of acceptance around open access publishing
- Moving the funds to units and schools that are not well funded by other sources, such as the NIH, so that a greater number of authors in more disciplines are aware of non-fee publishing options
- Educating colleges and departments about how to fund projects all the way through to completion, which would include publishing and any associated costs

4. Reframing the Statement on Affordable Content

Chair Duranczyk then moved onto a review of the committee’s [Statement on Affordable Content](#).

Jennifer Goodnough, chair of the Senate Committee on Education Policy (SCEP), who attended the February SLC meeting, was asked if SCEP would consider co-authoring the Statement on Affordable Content. After reviewing the request and statement with SCEP members, Goodnough reported back to Duranczyk:

- SCEP is very supportive of efforts to improve student access to affordable content and efforts to educate and inform faculty on how to provide such content.
- SCEP was not prepared to co-author the current draft of the statement due to the library-specific request for allocation of funds. Goodnough said the SCEP felt that was outside their charge.
- Should the draft move forward in its current form, SCEP would be willing to issue a statement of support for the Statement on Affordable Content.

The committee members reviewed and discussed the statement, made slight changes to the draft, and voted to approve the statement, with said changes.

In the interest of time, Duranczyk adjourned the meeting.

Geanette Poole
University Senate Office

