

LIBRARY COMMITTEE
MINUTES OF MEETING
NOVEMBER 11, 2009

[In these minutes: Congratulations to Wendy Lougee on Election to Board of ARL, GAPSA and Open Access, e-Education, Library Charge Ad Hoc Committee Update, Future Agenda Items]

[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: Jennifer Gunn, chair, Shannon McCrindle, Jonathan Binks, LeAnn Dean, Suzanne Thorpe for Joan Howland, Wendy Lougee, Mary Beth Sancomb-Moran, Bill Sozansky, Owen Williams, Jennifer Alexander, Michelle Englund, Elizabeth Fine, Isaac Fox, Stephen Gross, J. Woods Halley, Jay Hatch, Anatoly Liberman, Danielle Tisinger, David Zopfi-Jordan, Timothy Germain, Monica Howell, Jonathan Lundberg

REGRETS: James Orf

ABSENT: Manami Bhattacharya

I). Professor Gunn called the meeting to order and welcomed all those present.

II). Members unanimously approved the October 7, 2009 minutes.

III). Professor Gunn, on behalf of the Senate Library Committee, congratulated University Librarian Wendy Lougee on her recent election to the board of directors of the Association of Research Libraries (ARL - <http://www.arl.org/>).

IV). Professor Gunn introduced the first presenter, Monica Howell, who shared information concerning the Graduate and Professional Student Assembly's (hereafter GAPSA) position on Open Access. Ms. Howell introduced herself and noted that she is a PhD student in Organizational Leadership, Policy, and Development and one of two at-large directors for GAPSA, the University's graduate and professional student governance organization - <http://www.gapsa.umn.edu/about/>. Ms. Howell then provided information about GAPSA.

One of the issues that GAPSA has been discussing is Open Access to information, noted Ms. Howell. According to SPARC The Right to Research, "Open Access is free, unrestricted access to high-quality, peer-reviewed scholarship over the Internet." Open Access impacts graduate and professional students in a number of ways:

- Access to published materials.
- Possible fee and tuition increases for access to information.
- Publishing work.

- Complying with National Institute of Health (hereafter NIH) mandates.

Next, Ms. Howell highlighted two organizations that advocate on behalf of Open Access:

- The National Association of Graduate-Professional Students (NAGPS) - <http://www.nagps.org/>
- The Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition (SPARC) - <http://www.arl.org/sparc/>

Ms. Howell noted that the recent SPARC Student Statement on the Right to Research urges students, researchers, universities, and governments to open access to scholarly works. This statement is available at <http://www.righttoresearch.org/students/statement.shtml>. This statement endorses Open Access for the following reasons:

- Improves the educational experience.
- Democratizes access to research.
- Advances research.
- Improves the visibility and impact of scholarship.

GAPSA signed this statement this past summer. Currently, GAPSA is working with its constituents at the University to try and pass at least one resolution in support of Open Access. Additionally, GAPSA continues to educate students about issues related to Open Access and encourage them to get involved in this issue.

In closing, Ms. Howell turned members' attention to a list of Open Access and Federal Research Public Access Act (FRPAA) resources, and welcomed comments/questions from members.

Jonathan Binks noted that the University's Copyright Policy (<http://www1.umn.edu/regents/policies/academic/Copyright.html>) has an explicit principle that encourages open access to scholarly works. Unlike the Harvard or MIT policies, for example, the University policy views each scholar as an individual entity, who is allowed to decide whether he/she wants to make their work openly available. Under the University's policy, scholars own their work. Having said this, are graduate and professional students open to taking a leadership role in making a significant change to the University's current policy? Ms. Howell stated that while a significant number of graduate and professional students support the notion of Open Access, it has been challenging to find students who are willing to invest the time to work on this issue. Open Access is a polarizing issue for many graduate/professional students.

Professor Gunn asked whether the division of opinion on the Open Access issue maps to certain disciplines. According to Ms. Howell, the division of opinion around this issue does not appear to map to certain disciplines, but rather are individual opinions.

Scholars want to publish in journals that are both prestigious, and, historically, widely accessible to other scholars, noted Professor Hatch. Having said this, scholars who want to publish in these journals will likely sign away copyright in order to be published because scholarly reputation is often tied to the quality of a publication, and that particular quality is, in many instances, tied to venue. Ms. Howell stated that the Library

has a website, which highlights different arguments for overcoming objections to Open Access. While it will take time to overcome Open Access objections, eventually she believes it will happen.

Ms. Lougee noted that the implication that Open Access will save the Library money is not likely. Libraries would be reluctant to cancel journals since embargo periods for the open access versions restrict timely access.

Mr. Binks stated that there has been a tendency for the institution to focus on why it cannot move forward like Harvard, MIT, etc. with a mandatory Open Access policy. How is it that Harvard, MIT, Berkeley and Stanford can move forward and the University cannot? There could be a role for graduate students in moving this issue forward. Ms. Howell voiced an interest in looking into how this issue was furthered at these schools.

This discussion, noted Professor Gunn, raises the questions of the cost of Open Access and who is paying for it. Clearly, Harvard, Stanford and Berkeley have made commitments to fund faculty research publication costs. The University, however, does not have a similar agreement with its faculty on research publication costs. What is the cost of the University's Digital Conservancy? Ms. Lougee stated that the Digital Conservancy is associated with the Libraries' role as the University Archives. The University Archives have always collected institutional records and faculty papers. It is difficult to know whether digital content costs more than paper content given the vast differences in infrastructure for the two formats. An NSF-funded study was recently launched at Johns Hopkins University to explore what it would take to align all the institutional repositories and to look at the infrastructure requirements.

Professor Alexander asked Ms. Howell how graduate and professional students feel about their right to research that they have already paid for in the course of their work. In her opinion, stated Ms. Howell, this is a very important issue. She added that she is aware of one student who believes that researchers should be able to make a profit off their research, e.g., patents, royalties. Ms. Howell stated that she has not spoken explicitly with a lot of students regarding this issue.

A repercussion of the Open Access "pay to publish" model, stated Michelle Englund, could be that only disciplines that have money will be able to publish. Such a model could be detrimental for graduate students. Ms. Howell agreed that this is also an issue that needs to be examined if Open Access publishing is to gain momentum.

Professor Gunn thanked Ms. Howell for her presentation and stated that this topic raises the questions of what are the real costs of publishing, who should be responsible for bearing these costs, and to what extent can libraries push back on professional journal's restrictive publishing policies.

In response to a question about rising journal costs, Ms. Lougee stated that inflationary trends are running at approximately 8% - 9% per year. Three of the major publishers, Springer, Wiley and Elsevier, represent about 4% of the journal titles held by the Library,

and about 35% of the overall journal and database expenditures. The Library is currently in the process of trying to negotiate its journal packages with these publishers. Also, these negotiations include efforts to include Open Access provisions as part of the standard licensing agreements with publishers (i.e., allowing University authors to deposit copies of articles). Momentum is building around the MIT model of retaining the non-exclusive right to archive and distribute an author's work at the point of creation. It is now thought that such non-exclusive, institutional rights could actually protect authors.

Mr. Binks noted that a draft of the University's Regents Copyright policy included a provision for the institution to have non-exclusive rights, but Senate committees rejected this clause. Since that time, however, there has been increasing recognition that such a provision has value. Having said this, graduate students and/or the Library Committee may have a role to play in proposing amendments to the University's current copyright policy. The Library Committee may want to revisit this issue at a future meeting and consider making a formal recommendation concerning amending the University's policy.

In response to this suggestion, Professor Gunn asked for volunteers who would be willing to look at the difference between the copyright policies of Harvard and MIT and compare them to the University's policy. A lot of this has already been done, commented Ms. Lougee. The difference between the MIT and Harvard models is the point at which an author's rights are shared. Harvard has an opt-in approach and MIT automatically asserts institutional interest in an author's work. Ms. Lougee suggested the Library Committee think about collaborating with the Senate Research Committee to explore this issue further.

V). Professor Gunn introduced Liz Fine, assistant librarian, Health Sciences Libraries, to share information on e-Education. Ms. Fine began by sharing some e-Education-related facts. She noted that approximately 3,500 courses are currently being taught at the University using WebCT or Moodle. Ninety percent of students have either taken at least one class completely online or have taken a hybrid course. Recognizing that the use of e-Education is growing rapidly, one of the Library's FY11 strategic planning themes is to focus on e-Education.

Moving on, Ms. Fine highlighted some of the e-Education challenges and opportunities facing the Libraries. Challenges and opportunities mentioned by Ms. Fine include but are not limited to:

Challenges:

- Provide course/curriculum support as faculty build their e-Education courses. There is a significant learning curve when it comes to building e-Education courses well.
- Provide faculty and students with support as it relates to library asset integration.
- Lack of campus coordinated infrastructure for e-Education.
- Work with faculty to identify library resources that will be most useful for their courses. Help instructors be able to quickly find resources that will be useful to their courses.

- Technical and legal issues.

Opportunities:

- Libraries' collections.
- Liaison structure, which allows librarians to build solid working relationships with faculty.
- Involvement in campus Course Management System efforts.

Next, Ms. Fine cited examples of what is being done to integrate collections into course materials. For example, the new Library Course Page System builds on an existing tool, the CourseLib page. The Library Course Page System automatically generates course pages for every course at the University. This system will provide a seamless integration of library resources into course materials. The Library Course Page System is currently under development and will be rolled out in spring 2010. Another example highlighted by Ms. Fine was the Find It linking service, which allows users to create a durable link to a journal article from online course materials, and which has existed for several years.

Besides integrating collections into course materials, the Library is integrating its staff expertise. By using web conferencing software, noted Ms. Fine, librarians are able to record instruction sessions, which faculty can then embed in their course materials. The Library also has other instructional materials, which can be found on the Library website at <http://www.lib.umn.edu/>.

Moving forward, stated Ms. Fine, the Library is in the process of digitizing its assets so they can be easily downloaded into course materials.

Ms. Lougee added that there was a University e-Education task force that finished its work about a year ago. Today an external review committee will address the issues raised in the report they issued. The task force looked at the infrastructure for supporting online education, and this is where the Library is putting its focus. Copyright issues also intersect with e-Education. A lot of the pushback at the University around copyright issues had to do with instructional materials. Therefore, if the University wants to be able to repeatedly offer certain online courses and re-use instructional sources created by faculty, it will have to reach an agreement with creators about the re-use of these materials. Currently, the University's Copyright Policy has provisions that provide ways by which the University can secure ownership of instructional works.

The statistics Ms. Fine quoted at the onset of her presentation clearly reflect an institutional decision to push e-Education, noted Professor Alexander. Ms. Fine concurred and added that there are both economic and institutional pressures to embrace this new model.

In response to an extended discussion concerning the Library Course Page System, Professor Halley commented that it is unclear why such a tool is even necessary. There seems to be a proliferation of systems at the University. Ms. Fine acknowledged this

concern, and went on to say the ultimate goal is to have the multitude of Library systems condensed and integrated into a manageable number.

Professor Gunn stated that it is clear the Library is doing a lot of work to support online education. Having said this, is the Library focusing its efforts on integrating its resources or helping faculty with curriculum design? Is there a central responsible party for online education and the support of online education? Ms. Fine stated that the lack of centralized support for online education is one of the challenges facing the University. She added that the Libraries are focusing on integrating its resources into the system.

Wendy Lougee reported that Provost Sullivan has asked her and Vice Provost McMaster to explore the coherence of instructional support services in terms of how they work together to support instruction. This investigation is in its very early stages. Once complete, noted Ms. Lougee, she will share their findings with the committee.

Professor Gunn noted that today's discussion raises an issue the committee addressed last year in terms of the Library's budget and how many staff the Library needs to help faculty access the Libraries' resources. Making resources accessible depends, in many cases, on staff assistance to help faculty. In light of likely impending budget cuts, the committee may want to revisit the relationship between staff and collections.

In terms of Ms. Lougee's announcement about looking at the University's instructional support services, the Library Committee should find out if the Senate Committee on Information Technology (SCIT) is looking into this issue. Danielle Tisinger, a SCIT member who serves ex-officio on the Library Committee, noted that SCIT has only recently begun looking at what is online learning. To date, SCIT has not talked specifically about Library integration of resources or support structures.

Professor Gunn thanked Ms. Fine for her presentation.

VI). Professor Jennifer Alexander, chair, Library Charge Subcommittee, stated that the subcommittee is looking at the role of the Library Committee, its scope and membership. She reported that with the assistance of Renee Dempsey, Senate staff, she would email members questions that have arisen out of discussions within the subcommittee.

VII). Professor Gunn took the last few minutes of the meeting to encourage members to send her items they would like to see on future agendas. Ideas Professor Gunn generated included:

- Googlization of the University.
- Social and scholarly networking. How are scholarly networks working with libraries or working around libraries as a source of information?
- Coordination of teaching support and cost of access.
- E-book purchase process. What does it mean to read an electronic book, and what are the costs of the technology and who is bearing these costs?
- Navigating knowledge. In the emerging electronic environment, how is access to knowledge mediated?

In closing, Professor Gunn stated that her intent is to make the Library Committee more of a working committee as opposed to a listening committee.

Ms. Tisinger reported that SCIT recently discussed the Googlization of the University.

VIII). Hearing no further business, Professor Gunn adjourned the meeting.

Renee Dempsey
University Senate