

LIBRARY COMMITTEE
MINUTES OF MEETING
April 10, 2013

[In these minutes: Experts@Minnesota database overview; Revised Open Access Policy review; University Libraries update.]

[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), Brandon Adams, Jennifer Alexander, Elizabeth Benson Johnson, Phil Buhlmann, John Butler, Michelle Englund, Vicki Graham, Ronald Hadsall, Jessica Kessler, Wendy Lougee, Douglas Olson, Daniel Pesut, Luke Plutowski, Marlo Welshons, Owen Williams

GUESTS: Kate McCready, Associate Librarian and Project Director for Experts@Minnesota

OTHERS: Connie Lenz (for Joan Howland)

REGRETS: LeAnn Dean, Mary Alice Ford, David Fox, John Logie, Daniel Pesut, Evan Roberts, Mary Beth Sancomb-Moran

ABSENT: Judith Garrard

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

EXPERTS@MINNESOTA DATABASE OVERVIEW

Ms. Lougee provided background for the Experts Database. Several deans approached the Libraries requesting the Experts@Minnesota service to be implemented. The Libraries were chosen to sponsor this service because it is offered through a publisher and is essentially the cataloging of people and their publication data. It is offered by Elsevier and is an automated way for publication data to be harvested from the web and creates greater functionality than just an experts' database. This helps individuals on campus connect and collaborate with other researchers involved in the same area of interest. In the past five weeks there were over 12,000 uses globally, 62% of which was within the U.S. This service gives the expertise of the University a global audience.

Kate McCready is the Experts@Minnesota Project Director and further explained that a previous system was in place and housed at the same URL: experts@umn.edu. This previous website required faculty to input their publication data. The URL has remained, but the software behind the site is automated and does not require individuals to input their data. Ms. McCready used a PowerPoint to aid her presentation:

- Project Background

- This is three-year pilot implementation funded by 11 colleges, the Libraries, and OVPR.
- There are four components that were licensed: SciVal Experts, SciVal Funding, SciVal Spotlight, and Scopus Literature database.
- SciVal and Scopus are separate divisions of Elsevier.
- Three Data Points that Create the Expert Files
 - Grant Award Data from SPA.
 - Names from UMN HR.
 - Citations from Scopus.
- How are the profiles created?
 - The following components are analyzed to determine which individuals should be profiled: job codes, appointments, titles, colleges, clinical faculty, and senior research associates.
 - The deans of colleges are involved in who will be profiled to ensure a broad enough scope.
 - The data is provided to SciVal and then the publications are harvested and the grant award data is added.
- Value Added Services
 - Author disambiguation matches various name formats to the individual, for example if a person uses an initial for some publications and not for others.
 - All publication-related queries are responded to within 24 hours.
 - Seventy-five institutions are using the site.
 - The database can be searched by concept and/or last name.
 - The home page has an organizational structure specifically for the University.
- Funding Opportunity Matches
 - SciVal Funding Database is merged with the Experts@Minnesota database. This informs experts of funding opportunities that are matched with their areas of interest.
- Scholar's View – Must be logged in
 - As a member, you can view the other recipients of funding notifications and recommended collaborators.
- Enhancing Profiles
 - Faculty can add a link to: their CV, a research statement, or add research interest keywords.
- In the works...
 - Adding an automated process for updating HR and grant award data.
 - Adding staff involved in “Core Resources” like those that run labs.
 - Analyze what will be the most functionality for the lowest cost.
 - Promotion of the tool to those profiled.

Ms. McCready concluded her presentation and opened up the discussion to the members for questions and comments:

- Emails are sent to notify faculty when they are profiled on the database.

- Ms. Lougee noted that the work of humanists is not as easily represented on the Scopus Literature Database.
- Some adjunct faculty that are not on a tenure track or do not have tenure are not included in the database. Those without publications will not be listed, and this includes postdoctoral students in most cases.
- This service is only available for the Twin Cities.
- A member noted that he was pleased with the timely response he received on a correction that he requested to be made to the database to ensure all of his works were listed.
- The contract was signed for three years and at the end of the contract, if it is not re-signed, they will still have access to the data to be used on another platform. At the end of three years, the goal is to evidence that the database facilitated grant funding and collaboration. This will be difficult to track however, because SPA does not ask where the opportunity was discovered. They will also conduct a survey of users. Another benchmark might be how well the system catalogs large clinical awards.
- The Libraries have been in communication with University Relations to discuss how to drive public traffic of the database. There is not a clear plan yet because they are ensuring the data is correct.
- PubMed and SciVal have an overlap of nearly 1500 faculty, however, SciVal has on average 5% more data per individual profile.
- Only 40 people have opted out for various reasons: on principle of associating the Elsevier, did not assign a correct title, and/or did not list enough publications. There was a boycott of Elsevier last spring and this may have inspired some to opt out.
- Duplication of other resources is the largest concern.
- Other institutions use the tools in a different way; for example, some do not license the SciVal Funding Database.
- The CTSA effort has a broader agenda to share and exploit data.
- Some colleges have their own systems to capture faculty activity data for evaluative purposes.

Ms. Lougee hopes to present data regarding usage in the fall.

REVISED OPEN ACCESS POLICY DISCUSSION

Professor Olszewski distributed a revised draft of the Open Access Policy. The FCC created a subcommittee that was then placed under the Library Committee to develop a University policy for open access. The FCC raised concerns regarding:

- The amount of work required of faculty to comply with the policy. Authors would provide the Libraries or the Digital Conservancy with their final version of the manuscript. The onus was on the faculty to provide the publication. This could create a policy that the faculty are largely out of compliance with.
- The goal of Open Access is widely supported by the FCC. Nancy Sims and Wendy Lougee conducted research and discovered that other institutions have

automated mechanisms for harvesting publications, which would reduce the responsibility of the faculty.

The revised draft includes a mechanism for harvesting publications. Members reviewed the draft and discussed:

- How the policy will work:
 - Authors can upload their work, but the Libraries can also harvest it. How is content that is not available online or directly from the author shared? For example, foreign publications. Ms. Lougee explained that this is only for journal articles and faculty own all of the copyrights to their work.
 - Professor Olszewski responded that this would not be a perfect system, especially when considering publications that are published before the policy is established and some items will be excluded. It will be the responsibility of the individual to alert the University to their publications that are not listed. Ms. Lougee commented that harvesting would cover indexes and that will enable them to reach most of the data.
- Ms. Lougee has consulted with the General Counsel and they informed her that even if a faculty member signs over their rights within a publishing agreement, the preexisting University policy would override the agreement. If the University Senate adopted this Open Access policy, the Provost would decide how to align the institutional policy.
- Professor Buhlmann asked how this would affect embargo periods put in place by publishers and Ms. Lougee responded that University policy would override the agreement with the publisher. Professor Olszewski further explained that the University has the right to achieve the Open Access Policy goals. He emphasized that the control is with the author and there is an option to opt-out. If the author wants to adhere to the embargo period of the publisher, they can do that.
- Members expressed that there needs to be clarity regarding legal ownership.

Members reviewed the FAQ section of the draft:

- Professor Buhlmann pointed out that the FAQ sections does not address the workload for those who want to opt-out, it only addresses it for those who opt-in.
- Professor Olszewski posed the option that when the email notification is sent to the author informing them that their article has been harvested, the choice could be to “opt-in” rather than “opt-out.” The author can reply with their specifications regarding embargo periods and agreements with publishers. Members were informally surveyed and a majority agreed that the current “opt-out” email would be preferred. It was also suggested that another email be sent when it is posted to make sure that those that do not want it posted can quickly have it removed.
- Professor Olszewski posed the choice to opt-in or out being made global and applying to all harvested publications. Therefore, the author would not receive future notifications.

Professor Olszewski summarized by stating he will review the policy with Nancy Sims, assistant librarian, and Karen Williams, associate director, University Librarian’s Office, and he will bring the draft back to the committee in May. Ms. Welshons noted that she

would like to discuss the open access process to clarify the involvement of the Provost's Office.

UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES UPDATE

Ms. Lougee updated the committee on the following topics:

- Forty percent of the respondents to the Ithaca Survey start searches with search engines. Ms. Lougee commented that this information verifies the needed shift from catalogs to greater discoverability that includes larger search engines.
- The new discovery system requires better harmony with system wide policies involving loan periods and delivery systems.
- New space has been leased for physical preservation and a RFP has begun for digital preservation services.
- The Libraries have been recognized for their reorganization that resulted in a reduction of supervisors by 22%.

Hearing no further business, Professor Olszewski adjourned the meeting.

Jeannine Rich
University Senate Office