

**Senate Library Committee (SLC)**  
**February 20, 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; Overview of Open Access Publishing Fund; Review of Open Access Policy]

**PRESENT:** Irene Duranczyk (chair), John Butler, LeAnn Dean, David Goldfield, Anup Joshi, Connie Lenz, Wendy Lougee, Peter Marchetto, Anna Milone, Gautam Ray, Joanne Richardson, Matthew Rosendahl, Tim St. Claire, Marlo Welshons, Rhiannon Williams, Keri Youngstrand

**REGRETS:** David Brown, Bo Hu, Mary Beth Sandcomb-Moran

**ABSENT:** Paul Myers, Richard Nho, Adrienne Jadric, Rodney Williams

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

**OTHER:** Frances Lawrenz, associate vice president, Office of the Vice President for Research (OVPR)

**1. Welcome and Introductions**

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

**2. Overview of Open Access Publishing Fund**

Allison Langham-Putrow, scholarly communications and engineering liaison librarian, University of Minnesota Libraries, began her presentation with an explanation of the various pathways that authors can use when publishing articles in an open access format. She also explained the widely varying costs that an author may be required to pay for open access publication. Next Langham-Putrow explained that in some cases, authors are required to pay an article processing charge (APC) to publish in an open access venue. She then listed the various resources an author might use to pay the APC, including grant funding, support from their department or institution, out of pocket, and in some cases asking for the fee to be waived.

Langham-Putrow then introduced Nancy Sims, copyright program librarian, University of Minnesota Libraries, who went into further detail on the “born open” model of open access publishing. Sims explained that the University of Minnesota has had an [Open Access Publishing Fund](#) since 2012, funded by the University of Minnesota Libraries and the Office of the Vice President for Research (OVPR). Sims gave a brief history of the fund’s existence, the amount of funds available from year to year, and the decision in 2016 to no longer pay for APCs for hybrid publications from this fund; hybrid models allow the author to pay to open up their article within

a subscription-based journal. If the University was already subscribing to particular publications, Sims explained, paying the additional APCs did not seem prudent.

Sims next described how the University's Open Access Publishing Fund works, and the categories of work that the SLC proposed should be covered: peer-reviewed journal articles, scholarly monographs, conference proceedings, and data sets. Sims gave a brief overview of which types of publications the fund does support, and noted that the fund is intended to be a fund of last resort; that authors should apply for this resource only when they have no other options than to pay the APCs out of pocket. Sims said that \$40,000 per year is budgeted for the fund and estimated that staff time costs approximately \$10,000-20,000 per year. She added that the distribution of funds is heavily weighted toward the scientific disciplines, primarily biomedical sciences.

At this point, Sims said the purpose of visiting with the SLC was to get committee member reactions to this information and gather ideas about the future of the fund. Wendy Lougee inquired about the total number of authors assisted by the fund compared to the number of open access articles published by University of Minnesota authors in 2018. Langham-Putrow said roughly 1,600 of the 8,000 total articles by University authors were open access in some way; and only about 30 of those were assisted by the Open Access Publishing Fund.

The committee members and guests then had a lengthy discussion as to the relative costs and benefits of the program, the various sources of funding for University of Minnesota authors, and how far the benefit of access to these articles actually extended.

Frances Lawrenz, associate vice president, Office of the Vice President for Research (OVPR) wondered if this was really the most effective way to spend \$40,000 and the additional cost of staff time to assist approximately 30 authors. Lawrenz said she is in favor of the Green option of open access publishing, which typically means depositing a copy of the article or manuscript and waiting for the embargo period to pass (typically one year from the date of publication) before an article can be considered open access, and then it *becomes* open access at no cost.

Joanne Richardson asked for clarification as to what problem the fund was actually solving. The problem that is being solved, Sims said, is when an author wants to publish in a journal that charges fees, and the author has no funding at all. She also noted that most of the people that are being supported by this fund have other resources from which they could potentially get the money to pay the APC, and that the few who might have no other funding options do usually still have other options for making their articles open. Lougee suggested that with potential budget cuts on the horizon, it might be better to invest the money from this fund into educational programming. Might it be better to have copies of articles deposited in the University Digital Conservancy (published through green open access) Lougee wondered. Sims added that if the \$20,000 were invested in education and outreach to authors *before* publishing decisions were made, there might be more authors who would know how to select journals with less costly open access options, and thus fewer authors would be in a position to *need* the assistance of the Open Access Publishing Fund.

Rhiannon Williams asked if there was a requirement in the application process for the author to detail the research they had done around publishing options. Sims noted that that practice would be in deep contravention to previous decisions made in consultation with the SLC, as it was important to avoid making quality judgments as to where an author decided to publish.

### **3. Review of Open Access Policy**

The committee then moved on to reviewing the [Open Access Policy](#). Marlo Welshons, assistant to the provost, Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost, began by explaining how the policy review process worked and why it was necessary. She listed the questions that a comprehensive policy review should address:

- Is the policy still needed?
- Are the purpose and goal of the policy still being met?
- Are changes required to improve the effectiveness of the policy?
- Is appropriate education, monitoring and ongoing review of the policy occurring?

Welshons explained that the review process included consultation with the Senate Research Committee (SRC) and the SLC to determine whether or not they have the answers to the above questions. If it is determined that revisions to the policy are needed, further consultation will occur. At this point, Welshons gave the focus back to Sims and Langham-Putrow.

Langham-Putrow reiterated that the [Open Access Policy](#) refers to “green open access” which means an author publishes their article wherever they choose, and the policy provides a mechanism that is intended to allow the author to deposit a copy of that article in an open access repository, if the author chooses. Many universities have similar “[Harvard-style](#)” policies, she added.

Sims then gave a brief history of the development of the University of Minnesota’s Open Access Policy, which took effect on January 1, 2015. She explained how the University’s [Copyright Ownership Policy](#) works in conjunction with the Open Access Policy, and how, in effect, an author’s manuscript, the copyright to that manuscript, and the licensing to the University all come into existence at the same time. She noted that faculty and faculty-like staff own the copyright in their academic works, and the licensing to the University can be voided at any time by the author, by filling out an online form. Sims added that the University cannot make any publishing decision about the manuscript without the author’s engagement.

Committee members discussed at length how some peer institutions “actively harvest” faculty works; the tactics and reputations of various publishing companies; and the benefits of institutional archiving. Following that discussion, the SLC next asked Sims to assess faculty awareness of the publishing options available to them. Sims noted that while the University of Minnesota Libraries do a significant amount of outreach in this area, some of her past experience polling on copyright questions suggested that more than 50% of faculty polled didn’t understand their copyright ownership status.

Williams suggested that at the time a faculty member submits an article for publication, they could be presented with the options for how their material could be archived at the University.

At the very least, Williams said, that would build awareness of the choices that are available to them. Langham-Putrow noted that she recently learned of a process at other universities whereby as soon as an article is entered (by the faculty author) into the University's research information management system, an email is automatically generated and sent to the faculty member asking if they'd like their article placed in the school's depository.

Sims said it appeared that the SLC was interested in further discussion of active harvesting of University of Minnesota faculty work. Duranczyk suggested that the discussion be continued at the next committee meeting on March 27, 2019 with Langham-Putrow and Sims in attendance.

In the interest of time, Duranczyk then adjourned the meeting.

Geanette Poole  
University Senate Office