

LIBRARY COMMITTEE  
MINUTES OF MEETING  
MAY 6, 2009

[In these minutes: Diehl Hall/IHI Flood, InfoNOW, Event to Celebrate Robert Bly Archives, June 17 100<sup>th</sup> Birthday Party for Governor Elmer Andersen, Budget Update, May 18 Copyright Seminar, Results of Environmental Scan Conducted by the Scholarly Communication Collaborative, Agenda Items for 2009 – 2010]

[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: Jay Hatch, chair, Jonathan Binks, LeAnn Dean, Suzanne Thorpe for Joan Howland, Wendy Lougee, Mary Beth Sancomb-Moran, Bill Sozansky, Owen Williams, Juliette Cherbuliez, Isaac Fox, Jennifer Gunn, Anatoly Liberman, James Orf, David Zopfi-Jordan, Monica Howell, Jonathan Lundberg, Farzad Sadjadi

REGRETS: Danielle Tisinger

ABSENT: Stephen Gross, J. Woods Halley, Nora Paul, Simon Gale

GUESTS: Kris Fowler and Jim Stemper, co-leaders of the Scholarly Communication Collaborative

I). Professor Cherbuliez, chair pro tem, called the meeting to order and welcomed all those present.

II). The committee unanimously approved the March 4, 2009 minutes.

III). Professor Cherbuliez called on the University Librarian, Wendy Lougee, to provide the committee with a University Library update. Ms. Lougee began by reporting that a few days prior to the grand opening of the Academic Health Center's Institute on Health Informatics (IHI) there was a flood in Diehl Hall. In an effort to build partnerships with the Academic Health Center, the Bio-Medical Library had cleared the north side of the 3rd floor of Diehl Hall to house office space for the IHI. The new IHI space was able to be cleaned and salvaged, but the rest of the building did not fair so well. Fortunately, no books were lost.

Ms. Lougee went on to provide information on a new service launched by the Library, InfoNOW (<http://www.lib.umn.edu/infonow/about-infonow.phtml>). InfoNOW is the Libraries' new fee-based document delivery and research service for corporations and individual researchers outside the University.

Ms. Lougee also reported that the Library sponsored an international academic

conference April 16 – 19, 2009 celebrating the Robert Bly archives, which the Library acquired about 1½ years ago. Over a hundred scholars from around the world attended the conference, and the public evening events drew another 500 attendees.

On June 17 the Library will host a 100<sup>th</sup> birthday party for the late Governor Elmer Andersen after whom two of the University's libraries are named, the Andersen Horticulture Library at the Arboretum, and the Archives and Special Collections Library on the West Bank. In addition to the party, the Library and Twin Cities Public Television (TPT) will present a documentary celebrating the life and legacy of Governor Andersen.

In terms of the budget, Ms. Lougee noted that there is not a lot to report at this time. The legislature will be discussing funding for MINITEX within the next few days. MINITEX, reminded Ms. Lougee, serves as the regional network for libraries in Minnesota, North Dakota, and South Dakota.

As previously reported, stated Ms. Lougee, the Library has been asked to prepare budget reduction plans for 5% and 8% cuts. Even if the Library budget was stable, the collection budget would still suffer a 7% drop due to inflation.

Under the current hiring pause, the Library has approximately 25 vacancies. Then, as of June 5, 2009, the date when employees who opted to take advantage of the University's Retirement Incentive Option (RIO) must retire, the Library will have a total of about 45 vacant positions. As part of the planning for a reduced workforce, the Library is looking at how to consolidate service points in Wilson Library.

Professor James Orf asked about the likelihood that the Library's budget would not be cut as much as other units given the support letter the committee sent to the Provost earlier this year. Ms. Lougee stated that nothing explicit has been said, but discussions have taken place around the University that administrative units will likely be faced with greater cuts than academic units.

Professor Juliette Cherbuliez asked whether the Library has any reaction to the Implementation Team's report concerning the realignment of the Graduate School, which will undoubtedly have an impact on the Library. Ms. Lougee stated that an issue that was singled out in their report was the disposition of the University Press. She reported having met with the Implementation Team prior the issuance of their report. A recommendation in their report, with which she agrees, is that the University Press should report to the Office for the Vice President for Research. Ms. Lougee added that she also recommended that a strategic oversight body that would focus on leveraging Library and Press technologies and synergies be established. Currently, an editorial board controlled by faculty oversees the Press. Ms. Lougee stated that this topic could be an agenda item for next year.

In closing, Ms. Lougee announced that on May 18, 2009 the Libraries will sponsor a copyright seminar, The New UMN Copyright Policy: What Department Heads and Chairs Need to Know. This seminar will be held from 2:00 – 3:30 in room 303 Coffman

Memorial Union. Information concerning this event will be sent via email to members following today's meeting.

IV). Ms. Lougee introduced Kris Fowler and Jim Stemper, co-chairs of the Scholarly Communication Collaborative. Ms. Lougee stated that the Collaborative has a twofold focus:

1. Develop and implement a coordinated plan for the University Libraries to inform and educate its library liaison staff to work with faculty on author's rights issues.
2. Recommend ideas for engaging the campus community in scholarly communication policy and practice issues, and identify faculty champions who are interested in advocating for change in the scholarly communication system.

Jim Stemper began by noting that the Collaborative began to formulate a series of scans about the same time the Board of Regents adopted its new copyright policy. To give this initiative some context, Mr. Stemper stated that a guiding principle of the Board's copyright policy "encourages faculty and students to exercise their interests in ownership and use of their copyrighted works in a manner that provides the greatest possible scholarly and public access to their work."

Ms. Fowler noted that in order to better shape discussions and programs across the campus, additional information about current practices and attitudes needed to be collected. As a result, the Scholarly Communication Collaborative conducted an environmental scan in the spring/summer of 2008. She noted that 40 subject librarians (liaisons) collected relevant information on on-campus scholarly publishing, departmental policies, and faculty member activities from 123 departments in 14 colleges. Detailed information on the environmental scan was shared with the committee. Highlights from the analyzed data included:

- 5% of tenure/promotion policies accept non-traditional publication venues, and 7% explicitly prohibit them. (Given that many departments' policies were under revision, it was difficult to obtain definitive information about such policies).
- 30% of tenure/promotion policies explicitly consider citation/impact factors.
- 17% of departments have a fair number of faculty depositing research papers in an open access depository such as the University Digital Conservancy.
- 8% of departments have substantial (6 or more) faculty publishing in peer-reviewed open access journals.
- Faculty members serve as editors of over 700 journals/book series. 73% of these journals allow authors to post some version of their papers on their own websites, and 9% do not allow website posting.
- Faculty members serve on the publication board of over 30 societies/publishers.
- Faculty members serve as officers of over 60 professional societies.
- At least 17 peer-reviewed journals or book series are published or sponsored by campus units.

Professor Cherbuliez asked if there was a correlation between departments/colleges that publish in open access repositories and the department characteristics for high use? Yes, stated Ms. Fowler, indeed there was a correlation.

Jonathan Binks asked Ms. Fowler how she would characterize the Social Science Research Network she mentioned when providing details about the scan. Ms. Lougee stated that this is a hybrid repository containing working papers, various kinds of media as well as publications.

Professor Cherbuliez asked what is meant by “faculty member activities?” Ms. Fowler stated that this refers to professional activities such as officers in professional societies, and editors of journals.

Professor Liberman stated that while faculty members serve as editors of over 700 journals/book series is impressive; it is misleading, and needs to be taken with a grain of salt. Professor Liberman cited conducting a Google search as an example that greater access is not necessarily better. Ms. Lougee stated that there are differences in disciplines and also differences between Google and Google Scholar. In addition, Ms. Fowler stated that the Collaborative is aware that this statistic does not indicate how much influence each editor has.

Mr. Stemper concluded the presentation by sharing action items that have been discussed within the Library related to this data:

- Share results with the campus.
- Provide opportunities for researchers to discuss their publishing choices.
- Improve access to information on journal copyright policies.
- Encourage discussion of journal copyright policies by editors, sponsoring units, and society officers.
- Encourage discussion of official policies on dissemination of scholarly work.

Professor Orf asked what other institutions are using this tool, which was developed by the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL), to conduct similar types of environmental scans. Mr. Stemper stated that at least four other CIC schools are interested in adapting what the University Library has done. Ms. Lougee stated that it is likely the University is the first institution to gather this information at this level of detail.

Isaac Fox asked whether other governmental agencies such as NSF are planning to move in the direction that NIH has moved in terms of access. Ms. Lougee stated that NSF has discussed this; however, NSF does not have a governmental funded repository like NIH does (PubMed Central). Having said this, NSF is exploring using institutional repositories, and mandating articles be put in these repositories. There is also an inter-government agency looking at policies surrounding access to data.

Professor Orf suggested sending a letter to professional organizations asking them to look at their copyright policies in view of the changing world. Ms. Lougee noted that on the Provost’s Transforming Scholarly Communication website (<http://www.lib.umn.edu/scholcom/index.phtml>) there are success stories of scholars at the University who were able to change publisher’s policies to allow for greater access.

Ms. Fowler asked members their opinions about providing opportunities for researchers/professional society officers to discuss their publishing choices, e.g. forums, or would it be better to write a letter. How would the committee recommend engaging people who are involved with professional societies and publishers? Professor Orf stated that, in his opinion, a letter would be a better way to engage people and the letter should contain specific examples of success stories. Professor Cherbuliez stated that in whichever venue this is communicated she would recommend making the benefits of various publishing choices clear and how longlasting these benefits are. In addition, she suggested piloting some of the publishing changes with larger journals that are operating on campus. She recommended working with 2 – 3 different journals in very different fields to show what could actually happen using a different approach to access in publication. Professor Cheruliez reiterated her earlier comment about the need to show why various publishing choices better scholarship. As Professor Liberman stated earlier, noted Professor Cherbuliez, greater access is not necessarily better. Isaac Fox stated that he believes the assumption can be made that greater access is of value. In response, Professor Cherbuliez stated that this is a clear example of disciplinary differences.

Professor Hatch rhetorically asked whether it has been ascertained what percentage of faculty think better access is important. If a significant number of faculty do not care then it will be difficult to get buy-in. Secondly, he asked whether data exists on how faculty members post their scholarship. If it can be demonstrated to faculty that what they are doing in terms of posting their scholarship puts them in legal risk they would likely take notice regardless if the access issue is important to them or not.

Professor Gunn stated that the committee has discussed in the past the potential legal implications copyright infringement can pose for faculty who are unaware of their infractions. She suggested two approaches to educating the campus:

1. Make faculty and researchers aware of the resources that are available concerning copyright.
2. Offer/encourage workshops for younger faculty and researchers. These workshops should bring together tenured faculty and younger faculty to discuss copyright information and issues.

Ms. Lougee stated that based on her conversations with her colleagues across the country who are also grappling with large budget reductions, there is the likelihood that massive journal cancellations will occur. In response, publishers could be more apt than they have been up until now to take copyright action against those that have infringed on their copyright policies. Publishers are not showing any willingness to reduce their prices.

Professor Hatch stated that while he does not know precisely what action should be taken under these circumstances, he believes that this is an issue that deserves a great deal of thought, and likely action. Ms. Lougee reported that the Library is in the process of recruiting for a director of its newly established Copyright and Publishing Resource Center (CPRC), and hopes to have this position filled by the fall.

Isaac Fox asked whether Google Scholar could be a means of getting around the access issue. Mr. Stemper explained that the Library works behind the scenes with Google

Scholar to integrate the Library's Find It service software. Members of the University community are able access information on Google Scholar because the service recognizes a person's IP address and that person's affiliation with the University.

Professor Hatch asked whether Google Scholar content is available on the web like other information on Google search engines. Ms. Lougee stated that generally a publisher must deposit the work in Google Scholar for it to be available.

Ms. Fowler distributed copies of the draft environmental scan summary results that was compiled for the Institute of Technology. In addition, a document containing alternative publishing venues from a handful of colleges and departments' 7.12s statements was shared with the committee.

Professor Hatch, hearing no further comments or questions on this topic, thanked Ms. Fowler and Mr. Stemper for their presentation.

V). Moving on, the committee spent the remainder of the meeting discussing agenda items for the 2009 – 2010 academic year. Suggested agenda items included:

- Isaac Fox requested learning about what is and is not considered Fair Use, particularly for students. Ms. Lougee stated that this would be a good opportunity for the Library to provide information on how it works with the Campus Permissions Center and the University Bookstores.
- Professor Cherbuliez suggested looking at the Library's potentially changed role given the pending dissolution of the Graduate School. How will these changes fit into the Library's mission?
- Jonathan Binks recommended receiving an update from today's guests, Ms. Fowler and Mr. Stemper, on the work of the Scholarly Communication Collaborative given the completion of the 7.12s by colleges/departments.

Professor Hatch thanked members for their service on the committee during the 2008 – 2009 academic year. He announced that next year the committee will be chaired by Professor Jennifer Gunn. Members of the committee, in turn, thanked Professor Hatch for his leadership this past year.

VI). Hearing no further business, Professor Hatch adjourned the committee.

Renee Dempsey  
University Senate