

Minutes of the Senate Library Committee
Meeting of September 20, 2021
11:00 A M to 12:00 PM

In Attendance: Mark Lynn Anderson, Reid Andrews, Jeff Aziz, Lauren Collister, Charlotte Johnson, Kristen Kanthak, Robin Kear, Gary Kohanbash, Marty Levine,* Jonah McAllister-Erickson, Matt Moore, Diana Khoi Nguyen, April O’Neil, Elizabeth Reich, Jessica Rolke, and Lucy Russell.

**University Times* reporter.

Excused: Renae Barger, Mark Bernstein, Susanna Leers, Ken Saltzer, and Kornelia Tancheva.

1. Minutes of the SLC meeting of May 20, 2021 were approved by the Committee.

2. Because of the number of new members on the Committee, Anderson explained the relatively new governance structure of having a faculty librarian serve as co-chair for a calendar year starting each January. He alerted the Committee to be thinking about what sort of issue(s) they wished to pursue in the coming year in order to facilitate the recruitment of a new co-chair to the SLC for January 2022.

3. Anderson and Collister described their work in writing language into the previous solicitation and description of Momentum Funds that would make faculty applicants to these grants aware of open access as a important consideration for research and creation and to indicate the University’s commitment to freely accessible scholarship and sharable work products. These brief but effective emendations of last year’s descriptions of this internal funding were offered to Ryan Champagne, Assistant Director of Research Development, in early summer as a model for how to include “nudge” language in the new Momentum materials that were in the process of being revised. Champagne was supportive, but Anderson expressed his disappointment about the fact that no mention of open access was evident in any of the Momentum materials made available this year through the Office of Research, not even in the description of the importance of research impact. Collister said she would follow up with Champagne. Anderson noted that questions of open scholarship would seem especially pertinent during this Year of Data and Society at the University.

4. As there were many new members on the Committee, and as the SLC continues to work on questions of open access (OA), Collister provided the Committee with an overview of open scholarship and took questions from members about what constitutes OA. She noted that OA is a descriptor, and that open access work should not only be accessible for free, but available for re-use. There were questions about the University’s stance on OA, and Lauren mentioned the effort of several years ago [2010-2011] that went through the Faculty Senate to establish an Open Access Policy. That effort met with mixed results, but it did help establish the office where Collister works, the Office of Scholar Communication and Publishing.

A few questions emerged about what OA policies do and how they work. Anderson noted that the Committee last year considered whether now might be a propitious time to pursue an OA

policy again, but it was decided that, because of the dissonance and fallout around the newly created Intellectual Property policy, any attempt at an OA policy might be confusing and could do the promotion of open scholarship more harm than good. As evidence of how unaware the University faculty might be about the issue and about what is available to them, Andrew mentioned that he himself wasn't aware of Collister's office. Collister then described the work her office does, including administering a limited pool of funding for OA publication, assistance with question about licensing and publishing, promoting and helping maintain our institutional repository, D-Scholarship, the publishing of several journal, copyright compliance, etc. Collister mention that SLC member McAllister-Erickson was the office's principal expert and consultant on copyright. She also explained that HSLs has its own support for open publication and a scholarly communication librarian.

Reid asked a question about the repository and how repositories work at institutions with mandatory OA policies. Collister explained that the institution reserves the right to access the content of its faculties' scholarship, thereby allowing for the uploading of preprints and other version of published work identical in content to the published version. She noted that many if not most publishers now explicitly allow for the author to reserve access rights, rights that can then be transferred to the institution. Reid asked whether there were reprisals for faculty who didn't comply with OA policies at institutions that have implemented mandatory compliance. Collister explained that there is almost always an opt-out option for faculty. Reich mentioned that she taught at a school with such a policy, but she hadn't fully known what the policy entailed. She wondered how to convince junior faculty to participate. Reich related a story about a group of junior scholars who were publishing a collection of essays with a publisher who subsequently cancel the agreement once a prominent scholar pulled out because the publisher refused his demand for OA publication. Anderson responded that this is more of a commentary on the personality and prudence of the big-name researcher than an inditement of open access advocacy.

Collister emphasized that all journals have policies and that we know what we can ask for, and she reiterated that one of the principal purposes of her office is to help faculty negotiate rights with publishers. Collister maintained that the keys to success, with or without an institutional policy, are promotion, education, and advocacy. Anderson mention that our current project is to create a proposal for funding open scholarship projects pursued by those faculty hired as part of the current four-year cluster-hiring of faculty through the Race and Social Determinant of Equity and Wellbeing initiative. The idea would be to take a proposal or resolution to the Faculty Assembly sometime this year. Kear commented that, whether we feel the need to go through Faculty Assembly or not, we should work closely with the Office of the Provost. Russel stated that she has made the Provost aware of our plans and mentioned them to Vice-Provost John Wallace.

The meeting adjourned at 12:02 PM.

Minutes compiled and submitted by Mark Lynn Anderson
Revised and approved by Committee on 10/19/21