Minutes for Senate Library Committee
Meeting of February 20, 2020
3:00 PM to 4:30 PM
272 Hillman Library

In Attendance: Mark Lynn Anderson (co-chair), Jeff Aziz, Lauren Collister,* Carrie Donovan (co-chair), Barbara Epstein, Gary Kohanbash, Jonah McAllister-Erickson, Zach Horton, Clark Muenzer, Mary Rauktis, Aurea Sotomayor, Nancy Tannery, Kornelia Tancheva, and Courtney Weikle-Mills.

* invited speaker

1. Greetings and self-introductions of attending committee members and guest.

2. Approval of corrected Committee Minutes for meeting of January 23, 2020 as submitted by Anderson.

3. Anderson briefly reported that the two outmoded University policies that the Committee had requested be scrapped by the Office of Policy Development and Management had finally been officially decommissioned as of the first of February and removed from the University website. The decommissioned policies were: University Policy AC 47 (formerly 10-03-01), NOTIS: Library On-line Circulation System, and AC 59 (formerly 10-03-03), Special Library Cards and Access to University Libraries.

4. Anderson then returned to the question of the Committee seeking to advocate for librarian representation of the University Research Council (URC) as discussed in the January SLC meeting, suggesting that a memorandum be sent from the Committee to the Office of the Senior Vice Chancellor for Research, Rob Rutenbar, who currently oversees the URC and appoints its membership. Nancy Tannery reported that she had broached this possibility with Michelle Amato, Chief of Staff for the Office of Research, and Amato felt that this could be easily accomplished and that we should run our request through her. It was agreed that we would address a memorandum to both Rutenbar and Amato. There followed a discussion about just what was being asked of the Vice Chancellor and if we were recommending any specific appointment(s). It was clarified that we would only make a case for the benefits of including a librarian on the URC, and that we would make ourselves available for further consultation should that be desired. While not worked out in Committee, the eventual language of the memo read:

> *At the meeting of the Senate Library Committee (SLC) on February 20, 2020, members resolved to communicate to your office our desire that you consider appointing a librarian to serve on the University Research Council (URC). Given that the URC regularly considers and advises on all manner of University research policies, procedures, and initiatives, the SLC believes that such work would benefit from the regular participation of a professional research librarian. Alternately, such participation would facilitate the more effective communication of current developments in University research to University library and information science professionals.*
>
> *Should you wish to discuss this possibility further or should you require additional advisement, please feel free to contact any or all of the heads of the University libraries—Barbara Epstein*

5. Lauren Collister was invited to speak on the state of Open Access (OA) and OA initiatives today. Collister had previously address the committee in February of 2018, and her current presentation served as an update as well as providing and informational context for the Committee to discuss how it might make OA a central concern of its future work.

Collister reviewed the general context for OA such as the reigning contradiction of researchers giving away the products of their research for free while they and others then have to pay for those products in an escalating market of journal subscriptions. This places strains on library budgets and over the past fifteen or more years institutions, groups, and individuals have sought ways to expand OA to make delivery and access to current scholarship faster and more affordable, or even cost-free. Collister mentioned that one of the hurdles to OA initiatives is both the lack of knowledge that many faculty and researchers have about the costs of access, as well as their prejudices against OA sources since traditional publishing venues with perceived prestige are most often subscription titles. Thus, the pressures of hiring, promotion, and tenure factor into faculty perceptions. Collister reviewed ways to incentivize faculty awareness and commitment to OA including nudge language in institutional requirements for faculty, institutional mandates to reserve author rights which require inclusion of published and/or adjacent work in institutional repositories, and different publishing models for authors and institutions to increase access to published research, ideally at less cost.

Collister describe the relatively recent initiative of Plan S and its founding principles in the European Union, a plan that requires all publicly or privately funded research sponsored by any local, national, or transnational granting agency to have immediate open access at time of publication starting in 2021. She then reviewed strategies for publishing without a subscription as well as options for negotiating OA deals with publishers, evaluating their respective strengths and weaknesses; these included deals where institutions subsidize OA publication such as in Subscribe to Open models where titles become OA once a number of institutions buy into the agreement; and Transformative Agreements in which subscription fees include authors' publishing rights without APCs (article processing charges). The slides that Collister used for her presentation can be consulted here.

In the discussion that followed, Muenzer asked if Interlibrary Loan (ILL) was not a way around paying for access in some cases, Both Epstein and Tancheva explained that while there are ILL agreements between consortia of libraries, the service still cost money and once recent articles from a title are borrowed more than five times annually then rights charges begin to be applied, another instance where library costs are hidden from faculty and student users. Tancheva also mentioned that certain subscriptions prohibit ILL. McAllister-Erickson also pointed out that many libraries charge for ILL, and Epstein noted that her library charges.

There followed a brief discussion of how transformative agreements with publisher/vendor ACMs ultimately fail to make access less expensive for most institutions. McAllister-Erickson noted that institutions such as Carnegie Mellon University can afford negotiated contracts and that CMU has the highest number of ACM publishing faculty than any other institution. Muenzer inquired as to whether publishers ever consider advertising as a way to realize profits while

moving to OA. Collister responded that publishers are reticent to harm the "sanctity" of their venues outside of the promotion of scholarly activities. Epstein mentioned the importance of depositing preprints of published articles in repositories as a means of gaining fast or immediate OA to data and research findings. Kohanbash brought up the importance of including OA as part of research grants.

The case of the University of California system's termination of contract with Elsevier was raised, with Epstein reporting on suspicions that scientist in that state are going to illegal sites for access since paywall access is somewhat porous. McAllister-Erickson said that Elsevier is going after for profits like ResearchGate and not individual faculty members.

Collister stressed the importance of reading line contracts and reserving author's rights for institutional repositories. She also said it is good practice to have rights and OA conversations with editors and editorial boards. Tancheva mentioned how she and Collister have recently been in regular conversation with the dean of the School of Computing and Information Science about OA best practices. Kohanbash inquired whether institutions can retain these rights on behalf of its faculty so that individuals don't have to fight for these rights every time?. Tancheva explained that it is easier for individuals to reserve their own author's rights and that most publishers will be compliant. She further pointed out that it is necessary to have enough support from across the University in order to mandate depositing all published research in an institutional repository, and that institutions who have achieved such a policy include an opt-out clause. Muenzer asked if it is possible and desirable to deposit much older publish researched in our repository, D-Scholarship. There were many affirmatives with some SLC members having already done so.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 PM.

Minutes compiled and submitted by Mark Lynn Anderson