University Library Committee

Minutes
March 10, 2009

PRESENT: Alex Asbury, Val Burris, Deb Carver, Alisa Freedman, Andy Karduna, Gina Psaki, Steven van Enk

GUESTS: Andrew Bonamici, Associate University Librarian for Media & Instructional Services; Mark Watson, Associate University Librarian for Collections and Access

The meeting was called to order at 3:00 p.m. by Deb Carver (in the absence of Chair G. Sayre).

FINALIZE THE BIG IDEA ON UNDERGRADUATE RESEARCH

The committee reviewed and agreed to endorse the big idea "Undergraduate Research: Teaching the Scholarly Method." One change that will be made before submitting it to the Provost will be to change the title to "Teaching the Scholarly Method." The deadline to submit the document is March 15. Go here to see this document and the other big ideas.

AUTHOR SUPPORT OF OPEN ACCESS

Deb asked the committee to discuss the library's proposal to use $50K of the recent $300K library allocation to support faculty who wish to publish in open access journals. The text below, which will be distributed to faculty via email, summarizes the plan. The deans and provost have already given their support.

****

Dear Colleagues:

After discussion with the deans, I have decided to set aside a portion of the recent library allocation-$50,000 of the $300,000- to support faculty who are committed to publishing in open access journals. Many of you have expressed increasing alarm with the rising costs of scholarly journals, particularly those published by the commercial sector. It is clear to all of us that the current model of scholarly publishing is not sustainable, and a new model for disseminating peer-reviewed research is essential. Several universities are taking steps to promote a more open system. UC-Berkeley has developed an 18-month pilot program called the *Berkeley Research Impact Initiative* http://www.lib.berkeley.edu/brii/ that I think can serve as a model for a UO pilot. The program subsidizes, in various degrees, fees charged to authors who prefer to publish in peer-reviewed journals that are freely available to the scholarly community-as opposed to those that are available only through costly subscriptions. A pilot project will also yield data that can be used to measure faculty commitment and fiscal impacts of a new model.

I will work with the University Library Committee in crafting a mechanism for providing faculty support and assessing the results of a pilot project.

****

Deb added that even though articles published in open access journals are free and open to users, the publishers usually assess an author fee. Steven reported that he was recently asked by an

open access publisher to pay $1200. Deb explained that this would be a fund to help with those kinds of expenses when the author does not have funds from other sources, e.g., grants. There would need to be an oversight process, as we would not support all journals - it would be restricted to open access journals. Everyone agreed that this would be a perfect role for the ULC. Deb added that the Berkeley model also does this for graduate students; that is something we could consider. It was suggested that Deb talk with colleagues at Berkeley to find out more about their experience, what they have learned, costs involved, etc. Mark added that another way open access journals receive funding is through institutional membership fees. [Plos](#) is an example. There is a faculty member who has been accepted by Plos, but there is a $1200 charge associated with it. He could be the "poster child" for starting this pilot project. Alysa reported that she had an experience where her article published in an open access journal was not going to count towards tenure even though it was peer reviewed. It is important that the University endorses this process and that this kind of publishing will help faculty reach tenure. Members felt it is important to distribute the $50K equally between the humanities and the sciences. It was also suggested to put together a list of open access journals that would qualify under this model. Deb responded that we can work with SPARC and do some research to determine which journals have the highest impact in various disciplines. It is the library's goal to get this started before the end of the year. This pilot could be a model for other university libraries.

Next steps summary: 1) Deb will talk with colleagues at Berkeley, 2) the library will draft an implementation plan on subsidizing author fees for the ULC to review/revise, 3) email to faculty announcing this plan will be sent on Deb's behalf by University Administration, and 4) Deb will have a conversation with Rich Linton on whether the Office of Research would like to contribute additional funds.

SERIALS UPDATE
Mark reported that there has been a re-calculation of percentage target cuts, which have been distributed. The deadline for returning finalized lists for potential cuts is Friday, March 13; however, he noted that it is expected most will not be completed by then. The library's next step is to meet with colleagues at Oregon State University to compare titles for any overlap. The goal is to mitigate cuts to the extent possible. If there are duplicate titles to be cut, the group will determine whether one of the libraries should retain the journal. Both libraries will need to depend on document delivery to provide access. He added that we may look into color scanning.

The committee questioned if this process will simply shift journal costs to Interlibrary Loan. Mark responded that is a possibility and that it will be important to monitor ILL's costs. Margaret Bean, Interlibrary Loan, provided the following statement to the committee following the meeting:

"In general, ... if an item is heavily used and if the copyright costs for that particular journal are high, it is more cost effective to keep the subscription. If a journal is not heavily used and the copyright fees are minimal then canceling it would make more sense."

Deb added that the library will do more work on collecting data on copyright fees.

Submitted by
Sheila Gray