UNIVERSITY LIBRARY COMMITTEE
Minutes
November 10, 2006

PRESENT: Mark Blaine, Priscilla Elder, Alexander Mathas, Eric Mentzel, Lee Roth, Tze-Lan Sang, Dev Sinha

GUESTS: Andrew Bonamici, Assistant University Librarian for Information Services; Mark Watson, Assistant University Librarian for Collections and Access; Faye Chadwell (via speakerphone), Head, Collection Development & Access

Deb Carver, Dean of Libraries, convened the meeting and welcomed everyone; introductions followed. Deb is responsible for overseeing the first meeting each year. At the end of the meeting, the committee selected Mark Blaine to serve as the 06/07 ULC chair.

CAMPAIGN UPDATE
Deb reported that the library has met its campaign goal of $10 million. However, the library did not meet its programmatic goals. She hopes to raise an additional $5 million before the end of the campaign in 2008. The majority of library donations are going into endowments. Areas that have received substantive support include:
• Collections
• Endowed faculty positions
• Undergraduate Research Awards

MAJOR INITIATIVES
Deb reported on several exciting initiatives that library staff have been working:

Learning Commons is a new collaborative learning area near the reference desk of Knight Library. It provides collaborative workstations for students and faculty, including high-end hardware, software, laptop checkouts, presentation rooms and technical expertise. See
http://libweb.uoregon.edu/commons/

Scholars Bank is an open-access digital repository created to capture, distribute and preserve the intellectual output of students and faculty of the University of Oregon. There are currently over 3,000 submissions. For more information, see
http://libweb.uoregon.edu/catdept/irg/AboutSB.html

Classroom improvement has been a major project over the past summer. $300,000 from ed tech funds were put into improvements in 70 classrooms across campus. During winter term, a survey will be given to faculty in order to get feedback on the equipment and technical support being provided.

Portland Project involves a fairly expansive library. The library will also be responsible for providing media services, teleconferencing, classroom support, etc. It is hoped to have the facility operational by March 2008.

SCHOLARLY COMMUNICATION
Several documents/articles were distributed to the committee, which address various scholarly communications issues. Deb asked the members to review the articles prior to the next meeting.

Deb provided a brief summary on the ULC's history with scholarly communication, which has been a recurring theme for the ULC over the last five years. In March 2001, Gina Psaki, who chaired the ULC that year, presented to the UO Senate information on the crisis in commercial scholarly publishing and escalating serial costs. The ULC presented several recommendations on how the UO might respond to reform scholarly publishing. See Gina's document at

The recommendations put forth by the ULC were:

Recommendations
In consultation with the library administrators and subject specialists, and library representatives from several UO departments, the ULC makes the following recommendations to the university community:
A. Adopt a university-wide policy that all UO authors try, to the best of their ability, to retain copyright on their own work, including at the very minimum the right to
       1. Distribute copies of their work to classes and to individual scientists
       2. Publish their work on their own web sites
       3. Post their work on a local UO archive
B. Immediately identify high-cost duplicate titles among the three research libraries in OUS and establish target amounts for cancellation, in areas in which cancellation would not harm present faculty research, with the ultimate goal of substantially reducing duplication.
C. Educate individual faculty and graduate students to
       1. Retain copyright on scholarly articles
       2. Discover the pricing practices of the journals with whom they collaborate (as reviewer, as editorial board member, as author)
       3. Disassociate from those with unethical pricing structures
       4. Lobby professional societies to both put pressure on Elsevier and other publishers of inordinately costly publications, and work collaboratively with efforts such as SPARC in the development of lower-cost alternative publications
       5. Encourage professional societies, where applicable, to assume more responsibility for publishing in their field
D. Begin a campus discussion about adopting the "Tempe Principles," the Emerging Principles of Scholarly Publishing (http://www.arl.org/scomm/tempe.html) recently developed with the support of the AAU and the Association of Research Libraries. The principles provide a foundation for specific actions, such as those outlined above. By adopting these guiding principles, the UO would become part of a national effort to define new systems of scholarly publishing.
E. Ensure that promotion-and-tenure evaluation criteria favor this effort, by holding faculty harmless for declining to publish in journals with pricing structures detrimental to the free circulation of ideas. Request to the UO Senate: The ULC invites the UO Senate to consult the extensive documentation on this urgent problem, to discuss the ULC recommendations at its earliest convenience, and to either endorse or modify the recommendations for referral to the university administration.

The Senate's Resolution to address these recommendations is below:

Resolution US00/01-5 -- Resolution regarding rising costs of scholarly journals and authors' retention of copyright
The crisis in commercial scholarly publishing has resulted in the impoverishment of library serial collections across the county, the decrease in the number of books acquired by libraries, and the consequent decrease in the number of books published by university presses. The consequent recourse by scholars to publishing in expensive commercial publishing houses has in turn increased costs to libraries and again fed the problem of dwindling collections.
The community of research librarians and university faculties and administrators has been gathering information and planning strategy for several years, and concluded that these issues must be addressed at the point of the generation of scholarly research, not at the point of purchase by libraries. The latter focus has largely failed, and we cannot keep relying on it.
The University Library Committee has made a series of recommendations to the UO Senate and the UO community at large regarding first steps toward revising the scholarly publishing landscape in such a way as to reduce dependence on the most expensive and exploitative publishing houses and venues.

The University Senate makes the following recommendation: the UO should adopt the principles and procedures recommended by the University Library Committee's March 14, 2001 Report, modifying them as necessary and appropriate to campus-wide and departmental constraints.

This resolution was passed by the UO Senate 11-April-2001

Deb reported that last spring, the ULC formed a subcommittee to begin work on drafting a new Senate resolution. That committee did not have enough time to put a proposal together before the term ended. Last year's committee agreed to carry it forward to this year.

The question for the committee to address is whether there has been any progress made since the 2001 resolution. What can we do to continue addressing scholarly communication issues?

Some ideas that were discussed include:

- Work with faculty and graduate students to increase awareness. Provide more campus-wide discussion on the Tempe principles (http://www.arl.org/scomm/tempe.html).
- Identify titles to share with OSU, retaining only high-use titles. Both libraries have started a shared collection, with approximately 80 titles. There has not been as much growth due to both libraries moving to electronic subscriptions.
- As much as everyone agrees with the recommendation of holding faculty harmless for not publishing in expensive commercial journals, it is felt that might be very difficult to do across campus.

Faye Chadwell, Head, Collection Development and Access, participated in the meeting via speakerphone. Faye provided a brief description of open access. Open access journals are free to any user. See http://libweb.uoregon.edu/catdept/irg/Open_Access.html This site is designed to provide news and background information about the open access movement to the University of Oregon community. The library has done several things since 2001 to address scholarly communication and open access:

1. Scholar's Bank (http://libweb.uoregon.edu/catdept/irg/SB_Overview.html)
2. Access to open access and/or free journals via catalog and FindText, including Directory of Open Access Journals (http://www.doaj.org/)
3. Sponsoring meetings/programs with subject specialists and department library representatives on the scholarly crisis and modifying our subscription support of commercial publishers
4. Supporter of SPARC, BioOne, Columbia Earthscape, Evolutionary EcologyResearch, Public Library of Science (PloS)
5. Shared collection with OSU and PSU

MIT has a policy for all faculty to retain non-exclusive rights for their own work, however, not every institution has the culture to adopt a campus-wide statement that all faculty would use. The UC system is starting to take the same approach as MIT. Everyone agreed that the first step we need to do is educate the faculty. It is also important to make faculty aware of Scholar's Bank (SB), and the procedures for submitting their material. Each SB community can decide who will have access to their documents. If his or her research is funded with federal money, stricter requirements for making research results publicly accessible may apply.

It is important to build upon the 2001 memo to the Senate. Maybe the ULC should focus its attention on faculty retention of copyright. It might be advantageous to work with peer (AAU) institutions on a unified approach.

A concern with the art faculty is that scholars cannot get permission to reproduce images, and without images, they cannot publish. There is also some concern with open access articles not being peer reviewed by highly qualified editorial boards.

A suggestion was also made to use Inside Oregon as a way to bring awareness to the campus community.

Action Items:
1. The Library will draft a communications plan on how to increase campus awareness.
2. Invite Rich Linton, UO VP for Research, to attend the next meeting to discuss what the institution can do to contribute to accessibility of our research.

Submitted by
Sheila Gray