Voting Members

Faculty
- Yang Bai, Physics
- Sabine Gross, German
- Kyung-Sun Kim, Library & Information Studies
- Neil Kodesh, History
- Mary Trotter, English  *(acting as chair in place of Dan Klingenberg)*

Academic Staff
- Ron Harris, English
- Carol Pech, School of Medicine and Public Health

University Staff
- Darcy Little, Latin American, Caribbean, and Iberian Studies
- Joan Weckmueller, IT/Academic Technology

Students
- Jack Dorr

Non-Voting Members
- Julie Arensdorf, Memorial Library
- Steven Barkan (LCC Liaison), Director, Law Library
- Phillip Braithwaite, Budget, Planning & Analysis
- Carrie Nelson, College Library
- Ed Van Gemert, Vice Provost for Libraries

Also Present
- Deborah Helman, LCC, Wendt
- Carol Hermann (for Florence Hsia, History of Science, Integrated Liberal Studies, MLC)
- Jim Jonas (for Anna Lewis, LCC), MERIT
- Lee Konrad, GLS, Library Exec Group
- Brianna Marshall, GLS
- Lesley Moyo, GLS, Library Exec Group
- Doug Way, GLS, Library Exec Group
Mary Trotter led meeting in Dan Klingenberg’s absence.

**Approve February Minutes**
Approved with no corrections

**Update on 3/7/16 Faculty Senate discussion of the ULC Open Access Resolution/Proposal, discussion of next steps, Doug Way, Ed Van Gemert**

- **Ed Van Gemert:** Last Monday Karl Broman led a discussion of open access at the faculty senate. Dan Klingenberg, Doug Way, Brianna Marshall, and I were also there. The discussion was tabled because there was a lot of confusion over what the senate was actually voting on. The chancellor tried to make clear that the faculty senate was voting on a resolution to create a committee to build an open access proposal. The faculty senate’s questions, however, were primarily directed at the attached sample proposal.

- **Doug Way:** The themes that I identified were: disciplinary differences, how does publishing in open access impact publishing future monographs, the cost of publishing in open access journals, which version of manuscripts would be submitted, and concern about publishers. Lot of concern for for-profit publishers, such as Elsevier—thought this would have a negative impact on for-profit publishers. There is a need for education; these types of policies have been in place at very prolific institutions such as Harvard, MIT, UC System.

- **Ed:** Karl Broman allowed these questions to come to the floor without addressing each concern, and the Chancellor tried to clarify that the senate was voting on a resolution to create a committee to develop an open access policy, but that got lost. Dan stressed the need to talk about motivation: why is the ULC putting forth an OA proposal, how would researchers benefit or be harmed, more background information. This was tabled for the Faculty Senate’s April 4th meeting. Carrie Nelson has put together talking points. If this gets voted down, we would not be able to pursue this again for some time. Discussion over strategies?

- **Brianna Marshall:** At the faculty senate meeting, there was a lot of misinformation, a lot of fear, which really detracted from the actual issue they would be voting on. The handout that Carrie started is a good start. Important for faculty to be able to voice their concerns on this issue (want to be heard), without detracting from the issue.

- **Ed:** While there were several faculty members who voiced support for open access, many wanted to discuss the details behind the policy.

- **Doug:** The sample draft language was not good to include, since it distracted everyone from the resolution itself. Karl Broman has been invited to a University committee meeting in two weeks (Ed and Carrie will also attend), and we could provide some handouts to clarify. We also need faculty advocates who are willing to talk in favor of this, since the librarians are not able to speak in this meeting.

- **Neil Kodesh:** As a faculty member in the History department, I probably share many of the concerns voiced at the Faculty Senate meeting and would be opposed. What is the pitch for OA?

- **Carrie:** Going in, we didn’t really have a pitch because OA policies are more common, research is showing that the impact is greater for faculty who publish in OA environments (accessed more often and cited more often).

- **Neil:** In the humanities, ironically, getting cited more often would be an argument against publishing in an OA journal.
Carrie: It wouldn’t be until after the publisher has published the manuscript, and has given the ‘ok’ that this would go into the institutional repository. So if the publisher doesn’t want you to, you can opt out. We’re finding that most publishers are okay with including the peer-reviewed version, before the PDF markup, in IRs.

Mary Trotter: Who can actually access the open access materials?

Carrie: Anyone, anywhere in the world. And it can be different in different disciplines. Useful to put together materials that communicate: if you’re publishing in advance of your dissertation, here is what we’ve learned from other schools; you can opt out; many publishers are okay with this type of policy.

Doug: As a faculty member, oftentimes you give up a lot of your rights to distribute your work without realizing you have the option to retain some rights. Before you sign a copyright transfer agreement with a publisher, this would ensure that you maintain the right to allow the University to make this work available—you still retain the right to control how that downstream distribution works (can opt out). As scholars, many of us want to make our findings widely available, and to use in our teaching. Publishers’ licensing policies vary from publisher to publisher, and even within a publisher, their policies change frequently. This puts more control in the hands of the scholar who created the scholarship.

Carrie: Also, many publishers already have policies in place that say this is ‘okay.’

Ed: With regard to mandates: As researchers, especially in the STEM areas using federal research funding, there is the OSTP mandate around public access. Open access is different than these public access mandates.

Neil: It might be worth convening smaller discussions with departments within humanities and social sciences departments. When we went through this with the graduate school a couple of years ago, there were a lot of concerns. If you have a better sense of these anxieties, it will help to frame the proposal.

Carrie: There are ways to be more or less liberal with OA waive options.

Sabine: I think it might be helpful to do a summary of the points raised here, rather than a presentation. The document is too much administrative language—faculty are probably seeing this very shortly before the meeting began. I don’t think I would want to see this come up again with minimal revisions. Could it be delayed further? Let’s withdraw this and revise.

Neil: Get on a couple of department meeting agendas.

Mary: There is a motion on the floor to withdraw this proposal to do further research and bring it forward again in the fall when we have a better sense of proper pitch. I want to also acknowledge how hard Karl Broman and other committee members worked on this proposal. We tried a particular strategy and it didn’t work, but we want it to pass. We want to strengthen the opt-out option, strengthen the freedom of scholars to use their own work and decide where they want to publish it, freedom of information and knowledge, but at the same time acknowledging that people need to get their work in peer-reviewed articles and to honor non-profit articles. All in favor?

Joan Weckmueller: I second.

Mary: We now open the floor to discussion.

Sabine: Add the fact that most publishers are on board with this, and that it’s an opportunity, rather than forcing anyone to participate.

Neil: That’s the key—pitch this as an opportunity, rather than being forced to participate.

Carrie: Let’s withdraw it until it’s ready—let’s not put a date on it.
• Doug: The ULC could convene some listening sessions. Partly listening, partly helping educate. People are busy, so probably easier to do it this way—listening to individuals—rather than setting up meetings.
• Neil: Departments such as the history department already invite others to department meetings and allocate ~10 minutes.
• Kyung-Sun Kim: Make sure you emphasize the benefits for faculty, and guidelines to minimize concerns and persuade them.
• Ed: Karl would probably prefer a fast-track for this. There were faculty at that senate meeting that support open access, but were wary of being forced to do this.
• Sabine: Let’s collect talking points, and reframe it. Many of us already do this, so this is a way for us to create a broader platform and unify.
• Doug: This is an opportunity to clarify and say that this is about creating a group to then work on a policy coming out of the faculty senate.
• Mary: Also, listing the Universities that already do this, and making very clear the “opt out” issue, especially for pre-tenure assistant professors.
• Joan Weckmueller: This is a policy that has been adopted on other campuses, and make it easier for them to understand. If it’s not working, we need to be creative and come up with a new approach.
• Jack Dorr: Which depository are we talking about? Academic.edu? ProQuest? University Archives?
• Ed: There are many, and this policy should speak to a principle of open access, not a prescriptive policy.
• Carrie: As-written, it’s just giving the University the right to put it in our institutional repository.
• Mary: We request that the chair of the ULC, Dan Klingenberg, send an email to the chairs of all the departments so that Doug can present at departments.
• Ed: There is also a department heads group that would be helpful to connect with. Also, Dan will need to communicate with the secretary of the faculty senate to implement this.
• Mary: We also request that the chair of the ULC ask that the current OA proposal be withdrawn from the faculty senate to be revised and resubmitted with all deliberate speed. All those in favor: (many vocal ‘ayes’) All those opposed: (none). It is unanimous.

Review Deans’ Council presentation scheduled for 4/13, review/approve ULC letter to Chancellor Blank
• Ed: Lesley Moyo and I were invited to speak to the deans last week. Our presentation was deferred until April because of new budget model discussions. We have a proposal that is asking for inflationary dollars and dollars for new acquisitions. We also have comparison data that the Provost had requested. The request that I would make for the deans is for support for our continuing to seek dollars for the collection budget (not for more money). The audience is the Chancellor, and the Provost is helping us with this message. I want to provide them with some context, and the reasons why faculty and students value the libraries
  o Faculty and students need the content to do their work, they need the proximity of an academic librarian for assistance, and they need high-tech learning spaces.
I talk about consolidation and maximizing efficiency, I talk about the huge shift from print to electronic collections, I mention the importance of special collections and the value of print.

Students represent the least decline in terms of circulation by patron groups: 75% decline in print use for grad students, 65% for faculty, and 57% for undergraduates. I don’t currently have the numbers for the increase in electronic collections, but our overall collections use has increased.

- Ed: The focus on collections budget came out of our strategic planning. The tri-fold display “Re-envisioning the UW-Madison Libraries: Process and Best Practices” is to demonstrate that this is part of a long and carefully thought-out process.
  - Will give examples of the implementation of our consolidation and facilities master plan process.
  - Then go over inflationary spending adjustments since 1970, showing that funding has decreased significantly.

- Ed: We’re asking for funding for a finite period of time. We need more base funding. We have to spend more and more on subscription fees. We need campus help with the inflationary costs for licenses and electronic resources. Then comes the ULC letter sent in conjunction with the presentation in April or soon after. The Friends of the UW-Madison Libraries are composing a similar letter.

- Mary: There’s a big ask that’s coming in, and it is suggested that our letter be in support of this. Any questions or recommendations for revisions for the letter?

- Carol Pech: The third bullet point, could we add some specific examples?

- Kyung-Sun: What is the current ranking of the UW-Madison within the CIC?

- Ed: Last, with Nebraska (which does not have a medical school) and Maryland behind us.

- Mary: All in favor of approving for our chair (Dan Klingenberg) to revise and submit this letter in our name? (Many ‘ayes’..) Opposed? None. Abstentions? None. It is unanimous.

- Sabine: I thought we should discuss the campus master plan call for volunteers. The question I have heard is ‘what is the time commitment?’

- Lesley: Once the governor signs a contract for work, we will begin. It is a year-long project, starting before summer. The steering committee will help to gather information to provide to consultants. I see this perhaps going beyond one year—the one-year time frame may be a little aggressive. At a future ULC meeting, Carrie Kruse and I will do a robust presentation on what will be expected going forward.

- Ed: At the May meeting, we’ll be having Ben Strand visit, so perhaps this could be on the April meeting. The consolidation working group was comprised primarily of librarians, so we need to be careful moving forward to include representation from the entire university.

- Lesley: The consultants recommended including graduate students, undergraduate students, faculty and staff. They have categories of people and shared governance on their slate for input.

- Sabine: In advance of the next meeting, I suggest that we create a message that we could send out to people who might be interested in serving on the committee, and to include them as visitors at this meeting, and for you to have details about what this participation would look like.

- Ed: We’ll also invite Megan McBride who is project manager for facilities planning.

- Mary: All those in favor of adjourning? Unanimous in the affirmative.
Meeting adjourned at 3:00pm

*Jack Dorr noted after the meeting that when discussing open access, the terms scholars and researchers do not include graduate students, only faculty.