

**University of Washington**  
**Faculty Council on University Libraries**  
April 6<sup>th</sup>, 2016  
2:30 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.  
Suzzallo 5<sup>th</sup> Floor Conference Room East

**Meeting Synopsis:**

1. Call to order
  2. Approval of the Agenda
  3. Review of the minutes from February 10<sup>th</sup>, 2016
  4. Chair's report
  5. FCUL Input on Libraries Masterplan (45 minutes)
  6. Update from Vice Provost and Dean (10 minutes)
  7. Open Access Update (15 minutes)
  8. Good of the order
  9. Adjourn
- 

**1) Call to order**

Lattemann called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m.

**2) Approval of the Agenda**

The agenda was approved as written.

**3) Review of the minutes from February 10<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

The minutes from February 10<sup>th</sup>, 2016 were approved as written.

**4) Chair's report**

Lattemann explained that during the recent Senate Executive Committee (SEC) meeting, Kate O'Neill (chair, Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting) brought a proposal to disband SCIPC (Special Committee on Intellectual Property and Commercialization) and IPMAC (Intellectual Property Management Advisory Committee), and formulate/task a new single committee to address IP Policy-related issues at the UW. The proposal was approved by the SEC. Lattemann explained there is still some question if the new committee (name TBD) will address open access issues.

**5) FCUL Input on Libraries Masterplan**

Anne Roderer, Diane Machatka, and Shirley Dugdale were present to gather feedback from the council on the UW Libraries Masterplan. The guests represented Mahlum Architects and Dugdale Strategy LCC, two companies working with the UW Libraries to develop a Masterplan, which will guide development

in UW libraries a decade into the future and beyond. The guests were present to brief the council on the progress of the Masterplan as well as to receive input on key topics and discuss aspirations for the future of the library. They had a series of questions to present and garner council feedback on, which were listed in a projected document (Exhibit 1).

A progress update was given before questions were asked. Roderer explained the UW Engineering Library and the UW Health Sciences Library will be incorporated in the Masterplan. She noted work has been ongoing for three months so far, and final recommendations relating to the Masterplan will be made in the coming months. Dugdale explained the guests are also looking into library services and the possibility for new collections. The guests noted in a world where a growing amount of reading material is available digitally, the stakeholders working on the Masterplan must consider what materials need to remain browsable in campus libraries, and this is one area of feedback needed from the council. After a question, it was noted there has never been a formal Libraries Masterplan such as this at the UW.

The following are the questions and responses from council members prompted by the guests' projected questionnaire (Exhibit 1):

- I. What type of services and facilities will be needed to support the future needs of 21st Century scholarship, research and education?

Lattemann explained she used to regularly visit the UW Health Sciences Library, though, now with E-journals, a computer with an internet connection can achieve the same result. She explained one consequence of this is the missed opportunities to see colleagues at the library. Lattemann noted an important libraries service is access to older scholarly works (e.g. studies from the 1980s in her field), as these can be extremely valuable to researchers.

Bekemeier noted having a real person available to help guests search out scholarly works, books, and other materials is an invaluable library resource and also one that is not likely to be replicated digitally. West agreed and stressed the importance of physical space and collections in libraries to facilitate searching for things in-person, whether that be with human help or alone. He noted human interaction is important in libraries despite numerous and improving data storage technologies.

Kerr mentioned that the library currently provides writing advice and other trainings to international students, non-traditional students, and generally any students in need. She noted providing this aid to students is very important.

Flores explained there is an exhibit on Cesar Chavez currently running in the library. He noted this kind of display is valuable to the university's ultimate mission, and he would like to see these exhibit spaces protected so that similar exhibits can continue.

Discussion subsided on the question.

- II. What are the key challenges and opportunities the master plan must address?

Redalje noted a great resource for students and the chemistry community was lost with the UW Chemistry Library. She noted physical space for meeting and studying is still very important despite access to scholarly works online.

Lattermann questioned if shared physical study spaces in libraries would realistically ever lose their utility. Wilson explained data on UW libraries usage shows that demand is higher than ever, as people are visiting UW's libraries in record numbers. It was noted for students, going to the library symbolizes "getting serious" and having the intention of getting work done.

There was some discussion of security and safety in UW's libraries. Fugate noted the police have advised never locking down the building (Suzzallo Library) in a campus lockdown situation, as students outdoors would be unable to enter the building and get to safety.

Discussion subsided.

### III. What should be the measures of success when you look back at the plan in ten years?

It was noted student satisfaction is an important metric when measuring success of the campus libraries. Members noted students have expressed a need for more electric outlets and charging ports in libraries, a greater number of active learning-style classrooms, and a greater number of basic and enhanced spaces for collaboration. It was noted quiet study space also remains in very high demand.

Roderer thanked the council for their input and explained additional input can be offered via Cynthia Fugate. After a question, the guests explained they report to Wilson and Fugate. The council thanked the guests for presenting.

#### **6) Update from Vice Provost and Dean**

Wilson explained Denise Pan has been hired as the new Associate Dean for Collections and Content at UW Seattle. Pan comes from the University of Colorado Denver, and has studied impacts of collections on student academic success.

Wilson noted the UW Libraries Faculty Triennial Survey will be broadcasted to all three UW campuses on April 12<sup>th</sup>. The survey focuses on library use and satisfaction as well as user needs and library priorities.

Wilson mentioned that Cassandra Hartnett has received the 2016 Distinguished Librarian Award, and UW libraries employee Steve Hiller is the 2016 staff recipient of the David B. Thorud Leadership Award.

#### **7) Open Access Update**

Gordon Aamot (Interim Director, Collections and Content Strategy, University Libraries) explained the Open Access (OA) Advisory Task Force has been busy since the council received its last update, and the group's timeline has changed. Members of the OA Advisory Committee had explained that the faculty senate is tied up with other issues, and the timing is not ideal to bring open access issues to the faculty senate for deliberation this academic year. Aamot explained the report of the task force will be submitted to the Provost in May, 2016, and he will return to the council in the next year to discuss a successful conclusion to the initiative.

Aamot noted the OA Policy has been altered since the council last reviewed the document. He explained other university OA policies they looked at were relatively simple documents, which included FAQ sheets that provided more detail and background. He noted in the "Scope and Waiver" section, they wanted to allow for local interpretation of what constitutes "scholarly articles," and also to provide a

waiver option. He noted the OA Policy's accompanying FAQ Sheet has been revised with the addition of a brief synopsis of the OA initiative at the outset of the document (Exhibit 1).

Barker questioned how publishing with a journal interacts with open access. Aamot explained that the gist of the OA policy dictates that, by giving a "license" to the university, the university would be allowed to make drafts of scholarly works available (different from final published versions).

Lattemann explained if a publisher disallows the posting to open access *and* to their journal, a waiver to the university's OA policy can be requested by the faculty member in order to comply. A member noted that while some publishers are OA-oriented, others can be very resistant, and confusion among faculty is commonplace when it comes to publishing to OA and to an academic journal. Lattemann explained there needs to be more education/resources for faculty on this topic. Aamot agreed and noted that more conversations around the UW about this would be useful during the course of the next year. Further discussion revealed there is a website that aggregates publisher's policies and makes it easy to know if the publisher allows archiving "pre-print," "post-print," both - or do not support archiving at all. The website is called SHERPA/RoMEO.

Lattemann explained she has a recommendation for the section of the FAQ Sheet titled "What are the purposes of the suggested policy?" She noted the first thing to appear in this section should be the benefits of open access to authors of scholarly works, and then the section can transition into points about the UW's public mission and so on. She also added that the point in the FAQ Sheet about waivers to the policy being immediately granted upon request should be made more explicit to the reader. Aamot noted he would take the feedback into account.

#### **8) Good of the order**

This item was missed due to time constraints.

#### **9) Adjourn**

Lattemann adjourned the meeting at 4:00 p.m.

---

*Minutes by Joey Burgess, jmbg@uw.edu, council support analyst*

**Present:** **Faculty:** Lauro Flores, Dianne Lattemann (chair), Jevin West, Betty Bekemeier  
**Ex-officio reps:** Susanne Redalje, Juliya Ziskina, Ellen Barker, Beth Kerr  
**President's designee:** Betsy Wilson  
**Guests:** Anna Roderer, Diane Machatka, Shirley Dugdale, Gordon Aamot, Cynthia Fugate

**Absent:** **Faculty:** Trent Hill, Randall Leveque, Clay Mountcastle, Julie Nicoletta, Carole Lee, Kristin Gustafson  
**Ex-officio reps:** Anuv Vaghul

Exhibit 1 – 16 03 11 Recommended Open Access Policy FAQ\_fcul\_040616.doc









Although the UW license supersedes any subsequent publication and retains rights for the University, a potential publisher may not agree to those terms as a condition of publication. If that is the case you can delay access to the article or get a waiver.

## **ResearchWorks and Submission of Articles**

### ***What is the ResearchWorks Archive?***

The ResearchWorks Archive is the UW's institutional repository. It provides a permanent, safe service for providing access to articles, technical reports, datasets, images and other file types produced at the University of Washington by faculty and Researchers. The Archive enables University of Washington researchers and academic units to make their scholarly materials accessible to the world, at a stable URL, with the assurance that the materials will be maintained into the future.

### ***Which version would I submit?***

Authors would normally deposit what may be called either the "Accepted Author Manuscript" or "Author's Final Version": the final, accepted, post-peer review draft. However, some publishers allow authors to deposit the published (usually PDF) version – including final copy-edits and formatting – so you might prefer to deposit that version instead. A good source of journal and publisher policy information is the [SHERPA/JMEO web site](#).

### **Who can I contact if I have questions?**

[To be determined]

**DRAFT**