

University of Washington
Faculty Council on University Libraries
December 9th, 2015
2:30 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.
Suzzallo 5th Floor Conference Room East

Meeting Synopsis:

1. Call to order
 2. Approval of Minutes from October 14th, 2015
 3. Report on December 1st libraries advisory meeting / Open Access Initiative
 4. Discussion of rescheduling missed UW Bothell libraries tour
 5. Adjourn
-

1) Call to order

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

2) Approval of Minutes from October 14th, 2015

The minutes from October 14th, 2015 were approved unanimously as written.

3) Report on December 1st libraries advisory meeting / Open Access Initiative

Tim Jewell (Scholarly Publishing Librarian, University Libraries) was present to report on the state of the ongoing open access initiative. He explained the initiative formally began following approval of the Faculty Council on Research's (FCR) Class C Open Access resolution in the faculty senate, which included a component requesting that a new open access policy be devised for the UW, as well. Jewell informed the Council that he and other guests Thom Deardorff (University Libraries Copyright Officer) and Gordon Aamot (Interim Director, Collections and Content Strategy) were present to provide a background on what they and the UW libraries are doing in response to the aforementioned Class C resolution.

Jewell explained he has before the council a draft proposal of a new open access policy for preliminary review (Exhibit 1). He noted in devising the policy, a few questions were asked:

- 1) What might a robust and sustainable policy look like?
- 2) What should the libraries' role be in spearheading the effort?

Jewell noted he, Deardorff, and Aamot also drafted a timeline to be used for defining when varying consultations should take place, and when other action is to be taken (Exhibit 2). He mentioned that the "open access advisory group" which includes Lattemann (chair, FCUL), Rosenfeld (chair, FCR) and Kate O'Neill (former chair, faculty senate) have been integral in focusing his group's, and other groups' efforts. He explained a survey has been broadcast to the UW community with questions regarding institutional repository priorities, noting they plan to convene focus groups in January and February to look at survey responses. Many responses have already come in, and a large pool of interest is evident.

Jewell informed the Council that his group is hoping to complete a presentation draft of the open access policy in March 2016 for the faculty senate to formally take under consideration.

It was noted conducting a “needs and integration assessment” of the current UW repository is also underway, and a digital repository working group headed by Jennifer Ward (Director, Information Technology Services & Digital Strategies) is geared towards looking at the current repository and investigating various potential improvements.

Jewell explained UW’s current repository is run through open source software “DSpace.” He noted being open source, the software is open to customization, but also has limitations. He mentioned his group has noticed a trend of other institutions moving away from utilizing “DSpace.”

Jewell mentioned that his group is considering what is in the archive, the functions of the repository, and comparing these to what is available. He noted they are looking into continued use of the “DSpace” platform, but with some improvements (such as upgrading to the newest version of “DSpace” to boost the power of the software) (5.1). Jewell noted migrating to repository software “Fedora Hydra” is another option. He explained “bepress” is a commercial product, and is also very popular. He noted using commercial software means relying on a company to maintain the repository, which includes additional continued costs.

Jewell explained “Symplectic Elements” is another software option that is popular, and is being looked into by the working committees. He explained there is a tool included in the software that generates a list of faculty researchers, searches them against other repository databases, and returns useful information. He explained with some behind-the-scenes work, the repository may be able to formulate faculty research “profiles.” Jewell noted “Symplectic Elements” boasts 4 to 5 times more repository usage by faculty after implementation. They are also looking at how easy it would be to connect “Symplectic Elements” to the website “VIVO” - a popular networking tool used by researchers.

Jewell explained repository costs are another important consideration in making a final decision. He noted “bepress” software has an estimated cost of \$66,000 annually, Symplectic, \$80,000. He noted if the UW continues to use open source software, there will be a need to fund ongoing management.

West explained that pairing with web giant Amazon may be beneficial, noting that company may be the catalyst for a shared network of repositories that are able to mine each other’s data. He noted “Symplectic Elements” is good software too, and may require a full-time staffed position to manage it. West noted he is wary of using a commercial software, as well.

Lattemann noted the appearance and aesthetic design of the repository is important. She explained she would like to see a link on the front webpage of the UW to the repository, and that the repository itself should be incredibly easy to use, and to comprehend. She noted she believes it is important to talk to as many faculty members as possible in discovering the ideal repository design, and the aforementioned faculty surveys may be integral in this work.

Lattemann asked about the “bepress” software experience at UW Tacoma, where it has been in use for some time. Additionally, Nicoletta asked how UW Tacoma’s repository is to be integrated to the parent UW repository once implemented, seeing as they have their own. Jewell noted this is a good question, and has yet to be investigated. He explained he has not heard how the repository has been received at UW Tacoma, either. One member explained one can visit “faculty pages” through the “bepress” software, and there is also a dashboard element highlighting recent downloads and other information.

Lattemann asked where in the university budget money for the repository would come from. It was noted the location of the funds is unknown.

Lattemann explained she and the Council would like to help as much as possible in this effort. Aamot noted they are working through the questions and other faculty feedback received. Lattemann explained the FCUL would be happy to take questions from Aamot and the group, explaining she is open to beginning a dialogue between the Council and the working committee.

Jewell then presented the Open Access Policy draft devised by the working group. He noted they mainly used FCR’s Open Access Class C resolution from the faculty senate to frame this draft. He explained this is a draft policy, and numbered headings were incorporated throughout passages to facilitate discussion.

Deardorff explained information in the policy is cut down and condensed, and the adjoining FAQ will include more details (Exhibit 3). There were questions of the policy’s brevity, and the FAQ was noted as a good piece of supplementary material. Jewell explained they are not necessarily going to “revolutionize the publishing system” through this policy, referring to the notion that some scholarly article publishers have become an object of dislike and disapproval in some university communities. He explained the group researched as many other open access policies currently in use as they were able. He noted the Harvard open access policy is often used as a template at other institutions. He explained the University of California (UC) open access policy is unique and progressive in that it recently extended itself to alternative UC employees and community members separate from faculty.

Jewell explained the working group is taking pieces and ideas from the policies they like, and building a policy geared only towards UW faculty. He explained it is a repository-based policy, which works through the repository to make the scholarly works available. He noted the policy concerns research articles, and scholarly articles, and these purposely were not explicitly defined. He explained “peer-reviewed articles” are not seen in the policy, as this language is too specific.

Jewell noted that faculty will not relinquish their copyright to their scholarly work but will grant a non-exclusive license to the university to distribute their works. He explained the limited grant of rights would override any agreement a faculty member would subsequently sign with a publisher, and that the policy may be referred to if a publisher attempts to place an embargo on a faculty member’s work. Jewell clarified rights can be granted back to a faculty member to legally allow them to post copies of their articles on their webpages. Some publisher agreements disallow this act, it was noted.

The Council and guests looked at pieces of the draft open access policy in detail and discussion was held. It was noted section 2.1.1 comes from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) open access

policy, and the working group was not sure this information needed to be incorporated in the document. It was noted section 3.1 makes clear that if a faculty member does not wish to make a work available to others, they are not required to do so.

Jewell explained one of the nice features of “Symplectic Elements” is that they incorporate relevant open access policy information with the repository. He noted 5.1 and 5.2 will be revised with FCR concerns taken into consideration (a similar presentation was given to FCR in a recent meeting). It was noted the UW Attorney General’s branch will also be consulted with to a greater degree, as suggested by the FCR.

Lattermann explained she wonders about reviewing the policy within 3 years of adoption, as stated in the policy. The members agreed to take another look at the statement.

Jewell explained they want to have more conversations with FCUL in the future about their work on the draft policy. He explained if FCUL members have feedback for adjoining open access policy FAQ, the working group would benefit largely from receiving it.

The Council thanked the guests for presenting and for their work, and the guests left the meeting.

4) Discussion of rescheduling missed UW Bothell libraries tour

Lattermann noted due to power outages at Bothell UW during the day of the last-scheduled FCUL meeting in November to be held at that campus, the meeting was cancelled. She noted that meeting has currently been rescheduled for February 10th, 2016. It was noted power outages occur at Bothell UW often. No concerns were noted with the newly scheduled date.

5) Adjourn

Lattermann adjourned the meeting at 3:26 p.m.

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

Present: **Faculty:** Dianne Lattermann (chair), Randall Leveque, Julie Nicoletta, Jevin West, Betty Bekemeier
Ex-officio reps: Suzanne Redalje, Ellen Barker, Beth Kerr, Juliya Ziskina
Guests: Gordon Aamot, Thom Deardorff, Cynthia Fugate, Tim Jewell

Absent: **Faculty:** Lauro Flores, Trent Hill, Clay Mountcastle, Carole Lee, Kristin Gustafson
Ex-officio reps: N/A
President’s designee: Betsy Wilson

Exhibits

Exhibit 1 – 151112 OA Policy Draft (002).docx

Exhibit 2 – Open Access Initiative Timeline DRAFT rev 2 (002)

Exhibit 3 – 151123 Open Access Policy FAQ Question List (002)

Discussion Draft UW Open Access Policy

November 12, 2015

Rationale

- 1.1 The primary mission of the University of Washington is the advancement, dissemination and preservation of knowledge.
- 1.2 The Faculty of the University of Washington is committed to disseminating its research and scholarship as widely as possible.
 - 1.2.1 As a public university, the University of Washington is dedicated to making its research and scholarship readily available to the people of Washington.
 - 1.2.2 The Faculty recognizes the benefits that accrue to them as individual scholars and to the larger scholarly enterprise from wide dissemination of its research and scholarship, including greater visibility, impact, use, recognition, more thorough review, consideration and critique, and a general increase in scientific, scholarly and critical knowledge.
- 1.3 In keeping with that commitment, the Faculty endorses the following Open Access policy for all scholarly articles authored or coauthored by persons while members of the Faculty.
 - 1.3.1. The University of Washington further recognizes that by such a policy, UW Faculty authors of scholarly articles can more easily and collectively reserve rights that might otherwise be signed away, often unnecessarily, in agreements with publishers.

Policy and Grant of Rights

- 2.1 Faculty grant to the UW a non-exclusive, irrevocable, worldwide license to exercise, and to allow others to exercise, any and all rights under copyright relating to his or her scholarly articles, in any medium, provided that the articles are not sold for a profit, for the purpose of making their articles freely and widely available in an open access repository.
 - 2.1.1 Any other systematic uses of the articles by the University of Washington must be approved by the Faculty Senate.
 - 2.1.2 This policy does not transfer copyright ownership, which generally remains with Faculty authors under Section 2.B. of [University of Washington Executive Order 36: Patent, Invention, and Copyright Policy](#).

Scope and Waiver

- 3.1 This policy applies to all scholarly articles authored or co-authored while a person is a member of the Faculty except for articles completed before the adoption of this policy.

- 3.2 The Provost or Provost's designate will waive this requirement or delay access for a specified period of time for a particular article upon express direction by the Faculty member.

Deposit of Articles

- 4.1 To assist the University in making their scholarly articles available and preserving them, Faculty will supply to the University an electronic copy of each authored or co-authored article or a link to an openly accessible copy of that article, no later than the article's publication date. Acceptable forms of each article are the "final author's version post peer review" or, when allowed by the publisher, the "final published version."

Implementation and Oversight of Policy

- 5.1 The Faculty Senate and the University of Washington will be jointly responsible for implementing this policy, resolving disputes concerning its interpretation and application, and recommending any changes to the Faculty.
- 5.2 The Faculty Senate, the Provost, and/or Provost's designate will review the policy within three years of adoption, and present a report to the Faculty and to the University of Washington.

DRAFT

Open Access Initiative Timeline – November 24, 2015 DRAFT

Open Access Policy and Open Access Initiative Advisory Group	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	June
Finalize OA Initiative Advisory Group membership (OAIAG)	x	x							
Develop draft UW OA policy for discussion	x	x							
Discuss draft OA policy with OAIAG Discuss related issues with OAIAG (as questions come up)			x x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Digital Repository Working Group									
Digital Repository WG survey – help develop, pre-test, and administer	x	x	x						
Focus Group/s – follow up to survey questions			x	x	x				
Improve ResearchWorks – upgrade DSpace to latest version, new UI, review policies to remove barriers	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Repository Development – determine desired features, evaluate options	x	x	x	x	x	x			
Meetings with Senate Faculty Councils and Leadership									
Meet with FCUL – outreach, solicit feedback and advice			x	x	x				
Meet with FCR – outreach, solicit feedback and advice			x	x	x				
Touch base with Faculty Senate leadership – update, outreach, solicit advice and feedback. Give them a preview draft of recommended policy.				x	x	x			
Legal/Administrative aspects of policy implementation. Exec Order #36 Need to consult with combined IPMAC/SCIPC, and others			x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Communication and Assessment									
Communication – article in UW Today (overview of OA, interview w/ Tim & Betsy?)						x	x	x	
Communication – updates on Libraries Scholarly Communication webpage	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Communication – content for Subject Librarians to forward to departments				x	x	x	x	x	
Triennial Survey for faculty Spring Quarter 2016 – develop OA question/s				x	x	x			
Recommendations for Faculty Senate									
Finalize OA policy and repository recommendations, budget, and supporting			x	x	x	x x			

documentation. Make recommendations to Faculty Senate by 3/28/16									
Be available to work with Faculty Senate and others during discussions							x	x	x
Research Data and the Repository									
Meet with IPMAC/ SCIPC – discuss concerns, solicit advice			x	x	x				
Meet with CoMotion - discuss concerns, solicit advice			x	x	x				

DRAFT

The Open Access Policy

What is Open Access?

What is ResearchWorks?

What is the purpose of the policy?

How was the OA policy developed?

What are the terms of the UW Open Access Policy and what do I have to do?

What is the scope of the policy?

Are other universities implementing similar policies?

Who will monitor the implementation of the policy?

Publisher Issues

Will this change the terms of any publication agreement I sign?

What are waivers and delayed access?

How will publishers be made aware of the UW policy?

What if a publisher refuses to publish my article because of prior permission given to the UW under the policy?

Do I need to pay the publisher for open access?

Do I need to get permission from my co-authors to comply with the policy?

Submission of Articles

What is the process for submitting my articles to ResearchWorks?

What if my article is already openly available?

Which version should I submit?

Can I make my work openly accessible if I have copyrighted images?

Who can I contact if I have questions?

ResearchWorks Access and Metrics

Once the work is openly available what uses are allowed?

How will people find my article?

What metrics are provided on article use?