

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON  
FACULTY COUNCIL ON UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES  
TUESDAY, March 10, 2009, 3:00-4:30 p.m.  
Petersen Room, Allen Library

Chair Charles Wilkinson called the meeting to order at 3:02 p.m.

**Meeting Synopsis:**

1. Review and approval of minutes from meeting of February 26, 2009
  2. University Libraries' update — Lizabeth Wilson, Dean of University Libraries
  3. Presentation and discussion of the current draft of the Scholarly Communication Committee's resolution on authors' rights — Charles Wilkinson, Chair, SCC
  4. Presentation of new developments in the UW institutional repository — Ann Lally, Head, Digital Initiatives, University Libraries
- 

**1. Review and approval of minutes from meeting of February 26, 2009**

Chair Wilkinson called for any changes to the minutes of February 26, 2009. Hearing none, the minutes were approved as submitted.

**2. University Libraries' update — Lizabeth Wilson, Dean of University Libraries**

Dean Wilson gave a brief update on the Libraries' budget cutting scenario submitted to the Provost. She thanked council members for their input.

Wilson announced that she will chair the 14<sup>th</sup> annual meeting of the national conference of the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL). The conference begins tomorrow, and Seattle will host about 3,000 academic librarians in what Wilson described will be a "fabulous" event.

**3. Presentation and discussion of the current draft of the Scholarly Communication Committee's resolution on authors' rights — Charles Wilkinson, Chair, SCC**

Chair Wilkinson gave an update on an idea raised in a previous council discussion to create a list of all the journal editors. He reported that Tim Jewell has started on it, after Dean Wilson met with a group of administrators to discuss the idea. Wilkinson explained that the Graduate School, the Libraries, and the Office of Research are all sponsoring a Catalyst survey to be sent to all faculty asking about their research. He noted that they hope to generate a list of names with the idea of getting editors together to find out about their issues concerning open access and scholarly publication. It was suggested that the survey should include room for more than one journal as well as past and present editors.

Wilkinson also updated members on the draft resolution for scholarly communication at UW. He noted that the document is in its final form after the Scholarly Communication Committee passed it by acclamation. Wilkinson asked members to read the document over carefully in order to discuss and vote on it today.

Wilkinson noted the committee's attempts to remove references to open access because it was felt it was a trigger word that promoted resistance. He also explained that the committee was aware of differences across disciplines, and that they wanted to specifically include publishing in moderately priced journals as well as professional society journals, and in peer-reviewed open access journals. The document is meant to encourage faculty to be aware of their publishing choices and their rights, and to investigate the journal policies in which they publish or review for. Wilkinson responded to a question about finding information on journals by pointing to the resolution that states that the Libraries "is encouraged to provide relevant, current information regarding journal publishers, pricing, and authors' rights to departments and individual faculty members." He pointed out that this is a multi-level effort on the part of the faculty, the administration, and the Libraries.

Isabelle Bichindaritz asked about financial support for faculty in programs to publish in open works. A discussion began about how the wording might be improved in the last resolution that requests the UW administration to "provide resources to the Libraries in support of these efforts." It was decided that they should add "academic units" after Libraries in the resolution. Another suggestion was to replace the phrase "in support of" with "is encouraged to" in order to make the university administration more proactive in the process. A discussion began around the issue of departments that only look at the top-tiered journals in the tenure review process. Wilkinson noted that all they can do is encourage because they can't tell departments how to conduct their tenure process. A point was made that the price of journals and the policies of open access publishing are not widely known and faculty need to be educated.

Wilkinson reviewed the process for the resolution which will go before the Faculty Council on Research (co-sponsor of the resolution), the Senate Executive Committee, and if approved, the Faculty Senate. Just by presenting it, the document will function as an educational tool. Wilkinson noted that if it raises questions or controversy, it's worth it. He added that it has become a milder document than he had first envisioned, in part because they made efforts to incorporate various viewpoints. Wilson suggested that the timing for the resolution is good especially in light of the large number of journal cancellations that will likely occur with the budget cuts. One other suggestion was offered to replace the word "requested" in the last resolution ("the University of Washington administration is requested to"), to "encouraged."

**Action:** With no other comments, Wilkinson called for a motion to approve the class C Resolution with the recommended changes. The motion was made, and seconded. The motion carried as amended.

#### **4. Presentation of new developments in the UW institutional repository — Ann Lally, Head, Digital Initiatives, University Libraries**

Ann Lally, Head, Digital Initiatives, University Libraries, spoke to the council about changes being made to the institutional repository. She reported that the Digital Repository Steering Committee has met to discuss issues related to developing the repository. Lally projected the *ResearchWorks* webpage for

council members to see. She noted that finding *ResearchWorks* was the top problem and that another way to announce it would be through the Spotlight corner of the webpage, if the resolution passes. She also pointed to the collections page on the left side of the screen as another link. Lally explained the current challenges she faces in making the repository work for faculty members, including the fact that before being able to use it, a user must register and be added to a group with permission to submit to the repository, a process that is too time consuming. She noted that she will be working with Anjanette Young, Systems Librarian, Libraries Information Technology Services, to pre-populate the repository. A concern was raised about potential problems in populating research from the Medical School. Wilson suggested that Lally's group contact the Office of Sponsored Programs because they work with the electronic grants form, GC1, which knows the department protocol. She felt that Lally's group may be able to use that database.

Lally briefly addressed suggestions for the repository, such as "paper of the day" and pre-populating the community of departments. Her concern for the latter idea was that there would be many departments with zero papers in the repository because they weren't participating yet, which wouldn't look good. Lally was asked about the paper-a-week idea and how they would be selected. She noted that they would probably try to work through each department as they had papers available to publish. Lally also explained how the repository will hold more than formal papers, and will include data sets, images, and files. She noted that UW-Bothell and UW-Tacoma could easily be added to the repository, and that papers submitted from faculty in different programs can be mapped to both programs. Wilkinson asked if faculty members are the ones responsible for getting permission to deposit. Lally noted that they must verify they have permission to submit. She pointed out that the current process for submitting work to the repository is quite onerous and they are working to simplify the submission process. Lally said her committee discussed the idea of a "creative common license" that would allow faculty to tell people what they can do with their work, and that it can be cited. This agreement would need to be established before submitting it for publication.

Wilkinson asked Lally if she could give any kind of demonstration at the next SEC meeting, April 6<sup>th</sup>. Lally said she could show what she has, but nothing from the pre-populated pieces. Lally was encouraged to make the repository as prominent as possible to facilitate finding it again. Wilson noted that the Libraries will do an organized promotion for the repository to really push it for faculty. Wilkinson noted that in revising the resolution the committee made a point to refer to the repository as UW's *ResearchWorks*.

MacLachlan asked what would motivate a scholar to put his work in the repository. Wilkinson noted that the primary motivation would be the increase in citations through a Google search. The primary goal of the repository is published works, but working drafts will also be accepted. Other values of the repository include the service it provides to the whole university community, as well as the preservation issue, since many works will no longer be accessible due to the budget cuts. Lally was asked whether it was possible to have parallel classification schemes, one for papers, drafts, and research works, and another for peer-reviewed papers. Wilkinson asked if it was worth having a separate section just for published papers. Lally noted that searched papers will indicate they are from UW *ResearchWorks*. She indicated that it might be possible to put in a peer reviewed indicator. She demonstrated use of the Google Scholar search, and explained the structure of the repository system. It was suggested that whatever structure they

use that they make certain it is clear, and that it indicates the purpose and quality of the data presented. Mark Kot inquired whether faculty members will have the right to remove something that they have added to the repository. Lally explained that it will be considered on a case-by-case basis.

Wilkinson thanked Ann Lally for her presentation to the council. He also noted that the resolution needs an explanatory paragraph to help faculty understand why they will benefit from the repository and why they should support the idea behind it.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:12 p.m.

*Minutes by Melissa Kane, Faculty Senate, mmkane@u.washington.edu*

**Present: Faculty:** Laird, Kot, Retman, MacLachlan, Cooper, Wilkinson (Chair), Seaburg, Bichindaritz

**President's Designee:** Wilson

**Ex Officio Reps:** Thornton, Barker

**Absent: Faculty:** Diment, Mitchell

**Ex Officio Reps:** Banerjee, Song

**Regularly Invited Guests:** Chamberlin

**Special Guest:** Ann Lally, Head, Digital Initiatives, University Libraries