

Library Advisory Committee Meeting
Minutes
December 3, 2013: 4:00
Conference Room, Roy O. West Library

Present: Larry Stimpert (VPAA), Terri Bonebright (Dean of Faculty), Geoff Klinger (Chair), David Gellman, Brian Howard, Rick Provine, Bruce Sanders

- I. Geoff opened the meeting by volunteering to take the minutes of our committee meetings. The committee agreed.

- II. Geoff then turned the meeting over to Rick and Larry.
 - A. Rick offered a brief overview of the Open Access policy.
 - B. Larry began by talking about the status of the library. He noted that his reaction to a self-tour of the campus and library with the reaction: “You’ve got to be kidding; this is not a top tier library for a top tier campus.” He noted that there was no place for library renovations in current campaign priorities, but that it is now back on the list.
 - C. Larry next turned his attention to the Open Access policy. He noted the academic wide bias for faculty to publish in top-tier academic journals. He noted that there is never a question about signing over copyright privileges to journals in Economics. He also noted that page fees are also standard practice in a lot of disciplines. He said that Open Access raises a lot of important questions.
 - D. Larry noted that the working document, as it is currently written, seems to contain some contradictory language about the revocability of author’s rights to their work (specifically paragraphs 1 & 3). He says that while he believes the goal is worthy, he is not certain about the current lay of the land insofar as this issue is concerned.
 - E. Rick noted that in many ways, critics of Open Access employ a moving target. That is fed by the fact that the entire operation is in a transitional state. He said that the key to the entire movement is to have faculty authors keep their intellectual property rights. He also noted that a ‘critical mass’ is developing, and that large publishers are taking note. He also noted that the move to Open Access does not mean the death of peer review, or professional societies.
 - F. Rick continued that a number of journals are now allowing authors to keep their intellectual property rights (often with a fee).
 - G. Bruce added that big publishers are already starting to open up options on this front in order to appease the impetus behind the Open Access movement.
 - H. Larry noted that most authors simply sign the document (assigning rights to the journal) and move on, so this is an interesting development. Larry also observed that many journals say in their call that you lose your copyright privileges in you publish in a particular journal and this effectively gives authors prior notice.

- I. Bruce said that the shift to Open Access at Harvard has opened the doors with publishers.
 - J. Brian offered an example from science whereby authors and journals now negotiate the issue, and give authors a chance to retain copyright, but usually at a cost.
 - K. David addressed what he sees as another moving target (i.e. the payment for maintaining intellectual property rights). He asked who would be expected to cover those costs. He raised the concern that in the absence of an ironclad agreement with the administration regarding support, authors might be expected to shoulder too heavy a financial burden.
 - L. Rick responded that 2/3 of Open Access journals have no up front fees, and the fact that we house the repository locally would defray any unreasonable cost.
 - M. Bruce called the committee's attention to the Cornell study that indicated that the overall saving to the subscription budget would also help defray the costs of Open Access. Rick concurred that there would not be a significant final crunch.
 - N. David raised the concern that this might eventually lead to administrators encouraging faculty to publish in certain, cheaper journals. He also expressed some concern that different schools would most likely have different levels of institutional support. Bruce relayed a story about the history and evolution of the archives.
 - O. Larry called our attention to the recent faculty forum that highlighted the shift away from academic journals to mega-publishers. That these publishers cherry picked key journals, and that we do most of their editorial work pro bono.
 - P. Bruce noted that Open Access journals are typically non-profit, and encourage green access. He also noted that we insist on keeping copyright because sometimes articles are sold to anthologies and they share their revenues with authors.
 - Q. David used a Public Radio analogy to try and understand the issues at stake. In short, the public has to give money to support these programs whether they listen to it, or not. He also reiterated a concern about the fact that this movement will undermine professional societies. He noted that humanists are not used to paying author fees. He also noted that the editorial work that we do for journals comes from a sense of professional responsibility.
- III. Geoff reoriented the discussion picking up on an earlier thread from the meeting to consider the practical concerns about administrative support of the costs associated with the shift to an Open Access model.
- A. Rick noted that we have already invested in the repository, and that some authors are already taking advantage of this. He noted that the library already absorbs the 'nuts and bolts' of the enterprise. The question about who pays for things like keeping copyright must be addressed by individual authors and the administration

- B. Terri noted that the most obvious place for this type of support is the professional development fund already in place which gives faculty members up to \$2000 a year for activities related to professional development. She also noted that the amount used to be \$5000, so less is now available.
- C. Geoff raised the question of oversight of the process. Terri noted it depends on what we mean by this. If, for example, we want quality control related to the quality of manuscripts, it will affect whom we might choose for these types of roles. The issue of staffing was raised, especially given the many responsibilities already shouldered by library employees.
- D. Geoff asked how much it costs to purchase copyright privileges from journals. Bruce responded that it often costs \$1600 to \$2000.
- E. Terri asked how many people had requested funding for Open Access in the past. Rick responded only 1 to date.
- F. Terri reassured the committee that the administration would work with people through grants and the like to support such initiatives, and that her office remains willing to work with authors on an 'ad hoc' basis.
- G. Bruce noted that the entire movement is essentially a 'shot across the bow' on this big for profit publishers, and that Hope, Oberlin, Harvard, and the entire UC system has moved to an Open Access model.

IV. Larry then turned the discussion to library renovations.

- A. Larry noted that before renovations begin, we would need to first secure a significant commitment through fundraising. The desire is to avoid borrowing a significant portion of project funding. Current fundraising efforts hope to raise \$180 million, and that the stretch goal of the campaign is the reach \$250-300 million.
- B. Larry also noted that many areas of campus have already received attention: Emison, Anderson Street, the Union Building, the Athletic facilities, and the Dining Hall.
- C. Larry identified to priorities in any proposed library renovations: First, a renovation of the library proper, and second, support for the archives (which is now housed in different buildings across campus).
- D. Larry said that it is important not to jump the gun and make sure that we do this renovation 'right.' An important part of this is involving the faculty early in the process. He said that when you have input from all relevant stakeholders, the overall project improves tremendously.
- E. Larry noted that we are currently in a state of flux insofar as fundraising efforts are concerned, and noted that it is difficult to raise funds without first having schematics and renderings in place. The typical time line is 2-3 between we first begin to cultivate donors for a specific project, and when the actual work is done.
- F. Larry said that we may have identified a primary donor, and are currently making the case for this undertaking. The administration's overall pitch is that we want to develop a 21st Century undergraduate library facility. To

that end, Larry called for a working group to prepare these preliminary renderings to help cultivate additional donors. Again, he emphasized the importance of faculty input in this process.

- G. The committee then turned our attention to specific needs that should be addressed in any renovation. The committee identified group study areas, technological development, and asked whether it would be prudent to move the Academic Resource Center to the library.
- H. Brian asked how the previous plans to renovate the library that were developed 5-6 years ago might be relevant to our current discussions. Rick answered that 'none of it' is still relevant. He stated that the pieces have all changed from our consideration of the same 8 years ago. He indicated his desire to work with new consultants in the process.
- I. Terri said that this must be an open conversation, and that maybe we should revisit moving the Academic Resource Center to the library because, among other things, Asbury is currently 'bursting at the seams.' David noted that the library is 'where the action is' so there may be a sound reason to move the ARC to the library.
- J. David said he is not sure what the key issue is about the current state of the library; its difficult to put into words, its more like a feeling. This prompted Larry to ask the question: "What are we missing?" He continued: the library looks kind of 'dumpy' on the outside. Inside, however, he finds serious students hard at work. He said it feels like a 'working class' library. He also noted that there is no focal point, or an inspirational place that draws people in and makes them feel like they are some place important.
- K. Rick agreed that parts of the library are 'dumpy': the carpet is worn, the furniture used, and that there is no drama/aesthetic with boring spaces and windows/natural light.
- L. Larry noted that originally libraries were built to hold things so that walls were largely superficial (like warehouses). With the shifting purpose of the library, many of those walls can be reconfigured to open space and welcome natural light.
- M. Larry gave the following charge to the committee insofar as library renovations are concerned: solicit faculty input, work with the architects, and encourage conversations among all relevant stakeholders.
- N. Geoff asked when the best time to hold open meetings would be for this process. Larry suggested waiting until the initial meetings with the architects.
- O. Terri reminded the committee that the campus wide focus on sustainability must be included in the conversation.
- P. Larry expressed his optimism about the project reiterating that we have secured some financial resources that can be devoted to the preliminary stages of the project, especially for schematic work and renderings. Rick and Larry noted that preliminary work with the architects might begin as early as Winter Term.

V. The meeting was adjourned at 5:13.

