Meeting Synopsis:

1. Call to order
2. Open Access Policy
3. Discussion of FCR ABB survey results & drafting of ABB report to ABB Review Committee and UW Board of Deans and Chancellors
4. Vote on Classified Contract Waiver
5. Good of the order
6. Adjourn

1) Call to order

Rosenfeld called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

2) Open Access Policy

Rosenfeld explained in the 2015-2016 academic year, the FCR put forth a Class C resolution on Open Access to the faculty senate, which called on the UW libraries to begin an investigation with the intention of developing a university-wide open access policy and improving the existing open access repository (Researchworks).

Tim Jewell (Scholarly Publishing Librarian, University Libraries) and Thom Deardorff (University Libraries Copyright Officer) explained they are on the University Libraries Open Access committee (along with Gordon Aamot), and are tasked with drafting a university-wide open access policy and investigating possible ways to improve or replace the university’s repository.

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 Dianne Lattemann (chair, FCUL), Rosenfeld (chair, FCR) and Kate O’Neill (former chair, faculty senate) have been integral in focusing his, 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.

Jewell then presented the Open Access Policy draft devised by the working group. He noted they mainly used Open Access Class C resolution passed in 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 noted 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 nonexclusive 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.

**Council feedback**

Slattery asked if anyone from the UW branch of the Washington Attorney General’s Office (AG) is working with the open access committee on this draft, the guests noted no, but that they would consult with the AG’s office.

There was some discussion of including the word “profit” in the draft and if its inclusion was necessary. It was noted defining the role of the faculty senate within the policy is not advisable, and the term should be left out of the policy until the faculty senate can be consulted over its inclusion.

It was noted there is an elaborate mechanism that faculty follow for dispute resolution, and information need not be included in the policy on this process.

A member noted section 5.2 of the policy needs to be further defined, and this would be a good area to consult with the AG’s office over.
Council members thanked the guests for attending the meeting and presenting. Rosenfeld noted the role of the FCR is to help out in way possible with the work of the OA committee. Jewell and Deardorff noted they would keep the council updated on their work as it continues.

3) Discussion of FCR ABB survey results & drafting of ABB report to ABB Review Committee and UW Board of Deans and Chancellors

Rosenfeld explained results from the FCR’s ABB (Activity-based Budgeting) survey have been received. He explained the council was asked for a report on ABB by the end of fall quarter 2015. He noted he would draft the first draft of the report, inviting members to vet this once completed, at which point it will be forwarded on to the ABB Review Committee and the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting (SCPB).

He noted the survey received 785 responses, and of those, 45% of the responding faculty expressed that they were not familiar with the ABB funding model. It was noted faculty who teach to a lesser degree would likely have a lesser knowledge of ABB. It was requested that the final report include information that nearly half the responding faculty had little knowledge of ABB.

There was some discussion of results. It was noted some responses expressed that ABB correlated with declining interdisciplinary and collaborative research, though these comments were not the majority. There were also some positive comments relating to ABB. Most faculty seemed to express a neutral stance.

Rosenfeld explained he would communicate with the council electronically over the ABB report. It was noted the survey results should be made available to the UW Office of Research.

4) Vote on Classified Contract Waiver

It was noted the APL-UW (Applied Physics Laboratory) has forwarded a restricted contract for the council to review. Rosenfeld explained the PI on the contract is Geoff Cram. The contract will include confidential material that will not be openly published.

It was noted the title of the contract is “Desktop Study on improving Sustainability, Maintainability, and Data Availability of CTBTO Hydroacoustic Stations,” and it is based in upgrading and studying hydroacoustic stations.

The FCR subcommittee responsible for conducting preliminary reviews of restricted contracts has recommended approval of the request.

The contract was approved by the FCR by a majority vote.

5) Good of the order
It was noted the council will provide any additional comments on the open access presentation back to Tim Jewell and the OA working committee. Moreover, a preliminary ABB report will be drafted, and then finalized electronically by members before being forwarded to the appropriate parties.

6) Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 10:12 a.m.
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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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open Access Policy and Open Access Initiative Advisory Group</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finalize OA Initiative Advisory Group membership (OAIAG)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop draft UW OA policy for discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss draft OA policy with OAIAG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss related issues with OAIAG (as questions come up)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Digital Repository Working Group</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Digital Repository WG survey – help develop, pre-test, and administer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Group/s – follow up to survey questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve ResearchWorks – upgrade DSpace to latest version, new UI, review policies to remove barriers</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repository Development – determine desired features, evaluate options</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meetings with Senate Faculty Councils and Leadership</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meet with FCUL – outreach, solicit feedback and advice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet with FCR – outreach, solicit feedback and advice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Touch base with Faculty Senate leadership – update, outreach, solicit advice and feedback. Give them a preview draft of recommended policy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal/Administrative aspects of policy implementation. Exec Order #36 Need to consult with combined IPMAC/SCIPC, and others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication and Assessment</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication – article in UW Today (overview of OA, interview w/ Tim &amp; Betsy?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication – updates on Libraries Scholarly Communication webpage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication – content for Subject Librarians to forward to departments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triennial Survey for faculty Spring Quarter 2016 – develop OA question/s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations for Faculty Senate</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finalize OA policy and repository recommendations, budget, and supporting documentation. Make recommendations to Faculty Senate by 3/28/16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be available to work with Faculty Senate and others during discussions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research Data and the Repository</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet with IPMAC/ SCIPC – discuss concerns, solicit advice</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet with CoMotion - discuss concerns, solicit advice</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 is 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?