Meeting Synopsis:

1) Call to Order
2) Approval of the minutes from January 4\textsuperscript{th}, 2015
3) Review of the Status of the Open Access Repository Proposal & the Role of the FCR.
4) Good of the Order
5) Adjourn

1) Call to Order

Rosenfeld called the meeting to order at 9:10 a.m.

2) Approval of the Minutes from January 14\textsuperscript{th}, 2015

The minutes from January 14\textsuperscript{th}, 2015 were approved as written.

3) Review of the Status of the Open Access Repository Proposal & the Role of the FCR.

Marwick explained he and other proponents of an increased open access policy at the UW have been listening to faculty about their opinions on the notion in order to gain further awareness of the campus opinion. He noted there is reluctance from some faculty to yield any sort of rights or license to the university with regards to their published works. Additionally, Marwick noted Sean O’Connor, chair of IPMAC, believes there are problems with copyrights and patenting, and has expressed concern over the legality of an opt-out open access university-wide policy. Rosenfeld explained that O’Connor is a lawyer who knows copyright law very well, as it is his main legal specialty. Marwick noted O’Connor is in favor of increased open access and he believes rewriting EO36 (Executive Order 36) may be one way to make the policy legally sound. Nonetheless, it was noted O’Connor has stated there are legal security issues.

Rosenfeld noted that there are many universities around the United States that have university-wide open access policies, and that the UC system has had university-wide open access fully functioning for some time, which, notably, was implemented by way of their faculty senate.

Marwick noted IPMAC has formed a subcommittee to further address open access and the idea of a university-wide policy. Tim Jewell (Director, Information Resources & Scholarly Communication) and Marwick are taking part in the meetings of this subcommittee. Marwick noted he will continue in efforts to increase the use of open access at the UW. He explained Faculty Senate Chair Kate O’Neill noted
faculty leadership would still like to strengthen awareness on open access to the faculty, despite questions surrounding licensing. Rosenfeld added that the Faculty Council on University Libraries (FCUL) has stated they support increased open access. He explained “there is movement already.”

Marwick noted the Attorney General’s office has gotten back with their response concerning open access and legal issues. He noted he asked the office for input, and they referred Marwick to IPMAC and SCIPC, two bodies that advise the UW on intellectual property and licensing. Marwick responded to the AG’s office and asked for input explicitly from them. However, the administrative assistant in that office explained they could not schedule a meeting for some time (the exact time left unspecified). Marwick explained to the council he believes an AG lawyer and O’Connor spoke about open access at the UW frequently and have worked together looking at the possibilities and barriers in implementing a widespread policy.

It was noted the non-exclusive license (a part of the increased open access policy) is not consistent with EO36, which is a legal issue, according to O’Connor. Marwick noted his understanding of EO36 does not seem to uphold this claim. Rosenfeld noted that this implies the UW’s EO36 is not the same as other universities.

The AG’s office noted there are three ways to make open access work at the UW:

1) A “Band-Aid” job done on EO36 with conditions addressing non-exclusive rights. *The council noted they do not like this option.
2) The proposing of a policy that is a “non-policy” in the senate, noting that faculty “may” grant a non-exclusive license to the university. This changes the order of events for the granting of rights to occur after the senate resolution passes - later in the process of open access, during submittals.
3) To fully cooperate with the IPMAC process.
4) To put standing policy as it is now through the legislative process in the senate and hope for the best.

It was noted Kate O’Neill has stated faculty are not quite ready for a widespread open access policy. It was explained the Provost wants resources to go to the library for making the existing repository better, and to see its overall usage increased naturally. Marwick added Jevin West (Information School, member of FCUL) and others, are willing to contribute resources to make the repository better and more interactive.

Rosenfeld explained Tim Jewell had noted upgrades to open access software and salary for associated staff could be $100,000 per year. He continued if the Provost said no to investing in this, if faculty contributed to this, it could still be achieved. It was noted rearranging some priorities within the library was the original idea to better support open access, not adding money, which would be done by the Provost if done at all. The inflation of the library has been 7% per year. Provost noted degrading resources and upgrading costs in library, bad situation, in SEC. Rosenfeld noted provost said this is about taking back control from the publishers, our works.
* Interim step is building repository. Aragon noted if the repository is easy to work with, the faculty will use it. That is a great obstacle in the policy. Work with FCUL to draft legislation along these lines, which will put pressure on IPMAC.

Rosenfeld noted his opinion is to approach this the same way the faculty salary policy has been approached - by bringing this to the senate to create stronger awareness. Haselkorn noted he would like to draft Class C resolution to go before the senate, Aragon agreed.

Rosenfeld noted O’Neill has pulled back from this issue, and the salary policy has pulled away from this issue. Marwick agreed that it is a good idea to draft a Class C resolution. Rosenfeld agreed he wants to draft a resolution.

Haselkorn moved that members of FCR draft a Class C resolution stating the council supports an increase in library resources to create a better-working open access repository. The motion passed by a majority vote.

Rosenfeld noted he would the Faculty Council on University Libraries (FCUL) to weigh in on this discussion and possibly voice their endorsement for the resolution. He noted the councils will make efforts to combine on this initiative.

4) Good of the Order

There was nothing stated.

5) Adjourn

Rosenfeld adjourned the meeting at 9:38 am.
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