Meeting Synopsis:

1) Call to order & introductions
Lattemann called the meeting to order at 2:33 p.m. The council convened by introducing all members and guests. Ben Marwick, a member of the Faculty Council on Research (FCR), was present to discuss an Open Access Initiative.

2) Approval of the agenda
The agenda was approved as written.

3) Approval of the minutes from December 10th, 2014
Two small grammatical errors were corrected by the council, and the minutes from December 10th, 2014 were approved as amended.

4) Update from the Dean
Vice-Provost Betsy Wilson, the Dean of University Libraries, was present to give a few updates to the council. She noted on January 8th, all 37 members of the ORBIS Cascade Alliance (comprised of 37 institutions across Oregon, Idaho, and Washington) completed the move to a new system, and can now start building collaborative services and programs on top of that. She noted she will continue to give regular updates on the workings of the new system. She also noted that David R. Montgomery, UW professor of earth sciences, best-selling author and noted scientist, will be present to give a public lecture at the Friends of the UW Libraries annual meeting on January 29, and she urged all members to attend.

5) Presentation/discussion on Open Access issues for faculty (Exhibit 1)
Ben Marwick was present to provide some information to the FCUL concerning open access, and the proposal he and his constituents would hope to put forward to become university-wide policy. He
provided a hand-out which explains some details of open access and its benefits and effects, as well as its history. A major goal of Ben’s presentation was to bring UW Libraries staff and FCUL up-to-date on discussion around the issue of open access publishing by UW faculty, which is being simultaneously considered by multiple UW faculty councils and committees.

He noted that in 2007 the research office released a statement supporting the idea of open access, and in 2009, the faculty senate approved Class-C Legislation which encouraged endorsed, and generally recommended open access at the UW. He noted that the GPSS will be voting on a proposal to endorse open access at the UW on January 14th.

Marwick noted he was present to speak on open access publishing by UW faculty at the Faculty Council on Research earlier that same day, and a faculty member from the Law School, Sean O’Connor, was also present and expressed some concerns and questions. O’Connor is the chair of IPMAC. Ben found that the other members of FCR did not find the problems to be insurmountable, and they expressed interest in proceeding with Marwick’s planning. Marwick noted he had also spoken with the chair of the Faculty Senate, Kate O’Neill. She made it clear she did not want to wait to take action in the Senate on this matter. Marwick noted he is expecting some pullback from the Law School. He explained that O’Connor had some concerns with open access because he believes it to be flawed and legally inoperable. He preferred Marwick wait for information from IPMAC before proceeding.

Marwick noted Mike Rosenfeld, chair of Faculty Council on Research, will be going to the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) to ask that folks go back to their constituents, and come back with feedback and thoughts on open access publishing at the UW. Marwick explained he welcomes questions and comments from the council.

Concerns / Licensing

West began and thanked Marwick for spearheading this movement. He asked which questions O’Connor had made in the FCR meeting. Marwick replied they were mostly tied to licensing issues and questions.

Costs

Marwick asked the FCUL about the associated costs of doing open access. In December one of the members from FCR said it might cost a million dollars a year to make this manageable at the UW. Members agreed this sounded a bit high. One of the prominent costs would be looking through previous agreements from faculty members and looking at their previously published documents. It was that noted added staff time and support costs have to be taken into account for this sort of procedure, on top of automated services costs. A note was made there is a subscription service system that identifies people who should be contacted and notifies them automatically. Someone noted you could call institutions of similar size and ask them about associated costs. A point came up that a call was made to the Cal Digital Library manager, who also manages their repository. This person noted they use an automated program because the submission process was very onerous, and they didn’t receive a large amount of submissions because of this fact. A note was made that if a presumed number of publications in a year could be estimated, all cost models could flow from that number. Someone noted costs would likely vary between schools and units. The cost will have to include people’s time to implement the repository. Someone who is a prolific author will need notifications very often. Repository maintenance and update will cost a substantial sum, it was also noted.
Marwick noted that to make open access attractive, it could use metrics for authors to see how often their documents get seen by viewers. West, a faculty member in the Information school, would be interested in seeing if some students or others in the Information School would like to build a prototype for this sort of system, which shows how often published works are seen and provides a major incentive to the faculty member for endorsing open access. He noted this prototype would not be full-scale. He noted they could use help funding to pay someone to work on this prototype during the summer. West noted they have their own way of tracking all output from the information school’s faculty and students, which is like a repository in a way.

Someone noted it is a good idea to build something interesting enough that faculty want to sign off on this. Discussion ensued on perhaps this being an interface-driven model that shows when new documents or articles are published by colleagues. Lattemann noted that this a very good idea. West again noted the Information school might be able to help in building a prototype in a short time.

It was noted another way to make this attractive could be simply providing a web interface that acts like a sort of feed – showing new publications and other bits of information as they happen in one place, instead of all over the web as it is currently.

West noted he knows some folks who run SSRN (a multi-disciplinary online repository of scholarly research and related materials) one of them being a man called Ralph Dandrea, who could possibly build something. Someone noted departments might be interested in getting their publications into the repository and doing the work behind that if they had an incentive to do so. Someone agreed this method yields better results than forcing units to abide by new rules. Someone noted that another institution encouraged its departments to upload all former publications, even ones from the further past.

Lattemann asked for any other thoughts, or ideas, to which there were none. Marwick noted it is good for the idea to move around the councils before it goes on to the Senate Executive Committee.

6) Tour of the Data Science Studio

The council took a tour of the recently remodeled data science studio. The studio is on the 6th floor of the Physics and Astronomy building and encourages collaborative work between students, data scientists, data librarians, researchers, and professors by way of its design.

7) Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 3:50 p.m.

---
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