Open Access Task Force Meeting

March 25, 2014, 2:30 p.m.

Freedom Forum Room, Carroll Hall

Task Force Members Present: Bohlman, Caren, Curtain, Gilliland, Hall, Heitsch, Hemminger, Hunter, Jones, Kimbrough, Linz, Porto, Robin, Sherer, Vision, Waston, Weiboldt

Others Present: Elia (Provost's Office) Whisnant (Faculty Governance), Kiel (Center for Faculty Excellence), Boxill (Chair of the Faculty, to give the Task Force its charge, only first few minutes), Freifeld (University Counsel's office)

Task Force Members Absent: Brophy, Degener, Fraser, McGowan, Shearer

Welcome & Introductions

The Task Force received a welcome and its official charge from Jan Boxill, Chair of the Faculty. See the charter document.

Question: If we come up with something, is it binding?
Answer : If we pass something at Faculty Council, it will go forward to the implementing authority (provost's office and other entities) for activation.

We discussed the note-taking plan. Whisnant will take notes in a Google Doc, post to Sakai for comments, and when the commenting period is over, post to the public OFG committee website on the Faculty Governance website, as well as on Sakai.

Charter Document

Kimbrough discussed the charter document outlining the task force's plan of work. The charter document is posted in Sakai. Kimbrough emphasized the plan of meetings and the idea for organizing two subcommittees: survey and drafting. A research assistant may be available to assist with this work during the summer.

Vision and Kimbrough emphasized their efforts to create a diversity of membership. If people have suggestions for other departments/units that are not well represented, please send them

along. Vision noted that we do still have some holes; we can add people or consult with others if need be.

Curtain suggested representation from Physics and Philosophy, which have other pre-publication processes for circulating scholarship. Weiboldt suggested adding someone else from the School of Medicine.

Ground Rules Document

Kimbrough summarized the Ground Rules Document outlining general expectations and plans for the committee's work process, which is also posted on Sakai.

Overview of Open Access

Vision presented a set of slides outlining a typical rights-retention policy and highlighted the "Choice Points" memo (posted on Sakai) that describes specific issues that will have to be resolved when an institution considers a policy..

Vision explained that typical policies require deposit of final peer-reviewed manuscript into a university repository; by virtue of the policy, faculty have a pre-existing agreement with the university before they enter into any agreements with publishers. Typical policies have an article-by-article opt-out option. Some policies allow embargoes that delay making the article freely accessible until a later point.

Vision noted that we are not talking about books, or theses, or final published copies, but only the final peer reviewed manuscripts.

Vision explained that the success of these policies depends on how they are implemented. The ones that are most successful in terms of getting compliance (in that most documents become most freely available) require immediate deposit and link that to promotion/performance evaluation. More typical in the US is the policy that Harvard, Duke, and the University of California have, which requires immediate deposit, with embargoes or waivers possible. A third type is one where deposit is required but only when publishers approve. This usually leads to an embargo for a year or so. Fourth is what UNC presently has, which is a policy that recommends using OA venues or an institutional repository, but makes no requirement. (Most in the room were not previously aware that we had this.)

Vision showed an example of a successful university repository at the University of California, and a related Google search that shows that Google does index/find these articles. OA in this way exposes things outside traditional university or library routes.

Who would benefit? Vision's slides outlined a list, including less wealthy institutions, companies' researchers, non-academic audiences, alumni/prospective students, teachers, students, journalists/bloggers (much of popular science writing now based on this), and ourselves for other uses, including in classes. A good institutional repository underlying the rights retention is really what makes this work.

Decision points: Vision highlighted the specifics outlined in the Choice Points memo. On coverage, Vision did note that we are not considering anything other than articles here. On strength, it will be important to decide if and how we will require compliance. Will we make this a part of annual reporting? Vision also discussed issues of the nature of license granted, how exceptions will be handled, and implementation plans.

Questions and General Discussion

Porto: Any possibility of a consortium of these repositories?

Hunter and Gilliland: there are and have been some consortia, but it hasn't been an area of the most robust work because there is so much variation in what individual institutions are doing, in terms of specifics of the policy. In general, as a result, people have not tried to do this across a larger set of entities. Vision did note that libraries have collaborated on development of the underlying repository software, but he said that implementation has tended to be conducted on a site-by-site basis. Gilliland noted that the difficulties are more political than technical. Hunter said there may be a point in the future where you get there (Pub Med Central is probably the most like this now), but generally we are not there yet.

Hunter: What is the mechanism on this campus to deposit this material? We do have the Carolina Digital Repository, which the library manages; it is robust and can provide these services, and we can talk about this when the time comes.

Curtain: on the coverage (e.g. "we're not including books") issue: Described a situation in math disciplines where there is actually pressure to release even books in OA (the fact that they typeset their own work is part of what underlies this). Curtain asked if we should talk about the inclusion of (book) manuscripts in our conversations (math, physics both might fit this model).

Vision said that this issue is likely to be very sensitive especially for those who get royalties--though Jones said his forthcoming publisher (Bloomsbury) has no problem with this. Vision said one question here is about what we encourage or support, which may be broader than what we ought to mandate. Kiel added that if the Task Force wishes to discuss this, it certainly can, but Vision expressed a desire to be as efficient as we can with Task Force time, and therefore should not spend a lot of time on issues that don't have "legs."

Kiel suggested moving into the breakout groups.

Weiboldt observed that some collective bargaining aspects are relevant here; if whole departments say no one may opt out, that's a problem; we do have to worry if there is a waiver, that faculty will be pressured to waive. Also, might this press the university to be involved in negotiations with publishers? That creates an internal resources issue.

Porto expressed his feeling that the research created should be freely available to students and faculty and said that we need collective action to press back against the publishers.

Breakout Groups to ID Key Issues for Task Force

Kiel introduced the plan of the breakout groups. He asked members at four tables to make a list of critical issues they would like to see the Task Force explore. The groups were to take 20 minutes to discuss this and will then create a consolidated list.

After the small groups finished their discussions, we went around the room from one table to the next and made the following list of issues of concern:

- Harmonize our publication practices with the stated mission of the university, to build expand and distribute knowledge to the people of NC.
- Explore the impact of an OA policy on non-science disciplines and journals because of the fear of harming the disciplinary journals and individuals in those disciplines.
- How this would relate to student publications and research--especially at the graduate level, and especially dissertations (embargoes, professional development, future hiring). How might OA for student publications harm students' future prospects?
- Copyright issue--pre-existing agreements between author and universities--how does that harmonize with the author's agreements with the publishers?
- Harmonize with peer institutions. What are peers doing, and how do we fit with that; what are the benefits of collective, multi-institution action for effecting change?
- Why not all materials, including books?
- What about digital publications, those with multi-media, other forms like drama, artistic pieces, performances, data, non-textual content, etc. What about syllabi? (And how does any of this relate to public records laws?)
- If these materials will be used for promotions and hiring, and by search committees, how might having something short of the final, edited version posted online be detrimental to a candidate?
- How to strengthen collective bargaining, especially in regard to the discretion faculty would have to request/get a waiver? Where do you set the default on waiving? Do we say there is no opting out? Or do decisions about this get made at department or school level?
- Enforcement: how? Institutional role in enforcing or supporting the policy? How high do you have to go to get an opt-out?

- Incentives: What incentives might be offered for compliance?
- Financial stakes: What do publishers lose from this, what is relationship between disciplines that profit from publications, vs those that don't? What are the financial implications for all parties?
- Whether the opt-out can be exercised after the fact. Can someone change their mind or revoke the license? To what extent does that university take rights, and to what extent does the university give rights back to the author when the author leaves the university? How broad is the gift of rights--just to deposit, or something more? And what does the university give back to the author? (Weiboldt clarified that in the proposed policies you are protecting authors by pre-assigning rights before publishers get involved.)
- Administrative strain that implementation might put on the university? Who will bear this burden? What level of obligation does the university have to enhance discoverability? Who will remove (copyrighted?) images, sound, or data files, perhaps, that an author has secured, from a manuscript being posted to institutional repository? Who will sort through the paper and handle the permissions issues?
- Tenure. Factoring discussions of the repository and the policy in relation to tenure process. A conversation about how scholarship is disseminated pre-peer review, vs after--what counts for tenure.
- How much of an audience is there for OA manuscripts in various fields? This may differ from field to field. Who, in practice, really might benefit from having this material open? Are we working to bolster Google, or are there other beneficiaries?
- Working with professional societies.
- Health Affairs-related issues; need to be sure and factor in.

Vision said we will have to look at this list, consolidate into headings and questions for research.

Our next session (April 22, 12:00 p.m., Freedom Forum) will include two speakers from other institutions, Kevin Smith, Director of the Copyright and Scholarly Communications Office at Duke University Libraries, and Chris Kelty (Anthropology, UCLA, faculty member) for a public discussion (20 min each, 40 minutes for public discussion). See the public announcement at http://faccoun.unc.edu/2014/03/open-access-task-force-to-hold-forum-422/

How can we refine this list into a set of questions for speakers?

Porto: Do we know if other universities in the UNC-system are doing anything about this? Gilliland says UNCG does have "some kind of policy" that is relatively new; we don't know details. Porto advocated looking into whether this might be something to look into at the systemwide level, rather than just at Chapel Hill. However, Hunter raised the concern of "scope creep" for the Task Force.

Kimbrough said that we will create a synthesizing document of issues for the next meeting and invited others to bring questions. Curtain suggested "doing the do-able" at the flagship and then

thinking about what the next step might be through the rest of the system. "Keep our eye on the ball down the road." Sherer said that it might be well to engage Suzanne Ortega at UNC General Administration in this discussion. Porto noted that the UNC systemwide Faculty Assembly will now be chaired by someone (Prof. Steve Leonard) from UNC-CH. Curtain also emphasized power of collective action (University of California system, for instance), but also of doing it right, going slowly.

Vision outlined the two proposed subcommittees: survey and writing. We were thinking 4-5 people on each; we will take self-nominations via email.

The meeting adjourned 3:56 p.m.

Minutes drafted by Anne Whisnant.