

Open Access Task Force Minutes

January 17, 2014 Meeting

Attendees: J. Jawahar, S. Juliano, J. Baur, L. Cline, M. Gizzi, D. Holland, M. Jadallah, M. Jon Jensen (video), J. Kalmbach, D. Long, C. Mallory, A. Maginnis, R. MacMinn, C. O'Reilly, R. Rhykerd, A. Riaz, D. Ward Absent: S. Sprecher

The meeting began at 2:00 pm.

The purpose of the meeting was to provide an overview of open access and discuss the role of the task force and to plan a timeline to accomplish the tasks.

Deadlines

- Report to Provost Everts and President Flanagan – November 1, 2014
- Report Due to Board of Trustees – on or before November 15, 2014

Elements of the Charge (See Appendix I)

What Has Been Done

- Task force established, SharePoint site set-up, task force members are beginning to upload materials
- Identified OMA requirements which entail: all members of the task force to complete the training and share the certificate on SharePoint, set-up website through Provost web page which includes or will include the act, charge, roster, agenda and minutes. The task force needs to keep meeting minutes, approve, and post agendas and minutes.

Discussion of What We Know

- Michael Jon Jensen presented on a brief history of open access. Open access truly developed in the early 2000s with the open source movement. It allows people without memberships and without purchase, access to publications. Open access publications are sometimes viewed as “second class,” but this perspective has come largely from publishers because open access can be a threat to their income. Open access can cost universities more because they may need to pay for the rights to publications. Most institutions are waiting to see what happens and not implementing new policies.
- Open Discussion
 - Libraries heavily impacted because publishers limit availability of resources. If there are embargos on publications (e.g., 6, 12 or 18 months), publishers sometimes write into contracts that those cannot be shared through interlibrary loan.
 - Publishers have different restraints on what the authors can and cannot do with their work. Some publishers say faculty cannot put their work into their institutional repository after peer review (some say it is ok).
 - We need to define the purpose of the open access charge. Does “free public access” include everyone in the state of Illinois?
 - Library costs would not go down until everyone is in support of open access policies.
 - The open access task force is not charged to write a policy.
 - There is a perception amongst faculty that there will be a mandate to publicize all data and if required the public will criticize the use of time and money.
 - Northern Illinois University passed “Open Access Resolution for the Academic Senate of Northern Illinois University” on October 2 2013

Next Steps Needed to Execute the Charge

Schedule monthly meetings for task force
Schedule open forums to solicit input- end of March
Schedule open forums to solicit feedback on draft
Identify specific tasks that involve research and assign such tasks to subgroups

Meeting was adjourned at 4pm.

Appendix to minutes continued on next page

Appendix I

- (i) Each task force shall consider how the public university can best further the open access goals laid out in this Act, whether by creation of an open access policy for the public university, creation of an open access policy for the State, or some other mechanism
- (ii) review how peer institutions and the federal government are addressing issues related to open access and ensure that any institutional or statewide policies are consistent with steps taken by federal grant-making agencies
- (iii) consider academic, legal, ethical, and fiscal ramifications of and questions regarding an open access policy, including but not limited to the following:
 - (1) the question of how to preserve the academic freedom of scholars to publish as they wish while still providing public access to research;
 - (2) the design of a copyright policy that meets the needs of the public as well as of authors and publishers;
 - (3) the design of reporting, oversight, and enforcement mechanisms;
 - (4) the cost of maintaining and, where applicable, creating institutional repositories;
 - (5) the potential for collaboration between public universities regarding the use and maintenance of repositories;
 - (6) the potential use of existing scholarly repositories;
 - (7) the fiscal feasibility and benefits and drawbacks to researchers of institutional support for Gold open access fees (where publication costs are covered by author fees rather than by subscription or advertising fees);
 - (8) the differences between academic and publishing practices in different fields and the manner in which these differences should be reflected in an open access policy;
 - (9) the determination of which version of a research article should be made publicly accessible;
 - (10) the determination of which researchers and which research ought to be covered by an open access policy, including, but not limited to, the question of whether a policy should cover theses and dissertations written by students at public institutions; research conducted by employees of State agencies; research supported by State grants, but not conducted by employees of public universities; research conducted by faculty at institutions that receive Monetary Award Program grants under Section 35 of the Higher Education Student Assistance Act; research conducted by part-time, adjunct, or other non-permanent faculty; research at least one of whose co-authors is covered by the policy; research progress reports presented at professional meetings or conferences; laboratory notes, preliminary data analyses, notes of the author, phone logs, or other information used to produce final manuscripts; or classified research, research resulting in works that generate revenue or royalties for authors (such as books), or patentable discoveries.

