

University Enrichment Committee Meeting Minutes
November 30th, 2016, 8 AM – 9AM, Meister Room Collins Library

Attendees: Roger Allen (Chair), Terry Beck, Sunil Kukreja, Mark Martin, Rachel Pepper, Renee Simms, Jess Smith, Ben Tucker (guest), Tyson West

Call to order: Chair Roger Allen called the meeting to order at 8:08AM.

Approval of the Minutes:

Small corrections to the last two sets of minutes were discussed. The Oct. 5th minutes and Nov. 16th minutes were approved pending small changes.

Announcements:

The next meeting is Dec. 8th 10:00AM. We will review faculty applications.

Agenda Items Discussed:

The main agenda item for today was discussing our senate charge: “a) to determine whether there is a need to establish a guideline for funding on-line, public-access fees for publication and, if the UEC determines there is such a need, b) to create and publish the guideline.” We have already determined that there is a need to establish guidelines, today we focused on what those guidelines should entail.

- Ben Tucker, liaison library, introduced himself. He is the direct liaison for Business and Leadership, Comparative Sociology, Economics, and International Political Economy. He also manages Sound Ideas, our institutional open access repository and deals with open access issues.
- Ben gave helpful background information on the open-access landscape, including the following:
 - o Open access journals fall into three broad categories: Gold open access journals are fully open access and often have publication fees. Green open-access journals have restrictions on how their material is used in open access repositories – typically either the timing or the version of the article, hybrid journals are not open-access, but the author can pay an additional fee to make their particular article open-access.
 - o Science journals are extremely expensive to subscribe to, so the open-access journal landscape is more developed in science than in other fields.
 - o Some representative pricing to publish in open-access science journals: PLOS1 \$1,300; PLOS Medicine \$2,900; Elsevier (hybrid) \$3,500.
 - o Other institutions typically place restrictions on funding open-access publication fees. These include: funding is a last resort (other funding sources have been used or are not available), funding is for gold open access journals only (not hybrid).
 - o Some grants now require publication in open-access journals, and publication fees can be included in the grant expenses.
 - o Things can get quite complicated with different pricing for members vs. non-members, inconsistent policies, and negotiable pricing.

- Discussion of potential policies and their advantages and disadvantages followed. Topics discussed include:
 - The landscape is variable and we don't want to get in to the weeds, so our policy should be broadly applicable and flexible to change as the landscape changes.
 - Any policy we make should be revisited in the future (about two years) to evaluate if it is working.
 - We discussed making our guidelines general for all publication fees, including those for image charges, and for journals that are not open access. This is not specifically the senate charge, but may be more useful and broadly applicable.
 - A funding cap is a good idea, but our current \$2,000 funding cap may be sufficient.
 - We would like to fund a percentage of the publication costs. Most agreed 50% was too small a percentage, and 80% sounded reasonable.
 - We would like restrictions on the funding. Restrictions discussed followed what other institutions do and were:
 - Funding only required publication charges (e.g. only gold open-access, not hybrid fees).
 - The applicant must show proof that they have tried to negotiate down the publication fees.
 - If publishing in a journal, the journal must be peer-reviewed.
 - The applicant should make a strong case in their proposal for why this particular publication venue is necessary (e.g. this particular journal as opposed to ones that would cost less.)
 - No vanity presses, or equivalents. (Ben mentioned that other institutions require listing in Directory of Open Access Journals.)
 - UEC funding is a last resort – other funding sources have been applied for and used first.
 - The applicant shows a commitment to disseminating their work openly (e.g. has used open-access journals in the past, or put work in Sound Ideas).
 - There is a balance to strike between funding the actual costs of research vs. funding the dissemination of ideas. We may want to make clear internally our priorities – e.g. we prioritize funding money to start up new projects over funding publication fees.
 - There is also a balance to strike between making sure your material is disseminated broadly and effectively vs. publication costs.
 - It can be very difficult to determine if a journal is a legitimate open-access journal or a vanity press, as some “pay to publish” options disguise themselves well and even appear to be peer-reviewed.
- Ben offered to send us links to the policies of other places to assist with further discussion. Ben advocates looking at the applicants' previous commitment to open access/making work accessible.

- It was also discussed that Sound Ideas is a great way to disseminate work, in that it is accessible through Google Scholar, so people find and access our work through Google searches.
- A subcommittee was formed to draft instructions about UEC support of publication fees to be included in the instructions on faculty research grants. The subcommittee consists of Rachel Pepper, Renee Simms, and Jess Smith.
- The UEC should have time to discuss publication fees further early next semester. We need to discuss Register Lecture and Phibbs Award later in the semester, and also have until, March 1 for faculty research awards and until April 7 for student research.

Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 8:50 AM.

Respectfully submitted,

Rachel Pepper