

Open Access To Research Task Force
Open Forum
Thursday, 10/23/14

Minutes

Committee members in attendance: Michael Lorenzen, Linda Zellmer, Rose McConnell, Lisa Miczo

Michael welcomed everyone (4 people attended at the Macomb campus, 1 person attended in the QC) and provided handouts with the proposed policy and the link to the Open Access website: <http://wiu.libguides.com/OAWIU>. Linda Zellmer did a PowerPoint presentation that outlined the state mandate, the committee's charge, and general information and myths concerning open access. The PowerPoint was uploaded to the above website following the meeting.

QUESTIONS/COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

Q/C: Most of this, if it goes anywhere, will have to be bargained. Things like the grant, license, scope and waiver, deposit of articles, policy oversight, compliance mechanism, and policy reviews. All will have to be bargained with the union.

Q/C: Costs. Is it the university's intent to pay for any and all fees for open access for the faculty?

A: That is something that needs to be worked out.

Q/C: Cost of the repository itself. There will have to be hardware, software, and people to maintain it (not just one person). There is quite an expense involved to maintain this. The policy does not acknowledge anything about cost.

A: Michael pointed out that this is addressed in the full report. This is just a recommendation that the state fund this centrally, and not be a cost that WIU has to pick up. The committee is aware of the costs involved.

Q/C: Is there any coordination with the other state institutions about sending a unified request to the state that they pay for these costs?

A: Michael explained that at this point each of the public universities were asked to have their own task force working independent that will go back to the general assembly. We do not know whether they will do anything with it or not. Michael did talk with other library deans around the state about this. Some of the other reports will also be addressing cost issues, asking that it not be funded by the individual universities if it is mandated by the state.

Q/C: Why would WIU have to create its own repository? Why wouldn't there be one big state-wide repository for all of Illinois universities?

A: That will be an option. However, Linda pointed out that we would still need to participate in the process. As library liaisons, we would need to work with faculty to encourage them to participate in the institutional repository or a central repository. Michael pointed out that it is always optional. We are not recommending that people are required to participate in this.

Q/C: If individuals aren't required to participate, doesn't this defeat the purpose? Why have a repository?

A: Michael pointed out that we have to allow for academic freedom and we cannot dictate to faculty that they must publish in open access sources.

Q/C: This isn't publishing in an open access source. They can choose any source they want. The question is whether or not the obligation is to provide the open access of their work to the public. This has nothing to do with where they publish, but whether or not an individual wants their work publicly disseminated.

Q/C: I have a moderate concern about the pre-print and the post-print publication that is presented. There is no one size fits all. In his own experience - contracts are signed early on in the process and you submit with the intent to continue on through the process. There really isn't a good pre-print option in that case. That particular journal does provide authors with the opportunity to allow their article (once post-print) to be gold open access (\$350) through their website. That is just for the authors that are in the UK and through the European Union can meet those mandates. Linda asked if they allow the author's version of the post-print to be put in a repository. He was not aware of this.

A: Linda mentioned there is a resource called SHERPA/RoMEO that allows people to research whether or not you can post a pre-print or post-print. You can look up your journal and it will give you that information.

Q/C: Is this connected in any way with the discussion of predatory journals?

A: No, there is no relationship. There are some open access journals that are less than reputable. There are bad journals that are not open access. What we looked at doesn't judge any particular journals. That is something for individual departments to determine. We are not dictating which journals are appropriate here, nor are we talking about having a system that would flag and delete those that are predatory journals.

Q/C: Just imagine there is money and we are moving forward with this. How long would it take to set up and how many staff would be needed.

A: Good question – we will have to deal with that when we get there. It doesn't happen overnight. As for staffing, we're not sure how many would be needed. It will be something we have to look at very carefully and discuss. Hopefully, the work we have done gives people the starting point for planning and discussing this issue.

Q: Years away?

A: Yes. That is a very fair assessment.

Q: Would this be just for journals or books as well?

A: Linda believes this could include theses and dissertations, but would not be for textbooks unless you want them openly accessible.

Q: Our catalog already provides access to links to thousands of government documents and such. Could a catalog ever be infrastructure to do this?

A: No, Michael confirmed that a catalog is not set up to do this. A repository has the items permanently stored there. The links won't change. Items will show up in search results and will get the researcher more citations.

At future sessions, we will have a summary of our recommendations from the report. Once you start reading it you will see that we covered a lot of this in the actual report. The report is just a draft. If you

have any suggestions or comments, or see things we might have missed, please send them to Michael or Linda so that they can be included in our final version.

Thanks to everyone for attending. Sorry for any technical difficulties we had with the QC connection.

Respectfully submitted,

Lora Adcock, Recording secretary