Open Access / Institutional Repository Task Force

Dean Carolyn Allen noted that the provost formed a group last fall to investigate an Institutional Repository and open access on campus. The group reviewed available software platforms for an IR and chose bepress. We will share access to the site when it is possible.

An institutional repository will increase the visibility of the research output of the university. The open access model has been out there for at least a decade and arose from the difficulties libraries around the world have been having with obtaining access to materials.

We spend half of our budget on serials costs, which increases 5 to 10 percent annually, which is unsustainable on any but the most iron-clad budgets. We belong to several consortia to bring the costs down because the larger groups can bargain with publishers for discounts. All six University of Arkansas campuses pool our resources for Elsevier’s Science Direct titles.

The group adapted the open access policy from Harvard, where open access publishing by faculty is mandatory. Lutishoor Salisbury and Micah Hale are co-chairs of the Institutional Repository / Open Access Task Force. The Researcher Council reviewed the open access policy and approved it.

Our goal in the fall is to hold open forums for faculty on open access issues and to visit departments.

Dennis Beck noted that there was a clean pipeline to submit materials to the Institutional Repository during the period of annual review for each department.

Steve Smith noted that the following are objections faculty give when asked about open access: the open access journals do not have a high enough impact, publication in open access journals is not tied to tenure and promotion efforts, there is a general lack of information, and publishing in open access journals is often expensive to the author.

Dennis Beck asked whether publishing in open access journals would in turn result in more citations of one’s work. Answer: possibly, but we don’t have data on that.

Dean Allen noted that we cannot fund open access publishing at this point; ideally the institution would bear that cost. The NIH requires open access, and those with NIH grants can pay open access fees from grant monies.

The faculty are already paid to do the research and the writing, and there is not large economic gain from publishing in traditional journals.

The Open Access policy is fine; it is intended to be voluntary. There are some language hitches left over from the Harvard mandatory policy that need to be smoothed out and made consistent with a voluntary policy.
Publishers will charge for open access. The downside is there is no peer review. Answer: JCR has a list of open access publishers who ARE peer-reviewed.

We ask for the last edited version of an article before it is set in type by the publisher for the institutional repository, which many publishers will allow. We have to build it, get it up and running, and try to raise money for an endowment to offset costs associated with open access.

**Institutional Repository Policy**
The Institutional Repository policy was reviewed. We asked for four positions to staff the Institutional Repository in the annual budget review. We asked for a faculty half time split with an academic department, a librarian, and two support staff. Even if it is not funded, we will work with the existing staff in the library to get it going on a skeleton staff.

The committee made recommendations for changes to the language of the policy, including the use of the word "translate" on page two, which seems to imply major language translations. Having language translations available would boost citations.

**State of the Libraries Data**
The dean showed the committee a modified presentation she gave to the fund raising committee.

In reviewing the data of annual expenditures for the Libraries, she noted that the expenditures for books remain low. Ideally it would be $1.5 million for books annual with $8 to 10 million for serials. The total expenditures need to be at $24-25 million to be looked at seriously by ARL for membership; this has been a long term goal of the university. Although Auburn's annual expenditures are much lower, they have experienced budget cuts since they were made a member, and their holdings are much larger than ours.

Comparison data is updated every May.

$51 million for a campaign goal is a stretch for the Libraries. We are working on strategies and looking to add individuals to the steering committee to help our cause.

**Open Educational Resources**
The Libraries hosted a meeting a couple of weeks ago to get some interested parties on campus together to talk about open educational resources. Faculty can use existing resources or write new materials for open access. We need to get some buy in from faculty to make this a movement on campus. We would like to showcase these materials in forums related to the Institutional Repository. A couple of institutions who have implemented programs report savings to students of $2 million per year. Other institutions are tracking how much savings are being realized over time.

Some OER texts are not that much different than what is available from publishers. The online version of the Principles of Biology textbook is a good example.

Materials are integrated around major big ideas and advanced placement sciences. Textbooks don't reflect where biology instruction could be headed. Open access texts mirror standard formats in many cases, but provide the opportunity for faculty to try new approaches.
Lora Lennertz noted that petitions and bills from the student government would enhance awareness from a student perspective. There is compelling data from Florida on the percentage of students who purchase textbooks. The main reason they don’t purchase textbooks is the cost; and a large percentage of those without textbooks fail.

Faculty could develop assignments in electronic texts; students could print out hard copies if needed.

Question: could we partnership with the food pantry and identify students in need? That might help increase graduation rates.

There are a lot of good materials in the open educational resources movement available; faculty just need to take the time to find them and vet them. Then they just need to provide the appropriate links to students. There are a few courses where hard copy textbooks are necessary, but not many.

There are also different ways to provide course reserves. Chuck Rotolo reported he only adopts textbooks for his courses when an electronic copy is available for reserves.

Question: Could we designate a bin at the bookstore where students could donate books to be distributed to students in need next semester? This would rely on the generosity of students.

Dean Allen asked the committee to continue to give these programs some thought and provide feedback.

Open Educational Resources could be extraordinarily beneficial to our students.

Norm Dennis asked about the pursuit of ARL status. Dean Allen replied that ARL membership is by invitation only, not application, and ARL conducts regular reviews of land-grant institutions to determine whether they warrant an invitation to join. We need to keep on improving our libraries. Once we reach a certain level, they will extend an invitation. We have progressed during the thirteen years the dean has been her. The total budget was $6.5 million when Carolyn Allen took the job as dean of Libraries. Achieving ARL status is aspirational, and we should always be concerned with progress toward improving our libraries.

Steve Smith noted that circulation staff told him he could not bring a class over to 372B; that it was not available for faculty use. That is incorrect information; Lora will investigate.