Senate Committee on Libraries, Information Systems, and Technology
Minutes of 22 October 2013


Members Absent: Rebecca Bascom, Daniel Beaver, Tracy Fausnight, Mallory Gold, Amir Khalilollahi

Guests: Patricia Hswe, Mike Furlough

1. Approval of Minutes of the Meeting held Sept 10, 2013
   The minutes were approved. Motion – Ann Taylor

2. Comments from the Chair – Galen Grimes
   No comments.

3. Comments from the Dean – Barbara Dewey
   Dean Dewey deferred to her colleagues Mike Furlough and Patricia Hswe who presented at the meeting.

4. Comments from Vice Provost of ITS - Kevin Morooney
   Update on RennREN.

5. Update on Open Access – Mike Furlough, Associate Dean for Research and Scholarly Communications
   Mike Furlough provided an update for the informational report given to the University Faculty Senate last year. This was a PowerPoint presentation that will be made available to the group. The updates gave insight to current disciplines using open access journals. John Harwood questioned if major publishers of journals are active in the open access space and Mike Furlough answered that most participate to some degree.

   A flaw that open access still presents is the peer review process. As a test, a flawed journal article that was accepted by an open access system was rejected by a more highly rated journal. Barbara Dewey commented on the fact that licenses for accessing journals are quite costly for the University.

   Regarding federal and state policies and their use of open access systems, NIH requires published work to be placed in an open source system within 12 months (e.g., PubMed). The White House is encouraging a similar approach as that of NIH for all federally
funded research. At this time non-federally funded research has taken it upon them to create policies. The number of non-federally funded publications is about equal to federally funded publications at this time.

Gary Gray questioned what happens if you publish for science? Mike Furlough answered that they do not say you must publish in an Open Access system.

Ann Taylor commented that the CIC had a model to follow and questioned is this the same? Mike Furlough responded that it is the same but not mandated.

With regards to the presentation slide listing ‘Additional Steps’ (Do nothing, Promoting Awareness, Recommend, Form A Group to Advise the University Faculty Senate) Ann Clemens asked the question where are these open source spaces? Mike Furlough answered that the University of California’s eScholarship Open Access publishing services is a good example.

Kevin Morooney asked if this is a global movement. The answer is yes and the United Kingdom has made it a national policy. There are also similar approaches at the government level in Latin America and Asia.

John Harwood commented that given the talk at the Federal level, there should also be talks about controlling education cost from the perspective of predatory pricing by publishers.

6. **Scholarsphere Update – Patricia Hswe**

Patricia Hswe provided a PowerPoint presentation on Penn State University’s Scholarsphere repository service. Numerous faculty champions are using this repository for their datasets. The actual nature of the system helps promote the creation of a DMP (Data Management Plan). Consultants are available to support using the service which is available for faculty, undergraduates, and graduate level work. The service is quite flexible and features are being added to include integration with Dropbox.com, and allowing ‘sharing’ internally and externally. When choosing how you would like to share objects in the repository the site provides detailed help.

John Harwood questioned what would happen in the event the original contributor leaves or dies? Patricia Hswe answered that is a preservation service but also provides the ability to delete files.

At this time the repository does not support the hosting of relational databases that would contain contributor’s data but PSU Libraries is investigating the possibilities of hosting this type of solution. Additionally, a solution for hosting/streaming video is being planned.
Terry O’Heron commented that Box.com integration is being looked into for Angel.

Peter Dendle thanked Patricia Hswe for presenting this information and questioned if the system is widely used. Patricia answered that the system is growing. A majority of the growth is due to data files. Patricia also commented that she hopes that faculty will accept this service since it meets DMP compliance. Additionally, the infrastructure supporting this system is sustainable due to the code interoperability.

In order to create more awareness a marketing campaign is underway in the form of postcard and email to faculty who would utilize this service. Barbara Dewey commented that it is possible to get greater participation once they see the value. Gordon Blood questioned why/what is the barrier to participation? Mike Furlough addressed this question by stating it is a baseline service structure and use cases should be utilized to understand why users will use it. Ann Taylor added that communication and time are the issue. Gordon Blood also added that the LIST committee should be the vehicle to get faculty to understand the value of this system.

John Harwood raised the question “If I upload a word file, will it be readable in 50 years?” Patricia Hswe answered that forward migration is something to be considered.

7. **Additional Comments – Galen Grimes**

Galen asked for additional comments. Ann Taylor asked if we can learn more about Box.com and streaming video through Scholarsphere.

Ally Goldstein introduced herself and offered her as a connection to the graduate students.

8. **Motion to Adjourn**

Respectfully submitted,

Fred Aebli