


University of Pittsburgh Senate Spring 2009 Plenary Session:  
“Scholarly Publishing Today and Tomorrow”  
March 3, 2009

Follow-up Report of the Senate Library Committee  
November 4, 2009

 University of Pittsburgh  
*The Senate of the University of Pittsburgh*

The Senate of the University of Pittsburgh Spring 2009 Plenary  
**Scholarly Publishing Today and Tomorrow:  
What You Need to Know**  
Tuesday, March 3, 2009  
12:15 - 3:15 p.m.  
Assembly Room, William Pitt Union

<b>12:15</b> <b>COMPLIMENTARY BUFFET LUNCH</b>	<b>2:00-2:15</b> <b>Coffee Break</b>
<b>12:30-2:00</b> <b>PLENARY SESSION, Assembly Room, WPU</b>	<b>2:15-3:15</b> <b>CONCURRENT BREAKOUT SESSIONS</b>
<b>Opening of the Plenary</b> John J. Baker, <i>President, University Senate</i> <b>Welcoming Remarks</b> Mark A. Nordenberg, <i>Chancellor</i> <b>Comments and Introduction</b> Rose L. Hoffmann and Adam Shear, <i>Co-Chairs, University Senate Library Committee</i>	<b>I. THE FUTURE OF SCHOLARLY JOURNALS</b> location: WPU Ballroom Barbara A. Epstein, <i>Director, Health Sciences Library System</i> Steven L. Kanter, <i>Vice Dean, School of Medicine; Editor, Academic Medicine</i>
<b>INTRODUCTION OF KEYNOTE SPEAKER</b> James V. Maher, <i>Provost and Senior Vice Chancellor</i>	<b>II. THE ROLE OF INSTITUTIONAL REPOSITORIES</b> location: WPU Assembly Room Rush G. Miller, <i>Hillman University Librarian &amp; Director, University Library System</i> John D. Norton, <i>Director, Center for Phil. of Science and Co-Founder, PhilSci Archive</i>
<b>KEYNOTE ADDRESS:</b> <b>“University Research Distribution: From Option to Necessity”</b> David Shulenburg, <i>Vice President for Academic Affairs, National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges</i>	<b>III. AUTHOR’S RIGHTS IN THE NEW ENVIRONMENT</b> location: WPU Dining Room A Michael J. Madison, <i>Associate Dean for Research, School of Law</i> Cynthia C. Moore, <i>Associate General Counsel</i>
<b>ROUNDTABLE RESPONSE</b> Moderator: James V. Maher, <i>Provost and Senior Vice Chancellor</i> Steven L. Kanter, <i>Vice Dean, School of Medicine</i> Michael J. Madison, <i>Associate Dean for Research, School of Law</i> Cynthia Miller, <i>Director, University of Pittsburgh Press</i> John D. Norton, <i>Director, Center for Philosophy of Science</i>	<b>IV. THE FUTURE OF THE UNIVERSITY PRESS</b> location: WPU Lower Lounge Cynthia Miller, <i>Director, University of Pittsburgh Press</i> David Shulenburg, <i>Vice President for Academic Affairs, NASULGC</i>
<b>AUDIENCE QUESTIONS AND RESPONSE</b>	
<b>ALL FACULTY, STAFF &amp; STUDENTS ARE INVITED TO ATTEND</b>	

Report prepared by Rosemary L. Hoffmann (Nursing) and Adam Shear (A&S/Religious Studies), committee co-chairs, AY 2008-2009; and the committee members listed as reporters below. Report accepted by committee at its October 23, 2009 meeting.

**Table of Contents:**

<b>1. Summary of Plenary Session: Lecture and Roundtable Response</b>	<b>pp.2-3</b>
<b>2. Summaries of Break-out Sessions</b>	<b>pp.3-6</b>
<b>3. Key Issues Raised and Recommendations of the Committee</b>	<b>pp.7-8</b>

## 1. Summary of Plenary Session

Keynote Address: David Shulenberger “University Research Distribution: From Option to Necessity”

**David Shulenberger** began by posing the key issue as a two-fold crisis in the distribution of research: the first aspect of the crisis is financial as models for financing for publishing and distributing academic research have collapsed. The second aspect is the sheer amount of university research production contributing to information overload. The key questions, according to Shulenberger, are:

- how to disseminate information without harming journals and university presses?
- what should the role of the university be in disseminating research?
- in particular, do public universities have a particular obligation to disseminate research?

According to Shulenberger, universities in general and public universities do have an obligation in promoting the dissemination of research and it is possible to design institutional policies and modify individual behavior so that journals, university presses, and other organizations involved in dissemination of research are protected financially and institutionally.

Shulenberger suggests that universities develop policies that promote dissemination of research, that help the institution and individuals cope with information overload. He further suggests that universities can promote themselves and their faculty in doing so, through a process similar to “branding” in the corporate world. The main form of such policies should be institutional research depositories such as the ones being implemented at Pitt and voted on by the Harvard Faculty of Arts and Sciences. He also suggests that individual researchers make sure to change their practices to allow for the implementation of these policies, in particular negotiating with publishers to allow other forms of dissemination.

### Roundtable Response

**Steven Kanter**, the editor of a scholarly journal and vice-dean of the School of Medicine, focused on the integrity of journal articles as tested means of distributing scholarship. He cited several forces that currently affect journals, some constructive and some destructives. Three prominent forces are:

- The “wiki” phenomenon-- creates questions about at what point is the text authoritative.
- “Policy-driven access”-- how many different versions of an article will be disseminated?
- The “force of conjoined information” allows for possible electronic add-ons to an article.

**Michael Madison**, the assistant dean for research in the School of Law and an expert on intellectual property law, suggested that scholarship be viewed as “public goods” in economic terms, i.e. things for which it is hard to recoup costs. We have tried different ways of regulating these “public goods” in the past:

- Most traditional way: copyright/intellectual property law.
- More recently: public subsidy.
- “Commons” approaches emerging now.

The details of management under each scheme matter a great deal. He argues that since the chances of copyright reform are low, the best solution may be to build “commons” environments using existing IP law but tailored to the individual nature of different kinds of information and information users.

**Cynthia Miller**, director of the University of Pittsburgh Press, pointed out that many of the things that we value in university press books cost money:

- quality peer-review
- careful editing
- well-designed and produced books.

While some of these aspects work differently with electronic publication, many do not. Since these aspects of publishing cost money and since university subsidies are lower, university presses must think about market factors as well as scholarly quality in publishing.

**John Norton**, director of the Center for Philosophy of Science, argued that notwithstanding the difficulties raised in the dissemination of scholarly research, the quality of writing can improve in this new world of scholarship as electronic publication frees scholars from some of the constraints of print-based limits.

#### Further issues raised by the audience

- How are the changes discussed here to be connected to information literacy education for students?
- What are the implications of the different models for open-access?
- How will new forms of publication allow knowledge to be represented in different ways?
- Might information overload be the most serious problem, greater than the economic challenges?

## **2. Summaries of Breakout Sessions**

### A. Scholarly Journals

committee reporter: Patrick Hughes (PhD candidate, Cooperative Doctoral Program in Religion)

Barbara A. Epstein, Director, Health Sciences Library

Steven L. Kanter, Vice Dean, School of Medicine, and Editor in Chief, *Academic Medicine*

**Barbara Epstein** began the breakout session with an outline of the traditional function of scholarly journals, the different pressures currently affecting scholarly journals, and some of the issues surrounding the funding of the new Open Access model of scholarly journals. One audience member talked about a model of Open Access journals called SCOAP3 (Sponsoring Consortium for Open Access Publishing in Particle Physics) which has been trying to put control of high energy physics publishing back into the hands of physicists rather than publishers. This model proposes that all funds that are currently spent on high energy physics journal by subscriber institutions are instead spent on the SCOAP3 consortium, which is then able to leverage publishers for open access.

**Steven Kanter** asked for predictions as to how much longer people thought that the traditional print versions of journals would continue to last, and the rest of the session was spent in audience input on this and related matters. An audience member helped to re-frame Dr. Kanter's question by asking: "How often have you not read an article simply because it was not available electronically?" This elicited a number of sympathetic looks and stifled chuckles. Another audience member, who thought that electronic formats offer a much greater flexibility in the way that information is presented, opined that print journals could disappear today without too much problem. A staff member from the

Frick Fine Arts Library thought it important to caution that predictions as to the viability of print journals are really dependent on the field of study. She noted that in art history, images of artwork are crucial, and online journals do not yet have the same high quality as print versions do. She noted that students are always in the Frick Fine Arts Library specifically seeking out print copies because the online versions are just not high quality enough. Another audience member mentioned that one needs to consider the end-users of journals when discussing print versus electronic. He mentioned that while large institutions seem to be moving towards electronic licensing for research purposes, individual subscribers still prefer to receive a print version of a journal at home. Another audience member reinforced the important role that journals serve in defining the different academic disciplines, and that the future of archiving journals (in whatever format) is an important consideration in tracing the history of the specific academic disciplines.

Dr. Kanter furthered the discussion by challenging what it means to be an “issue” of an electronic journal. He suggested that perhaps electronic journals could be re-conceptualized as an “integrated collection” or as a “themed cluster” that bring coherence to a set of ideas, but could also lead to academic spontaneity with a “surprise me” factor. A number of people from the audience thought that such a new conceptualization of a journal “issue” could be beneficial, especially since journals are becoming increasingly narrow in scope. A new type of journal issue could be beneficial for those who work in an interdisciplinary way (which is not well served by traditional models of journals) and that new formats could help to break out of the current model in which journal reading is increasingly driven solely by research interest.

#### B. Institutional Repositories

committee reporter: Andrew Strathern (Andrew W. Mellon Professor, A&S/Anthropology)

Rush G. Miller, Hillman University Librarian and Director of the University Library System

Tim Delyannides, Head, Dept. of Information Systems, University Library System

John D. Norton, Director, Center for Philosophy of Science and Co-Founder, PhilSci Archive

**Rush Miller** welcomed the participants and referred to the Archive of European Integration, the Philosophy of Science Archive, and the D-Scholarship initiative.

**Tim Delyannides** gave a detailed power point presentation on D-Scholarship@Pitt, outlining its goals, scope, supported document types, accepted file types, discoverability of documents, its open access character, those authorized to contribute and the types of Author Agreements that will apply to it. Relevant points are that those authorized to contribute are University of Pittsburgh faculty and all individuals with a University of Pittsburgh computer account, whether primary or sponsored; authors must have and will retain copyright of materials where relevant; materials should be research-related and be products of the authors’ research; teaching materials, e.g. those that go on Blackboard, are not included; the archive will be maintained indefinitely; and the documents will be available anonymously and free of charge to Internet users worldwide. The system used at Pitt is E-Print, first developed in Southampton, UK.

Tim Delyannides also demonstrated a software program for creating and managing paperless scholarly journals. Two journals at Pitt are said to be converting to electronic form this year.

**John Norton** outlined the structure and use of the PhilSci pre-print archive, dealing with scholarly, peer-reviewed draft articles and conference materials or postings. The initial impetus for the archive came from the philosophy of science community, especially philosophers of physics. Most journals have been friendly to this pre-print initiative.

A lively discussion ensued, in which the following matters were aired: questions of plagiarism, the tenure review process; relationships with Google and Google Scholar; the *Journal of Telerehabilitation* managed by the Pitt library system for electronic publication; and a comparison between the mandatory repository scheme in Harvard's FAS and the voluntary nature of the Pitt system.

Rush Miller expressed a recommendation that these discussions should provide a basis for wider, departmental and school-based faculty discussions.

### C. Author's Rights

committee reporter: George Pike (Professor and Director of the Library, School of Law)

Michael Madison, Associate Dean for Research and Professor, School of Law

Laura Hillock, Associate General Counsel

The session opened up with an extensive discussion of the recent Google Book Search settlement. **Michael Madison** and **Laura Hillock**, who is responsible for intellectual property and technology transfer issues in the University Counsel's office, discussed the background of the Google book search lawsuit and basics of the settlement. (Google was sued by publishers over its scanning of books into the Google Book Search platform. A settlement was reached that would allow Google to continue the project, pay a royalty fee to authors whose materials are scanned, and create and manage a clearinghouse for payment of royalties to authors.) They went on to discuss the broader implications of Google Book Search, suggesting that it will "change the landscape" of both publishing and copyright law through Google's ambition to "digitize everything." Both Ms. Hillock and Prof. Madison were generally supportive of the settlement, suggesting that Google was in the best position to create both the digitized library and the royalty infrastructure, and that the program would be particularly beneficial to individual authors.

Looking to open access, the discussion leaders addressed several questions from the audience about the benefits and challenges of open access. Among the leading concerns were how authors could retain the rights to publish their scholarship on open source platforms. The traditional publishing model is that the author assigns the copyright to the publisher in return for which the publisher will disseminate the scholarship through book or journal publishing. Both discussion leaders focused on a new paradigm where authors can negotiate more actively to retain the right to publish their works on open access platforms—such as the University's new D-Scholarship repository—in addition to a traditional print platform. It was noted that more and more scholarly publishers are allowing authors to post their scholarship on open access platforms.

However, posting on an open source platform only goes so far. The discussion leaders both advised that authors should take a more active role in promoting and sharing their scholarship. (That has been traditionally part of what the publisher did.) Prof. Madison suggested that authors use blogs, forums and listservs and other e-tools to "share the good news" and affirmatively distribute information about their work.

A question was raised about whether publishing on open access platforms would raise concerns during tenure review. Prof. Madison suggested it might depend on the particular discipline, but noted that skepticism about the quality of open access publication appears to be dissipating. A member of the audience suggested open access has been more accepted in the sciences as the sharing of data was more integral to those disciplines. Another member of the audience commented that in disciplines where book publishing is a key element of tenure review, open access publishing of articles might have less impact.

Other comments focused on international copyright issues. Both discussion leaders noted that copyright laws differ from country to country. They also noted that the nature of universities differ from country to country with many countries having state-run universities. It was also noted that some European publishers were less flexible about providing permission for open access publishing to authors than generally in the U.S.

#### D. University Press

committee reporter: Fern Brody (Associate Director, University Library System)

Cynthia Miller, Director, University of Pittsburgh Press

David Shulenburger, Vice President, Academic Affairs, NASULGC

**Cynthia Miller** made the point that she does not have any answers about the future of the University Press. Her goal is to preserve what is good and figure out how to do it better and more cost effectively. She briefly talked about the project here at Pitt--522 titles available via open access. This is comparatively a very significant project in terms of what other University Presses are doing. The leaders in this area are the National Academy of Sciences, who have all their titles up that are over ten years old; the University of California Press which has 500 of 2500 titles open access; and MIT which has their backlist open access and 12 new titles open. Miller continued that she is doing this to see what will happen. The Provost is very supportive of her taking this risk. Ideally she will be able to verify and to demonstrate to other publishers that open access will produce no disruption in sales.

The audience raised questions about how people use online books and how often do people look at entire works. Ms. Miller responded that she had recently asked at a conference what faculty want: online only, print options, print on demand? In the fields that she publishes they clearly want to have titles in print.

**David Shulenburger** mentioned that there have been changes in what is published – for instance there are fewer bibliographies are being published now than in past years. In the Science fields especially they tend to like to use hot links from footnotes, etc. In general terms, it is most important for universities to get in front of the curve in this area. We have the power of the University Press as an authority site.

There was some discussion of the perceived tenure power of an open access vs. a traditional print book. There is already an issue for junior faculty who need to publish but who are in a small discipline. There is not always enough market for publications in those fields. If there is no market, then how to set up mechanism to verify and brand open access, full-length publications? We continue to need high quality reviewers. What is evidence of great scholarship?

Shulenburger mentioned his concerns about the University rewards system. Currently the “University Light” setting (schools with a focus on teaching over research) gets more per capita funding than the research University. It’s difficult to demonstrate the additional value that a research university education transfers to students because it is difficult to measure what universities put out in terms of critical thinking. Moreover, politicians tend to view scholarship as static. He argues for a need to fund universities at a federal level (beyond grant giving) to even out the disparate levels of state support.

Ms. Miller expressed her concern for scholarship on the edge – it is harder to get peer-review, and more difficult to sell those titles. The traditional cost recovery model doesn’t work as well for this.

### 3. Key Issues Raised and Recommendations of the Committee

#### Key Issues

In the view of the committee, many important issues were raised at this plenary and the discussions should (following the recommendation of Rush Miller) form the basis for long-term discussion and planning at the level of individual departments and schools, as well as at the level of the Provost and the Dean's Council. In our view, several key issues have emerged that concern the short- and long-term future of the University of Pittsburgh and the academic community more broadly. These are:

- The role of university as producer and disseminator of knowledge/scholarship. What is this role and how should the university design and implement policies to further its goals in this area?
- The role of individual members of the academic community in the dissemination of their own scholarship. What policies should our university implement to foster individual efforts? What is the balance between individual responsibilities and university mandates?
- What should be the economic priorities of the university in this area given the issues of cost and budget limitations in the current economy?
- How will the university evaluate and reward dissemination of scholarship in new or non-traditional forms in the tenure and promotion process?
- What are the long-term implications of new financial and technological arrangements for the consumption of scholarship and the production of new knowledge in research universities?

While some of these issues call out for several decades of conversation and research and others will involve a process of negotiation involving many groups, inside and outside of Pitt, the committee believes that some concrete recommendations can be made in addition to the general recommendation for further discussion.

#### Recommendations of the Committee

The Senate Library Committee presents the following recommendations to Faculty Assembly and Senate Council for discussion. Following those discussions, the committee is prepared to draft specific resolutions for Assembly and Council consideration.

1. *We recommend creation of a task force that would bring together constituents from all of the major groups concerned with these issues to continue the conversation and to provide further concrete recommendations.* Some of these constituencies would include: the Provost's office; the library systems; the university press, the general counsel's office; Senate Executive committee; the Deans' Council; and faculty with expertise in these areas.
2. Currently participation in the D-Scholarship repository is voluntary. *The committee recommends that the university open a discussion about moving toward a model of expected participation for faculty with an opt-out clause. In the meantime, the university should also strongly promote the repository to faculty.* While the university should respect a decision not to participate by a faculty member (or, of course, a prior publishing agreement that prevents participation), it seems that greater use of the depository will be achieved only if the default is

participation. It may be more appropriate to ask individual schools and departments to consider this option for their faculty members rather than create a university-wide mandate.

3. So many of the arrangements for publication of research involve individual negotiations between scholars and publishers; thus, the success of university efforts to promote dissemination of research depends heavily on the individual efforts of university members to sign publishing agreements that allow for participation in open access initiatives. Therefore, *we recommend that the university undertake to educate university members, particularly faculty, post-docs, and doctoral students, about author's rights.* Whether this initiative is taken by individual schools and the degree to which it would be coordinated by the General Counsel's office should be the subject of further discussion. At the very least, we recommend that faculty members be given a clear avenue for seeking advice on these matters.
4. *We recommend that individual schools examine tenure and promotion processes to make sure they take account of on-going changes in the publishing industry and new models of scholarly communication. We recommend that new faculty members in the tenure stream be informed about these issues as part of the information provided to them about expectations for tenure and promotion in their disciplines. (Note that this is not a specific recommendation about criteria for tenure and promotion or about the procedures used by different schools of the university both of which are outside the purview of the committee.)*

In our view, Pitt is one of many research universities that are undertaking these kinds of discussions. We believe that the discussion should continue and that Pitt should take a leadership position among public research universities in the development of new policies and initiatives in this area.

Respectfully submitted, The Senate Library Committee, October 23, 2009, Lou Berry and Rosemary Hoffmann, co-chairs.