

Academic Services Committee
Monthly Meeting Minutes
November 16, 2011

Committee Members Present: Caitlin Manley, Peter Hesketh, Helena Mitchell, Margaret Loper, Nancey Green Leigh

Guests: Ellen Witte Zegura (Chair, School of Computer Science & Chair, Library Faculty Advisory Board); Dr. Ron Bohlander (Secretary of the Faculty)

Committee Members Absent: Doug Britton, Marlit Hayslett, Amy D'Unger, Denise Johnson-Marshall, Raj Vuchatu (Executive Board Liaison)

The meeting was called to order at 11:15 AM. Those present introduced themselves and the special guests were introduced by Helena. Nancey asked for an update on the October meeting regarding the faculty club and it was explained options were still being explored. Ron Bohlander shared some history and Nancey asked if there was a plan to include the former site of Juniors restaurant as an option. Ron stated that a central location for any faculty club was needed; that any proposed business plan needed to carefully consider how a club would break even, etc. All items are still being considered. In terms of location, the question was asked if "Jazz" in the Commons was a viable option. Ron answered that the restaurant was not able to "keep up" due to the introduction of Starbucks. Caitlin mentioned that Jazz had a "countertop" presence in the Commons but that was all.

Helena asked if everyone had a chance to look over the October 26th minutes and if there were any changes or corrections needed. No questions were raised and the minutes were approved.

Dr. Bohlander spoke about the proposal to form a committee to look into "Open Access" regarding publications by faculty. He is in support of it. He felt that this subject is in the domain of the ASC charter. Some committees have specialized expertise, e.g. the Intellectual Property subcommittee was once a subcommittee of the ASC. Subcommittees of standing committees fall into two categories:

1. Chartered subcommittee: relevant to charge of ASC with a limited life line. They are chartered to achieve a particular result and deliverables and then are disbanded.
2. Ad hoc subcommittee: are put together as needed and then dissolved once task is accomplished.

Dr. Bohlander then stated that by example, the proposed subcommittee might be chaired by someone from the Library Faculty Advisory Board committee, but he expected that someone would serve from the ASC and then others would be solicited to serve on the committee. The Executive Board meeting will be held November 29, 2011 from 3p-5p at the Wardlaw building in the Poole boardroom. The ASC would need to brief the Executive Board on "interesting issues" from the subcommittee and the briefing would be comprised of whatever information on Open Access you might have available at that time. The next step would be for the subcommittee to report back to the ASC committee. Then it would be adopted at a faculty meeting as a resolution

or it would be taken to the Executive Board. The policy would then be reported in the faculty handbook.

Ellen Witte Zegura spoke regarding the Open Access issue. This concern has been grappled with since 2008. Open Access is about the rights of authors to be able to make work available to readers without the ability to pay. Proponents feel it is good to have their work widely distributed to their peers, etc. Ellen went on to state that funding agencies and universities now have policies regarding Open Access (i.e. Massachusetts Institute of Technology-MIT since 2009). Other federal agencies are considering making this a part of their funding practice to have wider circulation of grantee articles and publications. Ellen noted that Georgia Tech's "SmartTECH", would be a natural place for Open Access. She will send us the presentation she has been using across campus. She also stated that there is a concern by some that Open Access will put journals out of business and that peer reviewed journals will cease to exist if Open Access succeeds.

Questions that are being asked is "what does it mean?" and "how is it related to other policies?" What, if any Open Access policy is appropriate for Georgia Tech? The next step is to form a subcommittee to:

1. Draft a proposal on Open Access for presentation to the ASC (could also be a resolution instead of a proposal that would encourage authors but not require it.).
2. Take it to the faculty for a vote.

Nancey asked when the 12 month embargo would start. Ellen: from the point of publication in a journal. Nancey also asked what the impact on publishers is. How does MIT engage in discussion with publishers? Ellen stated MIT has a process but for other universities, disciplines, and here at Georgia Tech it is still under discussion; but the field of physics has already made the transition to Open Access.

Helena commented that electronic journals in the communications field often have a 6 month turnaround peer review and online publishing timetables. Are they affected? Ellen stated you might see some interplay, if it affects their cost structure.

Ron asked what's known about SmartTECH and D-Space. Ellen stated that evidence is available but the upside is that articles could be more widely cited if they are in Open Access as opposed to being in a paper journal.

Peter asked does this only apply to journals, and what about dissertations or theses. Ellen commented that this is something the committee would need to address. Georgia Tech has archives some of this. Course notes are not included.

Peter also asked can you write "anything" and place it in Open Access. Ellen's reply was yes, anything that is not copyrighted. Peter additionally asked are other universities using Open Access. Ellen commented yes. Princeton came onboard about 6-8 weeks ago, Washington University passed a resolution, NSF has a committee looking at it and NIH already has a policy.

So Peter stated the entire world would have access to work? Ellen replied yes. MIT believes intellectual property should be widely available.

Helena stated conferences place their articles in special journals or publish their proceedings. Would they be allowed to be placed in Open Access? Ellen replied an ad hoc committee would need to decide if conferences with published proceedings should be included. Things to keep in mind: 1) what type of scholarly products does this apply to; 2) length of time of embargo [6 months or 12 months]; and whether to 3) opt-in/opt-out.

Helena stated that this project was appropriate for the ASC committee. It fits into the action items for the committee. She mentioned that Marlit and Amy might be interested. She further stated that because members of the ASC had begun leaving or were absent, a quorum would be needed to address forming a subcommittee on Open Access: a purpose statement, the timeline, the deliverables, and what group of people would be responsible. Ellen responded that she would draft a statement by midweek next week (before Thanksgiving) and the ASC could distribute it among its members for response.

Dr. Bohlander will copy Helena and Ellen on Executive Board items for the Executive Board meeting on November 29th, 2011.

An additional thought by Dr. Bohlander was that the students on “the Tower” might be pointed in ASC’s direction. Helena and Margaret noted that they had addressed the ASC in the past.

The next meeting will be on Wednesday, December 14, 2011 at 11a in the CACP conference room 316 unless this date does not work for the majority of the committee. At that time, an update on what was presented to the Executive Board at the November 29th meeting will be given.

Caitlin stated she will need to find a replacement for her seat on the committee; she is working overseas next semester.

The meeting was adjourned by Helena Mitchell at 11:50 AM.

Minutes Respectfully Submitted by,

Joy McNeil, CACP
Substitute secretary for Amy D’Unger