

Minutes 11 November 2019
Circulated 25 November 2019
Approved 12 December 2019

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
Senate Advisory Committee on University Affairs (SACUA)
Monday, November 11, 2019 3:15 pm
4006 Fleming Administration Building
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109-1340

Present: Ahbel-Rappe, Beatty (chair), Conway, Dinov, Gallo, Malek, Manera, Marsh, Potter, Spencer, Banasik, Snyder

Absent:

Guests: University Librarian and Dean of Libraries James Hilton, University of Michigan Press Director Charles Watkinson, Brian Skib, Associate University Librarian for Collections, Professor Hannoosh, Professor Ortega, Members of the Press

3:16: Call to Order and Approval of Minutes

The agenda was approved; the minutes for November 4 were approved.

3:16: Executive Session

3:39: Library Open Access and Transformational Models

University Librarian Hilton said that Open Access is a statement of how works are distributed, altering the traditional model according to which monographs and journals sit behind pay walls. The Open Access movement, which would distribute works without putting them behind a paywall, began twenty years ago, with enthusiasm varying greatly by discipline. Although people do different things under open access, the basic meaning is that there is no paywall between the reader and the text. A common misconception is that open access is free to publish, but it's not. The movement of material from behind paywalls has led to remixing and reuse, and authors retain copyright when they publish or release something with open access.

Librarian Spencer observed that if a person wished to contest the use of material he/she had created in court, that person needed to apply for copyright. University Librarian Hilton replied that if a person registered copyright that person could receive statutory damages, otherwise a person could only receive actual damages.

University Librarian Hilton said access is about whether there is a paywall. There are three primary areas wherein open access is typical. These are open educational resources, repositories, and open access pre-print platforms. He said that monographs are increasingly being published with open access, which usually means there is a print version a reader can pay for and an electronic version that is free. Libraries assert a moral right to access. Professor Malek said this view is naïve.

University Librarian Hilton said traditional publishing models with paywalls are failing. He explained that university presses collectively provide the infrastructure that underpin the humanities and social sciences, but the majority of presses can no longer make money. He said

that the University of Michigan Press is part of the library, and that the library provides its funding.

Professor Malek asked what it costs to publish a book.

He said that one issue he faces is how to fix the monograph ecosystem. The second area is journal publication. He said the University of California system has walked away from its contract with Elsevier (<https://www.insidehighered.com/quicktakes/2019/07/11/elsevier-ends-journal-access-uc-system>). The result is that employees of the University of California system do not have direct access to Elsevier publications that were published after their contract expired (they can still access items that were available prior to their contract expiration. The cancellation of the contract stemmed from an effort on the part of the University of California system to force Elsevier to negotiate lower costs. The system had paid \$40,000,000 a year in subscription costs and \$10,000,000 in author publishing fees. The University of California was trying to shift what they were paying for, so that more would go for publishing, less for reading. Elsevier would not talk to the University of California system for 8 months, and then once they came to the negotiating table their offer was double their current fees. The University of Michigan is looking at whether “transformative agreements” such as that sought by the University of California work, and has concluded that the University needs to examine the situation carefully.

Professor Marsh said he works in biochemistry, and has multiple options for publication. If he selects an open access journal he will be paying \$2000 out of his grants, if he goes to a society (e.g., the Royal Society) then publication is free. The University decision to promote open access would increase his publication costs.

University Librarian Hilton said what University of California Library system was attempting to do though its “transformative agreement” was to put money behind publishing rather than reading. He said the University of Michigan is working with the Big Ten, as a consortium to explore similar “transformative agreements,” which he said are “stickers” that people are putting on contracts, and noted that the University’s costs were higher than those of other Big Ten institutions because of the greater volume of research. He noted there are also issues in Europe where universities have not figured out how to deal with major journal publishers because they are monopolistic.

Professor Ahbel-Rappe asked: if the reason one would support open access is because other forms of publication are unsustainable, how does open access work in terms of the hard sciences. University Librarian Hilton said that from where he sits, publishing models are broken in both spaces, but that the appetite for open access varies by discipline. He said, “I want to fix publishing, and I do not assume that if we simply pick and advertise better we will be self-supporting.” He said that model will not work any more.

Professor Dinov said that the University of California had said to Elsevier that it should not be paying Elsevier because its people were doing Elsevier’s work of writing and reviewing for no compensation. University Librarian Hilton said that Elsevier’s response was that the University of California’s people were free to do what they wanted to do. He feels that the currency of the academy is reputation, and that economists think that if authors understand the costs, faculty will turn to the provost requesting more money to support publication.

Professor Malek said it may take between \$500,000 and \$1,000,000 to accumulate the data to publish in *Nature*, and asked about the business model at the University of Michigan Press. University Librarian Hilton said that the University of Michigan Press publishes 130 books a year, 40 are textbooks, and 80-90 are scholarly monographs. The current business models are the university provides a budget to press, and subventions of \$7000-10,000 from faculty. Professor Malek said this was not a large sum of money; Professor Potter said he has published 16 books and never sought a subvention. University Librarian Hilton said libraries buy the books published by the University of Michigan Press; and that in the past, when people

bought the books, presses were set up to make money. He has argued that the mission of the press was not to make money.

Professor Malek, asked if the press has the right to reject monographs. University Librarian Hilton replied that acquisitions editors decide on the basis of peer review. Press Director Watkinson added that the Press Executive Committee makes the final decision; that the acceptance rate is 15-20% of proposals received, and that 4% of books published by the University of Michigan Press are written by University of Michigan faculty. University Librarian Hilton said the ecosystem for the humanities and social sciences depends on the press being healthy, and that to fund the press to mission it is necessary to discover the base funding and to support that. He is looking at flipping the model of monograph publication.

Professor Marsh asked if, in University Librarian Hilton's vision of the landscape of University presses, he was seeking to get the best authors, much like journals do. University Librarian Hilton said that University Presses have reputations based on history and the editors. He added that, given that sales are going down, they are not a good measure of impact, and that the long tail of discoverability, rather than advertising, drives sales. He said standard print runs of scholarly monographs would be around 200 copies and that all these copies would be purchased by libraries

Professor Potter said that the statement academic publishing is based on a model assuming that only 200 copies will sell, and all of these will purchased by libraries, is not concurrent with his experience. He said, in his experience of publication, that the low-end sales tend to be between 1,000 and 2,000 copies. He pointed out that a book he published with the University of Michigan Press had sold 13,000 copies. University Librarian Hilton told him that he was living in a nice universe.

Professor Potter asked why the UM Press would not advertise in publications such as the *New York Review of Books*, and University Librarian Hilton said they will only do this if it will improve sales.

University Librarian Hilton complained that e-books don't get into Press catalogues. Professor Potter said, in his experience, 10% of sales are e-books and asked why University Librarian Hilton was focusing on a tiny proportion of possible sales. University Librarian Hilton said that the University of Michigan cannot run a press based on commercial success, that the press is an imprint with an editorial process.

Professor Malek asked how much money the University of Michigan Press loses a year.

University Librarian Hilton replied that the University of Michigan Press currently runs a \$3,500,000 budget of which \$600,000 comes from the provost, the rest comes from subventions and grants. The deficit this past year there was \$500,000, and that presses in the University of Michigan's sector are running an 11% deficit, which he is certain will continue over time.

Professor Ahbel-Rappe said that while she is grateful for presses that publish scholarly work such as she has produced, a person who feels they could make money through publication will be turned off by University Librarian Hilton's approach.

Professor Malek said, given the importance of publishing to the Humanities, that the amount of money University Librarian Hilton mentioned is trivial. University Librarian Hilton agreed that the sums did not constitute not a large problem, and predicted that the University will fund the University of Michigan Press to mission. Currently, he said, the discussion is based around open access and that if an author was not interested in releasing his/her work through open access, the Press we would have to look and see if it could make back costs.

Librarian Spencer said that in History of Art, the Harvard University Press, Princeton University Press, and Yale University Presses are preferred and wondered how their financial outlook compared with that of the University of Michigan Press.

University Librarian Hilton said that the Cambridge University Press, Oxford University Press and Chicago University Press run large, diversified portfolios, of which book publishing is

only a part, and that the Princeton University Press has an endowment. The University of Michigan Press has been investing in digital services.

Professor Potter asked what the University of Michigan Press regarded as peer presses. Press Director Watkinson said that this was discipline specific, that Ohio University Press was a rival in African Studies, Routledge in Political Science, and Cambridge in Classics.

4:22: Faculty Senate Voting Resolution

Chair Beatty introduced the following motion

Whereas, Article I of The University of Michigan Rules of the University Senate, The Senate Assembly and the Senate Advisory Committee on University Affairs Last revised January 2009, provides that the University Senate (hereinafter Faculty Senate)may adopt rules concerning its own government and procedure.

Whereas, taking into consideration the difficulty of obtaining a quorum for Faculty Senate meetings, the Faculty Senate wishes to approve the use of e-voting for Faculty Senate business.

Whereas, toward this end, Faculty Senate wishes to authorize Senate Assembly to adopt procedures on its behalf to ensure that meetings that precede the use of e-voting are deliberative.

Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate hereby adopts a rule approving the use of e-voting for Faculty Senate business contingent on Senate Assembly approval of written procedures that ensure that meetings that precede the use of e-voting are deliberative.

Professor Marsh said that passage of the resolution would require the drafting of rules to govern the process. The resolution passed unanimously.

4:28: Faculty Ombuds Professor Hannoosh and Professor Ortega

[Executive Session]

4:50: Matters Arising

5:00 Adjournment

Respectfully submitted,

David S. Potter

Senate Secretary

University of Michigan Bylaws of the Board of Regents, Sec. 5.02:

Governing Bodies in Schools and Colleges

Sec. 4.01 The University Senate

"...[t]he Senate is authorized to consider any subject pertaining to the interests of the university, and to make recommendations to the Board of Regents in regard thereto. Decisions of the University Senate with respect to matters within its jurisdiction shall constitute the binding action of the university faculties. Jurisdiction over academic policies shall reside in the faculties of the various schools and colleges, but insofar as actions by the several faculties affect university policy as a whole, or schools and colleges other than the one in which they originate, they shall be brought before the University Senate."

Rules of the University Senate, the Senate Assembly and the Senate Advisory Committee on University Affairs:
Senate: "In all cases not covered by rules adopted by the Senate, the procedure in Robert's Rules of Order shall be followed."

Assembly: "The Assembly may adopt rules for the transaction of its business. In appropriate cases not covered by rules of the Assembly, the rules of the University Senate shall apply."

SACUA: "The committee may adopt rules for the transaction of its business."