

Prof Moriarty: I'd like to call the meeting to order.

Prof Moriarty: Is there a motion to approve the agenda for March 19th? Second? Any discussion? All in favor say aye. Opposed? Motion carries.

Prof Moriarty: Is there a motion to approve the draft minutes for February 19th, Appendix A? Second? Discussion? All in favor, say aye. Opposed? Motion carries.

Prof Moriarty: President's remarks.

Satish Udpa: Thank you. Thank you, Deborah.

Satish Udpa: I'll start with one major event or a couple of major events in the last ten days. My one and only Big Ten championship game, we won. I enjoyed that game. I enjoyed that game. I had the opportunity to walk down to the floor and hug both Don [Mizo 00:01:10] and [Lupe 00:01:10]. That has to be one of my major events in my life besides my wedding. That was great. I enjoyed watching the Big Ten tournament. Was there for the first two games.

Satish Udpa: I used the occasion to meet major donors, and I was also very pleased to meet a good number of students who are in our Financial Management Institute and they were visiting. They are part of the broad business program. Terrific students. I enjoyed meeting them as much as I've enjoyed meeting any good bunch of students. So it was terrific.

Satish Udpa: Some major announcements. I don't know how many of you have heard about the Alston case. Judge Wilken, who happens to be the United States District Court judge in Northern California, issued a ruling on what is now known as the Alston case. It has an important bearing and ramification for our athletics program, so I want to share a little bit of that.

Satish Udpa: The ruling essentially ended on an NCAA cap that we've had for many, many years on non-cash educational benefits that we can give to student athletes. Let me give you an example. Right now we are obliged or limited to giving them tuition support, we give them room and board, things like books and so forth, but we are limited in what we can do to these student athletes. The judge essentially removed the cap on education related expenses.

Satish Udpa: For example, if the ruling prevails, and I'll talk a little more about that, a university should be able to, for example, offer laptops to students. They should be able to offer expenses covering study abroad, for example, and a whole bunch of expenses that are related to their educational programs. No cash gifts to the students. Nothing of that sort has changed, but the benefits untethered to education, unrelated to education, continue to remain, so they will be in place.

Satish Udpa: Each conference can come up with its own rules. So the Big Ten, for example, can come up with a set of things saying that institutions that belong to Big Ten will do the following things. But we are barred from conspiring with other conferences. So we can't talk to the Atlantic conference group or the people in the South. We have to have our own set of rules for the Big Ten, so that is one thing.

Satish Udpa: Lots of complexities that will keep the athletic [inaudible 00:04:34] presidents of all the universities busy for the next several months. It's something that we'll have to face. The more important thing that, in my opinion, that we have to deal with is the perception that there is an assault on this concept of student athletes. Are they student athletes? Are they professionals? That is going to be under assault. Again, that's something that we have to deal with in the coming years.

Satish Udpa: We are appealing. The presidents of all the Big Ten universities got together on Sunday morning, why I attend a conference call and decided that we will support an appeal of that decision. Other conferences also will have to decide whether they want to support that appeal. We don't know whether that's gonna happen, but I'm hoping that we will. What that means is we'll get some breathing room to decide how we want to face this thing. We'll keep you posted.

Satish Udpa: Second bit of news, the Governor has come out with some good budget decisions on higher education. She has recommended a uniform three percent increase for all 15 universities across the board, a recommendation that I will take in a heartbeat. It's not a bad recommendation. I'll take Governor does not wish to tie reward with performance.

Satish Udpa: If you remember, in Snyder's time, there was a whole bunch of metrics that we were evaluated against and universities that did better on those metrics got rewarded a little more than others. That's now gone for good.

Satish Udpa: But the state faces many budget challenges, many budget challenges. You all know about the road issue and the desire to fix that. Whole bunch of things. And the legislature will have a big say on what happens in the end, what happens in the end.

Satish Udpa: So, in that spirit, I continue to meet with a lot of legislators, met with the Governor to press for our case. We'll keep you posted. It will not be too long before a final decision comes down.

Satish Udpa: A small group of people are discussing what should happen to the IM West pool. IPF, Infrastructure, Planning, and Facilities, submitted four plans. We are evaluating all four plans to figure out what we should do. And a big chunk of that decision is going to be influenced by the amount of money we have and

what it would take to keep that swimming pool going. So we're figuring out what works best given our financial constraints.

Satish Udpa: That's all I have, but I'd also like to use the occasion to acknowledge the presence of two of our Trustees who are sitting in the back. Can you both stand up? Trustee Brianna Scott and Trustee Kelly Tebay. We are fortunate to have them here. Thank you for coming. They did have an event yesterday evening, a town hall kind of an event, where they invited faculty and students to join and share their opinions on just about anything. So thank you for doing that and thank you for being here.

Prof Moriarty: Thank you. I wanted to acknowledge that as well and to let everyone know that I understand it's gonna be a quarterly event, and so continue to watch MSU Today. I think we tried to put it in four different venues this time, four different media venues, so that you would know the time and the place. But we will continue to try to lift that up and also remember to mention it as we meet before the next times of those events.

Prof Moriarty: I just had some announcements that I think are relevant to faculty interests. The first is, and many of you have already seen this, the campus wide survey to benchmark culture and perceptions went out today, the No More at MSU survey. Please, as you receive that, respond. We are really hoping to get a robust set of responses from faculty and all of our students and staff. This is the first, and I know you've seen this said several times, this is the first comprehensive survey of this type we've ever done. We've done things with faculty, we've done things with students, we've done things with staff, but we've never asked the same set of questions at the same time to our entire campus.

Prof Moriarty: And many of the questions reference specifically since Fall of '18, so that it's really trying to capture a point in time. And this will be the benchmark. This will not be the last time you see this survey. It's just the first time. But if we can ask these questions periodically, it will allow us to see where we need to work, where we need to develop programs and the progress that we're making. So thank you for your participation in that.

Prof Moriarty: I wanted to let you know, if you haven't heard, that WKAR, our MSU communications arts and sciences public television station was named the Michigan Public Television Station of the year in our state. And I think for those of you who have faculty colleagues who are involved in WKAR or you just enjoy WKAR or your children enjoy WKAR, I know they would appreciate a note of congrats.

Satish Udpa: [inaudible 00:10:42] certain did.

Prof Moriarty: Exactly. And our children [inaudible 00:10:46] curious crew. But anyway, a note of congratulations on that would be appreciated.

- Prof Moriarty: MSU Debate qualifies three teams for the Nationals next week, and there's only six schools in the entire country that are allowed to qualify three teams and Michigan State is one of them. So we'll look forward to supporting our students in that and I look forward to announcing some good news after that competition.
- Prof Moriarty: Finally, I just want to call to your attention the latest US News and World Report edition, "America's Best Graduate Schools." Again, we have five programs that are ranked number one nationally. It's always easy to say, "Oh, those ratings, and what are they doing?" But we do appreciate the ways in which those rankings, whether or not we appreciate all the metrics and the ways that they're sometimes derived, the ways that they lift up really good programs on our campus.
- Prof Moriarty: Several of the College of Education programs, again, are ranked number one in the country. They have the College of Education, congratulations to all of you, have, I think, all of the programs in the college are ranked in the top eleven, and, of course, once again, the graduate program in Supply Chain Management is ranked number one in the country.
- Prof Moriarty: So, as we recruited a new Chair for the Supply Chain department, I can assure you that it was a helpful characteristic of that program to be able to say that this is highly respected across the country. So much of this, and again, this is the criticism, so much of it is a reputational ranking, and we can be critical of that, but at the same time, it is useful to know that your colleagues and peers across the country think highly of your work and respect your work.
- Prof Moriarty: So graduate students and other faculty are often appreciative of knowing that this is a program that has been lifted up in the ranking. So congratulations to all of you who have contributed to that. Every time we see these rankings, we remember that this is the collective work of very, very committed, talented faculty. So thanks for your efforts.
- Prof Moriarty: Thank you. Just a couple of things. The first one is that I just wanted to let people know how many people voted in the at-large vote for the at-large members of the steering committee was 983. That is actually a very high number in comparison to what we've had in the past. It would be nicer to have a much higher number. It was about a third of the faculty who voted. It would be really fabulous if we had a lot more people voting, but, as I said, this last year was the largest that we have ever had. It was over a thousand and this comes in second.
- Prof Moriarty: At the last Faculty Senate meeting, Trustee Byrum was here, and at that point, she mentioned about having questions submitted to the Presidential Search Committee. An e-mail was sent out to the Faculty Senate to get questions as soon as possible. In the meantime, I also got a communication from Trustee

Byrum asking if we could have questions that would be given to her the Friday of Spring break.

Prof Moriarty: So we had received the questions, and what we did was, we brought these questions ... We received 18 questions from the Faculty Senate. We brought those questions to the Steering Committee, and the at-large members came up with themes for the questions and the themed ... So there are the themes of diversity, lots of different vision, that kind of ... Four different things.

Prof Moriarty: So we have two sets of questions, one of which is the full list of questions from Faculty Senate, the other of which is the shorter list, which is the themes that were presented in that longer list. Those questions are presently on the web site under the Tracking System. So if you go to the Academic Governance web site and you look at the column on the left, there's a place that you can click on for Tracking System, and they will be there on that. You can click on those and see what the questions are.

Prof Moriarty: Trustee Byrum indicated that what she'd be doing with the two list of questions is the long list of questions, the complete list of questions would be used as conversations with the presidential candidates, for the Presidential Search Committee finalists. And the short list of questions, I requested that we get answers in writing from the candidates if they're not willing to become public. If they are willing to be public, then they will be asked to the candidates in a public forum. So the questions have gone forward and they are on the web site.

Prof Moriarty: New business. The University on Curriculum, Professor Marci Mechtel.

Prof Moriarty: Yes?

AndalunaBorcila: Andaluna Borcila, James Madison College. Thanks so much, Professor Moriarty, for sharing this with us.

AndalunaBorcila: It would have been good to see the questions. That was part of the agreement was that, in the e-mail you sent us, that before they would go out to the Board of Trustees, Faculty Senate would get to look at them. So that's one thing that I didn't want to comment on the process for this. But the second thing, briefly, I know that I and a number of other people, really went back and forth on whether or not we should submit questions, and I've sent you e-mails about this because it seemed to us that we don't really know where this process is going and that this could be used in a way to basically ... How can I put it? Shut down conversations of opening up the possibility of encountering the top finalists and actually posing them these questions in person.

AndalunaBorcila: So a number of us went back and forth. Some people didn't submit questions because they thought that we shouldn't submit questions in writing, that we should be able to engage with candidates in open forums. And some of us did submit questions.

AndalunaBorcila: And so I just wanted that to be recorded, that this process was fraught and people responded in different ways to it. And so, you know, I also want to make people aware of the fact that a group of Faculty Senators have started a petition asking for people to sign on it to open the search just for the top candidates, if they want to sign it.

AndalunaBorcila: But, also finally, that I wanted to pose the question to you because when Trustee Byrum said that ... Did Trustee Byrum said that the Board would be asking the candidates if they would be willing to be public in answering the questions?

Prof Moriarty: My understanding was that that would be what was happening, that she would ask them if they would be willing to be public, and I think ... And that was my understanding of what she said.

AndalunaBorcila: Okay.

Prof Moriarty: And my response to that was that if they were not willing to answer publicly, then what we would like to have is written answers to the themed list of questions.

AndalunaBorcila: So, I would like to urge you to continue to ask for us to be able to have a public encounter with the top presidential candidates because I think that that is the only way that that will be even a possibility. So if we continue to ask for that, that's really important.

AndalunaBorcila: In terms of the written questions, people have said that anybody can basically write a written question, or written answer to a questions. So I don't really know how much that will give us. And I've made points about this to you in e-mails and I know that other people have expressed their concerns.

AndalunaBorcila: I would really like us to continue to urge the Search Committee to ask for a public encounter with the top candidates so that we can pose our questions and they can answer the questions and we know who's answering the questions. And for reasons we've talked about before.

AndalunaBorcila: Thank you.

Prof Moriarty: I think that one of the reasons why the questions were forwarded before coming to Faculty Senate was a matter of timeliness in order to make sure the questions actually got where they were supposed to get. I'm not really sure where the Search Committee is in terms of finalists, but my understanding is that they have finalists at this point. So I don't know when the questions are gonna be asked or what's gonna happen with that because it's obviously a closed search, so we don't really know.

Prof Moriarty: The questions that were forwarded were all of the questions that we got. They have been brought back to Faculty Senate at the first Faculty Senate meeting and the reason ... And they were not altered. The questions and the long list were not altered. I took out quotations marks, but aside from that, the questions are as they were submitted.

Prof Moriarty: The shorter list of questions is, as I said before, it's a list that is derived from the larger list of questions. So just to ... And those are the ones that would be answered, that would be specifically answered.

Prof Moriarty: And we will keep in touch. Any time I hear anything from Trustee Byrum, you'll be the first to know about it because we need to keep in touch and make sure that the Search Committee is continually aware of the faculty interest in this search, that they are constantly reminded of how important that is to us and how interested we are and how vital it is.

Prof Moriarty: Any other comments? Yes? Yeah.

Joyce Meyer: Joyce Meyer from the Writing Program. Can you tell us again where the questions are? I keep trying to find them in my laptop and I can't.

Prof Moriarty: You go to the web site, and you type in 'academic governance,' and that'll take you to the Academic Governance site. And then on the Academic Governance site, there is a column on the left, and in that column is Tracking System.

Joyce Meyer: So it's not on the Presidential Search page?

Prof Moriarty: No. It is not on the Presidential Search page. Sorry about that.

Speaker 6: It's a long way down-

Prof Moriarty: It's a long way down to the Presidential Search questions. Yes. It's not right at the top. It's quite a ways down. Sure.

Joyce Meyer: Thank you.

Prof Moriarty: Sure. Any other questions? Comments?

Jill Slade: Jill Slade, College of Osteopathic Medicine. Just a very quick clarification question. The questions, and you might have covered it and I missed it, but the questions that will be forwarded, especially the short list, will those be asked in context of all the other questions or are these kind of a separate pool? You see what I'm saying? Because it seems to me like you interview people, you probably don't give them the whole list of questions you're going to ask them, so these responses then would be genuinely responses, not just how well can I compose a paragraph based on some very important topic to the University, but how do I respond in the moment.

Jill Slade: So I guess my question is, I'm sure that they're gonna be, for the whole Search Committee, somebody takes minutes, right? And so if these questions are posed, I think the information at least is available and it will be recorded as such that it will be kind of on the same slate.

Jill Slade: I guess I bring this up because I still think it's quite a benefit to have these questions be available and used as part of the search. And I think that we're getting more than we think we are. Am I wrong?

Prof Moriarty: No, I think we are. I think we have come many steps forward in terms of initially, we were told that there would be no questions, we were not allowed to submit questions, and they would not be used. And in the conversation that I had with Dianne Byrum, it was clear that that had changed and that we were now going to not only submit questions, but the long list of questions is used as places for conversation with the candidates, and the shorter list of questions will be used as actual questions.

Jill Slade: Perfect.

Prof Moriarty: That's my understanding.

Jill Slade: Okay. Thank you.

AndalunaBorcila: So, just a quick question about the questions, which I'm only now seeing. I guess you took the ones that were repeated a few times and put them at the top? Or that's how they were done in terms of the themes? Because I haven't seen them. I haven't been able to see them until now. It says we're looking at that, is that-?

Prof Moriarty: The themes came about because things were repeated. Those seemed to be repeated several times in terms of the long list of questions. Yeah.

AndalunaBorcila: Okay. Thank you for that clarification.

AndalunaBorcila: And when Faculty Senate came up with a list of criteria, we had agreed to automatically add to that list, "Expertise and knowledge in issues of sexual assault." Nowhere in any of the notes to anything does that appear. Not in the prospectus, not in the criteria, not in any of the questions. I mean, I asked a question about that because I think it's a really important question to be asked, but we had agreed as a Senate that we would forward a list to the Board so that they know that this is something important for us, and that was lost. I don't know where that is. And it seems to me that that needs to be something that we ask somebody. I mean, if we don't have that as a criteria, we don't have that mentioned anywhere.



AndalunaBorcila: So I'm concerned about the fact that that was lost. It was lost from the process of what we said we'd put forward to the Board, and it was lost from the process of the Board recording it as a criteria, and it's lost from these questions.

AndalunaBorcila: Thank you.

Prof Moriarty: So the Board ... That was what was given. The criteria from Faculty Senate were forwarded to the Board for sure. That was, that definitely happened. And the questions that came from Faculty Senate and the themes are based on the questions that came from Faculty Senate. I don't know how to be more clear than that.

Prof Moriarty: Yes?

Filomena Nunes: Filomena Nunes, EFRC. So, I'm sorry that we're spending too much time, perhaps, on this topic, more than we wanted, but this has to be the most important thing that we have in the horizon is the hiring of the next president. I was one of those that didn't submit questions.

Filomena Nunes: Now, I have a lot of questions. It's not that I don't have questions. I have a lot of questions, but I truly believe that vetting the president with a campus visit is very important for us. So I was one that wrote to Debra and just told her, "Look. I want to ask my questions. I don't want these to go into some black hole that I don't know what's gonna happen with them, and then I actually don't even know whether I get to see the answers."

Filomena Nunes: I understand we have an excellent Search Committee, but the Search Committee always relies on the interaction of the candidate was the reality of where they go. I understand there may be many pressures for the candidates not to disclose themselves early in the process, but once they're actually at the top, they better be having these conversations with their home institution.

Filomena Nunes: So at some point, it no longer makes sense to keep it a secret, and I think it's really important for us to get to interact and see this person in the reality of the field. This is MSU. It is not some other institution where this person is. How does this person interact with faculty, staff, students, and not some restricted group that is meeting outside, some other place.

Filomena Nunes: So I amongst the various people, I am one of them that didn't send the questions, and believe me, it's not because I don't have questions. And I just thought this comment was important given that we've got some Trustees here and I want to make sure that they don't get the wrong impression. It's not that we want to boycott the system at all. It's we want to be part of it and we think it's really important for the future of this University to have an opportunity for the candidates to interact with the University as it stands with its faculty, with its students and the staff, and to then get that feedback as a Search Committee and as Trustees, I think that is of enormous value.

Prof Moriarty: I think that it is very important that ... I want to thank the two Trustees for coming to this meeting. I think that is extremely important. I think it's extremely important that they hear what the faculty discussions are on this because I think we have a lot of people who feel very, very strongly about it. I think most of the faculty feels very strongly about it. And Trustee Scott, I believe, is on the Search Committee.

Prof Moriarty: So we have an opportunity here to have her become aware of people's feelings and how important this is. So thank you very much.

Prof Moriarty: Other comments?

Prof Moriarty: University Curriculum Report, Marci Mechtel.

Marci Mechtel: Marci Mechtel, College of Nursing. I actually have a very short report.

Marci Mechtel: UCC met on February 28th and approved the following program changes. There are no new programs, 29 program changes, and no program deletions. Furthermore, we approved 45 new courses, 92 course changes, and three course deletions. There are no moratoriums or discontinuations to report.

Marci Mechtel: Again, there's always the link for the short report are in the appendix, and then the link if you really want to delve through all of the information.

Marci Mechtel: So at this time, I'll make a motion to approve the UCC Report as presented.

Speaker 16: Second.

Prof Moriarty: Discussion? All in favor, say aye.

Prof Moriarty: Opposed? Motion carries.

Marci Mechtel: Thank you.

Prof Moriarty: Next, we have Scholarly Publishing and Communications with Joseph Salem, University Librarian.

Joseph Salem: Okay. Great. Thank you.

Joseph Salem: Thank you, everyone, for the invitation to discuss these topics with you today. I'm going to give a short presentation. I'm ... Last, if you have questions.

Speaker 10: Could you hold it?

Joseph Salem: Oh, sure. Happy to. Yeah, that's much better.

Joseph Salem: I'm gonna give a short presentation on Scholarly Communication and on Scholarly Publishing. I really kind of kicked off by some of the negotiations and work that's going on in California. Many of you may have read in the Chronical or other circles about the breakdown in negotiations between Elsevier and the University of California system. That's kind of the backdrop for this discussion, but it's obviously a much bigger topic than any one event.

Joseph Salem: So I wanted to give a short presentation, about 10, 15 minutes, touching on select developments in scholarly publishing. It's a huge topic and we can't get into all of it, but enough for a backdrop for our discussion.

Prof Moriarty: Could you introduce yourself?

Joseph Salem: Oh, that's right. I'm sorry. I feel like I've been here forever now. My name is Joe Salem. I'm the University Librarian. I started in August. I apologize that ... This is the first time I've presented to this group in this room, but not the first time I've been in this room to present.

Joseph Salem: We've been pretty active, actually, in this discussion ever since I ... Right before I started, actually. So it seems like an evolving topic for us in libraries and I think on campus as well.

Joseph Salem: In addition to the backdrop, I want to give you a little bit of a sense of where we are at MSU and then talk a little bit about open access and open education and some issues that we as a faculty might consider and think about going into the future.

Joseph Salem: So the two big topics over the last year or two have been, obviously, the University of California negotiations with Elsevier. And then another that you might hear a little bit about, something called Plan S, which is a European initiative to really drive publicly funded research into the public. We have similar responsibilities and requirements for some federal funding in the U.S., but this really moves European federally funded research into the open access platforms and into the open access discourse in a really systematic, and in some cases quick, and it may feel unrealistic ways for something people, but the idea is to require that work gets into open access platforms and kind of figure out what that means as we move forward.

Joseph Salem: The biggest one, though, lately, has been the University of California and Elsevier deal. This is a pretty significant negotiation to have stalled or break down. University of California's obviously a very significant system. They have a few things going on this deal that I kind of want to spell out, and if you are aware of all these newer developments, I apologize.

Joseph Salem: But this does follow on some additional work that's going on nationally and internationally around scholarly publishing. You may have heard of some of our peer institutions, single institutions canceling what we call "big deals." I'll talk a

little bit about what big deals means and how we use that negotiating strategy here. This is the idea of unbundling journals and scholarly contracts from big publishers.

Joseph Salem: That's been going on in the United States at an individual institutional level. The idea is that ... And we engage in this right now. It makes sense for us because we're a large land grant R1. We purchase or license significant contracts with major publishers where we get either everything or large swaths of their output. And if we're doing it on an individual title basis, we might not do that, but the discounts and the packaging is so robust that it saves us more money to do that at the larger level than to negotiate individual prices. Smaller institutions are finding that it doesn't make sense for them economically because if they break down those big deals, then they would have much smaller subscription models.

Joseph Salem: In addition to the big deal cancellations, there's a couple of issues here. We see it in Europe and it's part of the Plan S implementation. Some of the European countries overall individual research institutions are starting to just cancel major publisher deals or not renegotiate them. Germany is a big player in this. All the universities in Germany have canceled their Elsevier contract. The Max Planck Society, the University Alliance in Sweden, in Hungary, and as of last week, Norway. So 44 institutions including all their universities canceled or did not renegotiate with Elsevier.

Joseph Salem: You've probably heard about this for a very long time. The issue, somewhat of the issue, is escalating costs. There are a couple of issues there. There's the individual costs for the journals, and then there's just the massive growth in the number of journals. So even if we hold constant the per title cost, there's some evidence that may be the case that the per title cost is not really growing. The number of journals is just growing because scholarship changes, outputs change, and we see major players coming into the market. The Asian countries, China, for example, their scholarly output has really grown, so journals have grown in the Chinese language.

Joseph Salem: But the real issue and the real breakdown for California has been around the second issue, open access or hybrid journals. Elsevier now can claim that they are the largest publisher of open access material because they follow this hybrid journal model in which major universities and programs subscribe to their journals, and that is really the fundamental way that they receive funding. But then quite a few of us, either because we receive federal funding, and that's a major revenue stream, or because we're altruistic, or we're writing about open scholarship, or because our program will fund it, or because we have a local open access requirement, we'll pay what is called an article processing charge or some kind of fee to take those journal articles and make them openly available.

Joseph Salem: So, in essence, two revenue streams have popped up for major publishers like Elsevier, the subscription model and also the open access processing charge model. And what really happened at the University of California and what's

happening elsewhere is an attempt to kind of really reign in the costs overall for the institutions. We know what we spend in the libraries, but the rest of those costs are so distributed throughout the University that, until California really worked on the methodology to determine it, no one really knew what that revenue stream looked like for a place like Elsevier.

Joseph Salem: So what the goal of their negotiations was was to say, "Okay. We've been giving you as a system, say, \$10 million in subscriptions for the journals," which seems to be a number that they may have been negotiating around. "And I don't know exactly what the APC cost was, but say it was that, too. Maybe we've been giving you another \$10 million that nobody paid attention to. So rather than continue that way, why don't we bundle it all into one bill with the benefit of now understanding what that bill is and seeing it only grow in a really managed way, and then the real benefit is then, rather than doing this one or two faculty or individual faculty open access idea, all of the work that comes out of the University of California system would then become open access.

Joseph Salem: "So it's basically a line in the sand for negotiations, and the idea that, rather than being proactive about open access, now we're gonna pay you a little bit more or a lot more depending on your perspective, try to reign that cost in over the long term, and now everything we have goes open access through your journals."

Joseph Salem: And that's how it broke down there.

Joseph Salem: A little bit of the economics. You could see some of these numbers. It's a little bit misleading when we talk about all this. The real big issue is that second issue that I talk about as far as kind of obstructing how to understand this. Because of bundling, it's hard to really tell what any one institution pays for a journal or how much journals cost. There's sticker shock. We look at the sticker price of a journal and we get scared, especially when having to describe that to budget people on campus.

Joseph Salem: But the real issue is the bundling kind of obstructs that a little bit. The real big issue is the increase in output. And so we've seen that grow steadily in the last nearly 30 years.

Joseph Salem: So what does that mean for MSU? We do enjoy good support for our collections budget. The administration understands the economics here and the pressure on the budget. We have been able to keep our inflation rate lower than that six or seven percent that you saw on that last slide, mainly due to this bundling option, this big deal option. Currently, we have no idea what our APC spend is, that open access charge spend. You'll see in a moment, we're working on that. University of California's been really great and has shared their methodology, and now we can start to understand that a little more.

Joseph Salem: But you see that even at a four and a half percent increase, our library materials budget is mainly made up of serial subscriptions. So the monograph, the single titles, is not as much of our budget, so when that goes up to four and a half to five percent, it's a significant increase on our buying power as a library.

Joseph Salem: The big deals don't really ... They're not as bad for us because we are a comprehensive R1, but the question is, is that a sustainable model, especially once we understand really soon what our APC costs look like.

Joseph Salem: And this is just laid out to give you an idea of how complicated of a landscape this really is. So Elsevier is the major one. This is the one we always talk about. They're easy to vilify, but they're part of a larger landscape. These are just three publishers. Elsevier is so complicated, we have three different packages, or four of them, negotiated in three different ways. Our major one is done directly. We get one through Midwest Collaborative for Library Services, and then two packages through the Big Ten Academic Alliance. We have three packages with [Springer 00:41:36] through the BTAA and then two packages with [Wiley 00:41:39] through the BTAA.

Joseph Salem: So why talk about this here other than we really don't fully understand what the impact of the Elsevier deal might be on the University of California deal might be on us in negotiating or on the whole landscape going forward.

Joseph Salem: We do have negotiating partners for a lot of our contracts. The big contract that we have with Elsevier is on our own, but it doesn't have to be. So we could find it more advantageous for us or just to think about it from a larger Big Ten perspective to negotiate next time with the Big Ten. Those agreements would probably be much more around the idea of open access and understand the APC charge. We have a good deal on our subscription but we might not be getting a good deal as a university on the APC cost. And so once we understand what's going on there, it might make a lot more sense for us to really band together with the Big Ten.

Joseph Salem: There is an awful lot to be thinking about overall, and I think it's not helpful just to throw a bunch of issues out at you, but this does kind of wrap into our land grant mission and how to think about some of this work going forward.

Joseph Salem: I mentioned Plan S before. Many of you who work, especially in the STEM disciplines know the federal requirements for open access, open data. At MSU, we've been working a bit in this area so there's a really great program that includes the College of Arts and Letters, support from the Provost's Office, and the MSU Press is part of this. It's called Toward an Open Monograph Ecosystem, or TOME, which sounds foreboding. This is the idea of sponsoring or subventing the funds for long form scholarship to make it open access.

Joseph Salem: And then, at this institution, we do not currently have an institutional repository, or a way for any of you to deposit your work, your scholarship, in an

open system sponsored by MSU. So the libraries, IT, and College of Arts and Letters are working on an institutional repository called MSU Commons based on the platform developed at the the Modern Language Association, the Humanities Commons. This would be an interdisciplinary version of that.

Joseph Salem: In a related area, we've seen work in support of open education. The library is taking a leadership role. Here, we're working with the Hub and others on campus. There are increasingly federal funding requirements or encouragement to have an open education piece as part of some grants, so turning scholarship into open educational resources. At MSU, there is the Course Resource Choices project that was a collaboration between the libraries and the Hub. There's obviously the Course Materials program in the libraries. The libraries just joined the Open Textbook Network and they will be on campus in the Fall to provide programming and training for faculty and a small stipend program for reviewing textbooks in their platform. And then we're recruiting an open education resources library to help support this kind of work.

Joseph Salem: So, finally, some issues for you to consider. One of the reasons that the University of California was successful in having these negotiations go forward and having a unified front across all those different campuses was the fact that the faculty had already, depending on whom you ask, either adopted or were forced to adopt an open access policy throughout the system. We want to say forced to adopt. I think there was enough momentum there, but it's a big system and I think it also kind of gains momentum after a bit.

Joseph Salem: But this is really at the core of why to negotiate on things like APCs and get work out into the open. So this is something that we can take up. We already have the University Committee on Libraries. This is work that the Committee on Libraries can easily look into. I serve as a ex officio on that committee and would be happy to work with them on either resolution or policy or how that might work going forward.

Joseph Salem: There's additional professional development and support. We'd be happy to work with the Hub and with the Academic Advancement Network. Really good programming and training on negotiating rights when publishing. Many of us don't even realize how much we can negotiate when we publish to keep our copyright and to be able to put things in the open access kind of platforms, either ours or others'.

Joseph Salem: And then, finally, there's always the sentiment that open access and open education requires changing things like promotion and tenure, and I really don't believe that. I think there's enough flexibility in our guidelines, but there is work around documenting the impact and how do you document that work. So that's another area where I think libraries and some of our partners would be happy to work with people like the Academic Advancement Network to advance that kind of professional development and engagement.

Joseph Salem: So, with that, I will shameless self promote and ask you if you have any questions or want to discuss further.

Lisa Lupita: Lisa Lupita, College of Natural Science.

Lisa Lupita: I really appreciate this presentation and I want to point out that I think everything that I've read about this in the press has really overlooked what I think is an important economic factor, which is that individual scholars, investigators, are making the decision of which button to click when they're submitting a paper and looking at the prices, which are usually a factor of four higher or five higher for open access and recognizing that that cost is coming out of direct cost from a grant. And it's entirely up to us. And you can think altruistic thoughts, but you can also think, "Gee, that extra \$2,000 could send somebody to a conference. That sounds way more useful than paying for open access."

Lisa Lupita: And so I'm really glad that people are trying to talk about the dispersity, but I think that if you really want to get at it, just the numbers isn't enough. I think you have to actually understand what is the actual ratio between those two choices for the average investigator?

Joseph Salem: I think that's a great point. Thank you for the comment. I would also say that we all recognize that none of this is free. It's a matter of who pays and what that cost has to be, right? There's an argument out there that there's enough money in the scholarly publishing system now to really support open access at scale. It's a matter of moving that money around a bit and it might be moving it away from a subscription model to more what's called a publish and read model, so much more around an article processing charge kind of model. In those, I think you have to move the costs to a central place and it has to be at scale to make sense. So the individual really isn't the one who has to make the decision on whether to make it open access or not. It has to be kind of a default to really work at scale.

Joseph Salem: There are issues, though. If you're in a developing country, right now the issue is around access, there it would be around output. So we really need to think that through in a more systematic way.

Rich Bellon: All right. Thanks, Joe. I think that was wonderful. This is Rich Bellon, Lyman Briggs College and Department of History.

Rich Bellon: There's just two other things that I would like to add. The first is these publishers are remarkably sort of profitable. The profit margin for Elsevier is somewhere in the neighborhood of 37 percent. So they're making an enormous amount of money.

Rich Bellon: And the second thing is that this money that they're taking in is, in my experience as a editor of an Elsevier journal, not being plowed into making a



better project. The production system that I've struggled with with Elsevier was awful. The one very senior scholar who published in my journal wrote to the Production Manager. She said, "In 30 years, I've never had such a bad experience."

Rich Bellon: So I think that that's also should be part of the conversation. One is these large, for-profit academic publishers are making a lot of money, but they're also providing, at least in my experience, bad service both for authors and for editors independent of the question of keeping readers away from our scholarship by putting it behind paywalls.

Rich Bellon: Thank you.

Joseph Salem: I would only add to that that I think the business model is changing a bit. I think some of Elsevier's profitability is around diversifying their business model as well. They're more profitable than other even large publishers and part of that is that they've moved into data and some other platforms, but your point is really well taken.

Joseph Salem: Any additional questions or concerns?

Prof Moriarty: Is there a way for people to reach you and reach University Library Committee if they have other comments or questions?

Joseph Salem: Please feel free to e-mail me directly. Sarah Long in the College of Music is chairing the committee this year and she'd be happy ... We've engaged in this topic in the committee as well, so we'd be happy to take it up in any way that the Faculty Senate would like to.

Prof Moriarty: Thank you very much. Do we have any comments from the floor?

AndalunaBorcila: Andaluna Borcila, back at the microphone. I wanted to ask about the process of election, the election we just did, or time's up, vote if you haven't, until five for the new Chair and Vice Chair of Senate.

AndalunaBorcila: So I was wondering, when I wanted to vote, I really would have wanted to have access to some kind of a statement. And also, I really wanted to know if there are people from this group who want to be Chair of Faculty Senate, I mean from the group of the five new Steering Committee members, three new [inaudible 00:52:37], or people who might really not want to run for Steering Committee Faculty Senate. I think that there are people who might want to run for the Steering Committee but not ...

AndalunaBorcila: So I'm just wondering, how can this process be made better? What do the bylaws specify about this? Because I'm uncertain. I've asked for some clarification, but we're basically voting for somebody, but unless you've copied and pasted the information about the three new Steering Committee members

or you voted for those, now you're voting for a Chair of Faculty Senate and you don't have access to even their old statement, what are we voting on?

AndalunaBorcila: So I voted. I'm not saying let's redo the vote. I just think that we were missing some important piece of information. When I vote, I want to know who I'm voting for, if they want to be elected to the position of Chair of Senate and why.

Prof Moriarty: So that is not in the bylaws. What is in the bylaws is only that the Faculty Senate Chair will be elected from the at-large members, and all at-large members are therefore running for Chair of the Faculty Senate.

Prof Moriarty: If there is further information that needs to be in the bylaws, then that should go to the University Committee on Academic Governance for addition into the bylaws.

AndalunaBorcila: I think that would be a good idea and I don't know how to move that forward, but [crosstalk 00:54:01].

Prof Moriarty: You simply send it to the Steering Committee and then it would go forward.

Prof Moriarty: Any other comments from the floor?

Prof Moriarty: Is there a motion to adjourn?

Speaker 16: [inaudible 00:54:16]

Prof Moriarty: Second? Discussion? All in favor say aye. Motion carries.