Graduate & Professional Student Senate

GPSS Executive Committee Meeting- 19 November 2014
Meeting called to order at 5:35 by meeting chair Alice Popejoy

Members Present:
GPSS President Alice Popejoy
GPSS Secretary Natalie Gordon
GPSS Treasurer Douglass Taber
GPSS Vice President Alex Bolton
Executive Senator Eddie Schwieterman
Executive Senator Elloise Kim
Executive Senator Evan Firth
Executive Senator Yasmeen Hussain
SAO Adviser Rene Singleton
Guest Juliya Ziskina
Guest Austin Wright-Pettibone

Approval of Agenda
Yasmeen moved to approve the agenda for Nov 19, 2014
Alice objected, moved to amend agenda to insert a discussion on the Innovation Pipeline event
Alice entertained motion to approve the edited agenda, Elloise seconded
Agenda for the meeting on 19 November 2014 approved without objection.

Approval of Minutes
Alice entertained a motion to approve the minutes (sent out by Secretary) for Nov 5, 2014
Evan moved to approve the minutes, Yasmeen seconded
Minutes for the meeting on 5 November 2014 approved without modification.

Innovation Pipeline Updates
Alex: There was good attendance, people were really engaging and the event fed into the Legislative Reception nicely.
Eddie: Was there anything that you would like to improve for next year?
Alice: I would have liked more people to show up. People thought that they had to have a poster to show up. Next time we should edit the language used in the email so people don't get confused.
Yasmeen: The people who were there were already interested in supporting higher education. I didn't quite get the purpose of the event.
Alice: For the most part you are right, but that is okay. When you have an advocacy event and you have something you want to support, you are most likely preaching to the choir. But they don't necessarily know what the antidote is and how to deliver those messages. We want to use these kinds of advocacy events to know who our allies are and to reach out to them when we want to persuade the others who aren't as supportive.

Alex: The people with credible voices are TAs and RAs and graduate students so it was good to hear from them.

Alice: Quick question, typically we do the Higher Education Summit before this event, but legislators aren't going to stay the whole day and then go have dinner at the Legislative Reception, so the idea was to have a shorter event. Does it still make sense to have the Higher Ed Summit?

Alex: Maybe if we invite other universities to join the conversation.

Alice: Ok we can discuss it more later. I want to give a big thank you to the Science and Policy Committee. They really gave us a lot of support.

Douglass: And Angela and other staff who pulled this off really last minute.

Open Access to Research Articles - Juliya Ziskina and Austin Wright-Pettibone

Juliya: I am a second year student at the UW Law School, I have been with GPSS for over a year, and I have been working on this since May. I have been working on this with Austin, Jenny, and several librarians who have a lot of experience with open access.

Open Access Presentation:

Definition of open access:

The free, immediate, online availability of online articles. We are not talking about open data or open government.

Why do we need open access?

Scholarly journal prices have increased in the last 30 years by over 350%. We have been really fortunate at UW, because we haven't really experienced much funding cuts. More and more universities are realizing that there should be an alternative. We can leverage digital technology to create, share and use scholarly work. It is more efficient.

Who benefits from open access?

Students benefit because education depends on access to scholarship.

Professors benefit because open access would provide more teaching resources and make teaching more effective.

The University of Washington benefits because open access would create more visibility for the institution.

The libraries benefit because open access would help us deliver more high quality research.

Authors and researchers benefit because they could be in control of their work and its copyright. Making their research openly available would increase citations and impact.

Since UW is a publicly funded school, the public should be able to have access to information. Knowledge should be a public good.

Proposal

Formalize the process of depositing research articles in the UW's existing database for institutional research work.

Scope of the policy.

Articles would be deposited after peer-review, but before copy-editing. We would be going from an opt-in system to an opt-out system. There are some publishers who doesn't like open access, so this is so the authors can waive the policy for a specific article.

The takeaway

This will not impinge on academic livelihood or integrity. We won't be the first at all, this has been adopted nationally.

<u>Misconception about open access</u>

This policy would be a financial burden

- This is unlikely because we already have the infrastructure in place. The UW libraries already have experience supporting access to research for the past several years.

Publishers won't want to publish UW work

- Publishers are used to dealing with these requests, if not, the authors can request the opt-out option.

Open access would harm journal or peer-review

- There is no empirical evidence that open access leads to a loss in revenue. It doesn't affect peer-review process at all because peer review happens before the article is deposited in the open access database.

It is difficult and time consuming to deposit articles.

- This is false. It can be as simple as sending an email to librarians who are already doing similar work.

<u>Recap</u>

Open access is cost-effective alternative and would improve students' educational experience and make resources more available.

Questions and Concerns on Open Access

Eddie: What will the procedure be for enforcing these rules? How are you going to ensure this would work? How do you make depositing articles mandatory?

- Juliya: Primarily by communicating with faculty. UW libraries have experience with this. UC also has a lot of experience and success with this system.

Yasmeen: If communication is a key thing, I wonder if the opt-out policy is necessary.

- Juliya: As soon it starts as a requirement, participation starts shooting up.
  - Yasmeen: I wonder if it has anything to do with making it a requirement though. I don't think it's necessary as a requirement, rather communicating this to students and faculty is what would really make a difference.
  - Juliya: I don't really see a downside of this though.

Elloise: What are the reasons for other institutions to have open access? I am concerned about the conflict that lies with faculty not wanting to participate.

- Juliya: This policy would grant a non-exclusive disclosure for UW. UW would retain the rights, but the journal publishers will have the final rights to the final edited version. The biggest push back from faculty I have heard is that they don't want to change. Another thing is communication. A lot of these misconceptions are very real. They are concerns with copyrights and more, but it's not necessarily true. It's mainly just communicating the facts to faculty and researchers.

Elloise: I am unsure how successful this would be at this moment.

- Austin: This is something that has momentum too. We are talking about prior work that GPSS has done with open access. Overall though, we want to look at places where there is actual progress.
- Juliya: Most faculty would support this if given the proper knowledge.

- Evan: Your PhD thesis goes into the depository, so faculty have some familiarity with it.
- Alex: Why hasn't this happened already? Why was it originally opt-out rather than opt-in?
- Austin: Libraries had capacity issues. They have made a lot of progress with the communication. They have also been able to bring this issue up to the provost and deans.

Evan: Will there be any financial incentive for open access?
- Juliya: Groups have mentioned setting up an author fund.

Alice: I am concerned with presenting the idea and resolution together at Senate. It is not fair to ask people to read it and have meaningful feedback during the holiday season. I think it would be better if we give you 30 minutes to present it and ask people to vote on it at a later meeting.

Yasmeen: Actually it sounds like it is going to have a lot of discussion, do you think it is possible for you to bring more people, so if people have comments and questions, they can just break out and have a discussion?

Juliya: Yes, that is a good idea.

Senate Meeting Agenda
Alice: We have 30 minutes for open access. Should we say open access in research articles? Also, who is our spotlight?

Natalie: Jaye from Scholars' Studio.

Yasmeen: Let's do 15 minutes for the spotlight.

Natalie: Did we decide senators need 7 days of update in advance for the legislative agenda?

Alex: Yes.

Natalie: Can you put that on the calendar?

Alex: I will do an update and recap email.

Natalie: I will send it out a week in advance.

Natalie: So far we have call to order, approval of agenda, approval of minutes, open access in research articles for 25 minutes, discussion and approval of the legislative agenda for 30, anything else?

Alice: Actually I think it should be separate items. Information item and action item for discussion and approval.

Yasmeen: Officer reports for 20.

Alice moved to approve the Senate agenda, Evan seconded

Executive Senator Reports
Yasmeen: I might be unable to attend meetings on time next quarter due to class. But I totally understand if we need someone to be present.

Alice: We have the authority to change the meeting time.

Yasmeen: Instead of trying to figure it out at this minute, maybe we can talk about it later, maybe send out a scheduling invite?

Alice: Sounds good, thank you for the heads up.

Evan: The Legislative Reception went well, and congratulations everyone.

Eddie: I am going to continue as a Union Steward.

Elloise: I will make sure to report if anything relevant shows up in meetings I am attending.

Alex: Austin and I are going down to Olympia tomorrow. Student debt will be the main focus of the meeting and conference.

Douglass: Travel Grants are done. We funded 16 out of 40 applications. There were a few mishaps, but it went smoothly. We are adding more steps to the Travel Grant system, and it should be even better.

Natalie: SriHarsha and I met today and we are going to pursue an app for GPSS.

Alice: The Dean of Built Environments is advising HFS on the new construction project. The access and affordability issues have not been resolved very well. The messaging is not very clear in terms of how this would affect diversity on campus if we raise the rate for on-campus housing.

Natalie: I am sending out the minutes and agenda now.

Rene: I have an update about the RSO directory. There was a problem with hyperlink so when you looked up RSOs, you had access to members' emails but it has been fixed.

Alice: The Ferguson conversation event was really good, I would like to do something more like that later in the year and maybe bring in the micro-aggressions issue. I think fighting racism is an important issue and I would really like to have more conversation on that in the future.

Adjournment
Alice entertained a motion to adjourn the meeting.
Evan moved to adjourn, Eddie seconded.

Meeting adjourned at 6:50 pm.