

**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE
ON
LIBRARY AND SCHOLARLY COMMUNICATION
2010-2011 ANNUAL REPORT**

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The University Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication (UCOLASC) met three times in the 2010-2011 academic year to conduct business in accordance with its charge, outlined in [Senate Bylaw 185](#), to advise the president about the administration of University libraries. Highlights of the committee's major activities are outlined briefly below.

Negotiations with Nature Publishing Group

Ivy Anderson, Director, Collection Development & Management at the California Digital Library reported on the negotiations with Nature Publishing Group. Last spring UC received its official quote for its licensing fee which represented a quadruple increase in the costs. CDL reduced costs by 8% with a large set of publishers and this increase would undo CDL's efforts. CDL had reached out to publishers to discuss the budget situation. Last spring a letter was sent to faculty about the proposal from Nature which indicated the possibility of a boycott. The letter was met with some consternation but much more support. NPG sees themselves as a premier service that should be expensive. The cost of Nature with the quadruple increase would be very unreasonable. UC entered into discussions with NPG which are about an entirely new model.

Under the proposed new model, authors would pay for submission and then for publication. The author will have to determine if an article should be submitted to Nature or some other journal. Paying for publication of the article can be seen as part of the experiment and the fee can be taken out of a grant although support will need to be provided for faculty that do not have grants. Authors will keep the copyright. By default of shifting costs, the goal is that eventually open access will be achieved, although in the short term, access will continue to be restricted to subscribers. Faculty in the Humanities and Social Sciences could be supported by the funds that are coming back into the University. If NPG agrees to change its model the hope is that other publishers will adopt it. NPG can decide how much to charge authors and possibly end up with higher revenue, and if the submission fee is too high authors will not publish in their journals. The negotiations have forced NPG to look at their current business model and where they want to be in the future. Currently UC has a month to month journal licensing agreement with NPG.

Journal Negotiations

Director Anderson also reported on recent negotiations with other journal publishers for systemwide subscriptions. In fiscal year 2011, CDL had \$39 million in systemwide expenditures and 87% was from the campuses and 13% was from CDL. Sixty-seven percent went to journals and 28% went to other kinds of content. The increase in the percentage to journals was related to publisher acquisitions and more content coming to UC. CDL has been working on reducing expenditures in the last several years and worked closely with publishers to do this. Zero percent increases were negotiated with many publishers while in the past typically there were increases in the range of 7%. These contracts included Sage and Wiley. CDL was asked to reduce expenditures by 15%. CDL had \$13 million in expenditures last year which includes a 15% reduction with Wiley. After a 30 day trial of SCOPUS this database was not purchased because it did not provide value in terms of its underlying content. This database would have cost UC

approximately \$1 million. Elsevier is developing a number of expensive search tools that use SCOPUS.

This year there were negotiations with Springer. The open access pilot with this publisher was well received. Springer is the third most expensive contract and on a cost per article download basis they are high. Springer was not willing to let UC cancel any journals, stating that the value of the deal is in the bundle. Data from purchase history is used to determine what will be used as a basis for what CDL proposes to pay. A small core of journals is heavily used and a larger group had medium usage. Libraries did not want to eliminate the low usage journals which would have resulted in about a 10% decrease in cost. CDL looks at how much a journal is cited by UC faculty and cost effectiveness which includes cost per use and per impact factor among other metrics. A list of journals is developed based on campus bibliographers and the metrics. The agreement with Springer was scaled back and open access was taken off the table. Springer was sold before the most recent negotiation and they are operating in a new management environment. The company is now owned by two different private equity investors. Three hundred sixty seven journals were canceled but UC will have access to some journals in the next year, but access will be lost to others. Springer is the first publisher to push open access on a large scale and now they have 70 journals under the Springer Open imprint.

Library Planning Task Force

The Library Planning Task Force attempted to identify areas where there could be budget savings. The Task Force's report is a series of recommendations around four broad strategies which are to expand and collectively manage shared library services, supporting faculty efforts to change the system of scholarly communication, explore new sources of revenue, and to improve the existing framework for planning and decision making. More work will be done in terms of how the Task Force's recommendations could be implemented. Implementation will occur in three phases.

Some recommendations would require start up costs that UCOP could get loans for as long as the projects will be able to pay UCOP back. The goal is \$14 million in savings in year one and \$25 million in year two, with the goal of saving approximately \$52 million by the end of year three. UCOP will consider ways to provide systemwide services that save the campuses' money and the savings could be added to increase CDL's budget. The task force suggested a variety of ideas including how space is used. UCOP has taken on some centralized functions of the libraries which has worked well and the question is can more be done centrally. Shared library services need to be pursued There are services that make sense to provide on a systemwide basis although some could be done by the campuses which would give them more flexibility in how funds are used.

The Task Force report will be reviewed by the EVCs and the campuses, and as the recommendations are implemented there should be consultation with UCOLASC. In September a group will be formed to determine how to implement recommendations in phase one with the goal of beginning implementation in January 2012. The budget may impact libraries before they are positioned to manage reductions or benefit from shared services. The Task Force was able to build on planning already conducted by the University Librarians. The draft report will formally be evaluated by SLASIAC. The report will be finalized in the fall. The decisions about cuts to library budgets will be made by the campuses, not UCOP. There will be an 18% reduction of the

UCOP budget and the goal is to be selective about what is cut. Libraries will continue to evolve and increasing efficiencies should be done regardless of the budget situation. UCOLASC submitted a memo outlining a number of concerns with the report.

Update on Library Initiatives

There is a working group on next generation collection services for libraries which appointed three task groups that will make recommendations on how to maximize systemwide efforts to benefit the individual campuses. One is looking at improving the systemwide financial infrastructure, another with exploring enterprise level collection management services and the final group is looking at new modes for organizing and providing access to digital materials, archives and special collection materials. There were forty recommendations that were prioritized with the highest priority given to recommendations that are aligned with recommendations from the Library Planning Task Force. One example is that UC could sign a systemwide agreement to acquire shelf ready services. A task force is looking at doing more digital library services. Digitizing high use materials can be done more systematically. Google has digitized more than UC could have afforded although special collection and non-text materials are not included in this effort. Campuses have put small digitization projects in place and this could be done more systematically.

Infrastructure to manage data has been put in place by CDL. This is an expensive undertaking that is done more economically at a central level. The University of California data center is a direct response to NSF's mandate for data management. A tool has been developed for faculty to create data management plans. Rationalizing the print collections has been a focus of the ULs for many years and this needs to continue. UC is a leader in respect to looking at print collections but other research universities are in a similar position. There is also work on rationalizing retrospective print journal collections. An archive of single copies of journals in different parts of the country is being considered.

Concern about Library Budgets

UCOLASC learned about the reduction of the libraries' operations budgets as a result of the cuts in state funding to UC. Library budgets have been cut by as much as twenty percent and future cuts are being explored. There have also been substantial reductions in library hours at many of the campuses. Discussions about consolidating or eliminating libraries have occurred. Special collections have been closed and specialized staff have separated from UC.

Google Booksearch

Dan Clancy, Former Engineering Director, Google Books and Jimi Crawford, Engineering Director, Google Books joined UCOLASC in May to discuss issues related to the Google digitization project and the failed settlement agreement. The committee wanted to inform Google about what is important to faculty. Lack of engagement with the Academic Senate and others at UC hurt the project and settlement agreement. Google felt that the agreement was a compromise that balanced the different interests, and that UC and Google have similar values. Having more conversations with faculty earlier would have been beneficial.

According to Mr. Clancy, the settlement was rejected primarily because it had forward going permissions. Scanned books in the public domain can be fully accessed and if publishers give Google the books, only 20% can be accessed. Most of the books scanned were from academic authors. Faculty with out of print books may not necessarily know if they have rights to them.

Google is still talking with the plaintiffs about whether there is another type of settlement. On the questions of pricing and monopoly, for the vast majority of academic books most of the authors would be willing to give their books away. University presses could be encouraged to support academic authors to distribute their books for free.

One major hurdle was figuring out what the content Google provides would look like. Faculty would like to maintain a boundary between the content and commercialization. UCOLASC was also concerned about privacy issues and the lack of information from Google about their plans for this was a problem. Google was not able to figure out a way to allow other companies to scan the books and was advised by the DOJ that this was not possible under class action law. Mr. Clancy thinks that if the settlement had been approved there would immediately have been legislation that prevented Google from holding a monopoly.

Mr. Clancy stated that Google had no intention of having advertisements and that this would have been bad business. If ads were run, this would have been in order to charge a university less for the subscription. Google used the subscription model grudgingly. In the settlement Google explicitly stated that academic authors could offer their books for free. The consumer price was separated from the institutional subscription. In Google Search and Google Scholar there is no directed research and the company is religious about not having a bias. The company does try to have links to authoritative sources and sponsored links have nothing to do with the organic ranking. Books that are in the limited snippet view are ranked lower because Google's consumer surveys find that people do not like them. OCR is run on all of the books and correction is done through recapture which improves OCR errors. The settlement agreement would have allowed institutions to have access to all of the books Google scanned.

Whether anything is happening with the settlement has to be determined and then the question of how to involve academics will need to be addressed. Google is willing to unlock the scanned books and giving them to users. There should be an initiative from academics promoting giving the books away. Most authors of out of print books can write the publishers to request that the rights are reverted to them. A statute will be implemented in 2013 that addresses reverting copyright. The money Google is spending on the project far outstrips the benefit to the company. Google has scanned 15 million books and there is no goal for how many will ultimately be scanned. The company has a new CEO and it is still unclear if this will have an impact on the Book project. Google should be invited to a meeting next year so the committee can have ongoing discussions with the company.

Joint Meeting with University Librarians

UCOLASC met with the University Librarians in February to discuss common topics of interest, including funding streams, the library planning task force, and library initiatives.

Campus Reports

UCOLASC devoted part of each regular meeting to member reports about issues facing divisional Senate library committees. In these discussions, faculty members touched on library budget and space issues, and collections.

Other Issues and Additional Business

In response to requests for formal comment from the Academic Council, UCOLASC submitted views on the following:

- Proposed Revisions to APMs 010 and 015
- Near Term Choices for UC
- Library Planning Task Force

Committee Consultations and Acknowledgements

UCOLASC acknowledges the contributions of its administrative consultants and guests. The committee benefited from consultation and reports from University Librarians Convener Virginia Steel (UCSC), University Librarian and Assistant Chancellor Karen Butter (UCSF), California Digital Library Executive Director Laine Farley, Vice Provost, Academic Information and Strategic Affairs Dan Greenstein, and Librarians Association of the University of California President Michael Yonezawa (UCR). UCOLASC also occasionally consulted the Academic Senate chair and vice chair about issues facing the Academic Senate.

Respectfully submitted:

Richard Schneider, Chair (SF)

Christopher Kelty (LA)

Chikako Takeshita (R)

Timothy Morton (D)

Lee Ann Baxter-Lowe (SF)

Garrett Liles (Graduate student-D)

Roberto Manduci (SC)

Sholeh Quinn (M)

Larry Armi (SD)

Stuart Linn (B)

Laurie Monahan (SB)

Joel Primack ((SC); Chair, UCCC, *Ex-Officio*)

Daniel Simmons ((D), Chair, Academic Senate, *Ex Officio*)

Bob Anderson ((B), Vice Chair, Academic Senate, , *Ex Officio*)

Brenda Abrams, Committee Analyst