Chair Manduchi summarized the meeting agenda. He noted that he recently sent the Academic Council a copy of the California Digital Library’s (CDL) six-month implementation progress report for the Senate’s Open Access Policy, along with a cover letter from UCOLASC indicating that the committee supports expanding the three campus pilot to all ten campuses. CDL’s next progress report will discuss the roll-out of the automated Open Access harvesting tool. Council has also sent comments to UCOP summarizing the systemwide Senate review of a proposed Presidential Open Access Policy that would apply to non-Senate UC authors.

II. Consent Calendar
   - UCOLASC October 31, 2014 Meeting Minutes

Action: UCOLASC approved the October minutes with minor corrections noted.

III. Consultation with Academic Senate Office

The Academic Senate Office manager reported that the Senate’s new travel reimbursement form is posted on the Senate website. All air travelers must attach an itinerary to the form that shows proof of payment. Drivers should provide total mileage along with to-and-from addresses.

IV. Consultation with UC Press
   - Alison Mudditt, Director, University of California Press

Director Mudditt briefed UCOLASC on two new Open Access (OA) programs that UC Press launched in late January—Collabra, an OA journal program, and Luminos, an OA monograph program. Scholarly publishing is facing a financial crisis. UC Press loses an average of $10,000 on each monograph it publishes, and the subscription pricing practices of the large journal publishers are pushing library budgets to the breaking point. UC Press believes that Collabra and Luminos offer a more sustainable business model that will help address the crisis. The programs also align with the new Open Access policy and the larger mission of the UC Press—to give “voice, reach, and impact” to the scholarship it publishes.

Collabra’s financial model is based on an author Article Processing Charge of $875, and a “pay it forward” system, which offers peer reviewers a $250 payment that reviewers may choose to defer to the Collabra Waiver Fund or to their library’s OA fund. Collabra has appointed 50 editors, and will be accepting submissions beginning in March. UC Press thinks the transparency of the model and its
community-driven editorial board will attract authors. Collabra will not require the publication of reviewer reports or the identification of reviewers, at least in the beginning.

Luminos was shaped by extensive research, broad consultation with a variety of UC constituencies, and a survey of 1,000 faculty. It maintains the same standards for selection, peer review, Editorial Committee approval, production, and marketing that UC Press uses for other books. UC Press thinks it will increase the visibility and impact of scholarly work, and ensure that publishing decisions are based on the merit of the work, not the size of audience. It will support the flexibility and multimedia capabilities of the digital format while maintaining a print option. The Luminos shared-cost financial model offers a community-based solution for increasingly unsustainable monograph costs. The model assumes a total baseline publication cost of $15,000 per monograph, supported by library and UC Press subsidies, revenue from print sales, and a $7,500 author contribution, which could be addressed in part by various campus/department funds and other sources. Luminos has already signed ten monographs for the program. The decision to participate will be entirely the author’s.

The Mellon Foundation recently awarded UC Press and the CDL a $750K grant to develop a cloud-based content management system for digital monographs that is expected to increase efficiencies and reduce costs.

**Discussion:** UCOLASC members asked Director Mudditt to clarify the components of Luminos’ publication cost, and also noted some concerns about the pay-to-publish model. Director Mudditt noted that $15,000 covers the cost of peer review, copy editing, professional cover design, XML file creation, marketing, digital hosting, and the production of approximately 50 print copies. The figure is low in comparison to most commercial and university publishers. UC Press cannot afford to cover the publication cost without an author contribution, although it is possible that fundraising and foundation support could help offset more of the total cost in the future. A UCOLASC member proposed that UC Press explore a less expensive model that would allow faculty to select specific publication and marketing services from a menu of options. Another member suggested that UCOLASC make a statement requesting greater institutional support for UC Press and/or subventions for first academic book publication.

**V. Challenges Facing Scholarly Communications in the Humanities**

- **Richard Terdiman, UCSC Research Professor, Literature**

Professor Terdiman is a former chair of the Senate Editorial Committee. He also served on the Special Committee on Scholarly Communication (SCSC), which made, in 2005-2006, a number of best practice recommendations related to copyright, book and journal publishing, and the academic personnel process.

One outcome of SCSC was the founding, in 2006, of the literary series *Flashpoint*, which received a five-year grant from the Mellon Foundation to publish first books simultaneously as hard-copy and OA publications. In 2011, after UC Press cancelled a number of unprofitable scholarly publications, including the *Flashpoint* series, the Editorial Committee released a statement and resolution protesting the cancellation and the lack of faculty consultation leading to the decision. (*Flashpoint* is currently hosted by Northwestern University Press.)

Professor Terdiman noted that scholarly communication is a system that involves multiple players and functions. Budgetary pressures on university presses have downstream implications for the faculty promotion and tenure system. As presses react to these pressures by downsizing and retrenching, they publish fewer titles, particularly in the Humanities, making it more difficult for faculty to publish and achieve tenure. He noted that the crisis in Humanities publishing should be addressed holistically, and
proposed that the Senate form a new Special Committee to consider the crisis from a modern UC perspective, to help the university get ahead of the changes in scholarly publishing that are expected to occur over the next decade.

VI. Consultation with Academic Senate Office
- Dan Hare, Vice Chair Academic Senate

Budget Update: State budget hearings began in Sacramento this week. UCOP senior leaders are there to argue UC’s case to legislators, and to educate new policymakers about UC’s mission and the role of research at a research university. Some policymakers are focused on the goal of cutting costs and increasing UC student “throughput.” Others are interested in the faculty research and teaching workload balance. Meanwhile, a Select Advisory Committee on the Cost Structure of the University, involving the Governor, President Napolitano, and their staff, has been meeting to discuss ideas for reducing UC’s costs. UCOP released a report on per-student expenditures as mandated by AB 94, which breaks down educational costs and expenditures by student type.

Transfer Streamlining: UCOP is implementing a Transfer Action Team recommendation to align the preparation requirements for specific majors across UC campuses, to make it easier for students to prepare simultaneously for multiple campuses and be competitive for admission. Transfer streamlining is a priority for President Napolitano and state policymakers. UCOP surveyed campuses to collect information about pre-major requirements for 10 majors, and now wants to assemble key individuals from those majors to explore the degree to which they can resolve differences and align prerequisites.

VII. Joint Meeting with University Librarians

Copyright and Software: Senior UC Counsels Rita Hao and Angus McDonald joined the meeting to discuss copyright in the context of software. A UCOLASC member noted that UC copyright policy should provide more direction about faculty ownership of software, particularly computer code, that computer science faculty use in teaching and distribute to students, or that faculty researchers use to share results. The Senior Counsels noted that the Office of General Counsel does not set UC policy, and only assists in its interpretation and enforcement. Federal copyright law mandates that employers, in general, own the copyright to their employees’ work, although the academic tradition, which is also codified in the 1992 UC Copyright Policy, says that faculty retain ownership of scholarly or aesthetic work. The 1992 policy, however, is outdated, and does not address the ownership of software or code specifically. Software presents unique issues, and not all computer code rises to the level of copyright. The Senior Counsels noted the Systemwide Library and Scholarly Information Advisory Committee (SLAISIAC), and specifically its Subcommittee on Copyright Policy, has authority over UC copyright ownership policies, and would be the final arbiter of any policy amendment. The Senior Counsels also discussed elements of the UC’s 2003 Policy for Ownership of Course Materials, and the “fair use” exception to intellectual property law. They noted that a new revision of the UC Policy on Copyright and Fair Use will be circulated for systemwide review later this year.

It was agreed that SLAISIAC should consider revisions to the UC Copyright Policy that incorporate software and copyright issues. It was also suggested that UCOLASC might produce a general statement of purpose to help guide the effort.

Open Access Policy Implementation (Catherine Mitchell, Director of Publishing Services):
The Open Access Policy adopted by the Senate in July 2013 gives UC a limited, non-exclusive right to make published UC faculty scholarship freely available in an existing open-access online repository (eScholarship) maintained by the CDL. In January, UCLA began using a new harvesting tool that automatically collects information about faculty-authored articles and facilitates their deposit into
eScholarship. The tool will be implemented at UCSF and UCI in March, and at other campuses later this year. The harvesting tool makes it easy for faculty to “claim” and deposit their publication, provides faculty with a comprehensive list of publications with accurate citations, saves money and staff resources, and promotes more compliance with the OA policy.

The January 14 email to UCLA faculty asking them to log into eScholarship produced a 25% response rate, and the deposit of 250 items, in the first 48 hours. A total of 542 articles have been deposited in the four weeks since the release of the harvester. The CDL is happy about the results, but also concerned that many faculty are still unaware of the tool or the policy. The librarians are considering new strategies to increase the visibility and faculty awareness of the policy. Another issue relates to the government requirement that NIH-funded research articles be deposited into Pub Med Central (PMC) within 12 months. CDL is concerned that UC faculty may be disinclined to deposit articles twice, and will not have a link to their PMC article when the request from UC arrives.

Regional Library Facility Planning (Lorelei Tanji): In the modern hybrid library environment, an increasing number of materials are digital, but there is still a need to preserve physical copies of infrequently used materials of enduring value. UC has two shared storage facilities, in Richmond and Los Angeles, which provide long-term physical space for materials, which students and faculty can access through the interlibrary loan service. However, these resources are expected to reach capacity in only a few years. The libraries are exploring the extent to which they can eliminate duplicate copies of materials consistent with persistence guidelines, but they will still need more physical space to house the growing collections. The librarians will be studying proposals for expanding the Northern Regional Library Facility (NRLF) in Richmond as well as lower-cost alternatives in the Central Valley, and potential funding mechanisms.

Discussion: UCOLASC members commended the librarians for moving the space and preservation issue forward and expressed interest in reviewing the options and plans as they develop. Members noted the need for robust loss-prevention systems at the campus libraries and the need to educate the public (and UCOP) about the critical importance of preservation and the of the libraries themselves. It was noted that the book still has a strong future in the academy and in libraries. Although the market for printed scholarly monographs has fallen and is not sustainable, a recent poll showed that 92% of college students prefer reading print text books to e-readers.

Mellon Grant Project: The Mellon Foundation is funding a joint UC Davis-CDL project to study the economic implications of converting scholarly communications to a pay-to-publish business model for Open Access publications. Many publishers like this emerging model because they think it can protect their revenue streams, and it appeals to some faculty who like the flexibility of publishing where they want, but the model also carries risks for UC and other large research universities who are likely to absorb author fees. Investigators will analyze five years of journal license expenditures from UC and other universities, and conduct a survey of publishers, UC faculty, and graduate students, to learn more about how they view fees. Investigators intend to build a financial tool that librarians can use to help them define a “reasonable” fee and help UC be more prepared in negotiations with publishers. The grant is one of several Mellon has made to projects related to increasing the sustainability of Humanities publishing. As mentioned earlier, a second Mellon grant is funding the development of a cloud-based content management system for digital monographs that will increase efficiency and reduce the cost of producing monographs by eliminating typesetting and moving workflow to the cloud.

Meeting adjourned at 3:40 pm
Minutes Prepared by Michael LaBriola
Attest: Roberto Manduchi