UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA   **ACADEMIC SENATE**
UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON LIBRARY AND SCHOLARLY COMMUNICATION
Meeting Minutes
February 19, 2016

Attending: Eric Bakovic, Chair, (UCSD), Sean Walsh (Irvine), Leonard Nunney (UCR), Eileen Zurbriggen (UCSC) (telephone), Candace Waid (UCSB), Karl Ryavec (UCM), Diane Mizrachi (LAUC President) (telephone), Lorelei Tanji (CoUL Chair), David Sabean (UCLA), Thomas Shannon (UCB), Cynthia Darling (UCSF), Peter Krapp (California Open Educational Resources Council member, Film & Media/Visual Studies, English, Informatics, UCI), Ivy Anderson (Interim Executive Director and Director, Collection Development & Management, CDL), Catherine Mitchell (Director, Access and Publishing Services, CDL), Dan Hare (Chair, Academic Senate), Brenda Abrams (Principal Policy Analyst)

I.   **Welcome**

Chair Bakovic welcomed the members to the meeting. The chair shared that the UC Linguistics faculty have been asked to sign a statement in support of a new open access journal called Glossa. This journal was started by an entire editorial team that left the Elsevier journal Lingua. The statement asks that faculty pledge their support to the new journal and to not submit articles to or review for Lingua. In addition, the faculty requested that the UC libraries cancel the subscription to Lingua. Since this is not easily done, Lingua was replaced with a less expensive Elsevier journal. UC has perpetual rights to the Lingua back catalog and continues to have access without perpetual rights to present and future volumes of Lingua via Elsevier's Freedom Collection.

II.   **Consent Calendar**

Action: The minutes were approved.

III.   **Consultation with the Academic Senate Office**
         - *Dan Hare, Chair, Academic Senate*

The January Regents meeting public comments focused on how UC will manage enrolling ten thousand new students within three years, divestment from Wells Fargo, adopting the State Department definition of anti-Semitism and the new student advisor position. The Herb Albert School of Music was approved. Admissions data show that more and more students apply to UC every year. Chair Hare's remarks touched on the need for staff and campus infrastructure to accommodate these new students. It is encouraging that some of the Regents have started asking if the inadequate funding for students puts the quality of a UC education and the UC brand at risk. A new model for funding dorms was presented which will be implemented first at UCB. The new model is a public-private partnership that will save UC's capital expense. A two-year pilot program for a non-voting student advisor was approved by the Regents.

Chair Hare was on a Regents' workgroup that developed a Statement on Intolerance which will be voted up or down at the next Regents' meeting. The chair is also on a joint committee that reviewed faculty discipline and the committee's report has just been distributed for a systemwide review. This committee found that there a no large gaps in policy needing to be bridged by new policy. However, it was found

that there is limited awareness of the actual policies, of tools that exist, and of how those tools can be used. The primary recommendations focus on education and minor amendments to parts of the APM. The chair described the budget framework initiatives. The Senate review of the retirement options was submitted to the President on Friday but it is not clear what will happen next. The issue of cybersecurity at UC has consumed a significant amount of time in the last month.

IV.   Campus Reports/Member Items

UCB: The Regional Library facilities have been under discussion by the committee. The undergraduate library is in need of major repairs and there is a variety of ideas for how it can be utilized. There is a question about the extent to which this library will continue to house books and other materials versus it being used primarily as a study hall. It was noted that it is not clear how decisions about the use of library space for student needs are made and who is making them. There is no official coordination between the libraries and the campus about the anticipated enrollment or about adjusting space allocations.

UCLA: The ARL library investment index shows that over the past 10 years, UCLA has moved from rank 6 to 12. The committee is starting to think about a media strategy that will bring faculty together over concern about the library. Space is a huge issue that is worsening. Undergraduates now use the research library but it is overcrowded. The planning should consider the entire space beyond the first floor. The business school library removed all of the books from the facility and is no longer purchasing books. This library space belongs to the campus but the politics are complicated.

Guest researchers and visiting scholars are common and it is difficult to arrange for them to have access to the library facilities and they do not have access to electronic resources. These restrictions are the result of Homeland Security policies and the representative would like to see UC policy address this.

UCR: Space for the storage of books is becoming limited so books that have not been used in 15 years are sent to storage. The campus has two libraries with seats for 9% of the student population although the target is 20%. The budget is not a major concern for the libraries in part because one of the campus librarians was able to move money around.

UCSB: The committee is interested in costs associated with Open Access. People do not have a lot of information about the libraries. There have been requests to hold weddings in the library. There is concern about handling the eight hundred additional students coming in next year. The library is really a place of collaborative learning. The committee is concerned about issues related to collections and is also thinking about how the library can serve as a lab for the students. There is a lack of awareness about costs associated with the library. Interlibrary loans are problematic and it is not clear that this is cost-effective.

UCM: The member asked how decisions are made about budgets and collections at the other campuses. If a request to purchase books is made, the campus librarian will indicate that the expense is not in their budget. The UCM library has no special collections.

UCI: Although funds were provided by the campus for collections, the library had to contribute funding to meet the total cost. The librarians created an app that notifies students when a computer in the library has become available.

UCSF: The campus does not have a budget by department and the purchasing is not differentiated by subject. The student population at this campus is not growing as much as at other campuses, so space is not a major issue. Work has been done in support of the Open Access policy, with funds being identified for faculty who do not have grants. Some work has been published in hybrid models and the Senate wants to only support Open Access, non-hybrid journals. The library has a coffee shop and a living room, and a "maker's space" is being created. This space will include 3-d printers, arts and crafts with a focus on eye-hand coordination and how to make things. It will be a mix of high and low tech. The maker's space will be open to families waiting on patients in the hospital. There is a four-part lecture series in the library.

UCSC: The major issue is the budget. UCM and UCSC are the only UC libraries that are not part of the ARL because their spending is so low. The committee is discussing different budget models that might be employed. The library switched to demand-driven acquisition so there is not a collections or acquisitions person, but this does not seem to have had an impact on the budget.

Discussion: At UCM there is no student union so the only place students can gather is the library. The 2020 plan will be released this summer at which time there should be information about whether a student union will be included. It is not clear what more can be done to provide library study space for students. Data on how many undergraduate students are accessing the libraries is not readily available. The issue of restricted access for guest researchers and visiting scholars at UCLA is not something other members are aware of but they will investigate their campus policies before the next committee meeting.

In response to the UCM representative's question, the UCB representative indicated that developing relationships with the department's collections or acquisitions librarians is important. LAUC President Mizrachi indicated it is not that the librarians do not want to help faculty, but that there are gaps in knowledge about everything that is involved. It would be helpful if everyone could meet with their relevant librarians to develop an understanding of how this process is conducted. It would be helpful if large departments provided a list of the books the libraries are asked to purchase.

V.   **Consultation with the California Digital Library**
   - *Ivy Anderson, Interim Executive Director & Director of Collections, CDL*

The CDL will have a new Associate Vice Provost and Executive Director, Günter Waibel, starting in May. This year there have not been major changes with the licensing and some negotiations have just wrapped up. Current renewals are with American Chemical Society, Wiley, Springer, the Royal Society of Chemistry, Karger, and Web of Science. These are large multi-year contracts. American Chemical Society and the Royal Society of Chemistry have both attempted to increase the cost of UC's license over the past few years. UC has done well with Wiley over the past several years.

Springer is merging with Nature Publishing Group which complicates the negotiations somewhat. CDL wanted to sign a multi-year agreement with Springer that keeps Nature separate, but this was rejected by the publisher. The result was a one year bridge contract with Springer with a status quo increase and next year the CDL will have combined negotiations with Springer and Nature. The Royal Society of

Chemistry wanted a significant increase but the CDL was able to negotiate a lower increase. The negotiations with Web of Science were successful, and negotiations with Karger are also expected to be straightforward. Web of Science is now for sale -- there is a lot of consolidation occurring in this industry and it is hard to know what the impact of this will be.

The cancellation of the Taylor & Francis contract in 2013 resulted in a new, reinstated contract in 2016. Taylor & Francis has acquired a huge number of journals in recent years. The base license fee has been reduced, but this will not necessarily be true at each campus, since the costs have now been redistributed across the campuses based on local subscription preferences. The new contract includes access to archives dating back to the first issues of their journals. Open Access article processing charges for UC authors will also be significantly discounted. CDL is examining the impact of open access offset agreements in Europe and considering a similar model for UC, with a goal of cost neutrality.

eBooks have been challenging to license for a number of reasons. It is still not clear when people want print versus electronic versions, but the available data suggests they want both. Many eBooks are being sold in packages similar to journal packages, and the libraries are very concerned about being locked into a package when UC's needs might be more selective. Cambridge has a comprehensive eBook program and the CDL is licensing their eBooks systemwide and will acquire two print copies of each book, one will be at UCB or the NRLF and the other will be at UCI. The Libraries will evaluate this strategy at the end of the agreement.

VI.   California Open Educational Resources Council (COERC)
- *Peter Krapp, COERC Council Member, Film & Media/Visual Studies, English, Informatics, UCI*

COERC is an intersegmental council with representatives from the California Community Colleges, the California State University system and the UC system. The first piece of legislation created the Council and other legislation called for the creation of the repository. Since the draft final report was prepared there have been some changes. The main change is that a new bill, AB 798, does not mention the University of California. The Council was created to coordinate all three segments. The goal was to create at least fifty viable textbooks that can be created and sustained into perpetuity. In year one, the Council worked quickly to identify the available resources and to set up test cases to determine if the books created by others could meet the needs of California students.

In the second year, about 75% of the membership of COERC turned over. The report indicates that UC lags behind the other two segments. Feedback from people asked to use the open resource books indicated that they did not find the courses met their needs. Other faculty indicated that they are already creating the open resources and would not participate in this endeavor since they already have what they need. Not many UC faculty volunteered to review or teach with the available open resources. Faculty with high-enrollment courses and high-cost textbooks indicated that they would be unable to use the resources, so there was an effort to identify who decides which books will be used.

If UC had a better system of communication, the participation might have been greater. Professor Krapp is the only original UC representative on the Council now. The CSUs have a central administrative function that allows for better communication with the faculty. This is the third year and there has not even been an official press release about COERC. Senate Bill 1052, signed by the Governor in 2012, created a number of tasks with deadlines which included finding matching funds and COERC was able to find the matching funds from the Gates Foundation and the Hewlett Foundation. This funding was mainly spent on the panels of experts who were vetting and reviewing the books, but about half of the money was not spent. When AB 798 was announced with aims compatible with SB 1052, UC was left out in part because of its constitutional autonomy. Fifty classes were identified across the three segments and in

different disciplines. COERCE identified open educational resources that are already available. The Council decided against commissioning books that do not exist but should because there are already U.S. and Canadian efforts that have created these types of books. COERCE thinks most of its effort should go into vetting which one of the textbooks that are free or very low cost compared to the expensive ones are usable for our purposes.

The timeline for AB 798 activities ends this summer. After May, the Council's work will be completed and over the summer there will be a review process of the resources. There will also be training. This basically ends the effort. In order to maintain all of the open educational resources vetted and approved already, there will have to be some process for updating them. There are no more specific UC deliverables but on a volunteer basis UC faculty are still part of the process of vetting and finalizing the reports. There are weekly brainstorming sessions focused on sustainability of the resources. The state funds will be spent on the incentives and the foundation funds can still be spent on the digital resources and coordinating the Council for the next few months. Any feedback the Council receives has to be maintained in the Cool4Ed resources. After the summer there will not be any faculty oversight of these resources. This will be a curated but open body of advice.

The Council may try to find an advisory board. Technically, COERC reported to ICAS until December 2015. Now, the reporting is directly to the CSU which in theory should simplify matters. This is not official yet and members of the Council have not been reappointed. A white paper has to be delivered to the State Senate as a final report. Faculty at the CSUs still have resources available to acquire support they need.

Case studies of campuses and their use of OER, the creation of information packets for new hires, and issuing invitations to faculty to participate as experts are some of the final activities for the Council. COERC has not reached the point where it is ready to scale beyond the fifty courses. The involvement of for-profit companies in the near future is inevitable. UC's involvement was not as significant as it might have been.

Discussion: UCLA has the Affordable Course Materials initiative that provides awards to faculty. Individual UC faculty have also put together courses that are online. Individual and campus initiatives help and a member proposed collecting information about these initiatives. Gates and Hewlett Foundations matched the state funding and at last report, about half of each of these pools of funds have been spent to date. There is variation across the segments about what is needed for the populations they serve and the courses they offer. In addition there has been resistance from different corners, including campus bookstores.

A concern for faculty was the sustainability of the materials that are online. Outside of law and some business fields, faculty earnings from textbooks are not significant. As an institution, UC has not put a structure into place that encourages faculty to make materials available in OER. Funding should be available for the small number of faculty who are experts in developing textbooks. The effort that is required to develop textbooks, especially in a field that is constantly changing, should not be underestimated. There is a subset of UC faculty that have been rewarded for turning materials into OER. The feedback to COERC from UC faculty has been very limited. It is hoped that more feedback will be provided in response to the upcoming white paper. Perhaps the number of UC faculty developing open educational resources independently will grow over time. The available resources can be found on the Cool4Ed website and the ICAS website has a COERC section.

VII.   Subcommittee on the Humanities

The UCSB representative provided an overview of some of the objectives for the subcommittee on the Humanities. UCSB is part of a national initiative called 4Humanities.org. Funding from the National Endowment for the Humanities has decreased by 70% from 1979 to 2014. UC's Humanities faculty have done very well, winning national and international book prizes. Digital Humanities are changing the interaction between faculty and graduate students so there is a need for labs. Extramural funding and subventions for Humanities faculty are extremely rare. The UC Humanities faculty set up a network in 2009 that received over 12M for a five-year period. Providing five thousand dollars per FTE for subvention is being discussed on a national level. Humanities research is an increasingly difficult issue that needs to be examined. How the research, scholarship and publishing in the Humanities can be integrated is a question. The subcommittee may provide a follow-up report at UCOLASC's Fall meeting.

VIII.   Consultation with Council of University Librarians (CoUL)

- *CoUL Members: Lorelei Tanji , CoUL Chair, Jeff MacKie-Mason (UCB), Ginny Steel (UCLA), Ivy Anderson (CDL), and MacKenzie Smith (UCD)*

Chair Tanji reported that CoUL met with President Napolitano on February 12 to discuss the UC Libraries' collections, the UC Regional Library Facilities and open access and open data. The President understood the value of libraries and how important they are.

Regional Library Storage Facilities
The libraries have a serious and long-standing space problem. In the 1970s, UCOP encouraged the libraries to develop storage facilities. Two regional facilities were established but the libraries now find that even these facilities will be out of space in the near future. A number of strategies have been employed for managing the collections, including coordination of collection development, institution of a persistence policy in the RLFs which means that what is deposited cannot be removed. There is also a policy against duplicating things that are being deposited in these facilities to ensure the space is used as efficiently as possible. Originally, the funding for the regional facilities came from UCOP to UCLA and UCB but at a certain point, UCOP turned the management of the facilities over to the two campuses. There is no central capital funding and there is also no clear path forward.

The facilities will both reach their fill date by 2018. It is not clear to many people why more shelving space is needed when so much material is available digitally. A briefing was prepared for President Napolitano and a group of the ULs met with her last week. It is important for UC to retain the books it has in part due to copyright. Through the Google Books project, UC is very close to having all of its regular volume collection digitized. But less than half of these materials can be used due to copyright. In addition, the librarians do not know how to keep digital materials alive, active and complete for more than a few decades. Students and faculty still prefer things in print format. The group received a positive response from the President who interrupted the ULs' presentation to state that the ULs should submit a written proposal for funding expanding storage facilities. The ULs are preparing a proposal for a feasibility and engineering planning study if necessary and will look to next year's budget cycle to obtain funding. Adding a module at an existing facility versus building a new facility in the Central Valley are the options. UC could rent or lease space from professional providers but whether this will be efficient has to be explored.

The conditions of the soil around the SRLF are such that expanding that facility is not possible. The materials inside this facility are not threatened. Large sections of journal backruns, also available digitally, are in the SRLF and could be moved elsewhere to free up some space at that facility.

Mellon Grant Update

The ULs provided an update on the one-year Mellon-funded Pay It Forward project. The partnership included UC, Harvard, Ohio State University, and the University of British Columbia in Vancouver. Other parts of the world are moving in the direction of gold Open Access whereas the US is focusing on green Open Access. It is not sustainable for UC to try to move in both directions so the aim of the study is to determine which model is preferred. UCOLASC is invited to provide feedback. The deliverables are a financial model and a methodology that other institutions can use to see what would happen at their particular institution with certain assumptions. To get to author attitudes focus groups and surveys were conducted at the four institutions to help inform the survey that was conducted. There were over two thousand responses to the survey from all disciplines and demographics. Some of the impressions adopted include that there are a range of perspectives about open access. Many senior faculty already deposit in open access repositories. Any model that requires faculty to publish somewhere new that they do not choose is a non-starter and this led to considering other models. Authors are price sensitive in terms of how much they would be willing to pay.

An analysis of the actual cost to publish and what publishers are charging in publication fees was conducted. For the cost to publish, a variety of data was reviewed. Publication output data was mapped to the APCs and where UC faculty publish was examined. Looking at this by discipline did not provide evidence of any disciplines emerging in open access but the average APC was found to be $1700. The preliminary finding about the article processing charges showed variation. Expenditure data was examined. Given what is spent on journals today and given the publication output at the institutions, the study asked what APC could institutions afford without spending any more money and this break-even scenario was examined. The analysis looked at the rate of corresponding authorship and the percentage of output that had grant funding associated with it. At UC, a large percentage of the output is grant-funded in the sciences.

The study looked at what the institutions could afford as an APC if the institutions funded all of the output of the corresponding authors and what the institutions could afford if only funding articles without grants associated with them. About 50-60% of articles produced across the institutions are grant-funded but this varies by discipline. Institutions with lower publication output have more affordable APCs. When grant-funded articles are removed from the mix the APCs become more affordable and all of the institutions could afford the average APCs. The basic conclusion is that this is not a sustainable model if the only source of money is library journal subscription budgets. The model to be created is that the library provides a subsidy at, or just below, the cost to publish and the new component would be a discretionary research fund to which all faculty would have access for any research-related expense. This model will make the author decide where to publish and increase their awareness of the costs. An economist working with the partnership has indicated that the proposed model is viable.

Discussion: A member stated that the delivery of books from the northern facility to a southern campus takes too long but a UL indicated that the materials are delivered in 48 hours. The proposal to the President will also address staffing. The regional facilities are limited to UC campuses and the idea of partnering with other universities is not viable.

Members had positive feedback to the report on the Pay It Forward study on APCs. There is a correlation between APCs and impact factors which gets stronger as time goes by. In the social sciences, there are not many grants available. Asking authors to push back against the publishers over the expense of publishing is a burden. Faculty may not be comfortable with publishing in lower-cost journals. With this new model, the cost of publishing will remain the same but some of the cost will be covered by the libraries and the other funds will come from the authors. Ultimately this will drive down the cost of publishing. Adding any amount of competition for the journals overall will likely lower prices.

IX.   Status of Senate and Presidential Open Access Policies

- *Catherine Mitchell, Director, Access and Publishing Services, CDL*

Director Mitchell provided an update on the Senate Open Access policy. The Symplectic Elements publication management system has now been rolled out to all ten campuses. While progress has been made, how to get more faculty to click through the first email needs to be figured out. A challenge is that Elements is harvesting from a variety of resources but they are STEM-heavy. Elements will have agreements in place to allow for harvesting from SSRN and MLA. The focus will be on reaching out and building awareness.

The Presidential Open Access policy is now in place. New HR feeds are informing the Elements system so that it will look for publications from all UC employees who publish academic research articles. Some of the categories of authors are not necessarily firm while others do have a more permanent employment status. For example, graduate students have variable employment status from term to term. The focus may be on the groups with more predictable employment status in the future.

The outreach and education at the campuses was to be done by the Chancellor's office on each campus but the ULs have agreed to conduct the outreach for this policy as well. As a result of staffing the Elements system, there has been a drop by 59% in technical staffing for eScholarship and a similar drop in program staffing. This information is being shared with the Provost's Office so the challenges are understood. With current staffing, the Elements system may not go live until January 2017. Once this process starts, it will mimic the process used with the Senate policy by working with only one or two campuses at a time. The ways that Elements can assist with other things is being explored and seven campuses have already approached the CDL about the data being available to feed other systems, such as the annual reporting system.

Discussion: A member asked about non-compliance. It was suggested that faculty may need reminders after receiving the original email from Elements. Faculty should be prompted to bookmark the page.
The Senate policy requires the final version and the ideal way would be for an automated system to harvest that version. It is not necessary to find an article that is already available because of the terms of the policy. Faculty would still need to confirm that it is their publication, especially if a person's name is tricky to disambiguate. If two UC faculty author a paper, both will be contacted by the system.

X.   New Business

There was no New Business.

XI.   Executive Session

There was no Executive Session.

Meeting adjourned at: 3:40 PM
Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams
Attest: Eric Bakovic