UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA   ACADEMIC SENATE

<div align="center">

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON LIBRARY
APPROVED MINUTES OF MEETING
THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 2005
UCOP ROOM 5320

</div>

I.   Welcome and Member Introductions
- Abdelmonem Afifi, UCOL Chair

UCOL Chair Afifi welcomed new and returning UCOL members and consultants.   After committee members introduced themselves, Chair Afifi reviewed the meeting agenda and the committee's business for the day.

II.   Consultation with the Librarians Association of the University of California (LAUC)
- Terence Huwe, LAUC President

REPORT: LAUC President Huwe provided the committee with a brief overview of the LAUC and its role in the university. The LAUC is a parliamentary academic association modeled after the Academic Senate, and is charged to advise the President, the Regents, and the campus administrations on library issues, and to advise the university librarians from the ground up. Matters currently under review by the LAUC include: (1) information literacy programs in cooperation with the University Librarians and the Systemwide Operations and Planning Advisory Group (SOPAG), an issue brought to the LAUC by UCOL last year; (2) development of procedures for librarians to teach for-credit courses; (3) e-scholarship – creating and sustaining a scholarly peer review structure, and the development of a scholarly journal for library issues; (4) creation of a public forum on the Web to affect library access worldwide; (5) review of the Systemwide Strategic Directions for Libraries and Scholarly Information Report ("the SLASIAC Report" (Systemwide Libraries and Scholarly Information Committee)); and (6) digitizing many LAUC operations, including web publishing and online discussion forums.
DISCUSSION: Members discussed various issues of concern in relation to LAUC's mission, and suggested that LAUC conduct town hall-style meetings to collect input from campus faculty, and provide computer literacy assistance to those faculty who are less confident about their computer skills. Other members mentioned concerns regarding interfacing technology, and the differing perceptions of faculty and librarians. LAUC President Huwe stressed the librarians' awareness of the need to be proactive with faculty and faculty concerns, and emphasized the importance of building one-to-one relationships with librarians and faculty.

III.   Collection Strategies: Shared Print Collections and Digitization of Library Collections

ISSUE: The committee is concerned with the strategies for collecting, storing and sharing print copies of library resources, and the effects of increasing digitization of library collections.
DISCUSSION: Members discussed whether print copies should be housed at one library location, and if so, what location would be preferred; or whether library collections should be

decentralized and housed at more than one location. Shared collections are currently housed at two main facilities: the Northern and Southern Regional Storage Facilities. One member suggested that copies could be loaned digitally. Another member mentioned the importance of maintaining both print and digital collections to ensure variety and choice for library patrons' use. One member questioned the ownership of library collections once they are relocated to a Regional Storage Facility, and it was answered that the original campus/sender of the material retains ownership. Ownership is important to the campus because the interests of the campus and the Regional Storage Facility can conflict on occasion.

Members then discussed the recent partnership established between Stanford University and Google to digitize the Stanford library collections, and questioned UC's involvement with industrial partners. Members discussed the benefits of industrial partnerships, and agreed that such ventures are worth exploring for the advancement of UC libraries.

Lastly, members expressed concern regarding the certain possibility that digital forms of media will become quickly outdated, and the expense involved in continually updating software to access various forms of digital media. LAUC President Huwe assured the committee that the university is the leader in digitizing media, and is staying ahead of outdated forms of digitization.

*IV. Scholarly Communication
   * Agenda item added upon request by UCOL Member Ben Crow

ISSUE: Member Crow requested a brief consideration of the issue of scholarly communication, as mentioned in UCOL's December 3, 2004 letter to the Academic Council (agenda Information Item C), specifically regarding UCOL's suggestion that the university should establish itself as a major publisher of journals.

DISCUSSION: Member Crow mentioned that the time is ripe for the university to establish a portfolio of journals for three reasons: (1) Elsevier has not taken the threat of faculty boycott seriously, (2) it is unclear whether Elsevier will reduce its prices for the long term, and (3) it is also unclear whether Elsevier will comprehend the threat that as the number of online journals increases, Elsevier's ability to control scholarly publications and maintain a monopoly erodes.

Members discussed local campus practices in relation to scholarly publication and alternative publication models. One member mentioned that the crucial problem involves the journal publication culture, and that smaller journals are simply not well respected. Member Grinstein member mentioned that the UCSD Senate has acted to establish procedures that judge the quality of scholarly work by content only, and not by the type of media or where the work was published; however the challenge remains to change the culture of the university despite establishing the new procedures.

Member Cardenas offered another view beyond the challenges surrounding publishable journals. His concern is the university's need to establish long term research support mechanisms, encompassing data management of all media beyond books and journals including course websites, data sets, unpublished research, reports and working papers. Member Cardenas would like to inquire into the Library's role in this new, long-term model of research support.

ACTION: Member Grinstein will locate the language of the UCSD Senate procedures requiring review of scholarly work with regard to content only, for distribution to UCOL members and further consideration by the committee.

V.   Campus Reports
   - UCOL Members

REPORT: Members reported on the recent actions of and issues concerning the divisional Academic Senate library committees.

Berkeley: The library committee is currently considering five issues: (1) scholarly communication – including encouraging faculty to publish online, organizing forums to increase faculty participation, and creating incentives for mid-career faculty to start new journals; (2) evaluation of use of space on campus, including available library space now that books have been replaced by other forms of media; (3) developing library instruction classes for faculty to learn new technologies; (4) collection strategies - balancing use of central storage facilities with maintaining local access to collections; and (5) evaluating role of specialist libraries on campus, which are outside of the main campus library.

Davis: Due to the UCD member's absence, Chair Afifi read from the member's submitted report.   UCD library news: the administration has funded two new positions in library instruction, and the new Health Sciences Library at the UCD Medical Center held a ground-breaking ceremony on February 24, 2005. Library committee activities include advising the Graduate Council on the library resources and budget impact of two new graduate programs, and advising the Senate Executive Council on the SLASIAC report. The library committee has also prepared a draft resolution on scholarly communication in response to a request from the UCD Senate chair, which is expected to be submitted to the UCD Executive Council this spring.
ACTION: Analyst Michelle Ruskofsky will request authorization to distribute to UCOL members the UCD library committee's *Draft Resolution on Scholarly Communication*, for the committee's information.

Irvine: The UCI member was not present at the meeting and a campus report was not submitted.

Los Angeles: Due to the UCLA member's absence, Chair Afifi read from the member's submitted report. The UCLA library committee has focused on three main areas of concern since September 2004, including: (1) faculty survey – all Senate faculty members were solicited regarding their views on the current state of the UCLA libraries, and responses were collated and distributed to UCOL members (see Distribution 2); (2) operational issues – the library committee focused on various library service operation issues that were brought to light by the faculty survey; and (3) dialogue with faculty editors – the library committee will be meeting with faculty members who are editors of journals published by professional societies, and will discuss with them issues such as how to create sustainable business models that would respond to budgetary constraints faced by libraries and at the same time maintain support of editors' work, alternatives to subscription-based business models for journals, and the feasibility/desirability of open-access models.

Riverside: The library committee has focused on the library's problems resulting from reduced budgets and minimal staff. Furthermore, the library committee would like to charge the university as a whole to continue a hard line approach with Elsevier publishing.

San Diego: The library committee has held two meetings during the current academic year, which have been informational only. Issues currently under consideration include: (1) the SLASIAC Report – specific comments are that the report does not adequately address distribution of non-printed media (e.g., art and music recordings); (2) budgetary issues and how to allocate budget cuts; (3) renovation of the Biomedical Library – addressing cost overruns by seeking recommendations from faculty; (4) creation of an electronic archive for most university publications (no action taken); and (5) recognition of scholarly work in smaller, less-recognized media.

San Francisco: The library committee had been working on a fifteen-year long range planning initiative, encompassing the following: (1) the new UCSF Medical Center in Mission Bay; (2) evaluating space planning and the library's physical space when it holds fewer books and increased digital publications; and (3) a resolution, sent to the divisional Senate and the Academic Planning Board, to prevent the cancellation of some journal subscriptions. The library committee has also addressed some informational items, including open access issues with the National Institutes of Health, which has instituted a quasi-mandate for institutions to publish in open-access forums upon acceptance of NIH funding.

Santa Barbara: Due to the UCSB member's absence, Chair Afifi read comments submitted by the member. The UCSB member expresses the concern that UCOL should be sensitive to the possibility that the campus libraries have been too long comfortable with operating as separate entities, and that this viewpoint is coloring their approach to the 21st Century. The member fears that there is a real reluctance to pursue the "one university – one library model," and that UCOL should champion this approach.

Santa Cruz: The library committee has addressed five items in the current academic year, including: (1) discussions with the campus research committee concerning linking research grants with incentives to publish in accessible media forms; (2) a resolution is currently being drafted, encompassing other campus' resolutions (i.e., Berkeley, Irvine and San Francisco) regarding best practices of the libraries; (3) funding concerns regarding the expansion of the campus library, planned for the next six months; (4) embarking on a new search for the campus University Librarian after last year's unsuccessful effort – discussion involves emphasizing the centrality of the campus library and the University Librarian in the sytemwide university, and a desire that the University Librarian is granted dean status; and (5) continuing discussions over the electronic filing of dissertations.

VI.   JOINT MEETING WITH THE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIANS
- Joint meeting co-chairs:
  - Karen Butter, University Librarians Chair
  - Abdelmonem Afifi, UCOL Chair

Please see Appendix B for a record of the joint meeting with the University Librarians.

Meeting adjourned at 3:00p.m.

Attest: Abdelmonem Afifi, UCOL Chair
Prepared by: Michelle Ruskofsky, Committee Analyst

UCOL Distributions:
1. Lucas, Kari. *UC Librarians: Able to Evolve, or Stuck in a Rut?* LAUC: Guest Opinions, January 31, 2005. Distributed by Terence Huwe, LAUC President.
2. UCLA Committee on Library: Faculty response to query about libraries. Distributed by Chair Afifi.
3. UC Davis Senate Library Committee: Resolution on Scholarly Communication, distributed 3-11-05 by email.

UL Distributions:
4. University of California eScholarship Repository: Postprints.
5. The Office of Scholarly Communication: Reshaping Scholarly Communication
6. University Faculty Resolutions on Scholarly Communication
7. Schedule of Events: Faculty Conference on Scholarly Publishing
8. Systemwide Library and Scholarly Information Advisory Committee (SLASIAC) Roster, 2004-05
9. University of California: 2005-06 Budget for Current Operations pp. 176-191: Academic Support - Libraries

Attachments:
Appendix A: UCOL 2004-05 Attendance
Appendix B: Meeting Notes, Joint Meeting of the University Librarians and the University Committee on Library, prepared by Gary Lawrence, Director, Systemwide Library Planning.

APPENDIX A

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON LIBRARY (UCOL) Attendance 2004-2005		Key: X = In Attendance, Abs = Absent, Alt = Alternate Attended					
		2/24/05					
Members:							
Abdelmonem Afifi, Chair	Los Angeles (Public Health-Biostatistics)	X					
Martin London, Vice Chair	San Francisco (Anesthesia & Perioperative Care)	X					
Whitney Davis	Berkeley (History of Art)	X					
Raymond Waddington	Davis (English)	Abs					
Lamar Hill	Irvine (History)	Abs					
Rogers Brubaker	Los Angeles (Sociology)	Abs					
Eugene Anderson	Riverside (Anthropology)	X					
Benjamin Grinstein	San Diego (Physics)	X					
Bruce Tiffney	Santa Barbara (Geological Sciences)	Abs					
Ben Crow	Santa Cruz (Sociology)	X					
Alfonso Cardenas	ITTP Chair (Ex Officio)	X					
George Blumenthal	Chair, Academic Council (Ex Officio)	Abs					
Cliff Brunk	Vice Chair, Academic Council (Ex Officio)	X					
Amanda Moussa	Graduate Student Representative (UCLA)	X					
Harry Khanna	Undergraduate Student Representative (UCSD)	X					
Alternates:							
Consultants, Guests:							
Maria Bertero-Barcelo	Executive Director, Academic Council	Abs					
Gary Lawrence	Director, Library Planning & Policy	X					
Daniel Greenstein	University Librarian for Systemwide Planning	Abs					
Terence Huwe	Chair, Library Assoc. of the Univ. of California (LAUC)	X					
Karen Butter	Chair, University Librarians	X					
Staff:							
Michelle Ruskofsky	Committee Analyst	X					

<u>APPENDIX B</u>

Joint Meeting of University Librarians and the University Committee on Library
February 24, 2005, Noon – 3 p.m.
UC Office of the President, Oakland, CA

<u>Meeting Notes</u>

University Librarians: Butter (SF), Gary Lawrence for Greenstein (CDL); Jackson (R); Leonard (B); Miller (M); Munoff (I); Pritchard (SB); Schottlaender (SD); John Tanno for Sharrow (D); Strong (LA) White (SC)

University Committee   Afifi (Chair-LA); Anderson (R); Cardenas (UCITTP); Crow (SC); on Library: Grinstein (SD); London (SF); Moussa (Grad Student - LA)

Staff & Guests: Terry Huwe (LAUC); Catherine Candee and John Ober (Office of Scholarly Communication); Nancy Kushigian (Shared Print); Michelle Ruskofsky (Academic Senate)

1. Scholarly communication

- Scholarly Communication Crises and Opportunities: UC's Response: Update on Progress Spring 2005
- University of California, Systemwide Library and Scholarly Information Advisory Committee, Resolution _: The University's Role in Fostering Positive Change in Scholarly Communication (**DRAFT**), 1/21/05
- Faculty Resolutions on Scholarly Communication, Office of Scholarly Communication, 2/15/05
- The California Stem Cell Research and Cures Bond Act Of 2004, Draft Policy On Public Access and Archiving of Research Results (**DRAFT**), 2/7/05

Candee began by distributing a handout describing aspects of *eScholarship*, UC's program to foster innovation in scholarly communication. The *eScholarship Repository* is an open-access platform that supports a variety of faculty-initiated publishing activities, with the goals of providing faculty with tools to broaden dissemination of their scholarship while providing long-term care for faculty-created content.

The *eScholarship Postprint Repository* was created to give faculty more control over their scholarship by providing a UC-managed environment for archiving previously-published articles (postprints). The Postprint Repository was launched only yesterday (2/23), and has already received 37 submissions from 19 authors. To promote the service, the CDL harvests citations to papers with UC authors from ISI *Web of Science* (from 2004, 12,000 citations after filtering by publisher), creates an automatic user account for each author listing their papers, and sends each author an email inviting them to deposit their postprint in the Repository. Through the Postprint Repository, UC and its faculty can support open access, reward and support "good" publishers, and ensure that the most current, final, peer-reviewed version of faculty work is available on the Internet. There was some discussion of the recently announced National Institutes of Health *Policy on Enhancing Public Access to Archived Publications Resulting From NIH-Funded Research*; potential relationships between deposit in the Postprint Repository and compliance with the NIH deposit requirement are still being explored.

Ober distributed some supplemental material further describing the organizational settings in which scholarly communication issues are being engaged within the University, and the themes of those discussions. He mentioned specifically ongoing work by the Office of General Counsel to develop an effective standard addendum to publishing agreements that faculty could use to secure needed rights in their works; and a draft policy prepared by the Academic Council Special Committee on Scholarly Communication for consideration by the Independent Citizen's Oversight Committee of the California Stem Cell Initiative, which would provide that publications resulting from research funded by the Initiative would be freely accessible to the public (subsequently, Lawrence reported that the Academic Council had endorsed the proposed policy). Ober reviewed the kinds of actions that UC faculty can take and are taking, individually and collectively, to reshape scholarly communication – these include providing open access to their works, passing resolutions similar to those under consideration at Berkeley, Irvine, and Santa Cruz, and sponsoring conferences and colloquia, such as the Berkeley symposium on March 31, and encouraged UCOL members to consider similar actions.

Crow, who serves on the Special Committee on Scholarly Communication, reported that the Committee was looking broadly at faculty perspectives and potential actions, including copyright issues and the problem with publishing of monographs in the humanities. The Committee is also considering development of a proposed Academic Council resolution.

At Afifi's invitation, Cardenas, speaking as chair of UCITTP, spoke of the emerging importance of the digital environment for the teaching and research work of the faculty, and the growing uncertainty about how to provide for the development, management, distribution and persistence of objects like working papers, datasets, extramurally funded Web sites, and instructional applications. UCITTP feels it critically important to develop a 10-15 year model of the University's information technology environment that can permit informed discussion and planning for development of needed services and agreement about operational and funding responsibilities. In response, Pritchard summarized the results of a Mellon-supported study at UCSB of the digital research data needs of campus faculty (see http://www.library.ucsb.edu/informatics/), which highlighted both the diverse needs of the various disciplines and the difficulties of identifying and bringing together the parties who must be involved in a campuswide strategy. The ensuing discussion highlighted some of the unresolved issues involved in addressing the digital content management needs of the faculty, such as boundary between individually-managed assets and "community resources" warranting institutional management, and the loci of institutional responsibility for managing and preserving research and teaching assets.

Crow returned the discussion to potential faculty and institutional actions to influence scholarly communication, noting that at Santa Cruz, COL had held discussions with the Committee on Research on open-access initiatives. He understands that there have been many committee and multi-committee discussions on different campuses. Faculty would appreciate an overview and summary documenting and collating the outcomes of these of dialogs. There was also discussion of the potential for institutional support for launching of new journals, and migration of existing commercial journals to new venues, acknowledging that funding and time are required to

establish a new journal, and noting the possible roles and interests of UC Press and scholarly societies in such ventures.

2. Collection strategies
2.a. Shared print collections

- Shared Print Program interim Web site (http://www.slp.ucop.edu/programs/sharedprint/)
- Developing a Planning Framework for UC Libraries Shared Print Collections, Version 1.6, February 9, 2005 (http://www.slp.ucop.edu/programs/sharedprint/PlanningFrameworkv1-6.pdf)

Butter introduced the topic by noting that the University Librarians, observing the extraordinary success of UC's shared digital collections, wished to extend the concept selectively to print holdings. Kushigian summarized the key features of the Libraries' shared print program, in which collection initiatives are prioritized collaboratively in order to avoid unnecessary duplication, save space, improve access, verify the quality and completeness of holdings, provide a print "backup" when digital versions are not equivalent, and expand the scope of the Universitywide collection. The program currently comprehends three kinds of collections: prospective print collections where the digital is also available (e.g., journals from Elsevier, Kluwer, Wiley, etc.); retrospective print collections where the digital is also available (e.g., JSTOR), and collaborative prospective purchase of monographs (e.g. German language and literature).

2.b. Digitization of library collections

Butter reported that various discussions are underway with a variety of parties regarding digitization of UC print collections, but these are not sufficiently advanced for general discussion. Leonard noted that the recently-announced Google initiative to digitize the collections of a few major research libraries is not as concrete or comprehensive as may have been represented in the press.

3. Library strategic plan – overview and commentary

- Systemwide Strategic Directions for Libraries and Scholarly Information (http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/planning/)
- Blumenthal to Greenwood, 2/3/05, Academic Senate review of *Systemwide Strategic Directions…,* with encl.

Lawrence began by noting that the Senate comments on *Systemwide Strategic Directions* provided valuable guidance and useful suggestions for ongoing planning. He suggested that he take a few minutes to discuss four areas of overarching concern raised in the Academic Council summary letter, and then could address general concerns raised with respect to the plan's five strategies and/or the specific concerns raised by UCOL, as the group preferred.

With regard to the general concern about the absence of specific proposals and detailed implementation plans, Lawrence noted that the document was developed in the spirit of the 1996-97 Library Planning and Action Initiative, which acknowledged that action and experience were necessary foundations for ongoing planning. In this vein, *Systemwide Strategic Directions* sets out directions for action, experimentation, and continued planning. This does not relieve the planners of the responsibility for setting goals and timetables when that is possible, but the key to continuous planning is regular assessment of progress and communication with the affected

communities. At minimum, assessment and communication will be accomplished through the Systemwide Library and Scholarly Information Advisory Committee (SLASIAC), an annual report on progress, and a page on the UC Libraries' Web site with frequently-updated narratives and links to current activities in each of the five strategic areas.

With regard to an identified locus of responsibility for administration and oversight, SLASIAC, which includes representatives of the key constituencies, is charged by the Provost to provide oversight and advice to the University on matters of libraries and scholarly communication. More generally, systemwide planning and operations in a decentralized and "federated" University is a distributed and collaborative responsibility. *Systemwide Strategic Directions* shows that a collaborative approach to planning is effective.

With regard to funding concerns, the University will continue to promote co-investment of campus and systemwide resources in shared collections and services, as this strategy affirms the value to campuses of shared initiatives, demonstrates commitment, and verifies the overall health of the system. Planners will continue to identify costs and opportunities for cost avoidance, and will continue to inform decision-makers about funding and budgeting issues as they arise.

Faculty have been and continue to be essential to this process, through SLASIAC (with three Senate representatives and six faculty "at large"), in the scholarly communication program, through consultations on the campuses that are communicated via the University Librarians, and through special initiatives such as the Senate's Special Committee on Scholarly Communication. The planners welcome suggestions for additional channels for faculty consultation and participation.

In discussion, Leonard alluded to the discussion at the previous day's Shared Library Facilities Board meeting of planning for library facilities. Lawrence explained that a proposal for construction of the third phase of the Southern Regional Library Facility has been stalled in part by the pressures on an inadequate capital budget for accommodation of enrollment growth, and in part by a dated understanding of the role and function of libraries and library facilities in the evolving, increasingly digital academic information environment. Provost Greenwood believes that it is essential to update and re-establish the University communities understanding of these issues. To this end, over the next 9-12 months, a collaboration between the Office of Systemwide Library Planning, the UCOP Budget Office, the Shared Library Facilities Board, SLASIAC, and other interested groups will work to develop, and consult widely with the University community about, a "case statement" that sets out, in clear and compelling terms, the key characteristics of the academic information environment as of about 2015 and posits the roles and functions of the libraries in that environment. The goal is parallel to Cardenas' call for a "model" of the University's information technology environment. The working team for this project would welcome UCOL and UCITTP participation.