

**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON LIBRARY
MEETING MINUTES – MARCH 27, 2007**

Present: [members/consultants] Ben Crow, Elaine Tennant, Richard Schneider, Roger Ingham, Lise Snyder (LAUC President), Claudia Rapp, John Ober, William Sullivan, Simon Leung, Andrew Waldron, and Todd Giedt; [ULs] Brian Schottlaender (SD), Marilyn Sharrow (D), Bruce Miller (M), Gary Strong (LA), Judy Cochrane (I), Julia Kochi (SF), Laine Farley (CDL), Tom Leonard (B), and Ginny Steel (SC).

I. Chair's Announcements

ISSUE: Chair Crow noted that the Assembly's consideration of the UCOL-proposed bylaw amendment has been postponed; it will be on the April Assembly agenda.

II. Consent Calendar

A. Approval of the Agenda

ACTION: Members approved the agenda.

B. Draft Minutes from the November 13, 2006 Meeting

ACTION: Members approved the minutes with minor amendments.

III. Open Access Policy

ISSUE: Analyst Todd Giedt noted that the Academic Council has not yet reviewed this issue, nor has it approved it to be sent out for systemwide review.

DISCUSSION: Members discussed the review process, noting that it is not strictly top-down or bottom-up, but that Provost Hume has sent it out going to a number of venues for comment (chancellors, senates, etc.). They were concerned about the lack of an orderly procedure for comment given that this is likely to be a contentious issue. Members discussed the different venues in which this proposal is likely to be discussed. The Santa Barbara divisional library committee hopes to convene a town hall meeting to discuss the proposal, as well as publicizing it in the staff/faculty campus newspaper/newsletter. At UC Irvine, the University Librarian (UL) and the divisional library committee will be hosting an event in late April. Email discussions within UCI's library committee have already taken place. Members remarked that there are a large number of faculty members who have yet to form an opinion on this issue. Therefore, the potential exists for a small number of people to negatively influence a large proportion of faculty opinion on this policy. Unfortunately, there are not pro and con viewpoints attached to this document. Consultant John Ober noted that there is a [Frequently Asked Questions](#) (FAQ), which is located on the [Office of Scholarly Communications website](#), is a useful tool in explaining this proposal.

Members commented on the different ways that this policy proposal will be viewed from the different segments of the University. Certainly, some disparaging comments may come from those with obvious conflicts of interest (i.e. those faculty members who are journal editors). Some faculty may see it as being forced upon them from above. Others may misread the policy proposal as an intellectual copyright 'grab'. The cynical view is that this is not the University

acting on the behalf of the faculty, but UC acting on its own behalf. The part that is missing (perhaps as background to the proposal) is the logic behind the policy--that if the University encourages all of its faculty to retain their individual copyright, the University can do collectively what individual faculty members cannot do on their own. Chair Crow added that this way of looking at the proposal (as a collective practice), must come from the divisions at this point. He is hoping that seminars, symposiums, and town hall meetings can be organized to mobilize faculty opinion on this issue.

Members also discussed the economics/efficiency argument for this proposal (i.e. reducing the licensing fees associated with academic journals). Consultant Ober said that the economic argument is complimentary; appealing to the direct interests of the faculty (in terms of copyrights) is perhaps a better way to go. However, other members disagreed. One member noted that the impetus behind this proposal lies in the high pricing policies of many journal publishers. For some faculty members, increasing the number of journals that they have access to is more important. Consultant Ober remarked that there are two dangers in primarily promoting the economic argument above the copyright issue. First, society publishers (who charge substantially less for their journals on average) may view this policy as a threat to their pricing strategies and revenue streams, which this policy is not intended to harm. It basically conflates for profit publishers with society publishers. Second, UC is not going to change the economics of journals simply by passing this policy. To effect that change, it will take the aggregation of multiple policies by a number of universities. Members did agree that if this policy is passed, the citation rates of faculty members will improve due to the effects of open-access.

IV. Proposed Subvention Policy

ISSUE: Chair Crow welcomed Dick Terdiman and Lynne Withey (UC Press Director) to the discussion; he noted that this policy tries to address the fact that on the one hand, the monograph has retained its importance for the purposes of tenure and professional promotion, while on the other hand, publishers have significantly reduced their monograph publications, especially in the social sciences and humanities. Dick Terdiman remarked that the real problem lies in the increasing proportion of university acquisition budgets devoted to purchasing expensive journals in the natural sciences, which has meant that fewer monographs are being purchased. This proposal, first suggested by the Academic Council's Special Committee on Scholarly Communication (SCSC) last year, would allow for financial support in the form of subventions to be given to junior faculty who are trying to publish their first monograph or book. An early draft of the proposal envisaged that the subvention could be included in start-up support for new faculty members. Subsequent SCSC discussion suggested that the subvention would be more effectively associated with the publication of a faculty members' first book. The main issues with the proposal centered on issues of quality, administration, and equity (in terms of the subventions) across the campuses and the disciplines. Dick Terdiman stressed that the subvention mechanism tries to avoid over-legislation, and recommends that the appropriate cognizant deans be empowered to make the granting decisions on applications for these subventions (the application would contain an acceptance letter from the university press and a certification form from the press that a subvention is necessary for publication). Towards that end, the cognizant dean would have guidelines, which would be determined by the local committees on research, in making the mostly pro-forma decisions on the subvention awards. An appeals

process would also be built in. The respective deans would also issue annual reports jointly to UCOP and the systemwide University Committee on Research Policy (UCORP), which would address equity across the campuses. One desired outcome of this policy is the improvement in the climate for monographs. As every press director will know of UC's subvention policy, it is hoped that their business decisions will be influenced by this subvention policy.

DISCUSSION: Chair Crow asked if the committee is ready to develop this proposal for consideration by Academic Council. Analyst Todd Giedt remarked that given that it is already almost April, along with the fact that the proposal is not yet finalized, it would be best to wait until fall 2007 for submission to Council. Members agreed that this would be a prudent timeline. The committee was most concerned about issues of implementation, timing, and quality. One member expressed concerns regarding the timing, specifically if university presses routinely ask for subsidies before accepting manuscripts. She also commented on the effect on tenure, noting that sometimes departments allow simple acceptance of the manuscript and other times, departments insist on publication. She remarked that in the latter case, one would need to add 12 months to the tenure clock. If subventions became routine, would not the application process for them delay the tenure cycle? Also, in terms of quality maintenance, if a campus signaled its willingness to give a subvention to a new faculty member at the time of hiring, would that not prejudice the tenure process in some way? Would a subvention lower the hurdle for tenure? Also, what would be the impact on library budgets assuming that libraries would be required to purchase the additional monographs published partially facilitated by these subventions? Lynne Withey responded that the timing is potentially an issue, but it is very rare for a press to require the receipt of a subsidy before publication. It is more often a mutual discussion in which after acceptance the press would seek a subsidy for the monograph, including asking the author if his or her institution maintains subsidies for publication. In response to the member's concerns about extending the tenure clock, Dick remarked that most of these decisions would be pro-forma and could be made within a couple of weeks. The internal review at UC would be very straight-forward and fast-tracked; it would almost be rubber-stamped because the press would have already accepted the book. Lynne added that the book could be in production while the author applies for the subvention. Dick commented that routinely giving every new faculty member a subsidy was originally considered, however SCSC thought that giving this authority to the cognizant dean was a better choice given the different levels of need for different fields. Members countered that if money is limited, it could be problematic for a cognizant dean to weigh in on these decisions. Dick responded that if the pool of money does become constrained, the cognizant dean model may not work well as it is hoped. He added that SCSC members felt that the committees on research might meet too infrequently to process these applications in a timely manner. Another member asked if this policy would apply to other areas (besides humanities and social sciences)—for example the arts. He remarked that art history is located in the School of Humanities on some campuses, while on other campuses, it is located in the School of the Arts. Dick replied the subvention policy would apply to humanities with a small 'h', and not to the actual and bureaucratic divisions found on the individual campuses. Towards the elimination of this potential confusion, this member suggested adding the word 'arts' to 'humanities and social sciences'.

Members also asked if the committee could tie open access to this policy. Lynne responded that if we truly wanted to make monographs truly 'open', we would have spent much more money on

them because it does cost money to publish books. Even if books were open-access, it would still be necessary to print the book in order for university libraries to purchase them.

Lynne said that each grant would need to be between \$5,000 and \$10,000. There is also the question of how many faculty would make use of these subventions. The best solution would be to figure out the number of humanities/social sciences/arts faculty members; divide by 5 or 6; and then multiply that number by \$5,000 to \$10,000. Members also requested that Lynne send information on the number of universities that currently have some sort of subvention policy in place. She said that there are a few subvention policies at various institutions, which range from being very casual to very systematic. In order to make a significant dent, it will be necessary for a large number of universities to institute subvention policies.

ACTION: The committee will consider a final proposal at its June meeting. Lynne Withey will send data to the committee on the number of universities that have some sort of subvention policy.

V. UCOL/OSC Seminar on University and Scholarly Societies

ISSUE/REPORT: Chair Crow asked for committee approval of UCOL/OSC sponsored seminar/symposium on the topics of university, scholarly societies, and open access. He reminded members that there are a number of scholarly societies that are skeptical to, or downright opposed to, UC's open access policy proposal, and it is important to open a dialogue with them.

DISCUSSION: Consultant Ober remarked that this symposium is important for two reasons. First, it would UC and key scholarly societies to find areas of compromise. Second, the symposium could profile those scholarly society publishers that have had success with open access publishing models. The identification of potential partnerships is another goal. For a moderator, he suggests someone who is on a scholarly society board or even a provost at a major university. Members agreed that for-profit monopoly publishers should not be invited to the symposium. Chair Crow mentioned that he has had some discussion with the [American Anthropological Society](#), which initially was quite opposed to UC's open access policy because they feared that their business model would be threatened. He said that this is the sort of society that UCOL would be interested in hearing from. Members suggested early fall as a good time to hold this symposium. Consultant Ober said that OSC would be able to finance the symposium, but he hopes that a joint letter of invitation from himself and Ben Crow could be generated. Financial support from an independent foundation would also be helpful in terms establishing UC's neutrality.

ACTION: Members agreed to sponsor this proposal. Analyst Todd Giedt will draft a letter requesting Academic Council approval for a joint letter of invitation to the symposium.

VI. ITTP Ten Grand Challenges

ISSUE: Chair Crow reported that the [Information Technology Guidance Committee](#) (ITGC), which is an administrative body, has been working on IT strategic planning for the UC system as a whole. The [Information Technology and Telecommunications Policy committee](#) (ITTP) is the

equivalent Senate body. ITTP is trying to aggregate the work of ITGC in its *Ten Grand Challenges*. He said that there are two things that UCOL can do: (1) Draft a letter to ITTP supporting the document; but (2) take apart some of these recommendations and seeing if there is any way to make them more tangible. He also said this could serve as a guide for topics that the committee might want to take up in the future.

DISCUSSION: Consultant John Ober mentioned that ITGC’s work is also good to look at for future discussion by the committee. He mentioned that two of ITGC’s focus areas--[Stewardship of Digital Assets](#) and [Common IT Architecture](#)—as two focus areas that UCOL might want to take a closer look at. Another issue of interest are ‘research grants without a home’, which is listed as number nine within ITTP’s *Ten Grand Challenges*.

ACTION: Members agreed to draft a letter of support in favor of ITTP’s *Ten Grand Challenges*. ‘Stewardship of Digital Assets’; ‘Common IT Architecture’; and ‘Research Grants without a Home’ will be placed on future UCOL agendas.

VII. Announcements from the University Librarians

ISSUE: UL Convenor Tom Leonard reported on the UL’s morning session. He announced that Dan Greenstein has been promoted to the level of vice provost at UCOP; Laine Farley is acting director/UL of the California Digital Library (CDL). UC’s preliminary talks with the [Online Computer Library Center](#) (OCLC) regarding the creation of a public catalogue are proceeding well. The ULs discussed digital preservation. The costs of preserving digital library materials over extended periods of time are much higher than previously assumed. In related news, future funding (approximately \$47 million) for the [National Digital Information Infrastructure and Preservation Program](#) (NDIIP) was recently rescinded from the budget of the Library of Congress. About \$10-12 million of these funds would have come to California. The ULs also held a discussion regarding planning for the library storage facilities; they will send out a survey towards this end soon (that will collect data on what UC will need to store in these facilities). Finally, he briefed members on UC’s mass digitization projects. UC has sent more than 200,000 books to Google for digitization; sent 78,000 books to the internet archive; and has just signed an agreement with Microsoft to scan an additional 100,000 books in 2007. Google is currently digitizing approximately 3,000 books per day from UC’s regional storage facilities.

DISCUSSION: Members talked about the budget for the Library of Congress budget. The ULs mentioned that the funding for NDIIP were part of unobligated funds, which were ‘swept up’ (or away) by Congress. The Library of Congress is now in the process of revising its 2008 budget request to guarantee some funding for this project.

VIII. Open Access Policy (with the University Librarians)

ISSUE: Chair Crow summarized the UCOL’s earlier discussion on this issue. He suggested the possibility of joint meetings between the ULs and the various divisional Senate library committees (i.e. town hall type meetings). He urged the ULs to join with the local library committees to mobilize support and the appropriate airing of criticism of this policy proposal.

DISCUSSION: The ULs mentioned that many publishers feel that open access will be their ultimate fate. Members asked the ULs for input on how to best publicize the proposed Open

Access policy on the campuses, given that the response date is May 20, 2007. The main concern is the controversial nature of this issue; it may be beneficial to solicit input beyond Senate committee meetings (forums, town hall meetings, etc.).

Members/ULs expressed some concern over the policy's current title, as well as the deadline of May 20th. They felt that a longer review might be needed. They also noted that the title of 'open access', rather than copyright, is problematic in the sense that open access is a much broader discussion. Open access raises publishing interests for members of the faculty, many of whom serve on editorial boards. Consultant Ober remarked that the working group chose 'open access' for the title because they felt that it was a useful rubric because it includes so many issues. Members wondered if the intellectual property aspects of the policy could be emphasized in town hall meetings. One UCOL member noted that issues of economics and copyright are intertwined in this policy. Certainly, one goal of this policy is to break down both of these barriers so that scholars have access to everything. The fact that publishers are slowly realizing that open access is becoming a more prominent feature in the publishing world is a positive development. Another cynical view is that people do not see this as retaining their own rights, but 'transferring their rights to UC'. Unfortunately, collective practice or bargaining for copyright rights is the issue that is being missed here. Towards that end, members talked about re-contextualizing the policy.

They also discussed the current support among faculty. In the Senate's initial review of this policy proposal, more than half of the comments were in favor of the policy. Consultant Ober added that a survey of almost 1,200 faculty members showed that 50% would be in favor of such a policy; the other 50% did not know enough about the policy to comment. Catherine Candee said that there definitely is the perception of controversy, even if the actual number of proponents (of this controversy) is small. In other words, the silent majority could be an issue here. Members briefly discussed placing a statement at the beginning of the proposal or even a covering memo; Chair Crow said that he thinks that at this stage of the review, it is too late to add such a statement. One option is to include such a statement in UCOL's comments on this policy.

ACTION: Chair Crow will contact Senate Executive Director María Bertero-Barceló seeking clarification on the timing/review of this policy proposal.

IX. Electronic Theses and Dissertations Proposal to Graduate Deans

ISSUE: Catherine Candee, special guest to the committee, introduced this item. She said that a proposal has been made to the Council of Graduate Deans (COGD) to implement the storage of theses and dissertations electronically (ETDs). The CDL is anxious to do this because [ProQuest](#) has now moved to an electronic dissertation management system. Currently, UC accepts paper dissertations, which are converted to an electronic format by ProQuest. However, there are a number of inefficiencies associated with this type of process. She noted that the infrastructure is in place at both ProQuest and the [Berkeley Electronic Press](#) (Bepress) that allows easy electronic submission. Some campuses, such as UCSD, have already instituted ETD submission. COGD will be meeting in May to discuss this issue. The CDL is currently examining and anticipating the costs associated with this project. Accompanying this proposal is a proposal from Davis for electronic submission of masters' theses, which is separate from the ETD issue.

DISCUSSION: Members discussed how dissertations would be available to library patrons. Catherine clarified that every local campus library will have to decide whether a print or an electronic copy will be kept on the shelves. Open access will also be provided (as long as the student agrees to it); however all dissertations will be scanned into CDL's preservation repository regardless. ProQuest is also willing to pay for the installation of the 'gateway' for these electronic submissions, so this is a good opportunity for UC to institute this process. Catherine assured members that there actually is much more control of students' intellectual property in a digital environment. She reminded the group that ProQuest currently allows access to student dissertations for a fee. One member wanted to know if there are mechanisms to prevent plagiarism among undergraduate students. Catherine said that ProQuest is using a number of sophisticated tools to detect plagiarism; UC is only responsible for depositing the work and ProQuest is also responsible for validation of the work. Other members wondered if graduate students would be open to any legal and/or copyright risk by putting their dissertation into an open access depository. Catherine responded that UC does not consider depositing the dissertation into the repository as a 'publication'. However UC deals with this in a number of ways. First, students can refuse to do this. Second, UC can hide or 'take down' the dissertation from the repository. That said, the appropriate education of graduate students' copyrights needs to be worked out with the COGD. Tom Leonard added that traditionally when a dissertation was placed on library shelves, it was considered as 'published'. Members expressed some concern whether putting dissertations in an open access repository will damage the student's chances of later publishing it as a book. Catherine reported that Lynne Withey, the Director of the UC Press, does not think that this will be an impediment. Enough work goes into transforming a dissertation into a book that having the raw version in an open access repository will not damage its chances of being published later as a book.

X. Association of Research Libraries' "Know Your Copyrights" Campaign and Materials

ISSUE: Chair Crow reminded members that they had previously discussed providing faculty members with more information on 'fair use'. He wondered if this document fulfilled this purpose. There is a box on fair use, which is useful, but it is also open to misuse. He reiterated the need for guidance on fair use, and applauded this document as step in the right direction.

DISCUSSION: One UL commented that the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) has been taking a multi-pronged approach to copyright. The ULs directed members' attention to the matrix on the inside back page, which renders fair use much more concretely than the four legal criteria found earlier in the document. In short, this document (1) renders much more concrete the kind of decision-making process on fair use; (2) it does so in a more cost-efficient manner; and (3) the document does no harm. The ARL has been trying to produce documents that inform but do not harm or put people in difficult legal positions. The campuses have taken various approaches to distributing this document, and its distribution has been fairly broad (it is available electronically as well). Members suggested that it should be distributed to the department managers (MSOs). Lecturers should be another target audience. One UCOL member mentioned that it does not address what a 'small portion' is, which is generally known as the 25-35% rule. ULs cautioned that there really is not any legally-defensible literature specifying what percentage a 'small portion' is. Members also asked if any progress has been made in tracking down

copyright holders in order to use their works as instructional materials. ULs responded that while the ‘Orphan Rights’ legislation is under active discussion, it will probably not pass due to the California lobby (Hollywood, photographers, etc.). The central issue is whether faculty members can use materials created by copyright holders who do not respond to inquiries. As noted above, content holders have objected to a clause that would have allowed use of materials in cases of non-responsive copyright holders. ULs reminded the committee that 1923 remains the cut-off date for copy-righted materials.

XI. Library Facilities’ Planning Issues

ISSUE: Gary Lawrence briefed the committee on the current state of UC library facilities planning. The State of California provides \$345 million for UC’s capital needs. Unfortunately UC needs about \$800 million per million. UC fulfills this gap partially through private borrowing, but the University is at or near its debt capacity. Enrollment growth needs account for about \$500 million. However, enrollment growth is projected to slow beginning by 2010, but facilities’ expansion has typically lagged behind the actual enrollment growth. This means that on the high-growth campuses, facilities are about 20% below that of state standards. Instructional costs have also increased by about 35% over the last ten years. It is expected that the capital budget for library facilities will remain strained for several years to come. In spite of this, print collections will continue to grow by about 1.8% (600,000 volumes) per year. Systemwide, about 30% of the total print collections are located in regional storage facilities. The capital cost of storing print materials is about ¼ of the cost to house them in stacks in campus libraries. He also acknowledged that the circulation of print collections is stable or declining, while the circulation of digital collections is rising at 7% per year. While there may be a case to be made that long-term investment in facilities for print collections; it may not be a good idea in an uncertain future. Certainly, the merit of building on-campus print space will not be self-evident to campus communities.

In that context, the regional library facilities (RLFs) were originally envisioned in UC’s 1977 library plan as low-cost housing for infrequently used library materials. Both facilities were designed to be modular, and capable of eventually housing 11 million volumes each. The Northern Regional Library Facility (NRLF) currently has a capacity of 7.3 million volumes. The Southern Regional Library Facility (SRLF) was planned with only three modules; two are already built and will be full by 2010. The third phase (SRLF-3) is scheduled to begin construction in the 2010-11 capital budget; occupancy would begin in 2013-14. SRLF is a systemwide facility; it reduces the need for funds by the campuses. This is an opportunity to identify and plan for services that will be needed that could be shared by the RLFs. For example, large-scale scanning facilities; shared print collections; as well as the addition of facilities to meet the urgent need for affordable and reliable storage of digital information are all suggestions. Towards that end, defining the scope of SRLF-3 will need to be completed within a year. As an initial step, the ULs are conducting a self-survey to provide base-line information. There will also be a consultative planning and design process in the context of a building for SRLF-3. This will begin to emerge sometime in the fall.

DISCUSSION: UCOL members emphasized the important role that libraries will play in the next fifty years. They wondered to what extent library functions are being included in central long-range infrastructure planning at UCOP. Gary responded that UCOP is quite open to this

type of broad viewpoint. He also announced a change in governance policy for the RLFs. There is now a systemwide board that provides for the governance of both RLFs, which will harmonize the operational practices and policies of the two facilities. That said, the operational characteristics of the RLFs are such that they still primarily serve the campuses in their respective regional areas. Capital planning for the SRLF is hosted at UCLA and the NRLF at Berkeley. ULs added that there is a return on investment to building and maintaining RLFs even in the age of digitization. UC has also received ‘free money’ of about \$6 million coming through the Open Content Alliance and its digitization efforts.

Chair Crow mentioned that the RLFs are not really seen, and he wondered if the RLFs could be made more visible through their use in teaching and research. The Merced UL noted that the digitization projects are making the library on his campus very real to faculty members there (with 35 million volumes digitally), even though the library is brand new. The Merced Library puts both the SRLF and NRLF on every faculty member’s desktop. It also has the technology to measure how many books should be on its shelves. Therefore, these facilities are hugely important. One UCOL member commented that the traditional advocates of the library would argue for the value of browsing the stacks. Some ULs pointed out that browsing on-line is much more effective however. They added that certain ‘recommender systems’ (such as those used by Amazon and others) are being studied by UC for this purpose. Gary Lawrence is not sure what would bring faculty to the RLFs, but he is willing to think more about it.

XII. New Business

ISSUE: Members did not have any new business.

XIII. Executive Session

[Note: Minutes, aside from action items, are not prepared for this portion of the meeting.]

ISSUE/REPORT: Members did not hold an executive session.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m

Attest: Ben Crow, UCOL Chair
Prepared by: Todd Giedt, Committee Analyst