

**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON LIBRARY  
MEETING MINUTES  
JANUARY 31, 2006**

**I. Chair's Announcements**

Chair Ben Crow briefed the members on the agenda. He also reported that APM 220-18-b(4) (Criteria for Advancement to Professor VI and to Professor Above-Scale Salary Levels) is open for review and comment. Members did not wish to opine on this issue.

**II. Consent Calendar****A. Minutes from the November 14, 2005 Meeting**

**ACTION: The minutes were approved with minor revisions.**

**III. Stewardship**

**ISSUE:** UCOL has been tasked with developing minimum criteria for the stewardship and the preservation of digital materials, which includes third-party storage of digital materials.

**DISCUSSION:** Consultant John Ober defined stewardship and put it into its proper context. Stewardship refers to the preservation and long-term care of digital materials with special regard towards the end of the life cycle of such information. Currently, UC is engaged in four main activities in this area: (1) [Systemwide Library Planning](#) has launched a study that is trying to determine what stewardship entails, faculty perception of stewardship, and how the responsibility of stewardship is currently divided among different groups. (2) The new Information Technology Guidance Counsel, which is a joint administrative-faculty committee, has been formed, and they have added stewardship to their agenda. (3) The California Digital Library (CDL) has created a digital repository. (4) The university librarians (UL's) have commissioned a working group to study the current state of the art of digital journal preservation, which is still rudimentary at this point given the numbers of publishers and different electronic formats used to publish digital journals.

Members were interested in the growth of the electronic journals over the past decade. John Ober responded that there are currently approximately 25,000 peer-reviewed journals worldwide. Most major publishers have electronic counterparts for these journals, although some smaller publishers have moved more slowly towards digital production. However, the trend towards digital production is increasing, with a few journals that are only being published digitally. Some types of journals are better suited to a digital environment, such as those that include simulations (statistical analysis, video clips, etc.). Members also discussed the importance of establishing an international third-party repository. John Ober noted that if there was a third-party repository, UC might be in a position of supporting, but not take on the sole task of preserving electronic journals in its own repository.

Principles for Acquiring and Licensing Information in Digital Formats

Members directed their attention to the draft paper from the UC Libraries Collection Development Committee, "Principles for Acquiring and Licensing Information in Digital

Formats”. John’s Ober noted that the CDL was formed in the late 1990’s, and this draft paper updates the principles for the selection of digital journals, which includes statements on archiving and preservation. These ‘principles’ have mandated that certain clauses be included within UC contracts with publishers that ensure perpetual access to journal materials. This draft has also inserted language that UC will give preference to publishers who adopt principles of broader access at lower costs and innovations in publishing (point 2B). Members felt that this language (2b) could be improved and clarified by simplifying the language into shorter and more precise sentences. John Ober also informed the committee that the second sentence in 2b should be changed to: “The libraries therefore make principle investments in publishing models that have the potential for transforming scholarly communications.” Members also noted the absence of third parties in this document. On this point, John Ober said that it does mention perpetual access in item 3b. Members agreed that this section does need to be reworked and should include language on third parties and their role in ensuring preservation and perpetual access of electronic journals. A perpetual access clause should guarantee access to the content even if the contract is rescinded or the license expires. Members discussed the different ways in which this could be accomplished. UC could maintain access to publisher’s website, however John Ober noted that there are marginal costs associated with this method. Another option is to allow the publisher to deliver content directly to UC (which UC would host on its own servers). Finally, UC could request that the publisher deposit content in a trusted third party repository. Members also discussed maintaining perpetual access to data base subscriptions (such as the Grove On-line Dictionary of Music) after discontinuing subscriptions for one or more years. Members acknowledged that even though there is very little value added with each annual revision, faculty members in those disciplines would strongly object to halting such subscriptions even on a temporary basis.

Members were interested in the development of a repository for materials to which UC once had, but may no longer have, access. John Ober clarified that UC currently does have a robust E-scholarship repository for open access scholarship produced by UC authors. There is also consensus within the academic community that a high priority needs to be placed on the long-term preservation of both journal and monograph content. He noted that this needs to be a cooperative endeavor because if every institution took on this effort individually, redundancies would emerge with poor economies of scope and scale. Second, publishers customize their platforms in such a way that makes it nearly impossible for UC to replicate in a UC-hosted repository. Members felt that while it is important for future UC contracts to require journal publishers to place journal content in a third party repository, they did not want the journal publishers to design such a repository themselves. To that end, John Ober mentioned two national projects (the newest is called “Portoco” [sp?]), which are building a business model where publishers and libraries pay a one-time start-up fee and on-going marginal costs to support a third-party repository. Another example is a model based on servers distributed across the country called “LOCKSS” The main advantage to such cooperative efforts are the large economies of scope and scale. John Ober also mentioned that the Library of Congress is currently running a program called the National Digital Information Infrastructure for Preservation that has been awarding large grants to study this problem. The CDL received one of these grants and is focusing on web content.

#### **IV. Campus Reports**

**ISSUE:** Members delivered reports from those campuses which had pressing issues to report.

##### UC San Francisco

The UCSF member noted that they have library space issues. On January 25<sup>th</sup>, UCSF hosted a symposium called “Google Scholar”, in which representatives from Google and the CDL talked about on-line scholarly resources; UCSF is also planning another symposium for scholarly communications (date still to be determined). The San Francisco divisional Committee on Libraries is pressuring its local Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) to develop a policy statement that would encourage faculty members to publish in open-access journals. Finally, the UCSF libraries are working with the CDL to identify materials to digitize.

##### UC Irvine

The UCI representative reported that UCI library holdings have grown from 2.1 million holdings to 2.4 million holdings, library usage has increased from 1.55 million visits in 1999 to 2.03 million visits in 2003-04, and library hours have been extended to 119.5 hours weekly in response to the increased demand. The Irvine divisional Council on Research, Computing, and Library Resources has been debating using email addresses as opposed to email portals for perpetual access for UC alumni. The debate centers on the high costs of maintaining email addresses for UCI alumni, and whether this is outweighed by the potential benefits of keeping alumni connected to certain schools (especially in the sciences) for fund raising purposes.

##### UC Davis

The UCD member reported a low attendance at the most recent divisional Committee on Library meeting. The committee is currently concentrating on the draft white papers from the Academic Senate’s Special Committee on Scholarly Communication. The UCD representative said that there is general agreement within the Davis committee that there is a need for more information on library issues at the campus level.

**DISCUSSION:** Members discussed strategies for increasing faculty member participation rates in the local divisional library committees.

#### **V. Development of Interactive Instructional Materials**

**ISSUE:** Chair Crow reviewed this discussion item from the November meeting, and he noted that the primary purpose of such materials would be an efficient way of informing faculty members on library issues in an efficient manner. At this point, he envisions something similar to the UC sexual harassment training module. He noted that three conditions would be necessary to make this project successful: Academic Council support, funding, and a number of faculty members who would devote their time to the project.

**DISCUSSION:** Members discussed the value of developing interactive instructional materials. First and foremost, such a project would take advantage of large economies of scale and scope; it would be able to inform faculty members about library/scholarly communication issues quickly, efficiently, and at a low cost. Second, it would help to keep UC out of court (i.e. the issue of electronic reserves and possible copy right infringement). Consultant John Ober offered the assistance of the UC Office of Scholarly Communication in this project.

**ACTION: Chair Crow will send a letter to Council Chair Brunk advocating for this project (with a copy to SLASIAC, the Systemwide Library and Scholarly Information Advisory Committee).**

## **VI. UC Press**

**ISSUE:** UC Press Director Lynne Withey presented both an overview of the activities of the UC Press and responded to questions raised in the UCOL discussion of the SCSC white papers. These questions included: (1) Possibilities for how the UC Press can assist with monograph and journal publishing, as well as describing the new developments in this area. (2) If faculty support can be obtained for monograph publishing, how can this best be utilized?

### UC Press Overview

Director Withey distributed the UC Press Annual Report, the ‘UC Press at a Glance’ handout, and the UC Press Strategic Plan. She briefed the UL’s and UCOL members on the strategic plan. The plan includes a set of strategies for books and journals publishing, in addition to a capital campaign planned for spring 2006. She noted that the Press receives approximately 70% of its revenues from book sales, and about 20% of its revenues from journal subscriptions.

### Book/Monograph Publishing

The books’ program is divided between scholarly books and monographs, as well as books intended for a more general audience. The traditional print program is subsequently focusing on those books that can be sold in bookstore, textbooks, and other specialized books that have the potential to sell a large number of copies over an extended period of time. The Press is also trying to print its more specialized scholarly monographs in a different way. Since these books sell only 300 to 600 copies, they are very expensive to produce. Therefore, the Press is trying to publish these books primarily in digital format using print-on-demand technology, as well as using faculty series editors for peer review. She cited four monograph series that are currently being published in this manner (three in the sciences and one in linguistics). Instead of distributing these monographs directly to libraries (via the library exchange programs), the Press digitally publishes these monographs and place them in the E-Scholarship repository at the CDL, while printing small quantities (300 or so) to satisfy their print demand. She noted that thus far, the sales of the traditional print copies have covered the actual print costs.

### Journal Publishing

The UC Press publishes 55 journals (13 of which are owned by the UC Press), and all of them are available in digital format. The journals’ program is almost entirely devoted to scholarly journals; the Press currently only publishes journals within the humanities and social sciences. Because the CDL platform is not set-up to publish journals electronically (and collect money from their sales), the Press makes use of an outside vendor for its electronic publishing. She noted that the Press faces fierce competition from for-profit publishers in journal publishing, which makes it harder to compete for new journals. In response to this heightened competition, the UC Press is becoming increasingly selective in which new journals that it wants to acquire, thereby selecting only those that lie within the Press’s areas of strength. She emphasized that the large commercial presses generally own their own journals, so it is difficult to simply pluck them away from the commercial presses. UC Press also publishes for scholarly societies (as do some commercial publishers as well). These societies are often financially-strapped, so it is very

attractive to societies when commercial publishers offer them a lot of money to publish their journals. To that end, Director Withey reported that the Press recently launched a project with the American Anthropological Association (AAA), which is a portal for anthropological scholarship. The Press is also beginning to offer digital hosting services for print journals. Finally, it is examining every single journal that it publishes with the aim of cutting costs.

#### Alternative Forms of Publishing

Director Withey also noted that there are alternative projects/publications that do not lend themselves well to traditional print. As an example, she cited UCOL Chair Crow's project on the "[The UC Atlas of Global Inequality](#)". She said that the UC Press and the CDL are collaborating on strategies to promote these types of projects, as well as bringing them to the attention of academic personnel committees.

**DISCUSSION:** Members discussed the UC Press's strategies for their books' and journals' programs, and asked Director Withey to delineate a coherent strategy for the UC Press. She responded that she would like to see a much more extensive monograph program that would be digital first (via CDL and open access), with a print component. In order to accomplish this goal, she said that both funding (for release time and administrative assistance) and faculty cooperation would be required to launch some series in subject areas that are currently underserved (literature, classics). Other initiatives included faculty-driven alternative electronic publications. In order to better market its books, all UC Press books are listed in Amazon's "Search Inside the Book" program as well as Google's Book Search program. Although the impact of these programs are hard to measure, she feels that it is necessary given the large numbers of consumers who purchase and research books on-line.

Members also asked Director Withey to elaborate on the UC Press's collaboration with the AAA. She noted that the AAA publishes 26 journals. The Press has worked with the AAA to establish an internet portal called "[Anthro Source](#)", which includes digital editions of all of these journals. It will eventually become a bibliographical clearing house for anthropological studies and scholarship, and it will eventually include other journals and books not published by the AAA, as well as primary source materials and field notes. It is designed to be a benefit to AAA members. At the moment, the project is being heavily funded by the Mellon Foundation, but there is a business model in place that suggests that it will be financially sustainable for the long run. Along these same lines, the Press is currently in talks with the Association for Asian Studies to create something similar, albeit on a smaller scale.

Members remarked that there are a number of specialized faculty-driven projects (such as specialized monograph series) and there exists faculty interest to do more in this area. Director Withey said that the UC Press is very interested in providing its services to faculty groups interested in developing such series. She did note, however, that while the Press could not take on this type of project alone, the Press could assist faculty members (who would lead the project) by digitally hosting, publishing, and distributing scholarly monograph series. She provided the example of the International Area Studies at UC Berkeley, which has a publishing program in place (called the "[The University of California International and Area Studies \(UCIAS\) Digital Collection](#)"). This program is digitally published through the CDL, while the UC Press provides print services. The Press is currently working on a literature series, which she hopes can be a

spring board for similar projects. Members also discussed the collaboration between the UC Press and the libraries on alternative digital faculty-driven projects (such as Ben Crow’s digital global inequality atlas). Director Withey said that collaboration with libraries is absolutely essential in developing any of these projects and their related spin-offs, as the Press doesn’t have the technology. Finally, these projects are in need of authentication of both the quality of the content and the format for CAP reviews. Director Withey responded that even though university presses are set up to evaluate traditional scholarly work, experimental projects represent a new form of scholarly production which deserves some serious thought on how best to evaluate them. Members also discussed the question of how best to preserve the content of these digital projects. Another aspect of the preservation problem is how much of the data sets (and supplementary data) should be kept. There was general consensus that it is impossible to hold onto all data forever, so careful selection of the data that should be preserved is required.

**ACTION: Develop a SLASIAC task force is being developed that will address strategies for scholarly publications (including the issues of digital preservation and evaluation). UC Press Director Withey will formulate a charge for this task force, which will be discussed at the June UCOL meeting. Analyst Todd Giedt will draft a letter to Council Chair Cliff Brunk advocating the creation of the task force described above. This letter to be jointly signed by UCOL Chair Crow, UC Press Director Withey, and the Chair of SLASIAC.**

#### **VII. Articulating the Role of Libraries in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century**

**ACTION: This agenda item was tabled until the June UCOL meeting.**

#### **VIII. Scholarly Communication**

**ISSUE:** Chair Crow invited members’ comments on the SCSC white papers.

#### **DISCUSSION:**

##### ‘The Case of Journal Publishing’ White Paper

Members discussed the last paragraph on page seven, which lists the SCSC’s recommendations for journals. Some UL’s noted that the SCSC recommendation that UC launch “competing journals in those cases where journals consistently fail to meet best practices” and encourage faculty members to start such journals may not be sound. They mentioned that the open access Public Library of Science (PLoS) journals are well funded, and it may be difficult for UC to fund similar ventures on its own. Members also stressed that it is important to keep these principles as principles as opposed to specific formulae. The UL’s also commented on the “best practices” criteria by which journals would be measured and noted that there are a number of ways that some journals can be evaluated. First, they cited [Ted Bergstrom’s journal pricing website](#), where faculty members can compare journals on such metrics as the Bergstrom-McAfee index (which relies primarily on price, but tries to normalize price around what the best non-profit journal publications can do). The CDL maintains a [“barriers” web page](#) that lists journal publishers that UC feels “fall well outside norms on pricing and/or other standard or desirable features for electronic content”. Finally there is an international website on open access, where journals are graded by color. While all of these types of metrics are helpful, members agreed that it is very hard to rely on any one single measure. Consultant Dan Greenstein said that it is technically possible to utilize UC E-links to distribute journal rating information, but this would have to be approved by the Academic Council, preferably through a Senate resolution. He added that UC

has been threatened with lawsuits by publishers for disclosing list price data. One option would be for UCOL to request such data on behalf of the Academic Senate.

**ACTION: (1) UCOL Consultants from the CDL and the Office of Scholarly Communications (OSC) will provide UCOL with an analysis of the metrics used in the evaluation of journals. They will also look at the risks involved in making journal price data and other metrics public. The analysis will be used to discuss a possible UCOL resolution on the public branding of certain journals at the June meeting.**

“Scholarly Societies and Scholarly Communication” White Paper

Members briefly discussed the scholarly societies’ white paper. One UL brought up the issue of the American Chemical Society (ACS), and said that they tried to inform faculty members about the ACS’s anti-competitive behavior against a free National Institute of Health (NIH) data base (called “PubChem”), which offered free access to medical and molecular data. She noted that this paper only addresses pricing behavior, but does not deal with some of these other predatory behaviors. Consultant John Ober (who is also a SCSC member) responded that the white paper does ask societies to reaffirm that dissemination of knowledge is one of their core missions. Secondly, it also states that societies should adopt innovations to maximize access and minimize costs. UL’s commented that it is sometimes difficult to examine scholarly societies in a critical light given the traditional affinity that has existed between scholars and their respective scholarly societies.

“Evaluation of Publications in Academic Personnel Processes” White Paper

Chair Crow explained that the Addendum to the paper on Evaluation of Publications in Academic Personnel Processes was intended to provide support for new forms of scholarly communication, when junior faculty may be reluctant to submit to new venues fearing that Academic Personnel Committees (CAPs) may value them less than established outlets. The UL’s said that this is not due to self-censorship of junior faculty alone. They commented that (1) the CAP’s have not given departments any guidelines on how to evaluate these newer venues; and (2) since scholars prefer the venues that they are used to, departments might naturally discriminate against some of the newer venues. This point is more applicable to departments in the humanities and the social sciences. In fact, some scholars in the hard sciences might argue that these newer venues are better suited to much of the scholarship that faculty in their disciplines typically produce. UCOL/SCSC members responded that the emphasis of the paper is that in some departments, there is a lack of proper peer review. The implication is that abdicating one’s UC in-house responsibility to external reviewers is not satisfactory. Another UCOL member argued that it is much better to rely on the peers (and experts in the field) outside the department when it came to the evaluation of the research per se. UCOL/SCSC members admitted that while this may be the case, external reviewers understand their role in the political process and they sometimes did not provide very useful analyses. Some UL’s also said that it might be useful to distinguish questions of content from questions of form.

“The Case of Scholarly Book Publishing” White Paper

UCOL members referenced the UC Press presentation from Director Lynne Withey and subsequent discussion for the comments on this paper. Members agreed with discussion statement #2 that UC faculty authors, university administrators, libraries, commercial publishers, and university presses should “collaborate to make best use of each other’s strengths while maximizing the efficient dissemination of scholarship”. They felt that such collaboration is essential, especially between the UC Press, UL’s, and the OSC. One UCOL member did mention that point #3 on page nine could lead to some misunderstanding. He said that some readers might jump to the conclusion that UC no longer requires a book for tenure. In reality, a book is still needed, whether it is in digital or a tradition print format.

**ACTION: UCOL members will convene a teleconference to draft their official comments on the SCSC white papers in late February.**

### **IX. Collection Management Strategies and Regional Library Facilities**

**ISSUE:** Consultant Dan Greenstein briefed the committee and the UL’s on the current status of the regional library facilities (RLF’s) and their future development. The RLF’s were created as part of the library master plan in the late 1970’s. There are two regional library facilities in the UC system--the northern facility at Berkeley (NRLF) and the southern facility (SRLF) managed by UCLA, and they hold about 1/3 of UC’s total collections (10 million volumes). A third phase has just been completed at the NRLF. The SRLF is nearly full, and a third phase of this facility is scheduled to be completed by 2011. Funding for these facilities is a campus-driven process within the overall capital plan, and the role of the systemwide office is to figure out how best to accommodate campus priorities. In the case of the RLF’s, the systemwide planning office has lobbied SLASAC to get funding for the new phases of the RLF’s. Dan noted that the collections at both facilities are managed efficiently as one collection by a single board, thereby minimizing duplication of deposits. That said, there is still 9% duplication, which will be cut by ½ over the next couple of years.

**DISCUSSION:** The members and UL’s discussed the future management of the RLF’s, as well as the challenges that they will face in the next 30 years. Members asked about electronic advances, and wanted to know how these advances might affect the outlook for the library system by 2050. The UL’s responded that the answer is different for different campuses, but stress that collaboration between UCOL, the campuses, and other library planning bodies is necessary to assess this. Another idea is to add a digital storage unit to one or both of the facilities, thereby relieving the individual campus libraries from having to duplicate their digital storage efforts. In terms of journal collections, the UL’s noted said they did agreed to move forward with group negotiations on access with Portoco [sp?], which would provide journal archiving services. They also mentioned that technology and mechanization should play a major role in the development of new phases of the regional facilities. UC is also about to be hit by a wave of new monographs from China and India, which the library system will have to purchase and store. Special Collections archives will also continue to grow unabated at the campus level, which are very space intensive.

UCOL Chair Ben Crow asked if there is some way for UCOL to be proactive in the management and development of the RLF facilities. Consultant Dan Greenstein responded that there will be a meeting in two months’ time, at which time a white paper on the utilization of RLF space will be



presented. He added that this white paper could be distributed to UCOL members. UCOL's input into the process by which the collections are assessed for their research value would also be very helpful. In terms of developing new RLF's, consultants and UL's emphasized that physical space or property (on which to place storage facilities) is not the issue. Rather, the difficulties are the bonds required to build the buildings. UCOL members were also interested in comparisons between UC and other large university library systems. Consultant Dan Greenstein responded that typically a number of different universities (or university systems) share one facility. He said that UC is the first university system to handle its collections on a system-wide basis, and it is moving towards using these regional facilities as a single entity. Members also addressed systemwide library policy, and inquired into what extent deposits are duplicated at the RLF's. Consultant Greenstein noted a recent change to university policy, where deposits will be largely persistent, rather than being subject to withdrawal by the campus that originally deposited them. That said however, many materials do circulate in some form back to the campuses via inter-library loan and other services.

**ACTION: Consultant Dan Greenstein will forward the white paper on utilization of RLF space to UCOL members.**

**X. Executive Session**

*UCOL Members did not have an executive session.*

The meeting was adjourned at 4:05 p.m.

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