

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON LIBRARY
MEETING MINUTES
NOVEMBER 14, 2005

I. Chair's Announcements

Chair Ben Crow introduced himself to the committee; explained the charge of the committee; and talked briefly about the committee's agenda for the upcoming year.

II. Consent Calendar**A. UCOL Annual Report**

ACTION: Annual Report approved.

III. Overview of Library and Scholarly Communication Issues

ISSUE: The committee reviewed some of the main library and scholarly communication issues:

DISCUSSION:Scholarly Communication

The nature of scholarly communication is changing very rapidly and it is important for libraries to respond to these changes. Chair Crow noted that UC's successful subscription negotiations with Elsevier as a major milestone in this regard. These negotiations highlighted the issue of scholarly communications for the Academic Senate, and it established a Special Committee on Scholarly Committee (SCSC). Members acknowledged the difficulty of addressing these issues because scholarly communication cuts across academic disciplines. Some members mentioned that there might be a lack of awareness in some corners of academia on this issue and an information campaign might be necessary to inform and update faculty members on scholarly communication. It was also noted that there are a number of journal editors on the various UC campuses, whose existence may represent some form of conflict of interest as UC deals with these issues.

Stewardship

Members discussed the role that libraries will play in archiving the world wide web. The preservation of digital materials that are not in hard-copy format is a key issue. Members noted that this goes beyond web pages and web sites. Scholars produce scholarly materials that range from formal journals to course materials to research data. Along these lines, members questioned the efficacy of preserving all scholarly material, such as faculty emails. At the moment, there is not a clear understanding or consensus on exactly what should be preserved, and for how long. The various UC library-associated offices (CDL and systemwide library planning) are investigating this issue and hope to produce a report sometime in the spring of 2006. Another issue involving stewardship is the minimal requirements for sustainability of the output of electronic journals. To that end, UC Librarians are currently working on a document that aims to outline the licensing guidelines for on-line journals.

ACTION: Office of Scholarly Communication will be producing an update on the requirements necessary for persistent access to on-line journal publications.

Articulating the Role of Libraries

Members noted that there needs to be a recognition that libraries are changing, and it is important to keep local planning processes and divisional Senates aware of the current issues. The suggestion was made to encourage divisional library committees to examine long-range planning documents in order to see how the library as an institution is being portrayed. To that end, the importance of obtaining some kind of library impact statement was stressed. Members felt it was important to differentiate between the role of the digital library and the role of the actual physical building. Consultants and members stressed that the “print” world is not going away and libraries will have to accommodate print materials (especially from institutions/presses outside of the U.S.) for a long time to come. As an aside, the aesthetic value of the library was also mentioned. Members were also interested in obtaining data on how many faculty members check out books and other printed materials on a regular basis.

IV. Scholarly Communication White Papers

Members noted that these papers should be taken holistically. In particular, members noted an apparent contradiction between the CAP WP and the Copyright WP. The Copyright WP claims that it is important not to relinquish copyright, however the CAP WP states that it is also important to publish in peer-reviewed outlets. Given the current state of journal contracts however, many junior faculty members would be hard-pressed to publish in reputable journals if they resisted in retaining their copyright.

A. CAP White Paper

DISCUSSION: Members appreciated the conservatism of this paper, however some felt that the number of venues for scholarly publishing could be expanded assuming that proper peer review is maintained. New forms of scholarly works are emerging that have some type of peer review, which are neither journals nor books. One example is the Civil War history website, [Valley of the Shadow](#), which is an elaborate scholarly website. Members also had concerns over “Item E. New Forms of Evaluation”. In particular, there was some confusion about whether the white paper referred to new forms of evaluation or new forms of scholarly work. These new types of works would require new types of evaluation.

Members also made the point that junior faculty members cannot afford to explore such new outlets for scholarly communication for obvious tenure reason. It was emphasized that it is really only the very senior faculty members who can do this, as even the younger senior faculty members will be naturally too concerned with promotion to explore such new options. Members made special mention that elements of the review process are constantly ongoing at all levels, and do not only occur in a CAP review. In that regard, there is need for a macro-sociological change in this area.

Regarding the outlet or venue of the scholarly work, members felt that it is important for the white paper to elaborate on evaluating new venues (or at least to strengthen the language on this point). In particular, strengthening the wording regarding the department’s responsibility to properly evaluate these new venues is important. Establishing new journals, such as the electronic Public Library of Science (PLOS), is critical to this effort. Once these new journals are established and have gained some prestige, CAP committees can look at their editorial

boards, etc., and better evaluate them for the purposes of advancement and promotion. There is a sense that electronic publications are fine only if they look and feel like traditional journals. New forms of scholarly communication, which are quite different from the traditional journals, could be included if they are validated by the academic community.

ACTION: Members made the following specific comments:

- **Item B: The responsibility of departments should be emphasized more. In the first sentence of this section, “Publishers of new and established books and journals should provide...” with “Departments should review new and established books and journals and should provide...”.**
- **Item E: It should be specified that the CAP committees should be encouraged to consider new forms and modalities of scholarly communication and new forms of evaluation for them.**
- **At the bottom of page 2, where it states, “The University should welcome publication in electronic or other new media where appropriate...”, “welcome” should be replaced with “encourage”.**

B. Copyright White Paper

DISCUSSION: In the background section that mentions “hyper-inflation”, the white paper seems to indicate that if only the problem of retaining copyright were solved, then the problem of the hyper-inflation of journal prices would go away. Members were also concerned with the following statement from the paper at the bottom of the third page, “It is primarily the individual faculty member who is in a direct position to manage their copyright in ways that address their own and the academy’s interests.” Members noted that in today’s environment, this is simply not the case. In many cases, if an individual faculty member tries to negotiate their copyright (or refuses to sign away his or her copyright) with a journal publisher, then he or she runs the real risk of not being published in that particular journal. This phenomenon is even more critical for the junior faculty member. Chair Ben Crow noted that a draft resolution is coming out of SCSC, which attempts to remedy this situation by recommending that UC assert a collective systemwide copyright:

“In order to facilitate scholarly communication, SCSC proposes that the Academic Council consider the following recommended UC copyright policy change:

“UC faculty members will assign to the Academic Senate, non-exclusive copyright to place their scholarly work in an open-access repository. Faculty can opt out of this agreement for any specific work they do not wish to appear in such a venue, or invoke a specific delay before such work appears in an open-access repository. The Academic Senate, in collaboration with UC Administration, will establish mechanisms for controlling the use of scholarly work covered by this policy. No net income will accrue to either the Academic Senate or to the University by this non-exclusive copyright assignment.”

SCSC understands that such a proposed policy change would require broad discussion and probably adoption by the Academic Assembly before submission to UC Administration for consideration.”

Chair Crow also clarified that individual UC faculty members can “opt-out” of this agreement. Members felt that the opt-out clause might be attractive to junior faculty members, who may feel it necessary in order to publish in a certain journal. With regard to faculty copyrights on works published in the open-access electronic journals, consultants explained that it varies by journal publisher. For example, PLOS publishes all of its work on the Creative Commons Attribution License, which means that the work is protected by copyright but the author and publisher both grant to all users certain rights to use the work in the future. In this case, the one type of use that is strictly forbidden is to misappropriate the work.

ACTION: Develop for readers examples of copyright policies (appendix). An implementation plan is also needed.

C. Journal Publishers White Paper

DISCUSSION: Members felt that journal publishers do not have anything to do with the “production of knowledge”, but have a lot to do with the dissemination of knowledge (first sentence). Concerning the value-added services that publishers provide (peer review, editing, access, etc.) in bullet point #2 in “Ideal Publishing Practices”, members wondered how these services could be priced independently in an environment where subscriptions are usually being bundled. Another concern is the intended audience for the white paper. It is not clear to the members if this paper is being addressed to faculty or to the actual publishers themselves. Members also agreed that this paper lacks a clear policy initiative. Members felt that this paper could be improved if it argued for establishing certain benchmarks or attributes, against which competing journals could be evaluated.

Members also suggested introducing competitive journals with strong editorial boards in strategic areas. Seed money for could come from UC. Specifically, budgets for most unused journals would presumably be cut to finance these new journals (or journals that do not meet certain prescribed benchmarks).

ACTION: (1) Members felt that “production of knowledge” should be changed to “dissemination of knowledge” in the first sentence on page one. (2) CDL will identify the amount of money that UC spends on journals that are unlikely to meet the benchmarks referenced above. SCSC or UCOL will propose that there be regular assessments to establish competitions to replace/supplant (or compete with) those journals that do not meet UC’s standards or benchmarks. A conclusion to this paper should be added that outlines the establishment of such benchmarks as well as a competition to introduce new journals.

D. Monograph White Paper

DISCUSSION: Members felt that UC should play a more active role in maintaining traditional monograph publishing. One such measure might include \$5,000 monograph grants, which would go a long way in getting a monograph published. It was also noted that in many parts of the world, monograph and book publishing is actually increasing, not decreasing (as it is in the United States). Despite the preconception that more money is spent on monographs in the sciences as opposed to monographs in the humanities, some data also show that the level of expenditures in these two areas is about equal. Committee members also contrasted the one-time

costs and the permanent nature of monographs with the recurrent subscription costs of electronic journals and data bases that UC subscribes to, and they questioned whether money could be better spent on more enduring monographs.

The committee made the following suggestions:

- Make bullet #1 a point of priority. Resources should be made available for younger scholars to publish individual monographs.
- The third bullet point on page one and #3 on page two should be either removed or rewritten (especially the first sentence in #3—“Break the dependence on printed artifacts...”). At the very least, these statements are too strong. In most fields, it is clearly preferable to continue print monographs (even if the production process for the most part is digital).

ACTION: (1) The third bullet point on page one and #3 on page two should be either removed or rewritten (see above). (2) Subventions should be created to encourage (and assist) junior faculty members to publish more monographs.

V. Working Lunch: Announcements from the Academic Senate Office

ISSUE: Academic Senate Chair Brunk, Academic Senate Vice Chair Oakley, and Executive Director Mariá Bertero-Barceló introduced themselves to the committee. Chair Brunk and Vice Chair Oakley also provided their views on some of the issues facing UCOL this year:

Cross-Committee Communication

Professor Brunk noted that many of the issues that UCOL will be addressing do not exist in a vacuum and will require input from other systemwide committees, such as UCAP. He sees his role as a coordinator or conduit between the different committees. He encouraged members to consider inviting Chairs from other committees when the need or specific issues arise.

Major Regental Issues

Professor Brunk also outlined some of the major Regental issues facing UC this year:

- Compensation: There have been a series of Academic Council resolutions supporting the Regents’ attempt to bring all of the salaries to market value within ten years. Regarding senior management salaries, a comparative analysis is currently ongoing with comparison institutions.
- UCI Liver Transplant Program: Professor Brunk mentioned that the UCI transplant program has been shut down.
- Los Alamos: UC will soon know the winner of the Los Alamos competitive bid.

The Future of Special Committee for Scholarly Communication (SCSC)

ISSUE: Chair Ben Crow raised the issue of the future of the SCSC with Academic Council Chair Cliff Brunk. Chair Brunk outlined a couple of alternatives. SCSC could become a subcommittee of UCOL or the life-span of SCSC could be extended, possibly with a modified charge and new Chair.

DISCUSSION: Members felt that the issues being addressed by SCSC would be better served through a special committee of the Academic Senate, rather than a standing subcommittee of UCOL.

ACTION: Members voted to extend SCSC as a special committee of the Academic Senate. Chair Crow will write a letter to Council Chair Brunk specifying this.

Strategic Planning Meeting

ISSUE: Members advocated a strategic planning meeting between UCOL, ITTP, and other related groups. They hope that such a meeting would clarify the overlapping roles and responsibilities of these groups.

DISCUSSION: Members were encouraged to wait until the receipt of the report from the IT Guidance Committee before planning a meeting.

VI. Campus Reports

ACTION: Discussion of the campus reports was postponed until the January meeting.

VII. Stewardship

ACTION: Discussion of the campus reports was postponed until the January meeting.

VIII. Articulating the Role of Libraries in the 21st Century

ACTION: Members were encouraged to look at the role of libraries in their local planning documents such as “academic programs’ planning” and “capital programs planning”.

IX. 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