UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA   ACADEMIC SENATE

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON LIBRARY
TELECONFERENCE MINUTES – MAY 17, 2006

Present: Phil Walker, Ben Crow, John Ober, Elaine Tennant, Winder McConnell, Bill
Sullivan, Rich Schneider, Rogers Brubaker, Lucille Chia, Dan Greenstein, and Simon
Leung

I.   Announcements
ISSUE:
- UCOL bylaw changes and name change (UCOLASC?): These amendments were
  initially passed by Academic Council and are being sent to the divisions for comment.
  The bylaw amendments would allow UCOL to serve in an advisory capacity
  regarding issues of scholarly communication.
- Copyright policy was amended by Council and passed by Assembly. Bob Dynes is
  asked to set up a joint Senate-Administration working group to work on the language
  of this policy. A copyright lawyer will be included in that group.
- Ben suggested setting up a phone conference in the summer. Winder will not be here
  in August. Simon may be in Hong Kong for two weeks in July.

DISCUSSION: Consultant Ben Greenstein stated that the policy review process is pretty
straight-forward (5-8 months); it just takes time. It is a formal process with consultation
with the Chancellors, etc.

II.   Continuing the Work of SCSC
ISSUE: SCSC continues until August. One of the concerns is that members of SCSC
have a fair amount of combined expertise and experience and there is some advantage in
continuing some small group. Two suggestions: (1) Subcommittee of SLASIAC
(however Ben has found out that they are not interested); (2) Establish a task force (or
subcommittee) of UCOLASC composed of both internal and external members, which
would last over several years. At the current time, UCOL does not have the 'specialist'
representation that SCSC has.

DISCUSSION: Dan Greenstein noted that with SLASIAC the problem is that it is an
administrative body so it cannot speak for the Senate. Faculty leadership is vital here.
Another problem is that the people who have been willing to serve on an ad-hoc
committee will be less willing to serve on a regular Academic Senate committee. He
raised the possibility of joint appointments. We would want the interest/support of
individual campuses. He suggested asking John Oakley to write a letter to possible
candidates. Another member was concerned about the credibility factor of UCOL. It
might be more effective coming from a group of people who are experts in these areas.
The possibility of sending this back to the Academic Council was also raised, which
would maintain the knowledge base and the momentum on these issues—rotating
members on UCOL may not be the best idea. It will be an uphill battle wherever this
committee is lodged. Another member argued that it could be successfully lodged in the

library committee. Ben suggested that a task force has a longer life than a single committee (three years) and UCOL should coordinate such a task force. Ben suggests that Todd, Elaine, and he draft a letter to John Oakley requesting that this task force be established, drawing upon divisional campus committees for expertise. Dan Greenstein suggests inserting language on faculty intellectual property issues. Another member suggested linking the copyright issue to faculty access to journals, etc. COC should also be copied on this letter. One member asked if the divisional library committee bylaws should also be changed. Ben clarified that we had talked about this, and we recommended that that the individual divisional library committees need to make changes to their bylaws on their own.

ACTION: Ben Crow, Todd Giedt, and Elaine Tennant will draft a letter to Council Chair John Oakley requesting the establishment of a UCOL task force to address SCSC issues.

III.   Implementation of SCSC's Proposals

ISSUE: Ben noted that John Ober created a good summary on the actions that need to be completed for the successful implementation of some of the SCSC's proposals. Consultant John Ober provided an overview of some of these actions, including (among others) expansion of the e-scholarship repository, development of a list of publisher best practices, and defining and examining the issue of subventions.

DISCUSSION: The Davis member noted that he has only received three responses on the proposed UCOL bylaw amendments, which he related to the committee. One response indicated that the bylaw gives adequate faculty oversight over the issues of scholarly communication. Another response stated that the addition of 'scholarly communication' would allow the Senate to dictate to UC faculty in which journals and with which publishers they can publish, etc. Dan Greenstein recommended that a FAQ should be created. Given that this is in flux, how can this be done now? How to get there is the issue. Modalities of implementation remain a large concern, and it is hard to allay faculty concerns when we do not know what these modalities will be. John Ober said that this could be a phased approach with a number of versions of FAQ's. He also noted that the Office of Scholarly Communication found a large gap between attitude and actual behavior in this area (through a survey). Ben Crow asked if there was a way to get this FAQ on various campus web sites? John noted that all libraries have at least a portion of their websites devoted to scholarly communication issues. However, most do not have a FAQ devoted to these recent issues (i.e., the copyright proposal).

ACTION: John Ober and Todd Giedt will work on a draft of this FAQ.

IV.   Campus Reports

ISSUE: Ben Crow asked for campus Reports.

DISCUSSION:
- UCSF: The San Francisco Library Committee is in the middle of discussions to decide how to allocate 10,000 square feet of its library (almost an entire floor) for

other uses. The library committee is somewhat divided over this issue. The administration is responding to pressures of retrofitting buildings for earthquakes, etc. A task force has been formed, which is charged with coming up with a formulation with what should be allowed for that space. The task force is considering the mult-media aspects of future libraries (which they argue would mean that libraries would need less physical space in the future). The response of the task force to losing this space is that library space is considered sacred, and should be protected.

- UCSC: The Santa Cruz Library Committee is looking into changing its name to reflect authority over scholarly communication. They have found that it is tough to do both library and scholarly communication. It's actually a bigger job than just one committee can handle.
- UCR: The Riverside Library Committee has been focusing on the library components of new graduate degree program proposals. She said that these proposals often take for granted the library resources for these new programs.
- UCSB: The Santa Barbara member echoed the Riverside comments on library resources for new degree programs. His committee just sent out a new survey that looks at regularizing the funding that new programs place on the library.
- UCD: The Davis member also commented on the library resource issue. He said that the Library Committee is asked to comment on whether the current holdings of the Davis library are appropriate for new graduate programs.
- UCB: UCB has the same procedure (for confirming library resources for new degree programs), but it is more informal. A library impact statement is required, which goes to the library staff.

DISCUSSION: Regarding library space issues, the Vice Chair (Berkeley) mentioned that a similar request came up at Berkeley for classroom space. The usage of existing library space during exam and other critical periods was a question that came up at that time. The UCSF member stated that most of this space had been used for stacks, etc. Karen Butters is very supportive, but the Library Committee is very concerned that the library doesn't lose control of this space. Ben Crow said that it raises two issues: (1) retaining control and various uses; and (2) the shape of the libraries of the future.

On the topic of library resources for new degree programs, Chair Crow thought that these issues are often considered trivial, and at times taken for granted, on the campus level. He felt that it is important for UCOL to raise the status of critical library resources for new degree programs. There also seems to a passing the buck on who pays for new library materials. The onus of new library funding for new programs should be placed on the respective campus administrations, rather than on the already depleted library budgets. Members agreed that it be helpful to have a UCOL statement on this issue. Start-up funding could be part of this statement.

ACTION: Analyst Todd Giedt will draft UCOL correspondence to Council Chair John Oakley on this issue.

V.   Preparation for the June 9th UCOL Meeting

ACTION: (1) Chair Crow asked members to begin reviewing their campus strategic plans in order to have a good discussion on articulating the role of libraries later in the summer. While this will most likely not be discussed at the June 9th, it might make a good topic for a summer conference call. (2) Chair Crow called members attention to the new legislation (Lieberman/Cornyn proposal). Ben said that the committee may want to put together a statement on this legislation. John Ober will forward the text of this proposed legislation to the UCOL list-serv.