Minutes of Meeting
Wednesday, February 13, 2019

I. Consent Calendar
The agenda and minutes were approved as noticed.

II. Chair Report
Chair Rich Schneider

The Chair reminded the committee that it would have a joint meeting with CoUL at lunch for 2.5 hours. He encouraged faculty to ask questions during that period.

The Chair noted that UCOLASC has sent three letters to the Council since October: one regarding the Academic Freedom task force, one on the revised policy on copyright ownership, and one library space and the removal of materials.

III. Consultation with the California Digital Library
Guenter Waibel, Associate Vice Provost and Executive Director, CDL

The Online Archive of California was an early flagship of CDL and launched in 1998. OAC brings together archival collection guides (also called finding aids) from libraries, archives, historical societies and museums across the state, ensuring archival collections, including those that have not yet been digitized, are discoverable.

CDL recently received a one-year grant to explore opportunities for establishing a national archival network where shared investment and collective action bring about improved services and a more sustainable business model for all.

Kathryn Stine gave an update on HathiTrust and shared an information packet. Her group is looking to spread information about how the Trust works. It started 10 years ago, and is an online collection of books, journals and other print resources that have been digitized by research libraries. In addition to providing access to nearly 17 million resources in the public domain, HathiTrust also provides long-term preservation for digital content. In January 1 the public domain opened a little bit; content that was published in 1923-24 now be accessed. This represents around 55K volumes.

IV. Consultation with the Academic Senate Leadership
Robert, May, Academic Council Chair
Kum-Kum Bhavnani, Academic Council Vice Chair

Council Chair May thanked the committee for the work it is doing with regard to Elsevier and Open Access. He said that the President has also come forward with strong support. He also asked the committee to bring forward the UCOLASC Principles to Council as an action item.

The Senate Chair remarked that the governor released his budget, and that now UC is waiting for the May Revise. UC received $240M (a 6.9 percent increase). This is favorable compared to the past, but there it is not as good as it looks. UC asked for $140M to make the one-time funds for tuition buyout permanent. Also, money for enrollment growth was not included. Normally, UC presents its
budget with various categories and it is given a block sum of money to fill those. This year the governor gave UC the money in terms of line-items, which severely restricts its use. The OP budget is normally assessed against campuses, but now is a line-item in the state budget and has no increases; this amounts to a four percent cut to OP. ANR is also line itemed. There is some optimism. This budget was put together by the Brown administration; OP government relations staff have been meeting with Newsom’s people and bringing them up to speed. This will involve a significant lobbying effort. There is nothing for faculty merit in the budget.

V. Elsevier Negotiations

Rich Schneider, Chair
Dennis Ventry, Vice Chair
Guenther Waibel, Associate Vice Provost and Executive Director, CDL
Jeff MacKie-Mason - University Librarian and Chief Digital Scholarship Officer, UC Berkeley
Ivy Anderson, Associate Executive Director and Director for Collections, CDL

[www1]Professor MacKie-Mason provided an update on UC’s negotiation with Elsevier for systemwide journal content. After several months of negotiating, Elsevier’s last offer included some of the open access components that UC is seeking but it also included significantly higher costs for UC, reduced rights in terms of perpetual access to content, and limitations on UC’s financial support for authors without grant funds. Elsevier’s proposal also precluded open access publishing in some high-profile Elsevier journals, like those from Cell Press and the Lancet. MacKie-Mason noted that UC already has perpetual access to most Elsevier backfiles. UC and Elsevier have agreed to continue negotiating and the team hopes to have an agreement by the end of the month. If UC and Elsevier are unable to agree on terms that meet UC’s OA and cost goals, the libraries have developed a robust alternative access strategy to ensure that UC researchers can still access the content they need.

The committee discussed this at length.

VI. Alternative Access Task Force and Communications Strategy

Kristin Antelman, University Librarian, UCSB, Task force Chair
Jeff MacKie-Mason - University Librarian and Chief Digital Scholarship Officer, UC Berkeley
Ivy Anderson, Associate Executive Director and Director for Collections, CDL

Ms. Antelman showed a PowerPoint presentation and explained that CoUL’s publisher negotiation task force charged an alternative access team to look at alternatives should UC lose access to new Elsevier subscriptions and backfile journal content for which UC has not already purchased perpetual access rights to. Beyond subscription access, there are many ways to access scholarly journal articles. The task force is working to communicate on this issue and get the alternative access mechanisms and workflows out to UC faculty, students, staff, researchers and clinicians (for more information, please see the Office of Scholarly Communication’s (OSC) alternative access webpage). While it is difficult to estimate the potential demand for alternative access, the library is confident in its ability to provide such access. Should UC lose subscription access, the Alternative Access Task force is developing evaluation and criteria for gauging impact and user satisfaction with alternative access.

VII. Licensing Update

Ivy Anderson, Associate Executive Director and Director for Collections, CDL

A. Renewals (and Savings Achieved)
B. Offsetting Conversations Beyond Elsevier

Ms. Anderson discussed the global state of the transition to open access and the ways in which UC’s current work and strategy is informed by the 2016 Mellon-funded Pay it Forward study. Involving authors and creating competition among publishers will improve OA publishing and help manage costs over time. UC is proposing a multi-payer model, involving institution and grant funds, to reflect the research funding model currently employed in North America.

Anderson’s group is in discussion with a number of publishers (commercial, society, university and native OA presses) about sustainably transitioning to transformative open access agreements. Ultimately, following the wishes, declarations, and policies of the faculty (and especially in light of UCOLASC’s decade of leadership on this topic) UC will move away from subscriptions in support of a broad range of OA publishing models. All of UC’s proposed transformative agreements include a consistent baseline of support for UC authors to publish OA. CDL has also been talking with journal publishing workflow producers.

VIII. ILS Project Update

Elizabeth Cowell, CoUL Chair
Guenter Waibel, Associate Vice Provost and Executive Director, CDL, SILS co-chair
Chris Shaffer, University Librarian, UC San Francisco, SILS Co-Chair

Following up on a prior update about the proposed systemwide Integrated Library System (ILS), Mr. Shaffer noted that the libraries are writing requirements for a Request for Proposal that will likely be released in late spring/early summer. Currently, each campus has its own distinct library catalog and a series of systems and services connect the distributed catalogs. A systemwide ILS will bring together all 10 campuses and the two library storage facilities into a single, cloud-hosted catalog. This would give the University a lot of advantages. It would make the collections more efficient and more accessible, would make the interface much more seamless, more user friendly, and more understandable, and would give the institution the ability to leverage data in support of decision-making.

Migrating to a systemwide ILS requires a significant one-time investment, and so UC has requested funding support from UCOP through the Major Projects & Initiatives (MPI) process. Over 50 consortia across North America have already migrated to a shared ILS. If UC does not migrate to a systemwide ILS, it faces potential service disruption as the costs and complexities of maintaining distributed systems continues to rise. In moving to a systemwide ILS, UC will continue to own its data; vendors are not permitted to monetize ILS data.

UCOLASC voted and is unanimous in its support of the ILS project.

IX. Consultation with the Office of Scholarly Communications

Catherine Mitchell, Director, Publishing and Special Collections

OSC’s work so far this year has included creating an inventory of Research Information Management Systems (RIMS) deployed across the system and developing outreach materials and documentation to support journal flipping (from subscription access to open access). While the results of the RIMS survey and inventory have been informative, OSC suspects that it did not capture many of the systems being used. It is clear that while there is overlap in the various vended RIMS being licensed systemwide and opportunity for future collaborative efforts, there is a lack of standardization and policy governing their use.
Chair Schneider said that UCOLASC will work with UCACC and send a report and recommendations to Council about the use of RIMS systemwide.

X. Refining and Extending CDL Publishing Infrastructure for Monographs and Journals  
Catherine Mitchell, Director, Publishing and Special Collections  
Ms. Mitchell provided a brief update.

XI. Revised Policy on Open Access for Theses and Dissertations  
Katie Fortney, Copyright Policy & Education Officer, CDL  
Angus MacDonald, Senior Counsel, UCOP

Mr. MacDonald explained that this policy flowed out of the Academic Senate’s systemwide OA policy for faculty authors that was passed in 2013. The policy went out last year for systemwide review and feedback. Based on feedback and the desire to provide ample review time, a second systemwide review was supported. Sixty-five comments were made and then considered by the ETD OA Task Force. Most of the campuses already have a policy that is very similar to this.

The committee asked questions and discussed this item.

The meeting adjourned at 4:01.