

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON LIBRARY AND SCHOLARLY COMMUNICATION

Minutes of Meeting

Wednesday, October 25, 2017

I. Consent Calendar

Approval of the Agenda as Noticed

Action Taken: *The Agenda was approved as noticed.*

II. Consultation with the Academic Senate Leadership

Robert May, Academic Council Vice Chair

NB: Academic Senate Chair Shane White was not able to be at the meeting due to a conflict with Academic Council meeting at the same time.

Academic Council Vice Chair Robert May explained that he would be providing an overview of things that affect the University broadly.

Two bills have recently come out of the legislature. AB 97 is a budget bill which was very influenced by the state audit. The University has to find \$15M to fund 1500 new undergraduate students on the campuses. The Council has written a memorandum to the President about this bill; it has three key points:

1. Budget decisions should prioritize the preservation of academic systemwide programs and services based on their contributions to the core teaching, research, and public service missions of the University (prioritized in that order);
2. Budget decisions should prioritize the preservation of systemwide academic programs and services that support multiple UC campuses, no matter where the programs are located;
3. Proposals for cuts to centrally-funded academic programs and services should be subject to review by the Academic Senate.

The second bill that is going to have an effect on UC is SB 201: unionization of graduate student researchers. The union is already out organizing, and OP is producing materials to notify departments and students of their rights.

Seven years ago, the University created a new tier of the retirement system, and part of that limited the amount of support that the Office of the President gave to retiree health. Ramping down the University contribution meant that the cost shifted onto the employee or retiree. This has become intersected with two other items: 1) UC has been committed to limiting the amount of increased contribution to health care - both for retirees and active employees - to levels lower than medical inflation; 2) both the retirement and health costs have ongoing future liabilities. The goal of the Senate is to maintain the benefit at the level at which we have it without placing an undue burden on retirees. There is a letter that will be posted by Council which outlines this position.

Another area that will be of importance in the coming year is transfer students. Over the last couple of years, UC has been trying to regularize the pathways so that students understand what they need to do to transfer to UC. As of now, the focus is on STEM and on the top 21 majors within the University. This has involved a lot of work, but it is going very well. In addition, The Master Plan says that UC should take 60 percent transfer students to 40 percent freshmen. However it is generally agreed that the target should be 1:2. The most selective campuses have been able to

achieve that. However, other campuses are doing an extraordinary job recruiting first-generation and underrepresented freshmen, but are being pressured to instead focus on transfer students. The University needs to do the right thing ethically with regard to first-generation and transfer students. He also discussed President Napolitano's leadership in protection for DACA students, staff, and faculty.

Issues of free speech and academic freedom have been raised on the campuses this year. Many students feel very threatened and vulnerable by some of the speakers that have been scheduled. Controversial speakers raise practical as well as philosophical concerns.

The University continues to search for a funding model that works for all campuses; the campuses are not equally wealthy and they are not equally funded. Every student at a UC campus should be funded equally. UCPB is starting to explore options that can help ensure equity. In a similar vein, the salary gap continues to be an issue. UC faculty are underpaid by a significant amount compared to the Comparator Eight institutions; it runs 8-12 percent behind. If you take 1999-2000 as a benchmark and adjust it to 2017 dollars, the faculty have received a 12.5 percent pay cut. A consultative group comprised of representatives from UCFW, UCAP and UCAADE are studying this problem and trying to formulate a plan to remedy it.

III. Welcome, Logistics, Chair and Vice Chair Reports

Chair Rich Schneider

Vice Chair Dennis Ventry

Chair Schneider thanked the committee members for their service and involvement. He noted that the committee has a lot of really good work to do and this year and that he hoped it would be very productive.

IV. Consultation with the California Digital Library

A. Licensing Update- *Ivy Anderson and Guenter Waibel*

B. eScholarship: OA Policy support and compliance, current publication platform and future potential - *Catherine Mitchell*

C. OA Senate Policy Support - *Catherine Mitchell*

Mr. Waibel informed the committee that even when there is not an official budget reduction, CDL sustains a three percent cut every year because it has to self-fund its merit increases. It also has a structural deficit in half of its budget because of contracts that inflate. CDL is facing increasing difficulty in attracting additional funds through grants because of policies that are now in place; it is an increasingly restrictive environment.

Ms. Anderson showed a PowerPoint presentation covering the CDL collections budget and upcoming issues. CDL spent a little under \$48M on licensing in 2016-17; most of that was campus money. The greatest level of expenditures goes toward journals; databases form about 20 percent of the purchases, and e-books about 10 percent. Next year, a number of major licenses will be renegotiated.. CDL has been very successful in negotiating strong savings with publishers.

The libraries have asked President Napolitano for a major collection budget augmentation to be allocated to CDL. The President was very supportive but the proposal needs to go through system processes and be officially reviewed. It will be very difficult for the President to make an affirmative decision in this political climate. In the meantime, the libraries are developing cancellation options for systemwide and campus licensed content.

CDL licenses 10,500 journals; six of them make up 10 percent of usage. Because UC is so large, even journals that have “low” usage actually have very high numbers. Publishers have both high- and low-usage journals, making it difficult to target individual publishers for discontinuation. CDL has a multi-factored analysis that it uses to help determine what licenses to buy. It looks at a variety of measurements – including break-down by discipline –to view it in a broader context. The Chair suggested that CDL and UCOLASC collaborate to develop and then articulate a set of principles that are in alignment with UC’s mission and values and can be used strategically to guide our licensing negotiations and renewals with commercial publishers.

Ms. Anderson discussed Pay It Forward from 2015-16 and discussed a sustainable model of Open Access article processing charges. In terms of affordability, if the libraries had to pay for all of their publishing, they couldn’t quite afford it; they have high output as research institutions. But if grant funding is added, then the libraries can afford the article processing charges (APC). There are many colleges and universities that would do well under this model because they are not publishing that heavily. CDL is looking toward a multi-payer model to achieve sustainability. Right now, CDL is spending millions and millions of dollars for journals – and on top of that many UC authors “who want to try to do the right thing” are also paying commercial publishers hybrid OA charges. CDL wants to pull all of these types of spending data together so that CDL and UC is in a good position to make sure commercial publishers cannot take advantage of UC authors and our institution by “double dipping.”

One of the differences between the US and European intuitions is that most of Europe’s academic publishing is centralized. In the US, everything is much more fragmented. CDL is trying to articulate a model that incorporates the strengths of the European model but will work in the US. Other OA strategies include options such as flipping journals to new, independent platforms, working with editors on alternative publishing models, and investing in institutionally-based infrastructure. CDL is also talking with some publishers about offsetting agreements and encouraging OA publishing by UC authors.

Catherine Mitchell discussed OA and the ability of authors to archive their materials in the eScholarship repository and make their articles available even if the publisher wants to keep them gated. UC has the most comprehensive OA policies of any academic institution in the US; people are using these materials all over the world. Testimonials appreciating UC’s leadership in the OA arena --including its provision of access to health information for low-income individuals – are well-documented. When the Senate OA policy was adopted, the policy itself made a directive to make participation in it as convenient as possible for the faculty. At first there was a manual process, but it was not well used. The University through CDL quickly moved on to a system - Symplectic Elements – that automated parts of the process and enabled faculty to participate more easily. The Senate is at a point at which it was going to review the policy again and present a report to the faculty to determine next steps.

When the University implemented Symplectic, it saw a growth in participation. However, it also saw a growth in cost. CDL was relying heavily on the Provost to help fund the license fee, but it received no money from her in 16-17. This was a tremendous burden for CDL and the campuses. CDL does not have the budget or staff to continue to support Symplectic. Ms. Mitchell presented three options: 1. Continue to develop use of Symplectic with the campuses in the hopes of “finding” funding, 2. Discontinuing Symplectic and return to manual deposit facilitated by the libraries, or 3. Discontinuing Symplectic and return to manual deposit without assistance from the libraries. CDL went with the first plan with the intention of maximizing Symplectic’s potential. CDL negotiated bridge funding to extend Symplectic to July so that it can revisit funding with the new Provost.

Ms. Mitchell gave an update on eScholarship and provided a quick demonstration of the newly updated site. eScholarship gives UC a way to highlight its repository and publishing platform under local branding. As a publisher, eScholarship publishes 76 UC affiliated journals. eScholarship also supports the Office of the President, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, and Agriculture and Natural Resources, and is interested in exploring the possibility of expanding this beyond UC.

V. Introductions and Campus Reports

Berkeley's academic senate voted in support of OA. The campus has questions about differences between humanists and STEMs regarding OA.

Davis has concerns about the physical collection at library. It has signed on to the OA policy.

Irvine: The Irvine member was not available.

UCLA is very interested in OA. The senate chair is enthusiastic, and the provost will attend the next meeting. There is a southern regional library facility that has trouble expanding for seismic reasons. UCM is building four to six new buildings. When they are completed, square footage should be freed up in the library by the relocation of administrative staff. The campus has signed on to the OA 2020 statement of interest.

UCR discussed OA 2020 and supported it in principle but had questions about mechanistic details. The campus is going to take on 1000 students, spurring concern about the capacity of the library.

San Diego's UL search is proceeding. OA is on hold until that position is filled.

San Francisco has hired a new UL. It is pushing forward with OA and data sharing initiatives.

Santa Barbara: The Santa Barbara member was not available.

Santa Cruz's COLASC is most concerned with demand-driven acquisition, and will push forward with OA 2020 as it can. The campus is also very affected by the 2:1 transfer issue and is wondering if libraries can play a role in that arena.

Student Representatives voiced concern about space in campus libraries and about paying APCs if that was the predominant model for OA publishing. Nonetheless, OA remains an area of importance for students.

Carla Arbagey with LAUC would like to poll librarians throughout the system to get a quick feedback on systemwide issues. Last year was its 50th anniversary, and it is working toward planning the next fifty years.

VI. OA2020

A. Background and Current State of Affairs - *Rich Schneider*

The Chair noted that UC has been on the Open Access (OA) path for about 15 years. As envisioned, OA was supposed to be the new way forward for the 21st century, yet only about 15 percent of the scholarship that the University puts out is published as OA – that is one percent a year. He stressed that UCOLASC needs to keep working to precipitate a major transformation in scholarly communication - not just as a singular path forward, but as a multipronged call to action to change the system. Furthermore, UCOLASC's efforts need to be coordinated in a way that meets the needs and desires of individual stakeholders – the transformation needs to work for everybody. The current system does not work for anybody, except for the commercial publishers. What might a roadmap for UC look like? At some point, UC will need to put its money where its mouth is and demonstrate that we are willing to walk away from subscriptions in order to redeploy and re-invest our money in order to change the system.

Steve Mandeville-Gamble said that when journals were housed in academic publishers and

professional societies they used to be more sustainable and cost a fraction of what they do now, but the for-profit modality has not been working for academia. Graduate students spend considerable time looking for money for their research already and have concerns about any new model whereby they would have to also acquire funds to publish. Ms. Samberg emphasized that UC was exploring a plurality of models to support OA including those that would have no fees for authors especially in disciplines that lack extramural funding. Also, a goal would be to re-allocate existing subscription budgets to support a range of models for different disciplines. In some cases, this may mean covering the APCs, in others, it might mean libraries, funders, or institutions paying other types of fees. Much of this is being discussed by a working group that is tasked with building a OA roadmap for UC.

Committee members discussed practices at competitor universities and in Europe. Also discussed were the practical differences between a journal subscription and a monograph. There is a nationwide endeavor to experiment with covering monograph costs, especially for new hires for their first book.

B. Roadmap for UC - *Rachael Samberg*

Ms. Samberg said that UC Berkeley, UC Davis, UC San Francisco, and UC Merced had signed the OA2020 expression of interest (EOI) and are all working to devise a customized strategy for implementation. The campuses that have signed on now have to come up with a plan to reapportion their subscription budgets and prioritize various possible implementation strategies. UC signatories plan to develop a roadmap that details various options available and describes what opportunities and risks are there for each option. What might the next steps be as a group or on individual campuses? Ms. Samberg noted that some of the strategies that exist are very much author-driven in order to force better OA terms from the publishers. Author engagement is fundamental. She asked the committee for suggestions about what it might like to see. The Chair observed that one of the privileges of being part of the UC system is the tremendous resources UC libraries have built to support campus systems; he said that is due to the way the librarians have coordinated, shared, and collaborated over the years. He offered that he would like to see librarians work with disciplines to identify strategies and build an infrastructure to work across campuses to create opportunities for faculty to discuss their needs.

C. Collaboration and Collective Action - *Anneliese Taylor*

Ms. Taylor is responsible for scholarly communication activities at the UCSF library and is part of a multi-institutional working group on transitioning to OA that started up almost two years ago led by Chair Schneider. In discussion with members from Harvard, MIT, Iowa State University, University of Toronto, and several UC campuses, the working group looks at ways that UC could transition journals or publishers to an open access model. The group talked in-depth about different ways to approach OA 2020 and what the process would look like (outreach, messaging, targeting a discipline, using tools, etc.). The committee discussed ways to use their professional networks to encourage other institutions to do the same.

VII. Consultation with the Council of University Librarians

- *Steve Mandeville-Gamble*

- A. State of Collections Funding System-Wide
- B. Collections Budget Request to President Napolitano
- C. Status of NRLF4 Project
- D. OA2020
- E. System-Wide ILS Working Group and the Reasons Establishing

Mr. Mandeville-Gamble said that about a year ago, the Council of University Librarians looked at

major transitions over the past 20 years and discovered that libraries are still trying to do all the things they used to do when they had 30 percent more staff. There is only one UC library that has a built-in augmentation to its collection budget, and that is only for the database. In spite of that of these cuts, the libraries have done some remarkable things; they have stretched their budgets and worked together. However, he noted, the libraries are now at the point where those strategies are reaching the end of their lifespan. UC needs to think through how it can change the publishing ecosystem so that it can provide access to high quality information. Mr. Mandeville-Gamble said that the President met with COUL two years ago and commissioned it to put together a budget. She was very supportive of the NRLF expansion, but there is not a “magic pot of money” from which she will be able to pull funds. COUL is being asked to look at new strategies for funding and development activities. It is not realistic to think that the libraries could do enough fundraising to pay for their core operations; they have to think creatively about how they can get resources. The President suggested three levels of ask by the librarians: gold, silver, and bronze. The bronze was intended to keep the libraries from falling further behind, the silver included things that should have been invested in, but weren’t, and the gold allowed more flexibility to move forward. The President was happy with the proposal.

Mr. Mandeville-Gamble observed that UC does not have a true systemwide integrated library system (ILS). Every campus has its own; this is a huge waste of staff and financial resources. He stated that this is the right time to look at selecting and implementing an ILS. Ideas that will help develop the RFP and the best functional requirements will be put together of the next four to five years. Because the current systems are reaching end-of-life, no one is building tools to reinforce them – UC needs to move to “next gen” systems. Mr. Waibel stated that most similarly-positioned groups have already gone to the route of systemwide approach. The committee discussed different systems and the changes that are being undertaken.

VIII. New Business and Executive Session

Three action items:

Letter of support to CDL – Mr. Waibel will report back.

Based on Ivy Anderson’s conversation – The big license renewals are not going to be for a year – what would a faculty document look like in terms of the conditions for renewing subscriptions: fair OA principles, no more copyright transfers for UC authors, no new subscription titles, just OA titles, offsets for any hybrid fees?

Unionization of graduate students – The committee needs to explore how the transition from student to employee affects copyright since the 1992 copyright policy had a carve out for students that allowed students to retain the copyrights in their thesis work but that might go away if students become employees, etc.

Possible topics for future meetings:

The problem of OA and graduate student dissertations.

The influx of undergraduates - libraries are too crowded. Mr. Mandeville-Gamble noted that there had been a document years ago that identified the ratio of space to students. Does that document still exist and is it still accurate? Should the study be redone in terms of digital content instead and crowded campuses/dorms.

There was no call for Executive Session.

The meeting adjourned at 4:04 p.m.

Attest: Rich Schneider, Chair
Minutes Prepared by Fredye Harms, Committee Analyst