

## UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON LIBRARY AND SCHOLARLY COMMUNICATION

## Meeting Minutes

October 7, 2016

**Attending:** Eric Bakovic, Chair, (UCSD), Luca de Alfaro, Vice Chair, (UCSC), Leonard Nunney (UCR), Eileen Zurbriggen (UCSC), Wolf Kittler (UCSB), Dana Peterman (LAUC President), MacKenzie Smith (CoUL Chair), John Colicelli (UCLA), Thomas Shannon (UCB), Cynthia Darling (UCSF), Hayden Jackson (Undergraduate Student Representative), Günter Waibel (Associate Vice Provost and Executive Director, CDL), Ivy Anderson (Director, Collection Development & Management, CDL), Catherine Mitchell (Director, Access and Publishing Services, CDL), John Chodacki (Director, UC Curation Center), Jim Chalfant (Chair, Academic Senate), Shane White (Vice Chair, Academic Senate), Mona Hsieh (Office Manager, Academic Senate), Brenda Abrams (Principal Policy Analyst)

**I. Chair's Announcements**

Chair Bakovic welcomed the committee members to the first UCOLASC meeting of the year. The committee voted to add the student representative to the listserv.

**II. Consultation with the Academic Senate Office**

- *Jim Chalfant, Chair, Academic Senate*
- *Shane White, Vice Chair, Academic Senate*
- *Mona Hsieh, Office Manager, Academic Senate*

Chair Chalfant began by making clear how important the matters discussed at UCOLASC meetings are to the Academic Senate. There are two chancellor searches, at Berkeley and Davis. The Regents were planning to discuss granting honorary degrees at their most recent meeting. The only honorary degrees that UC has granted in the past 44 years were granted in 2009 to Japanese-American students who were interned during World War II. There are other mechanisms already available at the campuses to recognize individuals. A new policy on professional degree supplemental tuition (PDST) will come forward. Students in professional schools can be assessed specific fees and the new policy will emphasize specifically what the money can be utilized for. The Regents have not approved a policy on PDSTs to date and the proposed policy will be on their agenda. Chair Chalfant described the outcome of the Joint Committee of the Administration and Academic Senate review of the disciplinary processes for faculty related to sexual violence, sexual assault and sexual harassment.

Chair Bakovic mentioned the issue of student access to library facilities and Chair Chalfant responded that this is a direct consequence of the additional 5k students the State required UC to admit. Chair Chalfant has observed the crowding issue at UCD and these infrastructure challenges are faced by all the campuses. UCOLASC members are encouraged to gather information, especially quantitative information, about the resource issues at their campuses which can be shared with Council or the Committee on Planning and Budget.

Chair Chalfant reported that the Legislature would like to limit the number of non-resident students at UC, and the Senate's Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) will be coming up with a policy to do so; such a policy would have an impact not only on admissions but also on budget. In June 2011, BOARS adopted a policy that the nonresident undergraduates admitted to a campus must compare favorably to the California residents admitted to that campus. BOARS also established procedures that ask campuses to report annually to BOARS on the extent to which they are meeting the standard. The President has asked BOARS to review the "Compare Favorably" policy for nonresident admission, clarify the policy's compliance with the Master Plan, and assess its consistency with the University's freshman

admission goals, comprehensive review policy, and holistic review processes. UCB piloted requesting reference letters from students applying for admission as freshmen and the President has asked the Senate to take up the issue of reference letters this year.

Office Manager Hsieh joined the meeting to review the current travel policies for the Academic Senate.

**Discussion:** The Chair of the CoUL pointed out that the PDST programs have significant budget impact on the libraries. Each of these programs potentially represents a new subject area that the library has added to its collections and/or its subscription licenses.

### **III. Consultation with the California Digital Library (CDL)**

- *Günter Waibel, Associate Vice Provost & Executive Director, CDL*
- *Ivy Anderson, Director, Collections, CDL*
- *Catherine Mitchell, Director, Publishing, CDL*
- *John Chodacki, Director, UC Curation Center, CDL*

AVP Waibel was happy to join UCOLASC in person and noted he's now been at the CDL for five months. CDL is taking a close look at how it operates and relates to the rest of the University environment and the campus libraries. The CDL will engage in strategic planning to clearly define its niche and better understand how it can continue to provide its currently valued services while at the same time carving out a space for the innovation required in a rapidly changing environment. The strategic planning will need to balance CDL's voice with the input of various stakeholders. CDL is interested in UCOLASC's feedback about the services currently offered and the services CDL might explore offering.

CDL is also working with the Council of University Librarians (CoUL) on an activity called "the alignment framework". This will explore the systemwide issues and form the type of social contract required to do joint work. This is a fundamental and important exercise. Making sure everyone is informed and has bought in will be very important to the CDL. A small group including AVP Waibel and members of CoUL will work on the framework. The goal for both the strategic planning and development of the framework is to have reached some significant milestones in six months with the understanding that more time may be needed. It would be helpful for the CDL to have feedback from UCOLASC in February on what we think CDL's priorities should be.

Director Chodacki from CDL's Curation Center joined the committee to discuss the project "DASH" (or as it's known at UCSF, "Data Share"). There is a focus on helping researchers with self-publication of data sets. The Curation Center aims to assist researchers to make data sharing easier and to get research outputs into the Center's data structure. The service is free to campuses and storage costs are being passed through to the library but there is concern about the availability of resources. Challenges include adoption and awareness. The Center has explored the costs related to the volume that is being considered for the long term and is considering where within the UC system this work will be managed. Director Chodacki hopes to continue discussing how to pay for curation and who should pay for it as well as what UC should be responsible for versus when alternatives in the industry should be utilized.

Director Mitchell reported that CDL is partnering with the UC Press on a project called Editoria ([www.editoria.pub](http://www.editoria.pub)). This is a Mellon-funded open-source monograph infrastructure project. The Press is strongly motivated to reduce the price of publishing books. The infrastructure to do this work is not available. The books have small audiences. Challenges for publishers include the fact that existing book publishing systems are dependent on inefficient legacy infrastructure. The goal with Editoria is to find ways to sustain this work. CDL met with the Collaborative Knowledge Foundation which is thinking about new forms of communication such as blogs. In Editoria, the book is being built in real-time. The

CDL is envisioning that faculty will author books within Editoria. Next year some of CDL's work will include refining the application and planning for long-term sustainability. The project has commitments from several presses to publish at least one book this year. Members can learn more about the Collaborative Knowledge Foundation here: [www.coko.foundation](http://www.coko.foundation).

Director Mitchell provided UCOLASC with an update on the status of the Senate Open Access and the Presidential Open Access policies. The CDL has focused on making systems convenient to faculty and personnel. The publication management system, powered by Symplectic Elements, is used to automate the process as much as possible. The system harvests records and alerts faculty that Elements has found their publications. Faculty log into the system to claim their publications and to deposit the articles into eScholarship. The system indicates whether an article is covered by the policy. Close to 30K publications have been collected. Faculty in areas that are not well indexed in the system can manually upload. Director Mitchell notes that many faculty are logging into Elements and claiming publications but that fewer faculty are taking the next step of going into the system to deposit the articles. The policy calls for the author's final version which is the post-review version and explaining this detail to everyone has been complicated. The CDL is interested in ways of integrating Elements into existing campus systems and various campus entities have reached out to CDL about collaborative opportunities.

AVP Waibel explained that a budget augmentation request was submitted to the Provost's Office but a request from Provost Dorr for additional details has created a delay. CoUL Chair Smith expressed concern over where the funding will come from, given its potential impact on campus library budgets.

**Discussion:** A member pointed out that Google Apps offers unlimited storage forever. Director Chodacki agreed that there are applications such as Google Drive or Box that the Curation Center can work with as access repositories to cut down costs. But long-term preservation and how it will be paid for are still major questions at UC. Another question is how UC will be involved with its own research outputs. The Curation Center does farm out some storage to Amazon but there are multiple factors related to preservation. The Curation Center is using the second version of DASH to re-engage with those campuses not currently using the system. Campus libraries may have concerns with the billing. Presses at other universities can utilize Editoria as a tool. A member indicated that it has not necessarily been clear that he needed to deposit an article after claiming the publication record in Elements. The committee discussed concerns about copyright and the issue of which version the author should deposit.

#### **IV. Open Access Policies Status Report and OA2020**

- *Eric Bakovic, Chair, UCOLASC*
- *Ivy Anderson, Director, Collections, CDL*

Director Anderson reported that two big journal licenses will be negotiated this year, with Springer-Nature and with Sage. These are not expected to be contentious negotiations but Director Anderson noted that UC and Nature have yet to exchange any numbers. Cambridge is the top university press from which CDL purchases content, and there is a 3-year licensing agreement for CUP eBooks. There is also an eBook license with JSTOR. Anything can be used on the JSTOR platform but it is not purchased by UC until usage reaches a certain rate.

The Pay It Forward Project's goal was to look at the impact on large institutions like UC if the journal publication business model was flipped from subscription to Open Access (OA). Library budgets are tied up with journal subscriptions so the funds for OA are not available. UC partnered with three other institutions and involved experts on the subject. Author attitudes, quantitative data about article publishing costs, the availability of grant funding and other factors were studied. The project was completed in June and Director Anderson shared some of the findings. Authors expressed support for OA but the primary driver for where people decide to publish is the quality of the journal. Currently, OA is

capturing about 15% of the global output of the literature and many UC authors continue to publish in the journals with which they are most familiar. Authors were also cost-sensitive about the charges they would be willing to pay for article processing. If a goal in the conversion to OA is to drive down costs and sustain costs over time, attitudes will have to be changed.

The CDL found that, for the most research-intensive UCs, additional funding would be required to support the flipped model. The analysis found that federal funding agencies and larger private foundations are supportive of using grant funds to publish in OA. Models are being reviewed to determine how different approaches would work. When the model incorporates grant funding to subvene article publication, the flipped model becomes more affordable for almost all of the UC campuses. The OA2020 model is predicated on the idea that large institutions or consortia would negotiate with the larger publishers on flipped arrangements. In Europe, the grant funding flows into the institution which then disperses it and there is more centralized control of policies. However, since grant funding is decentralized in the U.S., this model would not work. A model that would involve grant funding and author control is needed and what model will appeal to authors is a key question. One idea is that a baseline might come from the library and authors would have access to institutional funding. Director Anderson indicated that UC has not made a decision about signing onto OA2020. Some campus libraries are not on board with OA2020. The Pay It Forward project provides some of the information that would help faculty have these discussions. A decision about what kind of pilot UC would implement will be made and one idea would be to identify a discipline with a manageable number of publishers.

**Discussion:** Faculty need to have support to publish in OA journals. There are questions about the quality of the peer review processes. A member is concerned that faculty are stuck with a model that is expensive. CoUL Chair Smith indicated that the divisional library committees have to figure out how to engage other faculty and their libraries in the OA2020 initiative. One suggestion is for UC to start its own OA journal for UC authors since the University already has the platform for publishing it. But Chair Bakovic noted that faculty are not prioritizing publishing in OA because the prestige of journals continues to have primary importance.

There is a concern about people that would not have access to funds to help them publish (graduate students, for example) and who should be eligible to receive the subsidy. Director Anderson reported that there is interest in replicating a study like this in a developing country if funding for it becomes available. A member cautioned that some of the new OA publishers will publish anything and there is a danger of creating third tier journals. There are questions about peer review processes for some of these journals. Any change that UCOLASC were to propose in any direction would change the culture of academic publishing and part of that culture involves promotion and tenure and faculty attitudes towards publication regardless of venue. Many publishers are bringing the costs down but these are not necessarily the best places to publish. The CDL would like to get a sense from UCOLASC about OA2020 and members are asked to have these discussions with their divisional committees and report back to UCOLASC in February. Director Anderson offered to create a pro/con document to help faculty better understand the OA2020 model.

## **V. Campus Reports/Member Items**

**Berkeley:** The campus is facing major budget issues and the chancellor has announced that he will step down. Strategic planning for the next few years is a focus. There are discussions about what activities will be based in the undergraduate library and the library committee has asked why the libraries are the only units on campus asked to give up space for other uses. The status of the Northern Regional Library Storage Facility is a concern to many UCB faculty.

**San Francisco:** The committee is focusing on OA2020 and the campus will continue to provide the OA publication fund for faculty to publish in OA. Approximately \$45K funding is available in the publication fund.

**Santa Cruz:** Study lounges were turned into dorm rooms to accommodate new students and one library was asked to make space which was done by eliminating books. Faculty were upset since these changes were done very quickly. UCOLASC may want to discuss having a minimal level of access to journals across the UC campuses. A \$32M collection was just donated to the campus. The campus no longer has any collections librarians and collections are based on demand-driven acquisition. Depending on faculty to build collections might skew it in a way that disadvantages undergraduate students. The committee will think about the funding model within the campus for the library. The question is if other campuses use other mechanisms used to target funds for the libraries. Having baseline funding attached to every student specifically for the library might be considered.

**Santa Barbara:** Faculty are pleased with the long-awaited expansion of the library. Materials were put into storage at the Southern Regional Library Facility and there is a desire to digitize materials. Hathi Trust and Google Books are two ways UC is digitizing materials.

**Los Angeles:** The library committee developed a strategic plan. Students definitely want to study in the library so the campus will have to address this. The library has a conservation lab for restoring and caring for materials which has been relocated and a permanent spot has yet to be identified. The student representative to the library committee last year is proposing a student fee to support the libraries. The student representative commented that the referendum to vote on a fee from students to support the libraries raises the concern about students being expected to pay for other services.

**Riverside:** A donor has offered to give funding to the library to create a café for students.

**San Diego:** The library is undergoing renovations, beginning with the recent addition of a café supported by a donor. A company has been hired to interview stakeholders including faculty, staff, and students about the library space. Students at many campuses feel that this is a shared governance issue.

## **VI. Consultation with the Librarians Association of UC (LAUC)**

- *Dana Peterman, President, LAUC*

President Peterman asked for feedback from the LAUC in preparation for today's meeting. The library has to find a way to publicize its services and needs to work closely with faculty as partners on various issues. Librarians would like to come into the classroom to discuss the resources available in the libraries. Increasingly libraries and librarians are becoming less central because they have made it possible to access materials online. The relationships between librarians and faculty at each campus are different.

**Discussions:** It is difficult for the librarians to reach a large number of faculty. A member raised the issue of the shrinking number of acquisition or subject experts. Many librarians have moved to demand-driven acquisition plans and it is not clear to President Peterson how effective these plans will be. There is not as much collection development as there was in the past. CoUL Chair Smith indicated that at some campuses the jobs of the subject area experts have been consolidated, however this is not true for UCSC. A member commented that library committees and even the Senate do not have much power.

## **VII. Consultation with the Council of University Librarians (CoUL)**

- *MacKenzie Smith, Chair, Council of University Librarians*

This year the focus of CoUL is renewing the contract between the campuses and the CDL, with the goal of determining how the system can be more effective. CoUL is very effective sharing resources with CDL but for other efforts the bureaucracy makes it challenging. An inventory of the staff at each office is being conducted and the question of whether a resource can be shared is not always easy to answer. The question is if more librarians can be hired because the libraries are sharing certain resources when possible. CoUL is using a decision-matrix to help be more efficient. A task force will be created this year to examine UC's approach to preserving digital content. How digital preservation is defined is one question.

CoUL is looking at the Regional Library Facilities including the history of who was responsible for them. UCOP established the facilities but the operations were turned over to UCB and UCLA. There is a question about whether OP will pay for the expense of expanding the storage facilities. CoUL is talking to the Information Technology Leadership Council about digitized or open source textbooks. Multiple shared print initiatives are underway including some new national initiatives.

### **VIII. Scholarly Publication in the Humanities**

Chair Bakovic provided members with background information about the report on Scholarly Publication in the Humanities.

**Discussion:** CoUL Chair Smith reported that she is on the AAU/ARL/AAUP Digital Monograph Task Force which is discussing this topic. The CoUL Chair suggested that instead of UCOLASC having a separate subcommittee, she is willing to report to UCOLASC about this task force's discussions and to take input from UCOLASC back to the task force. One idea is that new faculty could negotiate funding for start-up packages that can be used to publish two books. Chair Bakovic explained that there was concern that the original idea for the charge for the subcommittee on Humanities became much broader than UCOLASC's purview.

### **IX. Goals and Priorities for 2016-2017**

Chair Bakovic indicated that OA2020 and the Humanities issues are two topics he would like to see on UCOLASC's agenda. Members were invited to share their ideas for future committee discussions.

**Discussion:** The UCR representative inquired about the Librarians perspectives on the intersection of technology, software for example, and the library. The UCD Library actively archives software, particularly open source software, that faculty produce and works with faculty on ways to increase the citations for the software. To meet hosting needs, libraries could make sure that the software is permanently accessible and citable. The software would be archived in something like Merritt to preserve it. Software is just viewed as another form of data.

There also needs to be obvious ways to link software to users' responses to it. Vice Chair de Alfaro reported that there are organizations that host "backtrackers" that can be configured by the authors of the software to allow anyone to enter a request for an enhancement. A member asked if there are entities in addition to the libraries that are involved with archiving software. The analyst suggested that UCOLASC might send a memo about scholarly communication and software to the systemwide Committee on Academic Computing and Communications. The UCR library and information technology committee are combined and the chief information officer and a librarian are ex officio members, and the campus representative will follow up on this topic with his local committee.

At UCD, librarians are teaching freshman seminars aimed at engaging students in how to do research. Students like the course but only when they can receive a unit credit. The librarians must find a faculty member to be the instructor of record in order for credit to be granted, and it can be challenging to find a willing faculty member. Chair Smith indicated that the campus Education Policy committee has been asked to consider this question. The course has been approved by the Committee on Courses and it is on the books. Members were surprised that it has been difficult to find faculty to assist the librarians. Perhaps the undergraduate advisor would be the appropriate person. This is fundamental in terms of faculty being in control of the record, so the work goes beyond signing a form.

Vice Chair de Alfaro would like UCOLASC to discuss whether UC should leverage its size and explore creating an open access archive venue as a way of regaining control from the publishers. It could be a place where papers are placed and reviewed at a later date for example. Or it might have an editorial board that would decide which journals would have their own editorial boards. The UC Press project Collabra was designed to be an OA mega-journal across all disciplines and is now being split into Collabra Psychology and other discipline-specific journals under the Collabra umbrella.

Vice Chair de Alfaro suggested that the editorial board would foster the creation of journals in various disciplines. There is a significant amount of work involved. UC could help the existing venues rather than starting its own. Chair Bakovic also indicated the eScholarship already allows faculty to start a journal and establish a board. A new version of eScholarship, that is more flexible than the old site, will be rolled out in March 2017. The journals on eScholarship are currently not very experimental. The idea is that UC could create something that has institutional prestige to attract faculty seeking prestigious publication venues for promotion and tenure. Why should a commercial organization like Springer be the home of editorial boards rather than a prestigious university like UC or other universities worldwide? Chair Bakovic noted that the flip from the Elsevier subscription journal *Lingua* to the OA journal *Glossa* is supported by a promising funding model, but that it has nevertheless been difficult to get editorial boards of other subscription journals to sign on to the model.

## **X. New Business**

Chair Bakovic asked members to ask their local library committees how the growth in student enrollment has impacted their libraries. Members were also asked to discuss how the local committees feel about the OA2020 letter of interest. LibQual is a survey of students used by many libraries to gather information about student attitudes toward the libraries.

## **XI. Executive Session**

There was no Executive Session.

**Meeting adjourned at: 3:15 pm**

**Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams**

**Attest: Eric Bakovic**