UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA   ACADEMIC SENATE
UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON LIBRARY AND SCHOLARLY COMMUNICATION
Videoconference Minutes
May 17, 2017

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), Eric Sobel (UCLA) (alternate), Amelia Regan (UCI), Hayden Jackson (Undergraduate Student Representative), Yi Hong Sim (Graduate Student Representative), Brian Eliceiri (UCSD), Dennis Ventry (UCD), Richard Schneider (Former UCOLASC Chair, UCSF), 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, CDL), Brenda Abrams (Principal Analyst, Academic Senate)

I.   Announcements

Chair Bakovic welcomed everyone to the videoconference.

II.   Consent Calendar:

Action: The minutes were approved.

III.   Electronic Theses & Dissertations (ETD) Task Force
- *Eileen Zurbriggen, UCSC*
- *Yi Hong Sim, Graduate Student Representative, UCSD*

The ETD Task Force has met twice and will meet again next week. Angus MacDonald from the Office of General Counsel at UCOP is drafting the ETD policy which will draw from the President's Open Access Policy. The Senate's Open Access policy indicates that if faculty are already publishing in a repository, they are in compliance with the policy. The licensing piece may be a greater indicator of the success of the Senate policy than the actual rate of deposit. Faculty now understand and care about the retention of their rights. UCOLASC will have an opportunity to comment on the draft before it is issued for systemwide review.

IV.   Open Access

The committee will be briefed on the Office of Scholarly Communications' (OSC) OA campaign and the OA2020 Berlin Conference. The OSC OA group has compiled materials that will be used in an effort to re-engage UC faculty. These materials will be shared with local libraries for dissemination but Chair Bakovic indicated that the next steps are not yet clear. Director Mitchell added that the campaign aims to encourage faculty to share their research and to look for opportunities to publish in OA journals. However, with the lack of clarity around implementation of the OA policy, there is hesitation about launching a major campaign.

Chair Bakovic reported that recordings of all of the talks at the Berlin 13 Conference are available and many different strategies and ideas were discussed. Signatories of the OA2020 Expression of Interest (EOI) discussed identifying point people to serve as national contact points and Jeffrey MacKie-Mason, the UCB University Librarian, has been asked to participate at a higher level. Representatives from multiple countries shared different ideas about a variety of potential models including some based on article processing charges (APCs). Reports following the conference characterized it as primarily advocating APC models but this was not the emphasis from the perspective of Professor Schneider. The

Max Planck Institute has conducted analysis of the current OA environment. Converting existing literature to OA could result in major shifts just through working with a small number of publishers. Eighty percent of the Institute's publishing is with 20% of publishers and this analysis shows where efforts to increase OA will have the most impact.

Discussion: A large part of the debate is whether there will be support for existing publishers converting to OA. The OA2020 idea is about transforming the existing system but there is a camp that wants to disinvest in the existing publishing infrastructure in a way that will destroy it. It is essential for faculty authors to weigh in on what is desired.

V.   Review of the Senate Open Access Policy

Professor Schneider explained that it is not clear why UC faculty have not deposited at a higher rate especially since the burden on faculty was significantly reduced with the automated harvester. A question is if the policy can be deemed successful without high levels of compliance by faculty. An issue to investigate is if faculty in some disciplines are more frequently subjected to waiver requests from publishers or if faculty in some disciplines are not getting any pushback from publishers. MIT has approximately a 40% compliance rate while UC's rate is very low. While Symplectic Elements is a great tool, the focus could be shifted from compliance to public access. One strategy might be to assign campuses to take ownership over certain disciplines and work on ways to change the culture within these disciplines to increase publishing in OA. Many funders tend to have a twelve month embargo but the Senate policy does not require an embargo period. Funders could be engaged in a discussion about the OA policy and the possibility of making UC articles available sooner.

Discussion: Professor Schneider suggested that what is needed is a strategic vision of the future of OA at UC and this vision could be included in the UCOLASC report to the Academic Council on the status of the policy. One measure of success is that publishers have not pushed back significantly and faculty across the system have been able to retain rights to their work. A member pointed out that there are discipline-specific reasons that faculty compliance varies. In general, there is huge variation in the quality of the OA outlets. One suggestion is that the policy could be changed to allow faculty to deposit a paper before it is peer reviewed. Another proposal was to separate the license issue from the issue of compliance with depositing. Providing clear and succinct information about licensing rights may encourage faculty to think more about OA and the OA2020 initiative. It was noted that there is a long-standing acceptance of OA in the sciences.

Director Mitchell indicated that faculty are not differentiating between articles deposited before the OA policy or after but the 50K manuscripts deposited have all been peer reviewed. Compliance with the Senate policy is related to a number of factors. The next phase of the policy may be to target disciplines where there are not existing OA outlets. A member suggested that if a significant percentage of UC faculty articles are already freely available, perhaps there is no need to worry about compliance with the Senate policy. Targeting disciplines where there is no culture of depositing in OA or where publishers are very much against OA would be a good approach. Director Mitchell indicated that the mechanisms to focus on specific disciplines are not currently in place however, and the funding for Elements is not secure and it is not clear if this discipline-specific strategy could be implemented without the automated harvester. Elements does not help CDL identify where content is already available in OA and it may not be the best tool if the emphasis shifts from compliance to access.

UC might partner with metadata aggregators like SCOPUS, Google Scholar, arXiv and Web of Science which do track OA publication. The percentage of UC articles already available in OA could be researched but one question is if this could be done at both the institutional and disciplinary levels. Perhaps reframing this to look at building collections could be effective. Council of University Librarians

(CoUL) Chair Smith indicated that UCD has one of the highest rates of compliance in the system but the campus provides funding to supplement the CDL funds. Compliance will continue with or without Elements, although not at the same level and not as easily. Professor Schneider suggested looking at the gaps in the open availability of content but Director Anderson indicated that past efforts to divide campuses to make them responsible for certain disciplines have not worked well. A larger vision for how the U.S. will embrace OA is an important piece of the puzzle. UC needs to articulate in a strategic way how to move the ball forward.

Enriching the collection by ensuring that the outreach is increased instead of spending money on the intake could be the shift UC makes and Director Mitchell commented that a mechanism for intake would be needed. It is important to understand the economic implications associated with the ideas raised today and a better understanding of why faculty compliance is so low is needed. CoUL Chair Smith indicated that if each library is asked to spend several hundred thousand dollars there may not be much support for this strategy. The cost for CDL is $300K for the license plus salaries for two staff. All campuses could equally share in the license but how the license is distributed across UC will vary.

Decentralizing the services that CDL now provides to the campuses would result in significant costs at the campus level. Executive Director Waibel proposed that CDL still could pay for the license. The question the ULs have to explain to their funders is what the return on the investment is. UCOLASC needs to help the ULs understand success from the perspective of faculty. Professor Schneider stated that the ultimate goal is to shift funding away from journal subscriptions and faculty need to inform the ULs about the subscriptions that could be cancelled. One idea is to encourage faculty to publish in inexpensive venues with the understanding that the content will ultimately be available in OA. A member pointed out that publishing in OA journals is expensive but Professor Schneider and Chair Bakovic responded that UCOLASC is not asking faculty to publish in OA journals. The idea is to take subscription money in order to support OA, which would start with identifying disciplines that already have a culture of publishing in OA.

Director Anderson recommended that the ULs could provide a very specific report at a future UCOLASC meeting about various strategies including OA2020. A member suggested that UCOLASC should focus on the question of getting faculty to upload their publications and identify ways to make the process less expensive. There is a cost for services that are not linked to Elements but are key to supporting faculty. A member noted that one positive related to Elements is that it has helped remind him as a middle author about the documents that he needs to upload. Various ideas include whether specific journals could actually be eliminated or if the Senate OA policy should be mandatory. It was noted that the final version of articles include publishers' intellectual property.

Professor Schneider explained that when this policy was created, there were serious concerns including issues related to academic freedom. Professor Schneider would like UC to set the stage to walk away from the big licensing packages. CoUL Chair Smith made the point that this year the library budgets are locked up and even if Elements stays in place, the libraries will not necessarily be able to invest in support at the local level. Director Anderson emphasized that losing access to some content is a consequence that needs to be fully understood before any significant changes to journal licensing are made. Director Mitchell pointed out that the Provost's Office has not provided funding to support the Senate's policy but perhaps the issue could be reframed as a benefit to the University's reputation. UCOLASC's letter to the Academic Council might emphasize the need for institutional support and that more time is needed to assess the true value of the OA policy but Executive Director Waibel indicated that letters from SLASIAC have not received the desired response.

Chair Bakovic summarized that the key points in the discussion include measures of success for licensing, measures of success for compliance and access. UCOLASC's review of the policy will include the data

provided by CDL. Another issue is how the burden on faculty is being minimized by Elements. The CDL built infrastructure for the transactional processes as part of this effort to help minimize the burden and it was suggested that CDL could conduct a longitudinal study about faculty attitudes towards Elements.

VI.   Campus Reports and Member Items

Chair Bakovic would like members to report on their division's decision to sign the Expression of Support for OA2020.

San Diego: The committee is interested in the process other campuses have followed in order to get the EOI signed. The representative has contacted other UCOLASC members for information about how the EOI was agreed upon at their campuses. The committee discussed the idea of "red" OA which signifies that certain subscriptions would be stopped because the materials are available in OA. The UL, Brian Schottlaender, is retiring and Chair Bakovic will be on the search committee for the new UL.

Santa Barbara: Some members of the divisional committee do not seem very interested in the OA2020 EOI. The librarians are not in support of APCs which disadvantage faculty in the Humanities. Chair Bakovic clarified that signing the EOI does not commit the campuses to the APC model but signifies support for the ultimate goals of transforming the publishing model from subscription-based to OA-based and investing in various types of OA models.

Los Angeles: The committee discussed OA2020 and voted unanimously to support it and is now consulting with the divisional Senate about how to proceed. A website will be created to solicit comments from faculty and ultimately the UL will ask for the provost's signature on the EOI. The goal is to complete this in June. Other issues include the increase in undergraduate students and the availability of study space in the library.

Davis: CoUL Chair Smith was instrumental in reaching out to various individuals and committees at the campus. The library committee had two unanimous votes in support of the OA2020 EOI and the divisional Senate's Executive Council has expressed support. The library is dealing with space planning issues. The large university library is primarily used by undergraduates and the campus does not have a separate graduate library. A smaller library used by Physics and a few other departments is being repurposed for faculty and staff.

Irvine: OA issues continue to be more frequently discussed at this campus. Space for library services and studying are issues that will be faced over the next few years as enrollment increases. The divisional committee has discussed OA2020 and the issue was presented by the AUL for Research Resources in late February.

Santa Cruz: The committee has had several discussions regarding the OA2020 EOI. The pros and cons document seems to have complicated the conversation. It has been determined that the chancellor or executive vice chancellor would sign the letter but a decision about signing will be postponed until a permanent executive vice chancellor is identified. The committee has been much more focused on the destruction of books at the campus.

San Francisco: OA2020 has been discussed a great deal. The UL search has been completed and the new UL will start on August 1st.

VII. Data Refuge/Libraries
- *John Chodacki, Director, UC Curation Center, California Digital Library*

Since January, the CDL has been working on a project called Data Rescue to develop a systemwide approach to dealing with federal data that is disappearing. In March discussions with data.gov focused on data that is at risk. Monitoring scripts were put in place to check the status of the data sets that have been backed up. A meeting with stakeholders across the country occurred last week and attendees gained a better understanding of the issues involved. Director Chodacki's presentation focused on methods to improve data.gov and demonstrated datamirror.org which checks for change history. The meeting ended with agreement on shared principles which were framed as an open coalition of partners to target, safeguard and steward high-value, at-risk data for long-term discovery and use.

CoUL Chair Smith pointed out that this effort started because scientists became alarmed that data, in particular climate change data, was disappearing and they asked for assistance from libraries. Vice chancellors of research have concerns about duplicating what the federal government is already doing. The purpose is primarily about ensuring access rather than preservation. The challenge going forward is to determine what should be saved because archiving will be expensive. Triangulating the demand, risk and cost is a central question.

Discussion: A member agreed that this is an important preservation effort and asked how faculty can get involved. CoUL Chair Smith indicated that many campuses have hosted Data Rescue events. It will be necessary to determine which data sets should be prioritized for moving into shared archives. Much of the data is very embedded and difficult to extract through the Web. The biggest risk to these federal agencies is that programs get defunded so there is no way to manage the data sets which simply erode over time. Both computer scientists and people at the federal agencies are key partners. Ideas include having a UC-wide virtual data event and undergraduates could be recruited to assist with this effort.

VIII. Consultation with the California Digital Library (CDL)
- *Günter Waibel, Associate Vice Provost & Executive Director, CDL*
- *Ivy Anderson, Director, Collections, CDL*

Director Anderson provided an update on the Springer Nature license, explained co-investment challenges and share licensing strategy, and a funding proposal to President Napolitano on reinvigorating UC library collections. CDL has been negotiating with Springer Nature this year and the merger of these two companies has complicated the discussions. Other libraries are having similar issues as a result of the merger. A three year licensing agreement is almost complete. The terms of the agreement include low annual increase caps and the terms of the Nature contract have been preserved. The National labs have been split off from the UC contract by Springer and the terms for the Livermore Lab are still being negotiated. CDL is having separate discussions about open access offsetting which will be discussed with the CoUL later this week.

The Director discussed challenges related to campus co-investment with CDL for licensing. As each campus has been challenged in its own way, many campuses are having difficulties with continuing to fund UC's large shared licensing portfolio. Additionally, as usage has become a factor that people look at, there are discussions about how costs across the system are examined. Any shifts will create winners and losers as costs are distributed across the system and some campuses are finding it difficult to share costs for what is being licensed. A default FTE-based model will be evaluated in 2017-18. UC cannot afford what is being licensed currently and cancellation options for next year are being analyzed using a variety of metrics.

President Napolitano asked for a proposal with three levels of renewed funding and this was presented by CoUL to the president in April. The basic principle is that there would be a replenishing of central funding held at CDL to be pooled in a certain way and managed in conjunction with the campuses along with a regular program of annual inflationary increases. The lowest request level is for a $5M permanent addition to the base budget, the middle level is for a $7.5M permanent addition to the base which would include some funding to invest in OA strategies, and the highest level request is for a $10M permanent addition to the base. According to Executive Director Waibel, President Napolitano remarked that it is important for UC to sustain its high quality libraries. Since this discussion, UCOP has been focused on the state audit so the status of internal discussions about the proposals is not clear.

Meeting adjourned at: 2:20
Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams
Attest: Eric Bakovic