UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON LIBRARY AND SCHOLARLY COMMUNICATION
MEETING MINUTES – JUNE 1, 2007

Present: Ben Crow, Laurence Armi, Elaine Tennant, Richard Schneider, Roger Ingham, Lise Snyder (LAUC President), John Ober, Simon Leung, Winder McConnell, David Crohn, and Todd Giedt

I.   Chair's Announcements
ISSUE: Chair Crow announced that Bylaw 185 has passed, which has changed the committee's name to the University Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication (UCOLASC). He reminded members that UCOLASC now has a mandate to consider innovations in scholarly communication, as well as opportunity to expand the committee with three at-large members.

II.   Consent Calendar
A. Approval of the Agenda
DISCUSSION: Chair Crow added an item on university librarian (UL) salaries.
ACTION: Members unanimously approved the agenda with the addition of a topic on the UL salaries.
B. Draft Minutes from the March 27, 2007 Meeting
ACTION: Members unanimously approved the minutes.

III.   Open Access Policy
ISSUE: Chair Crow noted the abundance of comments that have been received in response to the Open Access Policy proposed policy. He alerted members that these responses are coming from both administrative and Senate bodies. The responses from the Administrative units are being handled by the Provost's office, while the Senate responses will be reviewed at the June Academic Council meeting. He believes it most likely that the Academic Council will send these comments back to the working group for consideration and policy reformulation. Although UCOLASC does not have any direct authority over the next steps in this process, he invited members' comments, thoughts, and ideas about how this policy might be redrafted over the coming months. Towards that end, he believes that there are three possible directions for the policy makers to take: (1) Rethinking the goals of the policy; (2) reconfiguring the details of the policy (term definition or the creation of a glossary for example); and (3) thinking about some of the larger suggestions, such as rethinking the policy entirely towards a reduction in the bureaucratic load (and shifting these burdens onto publishers).

DISCUSSION: Members noted that there is less categorical and trenchant opposition than the summary letter/memo suggests. There is virtually no unit or Senate body that states that the University should categorically drop the proposal. The Davis member remarked that the Davis sentiments towards this policy seem to fall along area/disciplinary lines. Chair Crow stressed this point, adding that we need more data on the disciplinary practices regarding publication. The San Francisco member mentioned that most faculty in the medical sciences already place their publications in open access repositories. Another member mentioned that the actual

disciplinary make-up of the local library committees played a major role in the ultimate disposition of the proposal on the individual campuses. Most comments were in favor of scrapping the idea of collecting data on the number of open-access publications for the purposes of merit and promotion. In general, San Diego is very much in favor of open access, but the faculty on that campus are very sympathetic to the cost issues. That said, the San Diego library committee feels that the proposal in its current form is unrealistic with the large bureaucratic burden that this proposal represents. Alternatively, they would suggest that more pressure be exercised at the executive level to encourage open-access publishing. For example, he suggested that President Dynes ask the National Science Foundation (NSF) to insist that all of its research be published in an open-access format. At Riverside, the proposal went to three committees with its local library committee passionately supporting it. That said, there are some things that could be improved. First, it is much too vague. The cost issue is also not emphasized enough in the proposal. Much of the fear surrounding the policy comes from details that are not fully developed. Riverside also recommended that the University should negotiate directly with publishers as their subscriptions are up for renewal. Another idea was the development of other measures for journal impacts, such as page views, which could be used as markers for journal readership.

Consultant John Ober briefed members on the most probably time-line. He expects that the Provost will receive all comments with a fair amount of appreciation. If the working group is reconvened, he anticipates that another iteration of the policy proposal would be re-formulated; however, an actual policy change could take anywhere from 18 to 24 months to happen.

Members remarked that the comments indicate that the policy procedure was formulated in a confusing manner and at least two or three issues have become somewhat muddled. They also commented that most faculty have not read all of the white papers produced by the Academic Council's Special Committee on Scholarly Communication (SCSC). One issue is the high cost of scholarly communication; another is the retention of intellectual property by the people who produce it for the people who pay for it (taxpayers, etc.). Linking this policy to merit and promotion should never have been included and should be taken out. An overall goal of the policy should be increasing the number of articles published in open access, but asking faculty to report the number of open access articles at the time of merit and review is not right. Also, trying to force faculty to publish exclusively in open access journals would be counterproductive, as most faculty will want to publish in prestige journals, which are currently not open-access. Faculty are really only enthusiastic about an 'opt-in' clause. Therefore, it is worth asking if the policy could be rearranged in a simple and non bureaucratic way so that faculty would want to opt into it. Another member countered that an opt-in clause could be a recipe for disaster, as it would require a substantial commitment of resources and financial support for it to work. That said, this sentiment is not coupled to the high cost of the University's own intellectual property.

Another member stressed that this is really about transfer of copyright. Academia is unique in that its members regularly give up their copyright to their own work. Faculty should not have to resort to publishing their own work on private websites instead of legitimately retaining their own copyright. For example, photographers and artists generally retain their own copyright in perpetuity and just assign usage. While usage should be granted, the copyright should be retained. That said, one member noted that once something is published, most science and

engineering faculty do not have any use for it any more. Therefore, many faculty members do not feel dispossessed by the current practice.

Members also briefly discussed risks. While some members argued that faculty should simply be encouraged to post their articles on private websites, other members countered that this type of behavior can cause potential harm to University libraries. All agreed that if open-access publishing is the goal; the issue is how to reach that end. At least one member did not think that the proposed mechanism (as contained in the proposed policy) would accomplish this. The committee agreed that faculty will continue to publish in non open-access 'prestige' journals. Certainly, one long-term goal is the movement of these journals to a true open-access format. However, members conceded that this could take many years. Others commented that most faculty are simply exhausted and the imposition of one more thing might be too much. Although some funding agency mandates will help (such as the NIH), there are some academic disciplines that are not heavily funded by government agencies.

IV.   Subvention Policy Proposal

ISSUE: Analyst Todd Giedt provided background on this issue. He noted that the SCSC initially proposed a policy on book subventions. The current enclosure includes the addition of 'UCPB' to the consulting committees (on page 17), and a re-review time-frame of five years.

DISCUSSION: Chair Crow suggested including in the title, 'Publications in the Sciences, Arts, and Humanities'. However, another member asked why the title needs to restrict the subvention policy at all. He suggested rephrasing the title to simply 'Subvention for the Publication of a First Book'. This way, faculty members from the sciences could also apply. Other members argued that since books were less of an issue in the sciences, the need for such subventions in the sciences is less dire. The logic is that a first book is critical for tenure for faculty in the humanities and the social sciences. While subventions are certainly more important for faculty in the humanities and social sciences, other members felt that opening up subventions to junior faculty in the sciences is important purely on the basis of inclusion. The rest of the committee agreed that the inclusion of junior faculty members in the sciences is important, and felt that it should be included as part of the proposal.

Members also discussed the fact that currently such a proposal would be an unfunded mandate. Suggestions for funding included retention programs for junior faculty or even be part of a start-up package. This might also be an attractive program for a foundation; a combination of sources might make it feasible. At UCSF, there are foundations that have matching funds for such purposes, but not all campuses have access to such resources.

Chair Crow asked if there are points in the current proposal that can be improved. He wondered if the background statement should include some contextual statements about other innovations in publishing (suggesting that this is one of many complementary innovations going on in scholarly publishing). Members also emphasized that this proposal should be generally framed under 'support for faculty'.

ACTION: Members will send additional comments directly to Analyst Todd Giedt.

V.   UCOLASC/OSC Seminar on University and Scholarly Societies
ISSUE/REPORT: Consultant Ober reminded members that this committee endorsed the seminar/symposium, suggesting that it be delayed until the fall. He reported that the remaining question is whether invitations to the symposium could be signed by both the Office of Scholarly Communications and UCOLASC.

ACTION: Chair Crow/Consultant John Ober will draft the scope and list the potential invitees.

VI.   Announcements from the University Librarians
ISSUE: UL Convenor Tom Leonard reported that six Association of Research Libraries (both public and private university libraries) have received letters from law firms suggesting that litigation may follow because of the way that they are handling their electronic reserves (e-reserves). He remarked that after Cornell University agreed to the restrictive demands of publishers, faculty use of their e-reserves fell dramatically. Tom also reported on faculty concerns regarding copyright, specifically that standard copyright agreements allow publishers to legally re-publish work without crediting the author. Consultant Ober added that U.S. copyright law does not include a 'moral' clause, which does not bind publishers to crediting the appropriate authors (for example in the case of textbooks).

He noted that UC libraries are proceeding with the next generation of the Melvyl system, as well as the establishment of a partnership with the Online Computer Library Center (OCLC). This partnership is developing WorldCat, which should go live shortly after January 1, 2008. Regarding UC's physical capacity for the storage of materials, one area of concern is the rate at which the regional library facilities (RLFs) are nearing their space capacities. While the RLFs are on the budget horizon, there is always the danger they might be pushed out by other budgetary priorities. UC is increasingly looking towards foundations to pay for its research, development, and digital storage costs. He noted that the Southern Regional Library Facility (SRLF) is a J-STOR archive. He also reported that UC has decided to go with ARTSTOR to archive its art images, which is heavily funded by the Mellon Foundation. He also reported that the mass digitization project is moving forward. Google has scanned 325,000 volumes, with 210,000 already 'live' on Google Book Search. The Microsoft Open Content Alliance (OCA), which Microsoft funds and scans works already in the public domain, has selected 95,000 volumes; 67,000 have been scanned.

There is also an ongoing search for a new director of the California Digital Library (CDL), as Dan Greenstein has accepted a Vice Provost position. In the area of publishing, UC Press is doing well financially, and is hosting a meeting with the University of Michigan around innovative partnerships in university press publishing. He also mentioned that the metrics used to rank university research libraries might soon be changed.

DISCUSSION: Members asked to what extent the two projects are overlapping. It was determined that it was cheaper to simply allow Google to scan all books, even though there will be some overlap with the OCA. The OCA scans volumes at two RLFs, while Google is doing it locally.

Chair Crow raised the topic of UL salary scales. He asked what are the librarians doing about this and how can UCOLASC be helpful? Tom responded that both the lower and upper rungs of the UL salary scales may be raised in the not-too-distant future. That said, there are multiple agreements and collective bargaining arrangements that complicate progress on this issue.

VII.   Proposed Amendment to Bylaw 181 (ITTP)
ISSUE: Members agree that the proposed name change is appropriate and sensible.

DISCUSSION: Members endorsed the notion that the work of ITTP intersects with that of UCOLASC and looks forward to collaborating with ITTP in the future.

ACTION: Analyst Todd Giedt/Chair Ben Crow will draft and send a letter to Academic Council in support of the proposed amendment to Bylaw 181.

VIII.   Recommendations for UCOLASC At-Large Members
ISSUE: Ben posed two questions: What skills are needed? Who are the people that can best meet those skills? Chair Crow invited members to provide specific nominations.

DISCUSSION: Members mentioned that in the past, the committee suggested someone who has expertise in intellectual property and copyright, as well as someone in publishing (especially society publishing), such as a journal editor. Lynne Withey might be able to nominate someone in the publishing field. Someone with service on various budget committees would also be of value (either on the divisional or system-wide level). Someone with experience in resource planning and allocation might also be useful in terms of library planning. Members with committee on academic personnel (CAP) experience would also be helpful. It was mentioned that Nick Jewell, who has many years of CAP experience, will be on the committee next year. Specific nominations included Professor Emeritus Larry Pitts; and Professor Samuelson at the Berkeley School of Information, who has experience in both copyright and budget.

ACTION: Analyst Todd Giedt/Chair Ben Crow will draft a letter suggesting areas of expertise that members at large should represent.

IX.   Stewardship of Digital Assets
ISSUE: Consultant Ober explained that the Information Technology Guidance Committee (ITGC) now has completed an interim report along with draft recommendations. The report has two themes. The first is that it is important to deliver system-wide IT services where appropriate (when there are economies of scope), thereby harnessing the 'Power of Ten' campuses while preserving their respective strengths. ITGC has also prioritized the following issues that need to be addressed: support for research and scholarship (research grid); support for teaching and learning; and support for business systems. Library services will depend on digital storage. The second theme for early attention is teaching and learning (course management systems and access to instructional content. The third priority is business systems, which is driven in part by human resource issues. Academic Council will probably be invited to opine on the final report, which would be an opportune to time for UCOLASC to make its comments.

DISCUSSION: One member mentioned that under the 'support for teaching and learning' section, the interim report mentions open access. Presumably these courses would be open access. Consultant Ober responded that different campuses handle(s) access to course materials differently, but it is usually facilitated in instructional technology centers. Members agreed to look more closely at the final report when it is released to Academic Council for review.

X.   Common IT Architecture
ISSUE: The committee folded this discussion into the previous topic.

XI.   New Business: UL Salaries
ISSUE: Chair Crow asked Consultant Lise Snyder, who is the Librarians Association of the University of California (LAUC) representative to UCOLASC, to comment on UL low salaries.

Consultant Snyder said that it is important for the Senate to both understand and support the role of librarians, who remain important to the University's teaching and research mission even in today's technological age. Although the roles of librarians have changed significantly, librarians are needed more than ever before to work on issues of building collections, digitization, archives, and educating students on library resources. In fact, electronic resources are much more labor intensive than print resources. The majority of UC librarians are represented by bargaining units. While LAUC carries out the peer review process for the purposes of hiring and promotion, it is not involved in bargaining and advising the ULs or the library administration on bargaining issues. Basically, UC libraries are in a crisis situation in terms of recruitment and retention because of the low salaries. She added that in the past benefits used to balance out the low salaries, but this argument is becoming less and less compelling going into the future. The American Federation of Teachers (AFT) is the library personnel union. Consultant Snyder noted that while UC librarians were never classified as 'faculty', they were further bifurcated from the faculty in the 1990s, when they were excluded from cost of living adjustments (COLAs) that faculty receive. At the time, UC made the argument that UC librarians are the highest paid among academic research libraries (ARLs). However, the immediate competitors for librarians are not other ARLs, but CSUs, community colleges, and public libraries. Librarians at these institutions are compensated at a much higher rate than are librarians at ARLs. Professional development work is another issue. Academic research libraries require their librarians to do much more professional development work than public libraries do. She also remarked that librarianship is an aging profession, and a number of UC campuses are having difficulties recruiting new librarians. For example, UCLA currently has 20 openings for librarians.

DISCUSSION: One member asked if library schools grant degrees in both information science and library science, and whether librarians with more of an information science background are better compensated. Consultant Snyder responded that if a librarian is hired outside of the librarian series, such as in the programmer/analyst series, he or she is better compensated. However, this does not mean that the person is not doing typical librarian work. She noted that more and more applicants for the UCLA program in information studies are more interested in public libraries primarily because of the higher rates of compensation found at these libraries. Another member observed the paradox that more and more books are being produced, not fewer. Other members remarked that, much like physical library structures, librarians are becoming more and more invisible to people who receive their information electronically. Librarians are

increasingly being asked to assume additional teaching responsibilities, which add to their workload. For example, Organizational Research Units (ORUs) are claiming workstations in libraries, and librarians provide the service and access to materials for ORU post-docs. Another growing portion of librarians' workload is electronic licensing, which takes expertise to navigate effectively and efficiently.

Chair Crow proposed writing a letter to Academic Council to request additional data on librarian salaries and retention. The letter should ask Council to seek the appropriate body to gather data on the number of librarians that UC loses every year, as well as the time required to fill these positions. The disparity between the CSU and UC systems should also be stressed. Consultant Ober suggested tying the letter to other business that UCOLASC is interested in such as service provision, stewardship, and open access. He remarked that many of those services may have a natural home in the libraries. Overall, members commented that the role of the libraries is expanding, not contracting, and these issues are connected to many of the core issues of this committee.

ACTION: Analyst Todd Giedt/Ben Crow will draft a letter requesting additional data from Academic Council.

XII.   Executive Session
[Note: Minutes, aside from action items, are not prepared for this portion of the meeting.]
ISSUE/REPORT: Members did not hold an executive session.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m

Attest: Ben Crow, UCOL Chair
Prepared by: Todd Giedt, Committee Analyst

Distributions:
1. ITGC Draft Recommendations