UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA   ACADEMIC SENATE
UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON LIBRARY AND SCHOLARLY COMMUNICATION
MINUTES OF MEETING
FRIDAY, OCTOBER 22, 2010

Attending: Richard Schneider, Chair (UCSF), Christopher Kelty (UCLA), Laurence Armi (UCSD), Laurie Monahan (UCSB) (telephone), Timothy Morton (UCD), Roberto Manduchi (UCSC), Lee Ann Baxter-Lowe (UCSF) (telephone), Garrett Liles (Graduate Student Representative, UCD), Alan Weinstein (UCB), Sholeh Quinn (UCM), Chikako Takeshita (UCR), Laine Farley (Executive Director, California Digital Library), Ivy Anderson (Director, Collections, California Digital Library), Dan Greenstein (Vice Provost, Academic Information and Strategic Affairs) (telephone), Michael Yonezawa (LAUC President), Karen Butter (UCSF University Librarian & Assistant Chancellor) Trisha Cruse (Director, UC Curation Center), Brenda Abrams (Policy Analyst)

I.   Welcome and Introductions

Chair Schneider reviewed the committee charge and gave the members a brief history of the committee's work. UCOLASC has provided valuable input regarding library budgets. The committee has focused on open access over the past several years and has identified new strategies for advancing open access alternatives. The committee will discuss what the future of libraries will be from the perspective of different disciplines. The chair informed the committee that the discussions are confidential unless members are specifically asked to share or gather information at their campuses.

The history of the Google digitization project and book search settlement agreement was briefly discussed. UC felt it was important to digitize all books, not just those under copyright in order to increase access. The issues of concern to the committee included usage, Google's collection of data on the users, and Google's control of the content that is delivered back to UC. The copyright and rights holders were also concerns. Members of the academic community were very concerned about Google's agreements with commercial publishers. The Department of Justice also got involved and the settlement agreement stalled. The judge has not made a decision but the digitization work continues. All work that has been digitized is available in next generation Melvyl. The out of copyright materials are available through the Hathi Trust project. Of UC's 15 million unique titles, three million volumes have been digitized.

The committee voted to add the graduate student representative to the listserv.

II.   Consultation with the Office of the President
   - *Dan Greenstein, Vice Provost, Academic Planning, Programs, and Coordination*

The Vice Provost explained that his role at UCOP includes planning for libraries. A new libraries task force is a direct response to the budget situation and recognition of the libraries collaboration to provide resources to students and faculty. The task force will determine if there is more that the libraries can do and directions that might be valuable. SLASIAC is a provost appointed committee which UCOLASC's chair is on and the task force will make recommendations to this body. It met a few weeks ago and decided to look at collections, library services, and eventually organization and funding issues. The task force also adopted parameters for planning for the next three to five years. In this time period libraries can expect a 10% reduction in annual buying power, reflecting a flat budget. A series of calls will be

convened to discuss the three issues. Draft materials may be available as early as December and a report should be ready in March 2011. Chair Schneider intends to involve the committee as much as possible to ensure the faculty perspective is part of the planning for libraries. A review of CDL will be conducted over the same time frame. The committee should consider how to make the case for indirect costs going to the libraries. Campuses will determine how the indirect costs will be allocated. The University Librarians need to develop a strategy to advocate for funding for the libraries from the campus budget. Campuses will make decisions about how they support their libraries and with what level of funding.

Discussion: A central question is whether UC has one library system or eleven separate libraries. The system is not good at determining how campuses should make decisions including about how they support their libraries. The tension is between achieving greater economy of scale and the autonomy of the campuses. CDL will make an assessment on the campuses for the funds to support the journal licenses. If there were unlimited funds a centralized decision making process might make sense. Currently, however, librarians make decisions about materials needed at each campus. In the technical services piece economies of scale could be achieved and the librarians are working on this now. Faculty and other decision makers at the local level need to be more engaged to ensure that the library is supported. The ULs need to decide amongst themselves about which functions are centralized and which stay at the campuses.

The ULs will have identified short and long term strategies that can be shared with UCOLASC in February. Decisions will be made in the context of trade offs in light of the limited resources. Campuses provide significant funds to CDL to pay for journal licenses. UCOLASC would like to know the percentages of local and UCOP funding that are used for the licenses. New external sources of funding need to be identified to support libraries. UCSF's local library committee has discussed the idea of allowing biotech companies access to library resources in exchange for funding. What the centralized services need to look like and how much they should cost need to be determined. A review of UC Press is going well and identifying important opportunities to integrate eScholarship. A report with recommendations should be available in January and UCOLASC's feedback will be requested. A member remarked that hard data would be useful for UCOLASC to have during its discussions. The problems facing the Humanities faculty who do not have access to grants and indirect funds was noted. For accreditation campuses have to demonstrate a level of funding for libraries.

III.   Proposed Revisions to APM 010 and 015

The proposed revisions protect the rights of faculty to criticize the administration as part of university service without punishment. The court case of Hong vs Regents caused UCAF to be concerned about faculty speech. The chair clarified that the committee can comment because it is important for UCOP to hear the faculty's opinion especially when the position is different.

Discussion: Given the types of judges in charge of the courts, it is important for this protection to be in place for faculty especially as the definition of academic freedom is increasingly narrow. This change can also support faculty publication in open access without repercussions. Scholarly communication is on the border of academic freedom which is one reason for the committee to comment. The committee agreed to support the changes.

Action: The analyst will draft the memo with the committee's comments.

IV.   Resolution and Statement on Near Term Choices for UC

The Council passed a resolution and UCLA Division made a statement about the near term choices for the University. Comments are due November 10, 2010. The documents discuss the necessity of maintaining the quality of research and teaching which define UC as an institution. UC needs to think about the long-term consequences decisions will have on the resources that make the University unique.

Discussion: Any strategies the Commission on the Future proposes should be reviewed by the Academic Council. Libraries were fairly invisible and listed as part of building infrastructure as opposed to a central part of UC's core mission. Libraries and access to scholarship they provide access to are essential to research. Indirect funds should be given to the libraries not just used to build labs. Labs and libraries are both needed to conduct research. Publishers question why libraries do not benefit from the significant indirect funds received by UC. The allocation of the indirect is set by a formula which would be extremely difficult to change, although changing it may be a key to supporting the University in the future. Federal funding agencies specifically list libraries as an indirect cost.

Libraries should be defined so people are reminded that they provide access to resources for researchers. The functions of the library beyond just being a building need to be emphasized. UCOLASC should articulate its positions about libraries, indirect funds, and defining libraries. The recommendation on support for capital projects may be the place to couch the discussion about libraries and the emphasis should be on scholarly communications. There is no reference to resources for research in either the resolution or the statement. The committee letter will state without endorsing either document, UCOLASC would like to add its perspective to the consideration of near term choices for UC. The letter can also underscore how infrequently the libraries are mentioned in important documents from Council and UCOP.

Action: The Chair and the UCD representative will work on the committee's letter. The analyst will circulate the letter UCOLASC submitted in response to the Choices report.

V.   New CDL Initiatives
- *Trisha Cruse, Director, UC Curation Center*

Data management is a new area for the libraries. Director Cruse provided an overview of the digital landscape. There is a massive amount of content that is changing every day, there are diverse stakeholders and the technology is also changing. At the same time resources are decreasing. The question is how UC responds to these factors. A partnership between the CDL and campuses and peer institutions will be created and expertise will be pooled. The Curation Center is starting its work with three UC campuses. A goal is to maintain and add value to digital content for use now and in the future. The Center is working with national and international institutions and it is providing consultation services, hosted solutions, campus solutions, partnerships and community initiatives. Data management plans are being required by NSF and other agencies will follow suit. The plan will be a reviewed part of a proposal. The Curation Center has developed a data management service that is on the internet. The Center is monitoring agencies to determine their policies. A data management plan is being developed that will be a tool that allows faculty to fill out a form that can be inserted into their proposal. The goal is to provide centralized support but campuses may develop their own processes to support faculty.

The EZID service looks at research data in terms of the intellectual property. There are differences between journal articles and research data, and the data is secondary to the articles. The data is difficult to find and there may not be a link between the article and the data. EZID allows for the creation of persistent identifiers and manage them and the associated metadata over time. Users include individual researchers. The Merritt Service was launched with EZID in mid-September and it allows users to manage content the way they want. Content can be searched, displayed and shared and be made private or publicly available. Researchers have indicated that the metadata is too sensitive to share. A catalog will be developed that allows people to search for what is available. The UC Curation Center website is http://www.cdlib.org/uc3.

Discussion: The current plan is to charge only for storage. Faculty can recharge for the storage in their grants but

when the grant ends it is not clear how the storage will be paid for. NIH requires that the data is stored for ten years so a way to archive the data is needed. It was noted that there are national centers that provide storage for faculty in certain disciplines. However faculty in the Humanities may not have access to national databases and some federal agencies such as the NEA may not have the budgets to create such databases. Data centers on the campuses do not have the expertise in preservation and the curation center is hearing from faculty who have no where to store their data. An analysis showed that digital storage is much cheaper than physical storage but shifting the funding toward digital storage has not been done. The data storage will not go to scale if individual faculty have to pay for it and the curation center needs to figure this out.

VI.   Update on Negotiations with Nature Publishing Group

- *Ivy Anderson, Director, Collections, California Digital Library*

Last spring UC received its official quote for its licensing fee which represented a quadruple increase in the costs. CDL reduced costs by 8% with a large set of publishers and this increase would undo CDL's efforts. CDL had reached out to publishers to discuss the budget situation. Last spring a letter was sent to faculty about the proposal from Nature which indicated the possibility of a boycott. The letter was met with some consternation but much more support. An in person meeting was held with NPG during which CDL provided information about the issues facing all libraries and UC in specific. NPG sees themselves as a premier service that should be expensive.

Discussion: It is important to understand that the cost of Nature with the quadruple increase would be very unreasonable. There are a variety of metrics that need to be considered when determining the value of a journal. The goal is to reach a point where no one pays for anything by dispensing with subscriptions. The discussions with NPG are about an entirely new model. Nearly six thousand articles were submitted by UC last year to NPG and six hundred of them were published. There are six hundred in house editors and a very high rejection rate (ca. 96% for *Nature*). It costs NPG $30,000 per article to publish a *Nature* article. NPG sees itself as a reader service not an author service. Under the proposed new model, authors would pay for submission and then for publication. The author will have to determine if an article should be submitted to Nature or some other journal. Paying for publication of the article can be seen as part of the experiment and the fee can be taken out of a grant although support will need to be provided for faculty that do not have grants. Authors will keep the copyright. By default of shifting costs, the goal is that eventually open access will be achieved, although in the short term, access will continue to be restricted to subscribers. Faculty in the Humanities and Social Sciences could be supported by the funds that are coming back into the University. If NPG agrees to change its model the hope is that other publishers will adopt it. NPG can decide how much to charge authors and possibly end up with higher revenue, and if the submission fee is too high authors will not publish in their journals. Director Anderson clarified that NPG is not ready to move forward with open access per se.. Negotiations with other publishers are coming up and CDL will continue to push for models that include open access.

There would be no subscriptions for the back half of the journal but there will be subscriptions for the front half which students and other readers find useful. Submission and publication fees are currently unknown in the Humanities and used on a limited basis in the Social Sciences, so the situation with NPG will have to be explained thoroughly to these faculty so they are educated. The savings for CDL could be used to support faculty in these disciplines. UCB has a fund that helps faculty without a grant to publish in an open access journal. It was noted that there is an emerging open access movement in the Humanities. The Humanities faculty feel that they are supporting the Sciences and this model would keep costs with the Sciences. Smaller journals are competing to get authors to publish articles. CDL could step in when smaller journals go out of business and produce its own journals. Many members expressed excitement over the approach being used in the negotiations with NPG and the proposed model.

For large publishing institutions like UC shifting the costs to authors will lead to a net increase for UC and redistribute the costs across the system. The imposition of submission fees may also drive down frivolous submissions, but the goal is not to restrain submissions. UC needs to decide what to do about publishing its own scholarship. There are conversations with NIH and with the Committee on Academic Freedom at UCSF which

expressed concern over requiring faculty to pay a submission fee. Having a lower submission fee for authors from a country that is not wealthy may create a bias in favor of U.S. authors and this is something UCOLASC needs to think about. Overall, the committee needs to consider arguments both for and against this model. There will most likely be a hybrid model for a long time where subscriptions will not go away for faculty in the Humanities and Social Sciences. If this works with NPG it could eventually work with journals in those disciplines. If the experiment with NPG is successful this may alleviate concerns for faculty outside the Sciences. Members can report to their local committees that the negotiations with Nature are ongoing.

A survey is being finalized that will be disseminated through the same mechanism used to send out the Nature letter last spring. It will be a general survey aimed at collecting data that NPG would like to see. Concern was expressed that sending out the survey before faculty are fully informed would cause them to take a position against the submission fee model. A general letter explaining the approach that UC is attempting to follow would be a better approach. Just asking faculty if they are willing to pay a submission fee will cause a backlash. Faculty need comprehensive background information about what journals are costing UC and how much UC has to pay to get the content back. The committee discussed issues related to not publishing in a prestige journal.

UC negotiated with Springer to include UC-authored articles as open access without separate author fees . This is a two year pilot that ends in January 2011 which helped Springer understand how to position itself with respect to open access. A new program called Springer Open is launching new journals under a fully open access model with author fees. UC is currently in discussions with Springer which may lead to a modified version of its current arrangement with reduced author fees. In the current agreement, the submitting authors are notified when their articles are accepted but there may be some authors whose articles can be available through open access but were not made available in this way, and this should be addressed. It was suggested that UC end its subscription and only have access to UC articles that are available in open access. This publisher has been the most progressive and CDL should appeal to this during the negotiations. Springer makes soft-bound volumes of its textbooks available for $25 and pdf. versions downloads for free.

VII   Campus Reports and Member Items

Berkeley: There is a process to cut back costs through reductions of staff which the library has done though attrition. The committee is being merged with the committee on computing.

Santa Cruz: There was an uproar last year over plans to reduce the time to keep the libraries open. Students are now paying $6 a quarter to keep the libraries open. The main library being renovated and expanded will be open next year. The budget reduction was less than expected. The campus received the Grateful Dead collection of forty-five thousand items. There was a donation to open a room for the collection.

Riverside: There are space problems. Faculty are considering doing a demonstration to show the library is not getting enough support.

San Diego: A talk at the campus by Phillip Bourne, the editor of Computational Biology who is a strong advocate for open access, was poorly attended because most faculty have other concerns.

Los Angeles: The local committee had a discussion about the budget with the UL and there have been no additional cuts. Full library hours have been restored including at the student run study space. Students raised funds to restore the hours to the study space. A restructuring process is underway including at the main research library. The committee received an update on Google and discussed NPG. The campus is working on unifying the interface people use to get to library resources.

Davis: The committee nixed the idea of a library fee last year but may reconsider it this year. The science library was not eliminated but a University Librarian was not hired. There is no news about a new search.

Merced: There is no membership on the committee yet.

San Francisco: The library is participating in Operation Excellence. The finance piece will be implemented next year. The human resources piece is moving forward aggressively. The library is closed Saturdays and hours during the week were reduced. The budget was reduced by 16% and there may be cuts in the coming year. The library participated in Open Access week and talked to fifty to one hundred students and some faculty who did not know much about the topic. The second floor of the library is being renovated to create a teaching and learning center which will open in January.

Santa Barbara: The campus received a bond to retrofit the library. There is a search for the UL and the goal is to make an offer in January.

CDL: Activities include work on the UC Press/eScholarship, the review of the CDL review, the Google digitization project, and the Hathi Trust. The CDL took a 10% cut and a mandated cut of at least $250,000.

Senate: The analyst reported that the Senate website policy allowing committees to post documents that have not been or will not be endorsed by Council to their websites.

VIII   New Business

There was no new business.

IX   Executive Session

The committee did not have an executive session.

The chair made a motion to adjourn.

Meeting adjourned at: 3:45
Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams
Attest: Richard Schneider