UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA   ACADEMIC SENATE
UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON LIBRARY AND SCHOLARLY COMMUNICATION
MEETING MINUTES
FRIDAY, OCTOBER 25, 2013

Attending: Roberto Manduchi, Chair, (UCSC), Francis Steen, Vice Chair, (UCLA), Edward Dimendberg (Irvine), Eric Bakovic (UCSD), Patricia Mcdaniel (UCSF), Joseph Morse (UCR) (telephone), Candace Waid (UCSB), Luca de Alfaro (UCSC), Nick Robinson (LAUC President, UCB), Lorelei Tanji (UL Convenor), Thomas Shannon (UCB), Maxine Craig (UCD), Laine Farley (Executive Director, CDL), Ivy Anderson (Director, Collections, CDL), Catherine Mitchell (Director, Publishing, CDL), Katie Fortney (Copyright Management Officer, CDL), Trisha Cruse (Director, Digital Preservation, CDL), Bill Jacob (Chair, Academic Senate), Martha Winnacker (Executive Director, Academic Senate), Brenda Abrams (Principal Policy Analyst)

I.   Chair's Announcements

Chair Manduchi welcomed the committee members to the first UCOLASC meeting of the year. The committee's charge was reviewed. Chair Manduchi remarked that the committee works well with the consultants from the libraries and from CDL, and this is also reflected in the connections made at the campuses. The chair would like to expand the committee's discussions into issues related to data management and sharing to see how UCOLASC can help facilitate implementation of data sharing procedures across the campuses. The analyst reported that the next UCOLASC meetings will begin at 10:30 AM.

Discussion: Director Farley reported that the Academic Planning Council will consider the steps necessary to make the open access policy a presidential policy. A member asked if the fact that some campus library committees have merged with their computing committees means that UCOLASC will discuss computing issues. The analyst confirmed that there are some joint library and computing campus committees but that UCOLASC will not discuss computing issues.

II.   Consultation with the Academic Senate Office
- *Martha Winnacker, Executive Director, Academic Senate*

Executive Director Winnacker announced that the Senate's chair will join UCOLASC this afternoon. The Senate office has been very busy with the arrival of the new president. The Senate will need to educate the president about the value of Senate consultation.

Discussion: Executive Director Winnacker indicated that a Senate policy only applies to Senate faculty whereas a presidential policy applies to UC staff researchers and non-Senate faculty. It is not known whether the opt out provision will be included or excluded if open access becomes a presidential policy and it is not clear if the Senate can revise a presidential policy. The Executive Director reported that UCOLASC's immediate past chair, Chris Kelty, has been asked to call into the Academic Planning Council meeting next week to discuss the implementation steps. There is a question about whether the policy legally applies to the campuses not currently included in the pilot. Executive Director Winnacker will clarify whether the automatic transfer of the license is occurring at the campuses not in the pilot. Director Mitchell indicated that the CDL's mechanisms to request waivers are currently in place to support faculty at all of the campuses. Faculty members should be informed about how much time they have to apply for a waiver.

Executive Director Winnacker was asked to clarify whether the San Diego division can approve its own

open access policy. There is a precedent with UCSF having its own policy, and the systemwide policy was not meant to prevent divisions from developing their own policy, provided that is at least as broad as the systemwide policy. The UCSD policy could not be opt-in versus opt-out, but the policy could give faculty options for the type of license they select. A division might adopt a policy as a subset of the presidential policy. Director Mitchell made the important point that different policies would lead to implementation problems.

III.   Data Sharing Plans
  • *Trisha Cruse, Director, Digital Preservation, California Digital Library*

The UC Curation Center is a program in the California Digital Library. The Center focuses on providing tools and services that support data intensive research whether it is in the Humanities or Social Sciences. Without documentation and data management plans, the reproducibility of research becomes very difficult. Data management plans allow researchers to share data with other. Proposals submitted to NSF must include a data management plan, and almost all of the other funding agencies have implemented data management requirements. The National Institutes of Health was the first agency that required data management plans but many others require them now as do some foundations. The White House's Executive Order of May 2013 required federal agencies to have plans to make research publicly available. The issue of costs is a confusing one as it is often unclear who will cover the costs of data preservation. The mandate also spells out a role for the public sector in preserving data. The Nature Publishing Group requires authors to share data and Science states that the data must be available to any reader. Director Cruse cautioned against enabling the large commercial publishers to place the research data in private sector repositories from which UC has to buy back the data. Researchers hear about the data management plan requirements and they are not sure what to do.

UC3, in cooperation with the UC libraries, considered how best to help researchers meet the data sharing requirements and created a number of tools. Tools include the data management planning tool that CDL developed with several other institutions which walks people through the process of developing a plan. This tool links to institutional resources. Over six thousand researchers at eight hundred institutions are using the data management planning tool. CDL has received a Sloan Foundation grant to develop the next generation of the tool. DATAup is an open source tool used to share and publish data. CDL has worked with Microsoft to create this tool and new NSF funding has been received for a new project. EZID allows researchers to have a persistent identifier that links to the various places where a researcher's data can be found. Merritt is a repository for preservation and access to digital content and the Web Archiving Service allows people to collect web content.

Discussion: A member asked how the data sharing requirements align with institutional review board requirements that data is never made public. The services available apply to faculty in the Humanities as well. Director Cruse indicated that data can really be anything. Increasingly the data underpinning a journal article is becoming an important asset. The Humanities and Fine Arts are a complex part of the issue of data sharing. The issue is not only about money but rather how to perceive things that are not in the scientific model, and there are other fields that have these problems. Director Cruse commented that the CDL considers the needs of Humanities faculty when planning its services.

IV.   Journal Negotiations
  • *Ivy Anderson, Director of Collections, California Digital Library*

The libraries spent $37 M on systemwide content licenses in 2012-13 ($30M from the campuses and $7M from CDL). Current expenditure breakdown: journals are 71%, databases are 18%, 3% are one time purchases, 7% are ebooks (a growing part of the portfolio) and scholarly communication support is 0.4%. One time purchases are often of historical resources that have high price tags. UC is at the end of a five

year contract with Elsevier and Director Anderson reviewed details of the contract with the committee. CDL is in the process of negotiating a new contract with Elsevier. The CDL's Elsevier costs went up by over 12% between 2009 and 2013; the Libraries' collection budgets declined by 8% during that same period, while Elsevier's cumulative operating profit increased by 51%. The CDL estimates that UC faculty are authors on about 2.5% of the articles published by Elsevier and there is also a contribution from peer review and editorial service. Director Anderson did not share the specifics of the negotiations because things are in flux. The CDL is trying to change the balance by requesting some level of compliance with UC's open access policy.

Director Anderson reported the CDL's license with Taylor & Francis ended at the end of last year and reviewed the analysis used to determine the value of their journals. This is the same information reviewed for all publishers. The CDL is very aware of the fact that there are concerns at the campuses about a number of journals not licensed systemwide because of the dispute with Nature Publishing Group. Director Anderson briefly described the attempt to experiment with a transformative model with NPG that did not move forward. NPG is exploring open access with some of its journals but is not looking at anything like the model discussed with UC. Director Anderson reported that NPG has realized that it cannot increase UC's rates as significantly as it proposed in the past. NPG is currently relying on green open access rather than gold for most of its Nature-branded journals. Discussions have shifted to compliance with the UC policy (currently NPG requires policy waivers), and there is some positive movement on that front.

Discussion: The committee discussed the ability to calculate how much time faculty spend on peer review. The CDL may attempt to collect data on this. The impact of open access on the publishers' profits is not clear yet. Journals as publishing outlets are not struggling because their subscription base has not declined. However, some of the small scholarly societies are not doing well. A member shared the idea that UC and other universities could buy up the stock of a publisher such as Elsevier. Another idea is to have all UC editors leave journals, which would be very disruptive. The University would have to invest in the CDL in order for it to move into publishing on a truly large scale. The committee discussed possible strategies to make journal pricing sustainable to UC. Chair Manduchi mentioned that NPG is concerned about commercial use as well as the risk to their embargo.

V.   Open Access Policy Review

In 2007, UCOLASC attempted to pass an open access policy but the effort was not successful at that time. Since then, a number of universities have approved their own open access policies, which tend to be similar to one another. The new policy proposed by UCOLASC still receives criticism but the main concerns were addressed. Chair Manduchi invited committee members to share their questions about the policy before the update on implementation. Gold open access allows individuals to download articles. Open access was founded on three pillars: publications should be freely available, they should be deposited in a repository, and they should be reusable. UC's policy is very similar to what is used by other universities. UC's policy does not provide a mechanism for faculty to automatically impose an embargo, which is something that publishers would like.

Discussion: There is a question about whether the waiver requirement applies to faculty at the pilot campuses or to faculty at all campuses. Publishers hearing about this policy may request waivers from faculty at those other campuses, so this question does need to be clarified. There was a discussion about giving faculty a choice of license, and Director Mitchell indicated that CDL can let faculty see all of their choices. The policy currently does not require embargoes, and there is no automatic and legal way to impose an embargo on articles.

VI.   Open Access Policy Implementation
- *Catherine Mitchell, Director, Publishing, California Digital Library*

Director Mitchell provided a brief overview of eScholarship for the benefit of new committee members. eScholarship will be where faculty work will be deposited after it has been published and where research will be harvested into, and all UC faculty work will be represented here regardless of where it was originally published. eScholarship publishes sixty-two journals in gold open access, using the Open Journal System, which include both online only and in print. A waiver request must be made for each individual article. The Senate will report on the policy and UCOLASC will be monitoring implementation in the meanwhile. CDL has asked for feedback on the deposit workflow with the goal of reducing the burden on faculty. The publication harvesting tool is the next phase of implementation. Currently, the CDL is using a manual tool which will not be effective in the longer term. The new tool will enable the CDL to harvest the data.

On November 1st the deposit will be implemented for UCSF, UCI and UCLA. In May 2014 there will be a six month review of the implementation and, at a later date, the Senate will review the harvesting tool. Over three hundred letters were sent out to publishers notifying them about the policy. As CDL receives more responses from publishers about the policy, it will compile a list of "friendly" publishers. Director Mitchell indicated that the CDL has not heard back from the majority of publishers, which may be a positive sign that the policy is not problematic for them. Director Mitchell demonstrated the deposit process. During the deposit process, faculties have the option to add more information about the work, which will allow it to become more discoverable. Director Mitchell provided an overview of all the resources available on the Open Access website.

Discussion: There is a list of frequently asked questions for publishers but it is not clear that publishers have reviewed the document. The harvesting tool will probably go back only to a specific date. Director Mitchell requested feedback from the committee about an embargo date that faculty can indicate when depositing the work. This is a tricky matter because the date of publication is not necessarily known to the author. When the harvesting system is fully implemented, eScholarship will have the date of publication as a result of harvesting the metadata. Committee members seemed to reach agreement that a 12 month embargo is preferred. eScholarship should check with the publishers when the end of the embargo is approaching instead of contacting the authors.

A member asked if it would be possible for a deposit into eScholarship to meet the NIH requirement for making work publicly accessible, since the eScholarship deposit is much easier for UC faculty. It should be clarified that conference proceedings may be deposited into eScholarship, but it is not clear what the publication date for conference proceedings will be. Members recommended that more information about the types of licenses should be in the system and that there should be a default. There is a need to broadly advertise the eScholarship and Open Access websites to faculty. Senate faculty can be reached through the Senate Source and Chair Manduchi recommended sharing information about the sites with graduate students. Director Mitchell reported that if a faculty member forgets to notify a publisher about UC's open access policy and is out of compliance with the publisher's requirements, the CDL will remove the work from eScholarship.

More education about the difference between a waiver and an embargo is needed. At UCSF, 4-5% of authors have requested a waiver. Faculties need to be informed about how they will benefit from depositing their work. The metadata generates an automated email message that notifies faculty that work has been filed. Members were reminded that the option to opt out is available for faculty in the Humanities who have used works that are under copyright. A member recommended tracking the number of waiver requests. Deposit data will be collected by discipline and by source (e.g. manual or harvested deposits). Faculty may not want to wait for the harvesting tool because the tool will not be available until the end of the academic year and because there could be a six month lag before eScholarship harvests the

data. There will be data on usage that shows hits and downloads, including both totals and monthly averages. A member suggested that links to all profiles for a faculty member would be an incentive for faculty to use eScholarship. Members suggested that there should be more specific options for the discipline selected. Director Mitchell indicated that it will be important to track how the faculty in the Humanities use or do not use eScholarship. It should be made clear that certain disciplines will be reflected in the eScholarship data and others will not.

VII.   Campus Reports and Member Items

UCR: Against the objections of both committees from last year, the Executive Council of the Riverside Division recently approved a bylaw amendment, merging the Committee on Library & Scholarly Communication with the Committee on Academic Computing and Information Technology. The committee's new name will be decided at our first meeting. The representative has agreed to serve as vice-chair of this committee for 2013-14 (the vice chair serves as the UCOLASC representative).

Members were asked to email any campus reports to the committee listserv following the meeting.

VIII.   New Business

There was no New Business.

IX.   Executive Session

There was no Executive Session.

Meeting adjourned at: 4 PM
Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams
Attest: Roberto Manduchi