

**Attending:** Francis Steen, Vice Chair, (UCLA), Ruth Mostern (UCM), Edward Dimendberg (Irvine), Eric Bakovic (UCSD), Patricia McDaniel (UCSF), Joseph Morse (UCR), Candace Waid (UCSB), Jennifer Horne (UCSC), Nick Robinson (LAUC President, UCB), Virginia Steel (University Librarian), Thomas Shannon (UCB), Maxine Craig (UCD), Laine Farley (Executive Director, CDL), Catherine Mitchell (Director, Publishing, CDL), Bill Jacob (Chair, Academic Senate), Martha Winnacker (Executive Director, Academic Senate), Brenda Abrams (Principal Policy Analyst)

### **I. Chair's Announcements**

Vice Chair Steen will chair the meeting while UCOLASC chair is on sabbatical.

### **II. Consent Calendar**

**Action:** The minutes were approved.

### **III. Consultation with the Office of the President**

- *DoQuyen Tran-Taylor, Program Manager, UC Online Education, UCOP*

Vice Chair Steen asked for a representative from UCOE to join the meeting to discuss the role of libraries with online education UC. Program Manager Tran Taylor shared a list of the online courses that have been funded through the Innovative Technology Learning Initiative. ILTI was established to coordinate Governor Brown's \$10M carve out from UC's budget for online education. The courses span all of the campuses except for UCSF because the focus is on undergraduate courses and a number of campuses will work together to create a course. An online course at one campus is available through cross-campus enrollment to students at any UC campus. One goal of ILTI is to facilitate the process that allows students to enroll in courses at another UC campus. ILTI is working on getting the courses articulated across campuses. Currently forty students have used cross campus enrollment.

UCOE has been in conversation with Director Farley at the CDL and through her, with the University Librarians. One issue is access of library materials for UC students at another campus. If students are authenticated and allowed access to the libraries, there are questions about ways to restrict access. According to the Office of General Counsel, for the purpose of online courses, a student taking an online course at a different campus should be considered to be enrolled at that campus and therefore legally has access to the materials. The other issue discussed is the access to library materials by non-matriculated students. UCOE is encouraging faculty to use open access materials as much as possible until another solution is identified and UCOE connects the faculty with individuals who can assist with finding these materials.

**Discussion:** A member asked about intellectual property rights. Senate Chair Jacob indicated that because UCOP is providing funding, the question of who owns the courses is more complex. The intellectual property rights question has been left to the campuses. Faculty who work with Coursera, for example, sign away most of their rights. The governor wants UC to reach out to UC students as well as community college students. OGC has also indicated that non-matriculated students are considered to be enrolled in the campus offering the online course and should therefore have access to library materials. A member asked about mechanisms to measure the library resources and UCOE will look to the University Librarians for assistance with this. Chair Jacob commented that there are many hidden costs that are not being accounted for and committee members are encouraged to report when missing resources at the libraries are identified.

#### **IV. Consultation with the Academic Senate Office**

- *Bill Jacob, Chair, Academic Senate*
- *Martha Winnacker, Executive Director, Academic Senate*

Chair Jacob provided more information to the committee about online education. Provost Dorr intends to appoint a joint Senate-administrative group to consider the future of UCOE and ILTI, including how to unite them. The Regents, the legislature and the governor believe that online education is very important. The governor's \$10M carve out of UC's budget for online education will continue next year. Chair Jacob hopes that the group to be convened by the provost will devise an evaluation plan that includes looking at the financial issues. The Senate had a Blue Ribbon Panel that looked at the evaluation report from the UC Evaluation Center at UCSB and the 1000 page report provided no financial information. The report included student self-report on satisfaction which was difficult to interpret, but there may be some useful information for course designers. There is a proposal to create a communications hub to facilitate online registration and the learning management systems may be linked to it. The interim director of UCOE has indicated that the hub will cost an estimated \$5M to build. The Senate may see a proposal about the hub in the next month.

The Regents were provided with updates on the federal and state budgets at their last meeting. The 2013 U.S. budget sequestration cut UC research grant awards by about 12% in research grants and this will not be recovered. The NIH money is up a billion dollars from last year but it is still a billion below what it was a year before. The governor did as promised in his budget. The budget projections suggest UC may get a 5% increase for 2014-2015 which is technically only a 2% increase in core funds because only 40% of UC's core funds come from the state with the rest coming from student fees or indirect costs on grants. Indirect costs are down and the governor has insisted that there be no increase in tuition, so the only increase is in the state contribution. UC's mandatory costs are about 3%. The UCRP contribution on July 1 will tax UC employee paychecks at 8%, up from 6.5%. The president has just committed to a 3% raise on July 1<sup>st</sup> for unrepresented staff but there are currently no discussions about increases for faculty. The libraries will probably only see increases for mandatory costs. CSU received additional funding from the state for enrollment growth while UC did not.

At the last Regents meeting, Provost Dorr gave a presentation on ILTI. The Regents continue to believe that online education will save UC significant amounts of money. The president presented along with the chancellors of the CSU system and the community college system. The chancellor of the community college system discussed reaching out to seventh and eighth grade students to explain how they need to prepare for higher education. The joint appearances in front of the legislature and the Regents demonstrate that the systems are working together for the improvement of higher education.

In May, there will be a presentation to the Regents about the transfer initiative. The Senate is involved with implementation of UC Path and composite benefit rates. UC Path will be a centralized payroll system. Instead of charging employees the actual amount that has to be paid, an average for a group of employees is used for the composite benefit rates.

**Discussion:** Members commented that it is unclear why the hub needs to be linked to the learning management systems at the campuses. There was a discussion about why the Regents are so focused on online education. It was suggested that faculty in the digital humanities fields may be able to debunk the "romance of the machine" with the Regents.

#### **V. Update on the UC Open Access Policy Implementation**

- *Catherine Mitchell, Director, Publishing, CDL*

UCOLASC and the University Librarians worked together to develop an open access policy for UC and Director Mitchell will provide an update on the implementation. Phase II will include a harvesting system that will make the process less onerous for faculty. The policy applies to all UC campuses but implementation is currently at UCI, UCLA and UCSF. The data reflects low participation rates for deposits suggesting that more education will have to be provided to faculty. It has not been confirmed but the pattern suggests that a small number of faculty

have requested waivers on their own without being required by the publishers. UCSF faculty have requested approximately 400 waivers since the campus policy was implemented in spring 2012. Strategies to increase participation include outreach especially at campuses not in this implementation phase, and local FAQs are being developed at campuses. CDL is working with UCSF to create a decision tree that will help faculty understand the process. It would be helpful for faculty to learn about success stories about access and visibility so the incentives are understood. Faculty testimonials can be very helpful. Director Mitchell believes the harvesting tool will increase participation and a contract with a vendor, Symplectic, will be signed soon. CDL's partners at the campuses will be central to making sure the tool works at the campuses. This system could ultimately function as a publication information hub and feed into and harvest from a multitude of sources with information about what faculty are producing.

Director Mitchell outlined several questions about the review of the policy implementation including who is reviewing implementation, what will be reviewed and against what set of criteria, and the time frame for the review. This review may be used as the basis for the provost's decision to provide funding for implementation at the remaining seven campuses.

**Discussion:** It was noted that faculty may be confusing the waiver with the embargo, and Director Mitchell agreed that more education is required. UC will be licensing the harvesting system but it will be hosted locally, and the harvester will be linked to the campus payroll systems and with eScholarship. UC will be the second U.S. institution using the Symplectic's system but the company is well established in the U.K and Australia. The harvester can search for publications that pre-date the policy. Some disciplines will be represented better than others and CDL will maintain a manual deposit process alongside the harvester in order to support those faculty whose publications may not be picked up. The CDL will also look for other data sources and will work with the librarians to determine where faculty publications are missing. The CDL can also track which disciplines are represented to better understand what is missing and disciplines that are opting out.

Director Mitchell would like to limit the harvester to the date of adoption of the policy for the time being and at a later time consider harvesting older publications since faculty will want their entire corpus in the repository. An issue with harvesting the older publications is that faculty will have to determine whether an article is covered by the policy or not. The UCI Office of Research was reportedly notified by NIH that supplemental funding for a contract was suspended for failure to comply with the NIH open access mandate. If agencies like NIH are watching this closely, it will help encourage UC faculty to submit papers to eScholarship or some other repository. CDL is focusing on articles but Director Mitchell indicated that things like conference proceedings are considered to be the equivalent. The CDL has the capacity to host the datasets underlying a published article although this is not part of the open access policy. As open data mandates become more popular, the issue of data storage at CDL will become more pertinent. It is not clear if the review will focus on questions such as the rate of participation, the efficiency of the system, changes in publishers' behaviors, or evidence that the harvester is an improvement over the manual process. A three-year review will look at issues such as the faculty response to the process. Vice Chair Steen asked UCOLASC members to work with the campus committees to identify what should be included in the review. Director Mitchell agreed to draft a proposal outlining what could be reviewed.

## **VI. UC Open Access Presidential Policy Task Force**

- *Laine Farley, Executive Director, CDL*

The Senate recommended to the administration that the open access policy should become presidential policy and a task force chaired by UCOLASC's Immediate Past Chair, Chris Kelty, is now working on this. The Presidential policy would apply to non-faculty authors and the task force is discussing how the policy will apply to people who do and do not own their copyrights. The Presidential policy will be as bare as possible and refer readers to the policy the Senate passed. There is language that helps authors understand which category they are in. If the author owns the copyright, he or she can request a waiver, but the author has to involve UC if UC owns the copyright. When a draft is approved by the Provost, it will be submitted to the Academic Planning Council. The goal is to release the policy for a ninety day systemwide review in March.

**Discussion:** It is at present not known whether UCOP will provide more funding to the campuses if this becomes a Presidential policy. Currently the provost is funding the harvester with other costs being absorbed by the CDL and the libraries. From the CDL's perspective, the technical infrastructure will be no different, but it will simply be used by more people as a result of the policy being expanded. Director Farley reported that CDL's request for funding for more library staff was not approved because the chancellors would prefer that funding from UCOP not be earmarked and the pilot phase will be used to determine the impact on campus library resources.

**Discussion:** The new Presidential policy will not override the Senate policy. The goal is to link the policies so that if there are any changes in the future to either policy, the dependencies between the two will be very clear. The Presidential policy will reference the Senate policy. The reason to make this a Presidential policy is to expand the policy to the many non-Senate authors such as people in ANR, post-docs, graduate students, etc.

## **VII. ARL/AAU/APLU Shared Access Research Ecosystem**

- *MacKenzie Smith, University Librarian, UCD*

SHARE is an initiative of the Association of Research Libraries, the Association of American Universities, and the Association of Public and Land-grant Universities to address the Office of Science and Technology Policy's mandate to federal agencies to make all research open access. The agencies have now submitted plans detailing how this will be implemented. SHARE, specifically designed to meet the needs of higher education, is meant to link together all existing open access content already deposited (as a result of open access policies like the Senate's) and make them available in a federated manner. The proposal would create infrastructure at several layers. A discovery layer will help find open access already deposited and the articles will be below this. A preservation strategy will be in place to ensure that the articles will be available regardless of what the publishers do in the future. Ways to leverage this material will be explored.

The first step of SHARE is development of a national notification system so that repositories like eScholarship will know that an article has been published, and Symplectic may be the mechanism used. Grant funding is being sought to build this system. This initiative is being discussed at the chancellor level and a very long-term game plan is being considered. Agencies will begin requiring that authors submit publications related to research that they funded to them. Some federal agencies have partnered with publishers on CHORUS with the addition of a registry that tells publishers when articles were published. Others agencies are building their own infrastructure or are partnering with PubMed. It is important for UC faculty to be aware of SHARE because it will provide a faculty friendly approach that will meet the long-term needs of higher education as opposed to other strategies or to what the publishers have proposed.

**Discussion:** Agencies that did not fall under the White House OSTP mandate, including agencies that fund humanities research like NEH, are voluntarily participating in SHARE. The funding agencies in Washington see their efforts as a way to demonstrate to Congress the impact of their research funding. It has been reported that each director within NSF may devise program specific strategies. To date, books are not covered by mandates like OSTP's and funding agencies will have to figure out how to interpret the mandates for their disciplines. There is a concern about CHORUS because publishers are not known to have positive track records of saving back files or historic records, and there is fear of a world in which publishers are the custodians of the cultural record. The committee members were reminded that FASTR, a federal bill in Congress, would have an even broader impact than the OSTP mandate. It is important that UC faculty are aware that compliance with UC's open access policy will allow them to comply with the federal mandate.

## **VIII. Mellon Grant**

- *MacKenzie Smith, University Librarian, UCD*
- *Laine Farley, Executive Director, CDL*

University Librarian Smith is working with the CDL on this new initiative because there are new concerns about the so-called Gold Open Access article publication charge (APC) business model. With this model, authors

would pay publication fees in order to publish with immediate open access. Commercial publishers are beginning to see the viability of this model, and they are setting the price point for articles at \$5K and above. This may vary across disciplines and publishers, but publishers have the ability to protect their current revenue by charging what they want for the APC. Publishers are assuming that this money will come from grant awards as a result of faculty including the cost of publishing in their proposals. According to University Librarian Smith, the libraries believe they will ultimately pay for these fees somehow, either through the library budgets or by UCOP because some faculty simply do not have the funding. This is an emerging model that many publishers are beginning to use in light of open access.

The CDL conducted cost modeling to look at the potential impact of this model on UC's budget and there would be significant costs to UC because of how much research is published by UC authors. University Librarian Smith and the CDL are working on a proposal for a planning grant to study this issue. The study will look at current expenditures, by campus and collectively, on print and electronic journals by discipline and examine what the publication fees are by those same disciplines. The goal is to prove that this model will not be sustainable for institutions that will be asked to support it. According to University Librarian Smith, it will disproportionately harm institutions like UC, Harvard and other large research universities. Another goal is to adjust various factors the APC model in the hopes of identifying something sustainable. In disciplines where it makes sense, the costs will be covered by grants. Other factors include co-authorships where the costs could be spread out. The project will include an examination of faculty attitudes towards open access. It is hoped that the campus library committees could bring together individuals with disparate views about open access so data can be collected.

**Discussion:** Currently in the sciences, it is usually the individual principal investigator that pays the APC fees from the grant or another source of funding, whereas in the humanities there is typically no funding available to use. A member stated that it is incumbent upon all faculty to proactively adopt alternative models because the current model is not working, but actually getting worse. Since most faculty are still wedded to the traditional publishers like Nature, better ideas must be explored. Vice Chair Steen agreed that the campus library committees should help with collecting the data about faculty attitudes towards open access.

## **IX. Elsevier Negotiation Outcomes**

- *Laine Farley, Executive Director, CDL*

Director Farley reported that the negotiations with Elsevier have been completed and there is an agreement for 2014 to 2018. Elsevier has reduced the cost of SCOPUS for a one year trial during which each campus will again evaluate it and SCOPUS will be a source for the harvesting tool. The contract includes a one time purchase of eBooks. The CDL discussed possible ways that Elsevier can support UC's open access policy and they will continue to examine ways this can be done. According to Director Farley, before the holidays some institutions received take down notices about postings of articles primarily on faculty websites considered to be unauthorized. Some institutions received multiple requests while others received none.

**Discussion:** Student feedback given to one committee member about eBooks has been fairly negative. The committee discussed the usage of eBooks and Director Farley reported that the CDL has not purchased many eBooks at the systemwide level. One issue with eBooks is that a user can be locked into a proprietary platform and the CDL continues to evaluate which platforms are successful. In some cases, there are limits to the amount of eBook content that can be downloaded. One health sciences campus licenses medical eTextbooks as part of the class assignment to be read by all the students in a class, suggesting there are different eBook licensing models. Whether something can be downloaded to a server is a question of fair use and the CDL is trying to get reserve rights, which are negotiated with each individual publisher. At next year's meeting, UCOLASC and the University Librarians should discuss the status of eBooks at UC which might include what UC has, what the issues are and so on. The CDL website provides guidance to faculty about which version of their work should be uploaded and the same descriptive language will be used with the harvester. The harvester will be in compliance with the publishers' requirements about which version is uploaded.

## X. ORCID

- *Laine Farley, Executive Director, CDL*

Director Farley provided an overview of the Open Researcher and Contributor ID system. ORCID is a unique identifier assigned to an author that helps disambiguate that name from everyone else's so that author's publications can be "identified" or linked to that author. The ORCID can be linked to other identifiers authors may encounter. It was noted that this is a non-profit, open initiative and that this service is free of charge. ORCID can be used to create and control faculty profiles and will reduce the amount of time spent by faculty entering the same information repeatedly. Agencies are using ORCID to track authors and grants and publishers are beginning to use ORCIDs. Institutional memberships allow an institution to do things in a bulk fashion but UC is still working on an individual level.

**Discussion:** The vision of ORCID is that every publisher would require it as part of the submission process and the IDs would be embedded in the articles, thereby reducing the need for tools like Symplectic's. The basic problem ORCID is attempting to resolve is the name ambiguity issue and for UC's open access policy to succeed ORCID is needed. There are many situations where it is difficult to track names reliably such as when a woman marries and changes her name. Faculty are not required to put their publications into ORCID but every UC faculty member could be given an ID which would require the Senate's permission. An ORCID account travels with an author wherever he or she may go. UCLA is considering using ORCID as a campus wide initiative and it would be part of a faculty profile system that is used in Academic Personnel. The UCLA Office of Research is also interested in this as a way to monitor compliance with the OSTP mandate.

## XI. Future of the Northern Regional Library Facility Site

The University Librarians have assessed the capacity at the two regional library facilities in UCB's Richmond campus and at UCLA and both facilities are expected to fill up sometime around 2017. At UCLA there has been discussion for the past 8-10 years about a third phase expansion of the Southern RLF. The facilities were built in phases with funding from UCOP but at some point the budgets were transferred to UCLA and UCB. Currently there is no clear path for funding a building that is serving a systemwide rather than campus need for this work. University Librarian Leonard reported that there is an opportunity to expand the NRLF site cheaply but there is currently no budget for work. The University Librarians recently learned that the University of Missouri ARL library was denied funding to operate its own storage facility and outsourced its storage needs to a third party. Now over 1 million of their books have mold on them, a situation that will be very difficult to remediate. There is no state funding for capital projects and UCLA has not prioritized funding to expand the southern facility.

**Discussion:** The UCB representative visited the northern facility and noted that this issue will become critical in the next four years. The Council of University Librarians has monitored this situation for the past several years and is working on a plan for additional phases of the two RLFs. The Council has also looked at storage facilities at other institutions, such as the CSU system, to determine if they have space. Another possibility would be creating another facility in the Central Valley, although there would be additional costs for the infrastructure that needs to be developed. There is added complexity because of the digitization that has been done with Google Books. Originally UCOP covered the costs of the facilities but UCB and UCLA assumed the costs at some point, although the librarians consider the expense to be shared costs. The capital funding process on each campus is complex and the storage facilities are not a priority and a concerted campaign would be needed to get this on the list of projects.

## XII. Campus Reports and Member Items

San Diego: There is a campaign to inform each department about the open access policy and so far the response has been positive. The chair of the library committee emailed each department chair and a library liaison along with a member of the department are holding the meetings.

Santa Barbara: The library committee has discussed getting ahead of the curve before the open access policy is implemented at that campus and the librarians had already been arranging for visits at departments.

Santa Cruz: The committee has worked with the library to form a message about library values. The committee hopes to focus more on data management by exploring the degree to which the library can be helpful with preservation. The UC Curation Center, UC3, has a variety of tools and there will be a forum on campus to introduce faculty to these tools. Faculty are also interested in the question of who owns what and a forum about this will also be held.

Irvine: The library that hosts the humanities and social sciences collection is bursting at the seams and discussions about expansion are underway. The campus is considering whether there should be a bond.

Berkeley: A commission on the library recommended that there should be major support for the libraries. As a result of attrition and other reasons, there were twenty open positions. The commission asked for a \$13M commitment from the campus to support the libraries. A section of the undergraduate library will be converted from book space into study space. There have been discussions about consolidating and streamlining of some of the specialty libraries. The administration responded at the end of January but only committed \$8M a year, only \$3M of which is guaranteed and the libraries are expected to use discretionary funds for their support as well. There have also been discussions about the extent to which faculty should be making contributions through indirect cost recovery. The library committee is most concerned about the proposed requirement that faculty contribute to the maintenance of the library. The follow up to the commission report is the main focus of the library committee's work this year. The representative reported that the commission report is focused on print materials so a plan is needed for dealing with other types of media.

Merced: There was joint administration-faculty committee that met last year to discuss the libraries including future expansion and funding. This group wrote a report about the issues identified and will make a case for expanding the budget of the library and integrating the libraries into the strategic planning for the campus. There was not a library committee so the library had no advocate in budget discussions, and there has not been a clear line of communication between the faculty and the library. Vice Chair Steen suggested that UCM should propose hosting a Central Valley regional storage facility.

Riverside: The library and computer committees have been merged at the campus and there is confusion about why this was done. This merger has diluted the focus of the library committee. In a year or two the campus may look at how this is working.

Los Angeles: The library committee is concerned about study space for undergraduates.

Santa Barbara: The library committee is also looking at study space.

### **XIII. New Business**

The UC Press sells rather than gives materials to the UC libraries whereas other university presses give the work to the libraries. A member would like the CDL representatives to gather information about how much funding is spent on the UC Press materials. The member would to have this information submitted to the Academic Council with a request that the UC Press stops this practice. The UC Press benefits from the contributions of the UC faculty.

**Discussion:** A University Librarian reported attending a UC Press board meeting and indicated that the Press is struggling to remain profitable. It would not send a good message if UCOLASC asks that the UC Press give away materials for free and Press books constitute a very small portion of library expenditures.

### **XIV. Executive Session**

Executive Session was not held.

Meeting adjourned at: 3:25 p.m.

Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams

Attest: Francis Steen