

2. [Proposed Amendment to Senate Bylaw 140 – University Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity](#)

Action: UCOLASC approved the consent calendar.

III. General Updates from UCOP – *Catherine Candee, Executive Director, Strategic Publishing & Broadcast Initiatives; Gary Lawrence, Director, Systemwide Library Planning; and Laine Farley, Interim Director, California Digital Library*

Laine Farley reported that the University recently completed its final interviews for the position of *University Librarian for Systemwide Library Planning and Executive Director of the CDL*. She thanked Ben Crow, Robert Heyer-Gray, and other members of the search committee for their efforts, and said a final decision will be made soon.

Gary Lawrence reported that the Office of Scholarly Communications (OSC) is watching two court cases very closely. The first involves a lawsuit filed by three publishers against Georgia State University, which alleges that GSU is violating copyright law by providing course material to students through the library's electronic reserve service without seeking permission or paying appropriate licensing fees. He said UC operates in full compliance with copyright law and the fair use doctrine. The second case involves an alleged copyright infringement at San Diego State University. It challenges the concept that individuals working for a public university are protected by sovereign immunity, because a federal district court determined that although the violation was protected under sovereign immunity, the individual could still be sued as a private citizen.

UCOP is forming a joint Task Force, combining the Systemwide Library and Scholarly Information Advisory Committee (**SLASIAAC**) and IT Leadership Council, to examine the academic characteristics of the UC "cyber-infrastructure" and advise the ITLC about how that infrastructure should be developed to best support the role of faculty and students as creators, managers, and users of information.

IV. Consultation with UCOP – Editorial Board for OSC Website – *Gary Lawrence*

Issue: Director Lawrence said the OSC is proposing the establishment of a small editorial board to oversee the future development and maintenance of the [Reshaping Scholarly Communications Website](#). The board will consist of two Scholarly Communications Officers (SCOs) – Margaret Philips (UCB) and Brad Eden (UCSB) – and two UCOLASC representatives, and with staff support from UCOP. Meetings will be infrequent and usually held over the phone. A SCO subcommittee is drafting content for a new page that will host information about the NIH open access policy and faculty compliance. Another subcommittee is working to identify more faculty scholarly communication "champions" for the rotating display of photographs on the home page of the web site.

Discussion: UCOLASC members noted that the OSC website is accessible and well-organized. The site could help encourage and enable faculty-to-faculty communication about library and scholarly communications issues, and as a central repository of information about the NIH policy, could help campus librarians coordinate messages. There was also a question about the amount of traffic to the website in relation to a concern about the cost-benefit of maintaining a potentially redundant systemwide site.

Action: Claudia Rapp (UCLA) and Phillip Walker (UCSC) volunteered to serve on the board. The OSC will forward a URL with statistics about website traffic.

V. Consultation with UCOP – Review of Data on Library Budgets

Issue: After the December meeting, UCOLASC requested data about funding for UC libraries and scholarly communication infrastructure as it relates to faculty FTE. Members believed these details would help UCOLASC make more reasoned recommendations about library and scholarly communication issues and would help individual faculty evaluate specific publishing options on a cost/benefit basis. UCOP responded with data calculating the ratios of total library expenditures as well as materials and binding-only expenditures per faculty FTE by campus and in total for both tenure-track faculty and all faculty. UCOP was unable to gather data on “scholarly communication infrastructure” expenditures, and the data excluded funding for CDL (\$16 million) and investments in libraries as part of capital projects. The data indicate that UCB allocates the most money per FTE on library expenditures, while UCSF spends the least.

Discussion: Director Lawrence noted that library funding differs across campuses because the individual chancellors control funding allocations. UCOLASC speculated that UCSF has low spending ratios because its collection is less diverse than other campuses and because UCSF has been able to take greater advantage of shared collections. In turn, several factors may affect Berkeley’s high ratio, such as higher bindery costs for the larger number of historical documents produced there [Berkeley provides a binding service to all campuses]. There was a concern that the data could lead to a perception of over funding on some campuses, although it could help other campuses advocate for more funding.

Director Lawrence added that libraries derive funding from three sources: pooled funding from the state for enrollment increases based on the marginal cost of instruction per student; pooled funding from the state for non-salary price increases of library collections; and systemwide salary adjustments benefiting librarians. UCOP sends the pooled funds without specific library earmarks to the chancellors, who allocate them accordingly.

VI. Campus Reports

Santa Barbara: The Library Committee designed an online survey to elicit faculty views about the UCSB library. The committee plans to use the [final report](#) as a basis for future budget recommendations. An engineering issue is complicating longtime plans to build an addition to the UCSB library. The addition must now be separate from the existing library, so a new free-standing building is being planned. Finally, UCSB has a new University Librarian, and a group of Humanities and Arts faculty is concerned that there are not enough printed books and monographs in the library’s collection.

Santa Cruz: UCSC is the first UC campus to send its collection to the Google Books Library Project for scanning. The library just opened a new extension for the Humanities, Social Sciences and Arts collections, and the campus has a new Associate University Librarian, who deals specifically with electronic and other emerging issues. The Library Committee is concerned about a lack of communication between information technology services and faculty in the reorganization of IT on campus, and the Committee is waiting for a new open access policy to emerge before it plans any workshops or forums on the subject.

Irvine: The Library Committee is discussing the Harvard Open Access resolution and considering strategies for informing faculty about the resolution and generating excitement about open access issues. The Irvine library has a new [website](#) devoted to information about the NIH open access policy. UCI is one of two assessment sites, along with Berkeley, for the next generation Melvyl pilot project, which will be released on April 28.

Los Angeles: UCLA’s main research library is about to undergo a major renovation despite only partial funding for the project. Faculty have voiced concerns that space formerly dedicated to print materials is being replaced with meeting rooms and a cafe. The Library Committee wrote to

the new chancellor encouraging him to allocate more money to the library. For the first time, the library is part of a UCLA capital campaign, so it will be possible for development officers to approach high-level donors on behalf of the library. The Committee supports the Office of Instructional Development's new lecture pod-casting initiative, as long as the lectures are available to students only on a password protected website. Finally, the Committee was invited to provide input into a five-year review of the University Librarian.

Riverside. The University has completed its long-term library planning process. A new School of Medicine has been approved and will be housed apart from the main campus with a separate library. The Library Committee recommended that everyone on campus have access to that library, which it said should be a separate budget line item. The Committee is submitting an article on the open access issue to the campus newsletter, and food and drink are now permitted in the library.

San Francisco. The Library Committee is writing an article about open access for the campus newsletter with the support and buy-in of some prominent faculty. The Committee is also discussing plans to re-purpose campus library space for classrooms, conferencing, and "library-related" activities. UCSF has its own NIH open access policy compliance [website](#).

Davis. The library is facing a 7% cut as a result of the budget crisis, but the Library Committee is urging the provost to spare at least the collections budget, and a special task force has been created to discuss the issue. The Committee is discussing the Harvard open access resolution and the [SCOAP³](#) high energy physics project, and it recently heard a presentation about [WorldCat](#).

San Diego. After a slow start, the Library Committee has now met twice. Google is digitizing the entire [Pacific Rim Library](#), and the Mellon Foundation provided a grant to the Libraries to digitize the slide collection. The Committee is continuing its sponsorship of a Scholarly Communication Luncheon Series, which has been very successful. UCSD also has a NIH compliance [website](#).

Berkeley. University Librarian's Convenor Tom Leonard reported for Berkeley. He noted that the new East Asian Library opened in March, and the Bancroft Library opens a new Special Collection in October. There continue to be lively discussions on campus about space allocation proposals and their potential impact on libraries. Berkeley is very interested in news that the Mellon Foundation is providing \$4.27 million to CLIR for grants to [catalog hidden collections](#), and the library is contemplating its own mission and role in a [New Directions Initiative](#). Finally, the [Berkeley Research Impact Initiative](#) provides subventions to faculty who want to publish in open access journals; and humanists from Berkeley and the University of Chicago are collaborating on a cross-disciplinary planning effort called [Project Bamboo](#).

Student Representative. The graduate student representative said he emailed a graduate student list serve asking for input about libraries and open access, but received no responses back. He is concerned that most students do not understand open access or know what it can do for them, although the UCLA library is attempting to educate graduate students about the issues.

Information about UC Libraries Mass Digitization Projects can be found [here](#).

VII. Proposed First Book Subvention Policy

Issue: UCOLASC reviewed its draft subvention policy proposal. The idea was originally proposed by the Senate's Special Committee for Scholarly Communication (SCSC) in 2005. The policy would provide awards of between five and ten thousand dollars to deserving faculty preparing to submit a manuscript for their first academic book publication. In developing the

proposal, UCOLASC was motivated by the current economic climate, in which the business models of university presses increasingly deem first books to be economically unfeasible, while those books remain crucial to the tenure process, particularly for authors in the humanities and social sciences. While faculty members in the hard sciences would not be excluded from the proposal, the majority of awards would go to humanities and social sciences faculty.

Discussion: There was a request for more evidence of a “crisis” in publishing – i.e., the number of faculty denied tenure as a result of a book not being published due to insufficient finances. There was also opposition to the footnote provision limiting subventions to non-profit university presses as well as a concern that the proposal may help publishers more than faculty.

Director Candee noted that OSC’s study on [Faculty Attitudes and Behaviors](#) found that while most faculty are happy with their publishing options, 10%-20% did express frustration about publishing difficulties. Some faculty of various ranks also feel that the tenure and promotion system is out of synch with their preferred mode of publishing and believe some non-traditional forms and formats of scholarship are not being recognized adequately in the academic personnel process. It was also noted that the large list of prestigious universities with subvention programs is evidence of a recognized problem.

There was a comment that \$5-10K would not make a significant difference in some situations – e.g., art history texts with many illustrations. (Former SCSC member Professor Dick Terdiman related in a separate correspondence that the SCSC based the \$5-10K figure on the typical book subvention from various sources; it amounts to about one-sixth to one-third of the manufacturing cost of a typical book. He also noted that 80 percent of publication costs are incurred prior to decision about the mode in which the research appears.) A suggestion was made to provide subventions earlier on, as part of the general start-up package for humanities and social sciences faculty, but there was a feeling that their timing should be closer to publication to ensure the money would not be used for other purposes. The hope is that funding first manuscripts would appeal to a certain type of foundation interested in contributing toward the continuing vitality of academic book publishing; however, more clarity and certainty may be needed about the expected funding sources.

Chair Crow spoke to Chair Wudka of the University Committee on Research Policy to see if UCORP might have any potential concerns about the proposed role of the CORs in the policy. The UCORP chair noted a potential conflict of interest concern if the dean making decisions about subvention allocations is also making tenure decisions. There was also a question about the accuracy of the assumption that tenure depends on one published book. One member suggested the goal should not be how to change publishing, but rather how to adapt the peer review system to what is happening in publishing. Could CAPs be more flexible about tenure criteria – i.e., not requiring the monograph; or could the university provide more open access support for monographs rather than subvention?

Chair Crow suggested UCOLASC consider two options in addition to the current proposal. First, the policy could be modified either to be more narrowly focused – addressing specific disciplines where a monograph is traditionally required by the peer review process. Second, the statement could be broadened to address the need for more support in all of the areas of the university that face publishing challenges, including, for instance, page charges in the sciences. It was suggested that rather than create a specific systemwide subvention policy, UCOLASC should ask campuses to make available to deans a flexible pool of money to help individuals on an as-needed basis.

Action: Volunteers will develop both a more flexible policy (Claudia Rapp and David Crohn) and a more narrowly focused policy (Elaine Tennant) to compare and discuss at the next meeting.

VIII. Report on Journal Negotiations – with Ivy Anderson, Collections Director, California Digital Library (CDL)

Report: CDL Collections Director Ivy Anderson described some recent and forthcoming negotiations with journal publishers for systemwide subscriptions to shared electronic journals. In 2008, UC libraries will spend more than \$22 million on shared electronic journals, which amounts to 35% of the universitywide library materials budget. Four years ago, the proportion was 25%, an upward trend indicative of the rising cost of journals in relation to a static budget. The library materials budget grew at an average rate of 1.6% per year over the last three years; while the cost of multi-year shared journal licenses was held to 3.5%. (Single year contracts often have much higher price increases; for instance, *Nature* increased 63% two years ago.) But considering that average journal list price increases are 8.2% per year, UC efforts in holding down online journal subscription charges, are a success which is testament to an effective systemwide collaborative strategy.

In 2008, CDL adopted a new value-based strategy it is now using in negotiations with major publishers. It involves using objective metrics through which UC can compare the value of journals and establish price increase targets. One such metric is the Producer Price Index (PPI), whose use enabled UC to reduce annual increases in 2008 to 2.1%, only marginally more than the PPI rate of inflation. In addition, UC negotiations relate the frequency of UC authored articles that appear in the journals with the cost of the journal. If UC authors contribute significant value to a journal, that value should be factored into UC's cost as a credit. The strategy has produced some positive results.

CDL has also been pursuing more publisher receptivity to open access by promoting support of "author pays" business models and willingness to support deposits in open access repositories. Another goal is to secure for institutionally affiliated authors the right to retain copyright and deposit articles in an institution-based open access repository. The Max Planck Society has negotiated a deal with Springer giving all MPS journal authors the right to make their articles open access without additional charge. Any charges which might have been levied for open access are considered to be part of the subscription charge paid by MPS. In 2009, negotiations begin with Elsevier, whose journals are by far the most costly at \$8 million per year, equivalent to the combined materials budgets for three UC campuses. CDL is working with campuses to identify core Elsevier journals.

Discussion: Members noted support for the CDL's efforts and the value based approach to negotiations. There was a suggestion to use [eigenfactor](#) as a pricing metric. There was a comment that faculty generally are unaware of the actual cost of journals, and it would be useful to develop a mechanism for informing faculty of those costs each time they use a journal – for instance, by including links to subscription cost information next to each journal listing or by indicating the cost of downloading each article. There was also strong support for including open access as part of agreements. There was a comment that if all scholarship were open access the system would self-destruct. UCOLASC offered its support in helping to leverage support for negotiations.

IX. Open Access Goals and Strategies

Issue: UCOLASC considered strategies for giving UC a more prominent voice in the national conversation about open access initiatives and legislation supported by Harvard University, the National Institutes of Health, and others. In February, Harvard faculty passed a resolution in support of open access, granting Harvard permission to make available its faculty members'

scholarly articles and to exercise a limited copyright right to post those articles, which means that Harvard can establish systems to provide free electronic access to papers after they have been accepted by a journal. On April 7, a law went into effect requiring scholars who publish an article based on NIH-funded research to submit an electronic version of the final, peer reviewed manuscript to the open access repository [PubMed Central](#). Last year, the UC Senate failed to pass an open access policy, proposed by the SCSC, which recommended a mechanism for negotiating with commercial publishers to ensure that UC faculty scholarship is placed in an online open access repository. OSC is providing support and consultation to the UCOLASC members, the SLASAIC Standing Subcommittee on Copyright Policy, and University Librarians, and others on the feasibility of, and best strategies for, introducing a re-drafted policy along the lines of the Harvard resolution. The OSC and [SLASIAC](#) are also organizing Town Hall meetings for the fall to discuss the future of open access, scholarly communication, and other initiatives around journal publishing.

Discussion: Members noted the importance of having the revised policy emanate from the faculty. Director Lawrence said he believes it will be most effective to route any proposed policy through the joint faculty-administration bodies SLASIAC and its [Standing Subcommittee on Copyright Policy](#) after engaging the faculty as a whole. In addition, the planning and sponsorship of the Town Hall meetings should involve the executive vice chancellors, UCOLASC, and the University Libraries.

It was noted that some faculty felt the original UC proposal would deny them rights. There should be an opt-out mechanism, but the policy also has to have teeth. It should state that faculty own their own copyright until they give it away; it should encourage faculty who retain copyright on an article to make it open access, and it should require them to retain open access posting rights if they give the copyright away to a third party publisher. Faculty must also understand that they are not always going to have the kind of access to journals they currently enjoy under current economic and funding models.

It was noted that the goal of open access is to broaden public access to the scholarly work of UC researchers. UC faculty are funded by the public, so the public, not just publishers and journal subscribers, should have the right to access their research. Catherine Candee added that open access is a transitional strategy in building the ultimate goal of a more affordable and sustainable scholarly communication system through which UC can adequately support research and teaching. She said facilitating change involves the support of multiple models and approaches. There was also a comment that faculty will want to see data that make a convincing case for change and a suggestion that UC observe the Harvard system before committing to an approach. One member said UCOLASC should push for the NSF and other publicly-funded agencies to adopt NIH-style requirements.

Chair Crow suggested that UCOLASC consider ways it can help support and promote the Town Hall meetings with the help of local committees, draft a resolution articulating a basic set of principles regarding open access for Academic Council discussion and endorsement, and continue to consider a better formulation for an open access policy.

Action: Chair Crow, Richard Schneider, and David Crohn will draft a statement of principles on the open access issue, which UCOLASC members will review with their local committees and bring to the next meeting.

VII. Information Technology Guidance Committee Report “Creating a UC Cyberinfrastructure”

In reviewing the report, members noted that there should be a clearer distinction between the role and purpose of cyberinfrastructure in the service of research and in the service of teaching. Linking them in the document obscures their differences, but the two have very different missions and needs and should be considered separately.

Technology-enabled services are critical to the operation of the campus libraries, UC Press, and the California Digital Library. CDL is particularly dependent on the cyberinfrastructure. For them, managing the infrastructure is seen to be an increasing challenge in the future as it seeks to plan for preserving and managing digital assets over time while also maintaining long-term financial stability.

The development of UC's cyberinfrastructure should be based on the principles of maximizing the ability of faculty and students to be creators, users, and publishers of academic information, and of maximizing the cost-effective dissemination and impact of UC faculty research. Publishing is as fundamental to the research infrastructure of the University as classrooms and labs. The ITGC should consider the diverse set of perspectives across disciplines and campuses in terms of contentment, resources, and options for publishing and make recommendations for increasing investment in the tools and infrastructure that facilitate the sharing of academic materials.

Libraries should be included in all IT planning decisions affecting academic information. There are benefits to cross-campus collaborations around information technology, but those collaborations also need to be approached carefully. There was some concern that in collaborative efforts, the IT organization sometimes becomes the central decision-maker after input from faculty or librarians. There was also a concern that if faculty are required to operate through new systemwide infrastructures, they may lose other options. Flexibility should be maintained.

Action: UCOLASC will submit comments to Academic Council.

Minutes prepared by: Michael LaBriola
Attest: Ben Crow

Distributions:

1. Task Force on UC Cyberinfrastructure and Academic Information: Notes on Charge and Membership