I. Chair’s Announcements

There are no special announcements today. The meeting may end earlier than scheduled since there are primarily just updates on various items.

II. Consent Calendar

Action: The minutes were approved with corrections.

III. Proposed Open Access Policy

Chair Kelty revised the policy after the committee’s last meeting. At the Council meeting in March, there was agreement that a letter should be sent to the provost requesting support for the policy before the revised policy is either sent out for systemwide review or to the Assembly. As a next step, Council approved sending a letter to Provost Dorr which was done in April. It is not clear if the policy will go out for systemwide review if the provost commits to support. Another recommendation was to have legal clarification. Legal advice will be sought from the Office of General Counsel as well as from legal scholars in the system, and this will be coordinated by the Senate leadership.

Discussion: Director Farley reported that Provost Dorr is working on a response to the letter from UCOLASC. The provost discussed the funding request for eScholarship with the EVCs and it was a positive discussion and there was a promise of some. Committee members can send Chair Kelty the names of any legal scholars that might be willing to review the policy and identify problems. It is not clear when implementation would begin after the policy is passed. Academic Council may send the policy out for systemwide review or to the Assembly for approval and Chair Kelty discussed the possible timing of the review and approval process. Individual campuses may also decide to pass the policy.

It will be important for the Assembly to understand that the policy has been revised and Chair Kelty indicated that the annotated version should be submitted so that changes from the original policy are obvious. It will be important to have a communication strategy if the policy does pass and UCOP’s communications department will be involved. Director Farley shared that CDL has a standard way to work with the communications department on announcements like this, and there is also the Senate newsletter. The campuses will need to be involved with announcing the policy so the information reaches as many faculty as possible. The implementation plan can include an ongoing education component that involves CDL in partnership with the campuses.

Former Vice Provost Dan Greenstein had suggested making this a presidential policy and Director Farley indicated that it instead might be possible to institute the policy through the Academic Planning Council (APC). One reason the APC might work is because it already has a mechanism for Senate to be
represented alongside the administration for the oversight and review aspects of the proposed open access policy, and this approach would be less complicated than presidential policy. Members discussed what documents can be shared with various committees on the campuses and members were reminded that email communication is confidential.

IV. Federal Legislation Update

The Fair Access to Science and Research Technology Act does not seem to be moving forward yet and whether it will go to committee has not been announced. The status of the Office of Science and Technology Policy’s mandate to agencies to develop an open access policy may not be known until summer.

Discussion: Director Farley reported that the University Librarians are preparing comments on the OSTP policy in response to a request from the agencies involved for input about implementation. CDL coordinates with the UC state and federal government relations to track these issues. During the last meeting, UCOALSC proposed writing a letter in support of FASTR. Chair Kelty will write a letter of support for this legislation.

V. State Legislation Update: AB 609

Chair Kelty and UC state government relations people were contacted by a staffer in Assemblymember Nestande’s office and shared what has been learned in the process of drafting the proposed UC open access policy as well as the concerns faculty have expressed. Many of the changes discussed were incorporated into the revised legislation included in the agenda packet. Chair Kelty explained that input from UCOLASC and other Senate committees was summarized into one letter from Council which included recommendations that Chair Kelty believes are not in the best interests of faculty. The Council letter was incorporated into UC’s official position on this bill by the UC state government relations office. One of the recommendations from other Senate committees with which Chair Kelty disagreed is to have a 12 month embargo. This bill is slated to go to committee in May.

Discussion: The point was made that a letter from UCOLASC is important because it represents the faculty position whereas the official letter that has been submitted reflects the position of the university. UCOLASC could state that the committee does not agree with the revised legislation but this will not change UC’s official position. It is unlikely that the Senate would independently support or oppose a piece of legislation and submit a separate letter lobbying on behalf of faculty. UCOLASC should submit a letter to Council in support of the federal legislation discussed today that includes a directive to the Office of the President to support this type of legislation.

VI. Campus Reports and Member Items

UCSC: The librarian is leaving for UCLA. The EVC has decided to provide funding for extended hours for the library that have been supported by student fees in the past. Hopefully other campuses will take note.

UCB: The committee will meet in May and discuss the revised open access proposal. The report on the Commission on the Future of the Library at UCB has been delayed but there should be an update in May about the deliberations.

UCR: The Senate has proposed merging the Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication with the Committee on Computing and Information Technology. This would be a nine member committee and the chair of the computing committee would be appointed to the library committee and the chair of the
library committee will be appointed to the computing committee. The analyst reported that these committees are merged on the Berkeley campus. The UCR may want to investigate the status of the systemwide committee on computing before moving forward with a merger of campus committees and the representative reported that the library committee is not in favor of the merger.

UCSD: The committee discussed the revised proposal and there was strong support with one major exception. The committee unanimously objected to the fact that the grant does not restrict commercial use and this is a faculty concern that may lead to push back against the policy. The San Diego committee understands that the issue of the grant depends upon the legal interpretation of the policy.

UCSF: At the committee’s last meeting the new UCSF campus was discussed, including the belief that there is inadequate library space. UCSF also re-endorsed the revised open access policy and agreed that the campus policy will not be changed should the systemwide policy pass. The UCSF policy does not include waiver of the deposit requirement for UCSF faculty.

CDL: Director Farley reported that the CDL is investigating a harvesting tool and is supporting UCSF’s implementation of the open access policy. Director Farley also mentioned how UCOP’s policy unit works on legislation, which includes outreach to stakeholders like CDL, the Office of General Counsel, the Office of Research, and the Senate. This unit synthesizes the input and sometimes there are less than ideal compromises that have to be made in the official position statements. Director Mitchell anticipates working with a smaller number of campuses to develop the services for the eScholarship deposit and harvesting piece this year. Waivers and embargo requests will be supported from the moment the policy is passed.

LAUC: The LAUC Assembly will meet May 20th to discuss the Council of University Librarians Plans and Priorities 2013-2016 document. LAUC’s advisory comments will be finalized and submitted to the CoUL. The chair of Systemwide Operations and Planning Advisory Group will give a presentation about the upcoming modification of the library advisory groups.

CoUL: Open access has been a major topic of discussion because the librarians want to be prepared for implementation at both the systemwide and campus-specific levels. The CoUL is also looking at further digitization of collections to determine how to move forward. The project with Google has slowed substantially and the CoUL would like to identify strategies to digitize and make more available UC’s public domain content. The first step was to estimate how many materials are involved and it has been estimated that UC has 1.7M public domain books that have not been digitized. This includes over a half million government documents and the other category includes materials rejected by Google for different reasons. A task force is looking at how to approach this which will include determining the existing capacity within the libraries and the UC systems. Another issue is trying to build a coherent and comprehensive systemwide infrastructure for managing digital assets. Each campus has moved forward in creating its digital collections primarily through digitizing special collections but this has created a risk that some assets could be lost because the assets are not being managed as effectively as they should be because there are no repositories for the assets that are fully backed up. It should be noted that these collections tend to be fragmented so there is no central location that can be used to discover what is available elsewhere. A group working on this matter has agreed upon an approach to create a systemwide digital asset management system (DAMS) and CDL will take the lead on the technology development. The system has been designed to allow campuses to participate in different ways. This is a big effort that will take several years to launch. eScholarship is a different type of repository from the backend of the DAMS which is intended to be a place where materials digitized for special collections will be placed. What will go into the discovery or access layer has not been determined yet. Director Mitchell’s team will work on the DAMS.
New Business

There was no new business.

Meeting adjourned at: 11:35 AM
Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams
Attest: Christopher Kelty