



**Discussion:** There are limited comments about libraries in the Choices report. A member suggested that there should be a way for the libraries to benefit from indirect cost recovery (ICR). Libraries provide significant support for research at the campuses and this should be recognized. UCOLASC will write a letter pointing out that as administrative personnel has increased, the libraries have taken a cut and this needs to be remedied. UCSD hired an independent consultant to analyze the UCSD library's contribution to the research process and determined that the contribution is less than the percentage of ICR at UCSD that was being directed to the libraries. This was a year-long statistical survey that asked people who accessed the library website or visited an actual library if the purpose of their visit was related to research. At around the same time, the libraries were also told that they no longer needed to pay toward the campus' utilities deficit. The reduction ended up costing the libraries about \$1.5 million and the ICR share dropped from about \$3.5 million to \$2 million, but the libraries had been paying about \$700,000 annually towards the utilities deficit. The analysis took into account the journal subscriptions. This campus gets a percentage of ICR but it is not clear whether libraries at other campuses receive a percentage. The UCSD and UCI representatives will work on a draft of the letter. The letter will begin with the point that the report does not mention the libraries at all. A member commented that UCOLASC should have representation on Council. It appears that only one local library committee is on the campus' executive council.

Chair Powell was asked about the limited references to the libraries in the report which are not substantive. The UCOLASC Vice Chair has historically met with his campus budget committee at the beginning of the year although this did not occur this year and there is no sustained contact. There could be a paragraph about the libraries in the section that discusses indirect cost recovery and to the section about instruction. Vice Chair Simmons indicated that UCOLASC's feedback would be incorporated into the Council's response and possibly into a revised report. The fact that libraries are not mentioned in the Choices report is evidence that UC faculty do not think about the role they play in the core mission of the university. It was noted that the UC Commission on the Future work group recommendations do not discuss the libraries.

Chair Schneider indicated that there is a need for library issues to be a higher priority at Council and that UCOLASC should be represented on Council. Chair Powell indicated that UCOLASC can be invited to Council and explained that a request from UCAF to join the Senate was denied because that committee did not generate significant business.

#### **IV. Electronic Theses and Dissertations**

- *Catherine Mitchell, Director, Publishing Group, California Digital Library*
- *Patricia Cruse, Director, Digital Preservation, California Digital Library*

The California Digital Library is involved with a project for creating a service for electronic theses and dissertations (ETDs) at UC. There has been a long-standing desire to create a systemwide solution for ETDs as a way to manage UC research more holistically. Now students submit the work which goes to ProQuest that does metadata enhancement and rights checking, and UC has to wait for files to be returned. This process is often delayed and UC does not have copies of the files on hand. There is a desire to move submission processes to an electronic format. UC does not have a formal contract with ProQuest and it has somewhat of a monopoly. Access is also an issue since only people with subscriptions to Dissertation Abstracts International can see the work in ProQuest.

Director Mitchell indicated that complicated issues related to ETDs need to be resolved. Local preservation of these materials is wanted but issues include controlling access or establishing embargos in certain circumstances related to things such as grant funding or patent applications. CDL's curation center is in a position to provide the local preservation and manage the EDTs and any associated materials from creation to publication. eScholarship provides access to many publications coming out of UC, including journals and articles. CDL is working on a pilot project to create an integrative preservation access service for ETDs at UC which may go live in the fall. Participating campuses include UCI, UCM, UCSD, UCB, UCD and UCSF. Submission will happen directly into the preservation service and any embargo will be handled by only harvesting into eScholarship only those documents that have been cleared and have no embargo. The service will provide the ability to access those materials and to embargo. It will provide an opportunity to connect ETDs to their data so it is possible to go directly from the EDT to the foundational data which is something that ProQuest cannot support. The model will offer flexible submission options to allow for the variety of different workflows at the campuses, including bulk uploads via the libraries or student submission – a single submission model will not be required for the service. CLD can simultaneously submit to ProQuest and have a local copy. This is part of a larger CDL initiative to provide an integrated data and publication service, and a means to create appropriate access and visibility. An FAQ was circulated to the committee.

**Discussion:** The length of the embargo and whether they will be systemwide are issues that have not yet been determined. The harvest from the preservation repository into eScholarship is opt out, so students will have to say the ETD should not go into eScholarship. The adviser or division would need to verify that the material should be embargoed. It was noted that placing the burden on students to give informed consent could be problematic. A student may be unable to publish a dissertation if it has been available to read through eScholarship, and a higher bar with respect to consent should be used. There are campuses and other universities that make EDTs available through open access. A work group would be established to consider the policy issues related to the submissions of EDTs. Although having a dissertation available through open access is a good idea, UCOLASC encouraged the CDL to consider an opt in approach. Open access to publications could cause problems depending on the discipline. It would be good to not have ProQuest acting as the gatekeeper. Students have to understand what there options are and there should be a component that educates students about the consequences of the opt in and opt out approaches. Director Mitchell is willing to come back to UCOLASC after the policy work group has considered the opt in/opt out question and the embargo period.

## **V. Update on Journal Negotiations**

- *Ivy Anderson, Director, Collection Development & Management, CDL*

Chair Schneider thanked Director Anderson for the work done on the Nature journal negotiations. Director Anderson provided an update on journal negotiations overall during the current year. The CDL has worked hard to reduce spending on journals, including ejournals and other major contracts. The CDL is looking in a detailed way at which titles can be cancelled, which is a very complicated process. The goal is to be in a strong position to negotiate with publishers and achieve reductions in cost where possible. The CDL is making evidence-based and data driven decisions and has achieved reductions between 10% and 25% in negotiations for eight major publishers. In some cases by working with publishers the CDL has not needed to cut titles, and in other cases the CDL has cut titles. Overall there has been a 13% reduction in

expenditures, approximately \$1.6 million dollars. Some publishers have agreed to reduce the base cost, and in a few cases there were reductions in cost without a reduction of content.

**Discussion:** Members reported on the reaction at their campuses to the Nature letter proposing a boycott of the journal. While there may be support for boycotting editorial boards, the question of canceling the subscription is a more difficult one. The negative impact on graduate students and untenured faculty is a very serious issue. There needs to be time to inform and educate faculty in order to get support for a boycott. This effort would be delayed until August or September since faculty are gone from the campuses now. The renewal happens in 2011 so there is some time. Publicity and awareness of the issues should be generated as early as possible in order for CDL to put pressure on the publisher. Chair Schneider remarked that the first step is a strongly worded letter from prominent faculty and a letter that UCOLASC co-signs that Director Anderson can take into the negotiations, and the threat of the boycott could be enough for Nature to reconsider the price increase. This is what happened with Elsevier and the boycott never took place. This letter needs to be part of a longer term strategy. In the case with Elsevier, the situation was very public which benefitted UC, and UC was not the only institution involved. Director Anderson thinks the cost to UC should be significantly less than what Nature has proposed which is a 400% increase which would amount to \$1 million in addition to what UC pays for the subscription now.

Director Anderson believes that the situation with Nature is price gouging. If something public involving the faculty will be done, it must happen in the early fall. Most publishers have recognized the financial reality and since they are publishing for the academy, they do not want to be seen as damaging UC. UC faculty serve as reviewers and editors thereby contributing significantly to publishers. There could be a tiered approach that involves UC faculty not participating as reviewers or serving on boards. Faculty need to be educated about how much library resources cost the campuses. UC or CDL could announce that UC is expecting to cancel the Nature subscription which would provide advanced notice, and spur faculty to educate themselves about the issue.

Chair Powell suggested that UCOLASC members should talk to the divisional senate chairs about the issue. The senate chairs might give the members time at the divisional representative Assembly or general senate meeting to get this information to faculty. At least two UCOLASC members are scheduled to present this information to their divisional senates this month. Chair Schneider may draft a letter to Chair Powell so an announcement can be made to the Academic Council next week. Whatever strategy is used to disseminate this information should be coordinated with the divisional chair and senate. The letter could note specific actions that might occur at the campuses. The letter should also reflect the cost saving measures that have been taken during negotiations with other publishers. It is proposed that a joint letter be distributed by the ULs and by the divisional senates. The recommendations on what UC faculty can do will be reframed to indicate how they can help. Director Anderson's letter needs to go out as soon as possible. Some authors might take steps to publish elsewhere in response to the letter alone. The letter should clearly indicate that this letter is provided for information and not action. The end of the letter should include a range of possible actions including cancelling the entire subscription.

## **VI. Campus Reports and Member Items**

**San Diego:** The representative and UL Convenor Schottlaender will meet with the Senate to discuss issues facing the libraries, including the budget.

**Irvine:** The committee is waiting on the announcement of the interim UL and the associate ULs are running things at this point. The students have learned that a library will be renamed after a professor following his significant donation to the campus.

**Los Angeles:** The representative is ending his term as chair.

**Santa Barbara:** The search for the director of the library was stalled in the business office, and will get underway in the fall.

**San Francisco:** The committee continues to struggle with the budget reductions and anticipates more reductions in the future. There have already been substantial reduction in library hours. The committee will work locally to push forward the nature letter with Professor Yamamoto.

**Berkeley:** The local committee is trying to organize a push to subscribe to an open access letter that other universities have subscribed to. The committee is working with the campus leadership and the academic personnel committee on the peer review system following the meeting about this topic organized by the Center for Higher Education.

## **VII. Goals for 2010-2011**

The committee will continue to monitor the Google Book Search Settlement Agreement and project. Vice Chair Butler reported that he was at the meeting of American Council of Learning Societies where there was a panel on Google Books which included Dan Clancy who is in charge of Google Books. Mr. Clancy remarked that from the beginning there was consultation with faculty and the scholarly community. Vice Chair Butler challenged this assertion, indicating that selecting a few librarians and scholars was not consultation with faculty. This should be on the agenda for UCOLASC next year. It is unclear what will happen if the settlement is not approved, and UCOLASC should discuss what “plan b” would be.

Other topics for next year include Nature contract negotiations and subscriptions in general; open access and working with academic personnel committees on changing peer review for academic advancement.

Chair Schneider thanked the Vice Chair for his service on UCOLASC and thanked the other members for their active participation. The committee thanked Chair Schneider

Meeting adjourned at: 12:30

Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams

Attest: Richard Schneider