

Director Candee said the OSC established the eScholarship publishing platform in 2002 to support greater production and dissemination of faculty research through new technology. OSC also hoped the program would help curtail the growing trends of commercialization and unsustainable pricing in academic publishing. She said the economics of publishing have not changed, but many UC faculty are now participating in eScholarship. Faculty directly control its editorial and administrative functions. Currently, the open access repository contains 20,000 total objects, 1/5 of which are previously published scientific content; 15 peer reviewed journals; and four monographic series.

The OSC's August 2007 report, *Faculty Attitudes and Behaviors Regarding Scholarly Communication*, concluded that faculty interest in and demand for new open access and electronic publishing opportunities is increasing, but that adoption of technology differs greatly by discipline and rank. Most faculty are either unaware of eScholarship or believe that publishing in open access repositories presents a career risk. Those who do use eScholarship tend to be less risk-averse senior faculty members in the sciences. The survey also revealed that some faculty are concerned that there is a growing segment of scholarship being published in non-traditional forms and formats, which is not being recognized seriously or adequately in the academic personnel process (although the majority of faculty do not experience problems). Finally, the report recommends that rather than asking faculty to shoulder the professional risk associated with non-traditional publishing, the university should embark on an institutional effort to strengthen policy, infrastructure and services that encourage and validate publishing in non commercial, non-traditional formats.

The SLASIAC report, *Publishing Needs and Opportunities at the University of California*, co-authored by Director Candee and UC Press Director Lynne Withey, recommends that UC expand its publishing programs both by building on the university's traditional role as publisher of books, journals, and monographs, and also by creating new systems and opportunities for faculty to publish in alternative forms and formats. The report also asks UC to consider ways to better assess emerging and non-traditional forms of scholarship in the tenure and promotion process.

Director Candee said UCOP is re-organizing UC's scholarly communication functions – including the OSC itself – to create a more efficient and effective organizational structure that will provide a more strategic focus for innovation. One of the responsibilities of longtime UCOLASC consultant John Ober, who was recently promoted away from his position as OSC director, was overseeing the [OSC website](#). A suggestion was made that UCOLASC take “ownership” of the analytical content and direction of the website in collaboration with the campus Scholarly Communications Officers. (Systemwide Library Planning Director Gary Lawrence and his staff would manage its general upkeep.) UCOLASC members acknowledged the website's critical value, but they felt UCOLASC could not manage the responsibility of upkeep. There was a suggestion that UCOLASC recommend a continuation of funding for staff in OSC dedicated to that function. Director Lawrence noted that it would be difficult to make a case for new staffing at a time when UCOP is downsizing. There was also a suggestion that the University Librarians (ULs) take up administration of the website on a rotating basis.

Discussion: There was a question about the budget and what funding is provided for library and scholarly communication infrastructure in relation to total faculty FTE. Some UCOLASC members felt the committee would be in a better position to make reasoned recommendations about libraries and scholarly communication with more detailed information about the budget.

More generally, campus faculty can better evaluate publishing choices and options – e.g., how available funding could be most effectively used for journals, monographs, and page charges – if they have access to clear cost/benefit data. It was noted that a single approach will not work for all faculty, and while UCOLASC's advice to faculty should be based on the principle of maximizing the dissemination and impact of research, the committee should consider the diverse set of perspectives across disciplines and campuses in terms of contentment, resources, and options for publishing, which will make it difficult to arrive at a single generalized system. Director Candee said UCOLASC should consider what resources are necessary to build the ideal sustainable funding system for scholarly publishing. Moreover, UC should consider publishing to be as fundamental to the research and teaching infrastructure of the University as classrooms and labs. There was a suggestion that UCOLASC ask Council to request an analysis of economic incentives from UCOP. Another suggestion was for a task force to conduct a focused analysis of the economic possibilities for funding libraries and new initiatives in publishing and scholarly communications.

UCOLASC members raised two concerns about the academic personnel process: that the process does not protect faculty who take creative publishing risks, and that departments and CAPs lack the right tools and vocabulary to review non-traditional scholarship. Some members were unsure, however, that they could find hard evidence showing that the merit and review structure penalizes faculty. They felt a focused analysis using quantitative measures would be needed. There was agreement that UCOLASC should work with UCAP to discuss the changing interdisciplinary nature of scholarship and publishing as well as the culture and incentive structure within academia that may discourage faculty from electronic and other non-traditional forms. Specific examples mentioned were networked performance using telematic technology and collaborative work on a website or network.

Action: Elaine Tennant, Whitney Davis, and Lisa Naugle will develop a set of questions for UCAP about emerging scholarship in the academic personnel process. UCOLASC will contact UCAP to arrange a joint discussion with the chair or committee later this year.

Action: Chair Crow and the committee analyst will draft a memo requesting information on budget dollars spent per faculty FTE on libraries, journals and other publications

IV. Report from the Academic Senate Leadership

- Senate Chair Michael Brown and Vice Chair Mary Croughan

Vice Chair Croughan thanked UCOLASC members for their volunteer service to the Senate. She encouraged members to communicate with their divisional committees and divisional chairs about systemwide issues, and in turn to share local concerns with UCOLASC. She noted that she serves on the University Librarian search committee with UCOLASC Chair Crow. She said the committee analyst is available to provide high-level, professional support and to liaison with other relevant Senate committees - e.g. UCAP, on issues of common concern.

The vice chair reported that Senate Chair Brown serves on the Regents' Presidential Selection Committee and chairs the Senate's Academic Advisory Committee, which forwards candidate names to the Selection Committee. Council feels strongly that the new president must be a highly distinguished academic who has also demonstrated the ability to effectively manage a large, complex, public, research university. She encouraged UCOLASC members to forward candidate names to Senate Chair Brown.

Chair Brown joined the meeting. He said UCOP was restructuring its administrative systems and functions to increase efficiencies and identify opportunities for cost savings. He said the first phase of a four-year plan to improve faculty salaries took effect October 1, with a 2.5% COLA for all general campus faculty and an additional market adjustment for all on-scale faculty. The plan has only tepid support among some off-scale faculty, who feel it unfairly benefits faculty who have not been the most productive. Some of these faculty believe they should be able to maintain a differential salary position with respect to their on-scale colleagues. He said restoring the relevance and integrity of the rank and step system, however, is vital to making the salary scales useful to everyone. A university-wide salary scale is central to the idea that UC is one University with one standard of excellence. Chair Brown noted other topics on the Senate's agenda: a **proposal from BOARS** to reform freshman eligibility policy; a **report** from a joint ad hoc committee on international education; and support for the elimination of non-resident tuition for academic graduate students.

Chair Crow summarized UCOLASC's concerns about economic transparency and the committee's plans to collaborate with UCAP. Vice Chair Croughan suggested that UCOLASC make any request to Council as clear and specific as possible. She said UCAP had previously discussed electronic publications and the issue of evaluating independent contributions to collaborative research projects, and there was a consensus that CAP does not have a problem making fair evaluations. She said concrete examples of emerging genres would be helpful. One UCOLASC member noted that an overabundance of traditional publications could burden readers, reviewers and library budgets. CAP should be encouraged to use evaluation methods that incorporate indices of quality and impact, which may lead faculty to publish fewer, but more important papers.

V. Open Access Proposal

Issue: An **Open Access Policy** proposed last year recommended a mechanism by which UC would negotiate collectively with commercial publishers to ensure that faculty scholarship is placed on the Web in an open access repository. One of the consistent criticisms made in the systemwide Senate review of the policy was that the requirement for faculty to "opt-out" of a default open access obligation presented a burden. Reviewers also felt that faculty should not be on the front end of negotiations with publishers. The OSC has since suggested the proposal be reformulated as a strongly encouraged "opt-in" policy.

Discussion: Chair Crow said that in order to implement change, UCOLASC and the Senate would have to show widespread faculty support for at least a basic set of principles regarding open access. He suggested that UCOLASC draft a simplified proposal articulating those principles. Members noted that the principles and goals should include disseminating faculty research more broadly into the public domain, controlling journal subscription prices, and securing an open access policy that would work for the whole university across all disciplines. Members also agreed that UC should represent faculty as a whole in direct negotiations with publishers rather than ask faculty to negotiate individually.

One UCOLASC member remarked that open access is not viable under current publishing business models. Elsevier is often criticized, but many of the smaller publishers use a similar economic model. UC could best address the problem by engaging commercial publishers as a serious competitor. In order to do that, the University needs a financially viable business model.

Other members noted that some faculty might have perceived the proposal as an attempt by UC or The Regents to take control of faculty intellectual property, rather than an attempt to help faculty retain copyright and disseminate their research. Moreover, an opt-in policy might also face criticism from faculty who perceive UC as not doing enough. UCOLASC should clarify how faculty members can assert their authority to retain copyright and also state very clearly what UC needs to do to accomplish open access goals. Faculty are generally unaware of the real cost of journals and how libraries are funded. UC could raise awareness by including links to subscription cost information next to each journal listing. Removing access to some journals would also send a message. Finally there was a suggestion that UC collaborate with other universities to get an open access measure through the U.S. Congress.

Margaret Phillips noted that she and other Scholarly Communication Officers have been advocating for the open access policy and are interested in lending their support. In addition, the SCO's are available to help UCOLASC and the OSC organize a conference to bring together scholarly societies to discuss Open Access and other new initiatives around journal publishing.

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

VI. Campus Reports

Berkeley. The reallocation of library space at Berkeley has sometimes assumed that the digitization of library collections reduces the need for physical library space. As a result, the library committee has asked that a Library Impact Statement accompany any campus space allocation proposal. The committee is also participating in a new campus-wide review of library space and is discussing strategies for increasing the profile of libraries in the long-term planning process to ensure that the library is a top-tier budget priority. Finally, there is concern about the difficult time the library is having recruiting staff.

Davis. The committee has been discussing issues related to open access and copyright.

Santa Barbara. There was general uproar over an administrative plan to redirect library infrastructure funds without consulting the Senate, which prompted the library committee to consider the need for increasing the influence of campus librarians in shared governance. The committee is also conducting a faculty survey on the library and library resources that it plans to use as a basis for future budget recommendations. The committee wants UCSB to establish a clear budget setting mechanism for the libraries.

Riverside. UCR is growing and several new academic programs are being added. Questions have been raised about a request to make the library a repository for business school research data. UCOLASC members noted that such functions might indeed be part of the library's future mission, but that funding and access are both important to consider. There is concern that no LAUC representative, apart from the University Librarian, sits on the campus committee.

San Diego. The new Audrey Geisel University Librarianship is a positive measure of support for the library, but at the same time the library committee has yet to meet and has no chair, which points to lack of support among the faculty for library issues, and more generally, apathy in relation to Senate service.

San Francisco. The committee has been discussing proposals to re-purpose campus library space, open access issues, and a decision by Science magazine and the American Association for

the Advancement of Science (AAAS) to discontinue participation in JSTOR. The committee has also submitted a request to the UCSF divisional Council for a name change to reflect its new scholarly communication charge.

Action: the UCSF representative will circulate documents related to the AAAS decision about JSTOR partnership.

VII. Proposed Subvention Policy

Issue: UCOLASC reviewed a subvention policy proposal drafted by the 2006-07 UCOLASC committee, which had originally been proposed the year before by the Senate's Special Committee for Scholarly Communication (SCSC). The policy would provide awards of between five and ten thousand dollars to junior UC faculty preparing to submit a manuscript for their first academic book publication. In developing the proposal, UCOLASC was motivated by the economic difficulties facing faculty, particularly first-time authors in the humanities and social sciences, who need to publish books to gain tenure and advance their careers. While faculty members in the hard sciences would not be excluded from the proposal, it was anticipated that the majority of awards would go to faculty in the humanities and social sciences. It was felt that in endorsing the proposal, UC could help change the economics of scholarly communication.

Discussion: UCOLASC members felt that the proposal should clarify that funding would come from potential external funding sources – e.g. foundations, and not from state funds or library budgets. One member noted that five to ten thousand dollars would not make a significant difference in some situations. There was also a question about the rationale for that figure and how it compared to subvention policies at comparable and competing institutions, as subventions can be important recruitment and retention tools. One member said the policy should not restrict subventions to a specific dollar amount. There was a consensus that junior and non-tenured faculty need and deserve subvention support more than established senior faculty. One member said subventions could be part of the general start-up package for humanities and social sciences faculty, while others felt that a subvention should be available to any faculty member who could make a convincing argument that it is necessary in their discipline.

Action: The committee analyst will research dollar amounts awarded in other university subvention programs. A new draft of the proposed policy will be circulated, and when determined suitable by the committee, submitted to Academic Council.

Minutes prepared by: Michael LaBriola
Attest: Ben Crow

Distributions

1. Data on ladder rank faculty and the library budget.