

**Systemwide Library and Scholarly Information Advisory Committee**  
**Standing Committee on Copyright**  
May 3, 2006 10 a.m. – 3 p.m.  
Nile Hall, Preservation Park  
Oakland, CA 94612

**Meeting Notes**

SLASIAC members attending: Bisom, M. Brown (afternoon only), Crow, Goldberg, Greenstein, Hafner, Heinecke, Leonard, Talbot, Wartella (chair), Withey (afternoon only)

SCC members attending: Carter, Condren, Hafner, MacDonald, Rose, Schottlaender, Wartella (chair)

SLASIAC members absent: Abbott, Brown, Butter, Cullenberg, Jenny LeCuyer, Luce, Oakley, Walter

SCC members absent: Klein, Kurtz, Matkin, Oakley

Staff/consultants: Candee, Lawrence, Ober

Guests: Lawrence Pitts, Chair, Academic Council Special Committee on Scholarly Communication

**1. Introductions**

**2. CDL Update (Dan Greenstein)**

About two and a half years ago the CDL consciously broadened its services into a wider array of library-related programs and activities. These included scholarly communication activities such as the establishment of the Office of Scholarly Communication, and digital library programs such as digital preservation, the eScholarship publishing program, and provision of more configurable, user-facing tools for campuses to adapt for their own needs.

Starting this fall, to follow up on and assess its activities, the CDL will embark on a series of campus visits and presentations to communicate to the campuses the full extent of CDL's current array of products and services. The presentation will also include the results of "market research" that the CDL has gathered about campus needs. The campus visits will be preceded with a preview presentation to SLASIAC at the committee's fall meeting.

**3. ITGC (Kris Hafner)**

The Information Technology Guidance Committee, which met together for the first time in April, includes academic senate members, academic administrators, and IT experts from UCOP and the campuses. After an extensive consultation effort and focused research and planning, in fall, 2007 the Committee will report to the President, Chancellors, and COVC on how to better cooperate, collaborate and work as a system, and how to leverage campus investments in information technology. The staff leaders of the Committee are embarking on campus visits to gather information and assess campus

needs. Greenstein noted that in the first such visit, to UCI, he noted a striking convergence among several campus groups on the need for better collaboration tools, interchangeable data, and interoperable and reusable applications.

More information about the ITGC can be found at the Committee's web site (<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/itgc/>)

#### **4. Electronic Theses and Dissertations (Catherine Candee)**

The CDL has been trying to coordinate with the graduate deans from all campuses to plan for a common infrastructure for the deposit of electronic theses and dissertations (ETDs). A few campuses have begun electronic submissions to ProQuest using bepress, the software provider that powers the eScholarship Repository. The service includes management of a campus submission website and transfer of the electronic file (pdf) and metadata to both ProQuest and the library. CDL believes the time is ripe for a more coordinated, system-wide approach to managing UC's theses and dissertations, and ProQuest is eager to facilitate this. Currently there is a broad range of campus policies and practices for thesis and dissertation submission, and the process can be heavily bureaucratic.

Members of the CDL will meet with the staffs of the graduate deans at their next meeting (in the fall) to discuss how to bring the processes of the campuses together to benefit all.

#### **5. Legal, regulatory, and policy issues affecting scholarly information**

##### **5a. Overview; UCOP role and support requirements (Gary Lawrence)**

Background: *"Public Policy Environment for Academic and Scholarly Information"* (Draft, April 24, 2006)

The background document describes the range of regulatory and policy issues affecting scholarly communication and recommends a broader role for the Provost's office in coordinating and communicating among UC stakeholders across these issues. The main idea is that it would be desirable to be able to make connections, engage faculty, effectively draw upon existing expertise distributed throughout the campuses and UCOP, and act upon relevant issues more quickly than in the current environment. The Acting Provost is in favor of a coordinated function within his office, to monitor developments and ensure that academic needs are heard. SLASIAC is being asked to endorse this concept, with actual implementation to be determined by the Provost. With agreement that UC's involvement in legal, regulatory, and policy issues needs to be driven by academic needs – in consultation with Federal Government Relations, Office of General Counsel, and Information Technology officers – the Committee endorsed the idea that a coordinating function be adopted and supported within the Office of the Provost for Academic Affairs.

##### **5b. Proposed consolidation of SLASIAC and the Standing Committee on Copyright**

Background: *Revised SLASIAC Charge* (Draft, February 2, 2006)

Lawrence introduced the discussion by noting that many issues arising in the library and scholarly communication arena (as discussed in the previous item) are appropriate for consideration by both SCC and SLASIAC; the impetus for the proposal is a desire to facilitate broader discussion and leverage the varying expertise and perspectives represented on the two committees. Wartella noted that, in making the transition to the proposed committee structure, it is intended that the current membership of both groups be merged, and membership adjusted to the composition proposed in the draft charge through the normal rotation process. After much discussion on what format the proposed merger might take (one single committee, subcommittee, task force, etc.) the Committee endorsed the basic notion of a merger of SLASIAC and SCC, with SCC most likely becoming a standing sub-committee of SLASIAC for the near future.

## **6. Scholarly Communication**

### **6a. SCSC White Papers**

Background:

*Draft White Papers (January 13, 2006)*

*Commentary on SCSC White Papers (February 15, 2006)*

*Proposal for UC Faculty (Last revision: April 19, 2006)*

Larry Pitts, the chair of the SCSC, reported on the rationale for writing the White Papers and sending them for reviews to various groups inside and outside the University. In the papers, the Special Committee specifically addresses: the role of publications in the academic personnel process, book and periodical publishers, faculty retention of copyright, and the role of scholarly societies as publishers. The one action item is the proposal for a revised copyright policy for scholarly works published in journals and conference proceedings that would require the faculty member to retain the rights to deposit his or her work in an open access repository. The proposal was much debated among the members of the Academic Council, and some changes were made to accommodate the differences between books and journal articles, and whether and how to include an “opt-out” option (particularly to avoid creating obstacles for junior faculty). One of the intended benefits of having an actual policy is to give individual faculty members the strength of the University behind them in their negotiations with publishers. There was discussion of broadly informing all publishers of UC’s new policy as soon as it is enacted.

The White Papers and copyright policy proposal will be discussed by the Academic Assembly next week (May 10). Chair Pitts is hopeful the Assembly will endorse the papers and follow the Council’s recommendation to forward the copyright policy proposal to the President along with a request to appoint an implementation working group comprising faculty, administrative staff, and the Office of General Counsel to draft a new policy.

SLASIAC and SCC members discussed the potential technical difficulties of the depositing requirement, as well as enforcement issues. Ober and Candee noted that “harvesting” of newly published papers for deposit in open access repositories could be done relatively easily after publication.

The group was in favor of a faculty educational campaign to accompany and/or precede the change in copyright policy in order to help change established work habits that might impede practical application of the new policy.

The group had questions about the fiscal impact on publishers of open access repositories, and whether there were studies to that effect. Committee members were also concerned about the impact on scholarly societies, and the push-back that may come from faculty who are on the boards of such societies. Pitts offered assurances that the white papers reflected due diligence in studying and considering these concerns from the faculty perspective.

#### **6b. Revised name and charge for UCOL**

Background:

*UCOL Bylaw Amendments Request (March 13, 2006)*

*Statement of Purposes of Amendments to Bylaw 185*

At its 4/19 meeting, the name change and revised charge were approved for UCOL by Academic Council. The former University Committee on Library will now be the University Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication (“UCOLASC”) to reflect the broader charge.

Ben Crow reported that the next substantive issue is the future of the SCSC, and whether the special committee or its agenda might continue as a task force under UCOLASC. UCOL members are interested in implementing a “mandatory” educational campaign for faculty on scholarly copyright issues. John Ober reported that the Scholarly Communication Officers within the libraries have also prepared outreach and educational materials that are often available on the OSC or separate campus library web sites. The discussion tied in with the previous item’s discussion about the benefits of an educational campaign for faculty, and the benefits of sending material to authors and potential authors in addition to posting material to a web site. Faculty may also need incentives in addition to more knowledge in order to change ingrained habits when dealing with publishers and publishing agreements.

#### **6c. UC responsibility for support of scholarly publishing**

Lynne Withey presented some of the practical questions that have arisen as UC Press and the CDL work together to advance and optimize UC’s publishing capabilities.

1. What to do about traditional forms of publishing?
2. How to evaluate, promote, and distribute new forms of published materials (primarily digital)?

Withey distributed a draft letter to Acting Provost Rory Hume requesting support for a new initiative to evaluate the variety of publishing activities that currently take place on campuses, to investigate how to more efficiently disseminate the scholarly output of UC, and to experiment with new models of publishing. If approved, the one-year initiative would be sponsored and overseen by SLASIAC, with a smaller working group composed

of Lynne Withey, Dan Greenstein, and members of their staffs. SLASIAC members were supportive of the proposal.

## **7. University Committee on Library update (Ben Crow)**

UCOL set out for this year to be more active. The Committee's main foci are journal publisher best practices, promotion of open access to scholarly works, and a faculty educational campaign, including the development of online interactive materials. In addition, UCOL is reviewing campus academic plans as a means to articulate the role of UC libraries in the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

### **Meeting Summary**

To summarize the main actions of the meeting, Chair Wartella noted that the group had:

1. Endorsed the concept that the Acting Provost take action to provide more effective coordination of analysis of and responses to policy and legislative issues that affect academic uses of information.
2. Agreed to consolidate SLASIAC and SCC, with SCC positioned as a standing subcommittee of SLASIAC.

At the next meeting (in the fall, date TBD), Chair Wartella requested an open discussion of the Committee's proposed agenda for the next few years. Items on the table include:

1. Academic Assembly actions resulting in a revised copyright policy.
2. The UC Press and CDL joint venture (see Item 6c.)
3. Other related topics, including collaboration with UCOLASC.