

Systemwide Library and Scholarly Information Advisory Committee (SLASIAC)

May 7, 2012

9am – 12pm

Conference Call

Participating: Mark Aldenderfer, Rosio Alvarez, Dan Greenstein, Laine Farley, Robin Garrell, Cynthia Johnson, Chris Kelty, Gene Lucas, Catherine Mitchell, Rich Schneider, Pete Siegel, Ginny Steel, Wendy Streitz, Gary Strong.

1. Open Access Policy (Chris Kelty, Rich Schneider, Catherine Mitchell)

Chris Kelty:

A draft version of a [UC Open Access Policy](#) is available on the Reshaping Scholarly Communication website, along with background material and FAQ. Since early March, Chris Kelty, Rich Schneider and other contributors have been working on a final policy that will be presented to the systemwide UCOLASC meeting on May 25. In addition to the policy, UCOLASC members will be provided with educational materials including slides and an FAQ to share with their campus committee and fellow faculty members. Chris emphasized that while the policy is a *faculty-led* policy that will be passed *by faculty*, he hopes that the UC administration will contribute their support. In particular, the campus libraries and CDL will be called upon to assist in the implementation.

Chris has been meeting with systemwide committees in an effort to get all faculty up to speed and on board with the proposed policy. He has spoken to Academic Personnel, Academic Freedom, Faculty Welfare, and Research Policy committees and feels that the policy has momentum due to the Princeton University announcement of its OA policy and the recent memorandum about the cost of scholarly publications from the Harvard Faculty Advisory Council to the Library.

While UC's policy itself is nearing finalization, questions still remain, including what happens if not all campuses pass the policy, how to encourage compliance, and where the policy should reside. The Academic Personnel Manual is one place, but is a document that is difficult to alter should changes be necessary going forward. The immediate plan for adopting the policy is that individual campuses (or even schools) may vote to pass the policy without all of UC joining. UCOLASC wants campuses to be able to go ahead with the policy if they're ready (such as UCSF).

Rich Schneider:

At UCSF, Rich has talked with at least nine faculty committees and numerous individuals to garner support for the proposed open access policy. He has asked each committee to send a letter to UCOLASC expressing its support. On May 21st, the UCSF faculty senate will vote on whether to adopt the open access policy. Rich is confident that it will pass. Fully half of all UCSF faculty output is already available in PubMed Central.

Catherine Mitchell:

CDL Publishing Group Director Catherine Mitchell has been gathering information from Harvard and MIT on their experience in implementing open access policies on their campuses. She posed questions to SLASIAC that have arisen from those discussions, including the scope of articles to be deposited in a UC repository, compliance and assessment concerns, and the wider issue of multiple copies. While the policy is drafted to be independent of implementation specifics, the questions will eventually need to be addressed.

Questions & answers on the proposed policy

Questions for Chris included whether UC faculty editors (of existing journals) had been consulted in the discussions on the policy, as they are sometimes seen as defenders of the current model. Chris said that editors are primarily concerned with defending their scholarly societies and retaining the revenue that comes from working with commercial publishers and that helps support the societies. There are several choices for those who feel that open access would harm their field. First, there is an opt-out clause for any author who does not wish to grant license to the University. Secondly, substantial revenue is possible within the open access structure. Instead of relying on subscription revenue filtered through a commercial publisher, the societies can charge article processing fees (a standard practice for open access publications) that in most cases would generate comparable revenue and not contribute to the high profit margins of the largest publishers. Faculty have noted that some fields have less money available than others, and charging the author an article processing fee would be a barrier to publishing. It was pointed out that it's a "zero-sum game" in that either the library pays (for the subscription), the research funder pays (as part of a grant), or the author pays. [While it wasn't mentioned in the meeting, many Universities are setting up open access funds to help authors who otherwise cannot afford the fee to publish open access. One example is UC Berkeley's ["Berkeley Research Impact Initiative"](#) (BRII).]

Chris Kelty acknowledged that passing a UC open access policy is part of a larger and much longer process of changing the scholarly publishing model. The intention is for the policy to help make scholarly output more widely and freely available while not having adverse effects on scholarly societies or researchers. If faculty are concerned about charging authors from poorer countries, there are ways around that, such as pricing models that allow for different authors with different needs.

Another concern is that faculty not be burdened with the additional work of amending publishing agreements and depositing articles. This might be crucial in getting majority faculty support on some campuses. Chris Kelty noted that while Harvard's opt-out rate is less than 5%, their deposit rate is also fairly low. It is understood that compliance will not be 100% from the day the policy passes. UCOLASC will hold ongoing discussions about implementation and faculty education over the next year.

Gary Strong mentioned that the UCLA library has a history of working with faculty on open access issues, and sees the policy as part of a larger movement that includes using open access materials for teaching and providing a more cost-effective education for students.

Once the policy passes at UCSF, the information will be shared with the rest of UC, as well as publicly. Publishers will need to know about the policy so that they know what to expect from UC authors. There will most likely be a slow roll-out as implementation issues get settled.

2. Library Planning Task Force Report follow-up: Library Implementation Plan

Ginny Steel gave a presentation on the UC Libraries' initiatives, including a proposed financial infrastructure for supporting collaborative work. SLASAC members were asked to give input on whether there were items of higher priority that the libraries should be working on, and on assessment metrics. As the experts in the field, the librarians were seen as the best source of determining assessment measures. The libraries shouldn't take too much time doing assessment and metrics, such that it takes away from the actual work. Ginny said that right now, most library assessment measures focus on things (e.g., how many) and usage, and there is no good way of getting to the quality of services. The libraries want to make sure they're providing a suitable level of support for faculty and students at each campus.

Regarding determining the value of the libraries, Chris Kelty noted that faculty have differing perceptions of what the libraries and CDL actually provide and often don't realize the number of services available. Libraries make efforts to communicate to faculty, but it's challenging to do so widely and comprehensively, even on just one campus. Laine noted that trying to come up with metrics for the value of the CDL (as part of its self-assessment for its review) was difficult. There are not a lot of comparable entities or metrics for comparison.

Regarding e-books, Pete Siegel mentioned that there are several groups – both within UC and nationally – working on e-book strategies, and it would be beneficial to work together so as to complement each others' work. Pete specifically mentioned CENIC and Internet 2, and even though those efforts are primarily about textbooks (while the libraries are focused more on the scholarly monograph) there are points of common interest such as the technological infrastructure and working with publishers in general. One point of contact within UC is the Information Technology Leadership Council (ITLC). Ginny and Pete will work together to see what connections can be made.

Regarding funding, Debbie Obley mentioned that with the new funding system, all OP units were undergoing review, and she said that the CDL has received the most support in these discussions. Gene Lucas said that the executive budget committee (of which he is a member) supports investments made centrally that enable campus savings. A new service might also receive the same type of support if it can be shown that it saves the campuses time and effort.

3.a. CDL Budget and Budget Process

The budget process is still going on, although departmental targets should be released from the UCOP budget office soon. Gene Lucas said that the CDL was identified as a place *not* to cut, and to possibly even receive funds for initiatives that save campuses money. Materials will be made available prior to the Regents' meeting in July.

3.b. Digital Preservation Network (DPN)

Laine Farley described this nationwide effort to build an additional layer of security for preserving digital content. Initiated by Stanford, and Virginia, DPN would create diverse nodes for replication of digital materials. The idea is that the content and metadata would be able to survive single-site failure instances because there would be replication in different geographical regions, using different software and organizational structures. The current three nodes identified for replication are HathiTrust, Stanford Digital Repository, and the Academic Preservation Trust, a new initiative. The participants believe that research universities need to preserve this material and cannot rely on commercial entities. The European Union is looking into funding a similar effort. San Diego is participating on behalf of [Chronopolis](#).

3.c. New model for supporting arXiv

arXiv is an open access repository that has been around for 20 years, serving mainly as a source for physics, mathematics, and other physical sciences pre-prints. It is a moderated archive, with a group of faculty for each discipline that monitors what gets accepted. Once content is in arXiv, it is freely available at no charge. While the service has been maintained at Cornell for several years, the University recently determined that it could no longer solely support it, and so found funding from the Simons Foundation and worked out a plan for institutional membership. Since UC's level of use is high, and the University wants to support alternative publishing methodologies, the UC libraries decided to become participating members. Membership for all UC campuses will cost \$15,300 per year for five years (the span of the current model). UC will also have a seat on the governing board.

3.d. E-research support

The concept comes out of a series of meetings organized by the Digital Library Foundation (DLF) and Association for Research Libraries (ARL) to explore the role of research libraries in providing support for faculty and researchers as they move into the realm of “big data” and digital research. According to the ARL website, e-science is a large and complex topic that has developed over many years and touches every branch of science—both natural and social sciences. The concept at UC will be referred to as “e-research” (instead of e-science). The UC librarians are organizing their own meeting to share information and identify potential e-research collaborations on the local, systemwide, and network levels.