

Systemwide Library and Scholarly Information Advisory Committee
May 21, 2009, 1:30 – 5 p.m.
Conference Call

Meeting Notes

Members Attending: Lucas (Chair); Alvarez; Bourne; Butler; Candee; Ernst; Farley; Greenstein; Ingham; Louis; MacDonald; Powell; Rzeszutko (for Streitz); Schader; Siegel; Steel; Strong; Withey
Staff and Consultants: Miller
Guests: Ivy Anderson (CDL); Catherine Mitchell (eScholarship/CDL)
Members Absent: Gillman; Hancock; Waldron

1. Introductions

Lucas started the meeting with introductions, asking each participant to tell a little bit about his/her background or role on the Committee.

2. eScholarship Policy Issues

Background: eScholarship Publishing Services/University of California Publishing Services,
PowerPoint Presentation: eScholarship: Publishing the Work of UC

Mitchell gave a thorough overview of the eScholarship program, including the history, successes, and challenges as the service grows and evolves. eScholarship is currently in the midst of expanding and raising the visibility of its publishing services (for journals, books, conference proceedings, etc., as well as through the UCPubS initiative in collaboration with UC Press). Mitchell and her team are seeking input on policy issues surrounding criteria for the inclusion/publication of scholarly work within eScholarship. The group that will advise on policy matters might take the form of a sub-committee, existing committee, or some combination.

In the discussion after Mitchell's presentation, Powell noted that the Academic Senate Committee on Libraries and Scholarly Communication (UCOLASC) has been discussing the issue of the University's role in promoting open access publishing and would be a logical place for eScholarship issues. Butler, a member of UCOLASC, reiterated Powell's statement. Greenstein noted that any advisory group for eScholarship should take into consideration the publisher's perspective. The group discussed options, such as a joint sub-committee of UCOLASC and SLASIAC, or some other type of arrangement that would ensure flow of information to and from the faculty.

eScholarship is scheduled for an official re-launch of its services in October and would like to have any outstanding policy questions resolved by then. Greenstein, however, suggested that in order that the academic calendar not delay the launch, eScholarship should go ahead with its

current policies in place (including non-inclusion of undergraduate publications) and wait for advice from the Academic Senate to make changes if necessary.

Actions: Lucas suggested that SLASIAC pose eScholarship policy issues to UCOLASC and ask for feedback. The staff and organizers of SLASIAC will draft a proposal.

3. “Next Generation” library planning overview

Background: PowerPoint Presentation: Next Generation Library Services: *Taking It to the Next Level*

Farley’s presentation emphasized the efforts of the CDL and UC Libraries to provide broader and deeper access to greater quantities of information, in more and varied formats.

Some examples:

- Next Generation Melvyl will include views such as “campus,” “UC,” and “World”
- Collection development initiatives are focusing on reaching broadly, for the best materials, and reducing duplication
- Collection development efforts are also focusing on digital resources, and extending UC’s capacity for managing them
- Technical services on each campus are collaborating to provide more efficiencies in their work
- Projects to preserve and share digital collections include HathiTrust (<http://www.hathitrust.org/>)

Data on usage of digital collections make it possible to compare the use of print resources versus digital.

Greenstein summarized the presentation by noting that the intent of the libraries’ “taking it to the next level” is to (economically) provide faculty with the best services possible. Strong noted that not just the libraries, but also the communities they serve, are working together to collaborate.

4. Mass Digitization and Google Update

Background: PowerPoint Presentation: Massively Digitizing UC Collections

Ivy Anderson provided an extensive background presentation on UC mass digitization activities, including the history, overview of current projects, where and how to find digitized materials, and examples of various uses of digitized materials. Anderson also gave an overview of the Google settlement, and implications for UC and the libraries. Discussion afterwards focused on the Google settlement, which has become a hot topic nationwide.



Butler said that UCOLASC has drafted a letter to the court to express concerns about the settlement. The letter includes recommendations to make the settlement more responsive to the needs of the academy. Butler commended the effort of all parties involved in the digitization projects for a great effort.

5. Library space planning and the regional facilities

Background: Planning for Alternatives – Space Issues at the RLFs

Farley gave an overview of the space issues facing the University libraries, noting that the libraries are committed to maintaining and providing print resources and all of accompanying services. The librarians' Systemwide Operations and Planning Advisory Group (SOPAG) has formed a Task Force on Collections Space Planning to address not only space constraint issues but also to look at the broader collection management environment. Anderson pointed out that the libraries have a number of existing projects and initiatives that address these areas, including the JSTOR print archive and our work with the Center for Research Libraries.

Farley noted that universities nationwide are facing the same issues, and UC is working with other institutions and consortia regionally and nationally to find ways to share resources when possible. Greenstein drew the group's attention to the fact that projects like mass digitization are helping UC to expand its collections through the acquisition of digital content.

6. UC's Information, Publishing and Broadcast Services

Background: Information, Publishing and Broadcast Services description, The UC Portal

Candee provided some introductory background on UCOP's Information, Publishing and Broadcast Services (IPBS) in preparation for more in-depth discussions in the fall. IPBS coordinates and directs publishing initiatives across the UC Press, CDL, UCTV and UC College Prep domains. One example is the proposed UC Portal, which will surface the intellectual, scientific and cultural output of the UC community, and thus enhance the usefulness of UC's collective research for the public, policy makers, K-12 educators, alumni and business leaders of California, as well as our own faculty and students. The pilot issue of the portal will be focused on climate change. The audience for is the general public, journalists, K-12 educators, legislators and our own faculty. Marketing for the portal will be done in conjunction with UCOP's External Relations division.

7. Postings of course recordings to the web

Background: Policy on Use of Recordings of Course Presentations

MacDonald provided some background on the existing Policy on Use of Recordings of Course Presentations, including its origins in responding to a commercial, for-profit course notes



company that had come onto campuses to sell course notes taken by students (and non-students) without the approval of the instructor or University. One of MacDonald's concerns is the liability that the University assumes when one of its faculty posts a course recording to the web without oversight and without consent from students. She noted that there are sanctioned venues for posting courses to the web, such as through the University's agreement with iTunes to offer courses free of charge. The two areas of most concern are *copyright liability* (if the instructor infringes someone else's copyright) and *privacy* (of the students). One campus, in particular, has faculty who are not working with their Educational Technology Services department and are either posting directly to YouTube or planning to do so.

Discussion about the topic included different perspectives offered by SLASAC members. Powell noted that posting lectures to the web can be thought of as outreach and goodwill towards the general public. He said it is part of a broader discussion within the Senate and wanted to ferret out the specific issues of concern. Butler noted that, in addition to MacDonald's concerns, there are faculty concerns about academic freedom and intellectual property. He said that at his campus (UCLA) he does not believe faculty are giving "informed consent" when agreeing to record their courses for the University-sanctioned options. He later noted, however, that sometimes the recording is made by University staff, and the camera is trained solely on the instructor.

Greenstein said that practice is out of sync with technology, and the key will be to bring the policy in line with the practice. MacDonald would like to see action as soon as possible, since some faculty are ready to post lectures independently.

Action: Greenstein will work with Mary MacDonald and Harry Powell on next steps, including the convening of the Standing Subcommittee on Copyright, to work on a revised or new policy.

8. Next Steps

Issues for next year:

- Collection Management
- "Copyright" Policy
- Scholarly communication and policies surrounding open access publishing activities
- Budget responses

The next meeting will be in the fall, after Google Settlement decision date.

