

SLASIAC Conference Call

February 2, 2010, 9am-11am

Meeting Notes

1. eScholarship Policy Issues (Catherine Mitchell)

Catherine Mitchell acknowledged and affirmed the response from UCOLASC, forwarded by Shane Butler, regarding the pending policy issues discussed at the previous SLASIAC meeting.

From UCOLASC:

- (1) eScholarship should have priorities that involve UC-affiliation but that properly speaking these should exclude appropriate content only on a resource-available basis; i.e., even a tenuous UC connection should not automatically mean exclusion, since supporting open access publication is always a "win" for us (since it's one less journal we have to pay for);
- (2) supporting undergrad publication should probably be a CDL role but this should probably be under a different "brand" than eScholarship.

In response to the recommendation from UCOLASC, the CDL Publishing Group has proposed providing a separate platform for undergraduate work. It will not be branded as eScholarship, but will be related. SLASIAC endorsed this idea.

Responding to a question from Gary Strong about posting undergraduate articles (prize-winners, "capstone" projects) vs. journals, Mitchell noted that there would be space for all manner of vetted undergraduate work in the new publication venue.

Catherine Candee mentioned that there is a need for policies not just about who might participate in the CDL's publishing services, but also about how to secure institutional commitment to funding them going forward, given their important role as an institutional service highlighting (disseminating, providing publishing support for) the scholarly work of UC.

Mara Hancock asked whether there was any data showing the impact of eScholarship. Candee noted that there is usage data, as well as studies from the (now defunct) Office of Scholarly Communication and the 2007 report on the "Publishing Needs and Opportunities at the University of California" ([Word](#)).

Mitchell mentioned that eScholarship is currently conducting an outreach and marketing campaign surrounding the launch of the re-designed eScholarship website. While it's a challenge to communicate the opportunities offered by eScholarship to a system of 10 campuses + labs, she noted that they have also heard clamoring for services that go beyond what's currently offered. This has raised questions about mission and scope of eScholarship, what kind of support should be offered.

Shane Butler, a member of UCOLASC, reported that the UCOLASC statement stemmed from the recognition of a need for infrastructure for publishing options within UC. Some type of undergraduate component is part of that strategy.

Laine Farley said that UC is launching a pilot to add electronic versions of theses and dissertations (ETDs) to eScholarship. Three campuses will be the initial participants. The ETDs will also be going into the preservation repository.

The remainder of the discussion of eScholarship policies centered on what type of UC-connection – advisory or editorial board, perhaps, in the case of journals – that a potential contributor would need in order to use the eScholarship services. Basically, a minimal affiliation is enough. If the UC person leaves the system, then it makes sense to keep the publication with eScholarship for continuity sake. Same idea if a faculty member leaves UC and wants to continue to publish his or her journal in eScholarship.

Butler noted that, for an emerging field, there might not be enough faculty at UC to create a journal, which will inevitably lead to various types of situations. In short, there will have to be some discretionary decision making about what material qualifies for inclusion in eScholarship.

Gene Lucas volunteered to take to publicize eScholarship's services to COVC, if staff will provide a synopsis that he can distribute.

Next Steps:

1. Get undergraduate publication platform going – in a few months
2. Start to prioritize what to support (in terms of allocating resources). Make strategic choices.
3. Pull together data on usage of eScholarship
4. Send Gene Lucas a synopsis of eScholarship for distribution to COVC

2. UC Press Review Progress Report (Dan Greenstein)

The UC Press Review group convened in November to do scenario planning for UC Press, and also to think about university press publishing in general. Participants included members of the UC Press Advisory Board, librarians, and people outside the University. The meeting facilitator was a founder of “scenario planning.” There will be a preliminary report from the group in the spring.

Greenstein explained that given the current University budget and the transition of the publishing industry in general, everyone agrees that things need to change. Monographic publishing is not sustainable. The group wants to bring in more outside perspectives, such as Tim O'Reilly, and to get Google's ideas on scholarly publishing.

Gene Lucas asked whether everyone is struggling, and if there were any examples of successful transitions. Dan offered that everyone is indeed struggling and there are no good examples at this point.

3. Google Update (Laine Farley)

Revisions to the original Google Settlement Agreement are currently out for comment. A hearing will take place in the Southern District Court of New York on February 18. UC's FAQ is available on the Reshaping Scholarly Communication website (<http://osc.universityofcalifornia.edu/google/>). The main change from the original agreement was related to international publications. Google continues to scan UC materials.

Farley had no progress to report on UC's contract with Google. Counsel is reviewing changes. The DOJ might be submitting something to the Court on the revised settlement.

4. Budget implications for co-investment model (Laine Farley)

Farley described the financial inter-dependencies that the UC libraries have with each other, mainly in licensing of digital content. Campuses all co-invest, and there are elaborate and established methods for the process. Libraries devote roughly 50% of their collections budget to shared purchasing. The benefits are well-known, but can be difficult to document.

One estimate suggests that the average cost for UC is \$70 per license, while individually the license would cost somewhere around \$200-500. Recently, UC had to cancel 23 licensed resources due to budget constraints. When this happens, the CDL tries to negotiate with publishers so that campuses that maintain their own subscriptions don't have to pay extra, and that there is no penalty for re-subscribing when and if the campuses choose.

In addition to licensed content, the UC libraries also co-invest in library services. For example, for UC-eLinks (http://www.cdlib.org/services/d2d/ucelinks/about_ucelinks.html) CDL pays the software license, hosts the server, and performs updates, while the campuses pay service fees

For the "Ask a Librarian" digital reference service (<http://www.questionpoint.org/crs/servlet/org.oclc.home.TFSRedirect?virtcategory=10800>), campuses have joined together (and with a larger pool of librarians) for 24 hour reference service.

Ordinarily, CDL has discretionary funds to offer publishers for (e.g.,) back-files or special one-time purchases. These can help in negotiations for better deals from publishers. But in the current budget environment, these funds are drying up and the results will impact CDL actions for next three years.

In the past, the CDL also has had discretionary funds to invest in new, transformative technologies and services. Ideas in the pipeline include a service to help faculty manage their intellectual property, but there is no funding either centrally or on campuses for this needed service. Some campus libraries had plans to hire a copyright expert, but the positions were for the most part put on hold.

Funding for development of technical library services that will make a difference down the line is also in danger.

Gary Strong noted that UCLA did hire copyright person last year, and is conducting faculty seminars on copyright management. Farley suggested that UCLA could share its expertise in the copyright arena.

On the subject of cost saving for licensed resources for campuses, Shane Butler asked whether campuses would actually subscribe to all of the titles that they receive through resource sharing arrangements. Farley explained that it doesn't come out as less expensive (and it's not easy) for campuses to negotiate their own deals, or to do "a la carte" subscriptions.

5. Introduction of items for Standing Subcommittee on Copyright Policy (Mary MacDonald)

The first issue concerns faculty who are taping courses/presentations and posting the files on YouTube without oversight by Educational Technology groups on campuses.

Mara Hancock suggested broadening the subject to also look at "unsponsored" generation of course lectures, and to include the student involvement perspective. Dan Greenstein noted that practice has changed more quickly than policy, while Hancock agreed and suggested that the subcommittee discuss emerging practices and identify policy gaps.

The other issue is faculty who are packaging instructional aides such as past tests, slides, etc., and charging students for the materials. MacDonald suggested that this is not the same as charging for a formal textbook. Faculty do own copyright in their course materials.

Next step: Convene SSCP. Gary Strong said that he would be interested in participating as well.

Next SLASIAC meeting will be in the spring. Topics will include:

1. UC Press Review
2. Copyright issues follow-up