

# Systemwide Library and Scholarly Information Advisory Committee

February 22, 2001

10 am – 3 pm

Four Points by Sheraton Hotel, Los Angeles International Airport

Members present: Bergstrom, Dolgonas for Campbell, French, Luce for Hartford, Hume (**chair**), Peete, F  
Schottlaender, Viswanathan, Warren, Werner, Zelmanowitz

Members absent: Adams, Bero, Clark, Hay, Heinecke, McCredie, Pantelia, Sharrow, Stead, Vermeij

Staff: Lawrence

Guests: Catherine H. Candee, Director of Scholarly Communication Initiatives, California Dig  
Library

## 1. Preliminaries

### 1.a. Welcome and introductions; new members

### 1.b. Review of meeting objectives

Background Material: [SLASIAC 2000-01 Roster](#)

Hume convened the meeting and asked members to introduce themselves. The meeting objectives were reviewed.

### MEETING OBJECTIVES

1. Review and identify issues related to proposed new technology platform for CDL systems and consider consultation and communication issues.
2. Review transition plan for CDL-hosted databases and consider consultation issues.
3. Discuss current developments in the Collection Management Initiative and the Standing Committee on Universitywide Collection Management.
4. Discuss current developments in scholarly communication.
5. Review progress on implementation of proxy servers and discuss other authentication developments.
6. Discuss current developments in copyright policy, statewide K-12 networking, and UC enrollment planning.
7. Discuss current developments in the library budget, and ideas and processes for the work of the SLASIAC Scholarly Information Task Force.

## 2. Strategies for Managing Scholarly Information

### 2.a. Online Union Catalog, Request for Proposals (*Update*)

### 2.b. CDL-Hosted Databases (*Update*)

Background Material:

- Tradeoffs Between [Vendor System] and the MELVYL Union Catalog (**Internal Document**, CDL 1/30/01)
- [CDL-Hosted Databases: Transition Steering Committee, CDL 1/12/01](#) (NOTE: MS-Word document; follow your browser's instructions for viewing or downloading)

French reminded the Committee of Richard Lucier's letter of January 5, 2001, advising SLASIAC about the procurement of new technology to support the CDL's MELVYL® union catalog. She identified the apparent successful bidder, noting that the name will not be widely announced until a contract has been executed. French drew the Committee's attention to the background document, "Tradeoffs Between [Vendor System] and the MELVYL Union Catalog," noting that the vendor's technology offered several features of great value. In addition to the record consolidation and command-line interface capabilities of the current MELVYL catalog, to which UC faculty and librarians had accorded a high priority in the RFP evaluation process, the vendor's product includes such valuable features as support for a wide variety of non-Roman character sets and support for linking of citations using the recently-developed SFX technology. French expects that a contract will be concluded by mid-March, and a prototype system should be available for widespread testing by Fall 2001. Leveraging the distributed campus workforce that has evolved to support the CDL, a network of campus liaisons has been established, and a well-qualified campus librarian, Cris Campbell from UCB, has been recruited to serve as project manager for the transition to the new system. A Senior Associate for Education, Usability, and Outreach, which is viewed as a key position in the transition, is also being recruited from the campuses. The same vendor has been selected by a UC campus for a full-scale integrated library system implementation.

The Senior Associate for Education, Usability, and Outreach, who is supporting the MELVYL system transition, is also an integral resource for the team responsible for the transition of abstracting and indexing (A&I) databases. As announced previously, by the time the existing MELVYL technology is decommissioned (no later than December 2002), the CDL will no longer host A&I databases locally, relying instead on vendor-hosted access. The CDL plans to operate parallel systems, including both the MELVYL catalog and the A&I databases, through December 2002. However, not all locally-hosted A&I databases can follow this general timetable. As discussed at the October, 2000 SLASIAC meeting, it will not be possible to update the local version of Medline after January 2002, or the currently-available version of Georef (hosted by Stanford University) after December 2001; users will have to depend on the parallel vendor-supported access for the most current data after those dates. French noted that the need for CDL staff to support vendor-initiated changes in data formats of locally-mounted databases could divert significant resources from transition to the new system. She sought the Committee's advice on the feasibility of limiting investment in changes to locally-mounted A&I data in order to concentrate resource on the new system. The Committee did not express concerns about this strategy.

French asked for the Committee's advice on how best to handle consultation with faculty on the impending changes to CDL systems. The Committee, endorsing a suggestion by Luce, recommended the use of focus groups under joint sponsorship of the University Library and the Committee on Library at each campus.

## 2.c. Collection Management Initiative (*Update*)

## 2.d. Standing Committee on Universitywide Collection Management (*Update*)

### Background Materials:

- [Collection Management Strategies in a Digital Environment, Project Advisory Groups \(as of 2/14/01\)](#) (NOTE: MS-Word document; follow your browser's instructions for viewing or downloading)
- [Standing Committee on Universitywide Library Collection Management Planning, 2000-01 Roster](#) (NOTE: MS-Word document; follow your browser's instructions for viewing or downloading)
- [Standing Committee on Universitywide Library Collection Management Planning, 2/1/01, Agenda](#) (NOTE: MS-Word document; follow your browser's instructions for viewing or downloading)

Schottlaender provided a brief background on the project and progress to date, and reviewed the project organization as described in the background document, "Project Advisory Groups." In response to a question from Hume, he described the varieties of channels for consultation with faculty, including campus visits, the Steering Committee, SLASIAC, and the Standing Committee on Universitywide Library Collection Management Planning. Warren described the CMI as a "magnificent project," but cautioned regarding the importance of balancing the research and application dimensions of the project. Zelmanowitz recommended the use of *Notice* to inform faculty about the project.

Schottlaender summarized the initial meeting of the Standing Committee on Universitywide Library Collection Management Planning (known informally as the "Collection Management Planning Group") on February 1, 2001. At that meeting, the group reviewed its charge, the history of collection management policy and strategy in the University, events leading to the CMI, and the goals and methods of the CMI project itself. The Committee agreed that its primary focus would be upon space for collections, the management of collections, and the nature of the University's archival responsibilities. The next step for the committee will be to concentrate on possible new roles for the University's Regional Library Facilities (RLFs), using scenarios to be developed by a subcommittee. The committee will meet approximately quarterly, with the next meeting scheduled for April 26.

## 2.e. Scholarly Communication Initiatives –*eScholarship* update (*Information/Discussion*) [Deferred – see below]

### 3. Technological Infrastructure Support

#### 3.a. Authentication developments (*Update/Discussion*)

**Background Material:** "[UC Proxy Server Status – 2/21/2001,](#)" distributed at the meeting. (NOTE: MS-Excel document; follow your browser's instructions for viewing or downloading)

Dolgonas cited SLASIAC [Resolution C](#), Authentication of Authorized UC Library Users for Access to Digital Library Collections and Services (3/24/00), as helpful in securing University funding to support the cost of acquiring digital certificates from the University's vendor. The UCOP Information Resources and Communications department is working with campuses to interface existing local authentication systems with the Universitywide Public Key Infrastructure (PKI) and implement proxy services. For UCOP users, the preferred approach is to avoid creating an additional unique identifier for proxy service, but rather to use the PKI system to authenticate proxy users. The handout reviews the current status of campus proxy servers. The

rightmost column shows the location of information for campus users on how to make use of proxy services; IR&C will continue to update this list. French noted that the University Librarians' Systemwide Operations and Planning Advisory Group (SOPAG) had recently launched a [task force](#) to work on assuring the privacy of users' library transactions. Dolgonas declared that the UC PKI plan expressly provided that UC certificates would protect individual privacy. In response to a question from Werner, Dolgonas expressed the view that UC was close to the leading edge among peer institutions in implementing PKI authentication.

#### 4. Planning Context

##### 4.a. Standing Committee on Copyright update (*Information*)

Hume began by reminding the Committee of the national effort to educate faculty about ownership and retention of rights to their research publications, as expressed in the [Tempe Principles](#). The [Standing Committee on Copyright](#) (SCC) has temporarily deferred action on copyright education in this and other areas, pending the development of policies on ownership and appropriate use of course presentations and materials. The SCC's work on course ownership emphasizes the traditional principle of faculty ownership of their independently-created scholarly work and the limitations on this principle, and extends these to the area of course materials and presentations, with a special emphasis on digital formats. It is expected that SCC will soon be prepared to distribute its proposals in this area for broad discussion and comment within the University. Lawrence noted that structuring a coherent Universitywide copyright education, information and service program is extraordinarily complicated owing to the diversity of interests that are implicated in copyright issues and the significant differences in the way that these interests are organized on each campus. To begin addressing these issues, staff will discuss with the SCC at their February 23 meeting a preliminary proposal to develop a pilot education program in support of the UC Teaching, Learning and technology Center (TLtC), a presidential initiative intended to encourage UC faculty to share their instructional technology applications with other faculty and experiment with scaling these up to support multiple courses or campuses (additional information about the TLtC is available at <http://www.ucop.edu/acadinit/tltc/>). Dolgonas noted that the challenge in implementing the SCC's proposed policy approach is to ensure consistent implementation, particularly in regard to the interpretation of the concept of "extraordinary University resources" that provides a limitation on the faculty member's exclusive rights. Viswanathan expressed the Academic Council's pleasure that the SCC is coming to grips with the course ownership issue and suggested that, in the spirit of the Tempe Principles, the concept of "extraordinary University resources" might also apply to research publications. Bergstrom asked whether anything could be done in UC policy to address the issue of faculty assignment of all rights in research publications to the publishers. Lawrence responded that the proposed SCC policies include a provision, drawn from policies developed at other institutions, that encourages faculty to retain certain rights, consistent with the Tempe Principles, but does not attempt to restrict or regulate faculty publication decisions. Schottlaender noted that 26 of 30 institutions that are members of the Big 12 consortium have endorsed the Tempe Principles.

##### 4.b. Digital California Project

###### Background Material:

- Email, Hume to McCredie and SLASIAC, "Next Planning Cycle," 11/2/00.
- ["Digital California Project: K-12 Statewide Networking,"](#) powerpoint printout, 2/21/01,

distributed at the meeting.

Dolgonas reported that the Digital California Project (DCP) arose from an initiative of Governor Davis which resulted in an appropriation of funds to UC that are transferred to the Corporation for Educational Networking Initiatives in California (CENIC), the non-profit entity established to develop and manage CalREN-2, the California portion of the national Internet 2 project. DCP is intended to extend CalREN-2 to California K-12 schools in order to a) extend high-speed connectivity to schools throughout the state and b) remove cost barriers to effective K-12 use of the high-speed Internet. Dolgonas reviewed the network design, which generally provides connectivity to county offices of education in each county (with responsibility for connectivity to and within individual school sites resting with the school districts and other K-12 organizations). Oversight is provided by a broad-based program steering committee. At this point, the primary service to be supported by the DCP is the delivery of online Advanced Placement courses, but there has been ongoing discussion of how digital library resources at campuses and the CDL might support DCP goals. Discussions have shown that there is much UC digital library material that might be of interest to K-12; the CDL's Japanese-American Relocation Digital Archive (JARDA) (at <<http://jarda.cdlib.org/>>) is one example.

With deployment of the network infrastructure proceeding on schedule, attention is turning to examination of opportunities to leverage existing programs and resources to take advantage of enhanced connectivity. Dolgonas spoke with McCredie, who suggested this topic at the October 2000 SLASIAC but could not be present today, and understands that McCredie's intent was to encourage discussion of the potential for collaboration between the UC Libraries (and particularly the CDL) and K-12 schools. Dolgonas notes that specific funding for provision of library content through the DCP is another issue for discussion. Funding for this purpose was proposed in UC's initial proposal to the Governor, but was not supported at that time; this is an issue that could be revisited in the future. Werner noted that the UCLA Libraries have done a number of projects addressing K-12 and have discovered that the key issue is the readiness of a particular school to participate in network-based strategies; there is no reliable source of information on the networking capabilities of individual schools, although the California Department of Education has an outdated database on this subject. Zelmanowitz noted that the DCP can be viewed as a strategic plan for networking K-12; in this context, the key issue is getting K-12 to take ownership of the initiative, and the role of the program steering committee is central to that effort. Viswanathan noted the relevance of both the DCP and any prospective library component to the University's outreach program, and particularly the proposed Dual Admission program (which admits certain UC-eligible students to both a UC campus and a corresponding community college). Viswanathan also noted that for effective planning, it is important to know what costs K-12 will incur for DCP and how these costs will be funded. Schottlaender noted that for the purposes of planning and securing extramural funds for digital collections, the existence of the DCP can be cited as a significant readiness factor.

#### **2.e. Scholarly Communication Initiatives –eScholarship update (Information/Discussion)**

**Background Material:** [eScholarship Update – February 2001](#), distributed at the meeting (NOTE: MS-Word document; follow your browser's instructions for viewing or downloading)

Candee begin by reviewing the discussion questions set forth in the background item distributed at the meeting. The *eScholarship* program finds itself experimenting more with "digital publishing." For example, they are identifying scholars who are interested in the contents of the JARDA project of the Online Archive of California (a program of the CDL); these interests manifest themselves as opportunities to create digital publications, leading to active involvement with the UC Press. The [Electronic Cultural Atlas Initiative](#) (ECAI, described by Prof. Lewis Lancaster at the October 2000 SLASIAC meeting) is working with the Interactive University Project at UCB to construct a "K-12 interface" to the ECAI collection, creating a different kind of "digital publication." This experience has led *eScholarship* to focus its planning on several generic models of scholarly digital publishing.

The *eprint repository* model presents a number of technical and policy issues. The *Dermatology Online Journal* positions an eprint repository underneath an existing journal. The faculty participants in *International and Area Studies* (IAS) have a publication review model that features multiple levels of review and filtering; implementing this model requires significant custom programming, raising the issue of whether the investment can be leveraged by extension to other communities. The principals of the *Tobacco Archives* project envision using the eprint repository to collect, organize and provide access to original research in support of a broad program of archive development, education, and research support, under the guidance of an independent advisory committee; the organizers do not envision the research archive as being open to self-archiving by the creators. Luce noted that, on the basis of his experience with the arXiv physics archive, eprint repositories face fundamental issues of scaling and financial sustainability.

*Digital scholarly journals* present different issues. The *Dermatology Online Journal*, described above, presents the challenge of integrating an existing journal into an underlying eprint repository. The founders of the *Environment Journal* are all established faculty from multiple disciplines who want more effectively to reach a multidisciplinary audience, and want to explore how digital publishing can help. These faculty are looking at integrating datasets and dynamic visualizations into their publication (and are interested as well in the *dataset publishing* model discussed below), and are interested in the effect of new digital publishing models on the discipline of environmental studies. They have raised the notion of publishing in print as an accompaniment to the digital journal; the use of *eScholarship* capabilities to produce a print journal challenges the foundation concepts of the program. UC Press is interested in publishing in the environmental studies area, and is working on a print-on-demand system for the International and Area Studies scholars. Bergstrom reported on what he knew of a new private-sector initiative by Niles Associates, the "Berkeley Electronic Press," which is launching digital journals in economics with four explicit levels of quality/impact, with the assignment of a submission to a "level" determined by editors with the advice of peer reviewers. Bergstrom also advanced the view that replicating peer review online should not present serious problems, and offer potential for improvements. Zelmanowitz noted that economics, with its longstanding tradition of widespread distribution of working papers, is an excellent candidate for experimenting with new forms of peer review.

*eScholarship*'s experience with *digital monographs* is limited (*Tobacco War*, a joint publication of *eScholarship* and the UC Press is the primary example), but the prospect of an expanded digital monograph program raises issues of priority as between monographs and journals.

Archeologists have been the primary force behind work in *dataset publishing*, primarily through the ECAI program. As described by Lancaster at the last meeting, the concept of an evolving, constantly-updated collaborative dataset as a primary venue for research "publication" raises significant issues regarding ownership and control of individual contributions, attribution of works derived from the dataset, and the merger of the data with the software tools used to organize, access and display the information and the resulting rights of the software developers.

In view of the variety of fundamental issues that have emerged through the *eScholarship* program, Hume asked how Candee gets advice on what proposed projects to support. He advised that *eScholarship* establish a small, agile group of expert faculty to provide immediate feedback on management and editorial decisions. Viswanathan observed that finding the right faculty is a significant challenge, and SLASIAC agreed to return to this question at the next meeting.

**ACTION: SLASIAC invites Candee to attend meetings regularly to update the Committee on *eScholarship* activities.**

**ACTION: At the Spring meeting, the Committee will undertake discussion of a faculty advisory group for *eScholarship*.**

## 5. Budget Plans and Strategies

### 5.a. 2001-02 Governor's Budget (*Information*)

#### Background Material:

- "Proposed Program Allocation of Funds Provided for Libraries in the 2001-02 Governor's Budget" (2/2/01), distributed at the meeting.
- "New State and University Funds Received for Libraries and Scholarly Communication as a Result of the Library Planning and Action Initiative and Library Budget Initiative, 1997-98 Through 2002-03: Library Materials" (2/21/01), distributed at the meeting.

Lawrence reviewed the request for additional permanent funds for libraries in the 2001-02 Regents' Budget for Current Operation, and described the 2001-02 Governor's Budget, which provided \$5 million for library materials within the Partnership Agreement and a share for libraries from an additional \$20 million one-time allocation for "core needs," but did not provide the requested \$2.5 million in additional permanent funding for the California Digital Library (CDL). According to the UCOP Budget Office, prospects for restoration of the CDL funding in the 2001-02 budget are not favorable. For 2002-03, it is expected that the Partnership Agreement will be fully funded (once again providing \$5 million in new permanent funds: \$4 million for library materials, allocated to the campuses, and \$1 million to support the Resource Sharing program), but prospects for permanent funding for initiatives outside the Partnership are not bright.

French sought the Committee's advice on how the permanent and one-time funding provided in the Governor's Budget should best be allocated among the three coordinated programs in the Library Budget Strategy: library materials for campus collections, resource sharing, and the shared digital collections of the CDL. In French's view, the main issue to be considered is maintaining consistency with the strategy recommended by the Library Planning and Action Initiative and implemented in the Library Budget Initiative. The key elements of the strategy to address the structural cost problems of the libraries' collections budgets were to provide adequate funding for local campus collections while employing technology to support the continued growth and development of the Universitywide shared collection. Continued investment in the Resource Sharing program and the CDL support this strategy, provide maximum leverage for University financial and library resources, and provide a more uniform level of service to all campuses, regardless of size. On the other hand, French has heard some reports of significant and growing faculty concerns about the adequacy of funding for local campus collections. These concerns, to the extent they exist, may arise from incomplete information about the benefits to faculty at all campuses of the Universitywide shared collection, disciplinary differences in perceived benefits of the CDL and resource sharing, or reactions to the allocation decisions of specific campuses. SLASIAC members present did not report that this was a prevalent concern among faculty.

Zelmanowitz noted that the situation arises in part from the decision to place the CDL budget request outside the Partnership Agreement, and reported that he will discuss this within UCOP in advance of the preparation of the 2002-03 Regents' Budget. Werner made the point that the University has long been guided by the "one University, one library" philosophy (N.B. this concept was specifically reaffirmed by the Library Planning and Action Initiative Advisory Task Force, the predecessor of SLASIAC, in 1997); adherence to this rubric requires continued support for shared collections and services. Werner also noted that the University Librarians were prepared to deal with any faculty concerns arising from the recommended allocation.

Based on this discussion, the Committee recommended that permanent and one-time funds provided in the 2001-02 Governor's Budget in support of the UC budget plan for libraries be allocated in a manner that maintains support and sustains momentum for all three elements of the University's library strategy. SLASIAC discussed a draft staff allocation proposal, and was in accord with an allocation along those lines that provides at least \$1 million in permanent funds for the CDL while maintaining commitments to support campus-based library materials and Universitywide library resource sharing. The Committee also remains convinced of the importance and value of the University's library strategy, and strongly recommends that the University pursue every opportunity during the remainder of the 2001-02 budget discussions and in the 2002-03 budget to secure full funding for the multi-year budget plan for libraries.

#### **5.b. Scholarly Information Program Task Force (Update)**

**Background Material:** [SLASIAC Scholarly Information Program Task Force: Charge](#) (Draft 2/14/00) (NOTE: MS-Word document; follow your browser's instructions for viewing or downloading)

French reported that the Scholarly Information Program Task Force is awaiting its faculty appointments and has not yet begun its work; this item was placed on the agenda to allow for additional general discussion of possible strategies for development and funding for libraries and

scholarly information management. Viswanathan reported that the Academic Council should have its nominations for the Task Force within two weeks. Schottlaender suggested that the current scholarly communication system could be likened to a dysfunctional family; in this view, a strategic shift from libraries to other components of the system is analogous to refocusing on a different member of the family. Bergstrom observed that he came to UCSB from the University of Michigan, and has found library service at UCSB to be fully the equal of that at his previous institution, despite the smaller size of the local campus collection.

## **6. Future meetings and agendas**

### **6.a SLASIAC 2000-01 work plan update (*Discussion*)**

### **6.b. Scheduling for 2001 meetings (*Discussion*)**

<b>Background Material:</b> SLASIAC 2000-01 Plan (2/14/01)
--

Hume confirmed that the next SLASIAC meeting is scheduled for April 25 in Northern California. Lawrence reported that this date presented some difficulties for the library representatives to the Committee, and that he would explore both relocating the April 25 meeting to UC Irvine and rescheduling for a later date.