SLASIAC Meeting
Oct. 2, 2014
Oakland, CA

Attending	Scott Waugh (**Chair**), Karen Butter, Susan Carlson, Tom Cogswell, Laine Farley, Robin Garrell, Rita Hao (afternoon only), Dan Hare, Susan Koskinen, Angus MacDonald, Alison Mudditt, Jim Phillips, Wendy Streitz, Lorelei Tanji
On phone	James Frew
Guests	Mary Croughan, Catherine Mitchell
Staff	Joanne Miller

Meeting Notes

1. **Brief introductions**
2. **California Digital Library activities and budget update**

Laine Farley presented highlights of the California Digital Library's annual report, which was recently completed for 2013-14.

In addition to the CDL's accomplishments, Laine grouped the CDL's current work into the themes found in the annual report:

- Expanding global access to research
- Supporting data-intensive research
- Connecting users with unique digital collections
- Contributing to a National Digital Library

Laine went into further detail on some of the projects, such as "SNAC" (Social Networks and Archival Context), an archives search tool hosted at the University of Virginia. CDL is a partner and did much of the front-end development.

Overall licensing costs at CDL increased by only 2% last year. Two big contracts re-negotiated were Elsevier & Sage. The Elsevier negotiations resulted in a one-year subscription to SCOPUS, a product similar to Web of Science that has broader disciplinary coverage but less complete backfiles. It is used extensively in health sciences. Twenty-eight new resources – some one-time purchases – were added last year.

CDL Budget included one-time augmentation of $230K from the Provost for the harvesting tool to support the UC Open Access Policy. Ongoing funding has been requested. CDL's IT charges decreased, but are expected to rise again. However, future reductions will result from use of Amazon's cloud services and UCOP data center migration. The results of OP's new efficiency review, "Strategic Operational Review at OP" may also lead to budget changes.

Looking ahead, the CDL is taking the research lifecycle – its focus for past several years – and turning it "inside out" by putting scholars at the center. The main idea is to understand the scholarly experience, and determine how CDL's services can supplement or extend existing services. Specifically, the CDL seeks to understand the impact of disciplinary differences, how scholars manage their works, how they get credit for new types of works, and the tools scholars use to accomplish their work.

3. Strategic Operational Review at UCOP

Susan Carlson read a description of what the latest efficiency review at UCOP is designed to accomplish and then demonstrated the complex nature of the data collection by holding up a 5ft-long spreadsheet developed for the review and containing all of the elements of the CDL's operations. She explained that all OP departments will provide detailed data on each of their functions. The information collected will be analyzed and mapped to University-wide priorities, and will then go to the President with recommendations. It is still not clear what input, if any, SLASIAC will have in the process, although the Council of Vice Chancellors has provided feedback to Provost Dorr at her request.

4. UC Open Access Policy

a. Presidential Policy Status

The intention of the UC Open Access *Presidential Policy* is to extend the UC Open Access Policy that passed in the Academic Senate last year to the rest of the UC community. The latest draft is now with Provost Dorr, and is supposed to be sent out for formal systemwide review any day now. An issue that might come up in the review is that people do not necessarily know whether or not they own their copyright, and they may be surprised when they find out. The hope is that members of the UC community will accept the policy to express their support for providing greater access to scholarly works. Anticipated changes to UC's Copyright Ownership policy will mean that more categories of UC faculty own their copyright, but that might takes years to complete, and the OA Presidential policy should not be delayed.

b. RGPO Open Access Policy

Mary Croughan described the [Research Grants Program Office (RGPO)](#), a grant-making organization within UC that provides $52 million per year in research funding on behalf of UC and the State of California. Programs include the Multicampus Research Programs and Initiatives, the Laboratory Fees Research Program, the California HIV/AIDS Research Program, the California Breast Cancer Research Program, and the Tobacco-Related Disease Research Program. The RGPO recently instituted its own Open Access Policy for the recipients of its grants, to be launched officially in January, 2015. The wording of the RGPO policy came from the [Senate Open Access Policy](#). All grantees give RGPO a "nonexclusive, irrevocable, worldwide license to exercise any and all rights under copyright and in any medium for all scholarly articles and similar works generated as a result of an RGPO grant award, and agree to authorize others to do the same, for the purpose of making their articles widely and freely available in an open access repository." All RGPO grant programs will host sections of eScholarship that are devoted to output from their grants. Approximately 50-55% of all RGPO grants are given to UC faculty, so this policy will extend the open access requirements to researchers outside of the UC community (including national labs, CSU, community agencies, etc.). It is expected that the Open Access requirement for RGPO grants will add approximately 350 to 500 scholarly articles per year to eScholarship (beyond current expected publications from UC faculty).

The policy will be enforced similarly to the NIH open access requirements; grantees will not be eligible for additional funding if they do not comply.

In SLASIAC, members suggested that UC publicize all the various activities around the University related to open and public access of scholarly works; including UC Press' initiatives, eScholarship, open access policies including RGPO's, and others. It could be tied in to the recent passage of AB609, which mandates open access for all articles resulting from research funded by the California Department of Public Health.

   c. UC Open Access Policy Implementation

Catherine Mitchell passed out an "Interim Status Report" handout with updates on components of the implementation roll-out, harvester timeline, and next steps. The Office of Scholarly Communication website is the locus of activity for the UC Open Access Policy. A 6-month review of the Policy was provided to UCOLASC in June. The next phase, implementing a harvesting system on three pilot campuses, will launch in October. Once logged into the system, faculty will be presented with a list of research articles that they may be associated with. They will then be able to reject or accept the article as one of theirs. To comply with the UC Open Access Policy, faculty will have to either upload their "final" version of the work, or provide a link to an open access version. Faculty profiles listing their research articles are visible to anyone logged in, but not to the public; a feature that can promote collaboration within UC.

Campus libraries will be working jointly with the CDL and departmental staff to inform UC authors about the policy and harvester. Some campuses have existing systems that can help populate faculty profiles to complement the harvester, so the message on each campus will be specific to that campus. At Irvine, for example, the official launch might not happen until later in order to coincide with other campus events.

5. Office of Scholarly Communication (OSC) update

Office of Scholarly Communication (OSC) membership is almost final. A detailed workplan has been established, and while the scope is fairly extensive, there are priorities within the plan. The OSC will work with a Strategic Action Group from the UC Libraries advisory structure (SAG1) on Scholarly Research and Communication to determine the roles for areas of mutual interest. The [OSC website](#) will host guest blog posts on related issues.

At this point in the meeting, the topic of copyright came up; specifically, how to assist the faculty with their copyright questions and concerns. The OSC website contains some copyright information that relates directly to publications, and includes links to the UC Copyright website. While some campuses have folks knowledgeable in copyright in the library, educational technology, or offices of research who can assist faculty, others do not. Harvard recently formed a group of "Copyright First Responders" who can answer front-line questions from faculty about copyright. UC could do something similar, such as the 24-hour digital reference service provided by the libraries. Currently at UC, copyright-related questions can be sent directly to the owners of the OSC site at osc@ucop.edu, and to the UC Copyright website at copyright@ucop.edu. Messages sent to either of these sites are usually responded to within 48 hours.

6. Update from AAU meeting

Scott Waugh shared information about some of the new scholarly initiatives that he learned about at a recent AAU meeting:

a. AAU-ARL Prospectus for a First Book Subvention

 AAU and ARL have developed a model for a national consortium of colleges and universities to provide funding for a faculty member's first monograph. According to the proposal, the estimated cost for UC would be $68,000 per campus per year. The Mellon Foundation also has a book subvention proposal that overlaps this one.

b. SHARE

 SHARE is a new initiative from ARL, AAU, and APLU to make research assets more discoverable and more accessible, and to enable the research community to build upon these assets in creative ways.

SHARE's first project, the Notification Service, will inform stakeholders when research results—including articles and data—are released.

7. UC Press' Open Access Monograph Proposal

Alison Mudditt introduced the UC Press' Open Access Monograph Proposal by saying that the current system of scholarly monograph publishing is increasingly unsustainable. The Press loses money on almost every scholarly monograph published. Although the press has significantly reduced expenses such as composition and manufacturing, overall costs have risen due to the need to provide digital files as well as print copies, and there has been a significant decline in sales in recent years. These days, scholarly monographs frequently sell only 300-400 copies, mostly to academic libraries. The cost of producing a book cannot be recouped by such low sales volume and, equally importantly, fewer and fewer members of the potential audience have access to each book. The Press has therefore developed a new digital, open access model that will retain the same high quality standards, but facilitate much wider distribution along with multimedia capabilities. With the recognition that stakeholders for scholarly monographs include not only the publisher, but also the institution, the library, and the author, the Press' proposal suggests that each contribute monetarily to support the costs of publication. Alison estimates that with some streamlining of processes, the Press can reduce costs to $15,000 per monograph. The breakdown is documented in the proposal, which is linked from the meeting agenda. The Press hopes to publish 10-15 open access monographs in the first year. These will be in addition to the existing 200 books published by the Press per year, and the open access books will still have to be accepted for publication, approved by the editorial committee, and go through a publications process. Alison noted that the digital aspect is very attractive to certain faculty, such as those working in the digital humanities, who want the functionality that ebooks can provide. Technically, the books will be hosted on a different platform than the Press' existing digital collection. Alison acknowledges that it's a new area and adjustments might be needed along the way.

8. Copyright Issues Updates: Status of the Copyright and Fair Use Policy Revision

The SLASIAC Standing Subcommittee on Copyright Policy (SSCP) read the comments from the formal review of the policy revision (comments were due at the end of May) and decided to address the feedback received by making small edits to the policy. The SSCP rejected the idea of returning to a more prescriptive policy by adding prescriptive guidelines. As Angus MacDonald pointed out, while the guidelines may have been reassuring, they were not necessarily correct. A statement about the University agreeing to defend faculty "who acted in good faith" was added to the policy, as well as a brief mention of the specific considerations for fair use. The guidelines on the website will be enhanced, particularly as feedback is received, and information can be added about where faculty can turn to on their campuses for assistance with specific questions.

In the SLASIAC discussion, Dan Hare suggested that faculty would appreciate the following additions to the policy and/or the cover letter:
- Acknowledge that it's a complex area.
- State explicitly that the administration and faculty are *working together* to ensure that copyright laws are followed.
- Have the policy say that the University will provide support for faculty regarding their academic copyright concerns.
- The cover letter should more clearly state why guidelines have been removed from the policy.

It might be possible to do a limited review instead of a full systemwide, 90-day review.

Next steps:
1. Make changes to the policy and cover letter
2. Allow SSCP to review and comment
3. Forward to Provost Dorr and the Academic Planning Council
4. Send out for limited review

The SSCP discussed Copyright Ownership Policy recommendations but did not come to a consensus on final recommendations. That will be brought to SLASIAC at a later date.

9. Report on Developments in the UC Libraries

Lorelei Tanji started out by saying that the Council of University Librarians met recently with California State Librarian Greg Lucas and determined that there were several areas of common interest, including the management and archiving of State government documents and management and access to research data. Lorelei gave a quick overview of the latest UC Libraries Systemwide Plan and Priorities document (http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/about/vision-and-priorities). It was recently finalized by the CoUL with indications of which group in the advisory structure has a stake in each item. One of the strategies, exploring systemwide strategies for data curation, involves partnering with faculty to help them manage their research data, make their data more accessible, and to help ensure its preservation. Research data encompasses not only numerical, but also text, images, and other types of digital data. The libraries continue to consider and discuss shared staffing models that leverage expertise and support shared services (one example from the past was of a Slavic bibliographer that was shared among campuses; two current examples are a Chinese Cataloger for shared cataloging and the 24/7 Reference Coordinator). Lorelei gave a slide presentation on a pressing issue currently facing the libraries: space needs. Library buildings on the various campuses have reached capacity (or are close to reaching capacity). Less frequently used material is housed at the Northern and Southern regional library facilities, but these facilities are filling up fast. In particular, the Northern facility will be at capacity for commonly-sized materials in the next few years. Laine Farley and Susan Carlson met with some folks from the UCOP Budget Office, who provided advice on the process for proposals. SLASIAC supported further exploration, and CoUL will undertake next steps including gathering information from other universities who have recently gone through the process, and potentially hiring a consultant to help them do a study and prepare a proposal.

10. Data

Research data management will be a standing item on the SLASIAC agenda.

CDL is investigating the possibility of the university granting to each faculty member a given amount of digital storage space. Estimates show that it could cost as little as $300,000 to provide each UC faculty member with 10GB of digital storage, targeted for the "long tail" of smaller data sets. First, however, the UC libraries are gathering information on the existing digital storage options available to faculty on the campuses. So far, a survey of the campuses has shown many options, but most are designed for the short term.

11. Future Topics and Next Steps

Future topics will include Electronic Theses and Dissertations, the UC Open Access Fund Pilot (and assessment report).

Next steps will include the second revision of the UC Policy on Copyright and Fair Use, which will be circulated to SLASIAC members. SLASIAC staff will contact members about scheduling the next meeting.