

## **Systemwide Library and Scholarly Information Advisory Committee (SLASIAC)**

November 5, 2015, 10:00 – 3:00

1111 Franklin Street, Room 10325

Oakland, CA

### **1. Round-robin introductions and announcements**

Brief report from Scott Waugh about an interesting conference that he attended the day before that focused on open access and related issues, including updates on DPLA, DPN, SHARE, and more. The group is trying to find ways to develop coherence across systems. Waugh would like to invite the UCLA CLIR Fellow to give a presentation at a SLASIAC meeting, and perhaps at CDL and for CoUL. UC is at forefront, good to communicate about activities/policies, etc. Inform national conversation.

### **2. California Digital Library news & update**

Executive Director hiring update: Interviews for four candidates for the CDL Executive Director position will take place later this month. Several SLASIAC members are on the search committee and participated in first round interviews. All SLASIAC members are invited to attend in person or call in on Nov. 19 and 20 to interview the candidates. Those who come in person are also welcome to attend a presentation by each candidate. SLASIAC members should have received the schedule via email.

Ivy Anderson, the interim CDL Executive Director, gave a presentation with highlights from the recently published 2014-2015 Annual Report (provided in the background), including the recently updated Calisphere site, with digitized cultural heritage resources from hundreds of California institutions.

Anderson noted the positive outcomes of two lawsuits involving digitization, one for HathiTrust and the other for Google Books.

Anderson provided some information on the UC libraries' licensed content expenditures, and will come to a future meeting for a more detailed licensing update later in the academic year. Anderson's group at the CDL has done a lot of analysis on cost and cost-per-use to help inform licensing and collections decisions. In addition to pure cost, the analysis looks at the value of the content across the system. Thanks to UC's systemwide licensing, the smaller campuses in particular have access to more than they would have on their own. UC's size also helps provide leverage in negotiation with publishers because we not only license the content but also provide the scholarly articles that comprise much of the content.

In surveys of faculty opinions about ebooks, the findings have been that both print and ebooks are desired. There is a small study of faculty opinions currently underway at UC Santa Cruz. Currently, UC is negotiating for 1-2 shared print hard copies along with electronic ebook licenses. Negotiation terms may also include rights for perpetual access and/or downloading of material.

Ithaka S+R has a series of [reports on faculty attitudes](#).

With input from the campuses, CDL has recently re-released the [Calisphere website](#), a compilation of cultural heritage collections from around the state. The site has a new interface as well as new backend technology that incorporates a shared Digital Asset Management System that campuses may use. The changes enable the UC libraries to push metadata for content into the Digital Public Library of America (DPLA) as well as other benefits. The next step is to evaluate the technology to ensure it is the optimal infrastructure.

CDL's UC Curation Center (UC3) continues to develop and enhance support services for research data management. There are many facets to the data management environment. Barriers include reaching out to researchers, researcher attitudes, technological obstacles, policy issues, and financial concerns. Ideas to help promote data sharing among researchers included recruiting campus champions to promote data sharing among their peers, incentives to share or plan for the disposition of one's data, and a data management advisory committee. The Office of Scholarly Communication, which has already identified data as a focus for the coming year, can play a role.

Next steps: Future discussion on ebooks and data management

### **3. SLASIAC Budget Subcommittee**

The SLASIAC Budget Subcommittee will be revitalized this academic year.

### **4. Update on Council of University Librarian (CoUL) activities**

The Council of University Librarians (CoUL) consists of all ten University Librarians plus the CDL Executive Director. There has been a lot of turnover in the past three years, as new ULs have been hired.

CoUL is currently grappling with how to capitalize on and leverage together the digital library efforts of the campuses. The DASH tool (a data management interface) is a good example as it originated at UCSF and is now supported by CDL and used at multiple campuses.

The new UC Libraries advisory structure is trying to streamline systemwide efforts by providing support to multi-campus functions and initiatives. There is interest in capitalizing on the success of consortial licensing for e-resources and trying to apply some of the same principles to print collections. UC's print collection is a critical factor in recruitment of high quality faculty. As reported before, the regional library facilities (RLFs), which store less-frequently used print materials, are filling up. UCOLASC and SLASIAC sent letters of support to the UC administration for maintaining and expanding the facilities, and the UC libraries' Shared Library Facilities Board has been revitalized. The libraries are approaching the problem in a multi-faceted way that includes analyzing duplication (how much, cost to de-duplicate primarily federal documents) as well as looking at expansion options.

A suggestion was made to add maintenance of print collections to CoUL's list of systemwide priorities.

Libraries are turning to broader interests of researchers, including data. One recent example is the Digital Preservation Network (DPN). UC's members are San Diego, UCLA, and CDL. Members get 5TB for the first 6 years, so the UC libraries are pooling their allocations. The libraries are convening a task force

to determine which data will be “ingested” in initial phase of DPN. On the DPN background sheet there is a list of campus library contacts for digital scholarship services for faculty.

CoUL will be meeting with President Napolitano in February.

### **5. Pay-It-Forward grant project update**

The project is attempting to compare where break-even, or sustainability, would happen in open access models. Experts in scholarly communication and an economist are investigating article processing charges (APCs) vs. the subscription/licensing model. Harvard, Ohio State, British Columbia are UC’s partners in the project. The study is getting bibliometric data from various sources and will model the various scenarios for open access publishing.

Questions arose in the discussion about whether money is too big of a factor in publishing, and what happens to those who do not have resources to pay open access fees. In practice, APCs are designed to subsidize those who cannot pay. But price can also signal quality. If something is worth reading then people will be willing to pay. Open access doesn’t account for that.

If the models show that open access can be sustainable, the next step will be to figure out how to get to that point. Results are due in June, 2016, and will be presented to SLASIAC.

### **6. Electronic Theses and Dissertations – follow-up: What to do with the letter? Who is audience?**

In May, SLASIAC talked about UCLA’s draft policy and guidelines for theses and dissertations. UCLA issued a clear, definitive statement, along with a license agreement for providing open access to theses and dissertations created at UCLA. There is currently no systemwide statement, and some campus statements are clearer than others, leading to uncertainty by students.

SLASIAC decided to draft a letter to recommend open access for ETDs. The Presidential Open Access policy was just issued, which covers all UC employees, so draft is timely.

AUC policy could exist either as an articulation of principle of open scholarship or as a senate regulation having to do with graduate students. Implementation, guidelines on embargoes, etc., can be left to the campuses. Embargoes would be permitted, but with the suggestion of no more than two years (with additional time requiring “compelling circumstances”).

Arguments for and against having an open access requirement at UC included issues such as:

- Whether a thesis/dissertation is a book, a manuscript, or a draft.
- The ability of modern technology to make items public in a way that print could not.
- Considerations for graduate students to find other theses/dissertations.
- The use of university resources, including the time and effort of advisors, in writing a thesis/dissertation.

Before the policy was issued at UCLA, the campus convened discussion panels with publishers, who agreed that a dissertation itself is not a book.

Action: Angus MacDonald will revise the letter to include that campuses will be responsible for determining implementation, that graduate students should be consulted, and that we are aware the statement will incur vigorous debate. The letter should be accompanied by data that bears on the topic, including similar policies, data from ProQuest about the rate of embargo requests, and a summary of UCLA's discussions. The letter will be reviewed again by SLASAC members and will be sent to Provost Dorr and to the Academic Council, to forward to CCGA and UCOLASC.

## **7. Open Access Policy implementation update**

Catherine Mitchell summarized the second implementation report that was provided to the Academic Senate and UCOLASC about the progress of the academic senate's open access policy.

Access to UC's scholarship comes from all over the globe.

In a survey of users, most people who completed an article deposit felt that it was easier than expected. Even more are *very* likely to deposit another article. However, there is a gap between claiming activity and actual deposit, which indicates that some assistance may be needed. Either the author does not know to upload his or her final version of the article, or feels that it is too burdensome to do so. For some prolific authors, the article list can be daunting.

Next steps for the Office of Scholarly Communication and eScholarship include education and examining motivation, refinement of the upload tool and message, and integration with campus systems and reporting requirements.

## **8. Presidential Open Access Policy – update**

As of October 23, 2015, UC has an open access policy that covers all employees. It closely mirrors the policies at UCSF and for the Academic Senate, but opting-out is a bit more complex. The author has a greater requirement to show compelling circumstances. See <http://uc-oa.info> for more on the policies.

## **9. University Compliance with Federal Public Access Policies**

Federal agencies are now releasing their requirements for open access in response to the OSTP (US Office of Science and Technology Policy) memo issued in February, 2013. There are a variety of repositories that the agencies are using. The leadership of the AAU and APLU sent a letter to Offices of Research to alert institutions to be ready, and to look at their own policies and requirements. Wendy Streitz noted that the compliance is an institutional obligation, as funding comes through the institution to the researcher.

The libraries will work with CDL to help faculty, in addition to partnering with campus and systemwide Offices of Research and grants offices to extend communication and reach out to researchers.

The Office of Scholarly Communication might include information on the website about how UC's own policies align with various federal ones. The website could provide steps that researchers have to take in various instances.

Attendees at the Coalition for Networked Information's (CNI) round-table meeting in mid-December could report back.

## **10. Management and preservation of research data – including update on systemwide guidelines**

Federal requirements for data sharing are coming soon, and may meet some resistance among faculty. San Diego has released a policy (linked in the background materials), but no specific advice on how to adhere to it. Although a federal policy may be years away, many researchers and administrators are eager now for a plan.

A systemwide group has been working for several years on a data policy and/or guidelines for UC. There is a UC policy (in the APM) that clearly states that the university owns research data. The big issue now is what happens when someone leaves. UCORP and the Vice Chancellors of Research have advocated for a policy. The idea now is that original data – the physical or digital manifestation – stays with UC, but researchers can take copies. Permission of the VCR would be required in order to take originals. UCLA has received much feedback on its data guidelines, illustrating the need for a FAQ or notes to be included that might address questions about copyright and tangible materials, among others. A discussion draft of a UC-wide policy will be available in the relatively near future, and feedback will be solicited from SLASIAC, VCRs, UCORP, and more.

A new cyber-infrastructure report from the CIO/VCR summit is currently under revision and will also be circulated for discussion. SLASIAC will receive an update at next meeting. There is an interest in providing more assistance to researchers in handling their data, from simple data backup assistance to state of the art, high-speed protocols, etc. A SLASIAC member noted the need for a preservation repository to ensure that data would be accessible in the future.

### **Next Steps**

- Schedule meeting for Feb/March and May.
- Revitalize SLASIAC Budget Subcommittee
- Review second draft of open access ETD recommendation letter
- Future topics will include:
  - Ebooks follow-up
  - Data management
  - Open access stuff, national trends
  - ETDs
  - Copyright Ownership policy
  - New CDL director
  - Update on cyber-infrastructure report