

Systemwide Library and Scholarly Information Advisory Committee (SLASIAC)

Minutes
March 09, 2018 (10:00 – 3:00)

Chairs: Susan Carlson and Günter Waibel until Chair Waugh arrived at 12 noon
Note Taker: Danielle Westbrook

Members in attendance:

Scott Waugh (UCLA, SLASIAC Chair)	M. Elizabeth Cowell (UCSC)	Mark Seielstad (UCSF)
Deb Agarwal (LBNL)	Rita Hao (UCOP)	Wendy Streitz (UCOP)
Shaun Bowler (UCR, Graduate Dean rep.)	Ted Huang (UCOP)	Jenn Stringer (UCB, ETLG rep.)
Susan Carlson (UCOP)	Angus MacDonald (UCOP)	Tim Sullivan (UC Press)
Jennifer Chan (UCLA, LAUC rep.)	Steven Mandeville-Gamble (UCD, CoUL Chair)	Günter Waibel (CDL/UCOP)
Thomas Cogswell (UCR)	Rich Schneider (UCSF, UCOLASC Chair)	Shane White (Academic Senate)

Regrets: Tom Andriola (UCOP), Susanna Elm (UCB), Michael Pazzani (UCR, Research VC rep.)

Guests: Oscar Luna (CDL)

Consultants: Ivy Anderson (CDL), Catherine Mitchell (CDL), John Chodacki (CDL)

Staff: Danielle Westbrook (CDL)

Agenda Item	Time	Duration	Responsible	Documents	Outcome/Goal
1. Welcome & introductions - Tim Sullivan, UC Press Executive Director	10:00 – 10:05	0:05	Scott Waugh		

2. November minutes	10:05 – 10:10	0:05	Scott Waugh	- Nov. 27 th minutes	Endorsement with/without edits.
---------------------	---------------	------	-------------	---------------------------------	---------------------------------

Decision: The November minutes are endorsed without edits.

3. Standing committee updates A. Council of University Librarians	10:10 – 10:40	00:10	Steven Mandeville-Gamble		Updates and opportunity for discussion.
--	---------------	-------	--------------------------	--	---

CoUL met with the President, Provost and Vice Provost in February to discuss the libraries' collections, open access, and investigating a systemwide integrated library system (ILS). In preparation for the meeting, CoUL analyzed collection expenditures data from the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) and determined that UC is spending significantly less than our peers, and is being outspent by seven out of eight UC comparator institutions.

A SLASIAC member recommended that CoUL's ARL analysis also acknowledge UC's size and the incredible efficiencies realized through the libraries' collaborative approach to acquiring electronic resources. The Libraries can acknowledge these points while also noting where the

budget is stretched thin and services are unable to adequately meet user needs. Another member recommended that the Libraries analyze purchasing power and whether the amount of content acquired each year is dropping.

B. University Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication		00:10	Rich Schneider		
--	--	-------	----------------	--	--

UCOLASC has written a letter in support of the ETDs policy which conveys the committee’s concerns with the policy as it stands. The main concern is the current waiver (two years); some UCOLASC committee members asked that a longer waiver (or embargo) be possible from the onset because in some disciplines theses and dissertations are routinely turned into books, and that transformation takes longer than journal publishing. UCOLASC has also been working on the faculty Principles for OA to transform scholarly publishing, and voted unanimously in support of the UC Libraries offsetting pilot.

C. Office of Scholarly Communications		00:10	Catherine Mitchell		
---------------------------------------	--	-------	--------------------	--	--

The OSC has established working groups to better understand and/or create resources on: OA publishing and journal flipping; Open Educational Resources (OERs); Rights Reversion; and Research Information Management Systems (RIMS).

4. UC Data Network (UCDN)	10:40 - 10:55	00:15	John Chodacki		Informational. Opportunity for discussion.
---------------------------	---------------	-------	---------------	--	--

The UC Data Network (UCDN) aims to create a network of storage nodes for the long-term preservation of research data. Four campuses have opted to join the pilot: UCR, UCI, UCSB and UCSF. The pilot involves the CIOs, VCRs and University Librarians from the participating campuses and OP. By design, the pilot will leverage existing expertise and resources, though some pilot campuses may be purchasing additional storage capacity. While CDL’s Dash and Merritt are providing UCDN’s infrastructure, if data preservation projects already have a front-end discovery/service platform, UCDN can still provide the backend storage network to ensure the long-term preservation of the data. Dash and Merritt both support CC0 and CC-BY licensing.

UCDN is not trying to replace existing community initiatives (e.g. GenBank). Instead, the Network wants to serve the data preservation needs not met by existing programs and to make the preserved data FAIR (Findable, Accessible, Interoperable, and Reusable).

5. California Digital Library update	10:55 – 11:50	00:55	Günter Waibel	- CDL Strategic Vision	Update and opportunity for discussion.
--------------------------------------	---------------	-------	---------------	------------------------	--

CDL started its **strategic visioning** process in January 2017. The Vision was shared with CoUL in September and again in December. In addition to sharing it with SLASIAC for review and discussion, the UC Libraries Direction & Oversight Committee (DOC) will also review the Vision in April.

CDL’s new Vision emphasizes agility and the need to enhance CDL’s ability to track and incorporate new developments, and to continually adapt day-to-day activities to meet changing realities. Key themes in the Vision include: building and sustaining coalitions (existing and new, as well as within the system and cross-sectoral/cross-institutional); the interdependence of the eleven UC libraries, as well as national and international

interdependence/coalitions; openness, impact, and the relevancy of the academy; and attracting both intellectual and financial investment to accelerate and fuel an expansive sense of what CDL and the UC can achieve.

A SLASIAC member noted that examples like the Online Archive of California (OAC), eScholarship, and the DMPTool exhibit the value of the CDL, and that they should be shared with state legislative staff to demonstrate UC’s value. A member also encouraged the libraries and the UC Press to be even more ambitious in their efforts to transform scholarly publishing into an economically sustainable system that ensures the widest possible access to the scholarly record.

Known inflationary pressures and a consistently flat **CDL budget** has led to a significant budget shortfall. For FY18/19, the budget office has instituted a new process where actual costs are requested up front. As a result, CDL has documented and requested \$1.66M to cover its budget shortfall due to collections and software license inflation, as well as an additional \$230K for open access support (an unfunded mandate for the CDL since the introduction of the Senate policy in 2013).

CDL’s budget shortfall for 17/18 is \$1.3M; to manage this shortfall, CDL will utilize carryforward funds, and money from the one-time content¹ fund. These solutions are short-term, because the shortfall grows each year.

New OP staffing restrictions stipulate that there can be no new FTE, including FTE funded through grants and service contracts. Moreover, salary savings are now being swept into a central OP fund to cover merit increases. As a result, CDL is increasingly discouraged from writing grant proposals because FTE cannot be hired to fulfill the proposed projects, and savings from grant funding cannot be re-purposed locally.

Several SLASIAC members wondered if some CDL services might be monetized to generate revenue. Partnering with the campus libraries was also raised as a potential solution for mitigating the FTE and salary savings barriers, though this would increase administrative overhead and complexity. Committee members noted that campus library budgets are also facing cuts this year and/or in the near term, and campus library staffing levels have also been declining.

6. Guest: Provost Brown (working lunch)	12:00 – 1:00				
A. Welcome and introductions		00:05	Scott Waugh		
B. Framing how the UC system works together around libraries and scholarly information		00:10	Günter Waibel		

The Huron report recognizes the excellence of the libraries’ systemwide partnership, and reaffirms that the libraries sit at the heart of UC’s academic mission. This collaboration is supported by a number of committees, including CoUL, SLASIAC, and UCOLASC. SLASIAC is unique because it brings together academic and administrative representatives, OP and the campuses, and not only the libraries but also the UC Press.

¹ One-time content is non-subscription material. The Libraries would ordinarily use this money to purchase significant electronic backfiles outright.

Through efforts like the senate and presidential OA policies, the faculty, libraries and President have made strong commitments to open access. The next logical step is to create a scholarly publishing system where more scholarly resources are “born open” and freely accessible. Most content remains behind a pay-wall and library collection budgets are stagnant or declining; each year, it costs more to license the same amount of content, and the libraries forecast a significant spending decline for shared electronic resources if more funding isn’t made available in the short term, and if we can’t transition to OA in the medium-to-long term. This spending decline will result in dramatically reduced scholarly resources for faculty, students and staff across the system.

C. Faculty perspectives on the UC OA policies and larger OA issues		00:10	Rich Schneider		
--	--	-------	----------------	--	--

UCOLASC recognizes that the current scholarly communication system is too expensive and does not align with UC’s goals and priorities as a public institution, which includes making research accessible and available for the benefit of society at large. UC faculty have long been supportive of changing the scholarly publishing system, as is evident in their support for the UC OA policies. With the academic senate OA policy, the faculty asked for infrastructure to make depositing in UC’s institutional repository, eScholarship, easy. While CDL has begun building out those systems and services, it has been an unfunded mandate. The faculty strongly support funding UC’s OA policies since the needed infrastructure would help all UC faculty and staff equally.

The faculty can play a key role in exerting more pressure on the publishing system to push for even greater change. Additional pressure can be applied during submission (e.g. retaining rights, depositing work in eScholarship), editorial work (e.g., peer review and manuscript handling), and in support of the libraries’ license renewals (e.g. having faculty principles that guide the CDL in its negotiations with commercial publishers).

SLASIAC members and guests noted that having broader faculty support for the UCOLASC faculty principles for OA, including from Academic Council, will make the principles much stronger.

D. Financial challenges and the libraries’ OA ambitions		00:10	Steven Mandeville-Gamble		
---	--	-------	--------------------------	--	--

The Libraries are committed to transforming scholarly publishing at scale, and see transitioning away from subscription-based publishing models, and instead repurposing our investments into sustainable OA models, as a necessity. However, library budgets have been stagnant or declining in recent years. Collections budgets have been protected to the extent possible, but service cuts and reserves can no longer cover budget shortfalls, and so the libraries will need to subscribe to less content, and faculty and students will have access to fewer scholarly resources.

Action: CoUL will be asked to include a staffing level analysis in its overview of annual library budgets (2008 to present). A copy of the revised overview will be shared with Provost Brown.

E. Open discussion based on the presentations from Waibel, Schneider and Mandeville-Gamble		00:25	All		Discussion and comments from Provost Brown.
--	--	-------	-----	--	---

Several SLASIAC members acknowledged that while each campus is aware of their library’s budget shortfall, the seriousness and systemwide impact is less widely known. Commercial publishers are profiting significantly from higher education institutions, and the cost of negotiating and working with these publishers is also very high. Although the seriousness of the scholarly publishing problem is not new, committee members voiced that UC needs to take action to maintain access to scholarly resources necessary for academic work, and to transform the system to one that is open and sustainable.

The committee noted that the constraints of UC’s library budgets are showing, and it’s negatively impacting UC’s ability to both negotiate for more favorable pricing and push for open access publishing models. Broader faculty engagement around this problem is needed to ensure faculty understand that commercial publishers are profiteers; are supportive of the transition to a sustainable, open access publishing model; and so that faculty leverage their own power when they publish.

7. Collections (A – E)	1:00 – 3:00				
A. Report on the framing document for journal negotiations		00:20	Rich Schneider, Steven Mandeville-Gamble, Günter Waibel, Ivy Anderson	- Framing document for the 2019 journal negotiations	

The framing document aims to provide context for the principles and actions that will guide UC in its journal renewal negotiations from 2018 forward. The document should outline the imperative of containing costs, the imperative of open scholarship, the need to align the University’s commitment to open access with the goals for UC’s agreements with publishers, and the opportunities for faculty and the libraries to transform publishing. The framing document should also outline faculty principles for a publishing landscape and near-term priorities.

CDL needs the framing document by June to begin identifying tactics and priorities for the 18/19 negotiations.

A committee member noted that efforts might first focus on high-cost journals (for negotiating lower costs and pushing for more open access concessions). Another member also thought the Office of Scholarly Communication might be utilized for communications and outreach.

B. Library collection costs		00:20	Steven Mandeville-Gamble, Günter Waibel	- Analysis of expenditure data from the Association for Research Libraries (ARL) statistics	
-----------------------------	--	-------	---	---	--

The Libraries pool funds for systemwide scholarly resources; this creates a baseline of access, available systemwide, for core, high-use resources. UC’s collections coalition brings about significant savings and opportunity. From the over 70K journals made available systemwide last year, 37M articles were downloaded. For FY18/19, the libraries are changing their funding model for distributing costs for systemwide resources. Where

before the price allocations varied, now an FTE model, where shares are based on a 3-year campus faculty and students FTE average, will be applied to most resources. This will save administrative time, and create a fair and transparent system.

No matter the model for distributing these costs, the fact that the libraries have such a strong coalition around collections means they're interdependent. When one campus is forced to cut their systemwide collections spend, it results in a significantly greater reduction in systemwide purchasing power. With the FTE model, a \$100K cut from a big campus would result in a \$600K loss in spending power systemwide, and a \$100K cut from a small campus would result in a \$1.5M loss in spending power systemwide (if the big campus has an FTE share of 17%, and the small campus has an FTE share of 7%).

CoUL has been forecasting budget shortfalls for 18/19, recognizing that campus and OP budget requests are still under review. The worst case scenario forecasted involves a \$700K reduction from a medium-sized campus (due to a significant budget shortfall and the new FTE weighting). With an allocation of 8%, this scenario would result in an \$8.9M reduction in systemwide purchasing power. A reduction of this magnitude would necessitate cutting a large portion of highly-used and valued scholarly resources.

Decision: CoUL should present on the interdependence of library budgets to the CoVC and the University Committee on Academic Personnel (UCAP).

Action: Günter and Scott will arrange to have CoUL representatives join the CoVC at an upcoming meeting to discuss budget interdependence.

Action: Günter and Shane will arrange to have CoUL representatives join UCAP at an upcoming meeting to discuss budget interdependence and the potential impact on faculty in terms of loss of access.

C. Principles for OA to transform scholarly publishing		00:20	Rich Schneider	- Draft declaration of rights and principles	
--	--	-------	----------------	--	--

UCOLASC's Principles for OA outline goal posts for transforming scholarly publishing. The principles included cover a broad range of interests to bring together different community members and change the broader publishing eco-system.

CoUL reviewed an earlier version of the principles, and now needs to review the principles as they currently stand. Broader review, from SLASIAC and others, is still desired before Academic Council begins their review.

Action: SLASIAC members should review the Principles and send feedback to Rich.

Action: UCOLASC should share the principles with Academic Council for endorsement. UCOLASC might also consider sharing the document with other relevant Senate committees for endorsement, including CAP.

Decision: After review and opportunity to comment, the finalized principles can be shared back with SLASIAC so that the committee can write a letter of endorsement.

D. UC offsetting study (endorsed by CoUL and UCOLASC)		00:30	Ivy Anderson	- Offsetting Parameters - 2017 Offset Agreement White Paper	Informational. Opportunity for discussion.
--	--	-------	--------------	---	---

Offsetting is one of the open access models being investigated by the Libraries. Offsetting couples payment for access to scholarly resources with institution-wide payment for article processing charges (APCs). Already, grant funds are used to pay APCs. Instituting offsetting agreements would mean APCs would be paid for by both the library and authors (via department, grant and/or other research funds). Moreover, such agreements will control the total costs incurred by the university (no more hidden fees, or double-payment).

In the proposed pilot, the library partially subsidizes the cost of APCs upfront, and authors use grant or research funds to pay the balance of the APC at the time of publication. Authors without access to grant or research funds can request that the library cover the balance of the APC. Offsetting allows authors to publish OA with their publisher of choice, and the cost is greatly reduced given the library subsidy. Authors can also opt out if they so choose. The university benefits by ensuring wider dissemination of UC research, eliminating excess OA payments to publishers, and utilizing more grant funds to reduce the university’s direct costs.

The pilot team still needs to determine acceptable APC costs and library subsidy levels. Operational mechanisms, learning outcomes, and success metrics are also still required, as is the negotiation of a successful pilot agreement and an outreach campaign for UC faculty/authors.

SLASIAC members expressed interest in the pilot. One member recommended that the team target faculty groups (i.e. discipline-specific) based on the publishers involved in the pilot. Another member noted that because subscription costs vary across disciplines, the offsetting pilot might target higher cost subscriptions to begin with.

E. Determining next steps for the framing document and principles		00:20	Scott Waugh, Ivy Anderson		Action item.
---	--	-------	---------------------------	--	--------------

The committee observed that communications with faculty should involve the Academic Senate. Additional outreach to specific faculty groups (i.e. by discipline), based on the publishers being targeted in license negotiations, should also be incorporated into the library’s communications strategy. The OSC might also get involved in outreach and communications (since it already serves as a conduit for scholarly communication resources).

Decision: The framing document needs a slightly larger writing group (beyond the four original authors – Steve, Rich, Günter and Ivy).

Action: The writing group will work with Scott and Susan to decide on additional/new members.

Action: Committee members should review the framing document as it currently stands, and provide feedback to Danielle (who will collect comments and edits for the writing group).