Systemwide Library and Scholarly Information Advisory Committee (SLASIAC)

Meeting Notes	Chair: Scott Waugh
March 20, 2017 (10:00 am – 1:00 pm)	Note Taker: Danielle Westbrook

---

Members in attendance:

Scott Waugh (UCLA, SLASIAC Chair)	Ted Huang (UCOP)	Shane White (Academic Senate)
Susan Carlson (UCOP)	Susan Koskinen (UCB, LAUC Representative)	Michael Pazzani (UCR)
Günter Waibel (CDL/UCOP)	Jenn Stringer (UCB)	Eric Bakovic (UCSD, UCOLASC Chair)
Mackenzie Smith (UCD, CoUL Chair)	Robin Garrell (UCLA)	Angus MacDonald (UCOP)
Alison Mudditt (UC Press)	Wendy Streitz (UCOP)	
Elizabeth Cowell (UCSC)	Mario Biagioli (UCD)	

Regrets: Tom Andriola (UCOP), Rita Hao (UCOP), James Frew (UCSB), Thomas Cogswell (UCR)
Consultants: John Chodacki (CDL), Catherine Mitchell (CDL)
Staff: Danielle W. Westbrook (CDL)

Agenda Item	Begin	Duration	Responsible	Background	Outcome/Goal
1. Welcome and SLASIAC Introductions	10:00	0:15	Scott Waugh		

Agenda Item	Begin	Duration	Responsible	Background	Outcome/Goal
2. California Digital Library	10:15	0:10	Günter Waibel		

Günter has been visiting the campuses – most recently, UCSC and UCSD. Highlights include:

- explicit work agreements at UCSC and the positive impacts on collaboration and performance; and
- the matrixed nature of UCSD's digital library program; involvement from parties throughout the library's organizational structure strengthens it.

CDL strategic visioning is underway with the help of Grace Boda and Leigh Marz (consultants that specialize in complex/evolving organizational systems). Currently, CDL is wrapping up an initial staff engagement to deepen staff understanding of the current organizational structure.

- How will SLASIAC be engaged in CDL strategic visioning?
  - CDL will soon begin engaging external stakeholders (a representative sample) to better understand those relationships and what is expected of CDL. From SLASIAC, CDL will speak with Scott Waugh and Susan Carlson (they'll report back to SLASIAC). Günter will also engage SLASIAC on strategic visioning outcomes, once this initial 6-month push is complete.
  - This isn't a linear process with a fixed document/roadmap; it's a conversation that will continue beyond the 6-month push.

     o   For faculty engagement – opportunities through reps on SLASIAC and UCOLASC, and through Shane White of the Faculty Senate.

Günter met with Arthur Ellis, the UCOP Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies. Ellis reported that 50% of UC research publications are with international co-authors. UC researchers are transcending institution boundaries and engaging in international conversations; we need to do the same.

CoUL met with Grace Boda and Leigh Marz earlier in March to begin a "strategic alignment" process to become better aligned around how the Libraries collaborate and work together. Although a separate process from CDL strategic visioning, the same consultants were used. While CoUL already works together on a number of big initiatives (e.g. shared licensing, storage), there are limitations to our working relationship. CoUL has committed to defining a process for answering the following key questions: who is CDL accountable to and what is CoUL's role? What is CoUL's role in systemwide leadership? How do we formalize our agreements to create goodwill and trust?

3. UCOLASC	10:25	0:10	Eric Bakovic		

At the February UCOLASC meeting, two main items were discussed: the Open Access Policy implementation (which will be discussed in agenda item 8); and the OA2020 Expression of Interest.
The OA2020 discussion was held with CoUL. While there is support for OA, there is disagreement around the effectiveness of the Article Publishing Charge (APC) model.

UCB, UCSF and UCD are officially OA2020 signatories; it is likely that more campuses will sign. The UCLA COLASC members recently voted 100% in favor of signing the expression of interest. Currently, several UC representatives are at the Berlin 13 conference.

The Office of Scholarly Communication (OSC) released a statement, co-signed with CoUL, on the commitment to free and open information, scholarship and knowledge exchange. Eric sits on the OSC (and Günter is co-chair). The OSC hopes the statement will re-engage faculty with the OA Policy. OSC working groups are also collecting and creating information resources to distribute at the campuses.

4. CoUL	10:35	0:10	Mackenzie Smith		

NRLF4 is the proposed expansion to the Northern Regional Library Facility. The initial plans for NRLF4 totaled $50M and created storage for an additional 15-17 years. UCOP has unofficially proposed $30M (using state funds). While a $30M budget offers less growth capacity (7-8 years) and is a higher cost per volume, CoUL supports the proposal. The proposal still requires approval from the Regents.

- NRLF4 needs to remain a visible project; while storage isn't flashy, it is important. It needs a powerful but accessible narrative, with data around cost avoidance and the need to repurpose campus space for students.
- **Action:** Mackenzie will distribute NRLF4 talking points and the project URL to SLASIAC members so that they can speak to it locally.

CoUL strongly supports a systemwide push for ORCID adoption. This might result in a systemwide ORCID license. CoUL wants the UC Libraries to partner with the VCRs around ORCID support and outreach. CoUL is speaking with Arthur Ellis about this.

CoUL is looking at shared technology infrastructure and how to fund systemwide initiatives not in CDL's budget; such initiatives typically require significant investment. The UC Libraries have a history of co-investing, but without making cuts there isn't the money for new initiatives.

- The UC system doesn't have a mechanism for surfacing systemwide academic priorities. Initiatives typically come from the top/center of UC. While initiatives need the will and support of the center, they don't always need to originate there.
- The UC Council of Vice-Chancellors (COVC) is meeting with the Vice-Chancellors for Budget and Planning in June – they'll discuss various presidential initiatives, of which there are not many academic initiatives (although they overlap with the system's academic mission).
  - CDL and UCDC are two systemwide academic initiatives with visibility. UC needs better mechanisms to identify more.
  - **Action:** Mackenzie will email Scott about CoUL's discussions (re: new systemwide initiatives and identifying funding mechanisms) for consideration at the June COVC meeting.
- Some initiatives will be beyond the capacity the libraries; some might be capital projects. Open Access is one example.

5. SLASIAC Budget Subcommittee - CDL 2017/18 budget and current budget pressures	10:45	0:20	Günter Waibel, Scott Waugh		

For 2016/17, CDL made budget cuts across programs and services totaling 4%. Moving forward, there isn't a great deal of flexibility in the CDL budget; limited changes can be made with one-time content funds (7% of the budget) and travel/training funds (1% of the budget).

For 2017/18, CDL is facing increased budget pressure due to "mandatory increases." These include: approx. 3% annual increase on licensed content subscriptions; salary increases and campus fees for 12.25 FTE situated on campuses[1]; and approx. 4% annual increase for software licenses and hosted services. The shortfall amounts to $270,000. CDL has requested additional funding, but the money may need to be found within the existing budget. With a flat budget, this annual shortfall will quickly become unsustainable.

---

[1] CDL is responsible for salary increases and fees for 12.25 CDL FTE at UCSD and UCSB/UCB. These costs are unfunded (i.e. not currently covered by UCOP).

Salary savings, use of one-time content funds, and suspending/eliminating open positions temporarily address the shortfall. In April, CoUL is presenting the President with a $15M funding proposal to support the UC Libraries' collections. CDL is also investigating if UCOP can address the unfunded staff increases (for the CDL-UCOP staff located at the campuses).

- Aside from reducing content/collections, CDL can reduce its staff. If the future, SLASIAC may want to think about what this would mean.
- In terms of the systemwide academic priorities list (agenda item #4), library collections should be added to that list.
- Some faculty still push for print subscriptions, and print onsite. This affects space and cost savings.
  - **Action:** Eric should bring this to UCOLASC for discussion.

6. Electronic Theses & Dissertations (ETDs) OA Policy	11:05	0:05	Susan Carlson		

An OA policy for Electronic Theses & Dissertations (ETDs) was requested by the Provost Aimée Dorr. The task force roster is: Tyrus Miller (UCSC), Catherine Mitchell (CDL), Kwai Ng (CCGA Chair), John Renaud (UCI), Eileen Zurbriggen (UCSC, UCOLASC rep), and Yi Hong Sim (UCSD – student rep). The group has met once and has several more meetings scheduled, including a May in-person. They hope to circulate a policy in June for review.

Immediate next steps include: gathering policies from other institutions; collecting UC policies; and consulting with students. They hope to have another student representative on the task force too. Angus will serve as an advisor.

- Are there meaningful points of variance between the systemwide OA policy and the ETD OA policy?
  - For theses, we're talking about embargos. While students are concerned because they ultimately want to publish their thesis – demand for a thesis (in terms of downloads) is one metric used by publishers to identify good candidates for publication.
  - Students are in a different position from faculty – it might be a more easily enforceable policy with higher compliance.
  - Some but not all campus grad deans are filing embargoes and ensuring copies are in proquest and eScholarship.
  - There is minimal infrastructure to support this policy; while this won't change the policy, it affects our ability to implement it.
    - Who is responsible for participation? For the other OA policies, the individual is responsible. If the institution is responsible for the ETDs OA policy, that is a big difference.
- **Action:** Eric to send Susan an email, asking if an update from the task force is possible for the May 17th UCOLASC meeting.

7. data.gov backup	11:10	00:20	John Chodacki (consultant)		Informational item – to generate discussion and

					feedback.

Largely in response to the new federal administration, there have been individuals and groups backing-up U.S federal datasets (across the US and worldwide). At least 5 data refuge/back-up events have happened at UC, and more are scheduled.

For the most part, back-up events have not been coordinated (although many utilize a structure/template established by Penn for DataRefuge). Seeing a need for greater organizational leadership, and recognizing that the issue (federal data not being backed-up) is a problem no matter what the federal administration looks like, CDL has been actively talking to the Dat project, data.gov, Penn and others about what is needed at the administrative level and around a larger stewardship effort.

This May, ARL is co-organizing an event with DataRefuge/Penn in Washington, D.C. to begin looking at these broader questions. Günter and John will be attending to represent CDL. CDL has worked with its partners to complete a back-up of data.gov and linked federal data; scripts are run every 6 hours to capture changes (changes to the registry metadata and the source data). The server space has been donated by UCR.

Of note: CDL is already a partner for the End of Term Web Archive, an initiative to collaboratively archive the US federal government websites at the end of each presidential administration.

How should we be thinking about stewardship?
- For the last 50 years, many libraries have participated in the federal library depository program (mainly for documents). Can we draw on this community and their experience? That being said, being researcher driven is important.

Do we work with California caucus?
- Günter met and spoke with the state librarian about this; data.california.gov is charged with state data, although compliance has been a big issue (very little data there). Günter spoke with Arthur Ellis about this – he's intrigued and put it on the agenda for a Co-VCR call.

In terms of legal implications; these activities are low-risk, but still potential risks. Angus is unaware of any legal challenges so far. Raw data is not something the federal gov. owns the copyright of. However, if a protection is circumvented or terms of use ignored, there's a risk.

8. UC Scholarly Communications and Open Access	11:30	00:20	Günter Waibel	Exploring Options for Supporting the UC Academic Senate Open	Report to SLASIAC (re: CoUL and related activities); opportunity

				Access Policy (pdf)	for discussion and feedback.

The cost of Symplectic Elements ($300K+) was originally borne largely by the Office of UC Provost and Executive Vice President Aimée Dorr. At the end of 2016 this cost was absorbed by CDL and through systemwide funds at UCSF. This arrangement is unsustainable beyond January 2018, when the license expires; the UC Libraries and policy stakeholders must decide by the end of 2017 how to implement the Senate OA Policy going forward.

The *Exploring Options…* document is a draft roadmap to shape this investigation. CoUL is working on this, and has tasked, within the UC Libraries, the Direction and Oversight Committee (DOC) and the CoUL Planning Lead to conduct ROI analyses and explore alternatives.

We have a policy. The question is: how do we implement the policy? Arguably, there are three elements: speed, thoroughness and cost. We can support the policy in a manner that is fast, extensive and expensive (in terms of getting OA articles into eScholarship), or slow, shallow and inexpensive. The UC Libraries haven't created compelling narratives around the ways in which we can support the policy.

Who funds this is still uncertain – but having a better understanding of the range of options/costs (beyond just Symplectic Elements vs. nothing) will help. The Libraries should be wary of posing certain trade-offs around Symplectic Elements. For example, if faculty were presented an option to keep Symplectic but cut collections – faculty will always vote in favor of collections.

Another helpful piece of data being explored: what other entities on campuses and in UCOP want to leverage our current CRIS for non-OA ends? We know that LBL, RGPO and UCSF have use cases and are either using Symplectic or are actively investigating it. This may change the ROI analysis of Symplectic (if its usefulness extends beyond the OA Policy). This might also decrease the cost (through cost-sharing).

If SLASIAC is to advise how the policy should be implemented, they need to know the options.

==Action:== CoUL/DOC to prepare a document that presents a suite of options for implementing the OA policy. Although it is a short timeline, a draft document should be prepared for the April 24 meeting; with that in hand SLASIAC will talk about who needs to buy-in and at what level. If necessary, SLASIAC will have follow-up discussion/review after the April meeting via email.