Systemwide Library and Scholarly Information Advisory Committee (SLASIAC)
Conference call
Feb. 27, 2015, 9 – 11:45

Participants

Scott Waugh (**Chair**), Tom Andriola (for his item only), Mario Biagioli, Karen Butter, Susan Carlson, Tom Cogswell, Jim Frew, Dan Hare, Laine Farley, Susan Koskinen, Angus MacDonald, Roberto Manduchi, Catherine Mitchell, Alison Mudditt, Jim Phillips, Brian Schottlaender (for Sandra Brown), Wendy Streitz, Lorelei Tanji.

Staff: Joanne Miller

Meeting Notes

1. **Joint UC VCR-CIO-CoUL summit on Cyber-infrastructure** (Tom Andriola)

Tom Andriola described the impetus for the March 23rd conference, "Next Generation Research and the University of California: Planning for the Future of UC's Cyber Infrastructure," sponsored by UC's Vice Chancellors of Research and Chief Information Officers. The conference will bring together UC scholars and researchers with CIOs, research administrators, and representatives from national agencies for an integrated conversation about digital assets and digital information across the UC system. Research is clearly becoming more data-driven, and researchers often need a data management plan in place prior to receiving grant funding. Funders are increasingly starting to require the deposit and maintenance of all data generated from research. UC's CIOs have been gathering information on campus research needs, focused primarily around data storage and management. Participants in the March 23rd meeting will first focus on the work that UCs can do together, particularly with local campus information technology and research needs, and then bring it together systemwide. A future meeting will focus more specifically on cyber-infrastructure and data networking. University librarians are invited to attend the meetings, since their role in data curation and data flow are important to research. The CIOs believe that UC needs to start thinking of data as an asset that needs to be managed and maintained so as to be available to others.

2. **CDL news & update** (Scott Waugh, Susan Carlson)

The announcement of Laine Farley's retirement is the big news from CDL. As chair of SLASIAC, Scott Waugh will chair the search committee for Laine's replacement. The search committee (yet to be formed) will consult with various groups, including SLASIAC, for input during the recruitment period. The search will be nationwide and the Vice Provost would like to have the position filled prior to Laine's departure in October.

The Council of University Librarians will advise on whether or not to use a search firm, and if so, which one(s) would be worthwhile. Several SLASIAC members recommended hiring a search firm, due to the

amount of work and to the wider range of candidates that a firm might bring. But there were also words of caution that hiring an outside firm might not be worth the additional cost.

Once there is a draft position description, SLASIAC members will be invited to give input.

3. **Presidential Open Access Policy Review Results** (Susan Carlson)

A summary of the comments received from the systemwide review of the proposed UC Presidential Open Access Policy was included in the background materials. The policy is for all UC employees who write scholarly articles who are not members of the Academic Senate. No feedback was received from graduate deans or representatives of the university extension or unions.

The concerns raised in the comments were similar to the Senate policy, although the policies are not exactly the same. The requirement for deposit of an article varies slightly between the two policies. UC's Copyright Ownership policy breaks down copyright ownership at UC into authors who own their own copyright and those who do not, which complicates this policy. Susan Carlson hopes that in the future the Copyright Ownership policy can be modified so that the Open Access policy is easier to implement.

The Presidential Open Access Policy Task Force will reconvene to look at the comments and create a next draft. The Task Force reports to the Academic Planning Council, which will have the final word on this policy.

From just a brief conversation, it appears that even within SLASAIC there is no consensus on the right way to draft the policy. But members agreed that regardless of the final outcome, the policy will need a major communication and awareness effort. Further discussion of the policy and its next draft will be on the spring SLASIAC meeting agenda.

4. **Open Access Policy Implementation Status** (Catherine Mitchell)

An automatic publication harvesting system is now in place to support the Senate's Open Access Policy. Supported by the Academic Council, the goal was to have a mechanism for participation that would be as convenient and intuitive as possible to use. After an RFP process, the system chosen was Symplectic *Elements*. UCLA was the first campus to "launch" the system, which is now automatically "harvesting" the web looking for records of all publications by UCLA senate faculty. At UCLA, faculty received an email message from campus officials encouraging them to log in and go through the simple process of confirming publication information and uploading files.

Early data from UCLA looks promising, with an impressive 24% click-through rate for the email alert (standard response rate in an academic setting is generally around 5%). In one month, UCLA faculty have deposited over 500 papers, a 2,000% increase in deposit rate compared to the previous year (when faculty were manually depositing their papers in accordance with the OA Policy. Details are in the report that was included as background.

UCSF and UC Irvine will start using the harvesting system by next month. The rest of the campuses should be online by fall.

The key benefits of the harvesting system over manual deposit are that the increased ease and efficiency make it more likely that faculty will participate. The system can be used as a hub for faculty to manage their publications and track academic activity. It is compatible with other profile systems used on the campuses.

The biggest challenges so far are lack of familiarity with the policy and confusion about which version of an article needs to be deposited. While these are not insignificant, the hope is that even the problems will provide opportunities to familiarize the faculty with the policy and spread the word.

Ongoing funding for the harvesting system is a concern that SLASIAC may be able to assist with. The Provost agreed to one-time funding for the tool, but there is no ongoing commitment. SLASIAC could join UCOLASC in sending letters to the Provost to emphasize the importance of budgeting for the harvesting tool on a permanent basis. It will be very difficult for the Open Access policy to succeed without the harvesting system.

ACTION: SLASIAC will write a letter in support of ongoing funding for the harvesting system, send around for comment, then send to Provost Dorr. (Susan Carlson, Laine Farley, Catherine Mitchell, Joanne Miller)

5. **Promotion of UC's Open Access Activities & Involvement** (Laine Farley)

The draft document included in the background material is a result of a discussion at the last meeting when SLASIAC members discussed all of the various open access activities around UC. In addition to documenting UC's activities and showing the collective impact, the idea is to highlight UC's leadership position in exploring alternative modes of scholarly communication. By exposing UC's open access activities to more general audiences, the document could help create more awareness in this area, and perhaps bring more attention to the benefits of a Presidential Open Access Policy and how it fits into the greater open access landscape.

The document could be shared on the websites of SLASIAC and the Office of Scholarly Communication (OSC), and made available to anyone who could make use of it. UC Press was interested in seeing their open access activities as part of larger program.

ACTION: Continue to work on the document and give it more of public-relations tone. (Joanne Miller with members of OSC)

6. **Budget briefing/discussion: SOROP review process** (Susan Carlson, Scott Waugh)

President Napolitano is communicating results to division leaders at OP.

7. **Update on CoUL activities –RLF planning & expansion, shared print and collective digitization update** (Lorelei Tanji)

Lorelei Tanji, CoUL chair, covered three of the areas that the Council of University Librarians (CoUL) is focusing on now: Regional Library Facility planning, shared print, and collective digitization.

Both of the regional library storage facilities will be filling up very soon, with certain sizes of materials at capacity in 2016 at NRLF. At UC Berkeley, the Academic Senate library committee is looking at expansion of NRLF, but SRLF cannot be expanded. CoUL/Shared Libraries Facilities Board (SLFB) is exploring possible options for creating a new library storage facility, either in central valley or southern California with the idea of pulling together a formal proposal. Since UCOP no longer manages capital building projects a campus will have to take the lead. RLF directors are also exploring the cost benefits of de-duplication, and the current and future service and access needs for stored library material. SLFB is providing the coordination and leadership for the analysis of existing space and other options for RLF use. A suggestion was made to involve faculty in any discussion of de-duplication and future exploration of library collections storage needs..

Library storage facilities require security and climate control, and therefore are generally purpose-built. Libraries are doing more de-duplication than they used to, including prospective de-duplication between campuses and RLFs in certain collections. Retrospective de-duplication is not as clearly beneficial – especially for monographs -- because materials in the storage facilities are shelved by height.

CoUL has approved a "RoadMap" from the UC Shared Print Strategy Team to guide future shared print activities.

A UC Libraries group is looking at collective digitization and considering three funding options: partnering with a vendor to digitize materials in a particular theme, grant funding, and self-funding. As part of any vendor agreement UC would have perpetual access to any digital collection to which it contributes.

CoUL has long worked together to provide access to shared collections and shared services. The University Librarians are now looking ahead to address how to continue and enhance this cooperation in the current environment. For example, CDL was originally meant to be "the" digital library, but now all libraries have digital library components. For the current round of strategic and future planning, CoUL hired a consultant to assist them with strategic directions and to help assess the UC Libraries Advisory Structure, which has now been in place for one year. Lorelei will keep SLASIAC updated on the outcomes.

8. **Data: Dash** (Laine Farley)

Dash began at UCSF as a service for research data management called DataShare. It was led by faculty who wanted to share data, developed by the UCSF Library and the CTSI unit, and intended as complementary service for data repositories. CDL repurposed the code from UCSF so that it could be used by all campuses. Several campuses and UCOP now have the service up and running (see: https://dash.cdlib.org/). Lawrence Berkeley has also expressed interest.

Campuses can enhance the Dash services that they offer with various add-ons, such as a geo-location service added by UC Irvine.

CDL recently obtained a grant from the Sloan Foundation to revamp the user interface and update the technology. At UC, the default data repository for Dash data is Merritt, but the service will be able to work with other repositories, such as Fedora and dSpace. Covering the actual cost of storage has been an ongoing saga, however. So far, it has taken two years to try to get through OP hierarchy, but is currently scheduled for review in March by the recharge committee at OP. Payment will likely occur via a recharge for users, whether that is individuals, departments, libraries, etc. Campuses can decide how to handle who pays.

9. **Copyright Policies - Status update on UC Policy on Copyright and Fair Use** (Angus MacDonald)

Angus MacDonald provided a summary of the policy process so far. With a few minor changes, it is now ready for a limited systemwide review.

ACTION: Joanne Miller will work with Susan Carlson's office to send the policy out for review.

10. **Electronic Theses and Dissertations. Introduction to the issue and then continue discussion in May** (Angus MacDonald, Laine Farley)

Electronic theses and dissertations (ETDs) are the source of some confusion and concern on campuses. For the most part, campuses are treating electronic versions like the traditional print version, by keeping a copy and making the work publicly available. However, online availability can mean widespread distribution, which students may not want. There is currently no consistent explanation, policy, or guidelines for ETDs across the campuses. Students, librarians, and faculty would benefit from clearer policies or statements at both the system-wide and campus levels that are grounded on a shared understanding of copyright ownership of theses and dissertations at UC.

One possibility is to classify all ETDs as "open access," but apparently a similar proposal a few years ago was rejected. Graduate deans have expressed concern, including the impact that wide dissemination of ETDs might have on future publishing opportunities. It is a complex issue, and complex to manage in the eScholarship repository due to differences in how material could be treated, ranging from wide open to dark archive. Questions also come up about privacy and whether a thesis is a "published" work. It might be helpful to hear the graduate student perspective on this issue. The Council of Graduate Deans would have to be included in any changes.

The discussion will be continued at the May SLASIAC meeting.