Systemwide Library and Scholarly Information Advisory Committee
September 30, 2011, 10am – 3pm
Oakland, CA

MEETING NOTES

1. Introductions
2. CDL Review (Laine Farley)

Laine Farley gave a PowerPoint presentation of the results of the CDL review, which occurred earlier this year. Going forward, SLASIAC will be looking at the CDL budget, so it is important that members understand the relationship between the CDL and the campus libraries, as well as the value that the UC community sees in the CDL. SLASIAC members can also help communicate to their constituents about what the CDL has to offer, including publication services, data management tools, an institutional repository, and a web archiving service.

The review will be posted on the CDL website.

3. Scholarly Communication Update (Laine Farley)

Using the "snapshot" update provided to the Committee, Laine Farley described some of the activities and initiatives taking place at UC. She wanted to remind the Committee about eScholarship, which offers and open access publishing platform (including peer-reviewed articles) to the UC community.

Comments from Committee members included brief discussion about different practices in different disciplines. In the sciences, authors often pay page charges or processing fees. In computer science, there is usually no charge to the author from traditional journals. While some funding agencies routinely pay publication costs for authors, others have reported financial limitations that would impede this practice. There was also a comment that scholarly societies need to be "brought into the mix" to wield their influence as well.

4. UC Press update - including information on the future of UCPubS (Alison Mudditt and Laine Farley)

Alison Mudditt described the original intention of the UC Publishing Services (UCPubS) collaboration with CDL/eScholarship and the financial review that informed the Press' decision to terminate the program. The CDL's Publishing Group is currently working to identify a vendor to replace UC Press in providing print-on-demand and distribution services for monographic publishing programs at UC (and thus continue the UCPubS program in a slightly different vein). After a thorough review, they are focusing on Lulu.com, specifically the new "Partner Program" which would enable UC to create a branded site to manage sales. Details are still being discussed, but the goal is to avoid interruption of service for those partners who are interested in continuing with the program.

There were layoffs this year at the Press, and Alison hopes to see the Press' financial situation improve as a result. One of her next streamlining tasks is figuring out what to do with three million in unsalable

inventory in the warehouse. As reported at a previous SLASIAC meeting, the Mark Twain biography was a large percentage of the revenue for 2010.

The Press' new focus will be launched with its current title list in the next few months. They have a more sustainable program, which includes support for the humanities.

5. HathiTrust Lawsuit Update (Mary MacDonald)

Mary MacDonald described a lawsuit recently filed by the Authors Guild and other parties against the HathiTrust and its university partners, including UC, for alleged copyright infringement relating to books digitized by Google. Part of the lawsuit alleges that making library holdings available to Google for scanning and then UC's use of those scans constitutes infringement. The other part of the lawsuit alleges that the "Orphan Works Project," announced by the University of Michigan, the host of the HathiTrust infrastructure, also infringes copyright. Under that project, works still protected by copyright but whose copyright holders cannot be indentified or located will be made available for reading. UC has announced a similar plan. As of the SLASIAC meeting, UC had not been served with the lawsuit, but OGC had started interviewing potential outside counsel.

Mary provided some background about the 2005 class action lawsuit that the Authors Guild and publishers brought against Google for violating copyright law by digitizing in-copyright books. The parties' proposed settlement was rejected by the court. It is unclear what settlement talks are underway between Google, the Authors Guild, and the publishers. Google, meanwhile, has said that it is going to focus its digitizing efforts on deals with specific publishers and works in the public domain.

More background on the lawsuit can be found on the HathiTrust website:
http://www.hathitrust.org/authors_guild_lawsuit_information

6. Revised SLASIAC Charge (Gene Lucas)

The Council of University Librarians had made some edits to the revised charge circulated at the last meeting. The new charge was approved, and membership will be revised by Joanne Miller and sent to Gene Lucas to be approved by the Provost.

A new subcommittee will be added that is charged to annually review the CDL budget and evaluate multi-campus and systemwide budget proposals.

7. Library Planning Task Force Report – Senate Review

Gene Lucas noted that the comments received from the senate review of the Library Planning Task Force Interim Report could be divided into three groups: scholarly communication issues, faculty consultation in library planning, and "other."

While the scholarly communication portion of the Interim Report was not intended to be central to its content, the comments received show that it is a pressing subject for faculty, albeit one that needs more explanation and support before they are ready to take action. Respondents noted that it is difficult for

any one stakeholder to do anything and make an impact. In order to make some headway in the ongoing discussion, SLASIAC members agreed that a succinct "white paper" laying out the roles and potential actions by the various stakeholders would be useful. It could help formulate a more substantive long range agenda for CoUL in working with UCOLASC.

Action: Joanne Miller will draft a White Paper on the current state of scholarly communication and why changes are necessary. The paper will lay out actions and steps that each participant can take; e.g., authors, promotion and tenure boards, external editors, publishers, etc.

Additional discussion on the issue included a reference to the Ithaka study on faculty behavior that showed that despite years of sustained efforts to reform various aspects of the scholarly communications system, a fundamentally conservative set of faculty attitudes continues to impede systematic change.

Some in academia still have the notion that open access equals lower quality. Whether it's more relaxed peer-review or lower copy-editing standards, one SLASIAC member questioned the quality of material that appears in certain open access publications. Others said that whether a title is open access or not doesn't matter, promotion and tenure decision care most about whether the journal is top in its field.

Faculty consultation: Despite the claim from the comments that faculty were not properly included on the Library Planning Task Force, Dan Greenstein noted that, in fact, two faculty members were on the ten-person committee. They were outspoken and included in all aspects of deliberations for the Interim Report and preliminary papers. But, as one SLASIAC member suggested, it's likely that reviewers of the Interim Report were afraid there was a hidden agenda, perhaps in part because details of the proposed strategies were not included and explicit plans were not laid out. Some reviewers may have been afraid to endorse a vague plan. The issues described in the document are complex, and without really understanding the background environment the Interim Report might have been difficult for some reviewers to fully comprehend. In responding to the comments, it will be important to reassure faculty that they *will* (continue to) be consulted in all aspects of library planning. In addition, the revised SLASIAC charge shows more explicit commitment to faculty involvement.

Action: Staff from the Library Planning Task Force (or SLASIAC) will compile a response "package" that includes:

1. *A clarifying statement on faculty consultation.*
2. *A revised "final" LPTF Report that responds to the main categories of comments received in the formal review.*
3. *A FAQ table with consolidated comments and responses. The responses to the questions on scholarly communication and faculty consultation will refer to the white paper and clarifying statement, respectively.*

   Information and links will be added to the UC Libraries and SLASIAC websites to direct attention to ongoing work resulting from the Report, such as the new SLASIAC charge, the CoUL priorities, the "white paper," and more.

Other miscellaneous comments included questioning the overall vision for the libraries, the unrealistic timeline, and the lack of attention to library space. Responses to these will be available in the chart and in the final report.

8. Library Planning Task Force Report – Next Steps + Information on UC libraries' planning (Gene Lucas, Ginny Steel)

The Council of University Librarians (CoUL) is engaged in an annual planning process that results in a list of goals and priorities for a three-year period. The latest draft will be posted to the UC Libraries' website shortly at http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/about/.

In response to the new SLASIAC charge, the CoUL will also prepare an annual document for SLASIAC about new library initiatives and progress on existing initiatives. Ginny Steel, CoUL chair, said that there is much overlap in the recommendations of the LPTF Interim Report and the CoUL priorities, and that the document has been helpful in evolving the planning for CoUL meeting agendas.

In response to a question about how much detail to include in the libraries' report to SLASIAC, it was suggested that the CoUL create a matrix, with initiatives organized into categories, that could be easily displayed on a website and which would have links that enabled those interested to delve deeper. There could also be a mechanism for providing input into library planning.

9. Next steps (Gene Lucas)
Immediate next steps are the preparation of a document that lays out the state of scholarly communication and the various actions that each group of stakeholders might take to change the system. This document will be brought to UCOLASC for further discussion and potential call for action. The new charge to SLASIAC will be finalized, and a budget subcommittee will be formed. The revised Library Planning Task Force Report will be submitted in November.