

Systemwide Library and Scholarly Information Advisory Committee  
March 10, 2005, 10 a.m. – 3 p.m.  
UC Irvine University Club

**Meeting Notes**

Members Present:	Constable, Cullenberg, Glantz, Gottfredson (Chair), Greenstein, Hafner, Heinecke, Jensen, Leonard, Luce, Munoff, Withey, Zelmanowitz
Members Absent:	Abbott, Afifi, Bergstrom, Brown, Brunk, Davis, Olsen
Staff, Consultants & Guests:	Lawrence; Candee, Ober; Kushigian

**1. Introductions; meeting logistics**

**2. Scholarly Communication**

**2.a. Implementation paths for UC scholarly communication initiatives (Discussion)**

**2.b. A proposed strategy for scholarly monographs (Discussion)**

**2.c. Academic Council Special Committee on Scholarly Communication (Update)**

**2.d. Resolution on University support for scholarly communication strategies (Action)**

- Strategies and Implementation Paths for UC Scholarly Communication Initiatives: SLASAC Discussion Document (OSC 2/16/05)
- Resolution \_: The University's Role in Fostering Positive Change in Scholarly Communication (**DRAFT**, 1/21/05)

Greenstein introduced the topic by reminding the committee that at the last meeting, he and staff had committed to bring back both a revision of the draft resolution discussed then and a "roadmap" summarizing the specific implementation paths that would be used in pursuit of the scholarly communication strategy. He also noted that the background material for this item had been developed in consultation with a small group of advisors that included Academic Council Vice Chair Cliff Brunk, who is unable to attend today's meeting.

Ober provided an update on progress to date along with additional, selective background materials covering progress not discussed explicitly. The Mellon Foundation has provided support for a study of the volume of journal article production by UC faculty, the potential for uptake of a postprint repository, and faculty awareness of issues in journal economics and scholarly communication options. Preliminary findings show that about 6% of the articles in a group of 5,000 journals have a UC author; the percentage is higher for high-impact journals. The study also showed that awareness of scholarly publishing issues is greater than might be expected, and that faculty are eager for help in dealing with these issues.

In a wide-ranging discussion of copyright management issues and provision of language for a rights retention addendum for publication agreements, the following points were raised:

- It would be helpful to clarify the relationship between the University's inability to provide legal advice or assistance related to the faculty's intellectual property and the University's commitment to indemnify its employees when acting in the course and scope of their employment.
- Some forms of language that might appear in a standard rights addendum to protect the University from liability could have a chilling effect on faculty adoption (e.g., "please consult an attorney...").
- It would be helpful if a standard addendum made specific and unequivocal provisions for certain library uses, such as electronic reserves, for avoidance of doubt.
- The Creative Commons licensing system provides a well-developed and legally effective infrastructure for authors or publishers to express their rights management preferences, but would need to be presented to authors in a context that made clear how it would operate in a publication

agreement situation. It might be worthwhile to invite a Creative Commons representative to meet with the Committee.

- The basic rights addendum under discussion here is best suited to journal articles, but might not be applicable (or would need to be articulated differently) for books and other kinds of publications. This could be addressed by (a) developing scenarios or menus that could guide faculty to choose the correct language for their particular publication requirements, or (b) initially limiting work to the reasonably well-understood case of journal articles, deferring other forms of publication for subsequent development.
- There is a significant tension between the goal of providing faculty with enough information to make good choices for a variety of publication requirements on the one hand, and the goal of simplicity and ease of use on the other.

Ober indicated that OSC staff will continue to work on outreach and service for copyright management, will consult with OGC on those efforts, and, as indicated in the Strategic Directions and Implementation Paths outline, will continue to bring the issues and associated developments to SLASIAC.

Candee provided a brief overview of the recently-released eScholarship postprint repository program and provided a handout illustrating the process of submitting a postprint to the repository. In the two weeks since its release, the postprint repository has gained great visibility, experienced accelerated use, and attracted numerous inquiries. Among the emails received, two themes have predominated: questions about rights, and concerns about the effort involved in submitting. Glantz noted that the system requires the faculty author to submit a version of the paper that is under their control (i.e., the published version cannot simply be harvested from the publisher's site), with the result that the paper submitted to the postprint repository by the author may differ from the published version. In response, Candee observed that this is a transitional period for the scholarly communication system, and eScholarship can only make use of the rights that faculty have. It may be possible to simplify the process and help ensure the posting of the final published version by identifying and establishing a separate submission track for papers whose publishers permit this, but it is not likely that all publishers will come into alignment on this issue in the near future, so the repository will need to do the best it can in a "mixed" rights environment. There was agreement that staff support would be helpful to faculty to prepare their papers for submission, but it was not evident what sources of budgetary support might be available for this purpose.

In introducing the discussion of a proposed UC Press strategy for scholarly monographs, Withey reminded the group that there has been some discussion in SLASIAC of the special problems of the marketplace for scholarly monographs. For the last several years, it has been increasingly difficult to publish book-length scholarship, where print runs have dropped to 300-500 per title. Printing and distribution costs are not the culprits here, as 70-80% of total costs are "first-copy" costs, incurred before printing and distribution, chiefly composed of acquisition costs and those associated with managing editorial workflow. A possible solution lies in the "journal model," where the costs of editorial review are widely distributed, instead of being concentrated within a single editorial board. In the model currently under consideration, faculty editorial boards would, for a particular monographic series or subject area, assume responsibility for selection, editorial review, and copy editing, while the eScholarship Repository would serve as a publication/distribution platform supplemented by the UC Press' existing Print on Demand (POD) capabilities. An example is UC International and Areas Studies publications, which are reviewed and edited by faculty from UC IAS research units and published "in association with" UC Press, with ongoing administrative management provided by the Dean of IAS at Berkeley.

Withey believes that this model of monographic publishing raises three fundamental issues: (1) faculty and institutional support, (2) technical support, and (3) cost recovery.

With regard to the first issue, Gottfredson opined that the proposed publishing model would not be problematic for campus academic personnel committees (CAPs) as long as the review process was rigorous; indeed, if the topical editorial boards are properly selected, the proposed process could be viewed as more rigorous and credible than a more "standard" UC Press publication. The technical issues are viewed by SLASIAC as important but tractable, and the Press is in the best position to make judgments about cost recovery strategies. In discussion, the following points were raised:

- A strong and identifiable role for the Press is essential to lend credibility and the assurance of independence to the acquisition/selection/peer review process, as is "blind" reviewing.
- Institutional support commitments for "distributed" editorial boards would be significant (e.g., UCIAS has a managing editor, release time for the faculty series editor, etc.). Deans and ORU directors (but not necessarily department chairs) have some discretionary funding and staffing, and are concerned about the visibility of their units; however, sustainability strategies need to be in place against the inevitable turnover of deans and directors.

- It is possible that this model could be viewed as a shift of cost to the faculty, although this could be seen as preferable to the continued diminution of scholarly monograph publishing.
- The roles of acquisition editors and faculty editors/reviewers would need to be reconsidered and clarified in the proposed model.
- One possible strategy for moving forward would be to identify (in consultation with the Press Editorial Board, deans, faculty, and others) two or three areas that look especially promising for new monographic series.
- This model may be especially effective for first monographs, where format is not an issue and wide distribution and access are especially desirable. This model might align well with initiatives to provide first-monograph publishing subventions to junior faculty.

Zelmanowitz noted that the problem is how to expand capacity in a contracting market. The proposed model is a strategy for expanding capacity by "virtually" expanding the Editorial Board (and simultaneously manage costs by leveraging technology). Given the factors driving the need for expansion, academic criteria (and especially the personnel review process) should be given the heaviest weight in designing and making decisions about this model. Greenstein noted that it will be important to continuously distinguish among (a) editorial processes and (b) institutional support for faculty in their roles as (1) authors and (2) editors and reviewers.

Greenstein indicated that:

- OSC would continue to work with the Press to flesh out some "use cases" illustrating various alternative versions of the model, with scenarios and numbers;
- OSC, in collaboration with the Press, would continue to work on supporting technical development;
- These issues and associated developments would continue to return to SLASAC
- He would highlight these issues in planned Fall 2005 visits to key Senate committees; for the monograph issues, the key committee is UCAP, but UCORP and UCPB will also have important interests.

Returning to the previous agenda topic, with some suggestions for alternative language less disruptive than "disrupt the marketplace" and to tie these paths to *Systemwide Strategic Directions*, SLASAC endorsed the "Implementation Paths," and Greenstein indicated that an expanded version, with additional implementing detail, would be available in the fall for additional discussion with SLASAC and as a foundation document for discussion with key Senate committees.

With suggestions for minor wording changes, SLASAC **endorsed** *Resolution I: The University's Role in Fostering Positive Change in Scholarly Communication*.

### **3. Budget Update (Information)**

Heinecke reported that the 2005-06 Governor's Budget released in January followed the Governor's compact with higher education announced about a year ago. The budget proposal provides a 3% increase for basic needs, funding for 5,000 additional enrollments, and startup funding for UCM. However, two provisions added to last year's budget, for student academic preparation and labor research programs, is treated in the 2005-06 budget as a one-time allocation in 2004-05, effectively imposing a \$17 million cut. The Legislative Analyst continues to oppose the Compact as one more restraint on the flexibility of the Legislature, and recommends that UC enrollments grow more slowly. The LAO also recommends that the legislature standardize on a baseline percentage of student cost, e.g., 40%, that would be financed from student fees (student fees now cover about 30% of the marginal cost of instruction), would eliminate the provisions for a return to financial aid from student fees, and would base future budgeting on the University's current, deteriorated student-faculty ratio.

#### **Additional Item: Los Alamos National Laboratory Research Library**

Richard Luce gave a presentation on the Research Library at Los Alamos National Laboratory, both to inform committee members about a "hidden jewel in New Mexico" and to provide a different perspective on the issues addressed by *Systemwide Strategic Directions*. The rationale for the Research Library's strategy is built on:

- Integration of content (through local loading) and assurance of high availability
- Protecting privacy for users and the institution (to some extent, a national security issue)

- Data mining to surface content relationships
- Knowledge of user behavior to improve collections and services

The library strategy supporting this rationale includes:

- Internal management of data and collections
- User tools for awareness and discovery
- Tools to facilitate use and re-use of information on the user's desktop
- Development of research indicators

Luce avers that the Research Library's strategies are well aligned with and supportive of the NSF Cyberinfrastructure initiative and promote new methods of scientific collaboration, and invites discussion of how the various centers of excellence (in both information resources and scientific activity) and the capabilities of the LANL Research Library could be brought together for mutual benefit.

A wide-ranging discussion surfaced numerous points, including:

- Parallels to the work of the UC Information Technology Leadership Council, a proposed UC oversight group for IT and cyberinfrastructure planning, and ongoing work to describe the future role of libraries in the UC information environment.
- Possibilities for mutual mirroring of essential content as a disaster recovery measure
- Suggestions for new metrics of the value of published literature based on relationships other than, or in addition to, simple use measures
- The economics of local loading of published content in a University information environment that may soon be spending significant amounts to host and manage a wide variety of locally-created scholarly and administrative data and documents.

#### 4. Library Facilities

##### 4.a. Shared Library Facilities Board (*Update*)

##### 4.b. Facilities planning (*Discussion*)

- University of California, Shared Library Facilities Board, Charge (7/14/04)
- Shared Library Facilities Board Roster (2/15/05)
- Gottfredson to Greenwood, 12/20/04, SLASIAC Resolution H
- Greenwood to Gottfredson, 1/21/05, SLASIAC Resolution H
- Creating a "Case Statement" for Investment in Library Facilities: Discussion Item for the March 10, 2005 Meeting of SLASIAC (SLP 3/3/05)
- Capital Budgeting for UC Shared Library Facilities (SLP 3/4/05)

In Gottfredson's view, SLASIAC presented the case for including SRLF-3 in the capital budget; the response indicated that the proposal could not be accommodated now and required additional justification. SLASIAC is the only entity that will advocate for Shared Library Facilities and the allocation of capital resources to systemwide programs. Gottfredson proposes that SLASIAC write back to the Provost restating the case and emphasizing that it is compelling without additional justification, and insisting on the inclusion of SRLF-3 in the next five-year capital program. Gottfredson will take this letter to COVC for discussion, preferably in the presence of the Vice President for Budget. The committee **endorsed** this strategy. Leonard suggested that the impending occupancy of NRLF Phase 3 might provide opportunities to further publicize the issue.

#### 5. Systemwide Strategic Directions – Academic Senate comments (*Discussion*)

- Blumenthal to Greenwood, 2/3/05, Academic Senate review of Systemwide Strategic Directions..., with encl.

It was the sense of the committee that Senate groups (a) had provided valuable suggestions related to ongoing planning, and (b) had either explicitly endorsed or raised no specific concerns about the five strategic

directions. It would be appropriate and sufficient to acknowledge these points in any response to the Senate.

#### **6. Shared Collections (*Information/Discussion*)**

- UCL Shared Print Collections: Summary Goals and Strategies, March 2, 2005
- Developing a Planning Framework for UC Libraries Shared Print Collections, Version 1.6, February 9, 2005 ( <http://www.slp.ucop.edu/programs/sharedprint/PlanningFrameworkv1-6.pdf> )

Kushigian observed that it is increasingly evident that advanced services must be built atop rich and deep collections of books and other materials in all formats. Viewed in this way, "storage" seems a derogatory term for the persistent curation of the accumulated information resources that provide the foundation for leading-edge information services in support of teaching and research. Shared collections shift the perception of the RLFs away from the storage role and toward a position as highly efficient research resource centers, and the shared print program is fundamentally dependent on the RLFs serving as shared facilities in support of shared collections. The proposal for prospective collaborative development of German language and literature collections suggests a different set of values, helping campuses to gain the same kinds of leverage from collective purchasing that they now enjoy with digital resources, even in cases when not all ten campuses require the content.