SLASIAC Meeting Notes
March 16, 2011, 10am – 3pm
Oakland, CA

Members Attending:	Daniel Greenstein, Laine Farley, Alfred Kobsa, Charles Louis, Gene Lucas (**Chair**), Mary MacDonald, Alison Mudditt, Barbara Schader, Pete Siegel, Ginny Steel, Wendy Streitz, Gary Strong
Members Participating via Phone:	Shane Butler, Laurie Monahan, Rich Schneider (for part of the meeting)
Guests:	Gary Lawrence, Bruce Miller, Brian Schottlaender, Elisabeth Willoughby (afternoon only, for SLASIAC member Debora Obley)
Staff:	Joanne Miller
Members Absent:	Mark Aldenderfer, Rosio Alvarez, Robert Anderson, David Ernst, Robin Garrell

1. Introductions

2. UC Press Update

UC Press Director Alison Mudditt began by saying that it is an "interesting time" at the Press. The Press faces markets that are rapidly shifting to digital and other new modes of publishing, as well as internal challenges.

Press has a good reputation, especially in certain fields, is strong in traditional book publishing, with well-edited, highly-designed, good-looking print books, has a robust fundraising capacity, and has flexible staff willing and eager to make changes as necessary.

The challenges facing the Press include figuring out the best model(s) for going digital, expanding beyond its perception as primarily a book publisher, the physical and psychological split between the book and journal sides of the business, and financial realities that include flat book revenue (for the past decade) while staff costs go up.

Recent happenings at the Press include increased revenue this year from sales of the Mark Twain autobiography, an increase in ebook sales, and expanded scholarly society journal publishing, which is less lucrative because of the larger royalties paid to the societies. The UC Press Review, which occurred last year (Mudditt can send a copy of the resulting Report via email) looked primarily at the book publishing side of the business. The Review imagined seeing UC Press as not just a university press, but in a more holistic way, as the press of the University – including departments, libraries, bookstores, etc. The results are being used as a base for the Press' current strategic planning process.

While many university presses are suffering financially, some, like Princeton, are successful. The actions that have resulted in increased revenue for Princeton include moving their booklist into higher-priced science (and economics) titles, expanding into the textbook realm, and increasing international sales.

In response to a question about how SLASIAC members could help the Press, Mudditt said more two-way understanding between the Press and the campus communities would be helpful. In fact, she is going to be visiting the campuses in the next few months. The Press wants to find out faculty and student needs, both as authors and consumers, and wants to give the UC community a clear sense of what they can provide. For example, UCPubs (http://www.cdlib.org/services/publishing/ucpubs.html), a collaboration with CDL, is one new model for journal publishing, but it is losing money.

Shane Butler said that he had been approached by editors from other university presses, but never by UC Press. Dan Greenstein mentioned an opportunity for UC Press to link up with new research initiatives at UC to form partnerships within the system. Other potential partnerships include the online learning initiative (an obvious place to start because of the EVC Lucas connection) and connections with community colleges, such as collaborative defining of core requirements.

The Press is looking to form partnerships, especially for technical development, and has partnered with JSTOR to host legacy and current journal content from all UC Press journals. The Press is interested in working with campuses, too, for exploration of different digital environments. Some SLASIAC members mentioned collaboration and partnership with campus bookstores, but others mentioned the disintermediation of bookstores occurring on campuses (and elsewhere).

Some numbers:
70% of the Press' publications are scholarly, 30% trade titles (which are inherently riskier)
28% of business is from Amazon.com

3. Copyright Issues Update from Office of General Counsel

As a result of an action item from the last SLASIAC meeting, the Standing Subcommittee on Copyright Policy (SSCP) discussed the 1986 Policy and Guidelines on the Reproduction of Copyrighted Materials for Teaching and Research, and agreed to revise the guidelines (if not the actual Policy, which is brief). Two members of the Subcommittee worked on revisions, and Mary MacDonald sent the edited document to the Office of General Counsel's own Copyright Working Group. The response from the OGC Copyright Working Group was that the policy needs not just a quick update, but a complete overhaul to bring it up to date.

Discussion about the appropriate composition of a group to write a new Copyright "use" policy resulted in the decision that first a statement of the problem would be vetted by Gene Lucas and Mary MacDonald, who would then work with the SSCP co-chairs to determine the appropriate composition.

Action: Joanne Miller will work with Mary MacDonald to create a statement regarding the need for a review of the policies on use of copyrighted materials for teaching and research. The statement may be used for a charge to a new Task Force to write the new policy.

A second issue was brought to the group by Wendy Streitz, of the Office of Research and Graduate Studies (ORGS), regarding the inclusion of software as a copyrightable entity in the 1992 Copyright Ownership Policy. This is the same issue that Chuck Rzeszutko brought in draft

form to the last SLASIAC meeting. The Intellectual Property Policy Review Working Group is asking that the Copyright Ownership policy be revisited so that "ownership of software and other copyrighted works developed with the use of University time and resources that evidence the same practical applications as patentable inventions should be retained by the University."

Action: The SSCP will discuss the issue at their next meeting.

4. CDL Review Update

Laine Farley gave an update of the CDL Review, and the progress so far (PowerPoint slides are linked from the agenda). All APPC (Academic Planning, Programs, and Coordination) programs are undergoing reviews. The Review Steering Committee includes members from within and outside UC. An outside consultant directed the process, and conducted interviews and focus groups with CDL stakeholders. Results from the many interviews show the tremendous value of the CDL to UC, nationally, and internationally. The interdependencies of the libraries and the CDL has also been made abundantly clear, and the term "ecosystem" was used to describe the relationship. The Review will wrap up shortly, in the same timeframe as the SLASIAC Library Planning Task Force final report.

5. Next Generation Library Services

Bruce Miller gave a succinct update of the UC libraries' successes to date, and provided an overview of the new and ongoing initiatives of the libraries, including Next-Generation Melvyl, Next Generation Technical Services, HathiTrust, and more. Brian Schottlaender noted that the libraries have been involved with such innovative practices for three decades, and that it's important to recognize that many of these activities are transforming libraries. In the past change has resulted from opportunity and exigency. Now, with the current budget situation, cost avoidance and cost savings become a matter of strategy, and a primary focus.

Schottlaender said that it has become abundantly clear that trimming around the edges isn't going to be enough anymore; that core activities need to be tackled. The outcomes of the SLASIAC Library Planning Task Force should mean that the libraries work in a coordinated way to address the local budgetary shortfalls.

Charles Louis mentioned the new federal grant requirements that call for researchers to have data management plans in place, and said that a number of the disciplinary areas of the University were likely unprepared for this. The Vice Chancellors of Research haven't discussed it as a group. There was agreement that the University should have a systemwide policy, or at least procedures to follow. It is inefficient for each campus to have to create their own. Laine Farley noted that the CDL has created data management guidelines (http://www.cdlib.org/services/uc3/datamanagement/) and a service to provide data identifiers (EZID, http://www.cdlib.org/services/uc3/ezid/). The CDL is partnering with MIT and other institutions on these activities.

6. Library Planning Task Force

Gene Lucas gave a PowerPoint presentation that illustrated the budgetary challenges facing the UC libraries and summarizing the work and recommendations of the Library Planning Task

Force. The main issues still to be worked out are financing and governance. Much of the ensuing discussion centered on governance.

The Task Force's discussions focused primarily on existing and potential collaborations within the ten UC campus system (and the CDL). Individual campuses often partner with other (outside UC) institutions, and both the WEST project and HathiTrust are multi-institutional collaborations.

Some concern was expressed about unintended consequences of certain recommendations, such as the impact of reduced collection sizes on inter-library loan activity and cost.

There was extended discussion about scholarly publishing and the tenure and promotion process, including differing viewpoints on the acceptability of non-traditional and open access publications. It was noted that the faculty have to lead the change within the University, because they're the ones creating the scholarly work, and ultimately making the tenure decisions. The Committee members acknowledged that it's a long-term process and that even if perspectives and practices at UC change, scholarly communication is national and international in scope, so changes at UC alone will not solve the problem.

In terms of the governing function, Gary Strong wondered what the lines of reporting and accountability would look like. He said that he reports to his campus EVC, and performs library planning in response to the academic planning and programs on his campus. Strong also expressed concern about central priority-setting and funding support for the proposed initiatives, which will be needed to get some projects started. Payback of loan funding might be redirected from other sources on campuses. EVCs have to communicate and collaborate like the University Librarians do. It was also noted that the discussion of library space failed to take into account the pressures to repurpose existing space (e.g., UCLA), or the potential need to close some library facilities in response to operating budget cuts (e.g., UCSD). Strong noted that the recommendations also assume stability in information markets; changes in licensing terms, copyright laws, and other factors could change the contours of reliance on digital publications.

Some of the University Librarians present wanted more information about the proposed timeline for implementation, and the specific directives concerning implementation in the Interim Report. The Report should take care not to include so much detail as to invite criticism that might derail the process. Charles Louis suggested making the point clear that the Task Force understands that the status quo cannot be sustained in the face of such huge decreases in funding. The Report will be edited to clarify that a $52 million cut to library budgets *will* have an impact on scholarship.

The report should also explicitly state that finding solutions that work equitably for all ten campuses is very difficult. The governance function should have a provision for periodic monitoring and adjusting.

In various discussions, people expressed concern over what they see as a mandate for only "one copy" of any given item in the UC system. This is not what's being proposed. Ridding the system of "unnecessary duplication" doesn't mean that only one copy remains. And, in fact, *coordinated* de-duplication may be more beneficial than current practice, where one campus can decide to stop collecting certain items (e.g., museum catalogs) when other campuses are relying on it.

The specifics of the governance function are yet to be determined, but SLASIAC members expressed confidence that the University Librarians would be able to do the planning necessary to move forward on the recommendations in the Interim Report. The "executive leadership" mentioned in the Report need not be located at the Office of the President, but there has to be some direct linkage to the Provost.

In conclusion, SLASIAC has not yet endorsed the Task Force's Report. Members provided feedback, which will be incorporated in to the next iteration of the Report, which will then go to the Academic Senate and other groups for review. The review should take place between April and June (the Academic Senate needs 90 days).

The next SLASIAC meetings will be in June (a conference call) and September for the next face-to-face meeting.