

Systemwide Library and Scholarly Information Advisory Committee

March 28, 2000

10 am – 3 pm

UC Berkeley, Howard Lounge

Members present: Clark, Christ, Copeland, Cowan, Dolgonas, Hay, Henry, Lucier, McCredie, Pantelia, Peete, Sharrow, Stead, Tiffney, Varian, Werner, Zelmanowitz.

Members absent: Chandler, Hartford, Pryatel.

Staff: Lawrence.

Guests: Beverlee French and Patricia Cruse, CDL

1. Welcome and Introductions: Review of Meeting Objectives

Christ convened the meeting at 10:10. Members and guests introduced themselves. The meeting objectives were reviewed.

MEETING OBJECTIVES

1. Review and comment on the Shared Digital Collections update, with particular attention to initiatives to build digital primary source collections and the role of co-investment in building the shared digital collection.
2. Review and comment on the proposed collaborative relationship between the CDL and the California State Library's Library of California initiative.
3. Review and discuss current Scholarly Communication activities, with particular attention to the proposed OAC Digital Publications initiative.
4. Take action on a proposed resolution on UC network authentication strategies.
5. Review and discuss concepts of accessibility of library collections.

Christ announced that Rory Hume, Executive Vice Chancellor at UCLA, would join the Committee and assume the chair beginning July 1, 2000. In connection with this transition in leadership, Lucier inquired whether the methods that have been used to organize and manage the work of the Committee have been effective, and received the Committee's endorsement.

2. Shared Digital Collections

Lucier reminded the group that the CDL was conceived not just as a traditional library in digital form, but as a complete system to support the life cycle of scholarly information, from creation and publication to access and use. This discussion is intended not only to update the Committee

on CDL's digital acquisitions from other sources, but to focus on the CDL's role as a builder of original collections in digital form. Lucier then introduced Beverlee French, CDL Associate University Librarian and Director of Shared Content.

2a. Update on status of licensed digital collections

Background materials: *California Digital Library: Licensed Collections* (3/15/00) (to be posted at <http://www.cdlib.org/about/CDL_collection_db.pdf>, <http://www.cdlib.org/about/CDL_collection_jo.pdf>).

French reported briefly on recent acquisitions (Web of Science, Chemical Abstracts' Scifinder Scholar; Bell and Howell Learning & Information [formerly University Microfilms International] Digital Dissertations, including access to full text of all UC dissertations from 1997 forward; the Grove Dictionary of Art [a licensing effort originated by the campuses], 300 additional titles from Elsevier, Kluwer, and other major science publishers, and the new Science segment of JSTOR [see SLASIAC minutes, 1/14/00 <<http://www.slp.ucop.edu/consultation/meetings5.html>>]) and current negotiations (Lippincott; the Declassified Documents collection; the online Oxford English Dictionary and American National Biography; the London Times index and full text, and the New York Times Index). In response to a question from Varian, French promised to supply him with information about the licensing models employed by CDL's current suppliers; Varian will do some analysis and report back to the Committee. Lucier emphasized that recent acquisitions reflect the CDL's collection development policy of providing support for all academic disciplines; as a result, the CDL collection can no longer be characterized as focused primarily on the sciences. Sharrow noted that the acquisition of shared Universitywide digital collections by the CDL is one of the substantial and tangible benefits of systemwide library collaboration that could not have been achieved by the campuses acting individually. French reported that CDL licensing activities have provided about \$18 million in added value to the campuses, in the form of both reduced costs compared with individual campus licenses and access to additional published materials that campuses do not currently hold in print form and likely would not have licensed in digital.

The discussion also touched on questions of retaining and archiving print materials and of systemwide coordination of cancellations and weeding, both of which are within the scope of the University's Collection Management Initiative (see SLASIAC minutes, 1/14/00 <<http://www.slp.ucop.edu/consultation/meetings5.html>>) and SLASIAC Resolutions A and B (<http://www.slp.ucop.edu/consultation/SLASIAC_Resolution_A.html>, <http://www.slp.ucop.edu/consultation/SLASIAC_Resolution_B.html>).

2b. Building shared primary source collections

2.b.(I) Government Information Initiative (Information/Discussion)

Background materials:

- Primary Source Collection Building – Government Information: Background Information (CDL March 2000).
- Primary Source Collection Building – Government Information: California Data Profile (CDL March 2000).

French indicated that government information was in many ways an ideal candidate for collaborative building of new digital collections: all general campuses are federal and state document depositories; the information is for the most part in the public domain; while much of the information is available on the Internet (making acquisition/access easy) it is not well organized and there is currently no guarantee of persistent access. In pursuing this program, the University and the CDL can greatly improve service to UC faculty, students and staff while simultaneously providing something of value to the public. While this is initially conceived as a UC project, it is naturally amenable to participation by others, a possibility that will be actively explored. French then introduced Patricia Cruse, CDL Senior Associate, who provided an overview of the government information initiative. In subsequent discussion, the Committee advised the CDL to partner with UC researchers and government agencies to address the intrinsic problems associated with government-produced numeric data (incomplete documentation, frequent and often undocumented revision, absence of useful and standardized metadata, ephemerality) and build communities of practice that could advise on content and tools. Several possible partners were suggested, including the Governor's Office of Innovation in Government, the California Council on Science and Technology, UC's California Policy Research Center, NSF (which has a digital government information initiative) and the California Health and Human Services Agency (subject of an existing agreement between UC and the California State Library). Lucier concluded by noting that this initiative was highlighted in the 2000-01 Regents' Budget, that funding (as part of the CDL budget request) is included in the Governor's Budget, and that implementation of this initiative would confer substantial operating benefits for campus libraries, as well as service benefits for library users. Finally, Lucier expressed his gratitude to the Berkeley, Davis, and San Diego libraries, all of which had made substantial contributions to the development and implementation of this initiative.

2.b.(II) Online Archive of California (Information/Discussion)

Background materials:

- *Online Archive of California* (CDL 3/28/00).
- *Online Archive of California – Transition 1999-2000* (CDL February 2000).
- California History And Culture Available Online: \$1.5 Million Supports The California Digital Library's *Online Archive Of California* (UC News Release, 11/9/99).
- Smith, Abby, "Library Collections Online," in *Collections, Content, and the Web*, Washington, DC: Council on Library and Information Resources, January 2000 (<http://www.clir.org/pubs/abstract/pub88abst.html>).

French reviewed the history, current state of development, and challenges facing the Online Archive of California (OAC). Recruitment is underway for a permanent OAC Manager, signaling the CDL's commitment to the OAC. Lucier made note of two themes he's detected in discussions about large-scale digitization as a direction for OAC development, and asked the Committee's advice on how to address these. The first is the notion that the existing OAC finding aids (in Encoded Archival Description, or EAD, format) are sufficient – if scholars can discover and locate the archival and special collections material they need using the EAD records, they will willingly travel to the owning collections to use the material in preference to using a digitized surrogate. The second is the concept, advanced in particular by the CDL's eScholarship partners in archaeology, that digitized special collections materials may be of the

greatest value to the K-12 community, who will generally only have meaningful access to this material if it is in digital form. These observations led to a wide-ranging and animated discussion of the potential for use of OAC digitized primary materials in support of K-12. The discussion generated a number of ideas related to CDL/OAC involvement in K-12, touching on political factors and benefits, technology infrastructure issues, content and design considerations, and strategic approaches.

The sense of the group was that strategic involvement by the CDL in UC's outreach program would strengthen those efforts and provide great value for K-12 teachers and students. Lucier reported that the CDL is eager to move forward with carefully targeted pilot projects that would help identify and organize collaborators and gain experience in designing digital library services for our K-12 partners. However, his observation, echoing that of other Committee members, is that it is difficult to find a suitable point of entry into the highly decentralized UC outreach program that would permit him to explore these possibilities further. The Committee was unable to offer much useful advice on this point, but feels strongly that creation of opportunities for CDL involvement in outreach would be of tremendous value to the University, its library program, and the K-12 community.

ACTION: The Committee endorsed a suggestion that the Chair write to Provost King conveying these views, requesting the Provost's assistance in helping the CDL to identify potential partners among UC outreach program managers and participants, and encouraging the Provost's support of specific initiatives that might be developed to demonstrate the CDL's capacity to support our outreach programs.

2.c. Shared Digital Collections and the Role of Co-investment (Discussion)

Background materials: *Shared Digital Collections: The Role of Co-Investment* (CDL 3/28/00).

French summarized the CDL's approach to co-investment. Lucier reiterated that the CDL's goal is access for all faculty and students at all campuses, but it is important that campuses share in the financial obligations of achieving this goal. Stead observed that it is critical that the CDL be able to the CDL is able to "re-cycle" its resources to support development and deployment of new collections and services demanded by faculty. The problem arises when individual campuses decline to co-invest and therefore forego access to a particular collection. While these decisions may have a reasonable basis in priorities for campus library support of local academic programs, the practice also has the effect of undermining the principle of systemwide access and can be difficult to explain and defend to faculty at the affected campus. Lucier noted that the purpose of this discussion was to set the foundation for SLASIAC to return to this issue at a later time, and concluded by emphasizing that overall the level of cooperation among the UC libraries remains extraordinarily high.

4. Collaboration with Other Libraries (taken out of sequence)

4.a. Library of California Collaboration Agreement (Information/Discussion)

Background materials: *The California Digital Library and The Library of California: Joint Statement on Collaboration* (DRAFT, 3/13/00).

Lucier provided an overview of the proposed Joint Statement, indicating that this will be important in dealings with state government, and noting that the California State Library has demonstrated a willingness to invest in the CDL in ways that help to meet shared goals.

3. Scholarly Communication

3.a. eScholarship update (Information/Discussion).

Background materials:

- *University ePub and Electronic Scholarship Initiatives: 1999-2000 Progress* (CDL, March 2000).
- *OAC Digital Publications: an eScholarship Initiative* (CDL March 2000).

Lucier summarized work to date in this area, which he characterized as demonstrating good progress in a difficult and highly experimental area. The concept of the eScholarship program has captured the imagination of some UC faculty. Lucier notes that the involvement of the UC Press in some eScholarship activities is particularly welcome, as the Press has editorial and marketing expertise that the CDL has no interest in attempting to duplicate. The fundamental challenge faced by this program is engaging with working scholars on an ongoing basis. Libraries may be able to be helpful here, and Lucier is particularly grateful to Gloria Werner and the UCLA library staff for their ongoing efforts to identify potentially interested faculty.

3.b. Copyright update (Information/Discussion)

Background materials: University of California, Standing Committee on Copyright, Charge and Roster (3/17/00).

Lucier reported that the new Standing Committee on Copyright (SCC) will meet first on May 3, and will undoubtedly devote a significant share of its time to AB 1773 by Assemblymember Romero, a bill that attempts to deal with the problem of unauthorized notetaking services in a way that is viewed by many as encroaching on the integrity of the University's academic processes. It will also be necessary to align eScholarship efforts with the activities of this committee. As Rory Hume, incoming chair of SLASIAC, is also chair of the SCC, there should be excellent coordination between the two committees. In discussion, it was pointed out that student conduct issues involving copyrighted materials (Napster being the most prominent of these at the moment) underscore the importance of effective education regarding copyright. The absence of solid education programs raises potential liability issues for the University in the networked service environment.

5. Collection Management Initiative (Update).

With regard to SLASIAC Resolutions A and B, endorsed at the January 14 meeting (<<http://www.slp.ucop.edu/consultation/meetings5.html>>, (<http://www.slp.ucop.edu/consultation/SLASIAC_Resolution_A.html>, <http://www.slp.ucop.edu/consultation/SLASIAC_Resolution_B.html>.), Tiffney reported that the University Committee on Library had reviewed and endorsed both. The Committee also conveyed to Academic Council their concern about some issues arising in the review that merit

continuing attention as the collection management experiments move forward. With regard to Resolution A (Archiving of Print Copies of Journals Available in Both Print and Digital Formats), UCOL noted that the term "durable, reliable [digital] archive" should be understood to mean a digital archive with at least the archival qualities of paper. With regard to Resolution B (Continuous Strategic Planning for Universitywide Library Collection Management), UCOL felt that a single faculty representative on the important Standing Committee on Universitywide Library Collection Management Planning seemed insufficient, but noted that regular meetings between University Librarians and UCOL, as called for in the resolution, and consultation with divisional senate library committees mitigated UCOL's concern.

Lucier reported that the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation had been contacted in the wake of the January 14 meeting. The foundation has expressed strong interest in supporting the collection management experiments called for in Resolution A, and a proposal for support to plan those experiments is under development. This proposal will go to the foundation board for approval in June.

6. Technological Infrastructure Support

6.a. Resolution on Authentication (Discussion/Action)

Background materials: **Resolution C**: Authentication of Authorized UC Library Users for Access to Digital Library Collections and Services (<http://www.slp.ucop.edu/consultation/SLASIAC_Resolution_C.html>

Dolgonas summarized the development of this resolution beginning with the discussion at the January 14 SLASIAC meeting (<<http://www.slp.ucop.edu/consultation/meetings5.html>>). Lucier summarized the sense of University Librarians' discussions, which emphasized that a) full implementation of certificate infrastructure is complex and not fully under the University's control, while faculty are not willing to wait, leading to the conclusion that proxy services are needed now, and b) as library applications are at the leading edge of the need for authentication services, libraries should play a significant role in planning and decision-making in this area. University Librarians have also expressed concerns about financing certificate services; these concerns are shared by UCOL, which nonetheless supports the resolution. Dolgonas views certificate service as a shared infrastructure cost, and believes that it would be exceptional to finance these costs from library-specific resources. Varian noted that the business press has reported on slow deployment of certificate services owing to usability issues (and mentioned a project at the UCB School of Information Management and Systems on this topic), and observed that the unwillingness of certificate infrastructure vendors to guarantee the effectiveness of their technology is another stumbling block to widespread deployment. **ACTION: SLASIAC endorsed Resolution C subject to their review of minor modifications proposed in the discussion.**

7. Planning Context

7.a. Access to collections (Discussion)

Background materials: "A Few Scattered Notes on Collection Accessibility" (M. Cowan, 3/17/00).

Cowan introduced the main points of his paper, noting that the focus is on the time and effort required by UC library users to gain access to the library materials they need. Perceived obstacles to access have both rational and irrational elements, and are strongly influenced by peer practices and views. Of the three groups of library (including digital library) users described in the paper, the middle group (with moderate "information literacy" skills) constitute a "silent majority" that is difficult to identify and engage. The sense of the discussion was that library planning and operations should indeed recognize and accommodate coherent communities of scholarly practice, but that there was probably not much interest in supporting scholarly research on these topics. Cowan's suggestions for the use of Regional Library Facilities as case studies for these concepts should be taken under advisement by the SLASIAC Standing Committee on Universitywide Library Collection Management Planning authorized by Resolution B. Sharrow noted that library-based instruction (a growing activity at all campuses) is an important element of this picture as well. Lucier observed that user education, an important function of the CDL's program, has not as yet been scheduled for discussion by SLASIAC; this should be placed on the agenda for the coming academic year.

8. Future meetings and agendas

8.a. SLASIAC 2000-01 work plan

8.b. Scheduling for 2000-01 meetings

Background materials: SLASIAC 2000-01 Plan (draft); SLASIAC 1999-00 Activities; SLASIAC 1998-99 Activities.

Lucier asked for comments on the proposed committee work plan for 2000-01 by April 10. Staff will begin scheduling meetings for 2000-01 soon.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 pm.