

Systemwide Library and Scholarly Information Advisory Committee

October 22, 2007 10 a.m. – 3 p.m.

UC Office of the President, 1111 Franklin Street, Room 10325

Attending: Bisom, Brown, Butter, Candee, Carter, Crow, Gillman, Goldberg, Greenstein, Hafner, Ingham, LeCuyer, MacDonald, Ober, Waldron, Walter, Wartella (Chair), Withey

Guests: Kathryn Atchison (Vice Provost for Intellectual Property and Industrial Relations, UCLA), Jan Carmikle (Intellectual Property Officer, UCD), Laine Farley (CDL), Alison Gang (UCTV) Charles Rzeszutko (UCOP Office of Technology Transfer)

Absent: Bourne, Condren, Jenny, Louis, Streitz, Strong

Staff: Lawrence, Miller

1. Introductions; review of objectives

Background: SLASIAC [Roster](#)

2. Copyright and Public Policy

a. UC-wide copyright services: update (*Information/Discussion*)

- Summary Report: UC Copyright Support Needs (DRAFT, SLP, 10/10/07)
 - Additional background
 - Wartella to Hume, 6/16/06, SLASIAC recommendations related to the policy environment for scholarly communication
 - Hume to Wartella, 7/13/06, endorsing SLASIAC recommendations
 - The Public Policy Environment for Academic and Scholarly Information. Discussion Paper, revised 5/4/06

Lawrence discussed the consultations to date pursuant to SLASIAC's May 3, 2006 letter to the Provost. He reported that there was broad interest and enthusiasm, from an audience with a great diversity of location, focus, and responsibilities, and not a lot of consensus on specific useful action. His recommendation, based on the consultations and discussion with a UCOP advisory group was to focus on two areas that garnered strong and broad support: fair use information and education, and perhaps an annual UC-wide forum for campus staff with copyright responsibilities. On fair use, there are numerous resources that could be gathered, reviewed and presented, for example on a Web site (the existing UC Copyright site would be an excellent location), but it will be important to gain executive support and provide an effective communication channel to get and maintain community attention. Lawrence distributed the latest version of an annual letter from the Stanford Provost to all academic personnel as an example.

Atchison noted the importance of (a) communication to students (especially w/r/t file sharing), (b) targeted and tailored messages, and (c) attention to open-source software.

Butter noted that in her view the most pressing problem at UCSF is advice to faculty on submissions to publishers (a propos the open access policy)

Crow opined that at UCSC, something like the Stanford letter would be useful – short, clear, and targeted to faculty.

Wartella indicated that she would be willing to take a proposed Provostial letter to the EVCs for their consideration and possible adoption.

b. Open Access Policy Proposal: update (*Information*)

- UC Open Access Policy Proposal Update (OSC, October 2007)

Ober reviewed the recent history of the open access policy for which the formal systemwide review was recently completed. The results were mixed: virtually all Academic Senate and administrative responses were supportive of the goal but very concerned about the implementation path (routinely granting to The Regents a license to “place in a non-commercial open-access online repository the faculty member’s scholarly work published in a scholarly journal or conference proceedings”); strong preferences were expressed for an “opt-in” policy (akin to the current situation, where faculty can choose to make their work openly accessible if they wish) as opposed to the “opt-out” position of the draft policy (in which open access deposit is the default, and faculty must take an affirmative action to have their work published without depositing an open-access version). Planned next steps include redrafting the policy to continue to express support and encouragement to faculty to make their work open access on an opt-in basis, and conduct a feasibility assessment of services that would support faculty to do so.

In the wide-ranging discussion that followed, the following were among the salient points:

- While University counsel cannot advise faculty authors on the management of the works to which they personally hold copyright, a policy statement of this kind would make it possible for counsel to be involved on behalf of the University in negotiations with publishers on the terms of publishing agreements (MacDonald).
- The work of the Task Force on UC-based Scholarly Publishing (see item 5 below) shows that an open access policy may be necessary, but is not sufficient to change the economic and business models of scholarly publishing (Candee).
- While there is broad support for the goal of the policy, it is neither effective or reasonable to place the burden for achieving this goal on the faculty (Atchison).
- Faculty are not necessarily well-versed on these issues, and their views might benefit from broader “town hall” discussion (Brown) or targeted educational efforts (Butter). These efforts might be part of a broader campus discussion of the changing nature of publishing (Wartella) (also see item 5 below).
 - Commercial publishers are moving into ever-earlier stages of the publishing lifecycle, requiring deposit of supporting data, offering blog services to attract scholarly

communities, etc. (Wartella). Some scholarly societies are behaving more like commercial publishers in their treatment of their author and user communities (Walter).

- UC is not alone in its attention to these issues. For example, Wartella will be speaking at an upcoming NASULGC session directed to provosts of land-grant universities.
- Faculty leadership on the campuses is a key to success, both to address colleagues' fears and to provide EVCs with "point people" to foster discussion (Greenstein). As faculty have no direct experience with alternatives to traditional publishing, it may also be helpful to seed some pilot projects as part of an educational program (Crow).

3. Information Technology Guidance Committee update (*Information*)

- Report of the University of California Information Technology Guidance Committee (DRAFT: For Discussion Purposes Only, October 5, 2007)

The current draft of the ITGC final report emphasizes (a) infrastructure, including the provision of state-of-the-art network services and (b) shared services that leverage the infrastructure investment to provide widely-needed services at minimum cost with maximum avoidance of inefficient redundancy. Of equal importance, ITGC recognized that there is no ongoing forum to address on a multi-campus and cross-functional basis the development of IT infrastructure and services and prioritization of IT investments, and so seeks to ensure that there's a focal point for IT planning at each campus (by acknowledging and strengthening the roles of campus CIOs) and a governance structure to deal with these issues, including an annual collaborative planning process. The current draft will be finalized and submitted to the Provost, who will in turn formally request comments from the Academic Senate.

In discussion it was noted that:

1. Graduate students are positioned to drive adoption of technology in teaching and research (Brown) and would also be important targets for copyright education efforts (Wartella). Graduate students are not specifically addressed in the report, but it does give attention to helping students (at all levels) to learn and use the technologies that are most important in their respective disciplines. Student "information literacy" is also a matter of growing importance in accreditation reviews.
2. Instructional issues and opportunities proved to be the most difficult to deal with, because of the highly individualistic nature of UC instruction; it is hoped that the report will catalyze faculty discussion that can then be reported to the IT Leadership Council (ITLC) for action (Greenstein). Support for collaborative teaching is absent at some campuses (Crow) but common at others (Walter). It would be good to share department, school and campus policies on this topic (Gillman). The Grand Challenges document (<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/committees/ittp/ITTP.10.Challenges.0507.pdf>) developed by the University Committee on Information Technology and Telecommunications Policy (ITTP) addresses many IT issues from the faculty perspective (Crow). The report's recommendations bear some relation to a variety of teaching initiatives led by the Senate (e.g., the proposed task force on undergraduate education, various systemwide degree and concurrent enrollment proposals, the Senate's

review of the ITGC report), but it is clear that the faculty must lead in this area (Greenstein)

3. From a library and information service perspective, the ITGC recommendations make clear that libraries must collaborate effectively with CIOs and other campus constituencies; the challenge is to develop new methods to plan effectively and make key investment decisions across traditional functional boundaries.
4. New investment will be needed at both the systemwide and campus levels; it will be important to both the Senate and the EVCs to know what levels of investment will be required.

4. Remarks from Provost Hume

Provost Hume commended the Committee for its work to foster cooperation and collaboration across campuses in the areas of library planning and scholarly communication. He noted that examples of UC's knowledge output are used in negotiations with the State, and so the current work of the Committee is particularly relevant and important.

The following points were made in the Provost's initial remarks and ensuing discussion:

1. The CDL and UC's related scholarly information initiatives demonstrate the capacity of the UC system to work together to accomplish great things.
2. Our "scholarly communications" concerns include not only scholar-to-scholar communication, but communication of the results and value of our research and teaching to the public in all media.
3. The capacity to assemble and make accessible information that can help people solve problems is critically important, and speaks to the evolving conception of the nature of libraries. As UC explores this path, it will be necessary to develop a sophisticated and widely shared understanding of copyright and other intellectual property regimes, the full range of methods of publishing and distributing information, and the variety of formats in which content can be expressed.
4. Many of the issues confronting the University in scholarly information, including scholarly publishing and information technology support, demonstrate (a) the absence of appropriate organizational infrastructure that can credibly coordinate cross-functional resource investments and (b) the importance of effective and ongoing communication to overcome fear and inertia and build support for institutional action.

5. Task Force on UC-based Scholarly Publishing (*Information/Discussion*)

- Publishing Needs and Opportunities at the University of California (Draft, 10/18/07)
- Additional background: "Ideas to Shake Up Publishing," Inside Higher Ed, July 26, 2007 (<http://insidehighered.com/news/2007/07/26/ithaka>)

Withey first provided some background on the Scholarly Publishing Task Force (composed of Withey, Catherine Candee, Catherine Mitchell, and Laura Cerruti), including the focus on UC's research strengths and priorities. The primary driver of the effort was the high cost of scholarly journals, and the desire to find out whether UC could do some of the work of the publishers to

alleviate the burden. The first step was a survey of publishing activities, conducted via web and email. Withey and Candee then visited all of the campuses and spoke to Vice Chancellors of Research, deans, library staffs, and faculty. At the same time, the Office of Scholarly Communication was conducting a [study on faculty attitudes and behaviors regarding scholarly communication](#) and the Center for Studies in Higher Education at UC Berkeley was continuing its [research program in the future of scholarly communication](#) with support from the Mellon Foundation. All these sources helped frame the report of the Task Force.

The chief findings of the year-long inquiry showed that there is a great deal of scholarly publishing activity within the University (mostly centered in departments and Organizational Research Units), much of it small journal publications and monographs. More than 200 departments and ORUs are making use of eScholarship, but many more benefits could be achieved by providing units with additional infrastructure support for journal publishing. Other findings included:

1. There is limited awareness of publishing activities and scholarly communication issues
2. Most faculty continue to publish in their traditional venues, and are satisfied with the results
3. There is widespread awareness of scholarly publishing as an issue for concern, but no sense of immediacy (“it’s not a problem for me”).
4. There are two fairly commonly perceived areas of major concern:
 - a. Non-traditional formats: faculty whose work manifests in formats and media other than traditional books and journals are concerned about recognition of their contributions in the promotion and tenure process, support for their media’s technology, and for organization and distribution of their material. The general perception is that non-traditional formats are not being managed, curated and preserved effectively. Faculty respondents noted that P&T mechanisms don’t necessarily display “fear of the new,” but there is a critical absence of agreed-upon criteria for assessing the quality of non-traditional work.
 - b. Interdisciplinary research: while in most sciences publication in the traditional channels is perceived to be reaching the appropriate audiences, there is some concern that interdisciplinary research does not reach as broad an audience as would be desirable.
5. Some opportunities emerged as likely candidates for systemwide focus, including:
 - a. Subject areas where new interdisciplinary publishing needs and opportunities align with UC’s priorities, such as global health and environmental sciences.
 - b. New media opportunities that are concentrated in the arts and humanities.

The Task Force is proposing recommendations in two areas:

1. Areas that the Press and eScholarship can act on unilaterally:
 - a. Establish a UC-wide publishing program
 - b. Create a system to support publication in non-traditional formats
2. Areas requiring close collaboration with others:
 - a. Establish more comprehensive services for faculty publishing digital projects

- b. Collaborative development of criteria for assessment of non-traditional formats for P&T purposes
- c. Undertake a more formal analysis of the economic issues associated with the current and emerging scholarly publishing environment.

Withey noted that the publishing arena is a moving target and many aspects are already under examination from different sectors. UC is only a part of much broader issues, but can set examples and align with comparable institutions to establish criteria and priorities.

The Committee members' reactions to the Report and Withey's summary included suggestions to focus on the ease and attractiveness of submission for faculty, the UC Press plan, and noting the difference between emerging vs. established fields and modes of publication.

Next steps for UC Scholarly Publishing include a unified UC journals program, facilitated through UC Press and CDL, increased infrastructure and services, and education for faculty and staff.

6. Systemwide Strategic Directions for Libraries: progress report (*Information/Discussion*)

- Systemwide Strategic Directions for Libraries and Scholarly Information at the University Of California: Progress Report 2007 (DRAFT -- For Discussion Purposes Only, SLP, 10/15/07)
 - Additional background:
 - [Systemwide Strategic Directions for Libraries and Scholarly Information, June, 2004](#) (PDF)
 - [Systemwide Strategic Directions ...: Progress Report 2005](#) (PDF)

Lawrence provided some background about the original Systemwide Strategic Directions and the progress report that SLASIAC received in 2005. The document contains both “inward” (to libraries) and “outward” (to campus communities) perspectives, and Lawrence focused his comments on the inward-pointing elements, including:

- New collections enable new services: what can be done with massively digitized book collections?
- Capturing the benefits of collaboration: how does a campus make useful the benefit of avoiding use of future shelf space?
- Strategies for supporting “less than 10” – how does a model designed around UC-wide collections and services provide selective support to initiatives involving fewer than 10 campuses, and how can it be perceived to do so equitably?
- Redefining the collection: in the era of mass digitization, can we consider, say, Michigan's digitized collection to be co-equal with our own?
- Expanding our strategies: what does it mean to expand collaborative strategies from collections to include operations and services? How can we configure workflow-oriented and staff-intensive operations to benefit from multi-campus collaboration? How can these be financed, managed and sustained?

Kris Hafner suggested that SLASIAC request engagement of the library and scholarly communication community with the CIOs and IT managers who are developing recommendations from the ITGC Report (see agenda item #5).

7. UCOP Restructuring, UC-wide Planning, and SLASIAC (*Discussion*)

For reference:

- [Initiatives to restructure the University and recast the role and services of UCOP](#)
- [The report of the University's Long Range Guidance Team](#) (PDF)
- [The University's Systemwide Academic Planning Process](#)

Reports on UC-wide planning and the restructuring process have cited the libraries and the CDL as successful examples of UCOP involvement that brings about positive results. The libraries have been able to coordinate to enrich, augment, and leverage their collections and services. SLASIAC may be asked to comment on relevant portions of the restructuring effort as planning proceeds.

8. Next steps/next meeting

The next meeting will be in the winter/early spring in order to allow time for “town hall” style meeting on campuses in the spring (see Actions, below). At that time, SLASIAC will also (a) revisit the publishing theme (item 5) and the Strategic Directions document (item 6), and (b) consider the issues arising from the perspective of the discovery and use of scholarly information, as a complement to today’s focus on the University as a producer and publisher.

Actions from the meeting include:

1. Contact Provost Hume to request establishment of a joint task force sponsored by SLASIAC and the IT Leadership Council to study the IT infrastructure needs related to library and scholarly communication services.
2. Schedule “town hall” meetings on campuses to involve faculty and educate about copyright, scholarly communication, and open access issues. The exact content of the meetings needs more thought (e.g.: limiting the scope, how to attract more participants). In this connection, there was a general consensus that copyright questions are best addressed in their scholarly information context, e.g., as part of a discussion on publishing and faculty authorship, rather than in isolation.