

SLASIAC Meeting Notes
October 28, 2010, 1-4pm
Teleconference

Attending: Lucas (chair), Aldenderfer, Ernst, Farley, Garrell, Greenstein, Hancock, MacDonald, Monahan, Obley, Rzeszutko (for Streitz), Schader, Schneider, Siegel (part), Strong
Absent: Alvarez/Hafner, Butler, Candee, Louis, Kobsa, Steel
Staff: Miller

1. Introductions (Lucas)

Gene Lucas welcomed the new members and gave a brief introduction to the function of SLASIAC as an Advisory Committee to the Provost.

2. Information about SLASIAC Library Planning Task Force (Lucas/Greenstein)

Initial meeting agenda: (<http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/planning/taskforce/>)

Lucas contextualized the formation of the Library Planning Task Force within the recommendation of the Commission on the Future, specifically to improve administrative efficiencies across the system, including in libraries.

Library budgets are either going to be flat or decreasing, which means loss of purchasing power. The Task Force will approach the challenges in three broad areas: 1) Collections, 2) Services, and 3) Operations. They will look to a 5-year time horizon, with estimated 10% annual reductions in funding for purchases. They will assume there will be no new space for libraries. The issues discussed in the initial meeting follow the same lines as recent strategic discussions by the University Librarians, in particular: the difficulties posed by print + digital collections and the limitations from finite library space. The Task Force will meet every two weeks, and will provide preliminary findings to SLASIAC and the Provost in January, with a final report expected in March.

In terms of interaction between the Task Force and SLASIAC, there are several SLASIAC members on the Task Force, and there will be a face-to-face meeting with the Task Force and SLASIAC in February (still tentative). The Task Force will also keep the Senate Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication (UCOLASC) updated on its work. There are two University Librarians on the Task Force, in order to insure close communication with the ULs' Group.

Action: Joanne Miller will send updates to SLASIAC whenever the Task Force website is updated. Joanne will include a link for relaying feedback to the TF.

3. Copyright topics (Greenstein/MacDonald/Rzeszutko)

- Faculty posting lectures on the web (You Tube, etc.) on their own

Background: Article, “More Professors Could Share Lectures Online. But Should They?”
(<http://chronicle.com/article/More-Professors-Could-Share/64521/>)

While this issue was discussed at the last SLASIAC meeting, it was reviewed again for the benefit of the group (and the new members) before being turned over to the SLASIAC Standing Subcommittee on Copyright Policy. The Subcommittee will take up the question of “unauthorized” posting of course lectures online, as well as other potential practices (such as screen-casting) that might have legal implications for UC (e.g., privacy or third-party copyright).

Action: The Subcommittee will focus on whether there needs to be a new or revised systemwide policy, and will include online learning needs and digital instruction trends in its discussion.

- Faculty packaging instructional aides such as past tests, slides, etc., and charging students for the materials.

This issue arose from a specific incident at UCLA, and was brought to the UC Office of General Counsel. It brings up the larger question of whether instructors should be collecting royalties of any sort from their own work that they assign to a class. The Committee agreed that “there ought to be a policy,” but thought that this might be an ethical issue to be brought to Academic Personnel, instead of a copyright issue.

Action: Dan Greenstein will contact Susan Carlson, Vice Provost of Academic Personnel.

- From the Intellectual Property Policy Review Working Group: “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.”

See the 1992 Policy at:

(<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/copyright/systemwide/pcoi.html>)

Chuck Rzeszutko provided some background about the Working Group and its focus primarily on patent issues and finding ways to streamline and simplify the work of the campus Research Offices. The lack of a centralized copyright locus on campus or systemwide, and the fact that the copyright regime is not equivalent to patents, has led to some frustration by Research Administration. For patents, University employees are required to disclose their inventions to the University and allow them to be reviewed to determine if the University has ownership interest. That review includes use of University resources and facilities, use of University funding, and whether the material was developed within the course of University employment. The Working Group is particularly interested in software, which is covered by copyright, not patent law.

Mary MacDonald pointed out that the 1992 Policy on Copyright Ownership was consciously crafted with the intention that software was the “scholarly academic work” for computer scientists. There is general acknowledgment that re-opening the 1992 policy to make changes for this reason would be extremely contentious, and might not get support.

While SLASIAC members agreed that the issue could be assigned to the Standing Subcommittee on Copyright Policy, they first want clarification on what the Working Group specifically wants from SLASIAC.

Action: Chuck Rzeszutko will ask the Working Group what they would like SLASIAC to do.

4. Nature Publishing Group Update (Farley)

Laine Farley and Rich Schneider, who is the Chair of the Senate UCOLASC (Library and Scholarly Communication) Committee, and involved in the Nature Publishing Group negotiations, provided background on the situation. In 2009, the UC Libraries issued an open letter to alert publishers and vendors to UC’s budget constraints, and to ask for cooperation in finding an alternative to cost increases (http://www.cdlib.org/news/docs/UC_Libraries_Open_Letter_to_Vendors.pdf). Many publishers responded positively, but in 2010, Nature Publishing Group asked UC for a huge increase in subscription price, claiming that UC had had an unfair discount for years. UC responded with a letter to faculty alerting them to the situation and a potential faculty-initiated boycott of Nature publications. UC and Nature are now trying to work together to build a relationship and find a pricing model that will satisfy all parties. Talks between UC and Nature Publishing Group are continuing. More information about the UC/NPG negotiations can be found on the Reshaping Scholarly Communication website: <http://osc.universityofcalifornia.edu/npg/>.

In the discussion, Rich Schneider brought up the point that most people in the UC community don’t realize that the journal articles, databases, and e-books that they download for “free” from the Internet (from within UC) often consists of content for which UC has paid licensing fees. Researchers don’t realize how much their universal access to resources actually costs, because the access is so seamless. At the UCOLASC meeting last week, the NPG item prompted discussion about what UC is doing and should be doing in terms of developing our own publication channels to steer some of that funding back to UC.

5. Google Update (Farley)

Laine reported on the Library Partners meeting, which took place two weeks ago. Currently, Google has digitized 15 million books; there are 40 library partners and 30,000 publisher partners. Almost 3 million of the volumes have come from UC, with the work currently being done on NRLF, San Diego, UCLA, and Santa Cruz collections. Google is looking for more collections, but is become more selective about content.

The HathiTrust (www.hathitrust.org) is a compilation of the digitized content from 50 major academic libraries that provides preservation and access. There are currently 7 million volumes in HathiTrust, including 3 million from UC. More than one million of the volumes are in the public domain (approximately 20% of the total), with more content becoming available as more distinguished institutions join the consortium.

Similar themes have come up in meetings of digitization partners (the other main one being the Internet Archive), including:

- Digitization continues at a brisk pace.
- Researchers are finding ways to utilize the content in a variety of ways, including lexicographers and scholars using data mining.
- Interest in linking to external and related content within books, and using that for research.
- Developing better browsing and reading experiences.
- Using the content for collection development, particularly in specialized areas, and trying to get more out of public domain works.

Rich Schneider noted that Google is responsive to privacy concerns expressed by the partners, about such issues as retaining information about what scholars are looking at/for (much in the same way that libraries do not keep records of their patrons).

Rich also noted that the Google Research Program gives out grants to researchers and many UC applicants have received awards.

In terms of the Google Settlement Agreement, the parties are still waiting for the judge's decision.

6. UC Press Update (Greenstein)

Dan Greenstein provided some background on the UC Press Review, which was an academic process initiated by Press Director Lynne Withey. A broad group (from within and outside the University) was assembled to think about the future of University Presses and consult on what the University's publisher might require going forward. The group engaged in scenario planning, and the result was four areas for development:

1. Organizational changes for production and business services, including building a "venture fund" to invest in new areas. The Press expects cuts to salaries on the order of 17-20%.
2. Integration into the services offered by the Press of a suite of services currently offered by the CDL, i.e., the Publishing Group's UCPubS publishing services. The University should look to itself as a revenue-generating publisher via the Press.
3. Looking toward the future of the monograph (or "long form narrative") and what it might look like. Explore various formats, media, and subjects.
4. Deep or continuum publishing, focusing on UC scholarship but wider than a solely academic audience. Open up to reach broader constituency. Develop a publishing profile that includes

California Studies and Educational publishing. Leverage the expertise of authors for educational materials.

The resulting “business options” document from the review will be out shortly and will be sent to SLASIAC, the University Librarians, and other groups.

UC Press Director Lynne Withey will retire at the end of the year. A search for her replacement has begun, and Dan said that there were strong candidates. He also commended Lynn for her great leadership at the Press for the past eight years.

The next SLASIAC meeting will be at the end of February, and will be an in-person meeting. Committee staff will be in touch about scheduling the meeting.