

## Systemwide Library and Scholarly Information Advisory Committee

October 30, 2000

10 am – 3 pm

Preservation Park, Oakland

Members present: Bero, Campbell, Clark, Hartford, Hay, Heinecke, Hume, Lucier, McCredie, Pantelia, Peete, Pryatel, Schottlaender, Sharrow, Viswanathan, Zelmanowitz.

Members absent: Adams, Copeland, Stead, Varian, Vermeij, Warren, Werner.

Staff: Lawrence.

Guests: Laine Farley and Beverlee French, CDL; Cecily Johns, UCSB and Project Director, Collection Management Initiative; Lewis Lancaster, UCB, Electronic Cultural Atlas Initiative

### 1. Welcome and Introductions: Review of Meeting Objectives

Hume convened the meeting at 10:05. Members and guests introduced themselves. The meeting objectives were reviewed.

#### **MEETING OBJECTIVES**

1. Review and advise on current strategic directions for systems managing scholarly information, including the RFP for the UC online union catalog and plans for hosting Medline and other CDL-hosted databases.
2. Review and advise on current status and future plans for CDL's *Request* patron-initiated intercampus library requesting service and other resource-sharing initiatives; act on a resolution endorsing *Request* as the preferred method for receiving and managing intercampus library requests.
3. Review and advise on Universitywide collection management strategies
  - a. Advise on progress with the UC Collection Management Initiative and the Standing Committee on Universitywide Library Collection Management
  - b. Review, advise on, and endorse the preliminary proposal to the Mellon Foundation for *Collection Management Strategies in a Digital Environment*.
4. Discuss current developments in scholarly communication, specifically the *Electronic Cultural Atlas Initiative*.
5. Review and advise on library budget outcomes and long-range budgetary strategies.

6. Discuss current activities of the Standing Committee on Copyright, and advise on the *Principles for Emerging Systems of Scholarly Publishing* ("Tempe Principles").
7. Discuss current developments in network authentication techniques as they apply to library users and uses.

## **2. Strategies for Managing Scholarly Information**

### **2a. Introductory Remarks.**

Lucier traced the background of UC's systemwide library technology strategy back to the 1977 Library Plan, which led to the development of the Melvyl® online union catalog. The Melvyl system and the new services built upon it put UC in a leadership position among research libraries, but after 20 years, the system has reached the end of its useful life. Because of the importance of the CDL technology platform, including the Melvyl catalog, the CDL's process for identifying replacement technology has involved extensive consultation with campuses and focused efforts to build support among University constituencies. The emphasis on consultation will continue through the remaining steps in the process, and the Committee's advice on how best to structure these consultations is most welcome. Lucier introduced Laine Farley, CDL Director of Systems Services, who has been leading the process.

### **2b. Online Union Catalog, Request for Proposals.**

Farley briefly recapitulated the events leading up to the issuance of a Request for Proposal, beginning with preliminary discussions and planning studies in 1997. By late 1999, the CDL in consultation with the University Librarians had put into place a planning process featuring an all-campus RFP development committee, a preliminary scan of the library systems marketplace, a program of visits to every campus, and an online survey soliciting views about desirable system features that garnered about 3,000 responses. This process was extremely helpful in prioritizing among functions and features. The resulting RFP provided specifications for three separable components: the union catalog, locally-mounted abstracting and indexing databases (e.g., Medline), and the user interface. Prospective vendors were invited to submit proposals on any combination of the three components. After review within the University, the RFP was released to prospective vendors in June. Seven responses were received by the August deadline. A new all-campus steering committee was established to evaluate proposals, assisted by three external consultants. The steering committee began meeting in October, and visits with vendors and their current clients are in progress. Recommendations are expected in about a month (i.e., late November). A special Academic Senate committee will also be impaneled to review the proposals of the finalists, with a particular focus on the trade-offs among the candidate systems and with UC's existing services. Lawrence Coleman, past chair of Academic Council, will chair, with membership drawn from UCPB, UCORP, UCEP and UCOL. Contingent upon negotiations with the selected vendor, a prototype system should be available for testing in July or August 2001. The new system will be run in parallel with the existing system through December 2002, at which time it is expected to decommission the current system. Lucier noted that the new system is expected to cost about \$2 million over five years, and there will be significant additional costs to support parallel operations through December 2002. The University Librarians will recommend to Provost King that Resource Sharing funds be used to finance the transitional

costs. Hume, noting the difficulties at UCLA with implementation of a new library system, endorsed the cautious and consultative approach being taken by the CDL. Lucier noted that the Melvyl system was important as a backup service for UCLA, allowing the campus to continue to provide library services during a difficult transition. At the next SLASIAC meeting, CDL will provide a "consumer reports" document comparing the features of the finalist systems and the current Melvyl system.

### **2c. CDL-Hosted Databases**

Background materials:

- *Future of CDL MEDLINE/Health Star* (CDL 10/27/00)
- Letter, Bunting to Lipman, 11/23/99, w/attachment.

Lucier and Farley began by observing that the abstracting and indexing databases hosted on CDL systems (e.g., Medline, ABI/Inform, PsychInfo) are difficult and expensive to maintain. The CDL could at best expect to maintain only 10-15 such databases locally – it took ten years to do the eight currently available – while the number of academically useful files available has grown enormously. CDL also makes use of technologies based on the Z39.50 standard protocol for inter-system searching to provide access to some externally-hosted databases using the Melvyl user interface, but it is also labor-intensive to establish and maintain these services. Vendors responding to the Abstracting and Indexing component of the RFP demonstrated little experience with local loading of such databases, and responses regarding Z39.50 capabilities were also weak. While the goal of the local mounting and Z39.50 strategies has been to provide access to multiple information sources using a single user interface, demand for new services has resulted in the CDL providing access to many externally-hosted resources using their native interfaces. In view of these factors, the CDL has proposed, and the University Librarians have endorsed, setting aside the local mounting/Z39.50 strategy in favor of vendor-hosted options. The goal is to provide access to as many information resources as possible, using as few user interfaces as possible, subject to the requirement that any solution retain the key features available in the current environment: links to the print holdings of the UC Libraries, links to UC-licensed digital journals, and support for essential CDL tools and services such as Request and Update. Lucier anticipates that by December 2002, when the existing system is decommissioned, it is highly unlikely that the CDL will support local hosting of A&I databases. There are distinct positive aspects to this initiative – it may, for example, be possible to provide access to a wider range of resources using fewer diverse interfaces than is presently the case – but this represents a very significant change that will require careful planning and ongoing communication and consultation with the UC community. The Medline situation, described in the background materials, provides a good case study. Recent changes in the format of the Medline data produced and distributed by the National Library of Medicine (NLM) will require a major programming effort to support local loading; it is possible that the current CDL technology will be unable to support the new format. PubMed, the version of Medline hosted by NLM, is free, provides features not supported by the CDL version, and is already widely used by biomedical faculty and students worldwide, including many in UC. NLM has committed to incorporating the University's mandatory features, described above, into the PubMed service. In this case, there appears to be no compelling reason to maintain the locally-hosted Medline, and many reasons to transition to PubMed. In response to questions raised during discussion, Lucier noted that NLM

has assured us that expanded UC use of PubMed can be supported without deleterious effects on quality of service, that the change should not have an adverse effect on the CDL's SearchLight multidatabase search tool, and that steps would be taken to reassure faculty that features available in CDL Medline will continue to be available after the transition. Lucier concluded by stating that the CDL will proceed carefully and with extensive consultation, but service to faculty and students remains the highest priority, and these steps are necessary to maintain high-quality services.

## 2d. Request patron-initiated intercampus lending service: current status and future plans

Background materials:

- The *Request* Service: Status Report (CDL 10/20/00)
- [Resolution D: World-Wide-Web Based Request as the Preferred Method for User Initiated Intercampus Loan Requesting](#) (DRAFT, 10/23/00).

Lucier introduced Bevelee French, CDL Associate University Librarian and Director of Shared Content. French briefly reviewed the history of *Request* service: initially limited to requests for books for faculty and graduate students, then expanded to journal articles, and in Fall 2000 expanded to include undergraduate students. Developments currently underway will permit tracking of request status by the requesting user and automatic email notification when materials are ready to pick up. Phase 3 of *Request* development will feature Web-based delivery of articles to the requester's desktop and an interface to commercial document delivery services. Web-based request has been enormously successful and has served as a productive platform for introduction of new services. However, campuses must still deal with intercampus loan requests submitted on paper forms, by email, and through the older character-based ("Telnet") request service. In response to questions, it was noted that Desktop Delivery will be limited to journal articles (there are no plans to digitize entire books for delivery in this manner), that copyright issues are expected to be manageable, that field tests show that library operating costs for Desktop Delivery will be similar to those for photocopying/faxing, that Desktop Delivery is not intended to substitute for library course reserve services (including electronic reserves), and that access to copies delivered via Desktop Delivery will be limited through a password mechanism. After discussion Zelmanowitz moved and Viswanathan seconded SLASAC endorsement of draft Resolution D. **Action: Resolution D will be transmitted to Provost King with SLASAC's endorsement.**

## 2e. Collection Management Initiative

Background materials: *Collection Management Strategies in a Digital Environment: Project Overview* (Preliminary Version, 10/14/00)

Lucier introduced Cecily Johns, Deputy University Librarian at Santa Barbara and Project Director for the Collection Management Initiative planning project supported by a grant from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation. Johns briefly reviewed the activities undertaken for the planning grant, and summarized the highlights of the preliminary version of the project proposal resulting from the planning project, provided as background for this item. This proposal has been submitted to the Mellon Foundation in preliminary form, and after review and revision, will be submitted in final form around November 15. Lucier noted that Brian Schottlaender, University Librarian at San Diego and chair of SLASAC's Standing Committee on Universitywide Library

Collection Management Planning, will serve as Principal Investigator for the proposed project. This reinforces the concept that the focus of the CMI is on providing collection management flexibility to the campuses, and should therefore have campus leadership. In addition, this project is strongly related to the work of the Standing Committee that Schottlaender chairs. After discussion, SLASIAC unanimously endorsed the proposal. ***Action:* SLASIAC will prepare a letter of support to be included in the final proposal to be submitted to the Mellon Foundation.**

## **2f. Standing Committee on Universitywide Collection Management**

Background materials: [Resolution B: Continuous Strategic Planning for Universitywide Library Collection Management](#) (Approved by the Committee 1/14/00).

Schottlaender remarked that the CMI proposal is related to another initiative of the Mellon Foundation, its Digital Journal Archiving project. Lucier provided more details, reporting that Mellon's concept involves libraries partnering with specific publishers to provide a trusted archive of that publisher's digital journal publications. Mellon is prepared to provide up to \$500,000 per year for four years to support each of three or four successful proposals. The Mellon concept is not consistent with our approach to digital collection building and management, which is programmatic rather than publisher-based. Through the CMI project and the work of the Standing Committee, we would expect to determine our own priorities for digitization and archiving, identifying the titles not now in digital form that, if digitized, would provide the maximum benefit for UC in terms of collection management. As noted in the preliminary proposal to the Mellon Foundation, the timing of our proposed project fits well with the timeline for the Mellon Digital Journal Archiving project. Mellon has indicated that the CMI project would allow UC to be included in the group of institutions involved in planning for the Journal Archiving project, and could result in a proposal to Mellon consistent with our approach to the archiving question.

## **3. Technological Infrastructure Support**(taken out of sequence)

### **3.a. Authentication developments**

Background materials: [Resolution C: Authentication of Authorized UC Library Users for Access to Digital Library Collections and Services](#) (Approved by the Committee 3/24/00).

Campbell provided a brief overview of Public Key Infrastructure authentication and updated the group on the status of the University's implementation. The Verisign contract was executed in September. A meeting of campus and UCOP parties will be held in Oakland on November 2 to plan for next steps in implementation. Proposed policies include providing certificates to all UC faculty, students and staff, and not supporting encryption. A Universitywide committee will develop certificate practices; Campbell recommends that a library subgroup of this committee be established. The immediate goal is for each campus to identify 100+ skilled users as soon as possible for testing and development of certificate services and technologies. To accommodate the size of the University, a mass registration process will be required, although in critical situations (as required, for example, by law or contract), a more robust and certain process will be needed. Campbell noted that Melweb (the Melvyl system Web interface) and Bencom (UC Benefits) are already certificate-ready, but most UC software applications will need to be

modified to support PKI authentication. As to third parties (such as publishers), Campbell understands that the University is already working with JSTOR and Columbia University, but there are concerns about the feasibility of scaling and generalizing the technology to all third-party vendors. Campbell believes that proxy servers make the most sense in the near term for access to third-party sites, agreeing with Lucier that widespread acceptance of PKI certificates by third parties is at least three years out, but proxy technology can cause problems in some circumstances. The ensuing discussion touched on continuing faculty complaints about lack of off-campus access to licensed library content, the absence of a proxy server for UCOP, the apparent slow rate of implementation of campus proxy services, uncertainties about the source of funding for Versign certificate services, the composition of the groups planning and advising on the UC PKI effort and the role of faculty and libraries in these processes, and the relationship of these efforts to the New Business Architecture initiative. McCredie recommended that SLASIAC speak out about the proxy server issue. **Action: SLASIAC will write to King and Mullinex reiterating the importance to library users of proxy services for campus and UCOP users. Action: Campbell will formally request that SLASIAC review plans and processes for PKI implementation.**

## 2. Strategies for Managing Scholarly Information (Continued)

### 2.g. Scholarly Communication Initiatives.

Background materials: eScholarship Web Site: Selected Printouts (CDL 10/23/00).

Lucier introduced the topic by reminding the committee that the CDL's eScholarship initiative is designed to support *scholar-led* innovations in scholarly communication. SLASIAC should hear about these innovations from the scholars who are leading them. The CDL will continue to bring forward scholars from the eScholarship community to provide the Committee with a sense of what these faculty are accomplishing with new digital tools. Lucier then introduced Professor Lewis Lancaster of the Electronic Cultural Atlas Initiative (ECAI).

Lancaster reviewed some of the innovative characteristics of ECAI, including the use of Geographic Information Systems (GIS) as an exciting new tool for humanities research, the Timemap interface which adds the dimension of time to standard GIS tools, and the concept of promoting collaborations among humanities scholars to apply these new tools to their projects. ECAI software and technical support provide the framework for these collaborations; the key to this strategy is conformance with (and continued development of) international standards, particularly standards for the metadata that describe and provide access to the ECAI data. The ECAI collaboration with the CDL provides several benefits, including a credible strategy to ensure persistence of ECAI data, attention to defining and producing deliverables on a scheduled basis, and a reliable platform for publication of ECAI products. In this relationship, the CDL recognizes the primacy of the scholar-creators of ECAI data, a philosophy that is consistent with ECAI's approach to building scholarly collaborations. ECAI is at the forefront of a fundamental change in the substance and method of scholarly communication. The key to supporting this change is to team scholars, librarians and technicians in support of shared goals; the success of this strategy in turn depends on a reliable digital library infrastructure. Lucier and Lancaster reported that ECAI and CDL are planning to publish about a half dozen ECAI datasets within the

next few months, including: the Sasanian Seals collection; the Chinese Buddhist canon in digital form, with commentary and graphics; the linguistic atlas of Australasian languages, beginning with Southern Taiwan; and historic maps of China (created by Australian scholars) including governmental boundaries, etc. Datasets awaiting GIS markup include a University of Belfast project on the Irish famine (with a future tie-in to North American census data in order to correlate Irish immigration trends with potato virus propagation patterns), and the diaries, maps, and photos from the Oral Stein expedition to China.

## 4. Budget Plans and Strategies

### 4.a. Universitywide and campus library budget outcomes for 2000-01

### 4.b. 2001-02 budget request

### 4.c. Library resource strategies after the Governor's Partnership Agreement

Background materials: New State and University Funds Received for Libraries and Scholarly Communication as a Result of the Library Planning and Action Initiative and Library Budget Initiative (UCOP: Library Planning & Policy Development 10/23/00)

Lucier briefly reviewed the budget outcomes and planned requests as set out in the background material, and focused discussion on how to develop budget strategies for the period beginning in 2003-04, after the end of the current Partnership Agreement with Governor Davis. The following points were made in discussion: library funding in the current Partnership Agreement is based on making up past deficiencies – a new, compelling story will be needed for the future, and the CDL is a likely source; it is important to link with current budget issues (at this time, enrollment growth, outreach, and networking); the strategy should emanate from an academic vision; a strong case will need to be made in order to deal with University constituencies who may feel that the libraries have "had their turn." Many Committee members advocated that the compelling story lies in the digital scholarly communication possibilities beyond the digital library – cases like ECAI. Faculty need assistance to take the next steps in digital scholarly communication, but often do not realize that additional guidance is needed. A coherent vision might be fashioned around new modes of scholarly communication and the new roles of libraries in helping to manage them. It was agreed that a small group should take the lead in identifying major issues, key focal points and potential strategies. **Action: SLASIAC appoints the Scholarly Information Program Task Force to articulate a structure of vision and goals for post-Partnership resource development. Membership will include Heinecke, Schottlaender, and representatives of the University Committee on Planning and Budget and University Committee on Research Policy (Viswanathan will consult with Cowan on these appointments), with staff support to be provided by Lawrence. An initial report from the Task Force will be distributed to the full Committee about a month before the Spring (April-May 2001) meeting.**

## 5. Planning Context

### 5.a. Standing Committee on Copyright update

### 5.b. Tempe Principles

Background materials: *Principles for Emerging Systems of Scholarly Publishing* ("Tempe Principles"), 5/10/00 (<<http://www.arl.org/scomm/tempe.html>>)

Hume began with a brief summary of the events leading up to the Tempe Conference sponsored by AAU and the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) and the preparation of the Tempe Principles, noting that the primary motivator for these events is the persistent issue of escalating costs of scholarly publications; the sixth Principle ("In negotiating publishing agreements, faculty should assign the rights to their work in a manner that promotes the ready use of their work and choose journals that support the goal of making scholarly publications available at reasonable cost") focuses on this issue. Hume noted that much of what is recommended in the Principles would focus on educational activities for faculty, a matter that is under study by the Standing Committee on Copyright (SCC). Lucier reiterated advice on journal price issue offered by former Academic Council Chair Aimee Dorr: faculty will not be engaged by problems of journal costs, so it is preferable to focus on new benefits and potentials that faculty value. This perspective seems to be missing in the Principles. Viswanathan recommended that both UCAP and UCOL should discuss this document.

Hume reported that the early work of the SCC has been focused on new state legislation, AB 1773, which addresses inappropriate commercial use of course notes by third parties. However, the bill itself, and the discussions surrounding it, touch upon the difficult issue of ownership of teaching materials in digital form. The SCC is working on development of basic principles related to ownership and appropriate use of course materials and presentations. It is expected that, after these principles are reviewed and accepted, they will be married with the relevant parts of the Tempe Principles in a copyright education program that will also be developed with the guidance of the SCC.

## **6. Future meetings and agendas**

### **6.a. SLASIAC 2000-01 work plan update**

### **6.b. Scheduling for 2001 meetings**

Background materials: [SLASIAC 2000-01 Plan](#) (3/21/00)

It was suggested that, in view of the importance of enrollment growth and planning for the University, Assistant Vice President Sandra Smith be invited to give a presentation, along with Zelmanowitz, on this topic. It was agreed that any substantial discussion of enrollment planning should be deferred until the Committee has had a chance to work with the vision and goals material to be prepared by its Scholarly Information Program Task Force, but that a presentation by Smith and Zelmanowitz be added to the 2000-01 Plan as a possible item for both the Winter and Spring meetings. Lawrence will proceed to schedule the Winter (January-February 2001) and Spring (April-May 2001) meetings. The Committee agreed that meeting at an airport hotel would be most convenient.