

Systemwide Library and Scholarly Information Advisory Committee
November 1, 2004, 10 a.m. – 3 p.m.
Cal State Hayward Oakland Professional Development & Conference Center
1000 Broadway, Suite 109
Oakland, CA

Meeting Notes

Members Present:	Gottfredson (chair), Bergstrom, Bero, Brunk, Constable, Cullenberg, Davis, Glantz, Greenstein, Hafner, Heinecke, Leonard, Luce (for Hartford), Munoff, Peete (for Jensen), Talbot, Withey, Zelmanowitz
Staff:	Lawrence, Candee, Nancy Kushigian (Director, Shared Print Collections), Mary MacDonald (University Counsel), John Ober (Director, Policy, Planning and Outreach, Office of Scholarly Communication)
Members Absent:	Abbott, Adams, Afifi, Brown, Olsen

1. Welcome and introduction

MEETING OBJECTIVES

Action Items:

1. Review and endorse a resolution affirming the University's support for the library role in changing the economics of scholarly communication.
2. Establish and charge a SLASAC subcommittee to recommend a means for effective collaborative leadership and oversight for the University's scholarly communication initiatives.
3. Review and endorse a resolution affirming the importance of continued growth of library collections in all formats and setting out principles to be considered in planning for campus and shared library facilities.

Review and discuss:

1. Discuss the University's current strategy and programs for effecting change in scholarly communication.
2. Receive an update on implementation of recommendations of the University Librarians' Regional Library Facilities Planning Task Force.
3. Receive an update on progress and plans in creating shared print collections.
4. See a demonstration of the California Digital Library's current service offerings and strategies, and discuss implications of the shared services model.

2. Scholarly Communication
2.a. Overview (Information)

Background:

- Office of Scholarly Communication:
 - Issues summary http://osc.universityofcalifornia.edu/home/regain_control.html
 - Faculty seminar report http://osc.universityofcalifornia.edu/responses/faculty_forums_report.html

2.b. Issues for discussion (Discussion/Action)

2.b.i. The University's Role in Positive Change in the Economics of Scholarly Communication

(Action)

Background:

- DRAFT Resolution _: The University's Role in Positive Change in the Economics of Scholarly Communication (10/21/04)

2.b.ii. Open-Access Archiving

Background:

- Post-Prints Repository Overview (CDL, October 2004)

2.b.iii. Faculty Management of their Copyrights

- Opportunities for UC Response to the Challenges Facing Scholarly Communication: The Case of Scholars' Management of Their Copyright (OSC 10/20/04)

2.b.iv. Library electronic course reserve services

2.b.v. The Case for UC Engagement in Transformative Scholarly Publishing Initiatives

Background:

- Opportunities for UC Response to the Challenges facing Scholarly Communication: The Case of Supporting Transformative Models for Scholarly Publishing (OSC 10/21/04)

Greenstein began by noting that until recently, libraries have been left by themselves to contend with the challenges created by the unsustainable economics of scholarly communication and publishing. Over the last decade or so, the libraries have done a good job of controlling prices and fostering new methods of scholarly communication, but the scope and scale of the problem now calls for broader Universitywide engagement focused on, at least, the following issues:

- As the UC Libraries make use of their buying power to influence the economics of scholarly communication, they will need the support of their faculty and academic administration when they decide *not* to purchase a publication because its publisher's pricing model is economically unsustainable.
- Faculty can influence the direction of scholarly communication by taking such actions as retaining and managing the copyrights in their published works, choosing to publish with responsive publishers, supporting open-access publishers (who finance their operations from sources other than subscription revenues), and depositing their published work in open-access repositories such as the UC eScholarship Repository (<http://repositories.cdlib.org/escholarship/>); the Libraries and new Office of Scholarly Communication can provide faculty with information, assistance and support in these efforts, as represented by the Reshaping Scholarly Communication website (<http://osc.universityofcalifornia.edu/>), but success depends on the willingness of faculty to consider and make use of these options when publishing their research and scholarship.
- Libraries need broad institutional support to successfully address challenges to legitimate academic use of their collections, such as restrictive industry interpretations of copyright law applying to library electronic course reserve services.
- The University must be willing to invest in new services that support faculty in choosing publication options and that provide new technological means of disseminating their work.

Discussion centered on three themes:

- Effectively informing the faculty. Harking back to SLASAC's Resolution F: Publication of Data on Cost, Use, and Quality of UC-Licensed Electronic Journals (http://www.slp.ucop.edu/consultation/slasiac/SLASAC_Resolution_F.html, approved February 28, 2003), Gottfredson inquired about our success to date in informing faculty about these issues. While data and analyses are being made available, much of it is "passive" (e.g. must be known and consulted via websites such as <http://osc.universityofcalifornia.edu/journals/>), and it was generally

agreed that delivering this kind of information to faculty in a way that is effective and actionable remains a significant challenge; several ideas were suggested.

- Informing the faculty about their copyright options. The problem of effective information dissemination is particularly acute in the area of copyright, where the issues are complex and not well understood by faculty and the alternatives to assignment of all rights to publishers are unfamiliar and have uncertain benefits and costs. It is unlikely that the majority of faculty will make a career-long commitment to grapple with copyright choices for each of their published works; success is more likely if we can focus on the issue for a limited period and develop solutions that faculty can use in a routine way thereafter. There was strong support for the idea of developing a standard agreement or model license that faculty could use without modification; even better, model language that was negotiated in advance with each major publisher and would then be applied automatically to any submission from a UC author. The Creative Commons licensing scheme (<http://creativecommons.org/>) was suggested as a possible model for this initiative. University Counsel MacDonald, who has both copyright and licensing responsibilities within the Office of General Counsel, reported that she would be willing to help develop this strategy.
- Framing effective SLASIAC actions. With respect to the background materials for this set of agenda items, and specifically the action item, "The University's Role in Positive Change...", questions were raised about the target audiences and the formal channels for communicating SLASIAC actions. It was agreed that any action item from SLASIAC would need to be communicated as a recommendation to the Provost. Since the key audiences are the faculty and, to a lesser extent, academic administration, it would be prudent to consult with key Senate committees (e.g., UCOL, the Special Committee on Scholarly Communication) in the process of developing a statement. Brunk will ensure that any resulting action item will be communicated to faculty.

With respect to open-access archiving (item 2.b.ii) and the CDL postprint repository, it was suggested that deans and department chairs are key to widespread adoption of self-archiving practices by the faculty.

Greenstein summarized the outcomes:

- Staff will prepare (a) revised resolution(s) that a) links scholarly communication issues to the mission of the University, b) addresses broad University support for library actions, and c) captures today's discussion about approaches to faculty management of their copyrights. This document will be circulated to SLASIAC by email for comment as soon as possible, and will be carried forward to SLASIAC's Spring 2005 meeting if consensus does not emerge from the email review.
- With regard to copyright, work will focus on a) effectively informing the faculty, b) developing a "model license" strategy, and c) developing and informing faculty about alternative methods of distributing their scholarly work.
- For the SLASIAC Spring 2005 meeting, Greenstein will return with proposals for specific implementation paths for the scholarly communication initiatives discussed today.

2.c. Proposal for a SLASIAC subcommittee on scholarly communication (Action)

Background:

- DRAFT: Systemwide Library and Scholarly Information Advisory Committee: Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Scholarly Communication (SLP & OSC, 10/20/04)

With the proviso that membership on the Subcommittee should include faculty representation from the humanities/social sciences, SLASIAC **endorsed** the proposal.

2.d. Academic Senate Special Committee on Scholarly Communication (Information)

Background:

- *Web Site: Special Committee on Scholarly Communication (<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/committees/council/scsc/>)

Greenstein reported that the first meeting of the committee featured vigorous discussion, with special attention to the problems in monograph publishing faced by University Presses and junior faculty in the humanities and social sciences as a result of the dramatic increase in the cost of scientific, technical and medical journals (although Leonard noted that the problem was not so evident at UCB, where the percentage

outlay for library collections in the sciences was at about the same level as ten years ago). The Committee is proceeding to organize working subcommittees and is interested in developing statements of principle rather than operational recommendations.

[NOTE: at about this point in the meeting, Gottfredson excused himself owing to a competing commitment, and Zelmanowitz assumed the chair.]

3. Shared Collections and Facilities

Zelmanowitz introduced this group of agenda items by observing that campuses face a serious challenge in determining the optimal use of space and capital funds in the absence of agreed-upon metrics, criteria and policies. Consequently, self-interest and campus politics play an inordinate role in facilities decision-making, with the result that library facilities often end up as "the last teat on the pig."

3.a. Facilities Planning (Discussion/Action)

Background:

- DRAFT Resolution_: Library Facilities (10/25/04)

Greenstein introduced this item by referring to previous SLASIAC discussions on the need for, and obstacles to proceeding with, construction of phase 3 of the Southern Regional Library Facility, and of the recommendations of the University Librarians' Regional Library Facilities Task Force. The Task Force report (and the Library Strategic Plan) speak to the need for facilities growth both at the campuses and at the Regional Library Facilities, as well as to the increasingly complex interrelationships between them. The intent of the draft Resolution is to refocus discussion on the full range of library facility needs in the current environment of digital information, continued growth of print collections, and development of shared collections and services.

In discussion, it was noted that the Resolution speaks mainly to growth of collections as a driver for facilities growth, and should acknowledge growth in enrollment, staffing and research activities as drivers as well; the last sentence in numbered paragraph 3 in the Background needed to be more specific, to avoid the implication of a massive shifting of materials from campuses to shared collections; and that numbered paragraph 5 could be modified to include the influences of campus growth and collection growth in planning for campus library facilities.

Subject to revision to accommodate these points, SLASIAC **endorsed** the Resolution, which will be codified as SLASIAC Resolution H.

3.b. Report of the University Librarians' Regional Library Facilities Task Force (Update)

Background:

- NOTE: Discussed by SLASIAC 2/20/04 (Report at http://www.slp.ucop.edu/documents/RLF-TF_Final_Report.pdf; meeting notes at http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/slp/slasiac/notes_022004.html, Item 6.)

3.b.i. Persistence of campus deposits to Regional Library Facilities

Background:

- Persistent Deposits in UC Regional Library Facilities, May 6, 2004 (http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/planning/RLF_Persistence_Policy.pdf)

3.b.ii. Shared Library Facilities Board

Background:

- Provost Greenwood to University Librarians, 7/27/04, appointment to Shared Library Facilities Board

Munoff briefly reviewed the main points of the RLF Task Force report and the discussion at the 2/20/04 SLASIAC meeting, and reported that the University Librarians have successfully resolved the issues surrounding persistence of deposits to RLFs that were raised in February. Zelmanowitz observed that, in his view, the agreement on persistence of deposits represented a remarkable achievement in moving beyond traditional notions of "ownership" of collections.

3.c. Policy/planning framework for shared print collections (Information)

Background:

- Developing a Planning Framework for UC Libraries Shared Print Collections (Version 1.3. October 22, 2004)

Nancy Kushigian, Director of Shared Print in the Office of Systemwide Library Planning, described the planning approach being taken to the development of shared print collections, and briefly summarized the characteristics of the JSTOR archival journal collection. The JSTOR collection will consist of a single copy of each retrospective issue of the print journals digitized by JSTOR (all of which are available to UC in digital form via a systemwide license), drawn from the existing holdings of the campuses, and housed in one of the UC Regional Library Facilities. JSTOR's interest, which is well aligned with UC's strategy for retaining shared print copies of journals available in both print and digital formats, is in ensuring the availability of one or more complete sets of print copies of the material it has digitized, in the unlikely event that digital files are lost and material needs to be re-digitized, and therefore is providing substantial financial support for development of this collection. In addition to the JSTOR collection and the existing prospective shared print journal collections (newly-acquired print copies of journals to which UC subscribes through systemwide licenses), Kushigian is investigating the development of shared monographic collections: candidates include foreign languages and interdisciplinary and area studies collections, which campuses cannot always afford to develop locally to the depth required by the supported academic programs.

4. Review of Shared Services Offered by the CDL

4.a. Demonstration of current CDL services (Information)

4.b. Issues arising from the Shared Services strategy (Discussion)

Greenstein presented an overview of the CDL's current development strategy and the range of services currently available or under development that illustrate that strategic approach. The CDL is moving from being a provider of systems to a developer of tools and services that campus libraries can adapt to meet local needs. This approach relaxes the constraints of monolithic systemwide programs by allowing campuses to flexibly customize standards-based tools in order to design locally-responsive and innovative services, while still affording to all campuses the benefits of economies of scale and shared investment. Examples of these new services include UC eLinks ("clickable" links from citations to either the cited digital documents, information about library holdings, or interlibrary loan and document delivery services, operated centrally but configurable by each campus), site building tools (allowing each campus to develop Web sites that help construct, provide access to and present results from a variety of library-selected digital resource collections), and eScholarship tools and services that support new forms of scholarly communication.

In discussion, Davis raised questions about the policy issues that might be involved if the records of the use of such systems were mined (either by the institution or third parties) to profile the research interests or other characteristics of the institution. Luce observed that, as new tools are developed and existing ones migrate to new platforms to take advantage of emerging technologies, libraries will be challenged to "migrate" their users to these new services.

Additional item: The National Institutes of Health Proposal for Enhanced Public Access to NIH Research Information

Lawrence described the NIH proposal to request that NIH-sponsored investigators deposit at NLM's PubMed Central the final author's manuscript of any paper accepted for publication resulting from the sponsored research, where the paper would be available for free access six months after publication (see <http://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/notice-files/NOT-OD-04-064.html>). Lawrence then distributed a draft analysis of the proposal, which could provide the basis for a UC response to the NIH request for comments (due November 16), indicated that he was especially interested in hearing faculty views on the proposal, and indicated that points raised in the SLASIAC discussion would be incorporated in the University's analysis.