

## **Systemwide Library and Scholarly Information Advisory Committee**

November 2, 2006, 10 a.m - 3 p.m.  
Sheraton Ontario Airport Hotel

### **MEETING NOTES**

Members E. Wartella (Chair); D. Bisom; G. Brown; E. Condren; D. Goldberg; D.  
Attending: Greenstein; D. Walker for K. Hafner; T. Heinecke; P. LeCuyer; T. Leonard; L.  
Withey  
Staff & C. Candee; G. Lawrence; J. Ober  
Consultants:  
Guests: Robin Chandler, Director, Data Acquisitions, CDL; Patricia Cruse, Director,  
Digital Preservation, CDL; Laine Farley, Interim Executive Director, CDL  
Members D. Abbott; K. Butter; S. Carter; B. Crow; P. Jenny; M. MacDonald; J. Oakley; M.  
Absent: Rose; B. Schottlaender; J. Talbot; P. Walter

#### **1. Preliminaries**

##### **1.a. Welcome and introductions**

##### **1.b. Goals and objectives for today's meeting**

Greenstein noted two recurring themes running through today's agenda, indicated that these would be highlighted in the various contexts of the agenda items, and suggested the possibility of returning to these themes at the close of the meeting.

The first of these is the nature of "open," as this is used in such contexts as "open access," "open source," "open data," etc. The goal of such initiatives is one that is shared by UC, to make scholarly information as widely accessible as possible. However, public debate often polarizes these concepts, while the reality is more subtle and nuanced; a variety of strategies, including some revenue-generating models, is likely necessary in order to maximize access to the most generally valuable information assets produced by the University. Thus an important and complex question for SLASIAC is how to successfully and sustainably encourage and support open access in a public research university.

A second theme is the increasing intersection and convergence of traditionally independent issues around the general theme of "academic information." SLASIAC began with a focus on the libraries and means of fostering innovation in scholarly publishing, but the agenda expanded to encompass broader issues of scholarly communication, copyright and other public policy issues, and the information technology infrastructure that provides critical support for the creation, management and use of academic information. As the breadth of interest has broadened, so has the range of stakeholders (on campuses, systemwide and externally) who must be consulted. Thus an emerging challenge, for the University and for SLASIAC, is how best to

organize discussion and action about these interconnected issues, define and acknowledge the interdependencies, and identify and achieve synergies among them.

## **2. Libraries and the implications of mass digitization (Information/Discussion)**

### **[PowerPoint presentation](#)**

Robin Chandler, Director of Data Acquisitions at the California Digital Library, provided a presentation that:

- Described how the growth of digital library collections fostered the “Embedded Library,” which compels us to provide tools and collections in the online spaces where our users are actually working;
- Provided an update on systemwide mass digitization projects involving two external partners, Google and the Open Content Alliance; and
- Offered some reflections on future services.

## **3. Scholarly Communication**

### **3.a. Scholars’ copyright management (Update)**

### **3.b. Task Force on UC-based Scholarly Publishing (Information/Discussion)**

*Background:* - Oakley to Dynes, 5/30/06, “Proposed UC Faculty – Scholarly Work Copyright Rights Policy” (<http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/slp/slasiac/110206/copyright0506.pdf>)  
- Greenstein to Hume, 7/6/06, appointment of a working group ([http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/slp/slasiac/110206/copyright\\_advice.pdf](http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/slp/slasiac/110206/copyright_advice.pdf))  
- Task Force on University Engagement with Scholarly Publishing ([PowerPoint Presentation](#))

Greenstein remarked that the working group appointed by the Provost to develop a draft policy on scholars’ copyright management had only recently held its first meeting, and therefore there was nothing to report. Greenstein reminded the committee that the proposal to appoint a task force under SLASIAC to review UC’s scholarly publishing activities had been endorsed at the May 2006 meeting, and turned the discussion over to Candee and Withey. They reported on findings to date and led a discussion of the needs and opportunities to align scholarly communication and publishing more closely with the University’s research enterprise and research support infrastructure.

In discussion, SLASIAC members recommended that the Task Force:

- Think beyond the traditional institutional driver of the economic crisis in scholarly communication, and focus on the needs of the research community
- Define their scope broadly, to include communications needs other than formal publishing and solutions that might lie outside existing organizations like the Press
- Consider a range of revenue models, including donor subsidies

- Lay out choices clearly, with at least some indication of quantities and costs
- In consultation with the Vice Chancellors for Research, ascertain how a suite of research-related communication and publishing services might be embedded in campus research support infrastructure
- Consult with campus IT organizations, where faculty have often already presented their cases for institutional support of technology-based communication
- Consider whether there might be two models for formal communication and publication, one that supports dissemination of research and another that supports promotion and tenure, and whether one model might be more ripe, or a higher priority, for institutional support than the other (NOTE: the scholarly communication research of the UCB Center for Studies in Higher Education, at <http://cshe.berkeley.edu/research/scholarlycommunication/index.htm>, was mentioned as germane to this point)

#### **4. Stewardship of digital information resources**

##### **4.a. Digital preservation program (Information)**

###### *PowerPoint presentation*

Cruse presented an overview of the UC Libraries' digital preservation program and discussed some of the critical issues and challenges facing the problem, including engaging the faculty in digital preservation, development of tools for analysis of archived content, and copyright issues. In discussion, committee members touched on issues related to electronic theses and dissertations, opportunities for digitization of unique and valuable archival material held by the UC libraries, and the challenges of fostering better collaboration across campus organizations in order to achieve economies of scale in digital archiving.

##### **4.b. Information Technology Guidance Committee progress (Information/Discussion)**

*Reference: ITGC Web site, <http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/itgc/>*

Greenstein reported that the ITGC is currently in the fact-gathering stage, concentrating on six primary focus areas, and consulting broadly within UC. Campus visits have revealed both a sense of urgency about working together as a system and a degree of mutual distrust. There is some willingness to co-invest in common solutions, but only with a demonstrable commitment from UCOP, in the form of funding, infrastructure, and staff support. Advantages of systemwide IT investments are seen to include competitive advantage, affordance of capabilities that are too expensive for any single campus, development of a consistent framework to control delegation and decentralization (most evident in the human resources information systems area), and reduction of irrational redundancies. Some consensus is emerging that systemwide investments should be focused on common infrastructure components where campus excellence confers no competitive advantage, thereby enabling campuses to redirect local resources to developments that enhance distinctiveness. The common elements garnering the greatest attention at the moment are the network infrastructure, a UC Grid of interoperable computational resources and

services, core business systems, shared development upon a foundation of common standards and practices, and flexible funding models that support and encourage collaboration.

## **5. Legal, regulatory, and policy issues affecting scholarly information**

### **5.a. Academic Affairs policy analysis capability (Information/Discussion)**

*Background:* - Wartella to Hume, 6/16/06, SLASIAC recommendations related to the policy environment for scholarly communication ([http://www.slp.ucop.edu/consultation/slasiac/110206/x-SLASIAC\\_WRH\\_policy\\_environment.pdf](http://www.slp.ucop.edu/consultation/slasiac/110206/x-SLASIAC_WRH_policy_environment.pdf))  
- Hume to Wartella, 7/13/06, endorsing SLASIAC recommendations ([http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/slp/slasiac/110206/x-WRH\\_EW\\_policy\\_environment.pdf](http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/slp/slasiac/110206/x-WRH_EW_policy_environment.pdf))  
- The Public Policy Environment for Academic and Scholarly Information. Discussion Paper, revised 5/4/06 ([http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/slp/slasiac/110206/x-public\\_policy\\_environment\\_dp\\_1b.doc](http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/slp/slasiac/110206/x-public_policy_environment_dp_1b.doc))

Lawrence reviewed the decisions taken at the May 2006 SLASIAC meeting to endorse broader engagement with the public policies affecting academic use of information, reported on progress to date in developing an expanded staff capability to address these issues, and asked the committee's advice on the scope of engagement for this new staff capability. The committee generally recommended limiting the charge to areas where the academic and policy issues were well understood and the need for action generally recognized, chiefly in copyright and related areas.

**ACTION: SLASIAC members will send Greenstein the names of personnel on their campuses who have copyright-related responsibilities.**

### **5.b. UCOL issues related to copyright and fair use (Information/Discussion)**

#### **5.b.i. Developing a University position on fair use**

#### **5.b.ii. Provision of guidance to faculty on fair use issues**

*Background:* Draft letter, from SLASIAC member and UCOL Chair Ben Crow to SLASIAC Chair Wartella, re: fair use guidelines/policy, 11/2/06 ([Word document](#))

Leonard, who had participated in the University Committee on Library conference call in which this matter was discussed, read the key portions of Crow's letter (which was not available to be distributed at the meeting) and led discussion. Lawrence pointed out that (a) the revised SLASIAC charge accompanying the merger of SLASIAC and the Standing Committee on Copyright mandated the formation of a standing subcommittee on copyright policy, and (b) prior to the merger of the committees, the SCC had started work on a review and update of the University's 1986 Policy and Guidelines on the Reproduction of Copyrighted Materials for Teaching and Research (<http://www.ucop.edu/ucophome/coordrev/policy/4-29-86.html>). The Committee concluded that organizing the SLASIAC subcommittee and charging them to

continue their work on the 1986 policy would be a reasonable first step toward addressing UCOL's concerns.

**ACTION: - Chair Wartella will write to Crow reporting SLASAC's resolution of UCOL's request.**

**- Staff will work with the Chair to organize the Standing Subcommittee on Copyright Policy**

## **6. Review and next steps**

Wartella observed that the challenges presented by all the areas discussed today revolved around promoting cross-functional coordination among the numerous functional "silos" of campus and systemwide organization. In its broadening role, SLASAC needs to address strategies for organizing discussion and integrating response among these silos, even if the result is only to acknowledge and document these problems for the attention of more senior authorities. The Committee endorsed Wartella's suggestion that the committee set aside time at its Spring 2007 meeting to discuss these matters, and that it invite a panel of knowledgeable contributors from the campuses and UCOP to fertilize the discussion.