

Members participating	Shane Butler, David Ernst (at the end), Laine Farley, Daniel Greenstein, Charles Louis, Gene Lucas (chair), Mary MacDonald (1 <sup>st</sup> item only), Laurie Monahan, Barbara Schader, Rich Schneider, Ginny Steel, Wendy Streitz, Gary Strong
Members absent	Mark Aldenderfer, Rosio Alvarez, Robert Anderson, Robin Garrell, Alfred Kobsa, Alison Mudditt, Debora Obley, Pete Siegel
Guests	Trisha Cruse, Gary Lawrence
Staff	Joanne Miller

(Note: Agenda order was switched to accommodate presenters' schedules.)

#### **4. Copyright issues update – Mary MacDonald**

Mary MacDonald provided a recap of the May 19 SLASIAC Subcommittee on Copyright Policy's conference call. There was discussion of the UCOP Intellectual Property Review Working Group's recommendation on software and the existing UC Policy on Copyright Ownership. A member of UC Santa Barbara's Tech Transfer unit, Sherylle Mills Englander, joined the Subcommittee's call to provide further insight into the IP Review Working Group's recommendation. In sum, the Working Group felt that software should be treated separately from other scholarly/aesthetic works for which faculty have ownership. In general, software development uses more University resources and has potential for greater monetization than other types of works. Many Tech Transfer personnel believe that there is ambiguity in current policy. (Examples include faculty treated uniformly for patents but not for copyrights, and software treated differently depending on whether it was developed as part of a grant or through independent effort.)

Mary's recommendation to the Subcommittee was to inquire with University leadership about the feasibility or desirability of establishing University ownership of software developed by faculty ("Designated Academic Appointees" in the language of the Policy).

The other outcome of the Subcommittee meeting was for Sherylle Mills Englander and Shane Butler to draft a set of principles by which the University could operate. Specifically, what elements are needed to facilitate the University's primary interest: the dissemination of scholarship produced at UC? SLASIAC concurred with this as a next step.

Mary reported on the Subcommittee's discussion about the draft revision of the 1986 Policy and Guidelines on the Reproduction of Copyrighted Materials for Teaching and Research, the consensus was to make only factual corrections and clarifying edits for now, and wait to do a wholesale update to the policy. A task force will most likely be assigned the work of crafting a new policy and/or guidelines.

Mary reported that the Subcommittee was briefed on the status of Unit 18 Lecturers and course ownership, which is currently being examined in light of the UC pilot online education program. While

SLASIAC members asked clarifying questions about the policy, there was consensus that it does not need to be changed.

### **1. Library Planning Task Force Report – Discussion**

The Interim Report of the SLASIAC Library Planning Task Force has been distributed to the Academic Senate and to campuses for a comprehensive review. Gene Lucas has made presentations to the Librarians' Association of UC (LAUC) and other groups about the recommendations in the report, and has received positive feedback.

The University-wide Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication (UCOLASC) discussed the Report in great detail at their last meeting. Rich Schneider (chair of UCOLASC) reported that while UCOLASC members appreciated goals and effort of the report, there was an overall feeling of faculty being overlooked. For example, shared governance was minimally discussed. Mention of faculty input should have been included in more than just the examples of scholarly communication and open access. There is no obvious mechanism for how faculty should be involved in library decision-making (e.g., de-duplication, journal licensing, measures/metrics used to make decisions).

Rich said that suggesting to faculty that they retain and manage copyright in works they produce (see page 13 of the Report) can be controversial. Instead, the statement should be less direct, such as, "faculty must be prepared to decline to publish in..." or suggesting that faculty make "informed decisions" in the wider context of scholarly publishing. UCOLASC members saw the suggestions for faculty as a mandate coming from OP instead of a Task Force that included their peers. They suggested including a statement about what faculty expected from the library in terms of service; perhaps noting the bare minimum of support they see as essential. The report should say explicitly that each campus has a faculty committee on library where input could be given and where communication about library planning takes place. UCOLASC will send in written comments within the formal review process.

Discussion then turned to where library planning decisions would be made – on the campus or at the systemwide level. Some participants thought that the report should make more explicit that the nexus of library planning decisions is the Executive Vice Chancellors, who will have a new role in reviewing library planning activities that affect multiple campuses in addition to their own campus library plans.

### **3. Data Management Plan – Trisha Cruse**

Trisha Cruse from the California Digital Library joined the call to talk about a new data management tool that CDL is developing collaboratively with other institutions, including the UCLA and UCSD libraries. Data management plans are now mandated by NSF, and grant proposals may not be funded if a plan is not included.

Trisha showed wire-frame mock-ups of the tool, which is open and flexible, and customizable by organization. A beta version will be ready on August 5, with the final product due to be completed by

Sept./Oct. Trisha said there will be training webinars and information available for campus-based brown bag sessions, and can come to campuses to talk about using the tool.

Rich Schneider said that scientists are sometimes asked for a “resource” sharing plan for actual, physical items such as DNA or cell lines, to make these materials accessible. He asked whether there was any awareness or work on guidelines for this type sharing plans. Trisha said that the libraries might be able to support that, and also noted that issues surrounding data sharing and ownership, such as intellectual property, are also of concern to libraries as well as Offices of Technology Transfer.

Rich also wanted to know about duplication of campus efforts in the area of data management. He thought that UCSF had already done a lot of work in response to the NSF requirement. Trisha responded that the data management tool developers are working with campuses and will be able to integrate the work already done, as well as working with existing data repository functions.

Charles Louis asked if Trisha would make her presentation to the Vice Chancellors of Research at their meeting next week, and Gene Lucas suggested that it be presented during the joint meeting of EVC’s and VCR’s. Charles and Gene will work with their respective Councils to get this on the agenda.

## **2. New roles and responsibilities for SLASIAC – Gene Lucas**

In the revised charge, SLASIAC’s role and level of involvement in the work of the libraries increases substantially. The Committee is expected to perform analyses and present recommendations. Dan Greenstein said that SLASIAC would function as a board to oversee the CDL (which is chiefly accountable to the Provost) and systemwide library activities (accountable to COVC), as laid out in the SLASIAC Library Planning Task Force Report. Dan noted that with the change in funding streams (e.g., campuses being “taxed” for systemwide services), it is important to be transparent and show that there is an oversight function. Gene Lucas recapped the thinking about this; he said that COVC will want to deal with its new responsibilities in this area by being able to rely on a trusted group for independent advice. It could create another group, but the composition would end up looking a lot like SLASIAC so why not use the existing Committee in a new way. While the idea of two boards was raised (one for CDL, one for shared library services that reported to COVC), doing so would add another layer of communication and interwoven relationships. Additionally, CDL is currently the primary vehicle for operation of shared services, and while this may not necessarily hold true in the future, there are still many interdependencies.

Concern was raised about re-defining SLASIAC to be vetting (or possibly misperceived as supervising) the work of the CoUL. Some SLASIAC members were unsure of their ability to function in such capacity, especially with three meetings per year. Looking at budgets will be a new function that might be challenging for SLASIAC, but functioning as an official *board* brings SLASIAC in line with other systemwide operations. Dan Greenstein gave examples of new boards overseeing the Education Abroad Program and the Washington Center that operate similarly to the charge for SLASIAC. Those boards also needed some time to get up and running.

The charge requires broad representation from campus groups. Rich Schneider suggested that the chair of UCOLASC be made an ex officio member of SLASIAC in order to ensure that issues of concern to faculty are brought to the attention of the Provost.

It was generally agreed that a decision about this matter need not be made now, and the draft charge was not put before SLASIAC as an action item. A final action on the charge will very likely need to be taken in the fall, when planning and budget decisions required by the budget process and recommended by the Task Force must be made.

#### **5. Nature Publishing Group Negotiations – Brief Update**

Rich Schneider reported that the NPG negotiators appear to have taken UC's position to heart, and discussions are promising, but the negotiators need to take their internal discussions to higher levels in the corporation. In the meantime, UC continues to have access to NPG content on the terms and prices of our last contract, which is extended as an interim arrangement.