

## Systemwide Library and Scholarly Information Advisory Committee

### Conference Call

February 25, 2013, 1:30 p.m. - 3:30 p.m.

Participants:	Mark Aldenderfer, Mario Biagioli, Sandra Brown, Susan Carlson, Rebekah Darksmith (for Alison Mudditt), Laine Farley, Rita Hao, Cynthia Johnson, Chris Kelty, Bill Jacob, Gene Lucas (chair), Laurie Monahan, Jim Phillips, Rich Schneider, Pete Siegel, Ginny Steel, Wendy Streitz
Guests:	Ivy Anderson, Sharon Farb, Catherine Mitchell
Absent:	Robin Garrell, Kris Hafner, Debby Obley, Annalee Saxenian, Gary Strong
Staff:	Joanne Miller

### 1. Update on developments in the Council of University Librarians (CoUL)

The Council of University Librarians (CoUL) met the previous Thursday and Friday for two full days of meetings that included joint meetings with SOPAG, the group that has responsibility for implementing directions from CoUL, and UCOLASC, the Academic Senate library committee.

The CoUL is focusing attention on the strategies laid out in the [Systemwide Plan & Priorities](#) document (included in the fall SLASIAC meeting materials). Specifically, the systemwide focus has centered on four goals:

#### 1. *Enrich the systemwide collection.*

Expand the UC Library collection to include all content types and formats. Specifically, one strategy is to expand data curation activities and library support for e-research. In January, the libraries held a workshop on e-research, which led to a systemwide strategic proposal that would leverage work already done on several campuses and allow other campuses to avoid duplication of effort. At the February meeting, the ULs looked at the first draft of a strategic agenda proposal for e-research, and will come back to their March 22 meeting ready to make a plan.

In addition, the CoUL plans to continue digitization programs that emphasize public domain resources and to explore additional digitization opportunities. This involves understanding and planning for technical infrastructure requirements, identifying expertise, looking at kinds of collections, and advocating appropriately where necessary to be sure UC's voice is heard. The initial analysis of public domain materials across the libraries revealed that UC has 2.3 million public domain items, and only 24 percent of them have been digitized.

#### 2. *Capitalize on technological opportunities to accelerate the transition to a primarily digital environment.*

The CoUL looked at a proposal for a systemwide digital asset management system (DAMS) that would bring together digital assets from all of the campuses. Some campuses already have a digital asset infrastructure, but most do not, nor do they have the capacity to build one. The libraries are also continuing to maximize library processing efficiencies by making progress on the NGTS (next-generation technical services) initiative.

#### 3. *Maximize discovery of and access to information resources*

The goal is to enable faculty, students, and staff to more easily find resources and get access to the assistance they need. CoUL has decided to fund a permanent, quarter-time, systemwide position to manage the digital reference service. The service has been in pilot phase for the past few years and has grown rapidly, with 23,000 questions asked systemwide last year. The service includes libraries around the world and is operated 24 hours a day, seven days a week. Last year, seventy percent of the UC questions were answered by UC staff.

4. *Optimize & repurpose physical library space.* The ULs are conducting a space survey that looks at collection projections on the campuses. They are also interested in the regional library facilities (RLFs), which will essentially be full in 2019. They have asked the RLF directors for a report on the feasibility of de-duplicating journal holdings between the two facilities. Understanding that not all material is in good condition, the main question concerns the level of validation that would be necessary to ensure quality materials. However, doing extensive verification adds significantly to the costs.. In addition, UCLA is trying to move forward with a third addition to the Southern Regional Library Facility (“SRLF-3”), although the funding may not be available. The RLFs are Systemwide entities that have become the responsibility of Berkeley (in the north) and UCLA (in the south) to manage.

In addition to the priorities above, the CoUL is following and participating in open access conversations, including the proposed UC Open Access policy. The libraries are also continuing to build and leverage expertise in order to move forward with some of the other strategies in the Plans and Priorities document.

The CoUL meets monthly, with face-to-face meetings three times per year. At the next in-person CoUL meeting in June, the council will look back at progress over the year.

## **2. CDL budget update (Laine Farley)**

Laine Farley reported that she had received the formal budget call from the UCOP budget office, and confirmed that the CDL would be getting the augmentation agreed to last year. The CDL is also requesting funds that would be used for implementing the UC Open Access Policy (if passed) and for the digital asset management system (DAMS), as proposed by the UC libraries. Both of these are contingent upon current discussions and decisions to be made. The CDL has also requested a small amount of funds for additional staffing to extend existing services that have grown over the past few years. Timeframe: Provost Dorr to review the budgets of the Academic Affairs departments, then the budget goes to the executive budget committee on April 1. The expected date to finalize the budget is May 1.

### **3.a. UC Open Access Policy Update (Chris Kelty)**

Chris Kelty reported on the UCOLASC meeting that took place the previous Friday, a portion of which was a joint meeting with CoUL. Chris said that in addition to UC’s proposed open access policy, the group discussed the new federal open access bill (“FASTR”), the proposed California legislation on open access, and the OSTP Whitehouse directive, which was announced during the Friday meeting. Chris talked about receiving comments from campuses and systemwide groups as a result of the UC Open Access Policy formal review, and noted that the UCOLASC response to the campuses will need to address all of the national and statewide interest in open access. Chris reviewed all of the comments received and condensed them into a summary and chart showing what actions might be taken. Many of the issues raised during the review had already come up and been addressed, either in the policy or FAQ, but a certain amount of the responses were constructive comments that will be used in revising

the policy. While the campuses and Academic Senate committees did not feel that they could endorse the policy as-is, many said that they look forward to a revised version.

Chris is currently working on a revised draft for the March meeting of the Academic Council. The draft could be circulated for a formal review this spring. The main changes that Chris will make to the policy and accompanying materials include:

1. The scope of the policy language.
2. Tightening the “grant” language (incorporating suggestions from the OGC Copyright Working Group).
3. Creation of a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between UCOP and the Academic Council regarding the participation of CDL.
4. Providing more background on the OA policies of other universities, statements from small publishers and scholarly societies that support and allow open access, best practices documents, and more.

Chris said that the UCOLASC discussion about revising the policy focused on removing the deposit requirement. There was also some open-ended discussion on creative commons licenses, and whether commercial uses should be allowed.

Laurie Monahan brought up an issue of concern to art historians, who are worried about whether a “dark” archive would break agreements with image licensors. Chris wondered if a deposit requirement opt-out in the policy would satisfy art historians.

Rich Schneider commended Chris on his efforts to promote the policy. He questioned whether the work of revising the policy was worthwhile if a revised policy still had little chance of passing a systemwide vote. Rich asked about the possibility of individual campuses enacting open access policies, in the manner of UCSF. Chris believes it is an “all or nothing” situation at this point. Chris said that a lot of campuses want to see a revised version, so that’s what he is providing. He also noted that UCOLASC has already passed a “resolution in favor of open access,” so another attempt at something “weaker” than the current policy is not necessary.

Mario Biagioli noted that the White House directive is valuable to the open access cause. He wondered if it was worth preemptively mentioning an embargo period in the UC policy. Chris’ response was that an embargo can be used as a negotiating position with publishers, so it’s best not to offer it up front.

Rich Schneider said that at UCSF, 95% of publishers are okay with instant open access. The embargo request is from about 5%.

### **3. b. Latest information on implementation issues (Slides)**

Catherine Mitchell gave a slide presentation on the planning for implementation of the proposed systemwide open access policy, which includes a phased approach starting with manual deposit and then moving to an automated system that can “harvest” the meta-data for UC-published content from publishers and repositories.

Catherine said CDL has a strong commitment for following through for implementation services for UCSF, even if the systemwide policy doesn’t pass. Development of the deposit mechanism is going strong, and will be ready for fall. The harvesting implementation is pricey, and therefore might need

systemwide buy-in. eScholarship can still go forward with UCSF-only harvesting, but probably in a more limited way.

#### **4. Role of libraries in online education issues**

Laine noted that this is meant to be the beginning of a larger conversation for SLASAC about what libraries are doing, and what they should be doing, in the realm of online education. UC libraries already work on local, campus initiatives, and the CDL is involved in some online education issues as well. The background for this item was meant to give an overview of current initiatives, including California's Online Textbook Initiative. The legislation, which was enacted at the beginning of the year, calls for in-kind contributions from UC, Cal State, and the community colleges. It is not yet clear exactly what the commitments will be.

#### **5. Report from Ivy Anderson on licensing**

Ivy Anderson's slide presentation covered the recent history and beneficial outcomes of systemwide journal licensing for UC. Part of UC's strategy has been the purchasing power of a ten-campus system, and the large amount that UC spends on its journals. Approximately \$38 million is spent on systemwide licenses that are primarily negotiated on behalf of the campuses by CDL. In the past couple of years, CDL has implemented an algorithmic review of licensed journals to determine that UC's expenditures on journals are delivering the highest return on investment. Among the algorithm inputs are cost, use, impact factor, and disciplinary field. These are calculated to provide weighted metrics for evaluating journal packages and publisher offerings. While the "big deal" journal package was once seen as a benefit for universities, it now tends to lock-in buyers to a high price.

The libraries are also looking at e-book licenses, but don't want to get into a situation similar to journals and the big deals that lock them in. E-book purchases seem to be following more of an on-demand or PDA ("patron-driven acquisition") model.

In response to a question about whether the journal "weighted value algorithm" adversely affects small fields, Ivy responded that the methodology is sensitive to that and looks across disciplines and uses subject-specific benchmarks for ranking.

#### **6. Copyright Office call for comments on Orphan Works**

Laine Farley introduced the topic by noting that the topic of orphan works has been a subject of ongoing interest. The libraries knew the call from the Copyright Office would be coming, since there has been renewed interest coming out of the HathiTrust lawsuit and the issues brought up by the decision in that case.

Sharon Farb, UCLA's Associate University Librarian of Collection Management and Scholarly Communication, led the informal group that gathered information from around UC and responded to the Copyright Office. In 2006, an orphan works bill came close to passing in Congress, but did not. Since then, a new Register of Copyrights has assumed that office and has issued a list of issues that the Copyright Office will be addressing, including orphan works and mass digitization of books. The deadline for anyone who wants to comment on the comments is March 6.

The Copyright Office typically holds roundtable conferences around the country on issues for which they've solicited comments. Sharon is hopeful that they'll do it again for the topic of orphan works. If so, UC will send people to advocate and be spokespeople for the educational and academic library

perspective. Sharon reported that she has spoken to UC Federal Government Relations folks, but they are not going to take on the issue right now. And, in fact, UC is *not* looking for a legislative solution.

For those interested, the comments from UC can be found on the [Copyright Office website](#) (see “Council of University Librarians at the University of California”). The statement includes examples of UC’s uses of orphan works, suggestions for what might be done, and an executive summary on page 12, which lists elements of an appropriate legal framework.

## **7. Copyright Issues**

Rita Hao described the new draft policy on the Reproduction of Copyrighted Materials for Teaching and Research as much shorter and over-arching than the existing policy. The policy as written in 1986 has much more explanation, description of copyright law, and examples. Rita says that it’s preferable for the implementation details and/or guidelines for the policy to be on a website, while the policy remains broader in scope. She noted that she wrote the draft as somewhat vague and “wishy-washy,” and asked whether SLASIAC members thought it should be stronger one way or another. In terms of maintaining related copyright information on a website, Rita said that the OGC Copyright Working Group has expressed interest in maintaining such a resource and would be happy to take on formal responsibility. Regardless of the group that takes it on, the information and source will need to be widely-known. Gene Lucas said that he would rather have an individual doing oversight on a web resource, rather than a committee.