Systemwide Library and Scholarly Information Advisory Committee (SLASIAC)
April 3, 2014, 10am – 2:30pm

Attendees:	Mark Aldenderfer, Tom Andriola, Mario Biagioli, Karen Butter, Susan Carlson, Laine Farley, James Frew, Robin Garrell, Mary Gilly for Bill Jacob (morning only), Rita Hao, Martha Hruska for Sandra Brown, Cynthia Johnson, Alfred Kobsa, Angus MacDonald, Roberto Manduchi, Alison Mudditt, Debora Obley (for budget update only), Wendy Streitz, Lorelei Tanji, Scott Waugh (**chair**)
Absent:	Tom Cogswell, Jim Phillips, AnnaLee Saxenian
Staff & Guests	Joanne Miller, Catherine Mitchell

Meeting Notes

1. Introductions
2. Budget update (Deborah Obley, UCOP Budget Office)

   Debbie Obley provided a quick update on the overall UC budget situation, primarily concerning state funding. Per the agreement with Governor Brown, UC received a 5% increase to its base budget for this year. There will be no tuition increase, and costs for business-as-usual go up every year due to unavoidable expenses, such as increased employer pension contributions borne by the departments. (Debbie noted that CSU receives funding over and above its annual increase to support pension contributions, but UC does not.)

   In its request to the state, UC noted that it is lagging behind in many areas, including library materials. There is a standing request for $50 million per year (up to a total of $200 million) above the base 5% increase, but this was not granted. The governor did provide an additional $50 million as part of a competition for state colleges to improve performance on time-to-degree. These funds may end up being granted regardless of documented improvements, to be used for other needs.

   The California Senate leadership is very interested in higher education right now, and has recommended a $90 million increase for UC. So far, it has not been granted. Debbie talked about enrollment growth, and how some campuses are underfunded/overenrolled because they admitted new students in the economic downturn without state funding to support them.

   The state is interested in tying funding to performance measures, but the campuses already do very well on all measures. Some of the measures used are lagging indicators, however, and may slip due to budget constraints in recent years.

   This year, for the first time, the budget office will release a report on the cost of instruction. The first report, due in October, will be systemwide. A second report, due in two years, will have campus and other detailed breakdowns.

   Debbie went on to explain the UCOP budget, which now relies on taxes levied on the campuses. This assessment model was put into place a couple of years ago, and campuses are therefore more interested in examining the details of UCOP's budget because the funding comes out of their own budgets. The California Digital Library's budget is one of the biggest pieces of UCOP's academic programs' budget that uses mainly unrestricted funds. The CDL is very highly regarded and has been

thoroughly analyzed and assessed, but with a flat UCOP budget any increase provided to the CDL means a decrease to another department at OP or an increase passed on to campuses.

3. UC Press update (Alison Mudditt, UC Press Director)
Alison Mudditt reported on the latest news from UC Press, including a recent move to offices near Lake Merritt. The Press is focusing on transitioning from being primarily a boutique book publisher to establishing a larger presence in the digital publishing environment, while leveraging the expertise of UC scholars. Print sales decline each year, and publishers must adapt to survive. The Press is working on creating technical components for storage and discovery of digital materials, and developing digital infrastructure and digital asset management systems. One current project focuses on anthropology. UC Press is hiring for a "digital science publisher" position to lead its digital division. For journal hosting services, the Press will be moving to the Highwire Press platform, as JSTOR no longer meets all of their needs.

The two open access initiatives on the horizon include a broadly-scoped open access journal. One of the ideas is to open up and make transparent the activities and costs of journal publishing. For example, the journal could link to peer reviewers' reports. The second initiative is open access monograph publishing, in the vein of Knowledge Unlatched (http://www.knowledgeunlatched.org/). It is commonly acknowledged that the current model of academic publishing is not sustainable. Alison believes that the cost per title for monographs could be brought down to around $5,000 or less for digital content. The costs could be shared between publisher, libraries, and other stakeholders, with the result being less costly than the current system. Print books could be published on demand for a small fee. The books would be cheaper to produce, and would still carry the status of the UC Press imprint. The Press is hoping to get a Mellon Foundation grant to start the pilot.

4. California Digital Library update (Laine Farley, CDL Executive Director)
Laine Farley went over the accomplishments of the California Digital Library since SLASIAC last met in October. Some of the highlights included co-sponsoring the International Digital Curation Conference, which was held at the end of February; progress on the development of a UC digital asset management system (DAMS) that will immediately serve at least 6 or 7 campuses; collaboration with UCSF on DataShare, a project to facilitate voluntary data sharing among researchers; and adding more clients to the EZID and Web Archiving Services. These activities and more can be found on the CDL's news website (http://www.cdlib.org/cdlinfo/). CDL recently completed license negotiations with Elsevier (through 2018) and Nature Publishing Group (through 2016). The NPG agreement allows for reasonable costs increases, and adds three popular scientific titles (Nature Chemistry, Nature Communications, and Nature Climate Change). A press release will be forthcoming. The CDL also implemented a tool (called "Zephir") to manage the metadata for HathiTrust (www.hathitrust.org), including rights determination/status, and facilitate the ingest of digitized resources.

Susan Carlson gave an update on the CDL's budget situation, as she had just received new information. Since the funding level for all of UCOP is the same as last year, any increase in one program results in a decrease in another, and automatic cost increases are resulting in cuts to some programs. As Debbie mentioned earlier, the CDL has one of the largest unrestricted budgets within the division of Academic Affairs, so it is a prime target for cuts. Susan described two different cut scenarios for CDL; one for $354,000 and one for $528,000. The final decision will be made soon.

Susan noted that the harvesting tool being implemented to support the UC Open Access Policy will be paid for this year with one-time funds.

Discussion about the CDL centered on how to advocate for the funding that the CDL needs. Now that UCOP's budget is a tax from the campuses, the executive vice chancellors want to keep the tax as low as possible and are watchful of where the funds go. They do recognize that there are programs that offer collective benefits, such as the CDL and UCDC. As it has been said before, cuts to the CDL negatively impact campuses since they lose the leverage of a systemwide entity, and have to implement things that the CDL currently provides on a systemwide basis. Right now, SLASIAC seems to be at a disadvantage from not having a direct enough voice in the UCOP budget negotiations to advocate for CDL. Funding priorities seem to be on the administrative/business side; in particular, the UCPath implementation is a big expense right now. SLASIAC members said that they want to help out and bring up the importance of funding the CDL's crucial shared services on their campuses, but don't always know where to go. It is also not clear how to be directly involved in the UCOP budget process to make sure the CDL's benefits and cost-savings are heard. There should be a consideration in the budget process to distinguish between activities at UCOP that provide oversight and those that provide shared services that generate more value.

5. UC Libraries update (Lorelei Tanji, the chair of the Council of University Librarians)
   Lorelei Tanji provided an update on the latest UC library initiatives. The two big areas this year are shared print collections and space planning. The shared print efforts are being overseen by two teams with representatives from across the UC libraries: the Shared Print Strategy Team and Shared Print Operations Team. One project is coordination of the systemwide collection of journals, with systematic de-duplication of journals from the campuses and RLFs, ensuring that there is one print copy in the system, but that space can also be cleared. Another project is the digitization and retention of federal government documents (US government publications), known as "FedArc." This project will make sure there is a single print copy available (in an RLF or campus library) and a digital copy available via HathiTrust (www.hathitrust.org).

   In digital collections, the libraries have a pilot for demand-driven ebooks wherein the first few "clicks" are free, and the library only pays after two or three content views. The other projects are the digital asset management system (DAMS) – mentioned in the CDL update – and a newly established task force on collaborative digitization (digitizing material based on common subject or theme). Other projects that Lorelei mentioned were:
   - Open Access Fund Pilot assessment
   - Knowledge Unlatched (OA monographs) assessment via a "pre-implementation" Team
   - Shared metadata policy project (sharing systemwide best practices and guidelines)
   - Increasing access to licensed resources via a single sign-on (Shibboleth)
   - A task force to evaluate integrated library systems (ILS), and determine interest

   Staff play a key role in helping the UC libraries achieve their systemwide strategic plans and priorities. The UC libraries are exploring ways to leverage expertise in areas such as technology, emerging subject areas, and foreign language skills.

6. Office of Scholarly Communication update (Laine Farley and Karen Butter, Co-Directors of the OSC)
   While the structure for the new Office of Scholarly Communication have not yet been finalized, the participants are moving ahead with work that needs to be done, including support for the UC Open Access Policy implementation. The scholarly communications group from the UC libraries' advisory

structure ("SAG1") will appoint 2 representatives. In addition to maintaining the OSC website and working on the implementation of the UC Open Access Policy, the Office will work on monitoring state and federal legislation and policies. OSC will provide regular reporting to SLASIAC.

Because the OSC develops material and processes for the faculty, it was suggested that a faculty appointment to the Office would be beneficial.

Action: Catherine Mitchell, the OSC Operations Director, and UCOLASC chair Roberto Manduchi will consult with the Academic Senate leadership about nominating a faculty member for the OSC.

7. Copyright update (Joanne Miller, Analyst for Strategic & Project Planning for the CDL and UC Libraries)
    Joanne shared three copyright-related items:

    1. The UC Copyright Ownership Policy Working Group has continued to meet since the last SLASIAC meeting (where Sherylle Mills Englander provided an update and status report) and work on its recommendations for changes to the policy. The group should have a draft report by the next SLASIAC meeting

    2. The new UC Copyright Website (http://copyright.universityofcalifornia.edu) was launched in February. It will be updated and revised on an on-going basis, with help from Katie Fortney, the CDL's Copyright Policy and Education Officer, and OGC's Angus MacDonald.

    3. The revised UC Copyright and Fair Use Policy was sent out for formal review in March, and comments are due by the end of May. The analyzed results will be brought to SLASIAC (via the Standing Subcommittee on Copyright Policy) for review and assessment.

4. Open Access Policy update
    a. Catherine Mitchell, the Director of CDL's Access & Publishing Group, gave a report on the status of the UC Open Access Policy implementation, which is hosted at the CDL. Catherine's group runs eScholarship, an open access repository and publishing platform (http://escholarship.org/). For article deposit compliance with the Policy, faculty can go directly to the Office of Scholarly Communication website (http://osc.universityofcalifornia.edu/open-access-policy/deposit/), or via their campus library website.

        Catherine shared statistics on deposits to eScholarship as of Feb. 2014 from the three campuses piloting the Open Access Policy implementation. Taken together, the statistics provide a good indication of faculty participation in the Open Access Policy.

        Catherine reported that waiver requests – to opt-out of the policy – were minimal overall. UCSF gets requests directly from publishers, but otherwise requests seem to be on an individual basis. When the policy passed, faculty were told that there was no need to request a waiver because publishers had been notified.

    b. Catherine went over some strategies for increasing faculty participation in the Policy implementation, including providing additional FAQs, decision trees and video testimonials similar to those from Chris Kelty and Rich Schneider, and outreach to departments via meetings with an informed librarian and a faculty advocate.

c. In the next phase of the OA Policy implementation, the CDL team will employ an automatic article "harvester" to gather information on published works. The harvester culls UC publications from online indexes to bring into the system. After an extensive review and bidding process, UC selected Symplectic's Elements, a publications management system. The system will send automated notifications to faculty asking them to confirm their articles and then upload their version of the articles (the author's post-peer reviewed version) if necessary. Faculty can go into the system to update and clarify their information, use as a tool to manage publications lists. While the automated system is sure to bring up concerns, it also increases efficiency, is easy to use, and could be useful to faculty who choose to utilize it. The system works with faculty profiles that are already employed on campuses, and can harvest and feed that information. It can help to facilitate reporting requirements with various entities, such as funders.

SLASIAC members discussed who the notice that is received by faculty should come from; what will make faculty read the message and engage with the system? It was suggested that showing usage statistics would be enticing to faculty; eScholarship sends out monthly statistics on its publications. A suggestion was made for providing testimonials on the ease of use of the system from editors of well-known journals.

Assessment of the implementation will be reviewed by UCOLASC, with the first report to be primarily on the infrastructure since not enough time has gone by evaluate the success of the policy. There will be a 12-month review and other planned reports.

f. Representatives from the pilot campuses provided status reports:

UCLA (from Robin Garrell) – The University Librarian, Ginny Steel, has been working hard getting the word out. The EVC and chair of the Academic Senate sent a joint letter to faculty. Chris Kelty has done sessions with faculty. There is a step-by-step guide on the library website and in the library commons area. (It was noted that many people don't use the library website but go directly to their most used databases.) Upcoming efforts will include a table at the faculty center during lunch and training departmental administrative assistants on how to upload articles.

Concerns so far have included students' worry about creative commons licenses (which is not actually related to the OA Policy) and journal editors' fear of more work on top of the current requirements from NIH and other agencies. Right now, faculty feel there is not enough information to know whether they're following policy. Most faculty know about it, but haven't done anything about it. Many confuse "gold" (journals or fee-based) with "green" (repositories for authors' versions) OA, and are afraid they have to pay to comply with the policy. Some believe the Open Access Policy is about moving to an "author pays" model. The harvesting system will be key to making the policy work.

Irvine (from Lorelei Tanji) – For the launch, Irvine invited UCLA faculty member Chris Kelty to come speak. The campus will be holding "upload-a-thons" to show how easy it is to upload papers. The chair of Earth Systems Science found that uploading an article took just 2-3 minutes. The biggest hurdle that faculty have found so far is finding the right version to deposit.

SF (from Karen Butter) – SF's policy has been in place since 2012, and Karen reported that they are still seeing a relatively small number of waiver requests from faculty. UCSF will be doing big PR campaign over next week or two with fliers that exhort faculty to "Exercise your rights!" Faculty really want a workflow diagram to help them through the process. There seems to be confusion about what version to deposit.

e. Presidential policy for Open Access (Laine Farley and Susan Carlson)
The Academic Senate requested the creation of a presidential Open Access policy to supplement their own policy so that a broader audience would be covered (e.g., faculty who are not a part of the Academic Senate). The task force was convened to draft the presidential policy consists of a wide range of representatives including several SLASIAC members. The task force encountered difficulty in drafting the policy due to the distinctions drawn in the UC Policy on Copyright Ownership, which does not automatically give copyright ownership to all members of the UC community. A draft version of the policy is now out for an informal, 30-day review. The task force will assess the comments received at the end of the 30 days, and the policy will then go out for a formal systemwide review.

5. Future items for SLASIAC
SLASIAC agendas will continue to include current topics, such as budget, open access, and any other concerns of the UC Libraries surrounding scholarly communication. For potential future topics, there was much interest in the topic of data curation, which is becoming very important in certain disciplines. Because the library is a primary point of contact for research data, it has become a hot topic in the library world. UC is poised to become a leader in research data management. There is a lot of exploration going on right now at the CDL and on campuses.

Action: Data curation will be a topic on the next SLASIAC agenda. Anyone with suggestions or questions about the topic should send them to joanne.miller@ucop.edu.

Action: SLASIAC staff will find out if/which other groups within UC are discussing data management and curation.

Other future topic suggestions included:
o Online education; how CDL interfaces with campuses entities.
o External funding and the potential for monetizing UC's assets. Data might be an area to explore for alternative revenue streams.
o The Digital Preservation Network (http://www.dpn.org/) and advice on how the libraries might proceed. The DPN is a membership organization that offers a federated model of digital library preservation to avoid single points of failure. Funding over the long term is a financial challenge.
o Library space and forecasting. Advice will be needed on such topics as campus-based vs. regional-based physical collections and storage.

Action: If you have any suggestions for future topics, send to joanne.miller@ucop.edu.