

COMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY

Annual Report, 2006-07

To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

The Committee on the Library (COL) addressed a number of topics that have an impact on the Library as well as the entire campus. A summary of these issues and COL's response are provided below.

1. Open-access and Scholarly Publishing

In spring of 2005 the Santa Cruz Division of the UC Academic Senate passed four Resolutions addressing key issues in scholarly communication. COL was charged with their implementation. Similar issues are being addressed at the other UC campuses as well as at UC systemwide. Effective May 9, 2007, the Assembly approved a name change for the University Committee (UCOL) on the Library to the University Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication (UCOLASC). UCOLASC has developed a preliminary draft regarding the implementation of open-access publishing at UC. Our Committee concluded that the open-access policies developed by UCOLASC are a good start toward establishing a policy and culture of open access in the UC system and that the policy should be implemented. However, our Committee had a number of recommendations to be considered in a revised draft. Perhaps the greatest concern is the administrative costs associated with implementation. For instance, a key component of this proposal is the opt-out policy. This would require a new administrative unit to handle requests from individual faculty to opt out. One could easily imagine that staff could become overwhelmed by having to deal with each negotiation on a case-by-case basis. We recommend restructuring the opt-out policy to minimize the need for additional administrative units.

We also suggest that before this policy is implemented, ample notice should be given to the publishers. We understand that MIT communicated with the major publishers before implementing a similar policy. In their communications with publishers, COL suggests that UC mention that there is widespread support for the open-access policy and cite the overwhelming positive response to a recent UC systemwide poll.

COL is also concerned with a second component of the UCOLASC developed open-access policy regarding the requirement to list open-access publications in merit and promotion files. We understand the intent of this policy is to encourage open-access publishing and to acknowledge the potential sacrifice of publishing in open-access rather than more prestigious subscription-based journals. As stated, however, this policy appears punitive to those who do not publish in open-access venues. In addition, the opportunities for quality open-access publishing vary dramatically between research areas, and this information may be of limited use in personnel actions. We recommend that this component be excluded from the revised draft. The UCOLASC draft policy proposes maintaining a list of publishers who do not comply with the stated open-access policies. It is likely that many publishers will produce some open-access journals and some journals that are not open-access. Therefore a list of journals may be more appropriate. Also unclear in the policy is whether this document is intended to include

international or United States-based publishers only. If the latter, COL wonders if it includes publishers located within the United States even if their journals are based at editorial offices abroad, or United States-based journals that are published by foreign publishers? COL also suggests that in the revised draft UCOLASC considers the distinction between articles and book chapters where one signs for one's self versus a situation where an editor would be in a position to sign for all chapters in the publication. Finally, the document brought up the issue of plagiarism. This is perhaps too big of a topic to tackle by UCOLASC, but we noted that it is a growing concern that UC has yet to take a strong stance regarding, particularly as it may be facilitated by greater ease of access to digital publications such as open-access sources.

2. Establishing a Committee on Scholarly Communication

A further Resolution from the SC Division of the UC Academic Senate (spring 2005) on key issues on scholarly communication dealt with journal and book pricing, evaluation of academic performance, copyright policy, and finally the establishment of an Office of Scholarly Communication. In regard to the latter, the May 2005 Resolution number 4 specifically states *"That the UCSC administration explore the establishment of an Office of Scholarly Communication or similar administrative unit to take responsibility for the persistent stewardship of all forms of scholarly communication."* In order to recognize the importance of scholarly communication at UC, UCOLASC requested that each campus library committee consider changing its name to "Committee on the Library and Scholarly Communication" and modify its charge accordingly.

Our Committee concluded that doing so would so dramatically modify the original charge and focus of the Committee on the Library, and that the best solution was the establishment of a new committee focused on scholarly communication. We fully realize that a proposal to add another committee to an already over-burdened Senate will be met with skepticism. However, after much discussion, COL was unanimous in its opinion that the rapid changes in scholarly communication have such broad and far-reaching effects for the students, staff and faculty, that a new committee focused on scholarly communication is warranted. The issues facing scholarly communication are complex and range from copyright law to journal and press financing to strategies for long-term digital stewardship of scholarly material.

The issues regarding scholarly communication have progressed and gained enough momentum that they are now well beyond and, more importantly, distinct from the original charge of the Committee on the Library (<http://senate.ucsc.edu/manual/chargesonly.html#COL>). The diversity and complexity of the tasks prevent them from being adequately addressed simply by amending or expanding the original charge of COL. The vast majority of faculty do not have the background or training to provide an informed opinion and to develop policy on many of the core questions regarding scholarly communication. For example, addressing just one of these points (academic personnel evaluations) required the formation of a separate task force (this was approved by the Senate but, unfortunately, could not be staffed). Establishing appropriate copyright policy provides another example of the difficulties in addressing these issues. Copyright policy in the digital era is extremely complex and requires faculty well versed in this area and extensive consultation with experts in copyright law. COL believes that the only

effective mechanism for addressing these and other problems (book and subscription costs) at the campus level is through the establishment of a dedicated committee.

Many other universities, appreciating the complexity and importance of these issues, have already established an independent committee on scholarly communication. A brief web-search reveals that UC Santa Barbara, University of Indiana, University of Texas, University of Tennessee, and Carolina State University have Senate-level scholarly communication committees. This list is only partial and many more universities have already taken steps to establishing a dedicated task force on scholarly communication. UCSC's head librarian, Virginia Steel, and other members of the Library staff agree that it would be extremely valuable to have a committee, separate from the Committee on the Library and the Committee on Research, dedicated to scholarly communication.

UCSC has been a leader in scholarly communication thanks to the efforts of past COLs, particularly under the Chairing of UCSC Professor Ben Crow. The Senate Resolutions drafted by COL and ratified by the UCSC Division of the Academic Senate in May 2005 were instrumental in alerting universities nationwide to the crisis in scholarly communication. Consequently, UCSC has a national reputation for aggressively addressing current issues in scholarly communication.

If we are to maintain this leadership position, our Committee believes that we must act to establish an independent, highly visible committee on scholarly communication. Acting on that belief, COL drafted and circulated a justification and charge for a proposed committee on scholarly communication to the Committee on Committees (COC), the Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction, and Elections (CRJE), and the Senate Executive Committee (SEC). These committees reviewed the proposal and expressed concerns about staffing and interfacing with the University Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication, as well as other Santa Cruz committees such as the Committee on Academic Personnel. SEC recommended that we withdraw the proposal for further work. COL did withdraw the proposal.

3. Special Collections

COL invited Head of Special Collections Christine Bunting to give an update on Special Collections holdings and responsibilities at one of its meeting. In this presentation we learned that one of the missions of Special Collections is to document UCSC's history and academic growth. In addition, Special Collections is responsible for archiving and establishing collections of the work of notable UCSC faculty upon their retirement. Currently, no Senate committee provides advice on the choice of faculty members whose materials should be archived. COL suggested that this responsibility be added to the Committee on the Faculty Research Lecture that selects an annual speaker from among the Senate members.

4. Response to the Strategic Campus Academic Plan

COL had a broad discussion regarding the draft Strategic Campus Academic Plan. Among the concerns raised were a lack of a clear mission statement focused on UCSC's unique strengths and areas in need of improvement. The document did not put forth a coherent plan for graduate and

undergraduate education. While the document had ambitious research and educational plans, no coherent plan was put forth to increase extramural funding or graduate student enrollments. Finally, this plan had an emphasis on various areas of interdisciplinary research but no explanation of how these areas were chosen. This must be addressed in order to get the full faculty support. Surprisingly, there was no mention of the Library, which is of great concern given the proposed additional graduate programs.

5. Institute for Science Information Subscription

COL invited UCSC Librarian Martha Ramirez to discuss the Institute for Science Information (ISI) reference index and citations database at one of its meetings. With the launch of Google Scholar, COL raised the issue of cancelling UCSC's ISI subscription. ISI costs about \$65K per year or about 4 cents per use. We were informed that ISI has a large following and is used widely by faculty and graduate students. ISI journal citation reports were the most highly rated product in a recent faculty survey. Based on this feedback, COL decided not to recommend cancellation. We believe this issue should be revisited once more faculty and students become familiar with Google Scholar.

6. Library Hours

Library staff proposed changing the time at which the Science and Engineering Library reference desk closes from 9 p.m. to 7 p.m. Monday-Thursday because usage from 7 to 9 p.m. is low. The change will be run as a pilot during fall quarter of 2007. The McHenry Library reference desk will stay open until 9 p.m. Monday-Thursday. COL agreed with this change as this cut in services will allow more Library staff to be available when there is more traffic.

Respectfully submitted,

COMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY

Dimitris Achlioptas

Raoul Birnbaum (F, W)

Melissa Caldwell

Donna Hunter (S)

Forrest Robinson

Virginia Steel, University Librarian, *ex officio*

William Sullivan, Chair

Christy Caldwell, LAUC representative (chair W, S)

Allyse Cope, SUA representative

Ann Hubble, LAUC representative (acting chair F)

Kerry Scott, LAUC representative (chair elect)

August 31, 2007