

**COMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY & SCHOLARLY COMMUNICATION
MINUTES
January 19, 2017**

Present: Eileen Zurbriggen (*chair*), Chelsea Blackmore, Michael Cowan, Graeme Smith, Wendy Lin (UGSR), Gabriela Ramieraz-Chavez (GSR), Elizabeth Cowell (*ex-officio*), Susan Perry (LAUC Chair), Alix Norton (LAUC Vice Chair), Anna Sher (Guest)

Absent: Karen Ottemann

Announcements

Librarian Cowell announced that the construction of the active learning classroom is on schedule and that the Library's Business Case Analysis for the renovation of the Science and Engineering Library's infrastructure has been approved by the Committee on Planning and Stewardship (Senate member: Tracy Larrabee). It is now awaiting the Chancellor's signature. The interim CP/EVC Herbert Lee will be writing a keynote to support the Science & Engineering Library project; this will be published in Tuesday Newsday.

The consulting firm Brightspot has completed an informal survey of approximately sixty students at the Science & Engineering Library and interviewed various student, staff, and faculty. Chair Zurbriggen recently had a phone call with the consulting firm. This firm has worked with other UC Libraries and they have expertise in designing and creating space to integrate learning for undergraduate success, especially for STEM undergraduates. The firm has reviewed a lot of different data to understand how the campus can respond and address the "pain points" highlighted by students. These pain points include not knowing where to find support, not feeling a part of the community, having no room for error in taking courses to progress in their major, and a perceived lack of value in their degree. Brightspot will provide all the data with the report. COLASC looks forward to reviewing the report and data when they are delivered by Brightspot.

Consultation with Assistant Director for Assessment Anna Sher

Last year, the committee reviewed the open-ended responses to the faculty survey conducted by the Library. The committee decided to create a survey to learn more about faculty needs and concerns and invited Director Sher to consult on best practice and approaches.

Assistant Director Sher suggested that the committee review in detail the previous faculty survey to assess if there were any gaps they wanted to incorporate in the upcoming survey. She recommended that members be clear about what they would like to understand or learn prior to drafting the questions. If the questions are relevant to faculty, the results will be more meaningful and response rates will be higher. Director Sher can assist with drafting the survey and once it's deployed, she will be able to keep track of the response rate and keep the survey open accordingly. Also, the data and qualitative information will be provided in the aggregate by division.

A sub-committee will begin drafting the outline, building the questions and reviewing the overall design. Members agreed that the objective should be to learn what resources or services faculty would like to see the Library provide given the existing services and needs. The survey will need to be strategic on the open/ended questions to expand upon the previous survey.

During the course of the consultation, Librarian Cowell shared that the Library has followed up on some of the open-ended response from the 2014 Ithaka faculty survey and it has influenced some Library practices. In a future meeting, she will report to members what changes have been implemented by the Library in response to the Library's faculty survey. Additionally, she informed members that CruzCat (Enterprise system) will not be supported within two years and the Library is grappling with this issue, because CruzCat serves many functions, including tracking purchases, tracking circulation, the online catalogue for users, and integration with a national catalogue. The committee appreciates the importance of the CruzCat system and members expressed some surprise that they had not heard previously about this upcoming change. The committee requested that they be kept informed about any updates or information and noted that COLASC would like to be helpful in working towards a solution or picking a new system.

Proactive Agenda for Winter Quarter

The committee discussed their proactive agenda for the rest of the year. Chair Zurbruggen briefly described the Open Access initiative OA2020. This initiative involves a commitment by universities and other stakeholders to try to shift the publishing model for academic journals from one that is subscription-based (you must buy a subscription to the journal or pay for individual articles in order to be able to read them) to a model that allows for open access to all for published articles. There are several models for how the finances could be changed to reach this goal. The University of California has looked at one model which is based on prospective authors paying to submit an article for consideration or publication (referred to as article publication charges or APCs). They drafted a report called Pay it Forward looking at some different possibilities for the specifics of the finances. Meanwhile, the UC's Open Access policy requires faculty to deposit their author's copy of published journal articles in UC's repository (eScholarship). To make that easier for faculty, the central administration has been funding harvester software. However, Provost Dorr no longer wants to provide dedicated funding for this so the California Digital Library would need to fund it out of their general budget. Doing so would necessarily mean they have less money to spend on other items such as system-wide licenses for journals. This would especially impair access for campuses with smaller local budgets, such as UCSC. The Library has important issues to address in the near future and COLASC should review the open access materials and make a recommendation about whether or not UCSC should sign on to the OA2020 initiative.

Lastly, members discussed the Science & Engineering Library and inquired with Librarian Cowell if there were any specific plans for the S&E Library. She noted neither the planning phase nor the construction has started yet (with the exception of the active learning classroom). The architecture plan is conceptual and she has consulted with faculty and department chairs in the Physical and Biological Sciences division and the School of Engineering. Librarian Cowell will share the Business Case Analysis report after the Chancellor signs off. The committee is concerned that they have not had the opportunity to contribute to the vision of the Library and would like to be able to contribute in a positive way to move forward and help facilitate communication with faculty.