

**COMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY & SCHOLARLY COMMUNICATION
MINUTES
March 2, 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)

Absent: Karen Ottemann

Announcements

Chair Zurbriggen debriefed members on the recent UCOLASC meeting. The Legislature and Board of Regents are focusing on the enrollment of international students at each campus and have capped most campuses at 20%. UC Provost Dorr has indicated that she will withdraw funding support for Symplectic Elements (the “harvester” that finds UC faculty’s published articles and helps make the process of depositing them into the eScholarship institutional repository easier). The California Digital Library is uncertain about how to continue providing this service. The University of California researchers publish approximately one hundred article a day and 40% have international co-authors. Those co-authors often will not publish in non-Open Access venues, which helps increase pressure on U.S. publishers to provide Open Access options. An interesting model was proposed by the Electrochemical Society, called the “Free the Science” initiative. It would involve an endowment to fund Open Access publishing. Also, a modest increase in licensing fees would allow no author-side fees (article publication charges) for UC authors. The Librarians have drafted a document on the pro and cons of Open Access 2020, several UC campuses have signed on to indicate an “Expression of Interest”, however UCLA has decided not to sign on and some campuses are debating. OA2020 is only one leg of a three-leg stool. Publishers rely on control over faculty work and the products they make, the money university libraries give them, and the labor faculty give them in scholarship, reviewing, and editing. The open access movement is trying to take power away from publishers in all 3 ways. The OA policy that the Senate developed a few years ago is the first leg -- faculty retaining control over their own work and the rights to it. OA2020 is the second leg -- saying we want to make decisions about how we spend our money. The third piece is the labor -- faculty can’t regain control of journals unless we bring them back into academia where our free labor doesn’t enrich the publishers.

Librarian Cowell shared that the Northern Region Library Facility in Richmond has received additional state funding and Elsevier is coming up for re-negotiation.

October 13 minutes were approved.

Committee Business

Chair Zurbriggen reviewed some of the topics the committee would like to work on the rest of the year and members volunteered to work on the following topics:

- Chair Zurbriggen, Member Achlioptas, Head of Assessment Careaga, GSR Ramieraz-Chavez will work on drafting a survey to learn more about faculty’s library needs.
- Member Blackmore will participate in planning for the upcoming Library symposium.
- Member Ottemann and Undergraduate Student Representative Lin will research background information on possibly drafting a scholarly and data access statement, stating opposition to removing data from the public view, as has happened with some federal government websites.

Members discussed the usefulness of drafting such a statement and had questions about the intended audience and how to be most effective with such a statement. It might be better to have a higher body (UCOLASC or UCSC’s Senate Executive Committee) produce such a statement. The sub-committee agreed to draft a statement which could be proposed to these larger bodies for their consideration. Members agreed it was a nice gesture if organizations or even a small committee such as COLASC speaks to issues such as this that are so relevant to their charge.

Reviewed 2015 Graduate Survey & ILL Survey

The committee discussed the open-ended responses related to the library from UCSC's 2015 graduate student survey. The committee decided they would like to propose that additional library-related questions be added to this year's graduate survey as it may help inform the campus and assist COLASC with thinking through the design of the faculty survey. Librarian Cowell shared that some of issues raised in the graduate student open/ended responses and requested items are not feasible but for some other topics, the library has addressed the issues. She will follow up on the specific items that were addressed, to share with the committee. The committee will draft questions to propose that Institutional Research include in this year's graduate student survey. Because there might not be space for too many additional questions, the committee will rank the importance of the questions.

Continue to Draft Research Questions for Faculty Survey

The committee discussed the draft of the faculty survey questions. Discussion included a focus on the objectives of the survey. One of the priorities is to use the results of the survey as a tool to build advocacy for the library. Members determined they will identify three areas to focus on to begin drafting the faculty survey. Members discussed the type of questions, closed or open/ended, current place in career, type of physical space or software that would be useful. The Chair proposed meeting with the sub-committee members to decide on the main topics/queries.

Executive Session

The committee proceeded to hold an executive session with only Senate faculty before ending the meeting.