

**COMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY & SCHOLARLY COMMUNICATION
MINUTES
May 25, 2017**

Present: Eileen Zurbriggen (*chair*), Dimitris Achlioptas (*F,S*), Michael Cowan, Jennifer Horne (*S*), Graeme Smith, Karen Ottemann, Susan Perry (LAUC Chair), Alix Norton (LAUC Vice Chair), Wendy Lin (UGSR)

Absent: Chelsea Blackmore, Elizabeth Cowell (*ex-officio*), Gabriela Ramieraz-Chavez (GSR)

Announcements

Chair Zurbriggen provided a summary of the UCOLASC meeting. There was a lot of discussion on the changing landscape of the financial model for the Library. Points of discussion included Open Access 2020, which has approximately 200 signatures from top universities, mostly in Europe. The OA2020 initiative is a vision for flipping the funding for scholarly journals but it leaves open what mechanisms will be used to enact the change. This has left faculty fearful about having to pay article publication charges (APCs). The University of California has drafted a Pay-It-Forward Data Report to detail the specifics of how an APC model might be implemented at UC. Next year's committee will need to carefully review both the Pay it Forward report and the OA2020 statement to decide whether to recommend that UCSC become a signatory to OA2020.

Chair Zurbriggen has been serving as the UCOLASC representative on the Electronic Theses and Dissertations (ETD) Task Force. The task force completed a draft policy which will be disseminated for review next year. In some ways, the policy is similar to the faculty Open Access policy. However, the faculty policy allows faculty to opt out for any individual articles. In contrast, the draft ETD policy requires graduate students to get a dean's permission to opt out of making their thesis open access. Moreover, unlike for faculty who can remove an article from the open access policy permanently, graduate students can only remove their thesis from open distribution for a limited embargo period. Although open access is in general a positive goal, there are lingering questions about whether a limited embargo period could impair the ability of graduate students to get book contracts for their dissertations (this is not an issue for journal articles, which is the only type of publication that the Senate Open Access policy covers). The chair invited next year's COLASC to opine on this element of the policy when the committee reviews it.

UC Librarians have requested an increase in the collection budget to President Napolitano. The University of California Curation Center (UC3) has been working to save and back-up data from government website, using a site called datamirror.org.

Debrief Academic Senate Meeting

The committee debriefed on Chair Zurbriggen's presentation of COLASC's report on the Science & Engineering Library Resolution to the Academic Senate. Members noted there was a lot of focus on the Science and Engineering Library issue throughout the Senate meeting, not just during COLASC's presentation. The Student Union Assembly and Graduate Student Association have also passed resolutions relating to the Science & Engineering Library.

Several members commented on Dean Koch's question regarding the process to re-purchase books. Should this process be managed by COLASC rather than having individual faculty take ownership? The LAUC Chair mentioned that the demand driven acquisition model is already in place and provides a curated collection for faculty and students to access the materials they need. Members would like to better understand how demand driven acquisition is working. Librarian Cowell shared that Librarian Kerry Scott is working on a report analyzing the data for demand-driven acquisition and Interlibrary Loan. COLASC will invite Librarian Scott to present the report during a fall 2017 meeting.

Systemwide Review: Draft Electronic Information Security Policy Review

The committee reviewed the draft revised policy on electronic information security that will provide a framework for the University of California. The committee found the document highly technical but also quite vague in places. It was thus difficult for members to carefully evaluate the lengthy policy although they are supportive of the idea of creating an infrastructure that allows for different tiers of security and privacy. Members also appreciated that the policy intends to bring haphazard local practices into compliance with robust international standards. Evaluating the infrastructure to implement the security tiers was seen as outside of COLASC's charge. However, what is in COLASC's charge is concern about open access to scholarly information. It is important that the design of the infrastructure, as well as decisions about how information will be classified into the various tiers, will not impede access to information.

From the document, it does not appear the Office of the President is mandating how the information will be tiered and categorized in terms of security; however, some definitions in the glossary suggest that some decisions have perhaps been made and that these might be built into the policy. Members expressed that it is important that decisions about how information is classified into security tiers should remain with the Academic Senate and individual researchers. Faculty are best positioned to weigh and balance the needs for privacy with those for open access and professional associations provide ethical codes that faculty draw on in making those decisions. Members asked that the policy be more explicit that the decision-making power to classify information into security tiers remains with the Academic Senate and individual researchers. If this policy is meant to take discretion and decision making from the Academic Senate and individual faculty researchers in terms of the classification of their data, members are opposed to that change, especially if purely legalistic concerns meant to mitigate administrative risk will be used as the main decision-making criteria. This is seen as a shared governance concern. Another area of concern is whether in implementing this policy, faculty and graduate student researchers would be subject to criminal background checks.

The committee identified several additional areas for improvement. The term “unit head” might need some clarification: is the responsibility for implementation at the level of departments, deans, the CP/EVC or perhaps a specific point person on campus.

Discuss Scholarly Communication Statement

The committee previously discussed drafting a scholarly statement to advocate and speak to the committee’s concerns about the Trump Administration’s stance toward the deletion of data and information relating to scientific research and climate change. Member Ottemann and Undergraduate Student Representative Lin have researched and compiled their notes on existing statement of principle relating to access to scholarly communication. A member commented that without fully understanding the context of the situation at the White House it would be difficult to take a strong stance. The committee concluded that they agreed on the spirit of the statement and would like to reaffirm this in the annual report, but decided not to post or release an official stand-alone statement.

Discuss Committee Business

Members made final comments about their draft correspondence to Librarian Cowell commenting upon the Science & Engineering Library Renovation Business Case Analysis. The committee determined that they would like to advocate for a taskforce beginning in Fall 2017 that will consist of faculty, staff, and students to be directly involved in the discussion of the change to the campus libraries. Members would like to strongly advise that the taskforce: (a) be highly visible (to include the Senate Chair and CP/EVC), (b) be clearly balanced between the different constituencies and (c) have a limited purview, focused on the planned change to infrastructure and services (unlike COLASC which has a broader charge that also includes diverse issues related to scholarly communication). This task force can debate issues and issue a report. It would be possible to honestly and frankly confront budget trade-offs which seem to underlie much of the decision making that has already happened with regard to the S&E library. With the keen interest about the Science & Engineering Library from faculty and students this past year, it would be prudent to have transparency and ensure shared governance. Some members raised a concern about giving faculty and students full participation in this role although they noted that the committee could participate in an advisory role.