

**COMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY & SCHOLARLY COMMUNICATION
MINUTES
November 3, 2016**

Present: Eileen Zurbriggen (*chair*), Dimitris Achlioptas, Chelsea Blackmore, Michael Cowan, T.J. Demos, Wendy Lin (UGSR), Gabriela Ramieraz-Chavez (GSR)

Absent: Graeme Smith, Elizabeth Cowell (ex-officio), Susan Perry (LAUC Chair), Alix Norton (LAUC Vice Chair)

COLASC Proactive Agenda

Chair informed members she is inquiring with the departments to see if they would be interested in meeting with COLASC to talk about their library needs and has received request to meet with departments (Music, Biology, Linguistic). She would like the “listening tour” to be a precursor to a survey, to learn about the type of services and resources faculty would like the Library to provide.

For the upcoming year, the committee discussed a possible event, drafting a survey, and conducting a deeper analysis of the undergraduate and faculty survey. A member recommended focusing on a limited numbers of topics and the Chair noted the shortened meeting time has limited the opportunity for discussion and asked members to consider extending it back to two-hour meetings next quarter.

Open Access 2020 Initiative (OA2020) & UC Systemwide Pay It Forward Project

The Open Access 2020 initiative is an attempt to “flip” the funding model for scholarly journals from subscription based to some other method that would allow for open access. Open access fits well with scholars’ desire to share knowledge widely but there are challenges with determining that best alternative funding model. In Europe, most higher education institutions are public entities therefore their government endorses and subsidizes the open access publishing model. The situation is different for universities in the United States. Open Access 2020 is an international initiative aiming to accelerate the transition to open access publishing system from the current subscription system. The UC “Pay It Forward” study reviews how it may be financially feasible for academic journals to move from subscription-base to an article processing charging model.

The Pay It Forward project suggested a model in which each campus library provide faculty a set figure (perhaps \$1500) per article to apply toward the processing charge to publish that article. This amount would ensure that the author would have enough to cover the APC at some journal in their field. If the author wants to publish in a journal with a higher APC, these funds might come from a grant, an institutional research fund (not drawn from the library’s budget) or some other source. The assumption is that faculty will be able to influence the price that publishers charge. A member noted that NSF/NIH will not fund article-processing fees and a majority of faculty in their academic career will not be able to “shop” renowned journals. Members agreed this is concerning because it places the burden on faculty to publish and fundamentally change how faculty publish (choosing between journal or scholarly monographs) thereby affecting promotions and grants. The committee will discuss this topic in greater detail at a later meeting and the Chair will explore whether other Senate committees should also review the Pay It Forward report.

Science & Engineering Library Discussion

The committee reviewed and discussed the Physical & Biological Science faculty letter sent to Librarian Cowell inquiring about the floors cleared of books in the S&E Library. The Chair visited the S&E library in person and shared her surprise that the entire third floor was empty of books. Raw numbers of titles to be removed had not been discussed when Librarian Cowell consulted with COLASC in the spring on the S&E Library’s de-duplication project, and the committee did not anticipate a de-duplication so vast. A member pointed out that the Library’s rationale may be that the space is better utilized as study space rather than as storage for books that aren’t being used, which takes up valuable real estate especially if new books are not being purchased for the S&E Library. Members understand that it is reasonable for a library to “prune” unused items (get rid of “junk”) but this is different than a decision to dramatically reduce the size of a collection. Is there a commitment to continue to build the Science library print collection with new (“non-junk”) titles? Or was the de-duplication part of a project to have a much smaller footprint of print items in the S&E library? Members noted that there are trade-offs in any action, but wondered who had assessed those trade-offs in this case (e.g., the University Librarian alone or were the CP/EVC or Chancellor also involved).

There was a consensus among members that consultation (with COLASC and the faculty more broadly) had not been sufficient, which threatens the principle of shared governance. Consultation occurred during the last meeting of the 2015/16 year, with no written materials provided to COLASC. In addition, the agenda item was vague and did not explicitly indicate that a reduction in the collections would be discussed. The committee noted that if only a relatively small number of titles are being removed, an automatic algorithm that looks only at recent use and duplication across other libraries might make sense. But when the majority of the titles are being removed from a collection, some additional expert consultation (focusing on content) would seem to be wise. Faculty should have been better consulted prior to recycling the books since they would have expertise to make these determinations. Members are concerned about the lack of transparency, there should have been more of a programmatic discussion for the S&E library and the trade offs in order for the Senate to comment and provide feedback. Members would like to learn to what extent the Library's priorities are dictated by the CP/EVC. Most importantly, the committee would like to request Librarian Cowell to provide a list of the books that were removed to better understand the scope of the de-duplication. A member also suggested that having such a list would allow the library to compare it to ILL requests and purchase requests to assess the demand for books that were removed.