

Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication Annual Report 2015-16

To: Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division

The Committee on the Library and Scholarly Communication (COLASC) is charged with advising the campus administration on local and systemwide library and scholarly communication policies. Scholarly communication is the modality by which research and creative work are made public; including publishing, technology, archiving, and copyright. The committee also advises on the administration of campus libraries and on matters concerning acquisition and management policies for collections. The committee meets biweekly to support this charge and to better understand and learn about the challenges facing our libraries.

Library Funding and Budget

COLASC continued discussing the state of the library's budget. UCSC has the lowest level of funding per student of all UC's. We are not a member of the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) in part because our total expenditures, salaries/wages for professional staff, number of FTE, and budget for collections are all too small for us to qualify. Other than UCSC, in the UC system only UCM (a much smaller and younger campus) and UCSF (which is not eligible because it does not grant undergraduate degrees) are not members of the ARL. The library is in need of a budget increase. Committee members suggested highlighting the amount of funding the library needs to receive funding parity with similar campuses in the annual budget review submission to the CP/EVC.

The committee spent several meetings discussing possible alternate budget models for the library. Currently, the CP/EVC allocates a lump sum to the library. This sum is not formally tied to number of faculty, number of students, grant funding, or any other objective numeric metric; however, the need for additional resources (collections, staffing, and services) obviously increases as the campus grows. The committee discussed some of the pros and cons of moving to a funding model that would tie part of the library's budget to one or more of these metrics. For example, the library might receive a set percentage from the indirect cost recovery portion of research grants, or there might be a minimum amount of funding per student. It is unclear whether models such as these are politically or pragmatically viable and whether they would ultimately provide a floor of funding under which the library would not sink or would serve instead as a cap to funding. The committee expressed interest in continuing these discussions in the future, including garnering information about whether such models have been successful for other university libraries, inside or outside the UC system.

Associate University Librarian John Bono presented information about the library's budget to COLASC. The committee learned that seventy percent of the library's collection budget is slated for the California Digital Library agreement (a multi-campus package) and the remaining thirty percent are for UCSC-only journal subscriptions and monographs. The committee was surprised to learn that one-time funds (consisting of savings from open provisions, collection carry-forward, and other project funding) were relatively high at half the amount of the permanent budget. The campus has an ongoing structural budget deficit which necessarily leads to budgeting uncertainty and poses a challenge to the ability to plan thoughtfully for the future. The committee expressed

a desire for greater consultation regarding budget decisions and that Senate priorities be accorded due weight in decision-making. The COLASC chair also participated in a consultation between University Librarian Elizabeth Cowell, John Bono, and Committee on Planning & Budget (CPB). In this consultation, CPB reviewed a high-level budget and discussed library funding models, the use of GSRs in the library, and equality across the 10 UC campuses in access to library resources. The committee looks forward to continuing to work together with Librarian Cowell to advocate for needed resources for the library and to consult with her on faculty needs and priorities for the distribution and use of those funds.

Demand-Driven Acquisition Model for Collections

Since 2013, the library has implemented a demand-driven acquisition model, whereby purchase of monographs (but not journals) for the collection are made only upon request by a UCSC library patron (student, staff, or faculty). These requests can easily be made for many items through a “request purchase” button that will appear when a search for an item is conducted. Alternatively, there is an online form to request a purchase. The committee discussed the implications of this change. The committee also discussed possible methods for communicating this relatively new model to the campus community, because it is the impression of the committee that this change in our acquisition model is not well known. One concern of the committee is whether this model relies too heavily on the initiative of faculty, staff, and students to develop the collections. Although faculty and graduate students can perhaps be relied upon to build the collections in areas important for their own research, there may be less incentive to thoughtfully plan for building collections in areas important to the undergraduate curriculum and the general needs of the undergraduate population. An evaluation of the books that have been purchased through the demand acquisition model found that the types of books are comparable to what the acquisitions librarians used to order under the older model. A concern that a model like this might lead to exploding costs has not been realized; in fact, we are now spending less on increasing our book collections than under the old model. A related concern is whether this model will have a cascading effect of reducing the collections budget if users aren’t requesting purchases and if the resources will eventually be diverted to other priorities. When collections fall behind, it is virtually impossible to catch up later, even if additional funds are allocated for this purpose. The committee plans to further explore this topic and recommends continual review of the type of requests that have been submitted and the purchases made under the demand acquisition model.

Ithaka S+R Undergraduate Student & Faculty Surveys

The Head of Assessment and Planning provided an overview of the undergraduate (2015) and faculty (2014) survey results along with the Institutional Research & Policy Studies’ undergraduate and graduate student experience survey sections related to the library. The undergraduate survey (11% completion rate) showed that students are actively using the library two or three times a week. The issue of space was raised in several ways: availability of exam and group study space, increasing seating areas, and the need for more power outlets. Undergraduate students emphasized an interest in learning skills that will help them with their careers either through work experiences or in their field of study.

The faculty survey (28% completion rate) showed that faculty did not visit the library often although they used the database, subscriptions, and collections. The survey found that faculty are interested in managing access to resources, undergraduate research support, and assistance with

negotiating copyright. Surveyed faculty raised concerns about not having an intellectual property specialist available at the Library. It does not seem that faculty are moving towards ebooks. Because the faculty survey was designed to answer specific questions of interest to the library administration (rather than being designed to assess faculty needs and priorities), the committee also reviewed the collation of the faculty qualitative responses, which represent faculty concerns or thoughts that were not specifically addressed in the closed-ended questions in the survey. This review revealed some concern with the library's emphasis toward the provision of new services (e.g., digital storage) and whether this would have an impact on the provision of basic library services. There were comments about the library being under-resourced, focusing specifically on reduction in library staff (e.g., the Science & Engineering Library no longer employs a reference librarian), limitation of hours (e.g., McHenry's reference librarian hours are limited from 1-5pm), a lack of support for the teaching mission of the library (e.g., in-person instruction services are no longer provided for lower division courses), and inadequate collections (e.g., needing to use other libraries or simply purchase materials for one's personal collection because they are not available at UCSC). A number of comments also decried the elimination of the Slug Express campus mail delivery program and questioned why such a (presumably) inexpensive program could not be resumed, given the great time savings to those faculty who need to check out UCSC and ILL materials. Other comments requested more information about copyright and the ability to use materials in teaching. It is impossible to say how prevalent these concerns are without conducting a new survey that asks specifically about these issues, and the committee discussed the possibility of designing such a survey, perhaps working with Committee on Teaching (COT) and Committee on Research (COR) to ensure that it addressed faculty needs related to both teaching and research. Committee members also discussed further analyzing the existing survey data next year by specific demographics or divisions to better understand the responses and would like to collaborate with Librarian Cowell on identifying possible changes to support faculty based on the survey results.

Senate Forum

The prior year's committee had made tentative plans to conduct a forum on copyright during Fall 2015. The committee discussed whether to conduct such a forum and also discussed possible related forum topics such as publishing open-access textbooks, student access to information, and scholarly communication beyond academia (e.g., social media, traditional media, blogs, web pages). In the end, the committee was uncertain whether any of these topics would be of broad enough interest to faculty to proceed. The committee will re-visit hosting a forum next year, and invites Senate members to share their thoughts about their needs for information or workshops related to the library and/or scholarly communication.

UC Open Access Policy – eScholarship Harvesting Software

On July 24, 2013, Academic Council voted to approve the UC Open Access Policy, which requires Senate faculty to upload the author's accepted version of their scholarly articles to an open access database, unless they opt out of doing so. UC has created an automatic "harvesting" software to make adding publications to this database (the eScholarship repository) easier for faculty. This software was rolled out to UCSC in fall quarter 2015 and faculty began receiving emails from the software when relevant publications were found. The committee discussed the strengths and weaknesses of the harvester. It has the ability to search faculty scholarly articles in a variety of fields to upload to eScholarship. On the other hand, initial reports indicate that it might not be nuanced enough. For example, faculty with common surnames are getting flagged for many

articles they did not write. UC will continue to refine and improve the harvester, with the goal of making it easier for faculty to upload articles. The ultimate goal is to provide access to the research and scholarship of UC faculty as widely as possible.

Letter to Faculty

To facilitate communication about issues related to the library and scholarly communication, COLASC decided to send a letter to faculty providing a summary of the most relevant information, especially information that the committee felt might not be well disseminated currently. The committee completed drafting the letter at the end of the year and will send it to Senate faculty in early fall 2016, when it will be most useful. The committee welcomes feedback about the existence and content of the letter.

De-Duplication of the Science & Engineering Library Collections

During the last meeting of spring quarter, the committee reviewed a plan to de-duplicate the Science & Engineering Library stacks. Librarian Scott informed the committee of the Library's effort to de-duplicate the collections. Although the immediate impetus was the requirement to create more study seating, the library collections were never meant to be archival, but rather to be a working collection of materials that are actively used by the campus. A large portion of the Science & Engineering collection is duplicative, with about 80% of items also held elsewhere in the UC system. Also, a significant portion of the collection has not been checked out since 1994 (when the library switched their system to begin tracking checkouts). Some percentage of materials (including most journals) is available online and none of these are ever touched in their print form once an e-version is available. The Library will keep the titles that have been checked out or looked at within the last five years; they will also keep everything published in the last 5 years. Reshelving statistics are used to determine which items have been "touched". For the 20% of titles that are unique to our library, they are looking to see if the items are truly unique. Any de-duplicated title that is not already stored in a UC regional storage facility will be sent there. The de-duplication is planned to occur over the summer and be completed by the beginning of the 2016-17 academic year. The committee plans to request a follow-up report on this process once it is complete.

Consultations

Digital Scholarship Commons

The library has opened a new Digital Scholarship Commons on the ground floor of McHenry Library; it is a resource for divisions, instructors, and graduate students for the creation, management, and delivery of digital content and to enable the library to partner in research projects. Digital scholarship is a method to analyze and interpret materials in new ways, using visualization to change or reimagine concepts. It is headed by Director Rachel Deblinger, who gave a presentation to the committee on February 24, 2016 about the Digital Scholarship Commons and the new directions for the provision of digital services by the library. Digital Scholarship Commons Director Deblinger was a part of the Council on Library and Information Resources Postdoctoral Fellowship program; that fellowship position has now been transformed into a permanent line. She is actively working with the Humanities division to foster digital scholarship on campus.

UC Curation Center

COLASC consulted with John Chodacki on March 31, 2016, the recently hired Director of the University of California Curation Center (UC3), who will work with UC campuses to ensure that the California Digital Library's digital curation services meet the needs of faculty. These services include digital preservation, data management, and reuse. UC3 provides consulting services and resources for faculty to make informed decisions on digital curation and preservation, web archiving, and research data management. For example, there is a *data management plan* resource to walk researchers through creating a long term data management plan that will adhere to government funding requirements.

Prelinger Library

The committee invited Film and Digital Media Professor Prelinger, an archivist, writer, filmmaker, and co-founder of the Prelinger Library to consult with COLASC. The focus of the Prelinger Library isn't solely about collections. Rather, the focus is to create a space for the community to be creative and social. Professor Prelinger believes that physical materials are being re-validated and there is great potential in the collection for interaction, surprise, and discovery. He believes the future of the library is in the interaction between people and the library's collections.

Review of Policy Changes and Official Correspondence

Revised Library Start-up Funding Proposal

The committee reviewed on February 4, 2016 a revised version of a proposal to modify the allocation of library start-up funds for new faculty. Under the new policy, the Library will receive permanent funds of \$2,500 for each new centrally funded FTE and an additional \$2,500 in one-time funds for each faculty hire (whether a new FTE or an existing FTE). Previously, all start-up funds were one-time funds. The other major change is that funds will be controlled centrally, rather than by the individual faculty members. This will ensure that funds are actually spent, because most new faculty do not spend their library start-up funds during the available time window. The expectation is that the Library will manage the funds in such a way as to ensure that the collections needs of newly hired faculty are met. The policy was approved by the CP/EVC in January 2015 and it will be reviewed in 2018-19.

Review of Proposed Revision to Librarians Series: APM-360 & APM-210-4

The committee reviewed on April 14, 2016 the proposed changes to the Academic Personnel Manual, which applies to unrepresented librarians. The changes were intended to align policies for unrepresented librarians to those for represented librarians (which had recently changed). The committee found these changes unproblematic.

Respectfully submitted;

COMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY AND SCHOLARLY COMMUNICATION

TJ Demos (F,W)

Michael Cowan (S)

Howard Haber (W)

Catherine Jones

Frank Gravier, LAUC Vice Chair

Nicolas Meriwether, LAUC Chair

Gabriela Ramirez-Chavez, GSA (W,S)

Kevin Karplus (*F, W*)
Bakthan Singaram (*F*)
Graeme Smith (*S*)
Elizabeth Cowell, *ex-officio*
Eileen Zurbriggen, Chair

August 31, 2016