Librarian Association of the University of California
Executive Board Conference Call
Thursday, March 5, 2015 1-3pm
ReadyTalk [Please use the toll-free number 866-740-1260 and the access code 9181033#]

MINUTES

President Matt Conner called the meeting to order at 1:03pm.

    A.   Roll Call (Christina Woo)

President:	Matt Conner
Vice-President/President-Elect:	Diane Mizrachi
Past President:	[Nick Robinson not able to attend]
Secretary:	Christina Woo
Parliamentarian:	Dean Rowan
SLASIAC representative:	Susan Koskinen
SAG 1 representative:	[Diane Gurman not able to attend]
SAG 2 representative:	Susan Perry
SAG 3 representative:	[Angela Riggio not able to attend]
Web Manager:	Julie Lefevre
Assembly Planning:	Penny Coppernoll-Blach

LAUC-B:	Lynn Jones for Rita Evans, Chair
LAUC-D:	Bruce Abbott
LAUC-I:	Keith Powell
LAUC-LA:	Lynda Tolly (Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect for Rikke Ogawa, Chair)
LAUC-M:	Elizabeth McMunn-Tetangco
LAUC-R:	Rhonda Neugebauer
LAUC-SD:	Penny Coppernoll-Blach
LAUC-SF:	Evans Whitaker
LAUC-SB:	[Kristen LaBonte not present]
LAUC-SC:	Deborah Murphy

Committee chairs:

Diversity	Carla Arbagey
CPG/Comm. on Professional Governance	Matt Conner (President) and Dean Rowan (Parliamentarian) reporting
R&PD/Research &Professional Development	Diane Mizrachi

B.   Announcements (M. Conner) - none

C.   Meeting Goals:

    1.   Assembly Arrangements

D. Approval of minutes – February 5, 2015 and September 11, 2014 (Christina Woo) - both meeting minutes were approved

E. Review of action items from February minutes (M. Conner)

1. Diane Mizrachi to poll R&PD/Research & Professional Development committee members on local research funding - **DONE**
2. Approved R&PD/Research & Professional Development committee guidelines sent to Web Manager Julie Lefevre for posting to the website – **ONGOING** Diane has not done this yet for use next year.
3. CPG/Committee on Professional Governance draft recommendations distributed to the general membership – **DONE** (on March 11)
4. Continued development of Assembly topics – **DONE** by email, but we'll continue to work on this at today's meeting, under H. Old/Ongoing Business: Assembly Topics.
5. Webinar topics sent to CC/Coordinating Committee [we had agreed on 2 topics for March—one on HathiTrust and one on the Harvester Open Access tool] – **DONE** – Sent to Rosalie Lack, chair of the Coordinating Committee, who is back from her February absence, so the CC will discuss our recommendations. For the webinars to be successful, we need to do some work, such as figuring out the motive, harm, consequences, and relate the topics to LAUC member concerns.
6. APM/Academic Personnel Manual draft changes to be distributed when they become available. Janet Lockwood (Manager, Academic Policy & Compensation at UCOP's Academic Personnel and Programs – see http://www.ucop.edu/academic-personnel-programs/staff/index.html) had said they might be ready in February, but they weren't, so this is **ONGOING**.

F. Systemwide Committee Reports

1. R&PD/Research and Professional Development committee (Diane Mizrachi)

A survey of the campuses showed that 5 LAUC divisions offer local funding for presentations, research, etc. Diane at first thought that it was unfair that half of the LAUC divisions do not offer local funding, but the amount and type of professional development funding vary from campus to campus. On some campuses, such as at UCLA, funding varies even within a campus. Thanks to a private donor, UCLA BioMed librarians get more funding than other UCLA librarians. For next year, Diane said it would be interesting to get more details on how this is handled at the various campuses.

At UCLA, each LAUC-LA member gets $760 for professional development—which most people use for conference travel— and they may also apply for up to an additional $500 for research/presentation funding. Those who succeed have $1,260 for that year. LAUC-D members get about $1,000 for travel, and there's a separate fund for research. Learning more about individual practices in our divisions would require another survey. Diane is considering charging next year's R&PD Committee to look into this.

Diane reported that the call for the second round of presentation grants went out; the deadline was last Friday. R&PD received 25 applications for presentation grants that total $17,268. There is only $4,921 left to distribute. To divide this evenly would give each applicant just under $200. This is better than nothing but falls far short for many. Diane asked for our creative thinking on how best to handle this in a fair way. She has also asked for input from her committee members. For example, should applicants who received funding from the first round get less or no funding? Consider the location (travel distance) of the event? Give everyone small but equal funding? Give more funding to early-career applicants? Please contact her and/or the Exec Bd with your ideas.

No. of presentation grant requests by campus: Berkeley 6; Irvine 5; Riverside, Santa Barbara, and San Diego 3 each; LA and Davis 2 each; San Francisco 1.

Let's continue on this via email. While this funding distribution challenge is difficult, it is good that so many applications came in—and from so many campuses (unlike last year)—and that the revision in the calendar has spread out the availability of the funding.

2. Nominating Committee (Nick Robinson)

Nick is away. The slate is completed with 2 candidates for each position. This completes the work of the Nominating Committee.

3. Website Revision Ad Hoc (Julie Lefevre)

Two significant milestones to report: The first is the development team has completed the preliminary build of the new website in Drupal. Second, as part of that build, the programmers were able to import the table of grant recipients programmatically—a major accomplishment. Julie has been importing content from the old site to test the functionality and architecture, and she's been giving feedback to the development team. The whole committee will meet next week to review the beta site. The goal at the meeting will be to finalize the architecture and navigation. The next step will be to migrate content to the new site. Expect to have a demo for the next (April) Exec Bd meeting. The expected roll out date is close to May.

4. Diversity (Carla Arbagey)

Continuing to work on Meet our Members project. Next, the committee will create a timeline and outline of criteria for choosing which members to feature and will present them to the Exec Bd, such as the questions for members to answer about themselves. Eventually the committee wants to post a form on the website for members to complete. Until then, they're using a Google form.

5. Assembly Planning (Penny Coppernoll-Blach)

The local committee at UCSD is working on getting a website and registration ready, likely by next week—all of the logistics are on track. Matt Conner is concerned about tech support for our afternoon session. We're hoping for some sort of live-casting recording of our afternoon sessions (CoUL/Council of University Librarians presentation on the future of the workforce; panels on redesign at various campuses). For the CoUL session we are hoping for at least recording and maybe live-casting, plus a chat function, but no off-site presenters. For the redesign panels, just audio recording, since costs are a consideration.

Matt sent out details for how to make travel arrangements. Use the website to make a reservation online and get university discounts. This requires that you pay upfront, then get reimbursed. The other option has UCOP pay for your travel. What is not paid for by UCOP could be paid for by local funding, depending on the campus.

Once the Assembly website is up, we need reports by the Executive officers, committee members, and system representatives.
ACTION: Matt will request the appropriate people for specific reports for the Assembly website.

Checking on delegates: Division chairs should check the roster Matt Conner will send out to verify names and correct number of delegates.
ACTION: Matt will send out a roster on who is coming from the campuses

6. CPG/Committee on Professional Governance (Matt Conner, Dean Rowan)

The committee sent out the CPG draft recommendations on Feb. 11; feedback from the general membership is due tomorrow, March 6. The original timeline was for CPG to revise the draft, incorporating the feedback, in two weeks--by March 20. The Special Assemblies on April 7 (1-3pm) and 14 (11-1pm) have changed that, since they are taking place later than we'd originally hoped. That gives CPG extra time—all of March--to digest the feedback from the general membership.

The better the draft (more convincing and reflective of the membership), the easier it will be Special Assembly to do its work. CPG will have weekly conference calls in addition to email.
ACTION: Deadline for campus reports to Matt Conner is March 6.

As soon as the CPG revisions are written up, they take the form of a motion. Parliamentary procedure requires that LAUC Exec Bd—as the charging body—formally "accept" or "receive" it in order for it to move forward. This is not the same as approving it, but is part of the process. This will take place via Survey Monkey in late March.

ACTION: Matt will put out a bspace email for Exec Bd members to comment.

Matt Conner briefly went over the 3 campus reports received so far:
- UCLA's 3 responses: stay with the status quo and force Human Resources to figure out the membership problem; approve option B with some C mixed in; find different criteria for membership based on work instead of title codes.
- Irvine: too detailed to do it justice, includes survey data
- Riverside: stay with the status quo.

Dean Rowan clarified that "the status quo" means a bylaw definition of what we understand the rules to be—*not* to leave the bylaws as they are. At present they are troubling and difficult to figure out. CPG needs to introduce language that clarifies what "status quo" means. Matt took advantage of the librarians from these campuses in today's conf. call to get more detail about their reports and shared some of the CPG discussions that had considered various options/approaches.

7. UCOLASC/Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication - summary of Feb. 27 mtg. in Oakland (Matt Conner)

UCOLASC is the Academic Senate committee that interfaces with library issues—see http://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/committees/ucolasc/ . Matt Conner represents LAUC, and Lorelei Tanji (UL at UCI) represents CoUL/Council of University Librarians.

In the morning, UC Press Director Alison Mudditt (http://www.ucpress.edu/about.php?p=director) outlined a new scheme of Open Access for books. Each monograph published loses $10,000. A new program, to change this, involves digitizing books, funded by a variety of sources in addition to the press: the author, the library, the academic unit, and others. Literature professor Richard Terdiman (UCSC) spoke on the problems of humanities publishing. He noted that the UC Press stopped publishing humanities books in 2011, so UC Press responded with a new humanities series, FlashPoints (http://www.ucpress.edu/series.php?ser=ucfla) that kind of had an Open Access model. The professor is still dissatisfied and asked UCOLASC to recommend a special, systemwide committee to study humanities publishing and its role in the university. He fears that without such action the UC will turn into a giant MIT, where the humanities are marginalized. This led Matt to think more about Open Access and the economics of humanities publishing—all quite complicated and not well understood by anyone at the meeting. He followed up with Dr. Terdiman to say librarians could play a role in whatever committee is created, since we've all thought a lot about Open Access—more than most faculty.

Afternoon session: UCOP General Counsel came to discuss copyright. [NB: these are the folks who ultimately will decide on our bylaws.] What is the copyright status of software code? There is copyright protection for written text, why not also code—the computer scientists' intellectual output? The computer science field has outpaced the law, which is trying to catch up. The answer may be patents. A couple more presentations from CDL on an editing model that is completely in the cloud,

like a Google Docs model. Finally, a report on OA: Harvester is up and in use to smooth out the logistical hassle of depositing. It has been hugely successful—a 24-fold increase at UCLA alone. The other pilot campuses --Irvine and SF--will have numbers soon.

G. Advisory Groups

1. SLASIAC Systemwide Library and Scholarly Information Advisory Committee (Susan Koskinen)
   http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/slasiac/

   SLASIAC had a conference call all morning on Feb. 27. Highlights: Laine Farley is retiring, and she's been an integral part of SLASIAC since CDL started, so the committee will play a role in the search for a new CDL head. Tom Andriola (http://www.ucop.edu/information-technology-services/units/immediate-office/bio-tom-andriola.html) is working on the joint UC planning for infrastructure: "Next Generation Research and the University of California: Planning for the Future of UC's Cyber Infrastructure" is an all-day conference at UCLA on March 23. It will look at the plan of action for the next five years—see http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/groups/files/coul/docs/meeting_docs_2014-15/VCR_CIO_Summit_Purpose_Spring_Conference_2015.pdf Speakers include Michael Pazzani, UC Riverside Vice Chancellor for Research and Economic Development, and Larry Conrad, UC Berkeley CIO and Associate Vice Chancellor for Information Technology. They would like librarians to attend. Send a note to Tom Andriola.

   Susan Carlson gave an update on the OA/Open Access policy; LAUC has sent comments. Catherine Mitchell also gave an update on the UC OA policy. Laine Farley talked about OA activities and involvement. Lorelei Tanji (Chair, CoUL) gave an update on the RLF/Regional Library Facilities development, including what to do next as they fill up. They're leaning toward building something or using an existing building, if they can find one. The timeline is way out there, however.

   Lorelei Tanji also spoke about "collective digitization" of food and beverage collections across the campuses. This is a SAG 3 project. The embargo of Electronic Theses & Dissertations (ETDs) was discussed, and will be taken up again in May.

2. SAG 1/Scholarly Research & Communication (Diane Gurman)
   http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/sag1

   Diane submitted this after the meeting: The last SAG 1 conference call was on February 20, 2015. The meeting began with an announcement about Fair Use Week, which began on February 23. See http://fairuseweek.org/ for the materials people posted. Next, there was a short update about the ORCID (http://orcid.org/) Project Team, which was going to have its first meeting later in the week. This was followed by further comments about the SAG 1 work plan.

   There was a brief mention of the proposed OSC/Office of Scholarly Communication blog, and a call for topics—preferably ones that are new and controversial. Here is the current draft document circulated by Catherine Mitchell, Director, Access & Publishing, CDL, and OSC Operations Director (http://osc.universityofcalifornia.edu/about-osc/): https://docs.google.com/document/d/10V2YhMHqK2BJW3JlpqlCtqiheZWeUQygV_7-RPyZjWE/edit

   Finally, part of the conference call centered around a 2013 document, **UC Libraries Strategic Agenda for Shared Data Curation** (*see Appendix*), which CoUL/Council of University Librarians asked SAG to respond to. A suggestion was made to consult with campuses, in order to turn the generalizations in the document into concrete actions, where possible. SAG has already received comments from UCLA.

3. SAG 2/Access, Discovery & Infrastructure (Susan Perry)
   http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/sag2

   SAG 2 has been hearing reports from lots of projects and working teams. They reviewed policies from the UCLDC/UC Libraries Digital Collections group and commented on them. Because CoUL's plans and priorities document did not assign them much this year, they are working on their own to decide where to go on the areas in their jurisdiction, including discovery and digital asset management. They have working groups focusing on these topics.

4. SAG 3/Collection Building & Management (Angela Riggio)
   http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/sag3

   Angela submitted this after the meeting: We had one meeting on February 25 since our last LAUC Exec Board meeting. Those minutes have been published; once again I encourage all to read them and send me any feedback or questions.

   Collaborative Digitization: the team finalized the charge for the Vendor Proposal Task Force.

   Collection Librarians Group Guidelines: the timeline and tasks for sending out the announcement and guidelines was discussed. The Science and Engineering Librarians submitted a request to have an in-person meeting. This was approved by SAG 3; expenses will be supported by the campuses.

   Shared Print Update: Emily Stambaugh, CDL's manager of shared print, joined the call to give an update on the Journal Archiving Campaign. This was endorsed by CoUL/Council of University Librarians and scheduled to begin in July. SAG 3 wants feedback from its members and from CoUL on the processes involved with collection analysis, and the amount of engagement that would be required for this to be successful. This will be revisited on a future call, once feedback is gathered.

H. Old/Ongoing Business

1. Assembly Topics (Matt Conner)

Brian Schottlaender and Tammy Dearie (UCSD) will address our concerns about the Librarian Series:

Referrring to bspace wiki on Librarian Series Issues II document—*see Appendix.* Matt Conner opened the meeting for comments and discussion.   This is for our Spring Assembly 1-2pm session, where UCSD UL Brian Schottlaender and UCSD AUL for Enterprise Services Tammy Dearie will present on this topic. We'd like to involve CoUL, too, and we'll send our discussion points next week, so they can formulate a response. At present we have 4 numbered points and questions and concerns under each:

1. The librarian series and LAUC has seen a steady reduction of numbers that was recognized at least as far back as 1998 where this was observed in a report by the Committee on Professional Governance (CPG). Where do you see this trend going and what are its implications for the UC library workforce?
2. APM 360-4 definition of the librarian series
3. The creation of two classes of library professionals, inside the librarian series and out, has caused a good deal of confusion and divisiveness as reported by librarians and administrators
4. Administrative creep. There is a concern that this phenomenon in higher education is appearing in the hiring plans of UC libraries. Some divisions report an administrator to librarian ratio of 1:2. There is general recognition of the need for new administrative approaches and for making our operation more efficient and scalable. However, LAUC has some concerns.

Looking at 2: Need to reference MOU article 4 in addition to the APM, because its language is the same, so Matt will add that.

Looking at 3.3 Concern: "LAUC's first of two concerns here is based on our ongoing revision of LAUC's Position Paper 5: The Librarian as Academic. LAUC understands professional library work as a form of stewardship comprehending the fundamental library services of reference, instruction, collection building and the services that support them. These activities rely on a unique mix of skills and values developed from an MLS and professional experience. Extracting specialties out of this, elevating them with higher salaries, and separating them with different administrative statuses potentially hurts the compensation of the librarian series and devalues its work."

Rikke Ogawa's bspace comments. Recommendation that we be more concise? Or keep the nuances? Let's not avoid bringing up salaries—a cause of the problem--but not let them be the main issue.

Looking at 3.4 Concern: Some thought of making this more concise, with fewer nuances. Let's keep this as it is.

2ⁿᵈ afternoon session: Campus Redesign at Berkeley, Davis, San Diego, Santa Cruz (10 min. each if we include 4 campuses; 15 min. if 3 campuses)   Which campuses do we want to include? And whom to invite to present?

Berkeley: Susan Edwards spoke at last year's Assembly, so we don't need to invite her again on the same topic. AUL Beth Dupuis, one of the chief architects of the redesign, and Brian Quigley, who's been at Berkeley a long time, would be good speakers. Matt will contact them.

Davis: Matt Conner and Bruce Abbott will come up with names soon. If they don't come up names next week, Davis will pass.

San Diego: Roger Smith, a program director, plus one or two other people. Penny Coppernoll-Blach will follow up.
Santa Cruz: Elizabeth Cowell is not available. AUL Robin Chandler might be good to include and was involved in the redesign process. The other AUL, John Bono, is brand new and did not participate in the process.

ACTION: Matt will follow up with the Division chairs to identify speakers

We need a moderator and someone to monitor the chat questions. Carla Arbagey volunteered for the chat questions. Rhonda Neugebauer would like to moderate the redesign session. Penny Coppernoll-Blach volunteered to introduce the Librarian Series session.

2.   Webinar Series

At our last meeting we sent in two topics for March. Now the ball is in the CC/Corodinating Committee's court, so we're essentially done for now. Afterward, Lorelei Tanji (CoUL chair) suggested a different approach, but Matt hasn't put it on the bspace wiki yet.

ACTION: Matt will post Lorelei Tanji's idea on the wiki.

I. New Business - none

J. Round Robin of Divisions

LAUC-B (Lynn Jones for Rita Evans)

Holly Hathaway has begun as the the division head for the Arts & Humanities libraries, a result of the redesign to put libraries into groups. LAUC-B members' professional development funding has been cut back to the minimum the contract requires. This is a crisis they are wrestling with.

LAUC-D (Bruce Abbott)

Interviewing for head of the directorate for online strategies. First candidate is being interviewed today. Will also be posting a number of new positions.   Amy Kautzman, AUL for Academic Services, has left to become UL of Sacramento State.   Continuing to evaluate the Ithaka survey conducted a month and a half ago. Matt Conner later commented on a disruptive patron at UC Davis who was banned for a year for bad behavior, but he got to come back, because he wasn't actually threatening someone. He was noisy and contemptuous of library staff who confront him, but he never attacked anyone. Carla Arbagey recommended that the UC Davis library staff contact UCR's Anne Frenkel, who had similar experience with a disruptive person in the library. It took a lot to ban her. From Berkeley, Lynn Jones offered a code of conduct for patrons that they have gone over with the police. It is very detailed.

LAUC-I (Exec Bd Secretary Christina Woo read Chair Keith Powell's report)

Since our last LAUC Exec Bd meeting, the LAUC-I ranks have grown by three: Kelly Spring left Johns Hopkins University to become the Archivist for Special Collections in Special Collections & Archives on February 17. Alison Regan left the University of Utah to become AUL for Public Services on March 2. Also starting that same day, Laura Smart became the head of a new unit, Electronic Resources and Digital Scholarship, leaving a position at Cal Tech.

The newest job posting is for Electronic Resources Acquisitions Librarian—Lisa Mackinder's position. Other ongoing searches include Research Librarian for the Health Sciences, Digital Resources and Serials Cataloging/Metadata Librarian, and Research Librarian for Teaching, Learning, and Education.

On March 3, LAUC-I held a special forum on the CPG/Committee on Professional Governance recommendations on membership. LAUC-I members could also provide input via an online survey, which closed on March 4.

LAUC-LA (Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect Lynda Tolly read Chair Rikke Ogawa's report)

Positions: We have 7 open academic/professional positions - Director of Library Special Collections (not in the Librarian series), Digital Archivist (librarian), Geospatial Resources Librarian, Law Reference Librarian, Acquisitions and Electronic Resources Librarian, Digital Scholarship Librarian, Music Inquiry and Research Librarian.

Marta Brunner has been made interim Director of Teaching and Learning Services until June, when she will leave UCLA to go to Skidmore College as the university librarian. Kelly Miller—not in the librarian series—was the incumbent. Marta was moved out of the librarian series for this assignment and so is no longer a member of LAUC-LA. This has been a great loss for or LAUC-LA community not only because of her wonderful insight, but also because she was a member of our Committee on Appointments, Promotions and Advancement (CAPA), and the move came just as CAPA was to begin its busy season of reviews.

Membership discussion: LAUC-LA hosted a discussion on membership changes on February 19th. No clear consensus came out of the discussion, though suggestions made during the meeting have been passed on to Matt Conner. The LAUC-LA Chair and Chair-elect also discussed the suggestions with the UCLA University Librarian.

UCLA's Graduate Student Association is asking for more flexibility with electronic deposits of dissertations and theses, in response to the American Historical Association's debate/recommendation of up to 6 years embargoing after filing in order to allow graduate students more time to transition the material into a book. The motion was brought to the attention of UCLA's academic senate Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication, who is considering writing a letter of support/concern to appropriate administrators on the issue.

LAUC-M (Elizabeth McMunn-Tetangco)

The UL search is over. Mr. Haipeng Li will start in June, leaving the UL position at Hong Kong Baptist University.

LAUC-R (Rhonda Neugebauer)

LAUC-R organized an event that will take place March 12. As part of the LAUC-R Chair's Program, Dan Tsang (UCI Social Sciences Data Librarian) was invited to speak at UCR on data librarianship, how he started his activities in the 1980s, and what he does with data now. The Lunchtime session included union members, where we discussed redesign and organizational changes in the UCs. The afternoon session, designed to appeal to lecturers, was on academic labor in an era of corporatization of academia.

Then, something new this week in Rhonda's 33-year-long career took place. Collection Development librarians' offices were inspected. Detailed questions were asked about the use of space, furniture, work files vs. personal files/materials, books. When Rhonda asked if any librarians participating in this conference call had experienced any inspections of this sort, no one had, except maybe for invited ergonomic fixes.

On the recruitment front, nine interviews took place in 30 days. Two searches failed, so it's good that there are now 6 temporary librarians on board. UCR is still pursuing full staffing.

LAUC-SD (Penny Coppernoll-Blach)

Peter Mueller starts as the new subject specialist for music, starting on March 1. He is not in librarian series. Sybil Schaeffer (sp?) is starting on April 1 as the digital preservation analyst librarian.

LAUC-SF (Evans Whitaker)

Nothing to report

LAUC-SB (Kristen LaBonte)

Kristen not present

<u>LAUC-SC (Deborah Murphy)</u>

Replaced our Senior Development Director (not in the librarian series).

K. Adjournment

Motion to adjourn: Rhonda Neugebauer.   Bruce Abbott seconds.   Ayes to adjourn at 2:43pm

Next conference call date/time: April 9, 1-3pm   Because we will have so many LAUC meetings in April—
Special Assemblies on the 7th and 14th, and the annual Assembly on the 17th, the April 9 meeting may be short.
Still, we look forward to seeing the website demo.

Appendix:
SAG 1 report: LAUC representative Diane Gurman submitted the document below as part of her monthly
report.

UC Libraries Strategic Agenda for Shared Data Curation
2/13/13

I. Background

The ten University of California Libraries and the California Digital Library have a long history of
successful collaboration that is frequently held up as a model for the larger UC system. If this history has
taught a lasting lesson, it is that collaboration early in the adoption of any technological or business
innovation results in greater success and savings of time and costs as compared to attempting
collaboration after the campuses have gone in different directions.

The time is ripe for the UC Libraries to collaborate on their strategy for supporting digital or e-research,
and particularly research data curation. There is ample evidence that, across the UC system, the demand
for data curation and other e-research services is strong. While much of the technology of data
production and curation has come into existence only in recent years, the obligation to manage
information, preserve it, and ensure access to it over time has always been a core activity of academic
research libraries. Expanding the scope of e-research is, therefore, a logical extension of what academic
libraries have always done. In recognition of both the demand for e-research services and the
appropriateness of libraries having a role in this field, the UC Council of University Librarians has
identified data curation as a strategic priority.

To date, some of the UC Libraries have done enough significant work to prove that libraries have the
organizational structures and technological know how to play a role in e-research and data curation; at
the same time, the bulk of the UC campus libraries are new enough to this area that they have not yet

erected local organizational barriers that would have to be torn down or co-opted in order for systemwide cooperation to flourish. Nonetheless, in seeking to take advantage of this timely opportunity that will allow us to avoid redundancy and leverage collective strengths, the UC Libraries recognize that not all areas of collaboration will result in participation by all ten campuses and the CDL, and that the most likely outcome of collaboration will be a combination of Tier 1 (all participate) and Tier 2 (some participate) initiatives.

II. Potential Opportunities that Align with Strategic Priorities

The Library's particular role in e-research support and data curation will necessarily vary from campus to campus depending on the local IT and research infrastructure, research priorities and strengths, and campus priorities and politics. What we are seeking to identify with this agenda are strategic shared activities and services that the Libraries can jointly define, build, and govern to support the local activities of each campus.

- **Infrastructure Analysis and Development**
  E-research depends on sophisticated and expensive technical infrastructure, including high bandwidth gigabit networks, high performance computing clusters, petabyte-scale storage with varying persistence and security requirements, common analytical and visualization tools, and so on. Libraries by themselves are poorly positioned to acquire, manage and sustain this type of infrastructure, but campus and industry partnerships can leave gaps in the infrastructure necessary for aspects of data curation, e.g. the fixity management required for data preservation. An area of potential systemwide collaboration on e-research support involves identifying and developing solutions for specific infrastructural gaps that libraries need to fulfill their contribution to e-research support.

  There are further systemwide opportunities to collectively develop stand-alone tools that support e-research, such as the DMPTool currently under development by the CDL. Other examples of this are Researcher Profiling or Networking tools (e.g. VIVO, SciVal Experts, Pivot), and Virtual Research Environments (HUBzero, Mendeley, Research Hub). Yet other common infrastructure may involve simple components such as EZID and new initiatives such as ORCID that provide mechanisms for linking various research products together.

  In all cases, systemwide infrastructure may be jointly leased, purchased, or developed as appropriate, with its long-term sustainability in mind, and should leverage, or at least avoid duplicating, investments by individual campuses via local IT, research support groups, etc.

- **Shared Expertise (subject, technical, policy)**
  Many e-research support services require expertise that would be prohibitively expensive to recruit and retain on each campus, especially when they may have only occasional need for it. The Library system should explore creating models for sharing expertise in areas that support our

collective and individual e-research support goals. For example, we could jointly hire data specialists with particular subject-area expertise or expertise at working with a particular type of data or software tool; ontology experts to create new structures for metadata related to some new data type; legal and/or policy analysts with expertise in data; Postdoc or PhD-level researchers to serve as shared "reference" resource to researchers in their domain on any campus. Experience with CLIR fellows at CDL, UCD and UCLA provide opportunities to explore this area; similarly, we could build on expertise in IP/copyright issues that exist at CDL and UCLA in particular. This category is closely related to the Shared Services category above, although in some cases the expertise may not constitute a "service".

- **Training**
  Helping library staff and local researchers learn about aspects of e-research, particularly data curation, is a common activity across all the UC campuses. Exploring the commissioning, creation and provision of training, whether in-person, online, via print or multimedia educational resources, could be an effective way for the campuses to save time and expense and was identified as a high priority at recent workshops sponsored by CDL and SOPAG. There are already examples of this, e.g., the CDL's workshops and webinars on UC3 infrastructure for Library staff. Other examples are tutorials developed at a campus that have general applicability and can be published via shared e-learning infrastructure [http://www.lib.uci.edu/uc-research-tutorial/begin.html]. Examples exist of tutorials on GIS data management and other common library services that can be collected and expanded. We could initially develop a shared educational agenda for staff that, as a co-investment, would help us acquire the skills we need to be credible e-research collaborators on campus.

- **Shared Services**
  The UC Libraries have successfully developed a number of shared services in traditional areas, e.g., the Shared Cataloging Program for digital resources that the system licenses collectively. There are a variety of e-research and data curation-related services that the UC Libraries could develop collectively at one or more campuses, or at the CDL. Examples include Centers of Excellence for curating or analyzing specific types of data, shared metadata production for common data descriptive needs, or data enhancement. And finally, we could develop the platforms and services for peer-reviewed "data journals", leveraging eScholarship and/or possibly in conjunction with the UC Press, PLoS, or another non-profit and/or Open Access scholarly publisher.

- **Shared Collections**
  There are several opportunities for systemwide collection activities for e-research. For research datasets themselves, a service such as DataShare (UCSF and CDL) could be expanded in order to broadly share the intellectual output of the UC system. We could also identify key community or reference datasets that might be consortially-acquired (e.g. the LDC from the University of Pennsylvania). We could develop shared collection development and management policies to

"divide and conquer" the research data landscape, so that different campuses focus on different disciplines and/or data types.

- **Policy Advocacy**
  Research data involves legal, regulatory and policy issues that are new for libraries, and indeed for their parent institutions. Libraries have a long history of developing intellectual property guidelines to help faculty, students and researchers in their current research and teaching activities, so extending that role into research data, software, and other research products seems appropriate. It also provides an important counterweight to UC's technology licensing activities and counsel that are conservative and protective by nature, often at cross-purposes with researchers' goals. The UC Library system could establish a shared set of policy and security recommendations for research data of different types, along the lines of ARL's Fair Use Guidelines for traditional research materials (i.e. books, journals and media collections). However, careful collaboration with UCOP and campus constituents dealing with these issues (Offices of Research, General Counsel, Health Centers, SLASIAC Copyright subcommittee, etc.) would be critical for this work to be accepted by the UC research community.

- **Messaging and Marketing**
  Shared marketing and communication strategies and products that enable each library to improve its local outreach, similar to shared approaches to our communication on Scholarly Communication and Open Access, can save each library time and effort in developing effective messaging while allowing local tailoring. Messaging could include areas like the value of library engagement in e-research support and data curation, existing data-related library services, or for CDL-provided or other systemwide tools and services supporting e-research. The goal is clear and consistent communication across the research spectrum (i.e., students, postdocs, faculty, librarians, campus and UCOP administrators) regarding the existence and value of library data curation services.

III. Initial Action Plan

1. Develop use cases for each campus of likely e-research and data-related scenarios

2. Survey and evaluate existing UC-managed tools and services, including
   CDL DMPTool
   CDL EZID
   CDL DataUp
   CDL Merritt
   UCSD Chronopolis
   CDL eScholarship
   UCB Research Hub
   UCSF DataShare

UCSD Neuroscience Information Framework (NIF)

3 Identify potential partnerships within and outside UC, including
San Diego Supercomputer Center
Berkeley IST (Research Hub)
UCSF CTSI (DataShare)
DataCite
National Digital Stewardship Alliance
DuraSpace
Dataverse

4 Identify and analyze existing disciplinary data archives, including
ICPSR
DataONE
Dryad
NCBI
Figshare

5 Define possible governance structure(s) for new shared services. The new CoUL Advisory
Structure must accommodate this type of production-level shared service, including a well-
documented governance structure (e.g. business model, management structure, oversight
process). Existing stakeholders must be engaged (e.g. SLASIAC CDL involvement; UCOLASC).

6 Refine and prioritize the set of shared activities, with actions, and timeframes; finalize Strategic
Agenda by summer CoUL meeting.

Librarian Series Issues Ii

[Recently visited](#)
Librarian Series Issues Ii last modified by Matthew Conner on March 10, 2015 3:11:20 PM PDT

Note: Numbers do not signify order of importance and are for reference only.

1. The librarian series and LAUC has seen a steady reduction of numbers that was recognized at least as far
back as 1998 where this was observed in a report by the Committee on Professional Governance (CPG). Where
do you see this trend going and what are its implications for the UC library workforce?

2. APM 360-4 defines the librarian series as follows:

360-4

Definition

The librarian series is used for academic appointees who provide professional services in the University libraries in support of the University's educational, research, and public service functions. These services include:

1. selection and development of resources;
2. bibliographic control of collections and their organization for use;
3. reference and advisory services;
4. development and application of specialized information systems;
5. library administration and management; and
6. research where necessary or desirable in relation to the foregoing.

This passage is interpreted by some LAUC members as an imperative that individuals with academic training should be hired within the librarian series rather than in the various other positions both academic and non-academic that are proliferating at the UC libraries. What are your thoughts on APM 360-4?

3. The creation of two classes of library professionals, inside the librarian series and out, has caused a good deal of confusion and divisiveness as reported by librarians and administrators.

- 3.1 Question: Wouldn't it be easier for everyone if new professional hires were included within the librarian series? Would redefining the series in the APM offer a solution?

- 3.2 Question: If new professionals are hired outside of the librarian series for higher salaries, could they be included in the librarian series at an equivalent salary? Are there particulars on just what level of salary is necessary to attract new professionals? If money is not the only consideration in hiring outside of the librarian series what are other considerations? Concerns about "additional flexibility" for non-librarian series positions are not clear to LAUC as the AUL series, for example, has a certain amount of flexibility built into it. Conflicts of interest in the academic review of AULs that has been cited can be dealt with through a variety of recusal mechanisms. The membership would like to hear a fuller explanation for hiring professionals outside of the librarian series.

- 3.3 Concern: LAUC's first of two concerns here is based on our ongoing revision of LAUC's Position Paper 5: The Librarian as Academic. LAUC understands professional library work as a form of stewardship comprehending the fundamental library services of reference, instruction, collection building and the services that support them. These activities rely on a unique mix of skills and values developed from an MLS and professional experience. Extracting specialties out of this, elevating them with higher salaries, and separating them with different administrative statuses potentially hurts the compensation of the librarian series and devalues its work.

Comment RO: in the last sentence do we really need to bring in the "elevating them with higher salaries" piece? That was supposedly taken care of with the flexibility in the salary ranges for librarians with the new contract. It really just sounds petty to complain about money when the bigger issue is the philosophical separation of classes of professionals into academics and staff when all are expected to do academic work.

Comment DCR: Per our discussion, tone down the phrase to something more like, "to afford opportunities for a position to realize higher salaries…"

Comment MC: Rikke while salary may be less principled than the philosophical issues, the Exec Board seemed to feel that compensation is so central that it couldn't be left out and was worth retaining for emphasis.

- 3.4 Concern: The substitution of non-academic managers for academic status AULs has dire implications for the librarian series in the form of peer review. These positions traditionally review the librarian series, and the managerial classification potentially opens review responsibilities to people with no training in the academic areas of scholarship and independent professional activity. A lack of knowledge is the next thing to a lack of interest which leads to a lower priority compared to other things. While the MOU guarantees librarians freedom to work in four areas of responsibility: (1) job (2) University service (3) Professional service (4) research-- the activity in these areas is validated through the review process, and unsympathetic individuals could find a thousand ways to minimize the value of what is not in their area of interest. This process poses the real danger of eviscerating the academic character of librarianship and reducing it to a manager-based service activity after all. While LAUC appreciates the stated interests of ULs in safeguarding our interests as well as the qualifications of the reclassified administrators, people come and go and these intentions do not carry the weight of precedent and legal protection. In fact, these supportive elements could enable a mechanism that ultimately undermines the academic character of librarianship.

Comment RO: This sound like a long way of saying that managers who are non-academic could potentially have only the 'business' of the libraries in mind and leave out the academic nature of librarian jobs during review. Is that right? Also, in speaking with my UL, it was discussed that apparently this move of the AULs into senior management series was because the AULs portion of the APM (where their salary scale is?) has only been able to be reviewed once in 10 years (as dictated by UCOP, maybe?) and that the series that they are currently in were equivalent to that of deans or department chairs in previous years before the 'compensation-gate' scandal of the early 2000s. Just a little more background in case that helps with the framing of the questions.

Comment MC: Rikke, the Exec Board acknowledged the need to be concise. But the sense is that the longer version contains nuances that might engage CoUL and that the shorter version might seem like sloganeering that could be too easily dismissed.

4. Administrative creep. There is a concern that this phenomenon in higher education is appearing in the hiring plans of UC libraries. Some divisions report an administrator to librarian ratio of 1:2. There is general recognition of the need for new administrative approaches and for making our operation more efficient and scalable. However, LAUC has some concerns.

- 4.1 Concern: The contraction of the librarian series means that fewer people are doing the same workload.

- 4.2 Concern: There is a sense that administrative changes are not headed to relieve this burden anytime soon.

Comment RO: *4.3 question: In the minds of CoUL, has the nature of work changed so dramatically, that less librarians are needed to accomplish the tasks? If that is the case, what duties/activites have explicitly stated are unnecessary to continue at various campuses and has that happened?