COMMITTEE ON LIBRARY AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY
ANNUAL REPORT TO THE RIVERSIDE DIVISION
DECEMBER 5, 2017

To be received and placed on file:

The Committee on Library and Information Technology (LIT) met eight times during the 2016-2017 academic year. Following is a summary of Committee activities from September 1, 2016 to August 31, 2017.

The Committee reviewed eFile and made several suggestions to Computing and Communications to improve the software. Israel Fletes, Director of Educational and Computing Services, noted that several improvements will be worked on in early summer. More extensive changes will be part of a complete rewrite of the system planned to be completed by September 2018.

The committee also reviewed e-Buy, iGrade, and iLearn and made several suggestions to Computing and Communications to improve the software systems.

Steven Mandeville-Gamble and Alison Scott met with the committee and noted that UCR Library's print collections contain many items that are not often used, and many that are duplicated in other University of California on-campus libraries and in regional library facilities. Since on-campus library space is limited and library collections keep growing, a collection review will be conducted to allow UCR to ensure that library collections and library spaces are effectively managed.

Print items in UCR collections may be transferred to the Southern Regional Library Facility (SRLF) for permanent retention when they meet the following criteria:

- The Library has no evidence of use for a minimum of fifteen years,
- They are not already held in a regional library facility, or are held in only one or two other UC library collections, and
- They are understood to be of permanent value for research.

Print items in UCR collections may be withdrawn from the UCR on-campus collection in lieu of deposit at the SRLF when they meet the following criteria:

- The Library has no evidence of use for at least fifteen years, and
- They are already held in a UC regional library facility or in two or more other on-campus UC library collections.

Criteria for review

- Monographs
  - All printed books within call number range under review with no record of use for at least 15 years
- Serials
  - Print journals for which UCR Library has digital access with perpetual rights to permanent archive (such as JSTOR Scholarly Journal Archive)
  - UCR print subscription ceased or was cancelled more than 5 years prior to start of review for specific call number range

All items noted to have not been used for more than 15 years will be placed on a list and reviewed by librarians and forwarded to the faculty library liaisons in the departments for further review. There are approximately 300,000 items in Rivera Library that have not been used for more than 15 years. A member noted to that it would be great to have electronic versions of books transferred to the Southern Regional Library Facility (SRLF) available to UCR users.

Dani Cook, Director of Teaching and Learning, and the Chair of the Library's OneSearch Task Force, met with the committee to discuss OneSearch (the large search box on the homepage) and obtain committee feedback. She noted that they are currently in the process of putting together focus groups to improve this tool. They will be engaging with library users, including faculty, graduate students, and undergraduate students. The committee offered the following ideas/comments: eBooks do not show up in the catalog; OneSearch directs members to outside facilities even though the item is in the UCR library; searching for journal articles is cumbersome; google scholar should link to the article in the library; narrowing the search would be helpful, eg. when searching for films, the system should only show films in the results; the results should have an icon to identify if it's a film, book, etc.; there is currently no link to OneSearch from relevant UCR websites that come up on a Google search for it; include an advanced search option; and should be able to toggle thru Scotty and Melville.

Danna Gianforte, Vice Chancellor Computing & Communications, noted that UCR's core systems are not up to date including licensing and UCR's core system database and retention is not enterprise level. There is currently no disaster recovery in place. UCR's systems would be down for days if something were to happen. UCR is looking into the contract that UC has with Century Link. Their primary data center, located in Irvine, is a seismic level 4. The data center on campus has several infrastructure issues which also impacts academic space.

Mike Kennedy, Chief Technology Officer, met with the committee and gave an update on UCR's IT infrastructure. He noted the following about the previous state of UCR's IT infrastructure: the system was about ten years old; it is very slow with frequent failures; very little data was sent offsite; and management overhead was high. The strategy moving forward will be to focus on enterprise systems and make sure it can withstand both local and regional disasters, with backup both locally at Hunter Park and in Berkeley. UCR will be using Exagrid Systems for backup storage solutions and Veeam to backup software. There is currently a daily backup and data is retained for thirty days.

The LIT committee was notified that Banner does not allow students to print unofficial transcripts. Unofficial transcripts are very important to both students and faculty. From the faculty perspective, we write many letters of recommendation for students and generally ask each student to provide an unofficial copy of their transcript so that we can put our observations in the broader context of the student's academic record. These requests are usually time-sensitive, requiring the student to provide this information more-or-less immediately. With Jim Sandoval's approval, the Registrar's office is moving forward with implementing unofficial transcripts for the campus at large in R'Web as a new function of student self-service. The goal is to have this functionality available to students by the beginning of the fall quarter. The Grad Division can currently print them now upon request. It was also noted, that faculty have access to screens in banner that show all courses and grades.

The committee agreed to support the OA2020 initiative launched by the Max Planck Digital Library, which aims to facilitate the "large-scale implementation of free online access to, and largely unrestricted use and re-use of scholarly research articles," aspirationally by the year 2020. Four U.S. campuses have signed the Expression of Interest (EoI) (Cal State Northridge, UC Berkeley, UC Davis and UC San Francisco). The end-result would be "Gold" access (published version publicly available), rather than the "Green" access (authors final version being available) which is an option under the UC Open Access Policy.

The UC *Pay It Forward* study attempted to uncover the basic cost of publishing an article independent of any particular publishing infrastructure, and found that article publishing costs were too context-dependent to yield a reliable base cost. Some new publishing entrants (both commercial and institutionally-based) are able to publish at a very low cost, while many existing publishers, both commercial and nonprofit (e.g. many societies), have much higher cost structures. The *Pay It Forward* study argued that under an APC (Article Processing Charge) model, the most likely way to reduce per-article costs *to the consumer* (i.e. to lower prices) is to give authors a financial stake in paying for OA publication in those journals; since journals compete for authors (not for library business), and authors are likely to be price-sensitive in choosing where to publish. This resulting market dynamic should at a minimum restrain price increases, and at best reduce prices (and the costs underlying them) over time.

UC's *Pay It Forward* study looked at the impact of a transition to APC-based OA publishing on individual academic institutions in North America, with particular reference to large academic institutions that have high publishing output. This study found that under an APC model, the cost to large North American research-intensive institutions would increase as a result of their high publishing output, while the cost to smaller institutions would decrease, in some cases dramatically. In the *Pay It Forward* analysis, several of UC's smallest campuses would see lower costs compared to their current subscription expenditures, several would see comparable costs to today, and several of the largest institutions would see higher costs. Because high publishing output, research-intensive institutions are few in number compared to the number of academic institutions that exist in North America overall, a shift to an OA model based on APCs would yield a significant financial benefit to most academic institutions.

A funding analysis developed in the study combined current library subscription funds with some grant and institutional funds, and proposed several viable models that covered the costs of publication. However, in order for this to have Senate approval, it will need to go through a full Senate review.

The Committee reviewed and provided feedback on the following:

- Systemwide Review of Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition (PDST) Policy – Proposed Revised Policy. The committee noted the following: 1) Section 4.a.iii. – add "including Library & Information Technology resources required by the program" to the end of "uses of the PDST funds" to ensure equitable support of these critical campus resources. 2) Section 5 states, "Multi-year plans shall be reviewed and approved within a time frame that supports adequate planning and preparation for both students and their graduate professional degree program." The number of years constituting a multi-year plan should be indicated. The new policy provides no definition of the meaning of "multi-year". The previous Regents Policy 3103 indicated a maximum of three years. The Committee would like these issues to be addressed in the proposal.

- Campus Review of New Graduate Program Proposal – Biophysics Interdepartmental Graduate Program. The committee sees no significant increase in library acquisitions will be needed for the program and no increases in computing costs and therefore did not have any concerns with the proposal.

- Systemwide Review of Draft Presidential Unmanned Aircraft System (UAS) Policy. The committee noted the there was concern over how the Policy would be enforced. There seems to be no statement regarding the entity responsible for enforcing Systemwide regulations. Thus while a "Designated Local Authority" is charged with overseeing enforcement of local UAS related policies, and UCOP EH&S for the Systemwide policy, it is not stated how enforcement would occur and what the consequences of policy violations would be. Two more specific issues not addressed in the policy document were of concern to the committee. 1) The potential effects of drone noise on students studying, taking examinations, or listening to lectures, and on research that may be sensitive to ambient noise. It would seem appropriate to place Systemwide limits on noise levels, which could be tailored locally to protect sensitive locations. 2) The potential for drones to harvest electronic information regarding campus email traffic and other IT. A ban on the use of such technical surveillance equipment would seem appropriate.

- Systemwide Review of Proposed Presidential Policy on Export Controls. The goal of the policy is to ensure compliance with Federal export controls, bearing in mind that the Fundamental Research Exclusion (FRE) exempts most research. The committee noted two issues. First, the policy repeatedly refers to "training" as a solution. Too much Faculty time is already spent on peripheral issues without campuses requiring yet more training that is only relevant to a vanishingly small fraction of individuals. We agree that the training of "gatekeepers" is important (p11) - provided that "gatekeeper" (which is not defined in the current policy) is defined narrowly to include only those directly involved in the oversight of the local Export Control Compliance program, and those faculty involved in research not covered by the FRE. The policy is too vague on this important issue. For example, it is suggested that the whole campus community (faculty, staff and students) needs training (see p12). Such a broad-brush approach may satisfy a policymaker, but is a huge waste of valuable time. The policy should be crystal clear that training should be focused only on those who need it. Second, it is noted on p3-4 that object (executable) code is exempt under the EAR, but on p11 (bottom) it is stated that Faculty should be cautious (and contact the local Export Control Officer) regarding various items of "software". Based on the EAR definition, it must be assumed by the reader that this caution about software only relates to the source code, but this specificity needs to be made very clear. The distinction between having the source code vs. having an executable is a huge one and should not be a source of potential confusion.

- Systemwide Review of Proposed Revised Policy: Draft Revised Presidential Policy on Electronic Information Security (IS-3). The Committee would have liked more time to deliberate on this policy document; however, some concerns were immediately apparent. Our most obvious concern is the length of the document. It is positively encyclopedic and yet presented in a form that makes it very difficult (if not impossible) for faculty to identify pertinent information. Faculty appear to be defined under the very non-specific terms of "Unit Head" and "Workforce Manager", both of which appear to encompass a huge range of positions (in addition to faculty) that have very different

perspectives and responsibilities. The committee suggests preparing a document with sections focused on different groups rather than attempting (and largely failing) to have complete generality. For example, it would be more effective if the policy clearly distinguishes faculty from the various levels of administrator, and those faculty with sensitive data (i.e. P3 and P4 information) from those who do not (i.e. only P1 and P2 information). A number of very important issues potentially affecting faculty are glossed over. For example, it is noted in section 1.2.1 that there may be sanctions against faculty and student for "serious violations" of the policy, but the actions that constitute "serious violation" never appear to be defined. Moreover, it is stated that a Unit will bear the cost of a "significant failure to comply" (section 1.2.2). Does this mean the faculty grants or faculty individually are financially liable for any problems that occur regarding a laboratory or office computer? Again, this issue is never expanded beyond the simple statement of potential liability. In summary, this Policy is written as a legal document rather than a document that faculty can refer to in order to understand best practices. As such, it should be substantially revised and rewritten.

- Campus Review of Proposal for a New Master Degree in Supply Chain and Logistics Management. The committee reviewed this proposal, which indicates that Library and IT support will come from the indirect cost revenue generated by the program. Specifically, it is stated that Library acquisitions and computing are allocated in the line "Instructional Databases, IT & Course Materials". Unfortunately, this line is not provided in the Financial Table referred to; however, it is stated that revenue will be distributed according to principles used for other SoBA courses. Notwithstanding the lack of detail, the proposal does not appear to impose any undue burden on Library and IT resources, thus from this perspective the committee approves the proposal.

- Campus Review of Proposed Changes to CNAS Bylaws N1.1, N2.1, N3, N3.1, N3.1.1, N3.1.3, N3.1.4, N3.1.5, N4.1, N4.1.1, N4.1.1.1, N4.1.1.3, N4.1.2.2, N4.1.2.7, N4.1.2.8, N4.3. Of the proposed CNAS bylaw changes, only the proposal to disestablish the CNAS library committee, (by deletion of section 4.2), was considered relevant to the charge of the committee. The committee agrees with the justification presented and has no objection to the deletion of this section.

Committee Chair, Len Nunney, attended meetings of the University Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication and Vice Chair, Laura Harris, attended meetings of the University Committee on Libraries and Scholarly Communication. Both provided regular reports back to the Committee.

Respectfully submitted,
Len Nunney, Chair
Laura Harris, Vice Chair
John Baez
Joseph Genereux
Adam Harmer
Jiayu Liao
Matthew Mahutga
Molly McGarry
Lisa Raphals
Daniel Wong

Steven Mandeville-Gamble, University Librarian (*ex officio*)
Danna Gianforte, Associate Vice Chancellor Computing & Communications and Chief Information Officer (*ex officio*)
Hayden Jackson, ASUCR Student Representative
Holly Mayton, GSA Student Representative