

**SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON SCHOLARLY COMMUNICATION
ANNUAL REPORT 2005-2006**

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The Special Committee on Scholarly Communication (SCSC) met a total of 12 times (11 conference calls, one face-to-face meeting) during the 2005-2006 academic year. Members would also like to acknowledge the invaluable expertise and assistance that the following consultants provided to the committee: Karen Butter (University Librarians Chair), Daniel Greenstein (Assoc. Vice Provost --Scholarly Information), John Ober (California Digital Library), Lynne Withey (Editor, UC Press) and Julius Zelmanowitz (former Vice Provost, Academic Initiatives).

Responsibilities and Duties

SCSC's [charge](#) includes, but is not limited to: (1) investigating methods of cost-effective production and wide dissemination of scholarly works, both periodicals and monographs; evaluating possible business plans for production and distribution of these works; (2) ensuring that dissemination methods are optimal and of high quality, and can be used as the basis for peer review and academic advancement; (3) assessing the interest of scholarly societies of new methods of publication; and (4) consideration of the roles that the UC Press, the California Digital Library (CDL), and commercial publishers play in these new ventures.

SCSC fulfilled its charge by developing five white papers and two policy proposals that addressed challenges in the management of faculty copyright, journal publishing, monograph publishing, academic personnel processes, and scholarly societies. These white papers, which are described below, were accepted in principle by the Academic Council in April and were forwarded to the Academic Assembly, which endorsed them for transmittal to President Dynes. The work of SCSC has also been influential in the larger academic community. A number of books, articles, websites, and even weblogs have quoted or cited the SCSC white papers (see appendix).

[The Case of Scholars' Management of Their Copyright](#)

Motivated by the above-mentioned economic dysfunctions that decrease the UC community's access to scholarly materials and limit the dissemination and impact of UC's scholarship, this white paper called for:

- Faculty to transfer only the right of first publication to publishers;
- Faculty to routinely grant to the UC Regents a limited, irrevocable, perpetual, worldwide, non-exclusive license to place the faculty member's scholarly work in a non-commercial open-access repository for purposes of online dissemination and preservation on behalf of the author and the public;
- UC to explore and develop support services to assist faculty to manage their copyright and disseminate their scholarship;
- University stakeholders to develop information management services that allow the broadest access at the lowest sustainable cost to the scholar, students and the public.

Evaluation of Publications in Academic Personnel Processes

The committee also examined academic personnel processes with regard to new and emerging modes and venues for scholarly communication. It argued that publication in journals or books is not necessarily the predominant form of scholarly production in some fields. For example, faculty within the performing arts (music or dance) are often evaluated on their performances. Similarly, computer scientists often publish in proceedings of refereed conferences. Some UC physics departments assign equal weight to electronic journal articles for appointment and advancement cases. The white paper also noted that it would be disadvantageous to UC to discourage faculty away from these new venues simply because they are new. The paper made the following recommendations:

- The standard for evaluating scholarship should remain publications or presentations in peer-reviewed, refereed outlets, which do not necessarily need to be in print.
- Publishers of new and traditional books and journals should provide the following materials to evaluators: (1) Names and institutional affiliations of editors and referees; (2) names and institutional affiliations of authors for the past two or more years; (3) numbers of manuscript submissions and the acceptance rate for publication; and (4) copyright, open-access, and archival policies for the publication.
- It is the obligation of the evaluating department to assess the quality of both the publication and the publication outlet.
- UC should offer subventions to junior faculty to publish books in peer-reviewed presses.
- Academic personnel committees should consider new forms of scholarly communication, as well as new ways to evaluate it them, once they have been validated through experience.

The Case of Journal Publishing

Born out of the aforementioned crisis in journal pricing, this white paper calls for the journal publishers to do the following. First, they should concentrate on added value (peer review, editing, etc.) rather than ownership, which can be priced and valued independently. Second, they should pursue technological and organizational innovations to improve scholarly communication systems. The white paper also recommended that journal publishers should avoid monopoly pricing; provide transparent financial information; and enable permanent access to the scholarly record.

The Case of Scholarly Book Publishing

In writing this white paper, the committee responded to a crisis in scholarly monograph publishing in which opportunities for publishing in many fields have become increasingly scarce. Members also acknowledged that monographs remain critically important to scholarly communication and are often a requirement for scholarly advancement. In order to alleviate this crisis, the white paper recommends (1) experimenting with new publishing models, fully leveraging scholarly editorial expertise and digital technologies; (2) faculty, libraries, and scholarly book publishers should collaborate to capitalize on

each other's strengths; (3) indicators of scholarly quality that acknowledge the continuing value of the printed format should continue to be pursued, but the tacit requirement of print publications should be removed for acceptable scholarship; and (4) UC should rethink how university resources for monograph publishing are distributed. With regard to this last point, the white paper suggested offering subventions to non-tenured faculty to assist in the publication of peer-reviewed, high-quality scholarship.

Scholarly Societies and Scholarly Communication

Similar to the crisis in journal pricing, SCSC observed that some scholarly societies have begun to price their scholarly works above the minimum needed to maintain their publications. The committee views this practice simply as a way to provide additional income for the society, and considers it contrary to the traditional goal of providing the widest dissemination of new knowledge in their disciplines through the publication of these works. Therefore, this white paper urges scholarly societies to (1) sustain their publication of high-quality journals and monographs without resorting to increasing their subscription prices; (2) allowing scholars to retain copyrights that facilitate the non-commercial dissemination of new knowledge; (3) work collaboratively with universities and publishers to develop and adopt the most economical and technologically effective methods of publishing; and (4) develop transparent financial innovations to promote the efficient use of resources in scholarly communication.

Scholarly Work Copyright Rights Policy

From the outset, one of SCSC's main goals was the development of a copyright rights policy that would address the increasingly high prices charged for scholarly journals. This policy would allow UC faculty members to place their newly published scholarly journal articles in an on-line open access system such as UC's [eScholarship Repository](#), thereby facilitating worldwide access to new UC scholarship. It sets up a standard default position in which faculty members would routinely grant a license to the Regents (on behalf of the faculty) to make work published in scholarly journals and conference proceedings publicly accessible in such a repository. The committee presented this policy to the Academic Council in April, which forwarded it to the Academic Assembly. The Assembly endorsed it in May, requesting that President Dynes appoint a joint Senate/Administrative work group to refine it and prepare it for a full Senate and Administrative review.

Subvention Policy Proposal

Emerging from its discussion of the crisis in scholarly book publishing, SCSC also recommended that subventions (between five and ten thousand dollars each) be offered to junior faculty for the publication of first-time single-authored books of original scholarship. The source of such funds remains to be determined. It is the intent of the committee that these subventions would alter the current economic reality by helping to return scholarly book publication decisions of university presses toward considerations of quality, not of economic viability. SCSC is transferring this proposal to UCOL for further studying pending the approval of UCOL's Bylaw 185 (see below).

Open-Access Copyright Proposal to the California Institute for Regenerative Medicine

SCSC formulated a proposal for the California Institute for Regenerative's (CIRM) regulations, whereby published CIRM-funded scholarly work would be placed in an open-access repository within six months of publication. Initially, CIRM's Independent Consultants Oversight Committee (ICOC) had decided not to address this issue. In August, the ICOC reversed this position and has asked its Intellectual Property Task Force (IPTF) to reconsider whether or not such a policy would be beneficial to stem cell research and the people of California. SCSC Chair Pitts spoke at the IPTF meeting in July 2006 and the ICOC meeting in August 2006, and will continue to follow this issue with Ben Crow, Chair of UCOL.

Termination of SCSC

When the Academic Council established SCSC, it envisioned that SCSC could complete its work by December 2005. Because of an ongoing university-wide review of its white papers, SCSC was asked to continue its work until August 31, 2006, after which SCSC's tenure will be completed. The Academic Council is currently reviewing an amendment to [Bylaw 185](#), which would shepherd UC faculty interests in the scholarly communication arena under UCOL.

Respectfully submitted:

Lawrence Pitts, Chair (SF)	Donald Brenneis (UCEP Representative)
Nicholas Jewell (B)	Stephen Cullenberg (Editorial Representative)
Amihai Glazer (I) (Former UCAP member)	Richard Terdiman (Editorial Representative)
Elaine Tennant (UCOL Representative)	Todd Giedt (Analyst)
Ben Crow (UCOL Representative)	