



Academic Senate
senate.ucsf.edu

Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication
George Rutherford, MD, Chair

ANNUAL REPORT
2009-2010

Primary Focus Points for the Year:

- Boycott of Nature Publishing Group
- Budget Cuts
- Second Floor Renovation

Issues for Next Year (2010-2011)

- Boycott of Nature Publishing Group
- Continued Advocacy for an Open Access Policy and Alternative Methods of Publishing
- Continued Advocacy for Library Space at Mission Bay.

2009-2010 Members

George Rutherford, Chair
Richard Schneider, Vice Chair

Lee Ann Baxter-Lowe
Dorie Apollonio
Cynthia Darling
Mark Eisner
Donna Hudson
Dana McGlothlin

Isobel Russell
Lynne Steinbach

Ex-Officio Members

Karen Butter, University Librarian

Permanent Guests

Marcus Banks, LAUC Representative

Number of Meetings: 5

Senate Analyst: Shilpa Patel

Systemwide Business

The Academic Senate Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication took up the following Systemwide issues this year:

Google Digitization Settlement

In 2002, Yahoo initially approached UC about digitizing out of copyright books, which was aligned with UC's long-term goals to manage its collections more effectively, use space better, and increase accessibility. Microsoft became a partner and several hundred thousand books were digitized at that phase. Google then offered to digitize books, agreeing to cover all costs, indemnify UC from all the risk, and give UC all the digital copies of everything scanned. This offer was also aligned with UC's goals to improve service and access, and think differently about the long-term cost implications of collection management. Phase one of the agreement involved Google scanning both in and out of copyright books, making them available on the Google site and giving copies to UC, and indemnifying UC against all lawsuits.

Two million books have been scanned by Google to date.

Two years ago a lawsuit was filed by the Authors Guild and the Publishers Association claiming copyright infringement. Instead of going to court, these parties went into settlement discussions. UC, Michigan, Stanford and Harvard libraries have provided input into the settlement discussions advocating library interests and maximum public access to works in the public domain. The libraries were not a party to the lawsuit or the settlement.

The settlement discussions have taken place over the past two years under a non-disclosure agreement which is not unusual in negotiations of a commercial nature. At the latest, a hearing was postponed after the Department of Justice objected to components of the agreement. The DOJ raised approximately fifteen issues related to key provisions in the settlement agreement. To date, the settlement has not been approved and UCOLASC is now charged with the task of considering how to deal with orphaned books.

Divisional Business

This year, the Academic Senate Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication took up the following issues related to the San Francisco Division:

Space Planning at Mission Bay

The growth of the Mission Bay campus creates demand for additional academic services. As one of the academic services the existing Mission Bay Library is already at maximum capacity and new academic and clinical programs, growth in numbers of students, faculty and staff and the new medical center will place added pressures. Over the next 5 -10 years the design of new library space calls for a mixture of traditional and innovative space with elements that foster interdisciplinary/interprofessional collaboration, emphasize well-planned informal and formal learning spaces, provide ubiquitous access to technology and support, and highlight a service-oriented environment. The space will emphasize the collaborative nature of teaching, learning and research. The recommendations call for a library of 12,790 square feet. This is calculated from projected populations and programs at Mission Bay over the next 5-10 years. This plan would replace the current 3,000 square feet Community Center Library.

In the short term, students place a high value on safe and secure 24-hour study space on Parnassus. The addition of a restroom would create useable space in the Kalmanowitz Library and allow reductions in personnel expenses and service improvements for students. At Mission Bay the pending loss of the Genentech Hall Library creates a similar demand and short term solutions are under review. For both facilities a primary considerations is the safety and security of students.

Two planning initiatives offer an opportunity to consider long term space needs for library services and programs. Campus Planning is developing a Mission Bay Non-Academic/Academic Support Master Plan

as part of the next Long Range Development Plan. The Library was asked to summarize its current facilities, space requirements and future expansion potential. At the same time the campus is reviewing all capital projects to ensure that they reflect priorities in the UCSF Strategic Plan. COLASC solicited support from all standing committees of the Division and received letters of support from Rules and Jurisdiction, Academic Planning and Budget, Graduate Council, Education Policy, Faculty Welfare, and Research. ([Appendix 1](#))

Second Floor Teaching & Learning Center

The Teaching and Learning Center is a realization of the UCSF strategic goals to develop educational facilities and infrastructures to keep UCSF at the forefront of health sciences education and meet the growing demand for health care professionals. The Teaching and Learning Center will provide a technology-rich environment in support of interprofessional and transdisciplinary learning programs at UCSF. The programs will focus on training future health professionals and scientists to become leaders in delivering high quality care to underserved communities.

The second floor of the Parnassus Campus Library will be transformed to house this new facility, enhancing Library education space with a simulation and clinical skills education center; new teaching and learning space, including technology-enhanced active-learning classrooms and computing labs; and communications technology to facilitate interaction with health care providers, students, and support teams at other sites.

The project is state funded by the Telemedicine and PRIME-US Education Facilities initiative, which is part of California State Proposition 1D. All four professional schools and the Library have collaborated on the plans for the new center, which will support the curricula for Dentistry, Medicine, Nursing, Pharmacy, and other clinical programs.

The teaching and learning center is slated to open January 2011. More information can be found here: <http://tlc.library.ucsf.edu/>

articles will also be deposited in the California Digital Library's eScholarship Repository.

Budget

The Committee advised the Library on the anticipated 11% budget reduction. Since 66% of the Library's budget is allocated to salary and benefits, in all likelihood, staff and hours will need to be cut. The Committee had these recommendations:

- Reduction of library hours seems to be the most ideal choice as it increases visibility of the issue and it is the method that is easiest to revert back to original operations should funding return.
- Committee strongly recommended that journals be saved over hours given that journals can be accessed remotely.
- The core business of the Library is the collection and it must be protected.

Proposed Boycott of Nature Publishing Group

Systemwide and UCSF Academic Senate members are participating in the ongoing negotiations between the University of California and the California Digital Library and the Nature Publishing Group: "UC Libraries are confronting an impending crisis in providing access to journals from the Nature Publishing Group (NPG). NPG has insisted on increasing the price of our license for Nature and its affiliated journals by 400 percent beginning in 2011, which would raise our cost for their 67 journals by well over \$1 million dollars per year." [Read the letter](#) from UCOP, the California Digital Library and the (Academic Senate) University Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication to the UC Divisional Chairs and Members of the UC Faculty dated June 6, 2010. ([Appendix 2](#))

While this letter was an internal communication from faculty leadership to the UC Faculty, the Nature Publishing Group (NPG) responded to this letter in a public statement ([PDF](#), [NPG website](#)) on the afternoon of June 9, 2010. ([Appendix 3](#))

The University Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication issued a detailed response to this public letter the following morning, June 10, 2010, sending the communication "[Response from the University of California to the Public statement from Nature Publishing Group regarding subscription renewals at the California Digital Library](#)" to members of the UC Faculty. ([Appendix 4](#))

Going Forward

Ongoing issues under review or actions which the Committee will continue into 2010-2011:

Budget Cuts

The Committee will continue to assist the Library in prioritizing needs and services in preparation for the impending budget cuts.

The Charge Against Increased Publisher Subscription Fees

COLASC will continue to lead the charge in assembling faculty to rise against increased publisher fees. Further, COLASC hopes to restart discussions surrounding alternative means of publishing such as open access.

Appendices

[Appendix 1](#): Letters from Standing Committees of the San Francisco Division of the Academic Senate in Support of Library Space at Mission Bay

[Appendix 2](#): June 6, 2010 Letter from UCOP to UC Faculty Regarding Nature Publishing Groups Proposed Subscription Increases.

[Appendix 3](#): June 9, 2010 Letter by the Nature Publishing Group Responding to the UCOP Letter.

[Appendix 4](#): June 10, 2010 Response to the NPG Letter from UCOLASC to UC Faculty

Senate Staff:
Shilpa Patel, Senior Analyst
shilpa.patel@ucsf.edu; 415/476-4245

University of California
San Francisco



Academic Senate
senate.ucsf.edu

**Communication from the Committee on
Academic Planning and Budget
Warren Gold, MD, Chair**

March 22, 2010

George Rutherford, MD, Chair
Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication
Office of the Academic Senate, Box 0764

Re: Recommendations of the Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication and the Master Plan for Mission Bay Libraries

Dear Chair Rutherford:

The Committee on Academic Planning and Budget is writing to express its support for the Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication (COLASC) Master Plan for Mission Bay Libraries dated January 2009 and the COLASC recommendations set forth in the communication to Divisional Chair Fuentes-Afflick dated February 11, 2010. The Committee strongly agrees that consideration of library space should be part of the Mission Bay campus planning process, as well as student study space and student safety as it pertains to access to Library space and services. Please let us know through Wilson Hardcastle, Senate Analyst for the Committee (wilson.hardcastle@ucsf.edu), if we can be of any assistance in furthering these recommendations.

Sincerely,

Warren Gold, MD
Chair, Committee on Academic Planning and Budget



Academic Senate
senate.ucsf.edu

Communication from the Clinical Affairs Committee **Brad Hare, MD, Chair**

April 7, 2010

George Rutherford, MD, Chair
Committee on Library and Scholarly Communications
500 Parnassus Avenue, Box 0764

Re: Review of the *Recommendation on Mission Bay Library Space*

Dear Chair Rutherford,

The Clinical Affairs Committee (CAC) of the UCSF Academic Senate discussed the Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication's space recommendations for the Mission Bay Libraries in our meeting on March 24, 2010. Members strongly endorsed the recommendations outlined in the Library Master Plan, including a larger consolidated library at Mission Bay and secure 24-hour library access at all UCSF locations.

From a clinical perspective, CAC members emphasized the importance of the Mission Bay Library to support the clinical mission of UCSF and asked that COLASC consider the following when further developing the proposal:

1. Expanding the library space at Mission Bay, especially the creation of and use of small conference rooms. Clinicians use such rooms 24/7 for case conferencing as well as for trainee meetings. As clinical services migrate to Mission Bay, the creation of a 24/7 access space, which includes conference rooms, is vital to clinicians. At present, planning for Mission Bay Hospital has allocated few such rooms and CAC members envision the library being used, in some minor capacity, in this manner when the hospital opens.
2. Separate access to a 24/7 library space with journals is crucial for late hours research to address needs related to immediate patient care. While much of that is handled via the internet, ongoing UCSF library issues with journal reduction, including online access, has made the availability of older journals in hard copy form all the more valuable.

We look forward to your success in advocating for improved Library space, a resource critical for all of UCSF's missions. Please contact us if we can be of assistance in these efforts.

Sincerely,

The Clinical Affairs Committee

Brad Hare, MD, Chair
Steve Pletcher, MD, Vice Chair
Shoshana Arai, RN, PhD
Chris Barton, MD
Christine Cheng, PharmD
Karen Duderstadt, PhD, RN, PNP
John Feiner, MD
Marcus Ferrone, PharmD

Mehran Hosseini, DMD
Amy Houtrow, MD, MPH
Shelley Hwang, MD
Ruth Goldstein, MD
Susan Janson, RN, DNS, ANP, FAAN
Brent Lin, DDS, MS
Maxwell Meng, MD

Communication from the Committee on Educational Policy **Thomas Kearney, PharmD, Chair**

March 19, 2010

George Rutherford, MD
Chair
Committee on Library and Scholarly Communications
500 Parnassus Avenue, Box 0764

Re: Review of the *Recommendation on Mission Bay Library Space*

Dear Chair Rutherford,

The Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) met on March 10, 2010, to discuss the Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication's space recommendations for the Mission Bay Libraries. The Committee on Educational Policy agreed that the issues presented in the letter represent a critical and basic need.

For further development of the COLASC proposal, CEP had two suggestions:

1. Reserve current and future UCSF libraries for students and/or UCSF employees. If libraries are made available to certain sectors of the public (i.e., relationships established with Mission Bay biotech companies or local residents around the Parnassus campus), the public should be required to have a library card that would provide them access for a fee.
2. While a funding source is still to be determined for these proposed changes, the committee wondered about the quantitative figures surrounding the letter and the Library Master Plan. In particular, figures about student use of current library facilities and how many students, due to space issues, are prevented from using the library? This would bolster the COLASC letter and the Library Master Plan. The committee recommends a survey be conducted to obtain such figures.

The Committee on Educational Policy endorses these proposed changes with the recommendation that COLASC provide additional quantitative data in further iterations of their proposal.

Sincerely,

The Committee on Educational Policy

Thomas Kearney, PharmD, Chair
Peter Loomer, DDS, PhD, Vice Chair
Abbey Alkon, RN, PhD, PNP
Sergio Baranzini, PhD
Kurt Giles, PhD
Vineeta Singh, MD
Douglas Schmucker, PhD
Sophia Saaed, DMD
Elisabeth Wilson, MD, MPH

University of California
San Francisco



Academic Senate
senate.ucsf.edu

Communication from the Committee on Research Jim Sorensen, PhD, Chair

March 19, 2010

George Rutherford, MD
Chair
Committee on Library and Scholarly Communications
500 Parnassus Avenue, Box 0764

Re: Review of the *Recommendation on Mission Bay Library Space*

Dear Chair Rutherford,

The Committee on Research (COR) met on March 15, 2010, to discuss the Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication's space recommendations for the Mission Bay Libraries.

Members agreed that the proposed enhancements were reasonable and endorsed the proposal.

Sincerely,

The Committee on Research

James Sorensen, PhD, Chair
Roland Henry, PhD, Vice Chair
Laurence Baskin, MD
Mary Blegen, RN, PhD, FAAN
Dejana Braithwaite, PhD, MS
Doranne Cuenco, RN, PhD, NP
Kevin Delucchi, PhD
Macleod Griffiss, MD
Tomoki Hashimoto, MD
Wen-Chi Hsueh, PhD, MPH
Gary Humfleet, PhD
Mallory Johnson, PhD
Kirby Lee, PharmD
Wu Li, PhD
Mahesh Mankani, MD
Ralph Marcucio, PhD

Teri Melese, PhD
Janet Myers, PhD, MPH
David Saloner, PhD
Ram Vaderhobli, BDS, MS, Clinical Rep
Davide Verotta, PhD
Girish Vyas, PhD
Michael West, MD, PhD
Mary White, RN, PhD, FAAN

University of California
San Francisco



Academic Senate
senate.ucsf.edu

Communication from the Graduate Council
Elizabeth Watkins, PhD, Chair

March 19, 2010

George Rutherford, MD
Chair
Committee on Library and Scholarly Communications
500 Parnassus Avenue, Box 0764

Re: Review of the *Recommendation on Mission Bay Library Space*

Dear Chair Rutherford,

The Graduate Council met on March 11, 2010, to discuss the Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication's space recommendations for the Mission Bay Libraries. The Council agreed unanimously that providing safe places for students to study should be a planning priority for the University and therefore endorses these recommendations.

Sincerely,

Graduate Council

Elizabeth Watkins, PhD, Chair
Michael Beattie, PhD, Vice Chair
Patricia Babbitt, PhD
Daniel Fried, PhD
Joseph Gruydish, PhD
Mary Lynch, RN, MPH, MS, PNP
Sarah Nelson, PhD
Robert Raffai, PhD
Nancy Stotts, RN, EdD, FAAN
Pat Calarco, PhD
Peter Taylor, PhD
Christine Des Jarlais, EdD
Julie Hunkapillar, GSA Representative
Vuk Uskovic, PSA Representative

University of California
San Francisco



Academic Senate
senate.ucsf.edu

Communication from the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction
Anne Slavotinek, MD, Chair

March 11, 2010

George Rutherford, MD, Chair
Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication
Office of the Academic Senate, Box 0764

Re: Recommendations of the Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication and the Master Plan for Mission Bay Libraries

Dear Chair Rutherford:

The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction is writing to strongly support the Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication (COLASC) Master Plan for Mission Bay Libraries dated January 2010 and the COLASC communication to Divisional Chair Fuentes-Afflick dated February 11, 2010. We concur that 24-hour library access for students at the Parnassus campus and the plan for a larger, consolidated library at Mission Bay are critical for scholarly activities and will facilitate academic success at UCSF. We therefore endorse these two recommendations and the Master Plan for Mission Bay libraries.

Please let us know if we can be of further support.

Sincerely,

Anne Slavotinek, MD, Chair
The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction



OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
California Digital Library

415 20th Street
Oakland, California 94612

June 4, 2010

Re: Informational Update on a Possible UC Systemwide Boycott of the Nature Publishing Group

Dear UC Divisional Chairs and Members of the UC Faculty,

UC Libraries are confronting an impending crisis in providing access to journals from the Nature Publishing Group (NPG). NPG has insisted on increasing the price of our license for *Nature* and its affiliated journals by 400 percent beginning in 2011, which would raise our cost for their 67 journals by well over \$1 million dollars per year.

While *Nature* and other NPG publications are among the most prestigious of academic journals, such a price increase is of unprecedented magnitude. NPG has made their ultimatum with full knowledge that our libraries are under economic distress—a fact widely publicized in an [Open Letter to Licensed Content Providers](#) and distributed by the California Digital Library (CDL) in May 2009. In fact, CDL has worked successfully with many other publishers and content providers over the past year to address the University's current economic challenges in a spirit of mutual problem solving, with positive results including lowering our overall costs for electronic journals by \$1 million dollars per year.

NPG by contrast has been singularly unresponsive to the plight of libraries and has employed a 'divide and conquer' strategy that directs major price increases to various institutions in different years. Their proposed new license fee is especially difficult to accept in a time of shrinking UC library budgets and with the many sacrifices we all continue to make Systemwide. Capitulating to NPG now would wipe out all of the recent cost-saving measures taken by CDL and our campus libraries to reduce expenditures for electronic journals. More information about the UC Libraries' concerns, including a history of previous unsustainable price increases from this publisher and others, is available on the CDL's *Challenges to Licensing* page at <http://www.cdlib.org/services/collections/current/challenges.html>

UC Libraries have already taken a stand against NPG. After recently acquiring *Scientific American*, NPG doubled the institutional site license fee and raised the price of an institutional print subscription seven-fold. In response, UC Libraries, along with numerous other institutions throughout the country, discontinued their license to the online version and reduced the number of print subscriptions. As a first response to the current NPG proposal, UC Libraries plan to forgo all online subscriptions to any new NPG journals. But more drastic actions may be necessary.

What can UC Faculty do to help?

UC Faculty and researchers author a significant percentage of all articles published in NPG journals and are a major force in shaping the prestige of its publications. In the past six years, UC authors have contributed approximately 5300 articles to these journals, 638 of them in the flagship journal *Nature*. Using NPG's own figures, an analysis by CDL suggests that UC articles published in *Nature* alone have contributed at least \$19 million dollars in revenue to NPG over the past 6 years—or more than \$3 million dollars per year for just that one journal. Moreover, UC Faculty supply countless hours serving as reviewers, editors, and advisory board members.

Many UC Faculty now believe that a larger and more concerted response is necessary to counter the monopolistic tactics of NPG. Keith Yamamoto, a Professor and Executive Vice Dean at UCSF (yamamoto@cmp.ucsf.edu) who helped lead a successful boycott against Elsevier and Cell Press in 2003 (<http://www.libraryjournal.com/article/CA379265.html>), has begun to assemble a group of Faculty that will help lead a UC Systemwide boycott of NPG. This means that unless NPG is willing to maintain our current licensing agreement, UC Faculty would ask the UC Libraries to suspend their online subscriptions entirely, and all UC Faculty would be strongly encouraged to:

- Decline to peer review manuscripts for journals from the Nature Publishing Group.
- Resign from Nature Publishing Group editorial and advisory boards.
- Cease to submit papers to the Nature Publishing Group.
- Refrain from advertising any open or new UC positions in Nature Publishing Group journals.
- Talk widely about Nature Publishing Group pricing tactics and business strategies with colleagues outside UC, and encourage sympathy actions such as those listed above.

We clearly recognize that the consequences of such a boycott would be complex and present hardships for individual UC researchers. But we believe that in the end, we will all benefit if UC can achieve a sustainable and mutually rewarding relationship with NPG. In the meantime, UC scholars can help break the monopoly that commercial and for-profit entities like NPG hold over the work that we create through positive actions such as:

- Complying with open access policies from Federal funding agencies such as the NIH (<http://publicaccess.nih.gov>).
- Utilizing *eScholarship*, an open access repository service from CDL (http://www.escholarship.org/publish_postprints.html).
- Considering other high-quality research publishing outlets, including open access journals such as those published by PLoS and others.
- Insisting on language in publication agreements that allows UC authors to retain their copyright (http://osc.universityofcalifornia.edu/manage/retain_copyrights.html).

A full list of journals currently licensed from NPG by UC Libraries is attached. We will keep you informed as this situation progresses, including the possibility of canceling all NPG titles. Please feel free to contact the University Librarian on your campus with questions or concerns, or any of us. You can also communicate your concern to key contacts at NPG. The managing director of NPG, Steven Inchcombe, and other members of the executive committee can be reached at exec@nature.com.

Sincerely,



Laine Farley
Executive Director
California Digital Library
University of California, Office of the President
laine.farley@ucop.edu



Richard A. Schneider
Associate Professor, Department of Orthopaedic Surgery
University of California – San Francisco
Chair, University Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication
rich.schneider@ucsf.edu



Brian E. C. Schottlaender
The Audrey Geisel University Librarian
University of California – San Diego
Convener, University Librarians Council
becs@ucsd.edu

CC:

Henry Powell
Professor of Pathology
University of California, San Diego
Chair, Academic Senate

Daniel Greenstein
Vice Provost for Academic Planning, Programs and
Coordination
University of California, Office of the President

Thomas Leonard
University Librarian
University of California – Berkeley

Helen Henry
Acting Co-University Librarian
University of California – Davis

Gail Yokote
Acting Co-University Librarian
University of California – Davis

Carol Hughes
Acting Co-University Librarian
University of California – Irvine

Deb Sunday
Acting Co-University Librarian
University of California – Irvine

Gary E. Strong
University Librarian
University of California – Los Angeles

R. Bruce Miller
University Librarian
University of California – Merced

Ruth M. Jackson
University Librarian
University of California – Riverside

Karen Butter
University Librarian & Assistant
Vice Chancellor
University of California – San Francisco

Sharon DeDecker
Acting University Librarian
University of California – Santa Barbara

Lucia Snowhill
Acting University Librarian
University of California – Santa Barbara

Ginny Steel
University Librarian
University of California – Santa Cruz

Number of journals: 67

Includes: 25 Nature-branded journals
42 academic and specialist journals

Note: NPG publishes 85 journals in total, including titles not licensed at UC. For a complete list of publications, see <http://www.nature.com/siteindex/index.html>

Nature	EMBO Journal
Nature Biotechnology	EMBO reports
Nature Cell Biology	European Journal of Clinical Nutrition
Nature Chemical Biology	European Journal of Human Genetics
Nature Genetics	Evidence Based Dentistry
Nature Geoscience	Eye
Nature Immunology	Gene Therapy
Nature Materials	Genes & Immunity
Nature Medicine	Heredity
Nature Methods	Immunology and Cell Biology
Nature Nanotechnology	International Journal of Impotence Research
Nature Neuroscience	International Journal of Obesity
Nature Photonics	ISME Journal
Nature Physics	Journal of Antibiotics
Nature Protocols	Journal of Cerebral Blood Flow & Metabolism
Nature Structural & Molecular Biology	Journal of Exposure Science & Environmental Epidemiology
Nature Reviews Cancer	Journal of Human Genetics
Nature Reviews Cardiology	Journal of Human Hypertension
Nature Reviews Drug Discovery	Journal of Investigative Dermatology
Nature Reviews Genetics	Journal of Perinatology
Nature Reviews Immunology	Kidney International
Nature Reviews Microbiology	Lab Animal
Nature Reviews Molecular Cell Biology	Laboratory Investigation
Nature Reviews Neuroscience	Leukemia
Nature Reviews Rheumatology	Modern Pathology
American Journal of Gastroenterology	Molecular Psychiatry
American Journal of Hypertension	Molecular Therapy
Bone Marrow Transplantation	Neuropsychopharmacology
British Dental Journal	Obesity
British Journal of Cancer	Oncogene + Oncogene Reviews
Cancer Gene Therapy	Pharmacogenomics Journal, The
Cell Death & Differentiation	Prostate Cancer & Prostatic Diseases
Cell Research	Spinal Cord
Clinical Pharmacology and Therapeutics	

Below is an overview of online journal subscriptions and license fees managed by the California Digital Library for the entire UC System. Individual UC campuses also purchase many journal subscriptions locally and those figures are not included here. Please consult with your University Librarian for more information about online journal subscriptions at each of the ten campuses.

- Amount spent for online journal licenses for UC Systemwide: \$24.3 million
- Current number of online journals for UC Systemwide:¹ 7,846
- Average UC cost per journal:
 - Life and health sciences: \$4,142
 - Physical sciences and engineering: \$6,814
 - All journals (includes social sciences and humanities): \$3,103
- Current average UC cost per Nature Publishing Group journal: \$4,465
- Proposed average UC cost per Nature Publishing Group journal for 2011: \$17,479
- Increase in UC Library materials budget from 2005–2009: 7.46%
- Increase in major journal package license fees from 2005–2009:² 15%
- Reduction to UC Library materials budget in 2010: -\$1.9 million
- Current number of journals licensed from Nature Publishing Group: 67
- Increase in Nature Publishing Group license fees from 2005–2009:² 137%
- Proposed increase in Nature Publishing Group license fees for 2011: 400%

In 2010, CDL successfully reduced the cost of many major licenses by 15% or more in response to the current economic downturn. Virtually all publishers with whom we have concluded agreements in 2010 have cooperated with us to address UC's budget challenges.

¹ Includes research journals licensed directly from publishers only. More than 30,000 journals are available systemwide including aggregated databases.

² A small percentage of this increase is due to licensing additional journals from these publishers.

Public statement from Nature Publishing Group regarding subscription renewals at California Digital Library (CDL)

June 09 2010

http://www.nature.com/press_releases/cdl.html

CDL's letters to the UC Divisional Chairs and Members of the UC Faculty, dated June 4th, 2010, has today been brought to our attention, and to the attention of scientists and librarians around the world. This has been a shock to us at NPG, in terms of the sensationalist use of data out of context, misrepresentation of NPG pricing policies, and the fact that we were under the impression we were in an ongoing confidential discussion. It is with great regret we therefore have to publicly address, in detail, all the allegations contained in the letter. It is our hope in doing so that we can move back to discussions in good faith, and correct the already negative effects of this letter on scientific communication. We have had no information from CDL that they were under the impression that discussions had broken down. Negotiations began back in 2009, our last face-to-face meeting was May 14th, and the current agreement runs until the end of December 2010.

The implication that NPG is increasing its list prices by massive amounts is entirely untrue. We have been publishing our academic site licence pricing for several years on our librarian gateway. Dollar list price increases have been reasonable (averaging roughly 7 % over 4 years), and publicly available throughout. A 7% cap on annual list price increases is currently in place. The complication with CDL is that they have been on a very large, unsustainable discount for many years, to the point where other subscribers, both in the US and around the world, are subsidising them. The origins of this discount can be found in the lack of clear definitions around consortia and 'single institute, multisite' subscribers, as well as previous accommodations of CDL's budget limitations.

If we regard CDL as a consortium of multiple libraries (not least suggested by CDL's membership of International Coalition of Library Consortia (ICOLC), and the libraries' ARL listings), the CDL discount on list price is 88%. By their own figures, CDL receives average discounts of 55% from publishers. After several attempts, we are now trying to bring them close to a 50% discount (although this leaves CDL on better terms than many other consortia). We do recognise the situation can be viewed from different perspectives, and we remained committed to ongoing discussions.

NPG stands by its position that CDL is paying an unfair rate. Again, by CDL's own figures, the average cost of an NPG journal was \$4,465, well under the price of many major STM titles. NPG titles reflect the most highly used, and most high impact journals in science. NPG adds huge amounts of value to the very best quality original research, and this situation was simply not sustainable. It is our belief NPG titles represent excellent value for money, whether measured by cost per download, or perhaps more accurately, cost per local citation. Our own projections show CDL will be paying roughly \$0.56 per download under the new prices. This represents incredible value for money across any publisher's range of titles. We now call on CDL to reveal how much it spends with all the major publishers, and how this translates into cost per use, and/or other indicators of value. If NPG represents poor value for money, we will work with CDL to readjust their pricing. If, as we expect, NPG represents good value for money compared with other publishers, even at the new proposed pricing, we want to work with CDL to have this reflected in our agreement. We sincerely hope that no boycotts

will occur, not least because it is detrimental to the advance of science, but we will not be bullied into continuing CDL's subsidy by our other customers.

We are confident that the appointment of Professor Keith Yamamoto and other scientific faculty to lead the proposed boycott, will mean they will be in a position to assess value with a rigorous and transparent methodology. We specifically recognise the value faculty add to the publishing process, not only through authorship and peer review, but as the user group we aim to service efficiently and effectively. NPG journals are, and always have been run by scientists, for scientists. Nevertheless, while recognising this value as critical to our existence, we are utterly confused by the claims that UC authors have contributed \$19 million in revenue to NPG over the past six years. We look forward to learning more about those calculations.

Many of our other customers, editors, authors and peer-reviewers have been alarmed by claims from CDL. We would like to confirm our ongoing commitment to cap site licence list price increases for 2011. We would also like to assure customers that CDL is the only consortium with a legacy pricing issue which requires an adjustment of this size, to bring pricing into line with other customers, and ensure fairness across our customer base, in the US, in the west, and around the world.

We must also take this opportunity to address CDL's calls for increased compliance with funder mandates, more self-archiving, and authors retaining copyright. These are positions that NPG has actively supported and encouraged since 2005. However, we believe our colleagues at PLOS would agree that publishing high quality manuscripts, in journals with a high rejection rate, is an expensive business, and requires either high subscription fees, or high article processing charges, to be profitable.

To conclude, we are disappointed that CDL has resorted to using misinformation in inappropriate contexts to create publicity with the threat of a boycott, as part of a negotiating tactic, when NPG's intention has always been to reach a fair agreement. As of today, individual scientists, both within and outside of California are already suffering as a result of CDL's unwarranted actions. NPG will continue to do all it can to bring the world's best science to scientists around the world, hopefully working in cooperation with a more realistic CDL.

Response from the University of California to the Public statement from Nature Publishing Group regarding subscription renewals at the California Digital Library

June 10, 2010

The University of California appreciates the full and detailed response provided by Nature Publishing Group (NPG) to the informational letter recently shared with the University of California Faculty. As NPG has requested, we are providing a response of our own, attempting to answer in order the points that NPG has raised.

The UC letter that has been circulated was issued not from the California Digital Library (CDL) alone, but jointly from CDL, the UC Libraries, and the University Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication (UCOLASC), which is made up of Faculty representatives from each of our ten campuses. The letter was intended to be an internal informational update to alert our Faculty to the challenges surrounding the renewal of our site license with NPG for 2011. Our Faculty library committees have explicitly requested that they be consulted on major negotiations and journal cancellations. We also wanted to provide information on a separate grass-roots initiative developing among a group of senior Faculty who are concerned about the proposed price increases that NPG had presented to CDL. As this letter was issued by a large public university, we are not surprised that it made its way to the press, though that was not our intent.

To begin, CDL has a different impression of our last meeting in May to which NPG refers. While CDL had not yet proposed a counter-offer to NPG, we were led to understand quite explicitly that no counter-offer was possible, that ‘this was the price,’ and that the NPG offer had a firm deadline. NPG suggested to us several times that canceling journals was our most likely opportunity to achieve the cost controls we sought. The demeanor was markedly different from other publishers with whom we regularly conduct negotiations. As to the confidential nature of these discussions, again our communication was to our own Faculty community, with whom we have an obligation to consult in the course of internal business.

Contrary to what NPG claims in their response, the UC letter does not state, and nowhere implies, that NPG has increased its list prices by 400%. Rather, the letter states that NPG proposes to raise our site license fees by that amount. Any misrepresentation on this point is solely attributable to NPG. Whether the historical, published price increases by NPG have been reasonable—or whether they even mirror reality—is another and more debatable matter. On the first point, an increase of 7% per year translates to an increase of 40% over five years. Few, if any, library budgets have gone up at even a fraction of that amount over a comparable period (the materials budget of the UC Libraries increased by 7.46% between 2005 and 2009 and is now slated to decrease during the next few years). In other words, 7% increases compounded annually are budget busting (also note that 7% is more than three times the average US rate of inflation for the past few years).

In our most recent negotiations, nearly all publishers from whom we license content have worked with us to meet the significant budget challenges presented by the current economic downturn, significantly reducing fees in many instances. We would be acting in bad faith in our dealings with those providers if we turned around and accepted an increase of the magnitude that has been proposed by NPG. Moreover, doing so would completely negate the savings reductions achieved to date, which still fall short of cuts being absorbed by UC libraries.

On the second point, the past price increases of NPG journals at the University of California are instructive about the tactics of NPG. Between 2005 and 2009, NPG increased their licensing fees to the University by 137% (granted this included some new titles, but truthfully not enough to warrant such a dramatic price increase). Even when our license was placed on a new and, we believed, more stable footing in 2008, our fees still increased by 5%. But now, NPG claims that their proposed 400% increase is to make up for “an unsustainable discount” that they have provided UC all along. We find this to be an implausible explanation given the remarkably large sums of money others and we already pay to NPG every year. The notion that other institutions are subsidizing “our discount” is nonsensical. If anything, other institutions are simply paying too much.

NPG also refers to their proposed new license fee as a 50% discount off of list price, but this is misleading and has been taken out of context. First of all, NPG is free to set list price at any amount they want, so in many ways this is a meaningless number. Most academic institutions receive substantial discounts off of list price. Historical subscription patterns in the context of long-standing journal agreements tend to be the main determinants of price (as indeed they were for our original NPG agreement). But we recognize that NPG has a different perspective on this issue and welcome their commitment to authentic discussions.

The question of how to determine value is also a complex matter. Indeed, the UC Libraries have devoted significant resources to studying this issue. While we agree that NPG publishes very high quality content, so do many other publishers, at more reasonable costs. The Fact Sheet appended to our Faculty letter indicates that the current average price of NPG journals at UC is appropriately aligned with other content licensed at the University, whereas the new proposal from NPG would position its journals as significant outliers. While there is no question that cost per use for NPG journals at UC is low, the characteristics of these journals must also be taken into account to ensure that like is being compared with like. As many observers and analysts have noted (including those in *Nature* such as Andrew Odlyzko, <http://www.nature.com/nature/focus/accessdebate/7.html>), the marginal cost to a publisher of increased online usage is very low in comparison to first-copy costs. There are many extrinsic factors that drive usage in today’s digital environment, most of which bear little relation to a publisher’s internal cost structure. We look forward to working with NPG to determine a fair assessment of value as we continue discussions.

We appreciate that NPG recognizes that the scientific community is both its core audience and its major stakeholder. And we agree that NPG has been a leader in adopting the “green” publishing policies that many scholars seek today and commend them for these forward-looking perspectives. With respect to our attempt to assign a monetary value to the contributions of UC researchers to the NPG enterprise, we would be happy to share with NPG how we arrived at this estimate and to learn if NPG has a different way of calculating such figures. We note here only that our estimate made no attempt to factor in the value of peer review, editorial or advisory board service by UC Faculty, or the contribution value of UC articles in other NPG journals besides *Nature* itself. In fact, we would welcome more transparent means of determining what UC Faculty contribute and how this virtually free labor gets factored into revenue calculations or potentially could be used to offset subscription rates.

We have also frequently sought a dialogue with publishers about new business models needed to sustain high quality online publication. In an earlier era, journals were supported by more diversified sources of revenue, such as page charges, personal subscriptions, advertising, and the like. In today’s site license

environment, a significantly higher percentage of a publisher's revenue now depends on institutional library budgets. Using grant funds to support article processing charges for open access publication is intended in part to address this, as is the suggestion that journals with extremely high rejection rates consider charging submission fees. Unfortunately, we have found publishers largely unwilling to engage with libraries or authors on these issues despite repeated attempts on our part to enter into such conversations. UC would welcome an opportunity to have such conversations with NPG.

In summary, the CDL, UCOLASC, and UC Libraries categorically reject the notion that we have resorted to misinformation or distortion of any sort, as well as any suggestion that we sought to engender premature publicity. We included accurate information, not misinformation, in an internal communication intended for our Faculty. As the UC Libraries contemplate budget reductions of 20% or more over the next two years on top of reductions already taken in 2010, we are faced with difficult choices and seek publisher partners who are willing to work with us over the long-term. That being said, we want to emphasize that the UC letter represents the deliberations of many Faculty committees and librarians across the UC System who unanimously felt that UC needed to take a stand on this issue as a matter of principle and not merely as a budgetary consideration. Plainly put, UC Faculty do not think that their libraries should have to pay exorbitant and unreasonable fees to get access to their own work. A key concept in our letter is that UC ultimately wants to reach a "sustainable and mutually rewarding relationship with NPG" but Faculty and librarians feel that this cannot be achieved with the present proposal from NPG. Thus, we stand by our letter and look forward to a productive dialogue with NPG on these issues.