Developing Open Access Resource Management Principles in a Consortial Environment
A University of California Model
Erica Zhang and Cynthia Johnson

In the summer of 2021, the University of California (UC) migrated to a new integrated library system, called the Systemwide Integrated Library System project (SILS), which for the first time brought all ten UC campuses, two regional storage facilities, and the California Digital Library (CDL) together into one shared library system. With new potential for increased collaboration and cooperation, SILS leadership groups identified consortial open access (OA) resource management as a key opportunity in the new system, in alignment with UC's priorities around discovery and access to library collections, as well as UC's commitment to open access and transforming the scholarly communication landscape. This article discusses the formation of the UC Open Access Resource Management Task Force (OARMTF), a group charged to investigate what it would mean to consortially manage OA resources. Specifically, this article focuses on the OARMTF's work setting out principles for OA resource management, which the authors hope may serve as a useful case study for other institutions or consortia interested in developing principles around OA resource management, as well as encourage more discussion and research into best practices for consortial management of OA resources.

In July 2021, the University of California (UC) Libraries migrated to a shared library system, the Systemwide Integrated Library System project (SILS). This historic undertaking brought all ten UC campuses, two regional storage facilities, and the California Digital Library (CDL) into one shared library system using Ex Libris' Alma and discovery layer Primo VE.[1] During the last phase of the migration, questions arose about functionality of the new system—such as Ex Libris' Central Discovery Index (CDI), a proprietary index of more than a billion resources—and whether to rely on the CDI to manage open access (OA) resources.[2] While investigating this question, SILS leadership groups learned of the complexities of this seemingly straightforward question and its cross-functional implications; the question's focus on OA also provided an opportunity to prioritize discovery and access to OA resources in this new system, in alignment with UC's commitment to open access and transforming the scholarly communication landscape.[3] SILS leadership thus charged a new UC Open Access Resource Management Task Force (OARMTF) to investigate how best to manage OA resources in this new environment, including the development of OA resource management principles to guide this work.

This article discusses the formation of the OARMTF in June 2021 and focuses on its work developing principles to guide UC Libraries' consortial management of OA resources in SILS. The Task Force defined OA broadly as "'free to read for anyone, anywhere, with an internet connection" for the scope of

Erica Zhang (ezhang20@library.ucla.edu) is the Metadata Librarian for Open Access at UCLA Library. **Cynthia Johnson** (cynthiaj@uci.edu) is the Head of Reference and the Grunigen Medical Libraries at UC Irvine Libraries.

their work.[4] The authors lay out the challenges of undertaking this work in the midst of a large migration, including the realization that certain features and settings of the new system mentioned in the original charge behaved differently and therefore precluded the Task Force from fulfilling some of the deliverables. Nonetheless, how UC Libraries would manage OA materials consortially remained an important conversation to have.

The authors hope that in sharing the process the Task Force undertook and the discussion points raised, the article may serve as a case study for other institutions interested in developing principles around OA resource management—which in this context includes "selection, cataloging, and record/link maintenance across the lifecycle of these electronic resources"—to learn from or adapt to their own OA goals.[5]

Literature Review

During its work, the Task Force found that little had been written specifically about developing principles for managing OA resources consortially. Instead, existing literature focuses on individual aspects of this endeavor, from the challenges of cataloging specific types of OA resources, to how consortia manage resources more generally, to principles related to other aspects of OA work, such as negotiating transformative agreements.

The ever-increasing landscape of OA resources has brought with it more complexity in cataloging and maintaining access to these works. Finlay notes that one fundamental issue for OA journals is the fact that library technologies typically rely on title-level metadata, whereas OA status is typically assigned at the article level.[6] This is especially challenging with the hybrid OA model, where journals may include both OA and non-OA articles, and thus the journal-level OA metadata may not match article-level OA metadata. This is supported by Bulock and Hosburgh, who surveyed librarians about their experiences managing OA resources and the strengths and weaknesses of management systems.[7] Their survey asked how librarians were managing OA resources at the time of the survey and how those processes could be improved, and a major frustration highlighted in the article is hybrid OA. Even as discovery services were deemed to be the most effective at identifying OA journal titles, hybrid OA still proved to be problematic. A variety of other confusing aspects of OA that can lead to difficulty identifying OA resources are also reviewed. Another article that looks closely at the discoverability of OA resources is Chumbe, Kelly, and MacLeod's study, which found no evidence at the time of publication that the extant discovery services were able to systematically identify the availability of OA articles regardless of whether the articles were published in fully OA journals or in hybrid OA journals.[8] The authors propose embedding OA-related elements in the metadata freely exposed by publishers for aggregators and discovery services.

Moving to another format, in 2017 McCollough studied the discoverability of OA monographs by using thirty-five titles available at the time of the research from the University of Michigan Press's OA imprint digitalculturebooks to check their discoverability in a sample of library catalogs.[9] McCollough concludes

that the two most important factors in making digitalculturebooks titles discoverable "appear to be (1) the publisher depositing records in DOAB [Directory of Open Access Books, a third-party aggregator] and (2) libraries opting to systematically include or display OA monograph records."[10] Some other interesting findings that shed light on decisions made locally or consortially and that impact OA discoverability include the following: libraries that require user authentication for all content rather than providing the option for users to proceed as guests, which would allow them to find and view OA content; consortial arrangements can help make OA more discoverable when one library has included an OA record and all of the other libraries can then access that record through their shared catalog. However, McCollough also found that "consortial catalogs can prove detrimental to OA monograph discovery in cases where management is centralized and OA metadata have not been ingested, harvested, or displayed in knowledge bases for discovery layers and link resolvers, which enable users to find materials held at their library. In those cases, one decision effectively renders the content invisible for all affected users."[11]

The effort needed to increase the discovery of OA resources in library catalogs is also illustrated in Edmunds and Enriquez's 2020 case study, where Penn State University Libraries undertook various metadata-related approaches to increasing the visibility of OA resources in their library catalog.[12] This included data analysis to identify MARC records that were missing OA metadata and adding relevant MARC fields, reaching out to vendors with metadata enhancements on vendor-supplied records, and proactively seeking out and loading MARC records for OA monograph collections of interest. Through these efforts, the authors identified a number of challenges regarding managing OA resources in the catalog, including working out a shared definition of OA with which to move forward, evaluating OA collections, inconsistency of vendor metadata, the time-intensive effort of retrospectively identifying materials as OA, and hybrid content.

At a consortial level, Chin et al. discusses the University of California's Shared Cataloging Program (SCP), a consortial cataloging model.[13] This article provides a history of UC's SCP and discusses the key factors to the program's success and longevity. The article also provides details of specific processes, such as record maintenance for e-journals, and discusses how SCP adapted to the growth in electronic publishing, expanding from a focus on e-journals to include e-books, OA resources, and Demand Driven Acquisitions programs. Deng, Sotelo, and Culbertson conducted a literature review and surveyed library consortia worldwide to ascertain the cataloging models, strategies, and advanced technological tools used to ensure discovery of consortial collections.[14] Published in 2018, their study found only a handful of articles that focused specifically on cataloging for consortial collections. And in their survey, when the authors asked respondents whether they provided a way for bibliographers to request cataloging of OA resources, half of respondents who answered said that they did not have any formal process in place.

In addition to these studies on OA resource management and discoverability, in 2020, ALA Editions published *Techniques for Electronic Resource Management: Terms and the Transition to Open* by Jill Emery, Graham Stone, and Peter McCracken.[15] The 2020 monograph brings together their original

work on electronic resource management (TERMs) with their subsequent framework, Open Access Workflows for Academic Librarians (OAWAL). OAWAL is an open site that explores how individual institutions can manage their open access workflows.[16] The 2020 TERMS monograph notes the need for libraries to have strategies to deal with the explosion of OA content. One of the text's points is that OA content needs the same level of scrutiny and care as licensed content. The book's focus is electronic resource management that incorporates OA resource management rather than treating OA resources as separate and of less importance than licensed materials.

Finally, when it comes to policies and principles around OA, in 2021 Scott, Harrington, and Dubnjakovic wrote about the practices, policies, and attitudes towards OA in academic libraries.[17] Their study focused on the question of how academic librarians view the role and limitations of OA in their local contexts, whether librarians consider OA resources a valid part of their collections, and whether they write policies to ensure an intentional and systematic approach to OA. The article recognizes, through its literature review, that OA content incurs cost in the time spent managing access or cataloging resources. But despite favorable attitudes toward OA, few institutions have OA policies. Brunsting, Harrington, and Scott's *Open Access Literature in Libraries: Principles and Practices* monograph moves away from writing a book about OA policies to providing principles and practices around library support for OA.[18] By providing a summary of the landscape of such statements from organizations such as cOAlition S, AmeliCA, and Redalyc, the authors make the case that "support for OA publishing must be embedded in libraries' foundational principles and practices to ensure its sustainability" and that "by approaching OA support through principles and practices, librarians will be able to respond nimbly to changes."[19]

OA Cataloging at UC: A Brief History

UC Libraries has taken a centralized, consortial approach to cataloging OA resources since the early years of SCP. Established in January 2000, SCP formed to improve access to the UC's growing collection of electronic resources. The SCP workflow involved distributing ready-to-use cataloging records for all electronic titles licensed by CDL to each of the other UC campuses. It was launched "out of pragmatic necessity along with an institutional commitment to the cooperative ideals of labor-savings, experimentation, and the search for 'best practices.'"[20] Before the formation of the SCP, each UC campus maintained its own records for electronic resources in its online public access catalog and contributed records to Melvyl, the UC's shared union catalog and predecessor to the new catalog introduced through the SILS project, UC Library Search (UCLS). There was no system-wide oversight of cataloging or other technical services.[21] To move from an environment of local cataloging to a uniform cataloging approach for electronic journals licensed by CDL for all UC campuses, the UC agreed on a set of principles to guide their recommendations.[22] These principles focused on improving the user's experience while recognizing the importance of maintaining cataloging standards; they are also echoed in the principles articulated for SILS, which informed the work of the OARMTF.

Over time, SCP's processes adapted to account for the increasing number of electronic resources and have now expanded beyond licensed electronic journals to e-books and other formats as well as other business models, including OA.

As of the writing of this article, SCP provides two forms for UC bibliographers and catalogers to make cataloging requests for individual OA journals, as well as OA databases and collections. SCP then moves these requests through an evaluation process involving UC Libraries campus groups and CDL advisory committees.[23] Once the resource has been evaluated and approved, SCP identifies existing bibliographic records or creates new records that are then distributed to each of the campuses to locally ingest into their individual library systems. To facilitate this workflow, SCP has built and improved on the infrastructure needed to continually maintain access to these resources, which includes collaboration and cooperation within UC as well as beyond. It is through this model that SCP has successfully provided UC access to numerous diverse OA resources. This model has been complemented by local campus cataloging of OA resources, particularly individual monographs and locally created resources, such as publications by campus units and electronic theses and dissertations housed in UC's open access institutional repository, eScholarship.

The SILS Project

In 2017, UC Libraries launched a major initiative to implement a system-wide integrated library system and bring all campuses onto one library system, a project that took four years and several phases from the initial conceptualization to the final implementation.[24] As noted above, before the SILS project, although the UC had a long history of a shared union catalog, each campus maintained its own local ILS and discovery layer or public catalog.[25] This meant that each campus, the regional storage facilities, and CDL had their own policies, practices, and procedures. To guide SILS project members in developing shared policies, processes, and workflows, SILS Leadership articulated principles for this work, which the OARMTF also referred to in its work:

1. Prioritize high-quality user experience for UC faculty, students, staff, clinicians, researchers and other library patrons;
2. Transform and improve library work practices and policies, harmonizing to best take advantage of current and future operational and service opportunities afforded through the SILS;
3. Innovate and explore new ways of working, being mindful of benefits and costs;
4. Advance UC's values of diversity, equity, inclusion, justice and belonging through SILS-related operations and work practices;
5. Empower data-driven and consultative decision-making, where decisions are sent as far up the chain as is warranted but no further;
6. Commit to shared governance, transparency and open communication;
7. Align SILS-related work with near- and long-term UC systemwide priorities.[26]

In the fourth and final phase of SILS—the implementation phase—groups from across the campuses, the regional storage facilities, and CDL formed numerous teams to develop shared practices for various functions across the libraries. Finally, in July 2021, UC Libraries' SILS and system-wide discovery platform, UCLS, formally moved to production, ushering in new opportunities for UC to develop and implement shared services.

Forming the Task Force

One of the teams formed in the final phase of the SILS project was the Public Services Escalation Leadership Group (PSELG), which included representatives from each campus and CDL. Its charge was to adjudicate issues and decision-making related to interlibrary loan, fulfillment, discovery, lending/borrowing practices, and related areas. In addition to PSELG, there was a technical services counterpart, the Technical Services Escalation Leadership Group (TSELG), which had a similar charge, focused on adjudicating issues and decision-making related to acquisitions, e-resources, cataloging, metadata, and discovery.[27]

One of the questions brought to PSELG for consideration was, "Should we, as a system, use CDI [Ex Libris' Central Discovery Index] to manage open access (OA) resources?" A variety of functional teams had discussed this question; it ultimately landed with PSELG because of the need to think philosophically about the purpose of a discovery service in comparison to a standalone catalog, as well as pragmatic questions about the user experience in discovery.

PSELG's initial investigation of this question, which was also discussed with TSELG, revealed that the broader issue of how OA resources should be managed in a shared integrated library system was complex, crossed over multiple functional areas, and had implications for both UC and campus policies on resource management. Some of the questions PSELG surfaced included the following: What is the difference, from a user's perspective, between the UC's cataloging an OA resource versus relying on metadata coming from the CDI? What UC Library groups have responsibility for OA cataloging decisions? What groups will have responsibility for decisions regarding the CDI? PSELG articulated the concerns and questions, but neither it nor TSELG felt knowledgeable enough to provide useful guidance. The discussions consistently came up against questions regarding cataloging practices, how migrating to Alma would impact local and systemwide cataloging practices and policies, how the CDI might impact the need to catalog OA resources, and how the user would be impacted in the discovery and access of OA materials if the UC decided to rely on the CDI. PSELG proposed that the UC Libraries Direction and Oversight Committee (DOC)—the system-wide group that would assume oversight for SILS after it went into production—appoint a dedicated Task Force to further investigate. DOC then appointed the OARMTF, which was charged to do the following:

- Investigate how best to manage OA resource activation across the UC system;
- Develop a system-wide standard practice of how and when OA resources are included in the CDI; and

- Conduct a review of current UC documents outlining the policies and procedures for shared cataloging, linking and management; recommend proposed revisions.[28]

Members on the Task Force represented expertise in acquisitions, cataloging, collections and licensing at local and system-wide levels, scholarly communication, working with Ex Libris and the CDI, and expertise with SCP.

The Task Force had two distinct phases, which were articulated in its charge. Phase One provided time and space for the members to discuss how to define "open access," as well as learn more about existing UC policies for cataloging OA materials, and, ultimately, develop principles for managing OA resources. Phase Two then focused on reviewing and recommending workflows and management procedures for cataloging and discovering OA resources. As the Task Force progressed in its work, the Task Force was empowered to revise portions of the charge as they updated their understanding of the new system, particularly aspects of the charge that explicitly referred to new features of the new ILS, such as the CDI.

Development of Principles

The Task Force's key deliverable in Phase One was the development of principles for consortial OA resource management. The Task Force initially began by investigating existing principles as a starting point and found that very little was published by way of examples from other consortia. The Task Force then focused on developing a baseline and shared understanding of key terms and concepts found within its charge. Notably, the Task Force sought to develop a shared understanding of "open access" to guide its work, as well as a shared understanding of the relevant components of the new SILS—particularly features of the CDI—and of the larger context of UC OA initiatives and efforts into which the work of the Task Force fell.

Defining Open Access

Although all definitions of open access include the removal of price barriers, they can vary in how they express the removal of other reuse restrictions. Peter Suber characterizes OA literature as "digital, online, free of charge, and free of most copyright and licensing restrictions," whereas the Budapest Open Access Initiative provides more concrete reuse rights in their definition of OA, including the right to "read, download, copy, distribute, print, search, or link to the full texts of these articles, crawl them for indexing, pass them as data to software, or use them for any other lawful purpose, without financial, legal, or technical barriers other than those inseparable from gaining access to the internet itself."[29] Given that open access definitions may encompass a spectrum of reuse rights, the Task Force determined that developing a shared understanding of open access would be useful in scoping its work as well as guiding future discussions.

The Task Force identified several existing definitions of open access for discussion, starting with local definitions of OA in cataloging work. With SCP being the main distributor of cataloging records for OA

resources, the Task Force started with how SCP currently defines OA and what it considers within its scope of OA work. Per its policies, SCP defines OA as "resources [that] have no financial or legal barriers to access for members of our user community."

This definition is accompanied by five factors:

1. The publication must be available online at no charge to readers or institutions. No subscription can be required for online access. It is acceptable for the issuing body to require registration as long as no cost is involved.
2. Readers must be permitted to use the material for any lawful purpose, including downloading, copying, making derivative works, distributing, printing, searching, or linking to the full texts of works, crawling for indexing, or passing as data to software.
3. No licensor/licensee relationship shall exist between the publisher or provider of the online publication and the individual user or institution.
4. The publication must not be a free trial, complimentary access with subscription, part of an open access pilot project, or an "opt-in" title.
5. The publication must not be part of a mass digitization project (e.g., Google books, Open Content Alliance, etc.).[30]

Following SCP's definition, the Task Force also learned of local campus OA practices. For instance, at one campus, catalogers largely operated with a broader definition of OA as "free to read." As such, catalogers added OA-specific metadata to bibliographic records for resources that were accessible without logins or paywalls, including grey literature—such as government documents, theses and dissertations, and working papers, digital collections, and resources that did not explicitly note reuse permissions.[31] This definition aligned more closely with Peter Suber's concept of "gratis OA," "for the removal of price barriers alone," in contrast with "libre OA," "for the removal of price and at least some permission barriers."[32]

Finally, the Task Force reviewed what Ex Libris-managed resources would be labeled as OA in the new UCLS. According to Ex Libris documentation, resources are considered OA if:

- An item is freely available and openly accessible without requiring authentication by the user.
- An item is identified by the provider/publisher as Open Access.
- An item resides in a known Open Access repository, database, or journal collection that we determine to be Open Access.[33]

Ex Libris also adds, "We recognize that there are different flavors and models of Open Access that depend on where the article is published, who is responsible for the cost of publishing, reuse rights, embargo periods, and so forth. We do not distinguish or differentiate between any of these models."[34] Additionally, the metadata field that determines whether an OA icon is displayed for a bibliographic record in UCLS is based on either the MARC field 506 Restrictions on Access note or the Dublin Core field dcterms.accessRights, which do not necessarily denote additional reuse rights.[35]

Given the range of resources that may fall under any of these definitions, the Task Force determined to move forward with a broad definition of OA in recognition of the various flavors of OA that currently exist and would likely appear in UCLS: "For the purposes of this document and our Task Force work, we interpret open access to mean 'free to read' for anyone, anywhere, with an internet connection."[36]

Understanding the New Integrated Library System

Another area of learning for the Task Force was understanding components of SILS that would impact how OA resources are managed. For instance, with all campuses sharing a Network Zone, which allows shared "management of metadata records, acquisitions, and/or other Alma services, such as fulfillment, resource sharing, vendor information, or administration tables," local campuses can now contribute bibliographic records that can be instantly viewed in all campuses' catalogs.[37] This is in contrast to the previous environment of separate systems, where campuses relied on a central body, SCP, to distribute records to all campuses. However, although bibliographic records are easily shared among campuses without having account permissions in the Network Zone itself, *access* to the resources in question cannot be similarly shared, based on Alma's infrastructure. That is, although a campus cataloger may import a metadata record for an OA resource into the Network Zone, thereby making the resource searchable and discoverable in all UC catalogs, adding the accompanying URL link for access to the OA resource is something only those with permissions directly in the Network Zone can do. Such permissions currently are not distributed widely throughout the campuses, which affects the kinds of workflows that are possible in SILS.

Another feature the Task Force focused on learning about was the CDI, particularly given its centrality to the initial question that led to the Task Force's formation. The CDI contains billions of article, item, and full-text level metadata in a search platform that works alongside the information in the library catalog (Alma) to power UCLS (Primo VE).[38] These CDI records are associated with collections generally managed by Ex Libris.[39]

The Task Force learned that how these CDI records show up in UCLS had a lot to do with a configuration decision made during migration. Specifically, the Task Force focused on understanding the implications of UC Libraries choosing the EasyActive activation setting for all campuses, a decision that was made before the formation of the Task Force. At the time of the SILS migration, Ex Libris offered migrating institutions two options for making these CDI records discoverable in the library catalog—one in which institutions have control over what collections to activate for search and access, and therefore what CDI records to make discoverable in the library catalog (called "Fully Flexible"), and one where Ex Libris makes all CDI records automatically discoverable in the library catalog (called "EasyActive").[40] The Task Force learned that in choosing the EasyActive setting, all CDI records are searchable within UCLS by default; UC Libraries would not have to manually activate collections for search, only for access, meaning selecting settings so that URLs appear with the CDI record. What this also means is that UC Libraries has no control over the searchability of these records and cannot remove or deactivate these collections for search. The only option available to campuses is to filter the

initial search results presented to users; however, all of the CDI records are included in the search interface.

The original charge included goals such as "Develop a system-wide standard practice of how and when OA resources are included in the CDI" and "Propose a framework for ongoing consortial management of OA resources in the CDI."[41] In learning about the EasyActive setting, the Task Force realized that the charge's language implied a level of control over what CDI records appear in UCLS, when in fact, UC Libraries would not have options with regard to "turning on/off" CDI records for any included resource, OA or licensed; these records would automatically appear in relevant search results, regardless of whether UC had selected those OA resources to appear. With the level of understanding about CDI and EasyActive that the Task Force reached, the Task Force concluded that some deliverables that implied an ability to "manage" CDI records in UCLS were not possible due to configuration decisions already made, and noted as much in their reports to DOC.

Outlining University of California Open Access Investment

The Task Force also discussed how this OA work was situated within the greater context of OA initiatives currently taking place within UC per the charge's differentiation between OA resources "in the wild" and OA resources where UC has made some sort of investment: "Where appropriate, the Task Force should distinguish between OA resources within which UC has explicitly made a financial commitment or where it is the publisher, from those OA resources 'in the wild' which may be represented in the CDI."[42]

UC has made numerous investments in both OA resources and OA infrastructure in recent years. In addition to investments in OA initiatives such as the Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ), Biomed Central, Knowledge Unlatched, Reveal Digital, and the Directory of Open Access Books (DOAB), UC has also pursued a number of transformative agreements with publishers such as Elsevier, PLoS, Cambridge University Press, and the Royal Society, to name a few.[43] UC also manages OA resources through the UC institutional repository eScholarship, UC Press, and Dryad for datasets. Additionally, in 2021, Open Educational Resources (OERs) were called out as a UC priority.[44]

In discussing this ecosystem of UC OA activity, the Task Force touched on the prioritization of categories of resources within OA. Given that UC has provided investment in numerous OA initiatives, how would we ensure that monographs in DOAB or datasets in Dryad are discoverable and accessible in UCLS? Or given the argument that OA articles are more discoverable and have more citations, how would we ensure that metadata for a UC faculty's OA articles is of adequate quality for search and discovery? These discussions brought to the forefront the fact that the OA publishing landscape—and therefore the OA cataloging landscape—is broader than journals and monographs and encompasses materials such as datasets and grey literature. Also, discovery and accessibility of OA resources important to the UC may necessitate advocacy to content providers and aggregators who provide metadata to CDI, as well as relying on discoverability through traditional cataloging.

Alignment with Systemwide Integrated Library System Harmonization Principles

Another consideration for the Task Force in drafting the principles was alignment with existing principles governing the SILS project in general. In reviewing the SILS harmonization principles, which describe how the individual campuses can "come together to align practices, procedures, policies and workflows where appropriate," the Task Force discussed the principle of "simplify" when considering the idea that OA collections of interest should be activated for all campuses, rather than activating for select campuses, and therefore increasing the management workload.[45] The Task Force also considered "share the load" in the context of reducing duplication of effort as much as possible, such as reducing or moving away from the idea of campuses activating OA collections in their Institution Zone, which is the local, non-network environment in Alma.[46] Additionally, SILS provided the opportunity to work together in a shared system for the first time; what efficiencies might be gained from everyone being able to contribute more than ever before rather than solely relying on a centralized body?

After several working meetings to create a set of principles, an initial draft was shared with relevant stakeholders for review and comment. Stakeholders included the UC Shared Content Leadership Group (SCLG), charged by the Council of University Librarians (CoUL) to make decisions for the UC in the areas of system-wide collection development and management; relevant groups at CDL; and local campus scholarly communication librarians, technical services librarians, and other campus groups related to open access and resource management.[47] As the Task Force membership did not represent all campuses, SCLG also served as a way to reach and include all campuses in the draft review.

The review period was one month, after which the Task Force discussed and addressed stakeholder comments. The final twelve principles were published in the Task Force's Phase One Report in October 2021 and provided below.[48]

Principles

Quality

1. OA resources deemed to be of sufficient value to include in discovery tools at any one campus will be deemed good enough for all campuses.
2. Obtaining quality metadata for OA resources will be a combination of efforts to efficiently utilize existing metadata, create descriptions as needed, and advocate to providers of the resources.

Efficiency and Prioritization

1. OA resources selected by one campus should be made available for the discovery tools of all campuses.
2. Policies, practices, and methods of communication for OA resource management should be developed with attention to efficiency and de-duplication of effort across campuses.
3. Cataloging priority for OA resources needs to be parallel to that for paid/licensed resources.

4. Within cataloging open access resources, priority should be given to UC-sponsored projects and projects where the UC have made a financial investment.

Maintenance/Monitoring

1. As much as possible, use data-driven decision-making to monitor, maintain, and troubleshoot discovery and access to OA resources.
2. We understand that maintenance and monitoring of OA resources is ongoing and that a system-wide group is needed to support this effort.
3. Ongoing maintenance is shared consortially.

Governance

1. Stakeholders at every campus will have a voice in working toward shared practices developed through consensus.

Harmonization[49]

1. The more our OA resource management activities are harmonized, the greater we will be able to work in shared files and benefit from each other's efforts.

Discoverability

1. OA resources will be clearly labeled so that this material is discoverable in UC Library Search.

Challenges and Discussion Points

In developing the principles, a number of topics became key points of discussion for the Task Force, which revolved around what it meant to be making decisions based on a brand-new system, what it meant to work in a shared system and to "share the load," and what it meant to consider OA resources as equal in cataloging priority to licensed resources.

An Evolving Understanding of a New System

As mentioned previously, the Task Force spent several meetings learning about the CDI and EasyActive configuration before drafting the principles. The Task Force relied heavily on members with e-resource management expertise or previous Alma expertise to build this foundational understanding. However, given that SILS came together with a different configuration than those UC campuses who were already on Alma, but as a single institution, there were still many new aspects of the system to learn about, such as the Network Zone, which is only available to consortia. As such, the Task Force was constantly learning new aspects about how campuses could or could not interact with the Network Zone, as well as how the CDI worked; members of the Task Force regularly needed to revise their understanding of the new system as the work went on. This made it sometimes challenging to be certain that the Task Force's principles were based on an accurate understanding of what was possible. The Task Force thus made

sure to underscore in their reports that recommendations in general may need to be revised as either the understanding of the systems evolved or as the system itself changed over time.

Avoiding Prescriptive Principles

In line with the challenge of drafting principles while still developing an understanding of the new system, the Task Force also received feedback from stakeholders about wording that would seem too prescriptive. Reviewers commented that some principles were not general enough and may inadvertently commit UC to certain workflows or ways of working that may not be feasible as UC learned more about Alma and Primo VE, or that would be subject to change. As such, the Task Force worked to draft principles that, while informed by the new system, would ultimately be system-agnostic and could be adapted regardless of the ILS environment. The system-agnostic language would also avoid committing any particular group or staff to specific work.

Trust in Local Campus Standards

The first principle, "OA resources deemed to be of sufficient value to include in discovery tools at any one campus will be deemed good enough for all campuses," came together after key discussions related to having a system-wide ILS, where the work of one campus now had a direct impact on the other campuses. With the diversity of OA resources available, the Task Force discussions also veered toward the diversity of OA, both desirable OA resources and problematic OA resources. In discussing resources from publishers with problematic business practices or questionable content, the discussion turned toward the selection and vetting of OA resources going into the system to be filtered into all campuses' catalogs. This brought up the idea of trust—and what it meant to embed trust into principles for OA resource management. The Task Force, in drafting the final version of this particular principle, reached consensus that campuses already had the processes and workflows in place to select OA resources as they would any other resource, and as such, these OA resources should be made available to all campuses without each campus needing to re-evaluate the resource.

Rethinking OA Priority

In many ways, the decision to dedicate a Task Force to OA resource management signaled the importance of OA to UC, in alignment with UC's OA priorities more generally. As such, the principles were an opportunity for the Task Force to embed the idea of OA resources having equal cataloging priority with licensed resources, as it currently falls last in CDL's current cataloging priorities.[50]

The Task Force started with using an existing shared collections model currently in place at UC. This framework consists of four tiers that illustrate differing levels of access and responsibility for licensed resources.[51] Tier one resources are those that all campuses have access to, tier two resources are those that only some campuses may have access to, tier three resources are managed by individual campus libraries, and tier four resources are locally licensed by a non-library unit, to which the library unit may have access. In thinking about this framework in the context of OA resources, the Task Force discussed how certain resources may fall into different tiers; for example, tier three OA resources may be those for

which a CDI activation is sufficient, rather than managing bibliographic records in the Network Zone. Higher-tiered resources might include those for which UC has a financial investment. However, another perspective on the tiered approach was that because OA resources should be made available to all campuses, these resources are therefore tier one resources. This idea eventually contributed to the principle that "Cataloging priority for OA resources needs to be parallel to that for paid/licensed resources." Or, as one reviewer stated, payment models should not automatically set the priority for cataloging a resource.

Post-Task Force

Once the Task Force published its principles for OA management, the Task Force moved into Phase Two of its work, which included discussions of potential models of working within SILS and a review of current UC OA resource management documentation. In doing so, it was clear that a new team would be needed to operationalize the principles and further investigate how best to work in a shared environment, while also assessing the impact of any decisions about consortial OA resource management. At the same time, users began to notice one impact of the EasyActive choice, which was instances of CDI records tagged as OA, but with no link for users to access the resource. Additionally, users noticed that some OA resources were not tagged as OA. The Task Force was not in a position to take action on these issues, but noted that these types of access and metadata quality issues would be something that any follow-on group would need to address.

The Task Force released its final Phase Two Report in March 2022, in which the Task Force developed a proposed charge for a new team.[52] In late spring of 2022, DOC charged a new SILS project team, the SILS Open Access Resource Management Project Team, to continue the work of developing workflows and practices for OA resource management.[53] The project team consists of select members of the Task Force, individuals from other SILS operations sub-teams, as well as experts in cataloging, e-resource management, discovery, public services, and more. Among the goals of this project team are discussing OA-related issues that arise in the new system, such as access issues for OA resources; determining areas of advocacy, such as advocating to Ex Libris for the addition of OA metadata in CDI records; recommending new workflows or revisions to existing ones through the OA resource management lifecycle, including ingest and cataloging, maintenance, and assessment; and developing ways of assessing the impact of implemented recommendations. The project team's work is currently underway until June 2024.

Conclusion

Although principles and policies related to OA collection development, scholarly publishing, and the like exist at UC and at other organizations more broadly, there is a noticeable gap in principles in the realm of OA resource management. The SILS project provided UC Libraries with an incredible opportunity to rethink and reprioritize OA resource management. Brunsting, Harrington, and Scott

argue that "taking a principles-based approach to OA is useful in developing local practices because it forces librarians to articulate how and where OA aligns with local collection needs, library and institutional strategies, and scholarly output."[54] The OARMTF's experience with developing principles very much reflected that exercise. In crafting principles for consortial OA resource management, the OARMTF found themselves grappling not just with trying to work with a developing understanding of a new system, which was constantly being updated in the midst of the larger migration effort, but also the huge learning curve librarians faced in the early days of using the new system. They encountered intense discussions around trust, workload capacities, and what it means to lift OA resources from cataloging's last priority to an equal cataloging priority with licensed resources. As a result of working through these discussions with a diverse membership—from scholarly communications to technical services, and from on-the-ground librarians to campus library leaders across libraries—the principles thus demonstrate to both UC users as well as UC library colleagues a concrete, consortial commitment to discovery of and access to OA resources, alongside the broader UC commitment to OA via scholarly publishing initiatives, OA policies, transformative agreements, funding OA infrastructure, and more. This effort has served as the foundation on which the Task Force completed the rest of its work, including the proposal of a successor OA resource management project team to turn principles into practices that better prioritize and surface access to the ever-increasing body of openly available knowledge. In writing this article, the authors hope that this case study will be useful for other consortia—or individual institutions, for that matter—interested in prioritizing the management of OA resources, or in developing principles around OA resource management as part of their own scholarly communication and OA goals. The authors also hope that this case study can encourage more discussion and research into best practices for consortial management of OA resources.

Acknowledgment

References and Notes

1. Historically, the regional storage facility holdings have been managed in the same systems as their most geographically proximate campus.

2. "An Overview of CDI," Ex Libris, accessed October 19, 2023, https://knowledge.exlibrisgroup.com/Primo /Content_Corner/Central_Discovery_Index/Documentation_and_Training/Documentation_and_Training _(English)/CDI_-_The_Central_Discovery_Index/010An_Overview_of_the_Ex_Libris_ Central_Discovery_Index_(CDI).

3. "For Authors & Researchers," University of California Office of Scholarly Communication, accessed July 11, 2023, https://osc.universityofcalifornia.edu/for-authors/.

4. Open Access Resource Management Task Force, *UC Libraries Open Access Resource Management Task Force Phase One Report* (2021), 9, https://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/wp-content/uploads/2021 /11/OARMTF_Phase_One_Report_Oct_2021.pdf.

5. Open Access Resource Management Task Force, *Phase One Report*, 9.

6. Elizabeth Finlay, "Library Provision of Intellectual Access to Open Access Journal Articles," *The Serials Librarian* 77, no. 1–2 (August 2019): 6–14, https://doi.org/10.1080/0361526X.2019.1628161.

7. Chris Bulock, Nathan Hosburgh, and Sanjeet Mann, "OA in the Library Collection: The Challenges of Identifying and Maintaining Open Access Resources," *The Serials Librarian* 68, no. 1–4 (May 2015): 79–86, https://doi.org/10.1080/0361526X.2015.1023690.

8. Santiago Chumbe, Brian Kelly, and Roddy MacLeod, "Hybrid Journals: Ensuring Systematic and Standard Discoverability of the Latest Open Access Articles," *The Serials Librarian* 68, no. 1–4 (May 2015): 143–55, https://doi.org/10.1080/0361526X.2015.1016856.

9. Aaron McCollough, "Does It Make a Sound: Are Open Access Monographs Discoverable in Library Catalogs?" *Portal: Libraries and the Academy* 17, no. 1 (January 2017): 179–94, https://doi.org/10.1353/pla.2017.0010.

10. McCollough, "Does It Make a Sound," 191.

11. McCollough, "Does It Make a Sound," 189.

12. Jeff Edmunds and Ana Enriquez, "Increasing Visibility of Open Access Materials in a Library Catalog: Case Study at a Large Academic Research Library," *Journal of Library Metadata* 20, no. 2–3 (July 2020): 127–54, https://doi.org/10.1080/19386389.2020.1821946.

13. Renee Chin et al., "One for ~~Nine~~ Ten: Cataloging for Consortia Collections, a UC Model," *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 56, no. 2–3 (February 2018): 188–213, https://doi.org/10.1080/01639374 .2017.1388895.

14. Shi Deng, Aislinn Sotelo, and Rebecca Culbertson, "Cataloging for Consortial Collections: A Survey," *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 56, no. 2–3 (2018): 171–87, https://doi.org/10.1080/01639374 .2017.1388327.

15. Jill Emery, Graham Stone, and Peter McCracken, *Techniques for Electronic Resource Management: TERMS and the Transition to Open* (Chicago: ALA Editions, 2020).

16. "OAWAL: Open Access Workflows in Academic Libraries," accessed July 27, 2023, https://library.hud .ac.uk/archive/projects/oawal/.

17. Rachel Elizabeth Scott, Caitlin Harrington, and Ana Dubnjakovic, "Exploring Open Access Practices, Attitudes, and Policies in Academic Libraries," *portal: Libraries and the Academy* 21, no. 2 (2021): 365–88, https://doi.org/10.1353/pla.2021.0020.

18. Karen Brunsting, Caitlin Harrington, and Rachel E. Scott, *Open Access Literature in Libraries: Principles and Practices* (Chicago: American Library Association, 2022), https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/fpml/163.

19. Brunsting, Harrington, and Scott, *Open Access Literature in Libraries*, 7–8.

20. Patricia Sheldahl French, Rebecca Culbertson, and Lai-Ying Hsiung, "One for Nine: The Shared Cataloging Program of the California Digital Library," *Serials Review* 28, no. 1 (2002): 4–12. https://doi.org/10.1080/00987913.2002.10764701. The UC Merced campus began operating in 2005.

21. French, Culbertson, and Hsiung, "One for Nine," 5.

22. Chin et al., "One for ~~Nine~~ Ten."

23. "Open Access Resources at the UC Libraries," California Digital Library, accessed June 12, 2023, https://cdlib.org/services/collections/licensed/policy/open-access-resources-at-the-uc-libraries/.

24. "Systemwide ILS Investigation: All-staff communication," University of California Council of University Librarians (CoUL), November 21, 2017, https://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/wp-content/uploads/2012/11/SystemwideILS_CommunicationToLibraryStaff_11212017.pdf.

25. "Melvyl Through Time," UC Libraries, accessed June 12, 2023, https://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/uclibrarysearch/melvyl-through-time/.

26. "SILS Mission and Principles," University of California Libraries, June 2021, https://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/wp-content/uploads/2022/01/SILS_Principles.pdf.

27. "Systemwide ILS (SILS) Phase 4 Shared Governance Structure," University of California Libraries, February 2020, https://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/SILS_phase4_GovernanceStructurePackage_Endorsed.pdf.

28. "UC Libraries Open Access Resource Management Task Force Charge (FINAL)," UCLAS Direction & Oversight Committee, revised May 2021, https://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/OA_Resource_Management_Task_Force_Charge_FINAL_May2021.pdf.

29. Peter Suber, *Open Access* (Cambridge: The MIT Press, 2012), https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/9286.001.0001; "Read the Declaration," BOAI, accessed July 3, 2023, https://www.budapestopenaccessinitiative.org/read/.

30. California Digital Library, "Open Access Resources at the UC Libraries."

31. Wanda R. Marsolek, Kristen Cooper, Shannon L. Farrell, and Julia A. Kelly, "The Types, Frequencies, and Findability of Disciplinary Grey Literature within Prominent Subject Databases and Academic Institutional Repositories," *Journal of Librarianship and Scholarly Communication* 6, no. 1 (April 30, 2018), https://doi.org/10.7710/2162-3309.2200.

32. Peter Suber, "Gratis and Libre Open Access," SPARC, accessed June 12, 2023, https://sparcopen.org/our-work/gratis-and-libre-open-access/.

33. "Open Access Content in CDI," Ex Libris, accessed October 19, 2023, https://knowledge.exlibrisgroup.com /Primo/Content_Corner/Central_Discovery_Index/Knowledge_Articles/Open_Access_Content_in_CDI.

34. Ex Libris, "Open Access Content in CDI."

35. "Open Access Indication in Primo VE," Ex Libris, accessed October 19, 2023, https://knowledge.exlibrisgroup .com/Primo/Product_Documentation/020Primo_VE/Primo_VE_(English)/030Primo_VE_User_Interface /Open_Access_Indication_in_Primo_VE.

36. Open Access Resource Management Task Force, *Phase One Report*, 9.

37. "Introduction to the Network Zone," Ex Libris, accessed October 19, 2023, https://knowledge.exlibrisgroup .com/Alma/Product_Documentation/010Alma_Online_Help_(English)/100Managing_Multiple_Institution s_Using_a_Network_Zone/01_Overview/01_Overview_of_Collaborative_Networks.

38. Ex Libris, "An Overview of CDI."

39. "Community Zone—Join for Enhanced Library Collaboration," Ex Libris, accessed June 12, 2023, https://exlibrisgroup.com/products/alma-library-services-platform/community-zone/.

40. "Single Activation with the Fully Flexible Setting," Ex Libris, accessed October 19, 2023, https://knowledge .exlibrisgroup.com/Alma/Product_Documentation/010Alma_Online_Help_(English)/Electronic_Resource _Management/060_Alma_Single_Activation_Source_for_CDI/020Single_Activation_with_the_Fully _Flexible_Setting; "Single Activation with the EasyActive Setting," Ex Libris, accessed October 19, 2023, https://knowledge.exlibrisgroup.com/Alma/Product_Documentation/010Alma_Online_Help_(English) /Electronic_Resource_Management/060_Alma_Single_Activation_Source_for_CDI/040Single_Activation _with_the_EasyActive_Setting.

41. "UC Libraries Open Access Resource Management Task Force Charge (FINAL)," 1–2.

42. "UC Libraries Open Access Resource Management Task Force Charge (FINAL)," 1.

43. "New Scholarly Communication Investments by CDL 2022," California Digital Library, July 11, 2022, https://cdlib.org/cdlinfo/2022/07/11/new-scholarly-communication-investments-by-cdl-2022/.

44. "University of California Efforts to Advance Affordable Course Materials and Open Educational Resources," Office of the President, July 21, 2021, https://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/regmeet/july21/a3.pdf.

45. "Harmonization Principles & Guidelines," University of California Libraries, June 30, 2020, https://libraries .universityofcalifornia.edu/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/SILS-Harmonization-Principles-Guidelines_6-30 -20.pdf.

46. "Introduction to Metadata Management," Ex Libris, accessed October 19, 2023, https://knowledge.exlibris group.com/Alma/Product_Documentation/010Alma_Online_Help_(English)/Metadata_Management /005Introduction_to_Metadata_Management.

47. "Shared Content Leadership Group (SCLG)," UC Libraries, accessed June 12, 2023, https://libraries .universityofcalifornia.edu/sclg/.

48. Open Access Resource Management Task Force, *Phase One Report*, 9–10.

49. "Harmonization" is used in alignment with the "Harmonization Principles & Guidelines."

50. "SCP Cataloging Priorities," California Digital Library, accessed June 12, 2023, https://cdlib.org/services/collections/scp/organization/scp-cataloging-priorities/.

51. "Tiered Approach to Licensed Collections," California Digital Library, accessed June 12, 2023, https://cdlib.org/services/collections/licensed/policy/tiered-approach-to-licensed-collections/.

52. Open Access Resource Management Task Force, *UC Libraries Open Access Resource Management Task Force Phase Two Report* (2022), https://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/wp-content/uploads/2022/04/OARMTF_Phase_Two_Report_Mar_2022.pdf.

53. "Open Access Resource Management Project Team," SILS, accessed June 12, 2023, https://uc-sils.atlassian.net/wiki/spaces/OARMPT/overview.

54. Brunsting, Harrington, and Scott, *Open Access Literature in Libraries*, 96.