SYSTEMWIDE LIBRARY AND SCHOLARLY INFORMATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE
LIBRARY PLANNING TASK FORCE

March 4, 2011
1:30 – 3:00 p.m. (PST)

MEETING NOTES

Attending: Lucas (chair); Cogswell; Doyle; Farley (consultant); Greenstein; Meyer; R. B. Miller; Schottlaender; Waters; Wolpert

Absent: Schneider

Support: Lawrence; J. Miller

General background:

Meeting notes, Task Force meeting of January 28, 2011

1. Objectives for today’s meeting
2. Reports on consultations
   a. Council of University Librarians/University Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication, February 16, 2011

Schottlaender reported on three areas of concern to the University Librarians and UCOLASC:

1. Clarifying the equivocal description of the problem as a “budget cut” in some documents and as a “savings target” in others.
2. Deep reservations about the feasibility of proceeding with implementation in parallel with consultation.
3. A lack of clarity about who is responsible for implementation. In particular, the Council of University Librarians questioned the characterization of their organization as “informal” and exhorted the reports’ authors to acknowledge the role of the libraries in the academic enterprise and recognize their previous accomplishments and responsibility and authority for the next steps.

b. Council of Vice Chancellors, February 25, 2011

Lucas described the problem to the Executive Vice Chancellors (using comparative slides that have since been incorporated in the draft documents to be discussed below), discussed the recommendations, and emphasized the pivotal role of the EVCs both in providing financial support for shared services to be developed and supporting their libraries in taking the steps necessary to achieve change. The EVCs neither endorsed nor specifically criticized the Task Force recommendations.

In response to a question from R.B. Miller, Lucas indicated that, for the LAUC Assembly on March 10, he planned to add slides and narrative more fully discussing the question of implementation responsibility, highlighting the central role of the libraries and the Council of University Librarians, but acknowledging that the exact organizational structure remained to be determined.

In response to a question from Lucas, R.B. Miller confirmed that there was general consensus among the University Librarians about the overall directions recommended by the Task Force, but there are likely to be questions about the estimates and projections used in the report and there accuracy in depicting current campus conditions.
3. Review of new and revised documents
   a. Budget Scenarios, v.2a; Version 2 distributed by email 2/28; lightly revised 3/1

Lawrence reported that the purpose of Version 2 of this document was to introduce graphics and narrative, originally developed for the two presentations discussed above, that were intended to dramatize the size of the budget problem facing the libraries; no substantive changes in the estimate of the budget shortfall were introduced in Version 2.

There was considerable discussion about the attempt to characterize the budget cuts in terms of reduced acquisitions, and a general consensus that it would be preferable to portray these in dollar terms, as was done in most of the new comparison graphs. It may, however, be important to develop a variety of comparisons, expressed in a variety of metrics, for specific audiences.

Waters suggested that the budget assumptions embodied in the tabular presentations needed to be stated more clearly and explicitly, and drew the group’s attention to the description of the portion of the library budgets supported by non-general funds, speculating that a fuller understanding of this component of the budget might lead into and help focus discussion of strategies for revenue enhancement.

Lucas suggested that it might be useful to complement the budget impact presentations with a presentation characterizing collection diversity and the effect of de-duplication recommendations; this will be taken under advisement. Wolpert pointed out that de-duplication is an expensive “rear-view” strategy that should be trumped by strategies to slow the future growth of print collections, e.g., by acquisition of e-books. It was, however, acknowledged that weeding of journals (as proposed in Phase I) is considerably more feasible than de-duplication of existing book collections, and that any kind of de-duplication activity is less expensive if it can be undertaken as a side benefit of another project, e.g., transfer of materials to storage or between facilities.

   b. Action Memorandum 7, v.1a, “Implementation Planning,” distributed by email 2/28, revised in response to comments 3/1

The group returned to the general question of parallel consultation and implementation planning. It was generally agreed that the consultation process could be tainted if it were perceived as subordinate to implementation, but that time was of the essence in preparing to implement strategies that could deliver operational efficiencies to the campuses. There was no clear consensus about the feasibility or likely outcome of a request for a spring quarter “fast track” review by the Academic Senate, but a strong consensus that problems could be avoided if planning for specific services were not characterized as “implementation.”

It was agreed that:

- The work of developing specific project proposals for Phase I (and beyond) could be conducted by groups characterized as “analytical teams” or “development teams.”
- SLASIAc would:
  - Ask the Senate for an expedited review of the Task Force report
  - Ask the University Librarians to form “analytical teams” to perform additional detailed study
- The report should, as much as possible, elevate candidate projects that are “internal operational changes” (e.g., systemwide shelf-ready processing; non-controversial).

   c. DRAFT Interim Report, v.1 (NEW)
Several specific recommendations were brought forward:

- Change language pertinent to the Council of University Librarians and the Shared Library Facilities Board
- Reduce the level of detail in the description of shared services, or move the bulk of the descriptive information to an appendix (characterize this material as advisory to the “analytical teams”?)
- Correct the description of other institutions’ scholarly communication policies on p. 14.
- Consider raising the profile of indirect cost recovery in p. 13 (remembering that changes in the use of indirect costs represent reallocations of existing resources, not new sources of revenue).
- Recast the “recommendations” portion of the “Governance” section to clarify the specific recommendation of the Task Force and characterize the following bulleted list as “criteria” rather than “considerations.”

4. Next steps (Lucas) (5 min)

It was agreed that the Task Force would schedule a conference call shortly after the March 16 meeting of the Systemwide Library and Scholarly Information Advisory Committee (SLASIAC) to assess next steps.