MEETING NOTES

Attending: Lucas (chair); Cogswell; Doyle; Greenstein; Meyer; Miller; Schneider; Schottlaender; Waters; Wolpert
Absent: Farley (consultant)
Support: Lawrence (staff)

General background:

Task Force roster
Meeting notes, Task Force meeting of November 17, 2010
Schedule of Discussion Topics (11/29/10)
Library Planning Task Force, Operating Principles

The General Background documents were approved as submitted.

1. Review of work to date (45 min)

   Background: Revised draft, Action Memorandum 1, Management of Existing Print Collections
   Draft, Action Memorandum 2, Acquisition of Published Materials

Points raised in discussion of Action Memorandum 1 included:

- The phrase “duplication [that] does not serve essential curricular, research, preservation or risk management goals,” which is an important qualifier here and in other Task Force documents, is not operationally defined; its ambiguity will raise significant concerns among some UC constituencies.
- The importance of meaningful consultation with faculty in both planning and implementation of library strategies, particularly when these involve relocating or disposing of print collections
- The importance of devising (in consultation with faculty) effective algorithms for determining need for retention of multiple copies and identification of material to discard; case-by-case consultation at the scale proposed here is not practical
- It is important both to separate issues of strategic direction from those of implementation to the extent possible, and to clearly identify the principles that inform both planning and implementation
- It would be helpful to frame these decisions within the context of an overall mission statement
- It is generally agreed that strategy 1.a., de-duplication of print journal backfiles, will be non-controversial. As this step alone would add over a decade to existing stack capacity, it may be possible to avoid some potentially difficult discussions about the details of the other strategies by clarifying their lower priority.

ACTION:
• Staff will create a continuously-updated working document that captures the overarching principles emerging from Task Force discussion, and bring this document back to the TF for review at each meeting. Initially, this will include points related to the importance of faculty consultation and engagement, and the importance of retaining and expanding the depth and diversity of the collection while reducing unnecessary redundancy.

• Staff will develop some bullet points related to a potential mission statement, for discussion at the January 5-6 face-to-face meeting.

• As an aid to ongoing planning, and to help articulate the distinctions between planning and implementation issues, the TF will reserve a time (perhaps in January) for a “next steps” discussion, to include a consultation plan for University review of the Task Force recommendations, and consideration of implementation issues and strategies.

• Staff will make further revisions to Action Memorandum 1 to emphasize the principles that inform these action steps and modify language where necessary.

• Staff will modify the presentation in Appendix A to distinguish between the parts of the financial analysis that reflect estimated budget reductions and those that represent erosion of buying power.

Points raised in discussion of Action Memorandum 2 included:

• It was generally agreed that textbooks were out of scope for this group and for AM2, but it was agreed to put the issue in a “parking lot” for later discussion.

• The presentation of the three types of collections, the reasons for focusing on Type ii, and the scope and operation of the recommended actions raised numerous questions, and needs to be clarified.

• Regardless of how the recommendations are presented or implemented, there is likely to be significant faculty concern about the concept of relying on a single systemwide copy for any class of print material.

• The presentation of the “Centers of Excellence” recommendation is vague and confusing. It implies a single campus, whereas the Center could be housed across campuses. The listing of potential subjects raises difficult questions, is insufficiently specific, and does not materially add to the substantive recommendation. The recommendation needs to be retitled to align with the “Service Center” nomenclature used in the narrative.

• The Open Access recommendation as written is unacceptably vague, especially given its enormous scope. There is agreement that a recommendation for bold and effective action to promote OA is appropriate, that a “venture fund” approach makes sense, and that both the concepts of (i) using UC’s size and reputation to exercise leadership (without unduly undermining capacity to support the UC academic enterprise) and (ii) investing in order to save money should be included.

ACTION:

• Staff will revise Action Memorandum 2 in light of the points raised in discussion, for further review by the Task Force

• Staff will create a “Parking Lot” list for issues on which the TF prefers to defer consideration.

• To help keep the work on schedule, staff will circulate revised documents for review and comment when they are ready, rather than waiting for the next meeting.

2. Discussion of Issues and Strategies for Collections: Prospective Acquisitions (45 min)

Background: “Collections Scenarios—“Unpublished” Collections, DRAFT v.2
Deferred to the next meeting.

The next conference call meeting of the Task Force will be on December 13, from 11:00 a.m. – noon PST (NOTE: 1 hour meeting).