

Systemwide Library and Scholarly Information Advisory Committee
February 20, 2004, 10 a.m. – 3 p.m.
UC Irvine, University Club

Meeting Notes

Members Present:	Brown, Constable, Davis, Glantz, Gottfredson (Chair), Greenstein, Hafner, Heinecke, Jensen, Munoff, Pitts, Schottlaender, Withey, Zelmanowitz
Members Absent:	Adams, Afifi, Bergstrom, Bero, Hartford, Olsen
Staff:	Candee, Lawrence

1. Welcome and introduction

MEETING OBJECTIVES

Action Items:

1. Review and endorse the strategic plan for libraries and scholarly information, and comment on accompanying "perspectives" papers for specific audiences
2. Consider discharging the SLASAC Collection Management Planning Group (CMPG)

Review and discuss:

1. Plans for a print repository of journals digitized by JSTOR, and other matters related to development of shared print collections
2. Plans to implement the strategic direction to promote change in scholarly communication
3. The report of the University Librarians' Regional Library Facilities Task Force
4. Status of planning for Phase III of the Southern Regional Library Facility
5. Plans to implement the strategic direction on persistent access to digital information

2. Budget Update

Heinecke summarized the Governor's Budget for 2004-05 as it affects the University (see <http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/news/budget/welcome.html> for more information) and discussed Proposition 55, the education facilities bond issue on the March primary ballot. Gottfredson noted that while library budgets will be affected by the proposed \$45.4 million cut for academic and administrative support (including libraries), the treatment of library budgets is to a large extent a matter for internal allocation by the President and the Chancellors. Greenstein reported that, while the funding for library resource sharing programs has sustained a significant cut and planning for 2004-05 Office of the President budgets is still in the very early stages, in general systemwide library programs have been treated well.

3.a. "Systemwide Strategic Directions" documents

Background:

- Systemwide Strategic Directions for Libraries and Scholarly Information (Rev. 2/13/04)
- Perspectives on Budgeting Issues (Rev. 2/3/04)
- Faculty Perspectives (Rev. 2/3/04)
- Perspectives on State Financing Issues (2/10/04)
- (For reference: meeting notes of 12/1/03, item 3.a.i.)

After a wide-ranging discussion led by Greenstein, SLASIAC agreed to endorse the "Systemwide Strategic Directions" document and accompanying "Perspectives" in concept. The Committee need not review the material again before publication, subject to specific actions that will be undertaken by SLP at SLASIAC's recommendation:

- Allow 3-4 weeks for SLASIAC members to make suggestions about the language of the report
- Rewrite the Shared Services section to make it clearer and more forceful
- In the Shared Services section, and elsewhere as appropriate, strengthen language related to technology infrastructure to emphasize the need for an ongoing planning and implementation partnership with the CIOs.
- Engage an editor to review and edit the writing for general clarity, grammar, etc.

The Committee also suggested that SLP consider drafting a Perspective for CIOs. Gottfredson indicated that SLASIAC would be interested in learning more on an ongoing basis about what is and is not working in implementation of the strategic directions.

4. Collection Management and Coordination

4.a. JSTOR Print Repository

Greenstein reported briefly on the ongoing discussions with JSTOR, which is interested in establishing a secure print archive of the journal volumes that they have digitized. A small task force, drawn from CDL/SLP and the campus libraries and Regional Library Facilities, is working on a feasibility study and cost proposal to JSTOR for creation of the archive using existing RLF deposits and campus holdings of the 400 or so titles in the JSTOR collection. The libraries anticipate that this initiative would be attractive if it were possible at a modest marginal cost to simultaneously create from existing UC library holdings a parallel shared working collection of print JSTOR journals that could allow campuses to consider withdrawing their locally-held print copies to save shelf space.

4.b. Status of Collection Management Planning Group

Background:

- CMPG Roster (2002-03) (<http://www.slp.ucop.edu/consultation/cmpg/roster.pdf>)
- Founding resolution (http://www.slp.ucop.edu/consultation/slasiac/SLASIAC_Resolution_B.html)
- Web site: <http://www.slp.ucop.edu/consultation/cmpg/>

Greenstein reviewed the accomplishments of the CMPG in framing the planning for shared print collections and setting the stage for reconsideration of the roles of the Regional Library Facilities. When CMPG was founded by SLASIAC in January 2000, there was no identifiable group that could undertake the tasks with which it was charged. Subsequently, its issues have been incorporated in the *Strategic Directions*, the University Librarians have taken leadership in strategic planning for collection management, and numerous implementation activities are already underway. In view of these developments, SLASIAC agreed to discharge the CMPG and its Steering Committee with thanks.

5. Scholarly Communication

At the request of the committee, Greenstein reviewed the outcomes of the Elsevier negotiation (see <http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/news/negotiations.html> for more information), and acknowledged three factors that were essential to the favorable results: faculty support, administrative support, and a high level of collaborative support by UC librarians. Gottfredson noted that by all reports, the UC community feels that the libraries did an excellent job with this negotiation.

5.a. Library Plan

Background:

- The UC Libraries' Scholarly Communication Program Priorities (Draft, 2/5/04)

Greenstein reported that, in the wake of the Elsevier experience and the Fall 2003 faculty seminars on scholarly communication, a variety of strategies are being developed to build on the current level of interest in scholarly communication and begin to address the fundamental issues. As part of this effort, the libraries are planning collectively to a) provide tools and services to faculty who are interested in alternatives to their traditional publishing activities and in actively managing their copyrights, b) foster widespread communication on campus and systemwide about scholarly communication issues and UC responses, c) develop, validate and promulgate principled statements that represent the University community's values regarding the scholarly communication system, and 4) develop and nurture communities of interest.

5.b. Administrative Efforts

Background:

- *Reshaping Scholarly Communication* Web site (<http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/scholarly/>)
- Fall 2003 faculty seminars on scholarly communication (http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/scholarly/fall_03_facultyforums.html)

To provide high-quality staff support for the University's scholarly communication initiatives, including those centered in the libraries and the Academic Council, and ensure effective coordination of planning, communication, and deployment of services (e.g., eScholarship programs), Greenstein has established an Office of Scholarly Communication, reporting directly to him and staffed through reorganization of existing resources. Within this Office, Catherine Candee's role as leader of the eScholarship program will continue and be expanded with the new title of Director of Scholarly Communication Initiatives and Publishing. John Ober, current CDL Director of Education and Strategic Innovation, will assume the new title of Director of Scholarly Communication Planning and Research.

5.c. Academic Council Special Committee on Scholarly Communication

Background:

- Academic Council Special Committee on Scholarly Communication (http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/news/source/source2_2.pdf)
- Proposal for an Academic Council Special Committee on Scholarly Communication (Academic Council, 11/24/03)

Pitts reported that the membership for this committee is nearly complete, and noted that UCSF University Librarian Karen Butter has been asked to join the group. The first meeting should be within the next 4-6 weeks, and Pitts will continue the chairmanship for the Committee when Academic Council Vice Chair Blumenthal becomes Council Chair in September. Pitts envisions that the group will organize itself into subcommittees to address each bulleted issue in the charge, with each subcommittee composed of 1-2 committee members plus others with interest or expertise in the topic. The committee's Web site (<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/committees/council/scsc/>) will provide information about its work on an ongoing basis.

6. Shared Facilities

6.a. Regional Library Facilities Planning Task Force (Information)

6.b. Southern Regional Library Facility, Phase 3 progress (Information)

Background: RLF Task Force Final Report (2/13/04)

Munoff reported that the Task Force had been formed to address a number of questions about the RLFs that arose frequently in discussion of shared print collections. He proceeded to briefly review the report's recommendations. There ensued considerable discussion of Task Force recommendation 8:

Establish specific policies and operational agreements that can be implemented immediately to insure the persistence and availability of RLF deposits, and that will allow us to move forward in effective ways that will benefit all the campus libraries, regardless of future developments regarding the building of shared collections.

Constable expressed strong reservations about this recommendation, feeling that faculty would not look favorably on a policy that appeared to imply a loss of control of campus deposits in the RLF. In discussion, the following points were raised:

- The RLFs provide significant long-term benefits to the University and to each of its campuses, including:
 - The ability for campuses to retain in their collections valuable research material at a lower cost to the University than would be required for construction of new campus facilities, and at no cost to the campus' capital budgets (RLF's are budgeted as systemwide capital projects). Without the RLFs, it is unlikely that campuses could afford to build enough on-campus library space to accommodate all of their growing collections

- Retention of materials in secure space under highly favorable environmental conditions. These provisions slow the deterioration of the materials and minimize the risks of loss or vandalism.
- Materials are available with fast response to library users of the depositing campus and to all other campuses. All deposits are listed in the Melvyl union catalog, and circulate to campus libraries on request under circulation policies that are uniform across the University. Additional restrictions on circulation apply to Special Collections materials.
- The RLFs are managed as Universitywide facilities for the mutual benefit of all campuses. Therefore, an RLF will not accept for deposit duplicate copies of items previously deposited in that RLF. This policy is intended to make the most efficient use of available RLF space and ensure that all campuses have equitable access to the maximum amount of RLF storage space.
- In a limited number of cases, two or more campuses within a region both a) own and b) wish to deposit in their RLF a copy of the same item. This is most likely to occur for back volumes of highly duplicated serials. In this event, as a result of the non-duplication policy, a campus library wishing to deposit a copy of an item already on deposit at its RLF may instead a) retain the item in its own collection, or b) discard the item (in which case the campus will receive a "credit" toward its annual minimum storage commitment).
- In a subset of these cases, the campus wishing to deposit the duplicate copy will choose to retain the material in its local collection instead of discarding it. Often, this is because the library views the material as essential for research in an area central to its campus academic program, even though it may be infrequently-used and therefore eligible for storage. Because the campus that deposited the original copy currently has the unqualified right to recall it to the campus collection at any time, and thence to restrict access by other campuses or even to discard it, the campus with the duplicate copy believes that it must retain the duplicate to hedge against the risk of loss of access to the RLF copy at a future time.
- The RLF Task Force recommendation addresses these very limited numbers of cases in which a) a campus library wishes to deposit material in an RLF that duplicates items previously deposited by another campus, and b) this library places a high value on these items and decides to retain the duplicate material in its collection owing to concern about the potential loss of access resulting from a decision by the depositing library to withdraw the items from the RLF. By definition, this recommendation applies only to library holdings that are duplicated among the campus collections; the unique collections of each campus are unaffected. Further, it applies only to those duplicated materials that are considered eligible for storage by two or more campus libraries within a region, and only when the library wishing to deposit the duplicate copy has a compelling reason to ensure persistent access to the item and therefore chooses to retain the duplicate rather than discarding it. In these cases only, the intent of the recommendation is to provide assurances to the library with the duplicate copy regarding the permanence of the RLF deposit, so that it can feel free to discard its duplicate copy without fear of loss of access to the RLF copy in the future.
- The Task Force recommendation charges the University Librarians to develop an operational means to provide this assurance. The University Librarians are examining a number of options, ranging from modest revisions of RLF policies to address these cases, to procedures for case-by-case determinations. In addressing these issues, the ULs are aware of the need to provide the campus libraries with the flexibility to meet local needs, for example, to recall particular collections to the depositing campus to populate a recently-constructed library with material of greatest value to its intended users.

Gottfredson suggested that the assurance of permanence in these limited cases was important and could be a factor in marshaling campus support for SRLF Phase 3, and asked that the University Librarians return to the Spring SLASIAC meeting with a proposal to satisfy these concerns. SLASIAC would also be interested in seeing data that illuminate the benefits that campuses derive from the RLFs.

7. Preservation of Digital Assets

7.a. UC Libraries Digital Preservation Repository

Deferred to a future meeting

8. Next Meeting/Next Steps

The next SLASIAC meeting will be held on May 5, 2004 in Oakland. Details will be sent out prior to the meeting.