Systemwide Library and Scholarly Information Advisory Committee
February 28, 2003 10 a.m. - 3 p.m.
The Elihu M. Harris State Office Building
1515 Clay Street (between 15th & 16th Streets), Oakland

**Meeting Notes**

| | |
|---|---|
| Members Attending: | Constable, Davis, Glantz, Gottfredson (Chair), Greenstein, Hafner, Heinecke, Jensen, Munoff, Olsen, Warren, Withey, Zelmanowitz |
| Members Absent: | Adams, Bergstrom, Bero, Hartford, Pitts, Schottlaender, Vermeij |
| Consultants & Staff: | Candee, Lawrence, Miller |

## 1. Preliminaries
## a. Welcome and introductions
## b. Review of meeting objectives

MEETING OBJECTIVES:
1. Review and discuss the proposed framework for the systemwide planning process for libraries and scholarly communication
2. Review and discuss strategic directions and current initiatives for collection management and coordination
a. Take action on a proposed resolution on staff leadership for planning and implementation of shared collections
3. Review and discuss strategic directions and current initiatives related to scholarly communication
a. Take action on a proposed resolution on Universitywide dissemination of shared electronic journal pricing and usage data
4. Review and discuss current planning activities related to shared library facilities, library budgeting practices, and vision and advocacy statements for the UC Libraries

## 2. Budget Update

Heinecke distributed a handout at the meeting showing the shortfall in funding commitments through the Partnership Agreement with the Governor, totaling $956.8 million through 2003-04, and the budget changes proposed in the 2003-04 Governor's Budget (only enrollment growth is fully funded). The Legislative Analyst's analysis of the Governor's Budget recommends reducing enrollment increases, reducing fee increases, and cutting back financial aid. Heinecke reported that the Capital Outlay budget is fully funded, and that NRLF-3 will most likely move forward as planned.

Olsen noted that the one-time "core needs" funding cut for 2002-03 of $29 million

has now been made permanent. This cut, which includes deferred maintenance, instructional equipment replacement, instructional computing, and libraries, has been allocated to campuses in a block, to be re-allocated to specific programs at the Chancellors' discretion.

## 3.Systemwide Library Planning
## 3.a. General

Greenstein reported that work has proceeded on the themes that emerged from SLASIAC's Fall 2002 discussion of the report of its Scholarly Information Program Task Force. Addressing one perceived deficiency of that report, the University Librarians, at their November 2002 retreat, addressed visions, needs and achievements of the UC Libraries. Work has also progressed in addressing budget issues and advocacy approaches. It is now possible to glimpse convergence on the elements of a comprehensive report on strategic development for the UC Libraries, but the timing remains uncertain. Greenstein suggested that the group deviate from the agenda and consider the report on "Advances in Systemwide Library Service…" (Item 3.a.iii.) as a way to set the stage for subsequent discussion.

### 3.a.iii. Review of progress and current challenges
*Background: Advances in Systemwide Library Service in the University Of California: A*
*Five-Year Progress Report (January 14, 2003)*
*(http://www.slp.ucop.edu/documents/Progress_Report.pdf)*

Greenstein briefly reviewed the five-year progress report, highlighting achievements in leveraging resources. He noted that the fast pace of change makes it difficult to communicate with constituencies on campuses in a timely manner. Jensen noted that mention was not made of the impact on campus library operations of these systemwide achievements, and expressed concern about the effect of campus financial commitments to shared digital collections on campus flexibility during a slow growth period. Greenstein noted that discussion of campus co-investment is missing from the progress report.

Greenstein highlighted the nuanced utility/service model that is the current view of the CDL, emphasizing the change from the original focus on direct service to library users to a model in which the CDL provides services to the UC Libraries. For example, the CDL will unbundle services, allowing campuses to present them through locally-developed interfaces, although end-user services will always be provided for those who do not provide their own.

Constable asked about the LPAI recommendations, which are referenced in the Progress Report. Many concerns were expressed by faculty at the time, particularly at Berkeley and Riverside, including fears of uneven distribution of resources among campuses. Zelmanowitz noted that CDL has some well-documented advantages over campus-supplied resources. Glantz supported the LPAI directions, observing that they have afforded UC a huge expansion in available resources. The concept of shared infrastructure merits support as well, as it allows us to take advantage of economies of scale. Heinecke suggested that when the authors of the progress report present the history of library planning, they should contextualize in terms of the issues, conditions, etc. of the time. For

example, when describing the LPAI, the problem or crisis that was addressed in 1997 should be made clear.

### 3.a.i. Overview of Planning Process
*Background:*
*· Planning process overview*
*· Planning process diagram*

Jensen asked about the mundane, non-technical things that may be getting short shrift in the planning process, such as cutting serials and local budgets. She is concerned that the digital, systemwide plans are leaving out primary concerns of librarians. Dan Greenstein explained that ULs do talk about these issues, but these discussions are not always reflected in planning documents.

### 3.a.ii. UL Planning Retreat
*Background: University Librarians' Planning Retreat, November 14-15, Summary of Outcomes*

Munoff explained that the ULs meet frequently and engage in much collaborative effort. Over several meetings, it was evident that a number of important issues were emerging among the campuses and converging, calling for common agreement and direction from the ULs. Three of the five actions emerging from the November retreat are already underway. These outcomes are evidence of the previously mentioned rapid rate of progress. Some of the outcomes may be considered "radical" because they have not been discussed before. These include a comprehensive, perhaps more deliberate systemwide approach to collection management, and the beginnings of a definition for shared collections or collaborative ownership. The point of all this discussion, Munoff said, is not simply to avoid costs but to more effectively and efficiently provide better service on campuses. (**NOTE: this item continued below**).

### 3.b. Budgeting Practices
*Background: Budget Models for Financing of the Shared Library Collection*

Discussion began with the question of how to finance systemwide collaborative library initiatives and services, given that there's not a lot of money. The funding picture for the UC Libraries has evolved over the last five years, toward greater investment in shared collection, but for planning purposes, we need a model that's less complicated than the fractured, individual negotiations that we have now. Heinecke reviewed the factors and drivers that might be considered in developing equitable campus cost allocation models. She noted the possibility of linking operational budgets with capital planning, e.g., adjustments to RLF targets, as an incentive for participation

In response to a question from Davis, Lawrence reported that we do not have comprehensive data on digital content expenditures. Greenstein indicated that at UCSC, shared collections comprise approximately 40% of the collection budget, while at UCB the percentage is closer to 12.

Zelmanowitz summarized the next steps that are needed in this area:

1) Develop alternative budgetary models for shared collections
2) Consult with the libraries and budget & planning officers

Munoff suggested considering the nature of the material being shared and noted that the best models are driven by programmatic factors. Greenstein noted that some systemwide services, such as Melvyl, are not currently, and likely should not be, included in this model. Heinecke said that we now have a snapshot view of allocations, but seeing the trend over time would be beneficial.

### 3.c. Technical integration of digital libraries

Heinecke reported that the work of the Task Force on Information Technology Infrastructure is driven by two existing funding programs, instructional technology and CALREN-2 (the California component of the Internet-2 advanced network). Both are stalled owing to the budget crisis, but will need to be finished. How should the IT infrastructure be defined and framed? Possible components begin with physical equipment and connections, and could extend to advanced applications such as eScholarship. Glantz expressed a keen interest in basic service ("a hot plug in the wall").

Davis noted priorities emerging in initial discussion by the task force (which includes several members of SLASIAC) and observed that six or seven of these are directly or indirectly relevant to libraries and library service:

· Payroll/HR
· Security, authentication, identification
· Funding strategies for instructional technologies and applications
· Content management
· Tools for scholarly interaction: collaborative research, publication, data management and publishing, equipment sharing
· The network
· Standards and interoperability
· Persistence/preservation
· Policy

The challenge is to define the foundational infrastructure that supports everything we do with IT, to define a common vocabulary, and to identify opportunities for synergy and convergence.

### 3.a.ii. UL Planning Retreat (continued)

With regard to shared facilities (particularly the Regional Library Facilities), the ULs' planning encompasses two perspectives. One is forward-looking, and establishes a planning track to parallel other initiatives. The other is remedial and involves a comprehensive review of policies, practices and administration in the context of the Facilities' existing mission and services. Discussion of Shared Services focuses on
identifying services that can be operated more effectively or efficiently through collaboration. Examples might include student tutorials, information literacy. This planning theme also prompts the library community to actively consider the

service dimensions of the other collaborative planning activities.In terms of vision and advocacy, the results of the ULs' discussion are incorporated in the materials supporting that item in today's agenda.

### 3.d. Development of Vision and Advocacy Statements
*Background: Vision statement (draft)*

Constable expressed concern about the focus on innovation and the new, and asked whether the need to preserve the old was being left out. Greenstein pointed out the University's desire to continue building a collection of record - "things you can't throw away" - that is reflected in the planning documents. He noted that it important to add the concept of balance, including the relative roles of local and systemwide, to the vision.

### 3.e.i. Shared Collections
*Background:*
*· Developing a Shared Collection for the University Of California. Prepared for the Steering Committee of the Collection Management Planning Group. DRAFT, Systemwide Library Planning, February 2003*
*· Standing Committee on Universitywide Library Collection Management Planning, Steering Committee. Meting Notes, December 11, 2002*
*(http://www.slp.ucop.edu/consultation/cmpg/121102/notes_121102.htm)*
*· SLASIAC Resolution E: Collaborative Leadership and Support for the Planning and Implementation of Shared Library Collections (DRAFT)*

Lawrence provided a brief history of the development of the draft paper, noting that it presents information from a variety of contemporaneous sources, including the Scholarly Information Program Task Force Report, to frame the background discussion. It presents the ULs' working definition of a shared collection, and sets out some opportunities and benefits, as well as some challenges, associated with realizing the shared collection concept. These are drawn largely from the ULs November retreat and subsequent discussions within the library community. Most importantly, the paper sets out the intent of the shared collections by beginning to set boundaries around what shared collections will or will not do, and therefore warrant careful consideration by SLASIAC.

Lawrence observed that what is missing from the paper is the context - a description of the overall collection management and coordination strategy. There was general agreement that the Shared Collection paper should include a vision and clearly acknowledge the foundational role of campus collections.

In anticipation of and response to the Scholarly Information Program Task Force recommendations and the SLASIAC discussion, the University Librarians have formed a subcommittee to address development of a shared Government Documents collection and asked SLASIAC's Collection Management Planning Group to review the concept of shared collections and assess and augment a preliminary list of candidate shared collections

In response to an initiative from their Collection Development Committee, the University Librarians have formed a subcommittee to plan and implement an initial shared print journal collection, consisting of print copies of journals already

licensed in digital form from Elsevier and ACM. A draft plan from that subcommittee has been submitted to SOPAG and should be circulating among the ULs' advisory groups shortly.

In addition to the preparation of the draft white paper in the background materials, the CMPG has also agreed to develop a preliminary list of candidate collections and their behaviors, and prepare an initial draft of a policy that addresses the retention of a "last copy" of a title within the system, to protect against all campuses inadvertently canceling their subscriptions or discarding all copies of a book. The group also recommends a systematic review of the UC Interlibrary Lending Code to ensure that provisions that might interfere with evolving UC collection management and coordination strategies, including shared collections, are examined and updated. In subsequent discussions, the ULs' Systemwide Operations and Planning Advisory Committee and Resource Sharing Committee have observed that, because not all resource sharing activities and transactions will necessarily be considered interlibrary loans or be handled by interlibrary loan departments, it would be advisable to recast the existing code with a broader view, perhaps characterizing it as a "Resource Sharing Code." This work has not yet been scheduled. It is the intent of the CMPG Steering Committee and the ULs that these work products will circulate throughout the UL advisory structure for review and comment, and that some of them may be handed off to UL advisory committees for further development.

In regard to draft Resolution E, Greenstein conceived of the recommended new position as the "Beverlee French for shared print" (CDL Deputy University Librarian French is responsible, in collaboration with the campuses, for development of the shared digital collection). In Greenstein's view, a resolution is needed because the CDL is **digital** and this body should endorse and frame any move into shared **print**. In response to question, Lawrence reported that the Resource Sharing budget is used to support infrastructure and services that promote effective sharing of information resources among the campuses, and is viewed to some extent as a "venture fund" for innovation.

Zelmanowitz summarized by noting that the Resolution calls for 1) an experimental program, and 2) a budget commitment to shared collections. Munoff noted that normally, collaborative activities are supported with a commitment of campus staff; at UCI, for example, some 45 people on the library staff have some role in systemwide collaborative programs. The ULs agree that shared print need dedicated staffing at a level beyond the ability of the ULs to commit resources.

Resolution E was endorsed by the Committee.

### 3.e.ii. Ownership and Counting of Collections

Discussion began by examining why ownership is important and what "ownership" statistics are used for. Universities use these statistics to publicize themselves, for faculty recruitment and retention, development, planning, assessment, and management; for space planning and budgeting; for institutional comparison and status differentiation (if these numbers were not available, another way would be found).

Defining "ownership" of digital collections is problematic. It is hard to identify "items" and count them, much is licensed and not "owned," and collections are often shared, such as within the UC system.

Counting bundles a number of functions, and we should consider how to unbundle them:
· Access
· Financial commitment
· Responsibility for processing and archiving

If the challenge is to maintain breadth and depth of collections and sharing is an essential strategy to meet the challenge, then the impediments to sharing must be resolved. The goal is to satisfy the functions of traditional metrics without raising barriers to our strategic plans. This is not a problem that the libraries can solve alone.

Gottfredson noted that "ownership leverages budget"; this is something that should not be forgotten in planning. Warren mentioned turning away from counting inputs and toward assessment of outcomes. Constable noted that the dialog among faculty on the importance of ownership and collection size depended on their field. Jensen said that some libraries race to deposit in the RLF because they can recall "their" copy if faculty complain. This problem is reinforced when split sets from several depositors are at the RLF.

Zelmanowitz suggested that it might perhaps be easier to deal with the counting problem in the context of individual issue areas; for example, if RLF policies were more rational, what changes to accounting might be required?

### 3.g. Scholarly Communication
*Background:*
*· SLASIAC Resolution F: Publication of Data on Cost, Use, and Quality of UC-Licensed Electronic Journals (DRAFT)*
*· Scholarly Communication FAQ*

The planning process for Scholarly Communication is now at a crossroads. Systemwide Library Planning, with the support of the University Librarians and the Academic Council, proposes a three-part program:

1. Educate faculty, particularly about costs *to* the faculty in terms of
· Journal prices
· Publishers who do not provide perpetual access
· Other journal characteristics

2. Build on the repository infrastructure (http://repositories.cdlib.org/escholarship/), create a platform to support, for example, peer-reviewed publications

3. Aggressively negotiate with publishers, e.g. Elsevier

Regarding Resolution F, the group was alerted to possible legal challenges surrounding the publication of publisher pricing data. Staff will ask the Office of General Counsel to review, and include language in the resolution to this effect. The Committee counseled to avoid using the term "quality" in the resolution because there is no objective way to measure this, and to avoid use of term "publish" in the resolution (but it is agreed that there should be unrestricted access to this information).

With these provisions, Resolution F was endorsed by the Committee.