Systemwide Library and Scholarly Information Advisory Committee
April 29, 2003, 9 a.m. - 1 p.m.
Main Library, Room 570 (5th floor)
University of California, Irvine

Meeting Notes

Members Present:	Brown, Constable, Davis, Glantz, Gottfredson (Chair), Greenstein, Heinecke, Jensen, Munoff, Pitts, D. Walker (for Hafner), Zelmanowitz
Members Absent:	Adams, Afifi, Bergstrom, Bero, Hartford, Olsen, Schottlaender, Warren, Withey
Consultants & Staff:	Lawrence

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

MEETING OBJECTIVES:
1. Action Items
a. Review and endorse a White Paper on the University's overall library collection management and coordination strategy.
b. Review progress on the strategic planning agenda and set priorities for 2003-04.
c. Review and endorse a SLASIAC resolution on Digital Library Journal Collecting Principles
2. Review and discuss:
a. Preliminary findings from the Collection Management Initiative
b. A proposed strategy for communication with faculty and other constituencies on key library and scholarly communication issues
c. Methods for more regular and effective communication within SLASIAC

2. Collection Management Initiative: Preliminary findings (Discussion)

Lawrence reported that the Collection Management Initiative (http://www.ucop.edu/cmi/) gathered data in two general areas: a study of the use of journals in both print and digital formats, and a Universitywide survey of faculty, students and staff.

For the journal use study, about 300 journal titles were selected by campuses from a universe of about 3,000 titles that met project requirements. For each title, one campus sent to storage the print issues that also were available in digital form, and the other

retained these same issues on the shelves and closely monitored their use. This study ran for one year, from October 2001-September 2002. Use data for the digital versions were obtained from the journal publishers for both campuses. To measure print use, the campus that retained print recorded all reshelvings by library staff, and the campus that stored print recorded all requests for recall of the issues from storage. We found that:

- Recalls from storage were negligible, amounting to only about 3% of the use of the same titles at campuses that retained the material on the shelf.
- Digital use was greater than print use at campuses that stored their journals, both during and in the year before the study.
- Digital use was, on average, more than ten times the rate of print use for the same titles and issues at campuses that retained print on the shelf; for physical sciences and engineering, that ratio is over 33 to 1. Some of this difference arises from different ways of counting print and digital use; however, this cause seems unlikely to explain all the difference.

About 20,000 UC students, faculty and staff were invited to participate in the CMI User Preference Survey, using a sampling plan that oversampled faculty and graduate students. About 6,000 responses were received. Preliminary findings have been reviewed by University Librarians and by the CMI Research Advisory Committee, comprised of qualified faculty and librarians from UC, the University of Texas, and the University of Illinois. We found that, although faculty are somewhat more conservative than the other demographic groups, all groups demonstrate very high acceptance of electronic journals. All groups had consistent views about barriers to their effective use of electronic journals. These included: reading on the screen; navigating within articles; making marginal notes and highlights; non-availability of recent issues; non-availability of older issues; access from off-campus locations; and speed of home connection. Analysis of these data continues, with the goal of completing a final report to Mellon Foundation by the end of June.

Greenstein suggested three possible conclusions from the project data:

- It will be necessary to give serious consideration to acquisition or creation of digital backfiles;
- There is ample evidence to support reduction of redundancy in print holdings when digital is available, but it will be important to retain at least one print copy in the system;
- There is justification for taking a closer look at print-on-demand technologies to enable production of high-quality print from digital sources.

3. Northern Regional Library Facility: Change in Deposit Rates (Information)

Lawrence reported that for the first time, a number of campuses are making commitments to permanent storage beyond the minimum deposit rates established by

agreement with the State. The current annual commitment for the four northern campuses is 165,000 volumes per year. Beginning with the occupancy of NRLF Phase 3 in 2004-05, campuses propose to increase deposits to 221,500 volumes per year, a 56,500-volume increase. All campuses except San Francisco propose to increase their annual deposits. This will have the effect of shortening the time until NRLF Phase 3 is filled by about 3 years, to 2014-15. The UCOP Budget Office has been consulted about this change, and agrees that there are no objections in principle to accelerated depositing in regional library facilities, as this will have the effect of decreasing or delaying demand for expensive on-campus library facilities. Jensen asked about the status of SRLF, and Lawrence reported that UCLA is beginning discussions about planning for the next phase of its expansion. Munoff spoke of the formation of the Regional Library Facility Task Force, appointed by the University Librarians to review the policies, programs, and governance of the two facilities.

4. Systemwide Library Planning
a. Collection Management and Coordination
i) Collection Management and Coordination Strategy (Discussion/Action)

Background Material: Collection Management and Coordination: A Strategy for the UC Libraries (Draft working paper)

Greenstein introduced the discussion by observing that the Collection Management Initiative had led to the collection management and coordination strategy by stimulating innovative thinking in the UC library community about new strategies for managing collections. This paper provides the conceptual framework for the shared print collection strategy that has previously been discussed here and continues to be developed in detail. Both this paper and the one on shared collections will shortly go out to the UC library community for review.

Several suggestions were offered to improve the discussion paper, including decoupling the idea of shared print from the experience with digital collections; focusing on using technology to enhance access; clarifying and expanding the collaborative acquisition concept (which has the potential to fundamentally shift the culture of collecting); clarifying the distinction between coordinated collection development and shared collections; focusing on services to library users as a unifying theme; and adding user scenarios to make the concepts more concrete. Other topics raised in the discussion included the issue of how to count collections, strategies for communicating with faculty (it was suggested that speed of access and delivery will be a critical issue for faculty acceptance), and possibilities adding information to bibliographic systems, such as table-of-contents data, to make remotely located materials more accessible and useful.

Action: the Committee endorsed the report with editorial suggestions.

ii) Ownership and Counting of Collections (Update)

Discussion deferred to a future meeting.

iii) Collection Management Planning Group - Meeting Outcomes (Information)

Background Material: CMPG Meeting Outcomes (April 8, 3003).

Lawrence reported that in addition to reviewing the white paper on collection management and coordination strategy that we just discussed, CMPG at its April 8 meeting had additional discussion of the characteristics or behaviors of shared collections, and extensively discussed characteristics of a trusted archive. A "trusted print archive" can be thought of as anchoring one end of a continuum, at the other end of which is a campus general collection; thus, understanding of this concept helps illuminate the key characteristics of other kinds of shared collections. CMPG is continuing to discuss and refine these concepts, working toward a framework to assist in planning.

b. Shared Services (Discussion)

Discussion deferred to a future meeting.

c. Review of progress and current challenges (Discussion/Action)

Background Material: Planning progress report

The consensus of the Committee was that staff should proceed immediately to prepare a document that a) captures the evolving strategic direction for libraries and scholarly information and b) sets out the budgetary issues and opportunities associated with these strategies. This document would serve to guide resource allocation decisions that will continue to be made even in the absence of new State funds, and to inform faculty and other UC constituencies about alternatives for the deployment of library resources. It is particularly important to make campuses aware of the uneven budgetary and service consequences for campuses of the current, unsustainable situation, and to set out from a campus perspective the benefits and costs of various options for addressing the problem. In view of the budget situation, it would be appropriate to focus on internal and external partnerships that can help to provide or leverage resources. Greenstein and Lawrence initially will work with Heinecke and other UCOP staff to begin framing this document, and then consult closely with the University Librarians and others fill out the assessment of campus impacts.

Action: Staff will bring a strategy and budget document to the Committee for review at its Fall 2003 meeting.

5. Communication Strategy and Issues

a. Introduction
b. UC Libraries strategic communication Web site (Discussion)

Background Material:
· The UC Libraries Web site - Update for the University Librarians, 4/10/03
· UC Libraries Web site blueprint

Greenstein began by emphasizing the importance of communicating more widely and effectively with the faculty in particular, but also with the libraries and other constituencies, the vision for the future of UC's libraries. There are currently two opportunities to move forward on the communication front. First, with the assistance of the Academic Council leadership (and with thanks to Pitts and Binion), a small group representing the Committees on Research Policy, Academic Personnel, and Library is being formed to consult informally on strategies for communicating with faculty. Second, the proposed UC Libraries Web creates a new channel for communication.

In discussion, Glantz emphasized the importance of attempting to register the Web sites for the CDL, the UC Libraries, etc., in the ".edu" domain, rather than in ".org."

NOTE: the members of the Standing Committee on Copyright joined SLASIAC for the following discussion.

c. Scholarly Communication and Faculty Information
i) Alternative modes of scholarly communication
ii) "Journal Economics" and negotiation with commercial publishers

Background Material:
· Communication with UC Faculty on Topics Related to Scholarly Communication (April 18, 2003)
· Resolution G - Digital Library Journal Collecting Principles

Greenstein outlined the case that the economics of digital licensing and the bundled multi-title "big deal" are not sustainable. Recognizing that it is in the best interest of both UC and the publishers to find a mutually satisfactory way to continue current digital subscriptions, the CDL proposes the following strategies for dealing with the problem, in order:

- Offer strategic partnerships with journal publishers, for example, to serve as a print and digital archive for the publisher's product with a reduced subscription price;
- Continue to subscribe to the publisher's whole package, but negotiate a substantial price reduction and tie future price increases to enrollment growth.
- With no prospect for a contribution to the shared print collection, CDL withdraws its co-investment and the publisher can deal directly and separately with the campuses.

If these strategies are to be credible, faculty must be aware of and prepared to support them, including the possibility of cancellations of digital titles. Regarding methods of informing faculty about these issues, there was considerable discussion of the relative merits of early (as soon as possible) and late (Fall 2003) notification. Early notification allows faculty and libraries to prepare, but may polarize attitudes unnecessarily; late notification allows time for negotiations with publishers to develop without risking alarming faculty unnecessarily, but may leave too little time for faculty consultation if cancellations prove necessary. The consensus was that setting the stage now for what appears to be an inevitable confrontation seems desirable. It will also be necessary to be sensitive to the situations on individual campuses, and to structure the process so that the libraries will not be seen as standing between the faculty and the publishers; to these ends, UCOP will work with and provide support to the ULs.

Action: The Committee endorsed SLASIAC Resolution G with minor revisions.

d. Communication within SLASIAC

Not discussed owing to insufficient time.

6. Future meetings and agendas
a. Next meeting (Discussion)

Not discussed owing to insufficient time.