Systemwide Library and Scholarly Information Advisory Committee
October 29, 2002 10 a.m - 3 p.m.
UC Irvine Student Center, Crescent Bay Room

Meeting Notes

Members present:	Davis, Greenstein, Heinecke, Gottfredson (chair), Jensen, Luce (for Hartford), Munoff, Pantelia, Pitts, Pryatel, Schottlaender, Walker (for Hafner), Withey
Members absent:	Adams, Bergstrom, Bero, Glantz, Stead, Vermeij, Warren, Zelmanowitz
Staff:	Lawrence
Guests:	Beverlee French, California Digital Library; Thomas Leonard, Alexei Maradudin, Scholarly Information Program Task Force

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

MEETING OBJECTIVES

1. Review the background for strategic planning for libraries and scholarly information in the University of California
2. Review and discuss the report of the SLASIAC Scholarly Information Task Force with special attention to:
   a. Reviewing and reaffirming the vision for strategic development
   b. Reviewing, revising and endorsing the strategic directions recommended by the Task Force
   c. Considering the roles and responsibilities of campuses in the University's system for libraries and scholarly information
3. Develop a specific plan for further development of strategic directions, including:
   a. Reviewing and revising the issues for further development identified by the Task Force
   b. Identifying next steps and determining the roles and responsibilities of SLASIAC, its Scholarly Information Task Force and Collection Management Planning Group, and other organizations in implementing these steps.

Lawrence Pitts, in introducing himself to the committee, identified two issues of particular interest:

- The readiness of faculty to move beyond traditional print channels in their

publishing activities
- The extent of campus buy-in to the centralized strategies advocated in the Scholarly Communication Task Force report

Lawrence noted that there is a distinction between "systemwide" and "UCOP" - these strategies don't necessarily imply central operation. Heinecke remarked on the oft-mentioned relationship between technology and ownership; access no longer requires ownership. This is a powerful argument.

2. Report on Systemwide Library Planning and the California Digital Library
2.a. Planning and Budgeting for Libraries and Scholarly Information (Background)

Background Materials:
· Director's report on the California Digital Library and Systemwide Library Planning
· A Short History of Library Planning and Budgeting in the University of California, 1977-2002
· An Introduction to the California Digital Library

Greenstein noted that previous UC library planning efforts have been born of crisis. That this is not now the case is a measure of the maturity of the collaborative environment among the UC Libraries. The current planning process is founded on a history of unprecedented accomplishments in which each successive planning initiative has reaffirmed and re-established what can be achieved through collaboration. The CDL is a neutral party in this process, providing an infrastructure that can support a range of visions. The current focus at CDL is on infrastructure that enables service and innovation.

Greenstein identified some of the key investments that the University has made, including:
1) Systems and services that promote sharing of campus collections. These include the intercampus overnight courier service, the Request patron-initiated interlibrary loan request system, and Web-based electronic delivery of requested articles ("desktop delivery"). In addition, the Melvyl online union catalog can be thought of as an investment in knowing about the collections of all campuses, which not only serves library users, but informs the development of the collections. In a similar vein, the 7,000 Encoded Archival Descriptions hosted by the Online Archive of California provide valuable information about the archival and special collections of all UC campuses and other OAC partners throughout the state.

2) Shared collections. UC's shared digital collections enable multiple paths to access and availability, leveraging the fact that access does not require proximity. It was recently estimated that, if the campuses purchased in print format all the titles provided through CDL digital journal packages to which they had not subscribed previously, the additional cost to the University would be about $25 million per year. Of course, these bundled packages include some titles to which some campuses might not choose to subscribe, but the fact that additional access of this value has been achieved through an additional investment in digital journals of about $1 million per year provides an indication of the enormous leverage that has been achieved. Realizing these benefits requires not only funding, but shared and distributed capabilities for business negotiation and operational

administration that are an essential complement to the shared collection; UCSD's role in providing acquisitions and cataloging services for the shared journal collection is an example.

3) Services and tools that campuses need to deliver online services. UC-eLinks supports the establishment and maintenance of hyperlinks between information resources and the presentation of these links to users. It is an example of a technology tool that campuses can use to develop new information services and tailor them to the needs of the campus clientele.

4) Regional Library Facilities. The Northern and Southern Regional Library Facilities were designed to store infrequently used library material of enduring research value in optimal environmental conditions, and together currently hold about 10 million volumes deposited by the nine campuses. The RLFs have allowed the campuses to plan rationally for the growth and management of their collections, and have freed high-value campus space for new collections. This component of shared infrastructure offers interesting opportunities in the new digital environment. For example, it is not evident that the 7,000 journal titles currently in the shared digital collection need to be duplicated in print at multiple campus libraries. Storing shared print copies of these journals at the RLFs could noticeably reduce redundancy, an issue that is under investigation through the University's Collection Management Initiative.

5) eScholarship. The University's eScholarship program encourages change in scholarly communication, and has established a technology and service infrastructure that supports innovations. The eScholarship platform may be extensible to other academic domains, such as the management and delivery of content used in instructional applications.

In summary, Greenstein emphasized the emerging transition of the CDL from "library" to infrastructure, a set of services and tools (including managed collections of digital content) that can be tailored by each campus to provide a variety of services targeted to the campus clientele.

The committee discussed reasons why reducing print redundancy for titles where digital is available might be controversial, including print-dependent research methods, the habits of researchers, the short track record and continuing evolution of digital publishing, and concerns about the completeness of and continuing access to the digital surrogates. Schottlaender noted that the SLASIAC Collection Management Planning Group (CMPG), in its discussions of these strategies, has been deliberate in advocating the assured availability of multiple print copies as a risk management strategy, while noting that not all "safety net" copies need be held within UC. Greenstein observed that the keys to acceptance may be the development of an infrastructure that can be trusted by the academic community, and credible commitment to a digital preservation strategy. Munoff endorsed the notion of eScholarship's extensible platform for management and delivery of digital content, noting especially its potential usefulness for distance education, and Greenstein inquired whether investments in library infrastructure of this kind might be leveraged to other domains of University academic activity. Heinecke suggested that it would be useful

to tie these initiatives to larger university themes, such as the growth and support of graduate education or reducing time to degree. Greenstein noted that empirical evidence on these relationships is not readily available, although he would like to move systemwide library planning more toward a culture of evidence by supporting inquiry in these areas. Schottlaender noted that some campus libraries now survey systematically in selected areas, and Greenstein suggested that it would be useful to identify expected or desired outcomes in these areas that might result from library investment, as a guide to research.

2.b. Collection Management Initiative (Update)

Background Materials (distributed at the meeting):
· Collection Management Initiative. Summary Report: Quarters 1-3 Usage Data, October 1, 2001 - June 30, 2002 (Preliminary Data: Restated on October 24, 2002)
· Collection Management Initiative. Detail Report: Quarters 1-3 Usage Data, October 1, 2001 - June 30, 2002 (Preliminary Data: Restated on October 24, 2002)
· Collection Management Initiative. Inventory of User Preference Survey Questions. Draft, 10/28/02.

Schottlaender provided a brief review of the main characteristics of the Collection Management Initiative (see http://www.ucop.edu/cmi for general background and the most recent findings), and distributed summary data on the print and digital use for three calendar quarters (Fall, Winter, and Spring 2001-02) of the 285 journals selected for the study at experimental (print removed to storage) and control (print retained on the shelf with use monitored) campuses. He reported that the use data appear to demonstrate three things:

1. Print use is significantly higher at control campuses than at experimental campuses.
2. Digital use is significantly higher than print use at all locations.
3. The number of print copies recalled from storage at experimental campuses has been nominal, and usually associated with the nature of the content: missing information in the digital version (such as letters to the editor, advertisements), missing issues or articles in the digital version, or essential content, such as graphics, that is difficult to view or use effectively in the digital version.

The committee asked how use was measured. Schottlaender and Lawrence reviewed the methods involved (reshelvings of print at "control" campuses, recalls of print from storage at "experimental" campuses, and vendor reports of articles viewed for digital), and acknowledged that the methods of measuring print and digital use may not be equivalent. Munoff pointed out that, given the order of magnitude differences in print and digital use of the same titles, the measurement differences were not likely to be of paramount importance given the purposes for which the data will be used.
Schottlaender proceeded to describe the CMI User Preference Survey that is being designed with the assistance of, and will be administered by, the Social Science Survey Center at UCSB. The survey will be distributed to about 20,000 potential respondents (faculty, students, and staff) in early Winter quarter, 2003, in the expectation of receiving about 7,500 completed responses. He distributed a working inventory of draft survey items, noting that there will be 45-60 questions in five general areas, and that the questions were developed on the basis of interviews of faculty and students at two UC campuses in summer

2002. The sampling frame includes five subpopulations (faculty, researchers, graduate students, undergraduate students, and staff); faculty and staff will be contacted initially by mail, with email follow-ups, while students will be contacted only by email (owing to the poor quality of mailing address information in student databases); both groups will have the option of replying by a paper questionnaire or a Web-based survey. The sampling plan is expected to yield sufficient responses to produce 5 percent accuracy at the campus level for faculty and graduate students, and at the systemwide level for all other sample groups. The expected number of responses is likely to be sufficient to allow for statistically significant comparisons among disciplines at the systemwide level, but this cannot be guaranteed at the campus level. Preliminary results are expected in March 2003. The survey protocol is under review by and will comply with the requirements of the human subjects committees at all campuses. Data from the survey is expected to be useful in support of campus collection management planning, and in explaining those plans to campus constituencies. In addition, preliminary analyses at the disciplinary level have already yielded some surprises.

Leonard noted that these findings spell good news for traditional collections, in that they appear to point to savings in shelf space for dual format materials that can be used to accommodate more materials that are available only in print. Munoff noted that the preliminary findings have already proven useful in discussions with concerned faculty. Greenstein noted that other recent survey datasets, such as the survey conducted by Outsell for the Digital Library Federation (http://www.clir.org/pubs/abstract/pub110abst.html) show some interesting trends in how academic libraries are perceived and used by faculty and students. In discussions with the UC community, it will be important to place UC's initiatives in the context of these more general trends. In any case, these data look at only a part of the collection management puzzle; it will be important to consider all aspects of collection management as planning proceeds.

2.c. Collection Management Planning Group (Update)

Background Materials:
· 4/30/02 CMPG Meeting Notes
· Print Redundancy Avenues. B. Schottlaender, May 2002 (distributed at the meeting)
· Redundancy Types. B. Schottlaender, May 2002 (distributed at the meeting)

Schottlaender reiterated the charge to the CMPG from SLASIAC (see <http://www.slp.ucop.edu/consultation/cmpg/>), and noted the establishment of the CMPG Steering Committee, consisting of three University Librarians, three faculty, and an Associate University Librarian for Collection Development, to allow more frequent meetings. The group tends to focus on long-range planning for collections at the policy level; its recommendations are generally taken up by other groups for action. Since its first meeting in April 2001, the group has focused on two areas: 1) defining new roles for the two Regional Library Facilities, and 2) identifying and reducing unneeded redundancy among the campus collections. Schottlaender distributed two graphics that illustrate the various forms of redundancy (between campuses, between campuses and their respective RLFs, between RLFs), and classifying the redundancy in three dimensions: necessary (for

reasons of use or archival retention) " unnecessary, books " journals, and print + digital " print only. The Collection Management Initiative focuses on unnecessary duplication for journals in print.

Recent CMPG discussions have focused on two initiatives. Government documents represent large collections with a great deal of redundancy among campus holdings and substantial overlap with digital formats. As noted by French and Greenstein, planning for these collections is complicated by the fact that considerable professional expertise is required for effective service, and some of these materials must therefore remain in local facilities. The University Librarians have appointed a systemwide planning task force in this area, with a report due in Spring 2003. A second initiative, emanating from the Collection Management Initiative, is a plan to acquire shared print copies of selected publishers' journals included in the shared digital collection; these journals will be located in the RLFs as a "safety net" in the event of loss of access to the digital.

2.d. Scholarly Communication (Update)
2.d.i) Advisory Committee on Scholarly Communication (Information/Action)

Background Materials:
· UCAIS Press Release
· eScholarship Advisory Committee Discussion
· SLASIAC Discussion of Advisory Committee on Scholarly Communication (Notes from prior meetings)

Over lunch, Greenstein reported on developments in the eScholarship program, including the launch of the eScholarship Repository (<http://repositories.cdlib.org/escholarship/>). The three main issues that have emerged from eScholarship experience to date are: 1) persuading faculty to participate in innovative alternative methods of scholarly communication; 2) persistent concerns about the effect of such innovations on peer review (pursuant to the May 23, 2002 joint meeting of SLASIAC and the Standing Committee on Copyright, Greenstein is working with the Academic Senate leadership on developing a set of regional faculty seminars on this topic); and 3) expansion of the repository infrastructure to encompass other forms of unpublished scholarship. In view of developments over the past year, the CDL feels it does not need the eScholarship Advisory Committee discussed with SLASIAC in previous meetings. There being no objection from SLASIAC, the proposal for this Advisory Committee was withdrawn.

3. Budget plans and strategies
3.a. Budget Update (Update)

Background Materials: Library Planning and Action Initiative and Library Budget Initiative. 1997-98 Through 2003-04. Systemwide Library Planning, 10/24/02 (Distributed at the meeting).

Heinecke reviewed budget outcomes for 2002-03, noting that while UC's operating budget request within the Partnership Agreement was not fully funded, and the Governor is

expected to impose additional mid-year cuts, the passage of Proposition 47 would mean good news for the capital budget. The University's 2003-04 request will be for full Partnership funding (including the components that were unfunded in 2002-03, but that full funding is again unlikely. UC's priorities for 2002-03 include funding to accommodate enrollment growth and salary increases. Heinecke distributed a table summarizing budget outcomes for libraries over the last few years.

4. Report of the Scholarly Information Program Task Force (Discussion/Action)
4.a. Review of the Task Force report
4.b. Planning for development of a strategic plan
4.c. Next steps

Background Materials: "Strategic Planning for Libraries and Scholarly Communication" Oct. 21, 2002, Interim Report of the Scholarly Information Program Task Force

Greenstein introduced the discussion by noting that the report of the Scholarly Information Program Task Force presents a picture of what systemwide library infrastructure might look like in the near future, but lacks a complementary portrayal of what campuses could do with that infrastructure to improve library services. This is not necessarily a deficiency, as the Task Force was charged to address systemwide initiatives, and it is critically important to understand the difficult issues associated with universitywide infrastructure. It is important now to focus on the next challenges: How can we best utilize this infrastructure? How can we pay for shared infrastructure in a decentralized budgetary environment? How can we more effectively manage our collections in all formats in view of the capabilities of the shared infrastructure?

Discussion among the University Librarians has focused on the fact that a context is needed for the Task Force recommendations in the form of a vision explaining why these infrastructure developments are necessary and desirable. The University Librarians also plan to evaluate these proposals in terms of how they serve campus needs and fit into campus strategies, and whether they need to be expanded to include other infrastructure developments. The planning process that will be launched at a UL retreat in mid-November is viewed as complementary to and supporting SLASIAC's planning activities.

Gottfredson suggested that focusing on a potential budget request could provide focus and a sense of priorities to the planning process, and Heinecke recommended that planning address three broad issues: the larger environment (perhaps with an emphasis on changes in the creation and management of scholarly information and the commensurate move away from the traditional vision of library service); identification of trends; and definition of strategic initiatives that are capable of being implemented. Greenstein suggested that three key elements were missing: a vision to guide the libraries, a vision addressed to faculty, and a research capability to support planning and implementation.

As shared resources and services become more critical, campus vs. Universitywide ownership of library collection resources emerges as a central and controversial issue. The

concept of "ownership" entails issues of acquisition, access, control, counting, integration of collections and services, and ranking of libraries and their institutions; the perspectives of campuses and various University constituencies on these matters vary. It is important to recognize that questions related to "ownership" affect many constituencies, and all must be consulted. Pitts observed that because these issues are important for all research libraries, UC might have an opportunity to provide national leadership in redefining the way that library collections and services are measured and assessed. Such an effort must recognize the perceptions of donors, prospective faculty and students, and campus administrations, and must not be perceived as undermining accountability. Faculty in particular will need to be informed about the rationale and consequences of moving toward new metrics, and differences in campus views need to be accommodated. Strategies for shared collections and new metrics intersect with campus and Universitywide budgetary practices and strategies, and funding strategies for libraries may overlap with other budgetary strategies (e.g., for instructional technology, enrollment growth); these interactions need to be thoroughly understood and well integrated.

It was acknowledged that planning must comprehend services as well as collections. It is particularly important not to neglect services that are not directly related to collections, such as the instructional and cultural roles of the libraries, study support, and services to specific groups, such as those with disabilities. Integration of library technology strategies with instructional technology and services, and provision of additional services to facilitate the use of information in teaching, learning and research may be an especially promising area to explore. Finally, the facilities planning and capital budgeting aspects of these issues should not be ignored.

Greenstein summarized his understanding of the discussion as indicating that the Task Force document needs to be fleshed out with an overall vision and rationale for investing in new strategies; this vision should encompass the roles and aspirations of the campuses and the manner in which systemwide infrastructure provides support for these; initiatives related to instructional technology, information literacy, and enrollment growth should be further explored; and issues of ownership, budgetary strategy, and metrics for library assessment deserve particular attention.

Gottfredson recapitulated the discussion by emphasizing the importance of a document that focused on advocacy and analysis for a budgetary strategy, addressing four critical issues:

1. Ownership of (shared) print collections, including identification of the stakeholders;
2. Management and development of (shared) print collections
3. Metrics, assessment, and rankings
4. Services, to comprehend the changing view of the instructional view of libraries

5. Future meetings and agendas
5.a. SLASIAC 2002-03 work plan (Discussion)
5.b. Next meeting (Discussion)

Background Materials:

· SLASIAC 1998-99 Activities
· SLASIAC 1999-2000 Activities
· SLASIAC 2000-01 Activities

Over the next year, SLASIAC will focus on these strategic planning issues. The next meeting is scheduled for Friday, February 28, 2003, in Oakland.