

University of California
Shared Library Facilities Board
February 23, 2005
UC Office of the President, Oakland CA

Meeting Notes

Meeting Objective: Organize board, structures, procedures and practices. Conduct comprehensive review of key issues and make policy decisions or decide how to begin to address the issues and put processes into action.

Members Attending: Butter, Dunlap, Goldstein, Greenstein, Jackson, Leonard, Munoff
(Chair), Pritchard, Sharrow, Schottlaender, Strong, White
Members Absent: Miller
Staff: Bellanti, Carleton, Hurley, Lawrence, Miller

1. Introductions of members, staff and guests

- Roster, Shared Library Facilities Board, 2/15/04

2. Background of new board

- University of California, Shared Library Facilities Board, Charge (v.3, 7/14/04).
- Regional Library Facilities Planning Task Force: Final report to the University Librarians. February 13, 2004 (http://www.slp.ucop.edu/documents/RLF-TF_Final_Report.pdf)
- Summary of RLF Task Force Recommendations

Munoff reviewed the genesis of the new Board in the work of the Regional Library Facilities Task Force, emphasizing that the new Board's charge encompasses not only the responsibilities of the preceding Regional Boards, but also comprehends new roles and services for shared facilities in support of the UC Libraries' collaborative programs.

3. ORGANIZATIONAL ISSUES

3.a. Overview of past structures

- Boards
- Managers
- Operating groups

The Regional Library Boards were appointed as advisory groups to the Provost of the University. The Provost has strengthened the charge for the new Board and accepted the RLF Task Force recommendation to eliminate the non-UC membership in view of the facts that 1) non-UC depositors have made only limited use of the RLFs, 2) the RLF Task Force Report recommends the elimination of a set-aside for non-UC deposits, 3) UC campuses need to utilize the full capacities, and 4) the inappropriateness of including non-UC representatives on a board charged to develop institutional policies. The Board will, however, consult any non-UC depositors regarding operational issues related to them.

The Southern Board has retained an Operations Advisory Committee with representatives from each depositing campus/institution; in recent years, the group has met infrequently, but tries to schedule at least one face-to-face meeting each year. The Northern Board has replaced its OAC with a group of designated campus liaisons with whom the staff coordinate on operational issues.

Up until 1993 the RLFs were organized as units of the Office of the President. In 1993 and 1994, administrative responsibility for the RLFs was delegated to the respective host campuses, Berkeley and Los Angeles, under provisions of Memoranda of Understanding executed between the Office of the President and the two campuses. The MOUs provided that the Regional Library Boards would retain policy responsibility for the facilities with accountability to the Provost, and that the capital budgets for the facilities would continue to be treated as part of the Universitywide component of the University's capital program. The MOUs made no provision for increasing the operating budgets of the Facilities beyond routine range/merit and non-salary price increases that could be expected to be allocated to these budgets according to host-campus practice (although UCLA has allocated 5 FTE to SRLF from campus budget resources, chiefly to support timely processing of UCLA deposits). RLF budgets are also subject to sharing in campus budget cuts consistent with host-campus practices.

3.b. Changes at SRLF

Strong reported that Bellanti would be assuming a new role for the UCLA Libraries effective March 1, and described plans for filling the SRLF Director's position.

3.c. Overview of existing policies and practices

- NRLF Operating Principles (<http://www.lib.berkeley.edu/NRLF/oppr1.html>)
- SRLF Operating Principles (<http://www.srlf.ucla.edu/Deposit/OpPrinciples/OperatingPrinciples.htm>)

Staff summarized the contents of the respective Operating Principles, noting that an effort had been made to coordinate the documents several years ago, with the result that they now closely parallel each other, although they are not necessarily identical.

In discussion, it was recognized that the transition from two regional administrations to a single Universitywide board with coordinated facility operations would require:

- Harmonization of the existing Operating Principles to the extent practicable, allowing for differences where appropriate.
- Development of new provisions to reflect existing practices and policies not currently included (e.g., Persistent Deposits – see item 4.e. below – and provisions of the MOUs)
- Added provisions to make the Principles consistent with systemwide, rather than regional, governance
- Identification of policy provisions needed to support new RLF programs (e.g., shared print).

ACTION: Staff will provide the Board with a report analyzing the existing Operating Principles to (a) identify differences that must be reconciled and (b) propose new provisions to reflect existing uncoded policies and practices.

It was agreed that the Board wished to consult broadly on revised and consolidated Operating Principles and that the existing ULs' advisory structure could be employed for this purpose. Leonard also suggested that consideration should be given to finding an appropriate label to replace "regional library facilities"; it was agreed to defer action on this question until the new roles of the facilities were better understood.

3.d. Define and document operating principles and practices of the SLF Board

Munoff advised the Board that, by agreement, the University Librarians' Steering Committee (currently Munoff, Butter, Greenstein and [representing SOPAG] Hurley), which sets agendas for UL meetings and deals with between-meeting matters, would also serve as the steering committee for the Board.

The Board **agreed to the following:**

- In general, the Board will allow the issues to dictate the agenda and frequency of meeting (**ACTION**: Steering Committee).
- Initially, the Board will plan to meet twice a year (**ACTION**: Steering Committee).
- A formally constituted staff team will support the Board, consisting of (at minimum) the Director of Systemwide Library Planning, the Director of Shared Print, and the Directors and Operations Managers of the two RLFs. Initially, Lawrence will convene and coordinate the work of the staff team (**ACTION**: Staff).
- A Web site will be created within the "Systemwide Groups and Activities" section of the UC Libraries' Web site (http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/about/groups_activities.html) to host the Board charge, roster, agendas, meeting notes and documents. Links will be provided to this site as required from other UC Libraries Web components (e.g. Systemwide Library Planning/Shared Facilities, University Librarians), the separate identities of the RLFs will be sustained (e.g., by listing the RLFs on the "Campus Libraries" page, continuing to maintain and update the existing RLF pages on the UCB and UCLA Libraries' Web sites), and means will be developed to allow linkage to specific Board policy and planning documents without the necessity of navigating through the "Groups" page (**ACTION**: Staff).
- The revision/consolidation of the Operating Principles (see item 3.c. above) should reaffirm the existing reporting relationships of the facilities directors (**ACTION**: Staff).

Board members suggested that, subject to other scheduling issues, it would be desirable for the Board to meet in person at each of the Regional Facilities as soon as reasonably possible. In this connection, Board members should note that the ULs will be meeting at UCLA on May 5-6; if these dates are not timely for a Board meeting, it may still be possible and desirable to arrange a visit to SRLF for Board members.

3.e. Review and revise the operating policies and practices of the RLFs

See item 3.c. above.

3.f. Operational coordination and oversight for the RLFs.

The Board **agreed that:**

- Existing operating groups and structures would remain until a need for reconsideration is evident.

- The Staff Team is charged to effect operational coordination as between the facilities and raise any significant issues to the Board (**ACTION**: Staff).
- The Staff Team will incorporate appropriate provisions regarding operational groups and operational coordination in their review of the Operating Principles (see item 3.c. above) (**ACTION**: Staff).

4. PENDING ISSUES

4.a. Facilities updates

4.a.i. NRLF

- Northern Regional Library Facility, Background Information for the Shared Library Facilities Board Meeting, February 23, 2005
- Northern Regional Library Facility, Organization Chart, February 2005

NRLF Phase 3 will be completed at the end of March, with a capacity of 2.2 million volume-equivalents and a new reading room, providing a capacity of about 9 years at existing “normal” annual deposit rates. NRLF staff will immediately transfer 200,000 items temporarily housed in “unrated” space in Phases 1 and 2, and will then begin to accept normal deposits. [NOTE: subsequently, Heinecke provided the following data about NRLF-3:

- Total P-W-C cost: \$15,645,000
- 67,302 gross square feet (gsf), 56,713 assignable square feet (asf) (89% efficiency)
- Total (P-W-C) cost/gsf = \$232; Construction-only/gsf = \$181]

4.a.ii. SRLF

- Southern Regional Library Facility, Annual Report, 2003-2004

SRLF is currently focused on three areas:

- Coming up on the new Endeavor ILS: staff have completed initial training, and indications are that deposit processing will proceed at about the same rate as the previous ILS, about 15 items/hour. At this writing, deposit demand from the campuses totals about 300,000 items/year, while normal SRLF processing capacity is about 200,000 volumes/year.
- Shared print operations. SRLF, in collaboration with the UCLA and UCSD libraries, is successfully processing the shared print journal volumes associated with the digital titles licensed from Elsevier, ACM and other publishers.
- JSTOR shared print archive. SRLF is gearing up to process over 22,000 journal back-issue volumes associated with the project to create a print archive of journals digitized by the JSTOR project. A project manager has been hired, and processes are underway to recruit a Library Assistant 3 supervisor and about 20 student assistants to process the materials. Over the 2 years of the initial phase of the project, shifts will be scheduled between 7 a.m. and 7 p.m. on weekdays, plus some weekend hours, and half the SRLF reading room has been given over for the project.

4.a.iii. Facilities planning issues and strategies

- Gottfredson to Greenwood, 12/20/04, SLASAC Resolution H
- Greenwood to Gottfredson, 1/21/05, SLASAC Resolution H

Heinecke described the UC capital budgeting process, the inflationary factors (including the newly-imposed State policy to charge the capital budget for administrative costs and the recent rapid run-up in construction costs) that have adversely influenced the funding prospects for the current five-year capital budget plan, and the uncertainty about capital funding sources after 2005-06, when funds from the current general obligation bond will have been expended. In the context of these pressures on the capital budget, questions have arisen regarding the role and function of the Regional Library Facilities and their relationship to needs and plans for campus library facilities. It is evident that under these conditions it is important to revisit and refresh the justifications for capital investment in shared library facilities.

In discussion, Board members mentioned several points that might be included in such a justification, including:

- Continued worldwide print production
- Worldwide scope of UC collections and the continued growth of print in non-Western countries
- Competitive advantage
- Unintended consequences, including encouragement for proliferation of departmental collections
- The asset value of the collections, and the importance of making and protecting the investment

Board members also strongly recommended enlistment of outside expertise to help formulate and frame the message, and noted the importance of including students, especially graduate students, in the constituency to be consulted.

Greenstein indicated that the next steps would focus on the process for developing the justification in consultation with the Board.

4.b. Planning for RLF capacity needs and utilization

Agreed that planning for traditional and new uses will cover this, and it need not be addressed separately at this time.

4.c. Duplication policies and procedures.

The sense of the Board was that the operating groups could handle this, but that staff should ensure that relevant data could be produced on short notice. Schottlaender noted that the matter of withdrawals in lieu of deposit would continue to require attention. **ACTION**: Delegated to staff team and operating groups.

4.d. Shared print collections.

4.f. Address the policy issues arising from the Shared Print program

- Developing a Planning Framework for UC Libraries Shared Print Collections, Version 1.6 February 9, 2005 (<http://www.slp.ucop.edu/programs/sharedprint/PlanningFrameworkv1-6.pdf>)

Issues will be brought to the Board as specific Shared Print collection plans are developed.

4.e. Persistence and availability of RLF deposits. (ACTION: Approval by the Board)

- Persistent Deposits in UC Regional Library Facilities. May 5, 2004
(http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/planning/RLF_Persistence_Policy.pdf)

Acknowledging that the 5/5 document had previously been formally endorsed by the University Librarians, and notwithstanding some concerns about the clarity of item 4 in the document, it was **moved** (Schottlaender), **seconded** (Strong), and **unanimously endorsed** by the Board to **approve the statement on Persistent Deposits in UC Regional Library Facilities** as operating policy for UC Shared Library Facilities. Staff will incorporate the provisions of the statement in their work on revising the Operating Principles.

4.g. Non-UC Deposits

4.g.i. Review and revise policies for acceptance of deposit requests from non-UC libraries.

4.g.ii. Consider requests for deposits

- UCSC (NRLF) (*Action*)
- The Graduate Theological Union (NRLF) (*Action*)
- UCB Law (NRLF) (*Action*)
- Request to Increase UC Santa Cruz's Annual Deposit to the NRLF (2/11/05)
- UCSC Request for an Increase to their Deposit Allocation (NRLF, October 6, 2004)
- GTU Request to permanently store at NRLF 30,000 volumes as an initial deposit and 8,000 per year thereafter (NRLF, undated)
- UCB Request for an Increase to their Deposit Allocation (NRLF, October 6, 2004)

UCSC wishes to increase its annual deposits from the longstanding level of 20,000 to 50,000 per year beginning 7/1/05 for four years, coterminous with the McHenry Library addition/renovation, and then fall back to a sustained rate of 35,000 per year. UCSC is prepared to pay the marginal costs for NRLF staff to process the additional deposits. UCB Law is making its first request for deposit, and the General Library is unable to reduce its deposits to accommodate the Law material within the current campus annual deposit rate. NRLF staff estimate that the UCSC request, at the initial 50,000-volume rate, would reduce the capacity-life of NRLF 3 by 6.5 month, and the Law request by 5 months (the latter also generates an unfunded workload for NRLF).

Greenstein suggested that it would be worthwhile to evaluate exceptional deposit requests (non-UC requests and UC requests beyond approved annual deposit rates) strategically, in the context of the UC Libraries' collaborative collection management strategy (cf. *Systemwide Strategic Directions for Libraries and Scholarly Information*), by assessing a request's contribution to the breadth/depth of the systemwide collection and/or the opportunities for campus cost avoidance. It was **moved** (Sharrow), **seconded**, and **unanimously agreed** that the Board **charge the staff to develop a draft set of criteria for assessment of exceptional deposits within 30 days, for review**

and finalization by the Board within the subsequent 30 days, to allow the Board to take action on the UCSC request in a timely manner.

The remaining agenda items were deferred to a subsequent meeting of the Board.

4.h. Funding strategies

4.i. Communication strategies

4.j. Develop strategies and procedures to prospectively identify poor copies included in new deposits in RLFs and effect replacement with a good copy when possible.