APPENDIX D. Summary Chart of LPTF Comments Received from Academic Senate, Campus and LAUC Review
Organized by Response Category

Comments received from:
- Systemwide committees:
    - UCFW (Committee on Faculty Welfare)
    - UCOLASC (Committee on Library and Scholarly Communications)
    - UCORP (Committee on Research Policy)

- Campuses:
    - Davis (Graduate Council; Committee on Planning & Budget; L&S Faculty Executive Committee)
    - Irvine (Council on Research, Computing & Libraries; Council on Educational Policy; Graduate Council; Council on Student Experience)
    - UCLA (Committee on Library and Scholarly Communications in consultation with other faculty)
    - Riverside (UC Riverside Committee on Library and Scholarly Communications)
    - Santa Barbara (Council on Research and Instructional Resources; Undergraduate Council; Graduate Council; Council on Planning and Budget; Faculty Executive Committees for the College of Letters and Sciences, College of Engineering, Education, and College of Creative Studies)
    - San Diego (various)

- UCSF Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost Jeffrey Bluestone
- UCSC Chancellor George Blumenthal
- UC Davis Professor Brian H. Kolner
- The following LAUC divisions:
    - Berkeley
    - UCLA
    - Irvine
    - Davis (Comments are those of individual librarians and do not necessarily reflect consensus among LAUC-D members)
    - Riverside

The responses can be divided into three categories:

1. Issues regarding scholarly communication
2. Faculty communication
3. Other issues

The following chart groups the responses by these three themes...

Response category	Comments on Interim Report	Task Force response
1. Comments on Scholarly Communication Mainly in response to Section 5.2, Strategies that Address the Pricing of Academic Publications, of the Interim Report. The Interim Report said: *It is evident that the costs of the existing system are not sustainable, the tide of opinion regarding methods and prices for scholarly publications is changing, and the time is right for new leadership aimed at restoring academic control over the system of scholarly communication. The size and prestige of the University of California can be leveraged to make a difference in encouraging scholars, publishers, and peer institutions to give more favorable attention to these issues.* ***The Faculty Role*** *Ultimately, the system of scholarly communication belongs to the faculty, as its producers and primary users. Institutional initiatives can go only where the faculty lead. To foster successful change in scholarly*	*UCOLASC:* LPTF Report could do a better job of acknowledging ongoing efforts by faculty to change the system of scholarly publications, and to emphasize that faculty must continue to participate in negotiations with publishers, which adds considerable weight to the process and draws greater attention to the interests, needs, and concerns of the scholarly community. The language used could be less didactic and more reflective of the true collaboration that will be needed among the faculty, the University Librarians, and the Office of the President in order to transform the broken system of scholarly communication… A cogent argument as to why promoting retention of copyright is important should be made and the recommendation should be presented lower in the list. Committee members are afraid that many faculty will take offense at being told where they can and cannot publish, or in what type of professional activities they can and cannot engage… use as opportunity for the LPTF to express to faculty how the choices they make as individuals can in fact help change the system. UCOLASC encourages the LPTF to elaborate more thoroughly the reasoning behind such recommendations, and make the faculty role more explicit rather than implicit. *UCD L&S FEC, CPB:* A bit too strong in encouraging the faculty to not submit to or serve as reviewers for journals with high prices… the suggestion as presented may be interpreted as impinging	The Task Force readily acknowledges the ongoing efforts of UCOLASC, individual faculty, several campus Senate Divisions and their committees, the campus libraries and the California Digital Library to constructively engage in efforts to diagnose and change the system of scholarly communication and its unsustainable economics. The view that the Task Force attempted to express in the report is that, as the comments make clear, this is an area of great complexity, with many moving parts and diverse and sometimes conflicting views and perspectives. In foregrounding the idea that the faculty must take leadership in this area, the Task Force merely sought to avoid saddling the libraries (who were the subject of the Task Force charge) with a responsibility that they clearly could not meet by themselves. The Task Force emphatically agrees that many potential paths (including those suggested in the comments) need to be explored, and that the solutions must lie in collaborations among the parties to the scholarly communication system, including faculty (individually and collectively), libraries and librarians, campus and systemwide administration, publishers, both commercial and non-profit, and peers (both institutions and faculty organizations) throughout the world. The importance and complexity of these issues

publishing and communication, UC faculty must be prepared to:

- *Retain and manage their copyrights in the works they produce*
- *Participate actively in new publishing models and innovations in scholarly communication that more effectively serve the interests of the scholarly community*
- *Decline to publish in, edit or review for journals that persist in unacceptable pricing or copyright practices*
- *Encourage their academic colleagues and scholarly societies to take similar actions.*

upon the intellectual freedom of the faculty.

UCD GC:
There must be a change in culture of the merit and promotion process where equal weight is given to publication in high quality, peer reviewed open access journals as to traditional print/digital journals.

UCI CEP:
UC system has not adequately utilized its clout as an organization or as faculty to help control publishing costs for journals. CEP suggests that:

- UC improves the leveraging of its bargaining power through forming a consortium that includes other high-caliber universities.
- For this to be effective, faculty need to work together, with CAP, to recognize and utilize the growing number of open-access journals that are viable options to traditional journals used in the review process.

UCR COLASC:
We think faculty would be willing to become engaged but there is a lack of leadership and clear focus regarding how the system needs to be changed. Scientific journals that refuse to reduce publications costs and post articles rapidly for free and open worldwide access should be boycotted with progressive vigor - a nice way to start would be publication of costs and availability so PIs knew who to avoid and who to provide their product to (i.e. submitted articles). The same likely needs to be extended to books and other publication venues. Many scholarly disciplines will likely have their somewhat unique problems and concerns. But those who refuse to get on the train (open and inexpensive access)

has led the Task Force to commission a separate white paper, laying out the roles, responsibilities and limitations of each of the parties (at least within UC) and identifying promising paths for collaborative action. This white paper will be developed in collaboration with UCOLASC and will be distributed for review and discussion shortly.

should be left behind.

UCSB CRIR:
The "faculty role" in the report occupies less than one half of one page… Rather than inviting constructive faculty participation, it lists directives to the faculty about copyright and publishing. There is no clear view of faculty participation or shared governance indicated in the document.

Faculty cannot be expected to decline to publish in certain journals or to insist on retaining copyrights unless and until institutional support and protection for taking such actions is firmly established. CAP should be consulted about the impact of changes in scholarly publishing and communications … in relation to personnel reviews.

UCSD Academic Senate:
Institutional support is lacking for the report's recommendations that faculty authors retain copyrights, participate in new publishing models, and refuse to associate themselves with overpriced journals. Those that negotiate to maintain their copyrights may face publication delays (or worse). Many faculty authors are not aware of publishers' impacts on the Libraries' collections budget. The Committee on Library suggested that more of an effort be made to educate faculty and develop and test new publishing models to establish strong, well-understood alternatives to traditional publishers.

Capacity of Divisional CAPs to assess the quality of open access journals is unclear, as is the impact of citation rates on academic reviews. These factors may deter faculty who might otherwise be interested in pursuing novel publishing options.

	USCF EVC: Even larger than streamlining library processes is the unrelenting increase in the cost of publications and the rapid growth in their numbers… urgency in partnering with faculty and scholarly societies to change current model: • Shared support for cost of publications • New business models for scholarly societies • Innovative, rapid ways to communicate science outside traditional journals. *Irvine LAUC:* [Librarians] Have to continue to work with the faculty. Scholarly communication is their process. The costs are shifting, but some is shifting to the authors who are the faculty. Need to talk to our faculty and encourage them to publish in open access journals. They are very concerned about high citation counts, etc. We need to help them see the importance of moving to open access. Should be more direct and tell them which journals are unacceptable.	
2. **Comments on faculty involvement in library planning**	*UCOLASC:* Committee members are deeply concerned that the vital role of faculty in the decision making process (i.e., shared governance) has been entirely overlooked by the LPTF. Right from the beginning of the report, starting with the executive summary, there is no process described to obtain the formal input of faculty… UCOLASC should be included in the list of Systemwide bodies involved in planning, consultation, and decision-making and be engaged in ongoing discussions in a meaningful way.	As the deliberations of the Task Force proceeded, it became increasingly evident that the immediate budgetary problems facing the UC libraries could not be readily untangled from the broader changes working their way through the academic library world in response to rapidly evolving information technologies, changing expectations of library users, and shifts in the fundamental practices of research and teaching. UC's response to these broader forces will necessarily develop and change over

	Faculty should be consulted and: • provide input on the issues surrounding de-duplication of materials • be involved in decisions regarding acquisition of multiple copies of books across the system • help in the analysis of the various "costs" of having multiple copies of a book … versus paying for interlibrary loan multiple times • help determine the value of different journals and provide feedback on discussions about objective measures used to make licensing decisions • help evaluate the collective cost of buying a print book from an online vendor themselves versus the cost of lost productivity if the equivalent library purchase is delayed by the process of library procurement and cataloging • help assess the benefits and disadvantages of digital collections and prioritize the directions of expenditures based on programmatic needs. *UCD L&S Faculty Executive Committee:* Faculty should be asked to review collections more frequently. Those collections found to be seldom used might be relegated to regional storage, thus freeing up additional space at campus libraries. *UCLA COLASC:* Based on summertime review, faculty have been insufficiently consulted in the process. Report does not sufficiently include faculty perspective. UCOLASC and local committees should be part of any action that will affect campus libraries.	time, through close consultation among faculty, libraries, campus administrations, and peer institutions. Owing to this emerging understanding of the problem, the thinking of the Task Force shifted over time from preparation of specific recommendations to address financial exigencies toward development of a communication and consultation process that would ensure effective representation of all the key stakeholders in the broad transitional issues while ensuring responsible and effective decisions about immediate financial problems. Owing to the pressure of time, however, the Task Force interim report may not fully reflect the group's evolving view of the importance of the proposed process. As the Task Force considered the issue of communication and consultation structures, it understandably looked to the areas that were most in need of clarification and strengthening. The Task Force understands that the faculty are strongly and deeply involved in decisions about library services at all levels, and therefore did not address faculty engagement at length or in great detail in its report. To clarify in response to these comments, then, it is the view of the Task Force that three major constituencies have vital roles to play in planning, policy, and funding for UC library services: the faculty, the libraries, and the Executive Vice Chancellors. All three are

	UCSB: Of greatest concern to reviewing groups is that the Report does not recommend a specific means by which faculty would be more integrated into the decision making process regarding library resources. *UCSB CRIR:* The first phases of the proposal are to be implemented before the Academic Senate suggestions can be addressed. This appears to defeat the purpose of Senate review. We feel strongly that protocol regarding the process for Senate involvement when a shift in operations is expected should be included in the report. *UCSC Chancellor/Administration:* The ambitious timeline (of phase I)… does not allow sufficient time to get input from faculty and other constituencies.	represented on the Systemwide Library and Scholarly Information Advisory Committee (SLASIAC), along with other major participants and advisors, including librarians (via the Librarians Association of UC, LAUC), information technology officers, budget officers, and research officers. As described in Sections 5.4 and 6 of the Interim Report, SLASIAC plays a pivotal role in the communication and consultation process as the primary systemwide forum where the views of the principal stakeholders are brought together, and its roles and responsibilities have been clarified and strengthened in recognition of its central importance in this process. Currently, the faculty engage in this process in the following ways: • On their respective campuses through their Divisional library committees, the University Librarian, and other Divisional committees (e.g., planning and budget, academic personnel) as required by specific issues. • Systemwide through UCOLASC (which consults regularly with the Council of University Librarians, CoUL, and includes ex officio representation from CoUL and LAUC), and through other systemwide Senate committees (e.g., Planning and Budget, Educational Policy, Academic Personnel, Research Policy) as required by specific issues. • Systemwide through participation on SLASIAC, which includes representation

		from the Academic Council (typically the Chair or Vice Chair) and UCOLASC, as well as several at-large faculty appointed to represent various disciplinary perspectives; currently, six of 22 members of SLASIAC are UC faculty members.
		Within the overall consultation and communication process recommended by the Task Force, the faculty can be expected to receive regular communication about proposed systemwide library plans, programs and priorities, and to have expanded opportunities to comment and help guide these initiatives.
3. Other comments: • Overall vision for libraries • Timeline • Local v. systemwide resource allocation • Library space *[Revised report should note that a new Office for Systemwide Library Planning will not be established. Instead, systemwide library planning will be conducted via the CoUL.]*	*UCORP:* The committee felt the report did not specify clearly enough the efficiencies to be realized nor the plans to achieve them. UCORP also felt that the report did not explore adequately the implications and limitations of the recommended boycotting policy, nor did it address fully changes to the libraries' physical plant and those intersections with the still-emerging information stewardship strategy for the new century using new media. *UCOLASC:* The report should state explicitly what libraries are expected to do and what the minimal levels of services and activities that faculty can expect from the libraries will be. *UCLA COLASC:* Consider report to be a failure with respect to outlining the major structural and systemic problems facing the scholarly communications system within UC. The report ignores a more general crisis in order to respond to the particular	The discussion in Section 2 above highlights the need to plan for a long-term transition in library roles and responsibilities as well as immediate financial exigencies, emphasizes the necessary uncertainly involved in the long-term transition, and sets out recommendations for a strengthened communication and consultation process to address both long- and short-term issues. In light of these factors, it was neither possible nor desirable for the Task Force to set out specific plans; these will be developed through the proposed planning process, involving close consultation among all UC's stakeholders. The specific timetable and savings targets set out in the Interim Report were meant to convey both the magnitude of the problem and the sense of urgency imposed by the University's current financial situation; these proposals are subject to review and revision, with extensive consultation, through

	budget crisis of the last two years. Report entirely focused on collections; does not reflect strategic thinking about the services libraries provide (reference, training, consultation, educational assistance, technical instruction) or those it will have to provide in the future. *UCI Council on Research, Computing and Libraries:* Report does not provide a realistic or sufficiently detailed plan to mitigate the impact of budgetary reductions. Agrees with strategies but accelerated time frame and estimated future savings highly unrealistic…. Libraries are not simply being asked to do the same job they have always done with fewer resources, but that they are in fact being asked to do an ever increasing range of jobs with shrinking resources. *UCSB CRIR:* Timetable for implementation of some of the Report's recommendations seems overly ambitious. *UCSC Chancellor/Administration:* Overly-ambitious timeline does not allow sufficient time to get input from faculty and other constituencies. Concern about notion that C3 loans can be repaid through library cost efficiencies gained over time. *Davis LAUC:* Research assistance/instruction and collection development are interrelated -- but neither is developed in this document… leads to an abstract notion of collections, wherein efficiency becomes synonymous with cost cutting,	the communication and consultation process proposed by the Task Force. Scholarly communication issues discussed in this set of comments are more fully addressed in Section 1 above.

	and value becomes equivalent with increased numbers of units (books, journals, articles). Let's spend our resources more wisely. *Irvine LAUC:* No mention of the infrastructure changes that will be needed to make further resource and service sharing possible. Collaboration takes a lot of energy and staff time too. It is hard to cut back and do more collaboration. *Berkeley LAUC:* Acknowledge that budget cuts, austerity measures and increased interdependence via shared services will have an adverse effect on library services and support for the University's academic programs. Report needs to re-affirm and acknowledge the core service value of librarians, who work directly with faculty, students, patrons, donors and the university. *UCLA LAUC:* Recommend that LAUC's advisory role be observed throughout all phases of planning and implementation of Next Generation and System-wide shared library services. *LAUC in general* Supports CoUL's continuation of governance and oversight of shared library services and would like to see a more high-profile advisory role for LAUC.	
	UCI Council on Research, Computing and Libraries: [The TF has] preempted a strategic approach to the problem of the library's position in overall campus research resource allocation by floating a de facto budget proposal.	The Task Force is acutely aware that library services for the UC system are not, and should not be, monolithic; campus differences must be respected and accommodated. Indeed, as the University has moved toward a more

UCLA COLASC:
Report does not articulate principles that should determine the balance between centralized and local control of collections or services.

The need for study space, communal space, ad-hoc educational and technical resources that facilitate research and learning are central to the library's mission.

UCSC Chancellor/Administration:
Report does not address the importance of study space available to students in the library. Students rely on the libraries' safe, quite study areas that are available all week and many hours of the day. This space will be needed even if collections are reduced.

Concerns about the assumptions in the report that may over-estimate the availability of digital copies of materials needed for faculty work. As plans are made to implement recommendations to reduce the number of print copies of items and the amount of duplication across the UC campuses, it will essential that adequate time be built in for consultation, careful coordination, and modification of the plans.

If local decisions about collections and services are overlooked or downplayed to meet systemwide goals, this could unfairly disadvantage UCSC's faculty and students. Quotas could have a disproportionately deleterious impact on UCSC. Therefore, having appropriate governance structures in place is critical.

UCLA LAUC:
Concern over the one-size-fits-all approach. A necessary

"federalized" model for financing (though the Funding Flows model) and a reduction in the size and role of the Office of the President, the differing needs, resources and priorities of the campuses have attained a heightened importance. Through its proposed process for consultation and communication, the Task Force envisions that (a) many initiatives for systemwide or multicampus library services will be built "from the bottom up," initiated by one or more campuses and vetted and developed by CoUL in regular consultation with the faculty and the Council of Vice Chancellors and subject to review by SLASIAC; (b) that the planning, budgeting and operation of systemwide and multicampus library services will become more transparent to the campuses through the review and reporting processes recommended by the Task Force; and (c) that the proposed communication/consultation process will provide ample opportunities for campuses (and other stakeholder groups) to identify and explore differences and achieve consensus on priorities for systemwide investment.

At the same time, it must be remembered that the charge to the Task Force was "to recommend the systemwide strategies and investment that the University needs to pursue…." (Interim Report, p. A-2, emphasis added). Thus, the Task Force recommendations do not focus on campus differences except to the extent that these may affect systemwide strategies (see, e.g., pp. 4

	degree of autonomy is needed to fulfill the individual needs of campus stakeholders.	and 6-7 of the Interim Report); however, the recommended communication/consultation process is, in the view of the Task Force, an effective mechanism to capture and balance the inevitable conflicts between campus and systemwide priorities. With respect to issues of library space and its utilization, a systemwide strategy is not evident at this time, and the Task Force defers these issues to campus consideration.