SYSTEMWIDE LIBRARY AND SCHOLARLY INFORMATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE
LIBRARY PLANNING TASK FORCE

April 7, 2011
1:00 – 2:30 p.m. (PST)

MEETING NOTES

Attending: Lucas (chair); Cogswell; Doyle; Farley (consultant); Greenstein; R. B. Miller; Schneider;
              Schottlaender; Waters; Wolpert
Absent: Meyer
Support: Lawrence; J. Miller

Tentative Schedule for Report Development and Consultation, v.3, 4/5/11

1. Objectives for today's meeting (Lucas)

Per agenda: review and discuss SLASIAC outcomes, come to closure on governance, review the draft
Interim Report, discuss next steps.

2. Reports on consultations
    a. Systemwide Library and Scholarly Information Advisory Committee, March 16, 2011 (Extract
        of meeting notes attached)

No additional discussion.

3. Review of new and revised documents
    a. Action Memorandum 4, v.3, "Governance"; discussion paper, "A pragmatic view of
        governance issues for shared services," GSL 4/5/11

Lawrence described the motivation for his discussion paper, proceeding from an understanding of the
characteristics and successes of the current structure for library planning and decision-making, and
analyzing the new considerations that might need to be accommodated by that structure.

There was considerable discussion of the roles of COVC and SLASIAC and the flow of reports and
recommendations as set out in AM4. Lawrence suggested that it might prove useful to be mindful of
the distinction between general governance and oversight of the three-phase planning process
recommended by the Task Force, and noted that the discussion paper introduces concepts not yet
included in AM4, particularly the notion that in the current system, decision rights involving
"systemwide" money rest with the Provost, who receives advice from SLASIAC (which in turn represents
ULs, COVC, etc.); these decision rights don't necessarily change in the new environment. In response to
a question from R.B. Miller, Lawrence and Greenstein clarified that "systemwide funds" means funds
allocated to UCOP and used to support shared services, including Funding Flows assessments, loans, etc.
There was discussion about the possibility that decision rights might change with Financial Flows, but
Greenstein and Lucas agree that the answer to this question remains unclear – libraries may set a
precedent. It is generally agreed that the institutional framework for financial decision-making at the
systemwide level is in flux, and that the roles of stakeholder groups in shared service decisions may in
any case vary among specific services. Given these uncertainties, it is best to allow for and encourage
flexibility, and focus on the content of and protocols for communication among the parties. CoUL would
welcome greater understanding of the framework within which it can move collaborative initiatives

forward. The use of the term "governance" in the Task Force report may create a problem. The concept as understood by the task force includes such diverse functions as planning, coordination, advising, informing, consultation, and moderation. Lawrence suggested that it would be straightforward to substitute a term that emphasizes the concept of a framework for planning, consultation and decision-making.

Greenstein summarized as follows: (a) the Task Force is generally comfortable with the overall approach, but not the vocabulary; (b) the important point to emphasize is communication among the bodies (e.g., build in appropriate "touch points" such as frequency and subject of SLASIAC meetings; allowance of a routine annual "library" item on the COVC agenda, etc.); (c) it may be useful to illustrate the roles of the bodies (e.g., campus authority of the Provosts; past COVC roles as moderator and coordinator, new roles in light of Funding Flows); and (d) as this is a "moving target," review and revise periodically. Lucas suggested that it might be useful to illustrate the "map" of relationships by applying it to one shared service likely to be brought forward in Phase I.

With respect to the use of the term "savings" in AM4, GSL will clarify that the Interim Report is consistent in referring to "anticipated budget cuts" and strategies to aid to the campuses.

  b. DRAFT Interim Report, v.3

Some specific editorial suggestions were made.

4. Next steps (Lucas)

Referring to "Tentative Schedule for Report Development and Consultation," v.3, 4/5/11, Lucas reported that he will update COVC on April 19, and plans to initiate the conversation on the roles of COVC in the institutional framework, GSL will prepare a background document that he can share with the Council.

There will be one more iteration of the Interim Report before it goes forward to the Provost. Lawrence reported that discussions with the Executive Director of the Academic Senate suggested some issues with the prospect of Senate review before end of July; a contingency plan will be needed. However, a delayed Senate review may not materially affect the Phase I schedule. There should be a revised draft of the Interim Report for LPTF review by about April 15, with the intent to submit to the Provostand issue the request for review to campuses and the Senate by the end of April.

Wolpert suggested the need a public relations/communication plan; Greenstein and Lawrence committed to develop a draft, to include talking points and FAQs, for consultation with the Task Force, CoUL, and UCOLASC. CoUL meets 4/8 to discuss roles, plans and actions with regard to the TF report and Phase I.GEL willing to visit campuses.

It was agreed to schedule a date after the 4/19 COVC meeting for a possible 1 hour Task Force conference call.