UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

OFFICE OF THE VICE PROVOST --
ACADEMIC PLANNING, PROGRAMS AND COORDINATION

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
1111 Franklin Street, 11th Fl.
Oakland, California 94607-5200

March 24, 2001

MEMBERS OF THE CALIFORNIA DIGITAL LIBRARY REVIEW STEERING COMMITTEE

Colleagues –

I appreciate your memorandum of February 28, 2011 regarding the status of the CDL review. I understand and fully endorse all the points you've made about the value of the CDL and its interdependence with the campus libraries. Moreover, I agree that there must be close consultation, effective communication, and maximum transparency among the libraries and the CDL regarding plans programs, priorities, and financial resources.

As the work of the SLASIAC Library Planning Task Force has made apparent, there is a clear need for both the regular assessment of existing systemwide library services and the development of new services to assist the campuses in grappling with significant budget shortfalls. There is a concomitant need for credible governance, close consultation, effective communication, and maximum transparency among the campuses, the systemwide programs and UCOP regarding all existing and prospective systemwide library plans, programs, priorities and budgets, regardless of their location or administrative structure. It is important to remember that there are current systemwide programs and services related to libraries that are not located within the CDL – for example, the Regional Library Facilities – and there should be no presumption that future systemwide library services will be located at or administered by the CDL.

The University Librarians have been unusually effective in developing a systemwide view of new services that can help offset the effects of the anticipated budget shortfall and enhance library services through, for example, the Next Generation Melvyl initiative and the Next Generation Technical Services planning program. It is clear at least to me that the University Librarians and their supporting systemwide organizations should have the lead responsibility to further develop their initiatives by preparing detailed program plans and analyses for those services, and I believe the task force is moving in that direction as well. The issue came up at the recent meeting of SLASIAC where this view prompted no dissent. It is equally evident to me that the libraries, as primary stakeholders, need to continue their deep engagement in the ongoing governance of systemwide library services, and I appreciate the review committee's input on what governance might look like.

In this regard your input is also very timely as the task force is only now turning its attention to the various options and will undoubtedly consider the one you raise as well as others as it crafts its recommendations. Further, I know that the Provost will look forward to gathering additional input through the consultation process that surrounds the report once it is released in the next few weeks.

Finally, while it would be premature to commit to any particular governance structure, it seems to me that no likely governance model would preclude effective and continuous communication and coordination among the CDL and the libraries. Hopefully, existing strength will be bolstered not diminished, and I am confident that ways will be found to achieve this within the framework of a broader governance structure.

Sincerely,

Daniel Greenstein
Vice Provost
Academic Planning, Programs and Coordination

cc: Provost Pitts
Executive Vice Chancellor Lucas