

SYSTEMWIDE LIBRARY AND SCHOLARLY INFORMATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
LIBRARY PLANNING TASK FORCE

November 17, 2010  
10:00 – 11:30 a.m. (PST)

MEETING NOTES

Attending: Lucas (chair); Doyle; Greenstein; Meyer; Schneider (part), Schottlaender; Waters; Wolpert

Absent: Cogswell; Miller

Support: Farley (consultant), Lawrence (staff), Ivy Anderson (CDL staff)

General background:

Task Force roster

Meeting notes, Task Force meeting of November 1, 2010

Schedule of Discussion Topics (11/9/10)

1. Task Force Operating Principles (Lucas) (15 min)

Background: Draft, Library Planning Task Force, Operating Principles

In discussion, Lucas confirmed that for the purposes of the work of the Task Force, the amount of building space available to the UC libraries (including the Regional Library Facilities) is considered fixed, although the available space may be reallocated among library functions. It was agreed that public policies critically constrain the options available to the libraries (e.g., the use of in-copyright but potentially “orphaned” works in the HathiTrust digital repository), that these constraints should be clearly identified and assessed in the work of the TF, and that the TF could, in its reports, highlight these public policy issues for potential action by the University.

The Operating Principles were endorsed by the TF subject to agreement that the word “growing” would be deleted from item number 2.

2. Review of work to date (Lucas) (15 min)

Background: Draft, Action Memorandum 1, Management of Existing Print Collections

It was observed that recommendation 2, related to the use of available library space, would be resisted as presently worded. Wolpert suggested rewording the recommendation to read “Plan for the management of print collections in an integrated fashion across all available UC library facilities.” This suggestion was endorsed by the Task Force.

Anderson confirmed that the estimates related to de-duplication of HathiTrust holdings (recommendation 1.c) comprehended only public-domain material in the HT repository; it was agreed that (a) this should be clarified in the narrative, and (b) it would be worthwhile to develop an additional scenario estimating savings from de-duplicating the in-copyright material in HT (see discussion of public policy issues above). Recommendation 1.c. raised other questions as well:

- Do we intend “retention of at least one high-quality print copy among the HathiTrust partners, or within UC (a question of scaling and trust)?

- Is one copy sufficient? How should the Task Force consider the question of the appropriate number of copies?
- How difficult is it to define and operationalize the term “high-quality” for this purpose?

In view of these questions (which are not necessarily set aside by this change), it was agreed to delete the word “duplicate” from the language of recommendation 1.c.

### 3. Discussion of Issues and Strategies for Collections: Prospective Acquisitions (Greenstein) (1 hour)

Background: “Collections Scenarios,” Revised DRAFT v.4, 11/12/10

In introducing the section on “Options for managing new acquisitions” of the Scenarios paper, Greenstein observed that these scenarios were informed by the general rubric “acquire the general (i.e. ubiquitously available) uniquely (i.e., with minimum duplication) and the unique generally.” He briefly reviewed the first two scenarios, (a) minimizing duplication of print monographs and (b) minimizing duplication as between print and digital monographs, and opened extensive discussion around the third scenario related to availability of material in the commodity marketplace. There was some consensus around the observation that the idea of “commodity content” masked a tripartite division of (chiefly monographic) collections, with each component both composed of different material and addressing different academic audiences:

- i. Readily available current material, collected broadly but shallowly and needed immediately in support of (chiefly undergraduate) teaching.
- ii. Readily available, relatively widely held material collected more deeply and selectively in support of advanced undergraduate, graduate, and faculty research.
- iii. Material not commonly available or widely held and collected in depth in support of research.

There is a clear tension between these categories in the collecting priorities of research libraries, and each may lend itself to different strategies. Teaching material, for example, might be provided through rental collections, and readily-available research material could be collected, at least in part, through patron-driven acquisition (PDA) strategies. The driving concept behind this bundle of issues is that there may be classes of material for which it is no longer economical to acquire institutionally. Possible implications seem to lie in three directions:

1. Patron-driven acquisition is a scenario (especially for the “type ii” collections) that should be explored further.
2. If “commodity content” means “available at retail,” the concept invokes complicated issues around responsibility for payment (users, various institutional sources, etc.), and pricing is clearly an important, if unpredictable, factor.
3. If the economics of library provision have lead to consolidation of branch collection operations at the campus level, and of campus operations at the system level (as has been achieved by UC in limited cases), perhaps the next frontier involves consolidation at yet a higher level.

Discussion moved to the fourth scenario in the background paper, involving open access. The problem here is parse the variety of strategies and tactics that have been advanced to promote open access in order to make OA truly strategic for the institution, and to do so in a way that allows benefits to be modeled and quantified.

Finally, Greenstein introduced yet another strategy gleaned from his reading of draft materials from the University Librarians’ Next Generation Technical Services planning initiative (which will be considered more fully by the Task Force in subsequent meetings), the idea of service centers focused on particular

collections characterized by subject, format or source; examples might include federal government documents and less widely collected languages and literatures. These might be considered as specific methods for achieving part of the prospective de-duplication envisioned in scenarios (a) and (b).

The Task Force turned its attention to summarizing the results of today's discussion in a draft Action Memorandum. It was acknowledged that the benefits of all these strategies will need to be expressed in terms of future cost avoidance instead of immediate cost savings, as was the case in Action Memo 1. It would be helpful to have some data about the distribution of use of recent acquisitions (e.g., to help classify current and prospective collections into the three collection groups), but it is not known whether such information could be readily supplied by the libraries. Greenstein suggested that the benefits of Open Access might be roughly quantified by taking the current expenditure for shared digital journals as a baseline, and estimating how these funds might be alternatively allocated to support OA, and what benefits and consequences would accrue. Anderson reported that some modeling of OA has been done internally, and staff will work with Schneider, in his capacity as chair of the Senate Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication, to explore these possibilities further. Staff will work to develop a draft Action Memorandum for review by the Task Force.

The next conference call meeting of the Task Force will be on December 2, from 9:00 – 10:30 a.m. PST.