SYSTEMWIDE LIBRARY AND SCHOLARLY INFORMATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE
LIBRARY PLANNING TASK FORCE

January 5, 2011 4 p.m. – January 6, 2011, 3 p.m.
Hotel Solamar
San Diego, CA

MEETING NOTES

Attending: Lucas (chair); Cogswell; Doyle; Greenstein; Meyer (Day 2); R.B. Miller; Schneider; Schottlaender; Waters; Wolpert
Support: Anderson (Consultant); Farley (consultant); Lawrence (staff); J. Miller (staff)

General items

- Some of the areas addressed in the Action Memoranda and other documents are impossible for libraries to address alone (e.g., preservation). These must be institutional priorities that UC supports.
- New document/memo: Ways that UC libraries can increase revenue
  o Charging for services (for users outside immediate UC community)
  o Fundraising for specific digital projects
  o Fundraising for surfacing hidden special collections
  o Explore arrangement with journal publishers/vendors to provide access to individuals.
- Libraries need to engage in priority-setting and thinking about user needs because they need to do planning… regardless of budget cuts. The budget situation might drive a more aggressive approach. Written report should state the importance of allocating resources for innovation.

1. Review of library services scenarios (continued from December 13, 2010 conference call)

   - Action Memorandum 3, Systemwide Library Services, Version 2, 1/3/11

- Redraft to emphasize alignment with changing methods of research and scholarship, competitive edge
- Include consideration of importance of innovation and development (especially relevant to group 4 services)
  o Now, some library initiatives are being done on a small scale on campuses, which means there is duplication & possible waste of effort. The LPTF Final Report should talk about innovation and individual campus vs. systemwide investment.
  o Innovations and new services are necessary, even if they don't introduce efficiencies. Some have future return of investment, but some only add costs (although doing them together can reduce those costs).
- Distinguish between services and the systems developed to support them
- Consider how the UC budget (especially UCOP's) can be structured to incentivize innovation at the campuses
- Emphasize joint commitment from UCOP and campuses.

2. Review of members' perspectives on the development of UC library services (roundtable)
3. Review of progress to date
   a. Summary of issues

      - Review of Recommendations and Issues, December, 2010, Version 1, 12/20/10

[NOTE: As this document was intended only to serve as a review for this meeting, there is no plan to update it as a freestanding document at this time. Observations noted below will be incorporated in other Task Force documents]

- New (4th) bullet point and revising the wording of the strategies to address the problems to be more solution-oriented.
- Talk about "challenges and opportunities" rather than problems.
- In talking about the space issue, include management going forward not just retrospective de-duplication; i.e., managing the growth rate.
- Remove reference to retirement system.

  b. Review of principles
  - Principles, DRAFT version 2, 12/9/10

- Need a little more "plain-speak" and less library jargon for non-library audience (but also remember that this will be communicated to library staffs)
- Revise Principle 2
  o Clarify "breadth" vs. "depth," eliminate "depth" throughout the documentation; the issue is "breadth" vs. "multiple copies"
  o Reformulate from the user's view: collections support campus academic program, deduplicate where possible given this priority; reposition as "management of collection growth"
  o Reference and incorporate the CDC document
  o Expand to all forms of materials; say something like "work with faculty to minimize inconvenience"
  o Split into two principles:
    ▪ Maximize support for teaching and research
    ▪ Identify and leverage trade-offs between convenience (duplication) and collection breadth
      - Avoid unintentional duplication
      - Prefer digital in light of key factors: access, persistence, cost
      - Don't duplicate formats
      - Facilitate access
      - Develop supportive service models where compromise of convenience is necessary
      - Aim for maximum persistent access
- New principle
  o Focus on necessity of innovation
    ▪ To maintain support for evolving methods of research, scholarship and teaching
    ▪ As a means to more effectively manage collections and services, and reallocate funds to high priority needs
  o Avoid library-centricity: expand to the overall scholarly enterprise
  o "Libraries innovate because the UC academic community innovates"

4. Review of candidate recommendations
  a. Managing existing collections
  - Action Memorandum 1, Management of Existing Print Collections, DRAFT Version 3, 12/9/10

- Delete "discard," find a more neutral term ("deaccession"?)
- Use terminology "appropriate number of copies"
- Don't' focus exclusively on print – consider collections in all formats, role and importance of Special Collections, setting priorities

  b. Managing new acquisitions

- Action Memorandum 2, Acquisition of Published Material, DRAFT Version 4, 12/9/10
- Second bullet in first para.: "inflation" becomes "price increases," qualify with "barring changes in publishers' pricing practices"
- Refocus on "management of collection growth/development"
- There needs to be some consideration of checks and balances – what happens if application of these recommendations "goes off the rails"; return to these after consideration of governance
- In general, be mindful of the differences between "cost savings" and "cost avoidance"
- Add a conclusion/summary
- With regard to collection categories
  - Category i is "teaching"
  - Categories ii/iii reduce to "ii. available in the market" and "iii. Unique and special collections"
  - Reconcile the narrative with the numerical order of the definitions
  - Expand to all formats
  - Expand the introduction to include new formats and new research models – cf. NGTS "New Modes" report
  - In Cat ii, reference and reconcile with language in the revised Principles; define this category as "greatest opportunity for savings"
  - Emphasize:
    - Engagement with faculty
    - Engagement across the libraries
    - Accountability and transparency
- With regard to scholarly publishing and open access
  - **Create a new Action Memo**; reference it here
  - Emphasize the importance of an investment pool to support innovation in scholarly publishing; link to AM on revenue enhancement
  - Don't promise a ROI; but examples of projects that could produce a measurable return would be helpful
  - "Communicating with faculty" is a non-starter; better to formulate this as "support faculty initiatives"
  - Cite a variety of examples: OA, Open Source, COPE, etc.
  - Be explicit about the benefits of joining with other institutions
  - Can we take a more activist stance?
  - Suggestion to put the needs of the University above the individual needs of faculty and researchers + publicizing our intentions.
  - Confronting the publishing system requires the whole University, faculty in particular, but also administration.
  - Do faculty have tolerance for journal cancellation? Can this be tested?
  - Could be potential fundraising or grant opportunity

  c. Services
  - [See Item 1]
5. Discussion of outstanding issues (including, but not limited to, governance, funding, organization, assessment and accountability)
6. Next steps
   a. Revisit Task Force principles
   b. Purpose and scheduling of additional task force meetings
   c. Issues related to consultation with the University community
   d. Issues related to implementation

- Funding, governance, organization
  - Importance of transparency, effective sharing of information, accountability.
  - Importance of extra-library participation and consultation, consistent with both investment needs and the requirements of faculty engagement and innovation
  - Importance of a continuously supported central library planning function, complementary to the campuses and coordinating their efforts
  - Importance of investment in production and compilation of accountability information (data)
  - View the bundle of issues as a confluence of:
    - Planning problem
    - Oversight problem
    - Communication and marketing problem
  - Funding responsibilities are, of necessity, shared by campuses and the central administration
  - Funding needs include:
    - One-time investment to conduct planning
    - Ongoing support for the planning and coordination function
    - Ongoing support for systemwide services
  - It would appear that the best way to support the initial and ongoing planning functions is an off-the-top reservation of funds; this may also be true for (some) systemwide services
  - A compelling case statement will be needed to generate Universitywide support and justify the needed investments
  - SLASIAC is well-constructed to represent the key constituencies, but it's charge would need to be modified to include the oversight function; a subcommittee could be charged with the oversight responsibility
- Process
  - Revise existing documents as agreed at this meeting; circulate to TF for comment
  - Draft a final report; circulate to TF for comment
  - Schedule a teleconference for the TF at the end of January/beginning of February, especially to focus on the draft final report (but including revisions to other documents)
  - Begin consultation process
    - Consult with ULs ASAP
    - Prepare for joint UL/UCOLASC meeting 2/16/11
    - Schedule a SLASIAC meeting for late February; consult with SLASIAC
    - Plan for informal consultation with the Academic Senate in Spring 2011
    - With SLASIAC sponsorship and support from EVCs, plan for campus visits and stakeholder consultations in Spring 2011