

## Summary Chart of LPTF Comments Received from Academic Senate and Campus Review

(LAUC comments are separate.)

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

Policy	Comment
Overall	<p><i>UCFW:</i> The committee chooses not to endorse the report due to significant reservations about the assumed strategic vision underlying its recommendations.</p> <p><i>UCORP:</i> We cannot endorse the report at this time as the committee has several concerns regarding the report’s analysis and recommendations. 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.</p> <p><i>UCOLASC:</i> 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</p>

	<p>libraries will be. [More from UCOLASC in sections below.]</p> <p><i>UCI Council on Research, Computing and Libraries:</i> Report does not provide a realistic or sufficient detailed plan to mitigate the impact of budgetary reductions.</p> <p>[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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p><i>UCLA COLASC:</i> 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 budget crisis of the last two years.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p><i>UCSB CRIR:</i> Timetable for implementation of some of the Report's recommendations seems overly ambitious.</p> <p><i>UCSC:</i> Report does not address the importance of study space available to students in the library. Students rely on the libraries' safe, quiet study areas that are available all week and many hours of the day. This space will be needed even if collections are reduced.</p>
<p>On faculty involvement (in general)</p>	<p><i>UCOLASC:</i> 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...</p> <p>Faculty should be consulted and:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• provide input on the issues surrounding de-duplication of materials</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• be involved in decisions regarding acquisition of multiple copies of books across the system</li> <li>• help in the analysis of the various “costs” of having multiple copies of a book ... versus paying for interlibrary loan multiple times</li> <li>• help determine the value of different journals and provide feedback on discussions about objective measures used to make licensing decisions</li> <li>• 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</li> <li>• help assess the benefits and disadvantages of digital collections and prioritize the directions of expenditures based on programmatic needs.</li> </ul> <p><i>UCLA COLASC:</i> 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.</p> <p><i>UCSB:</i> 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.</p> <p><i>UCSB CRIR:</i> 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.</p> <p><i>UCSC:</i> The ambitious timeline (of phase I)... does not allow sufficient time to get input from faculty and other constituencies.</p>
5.1 Strategies for the Expansion and Management of Shared Services	<p><i>UCD L&amp;S Faculty Executive Committee:</i> 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.</p> <p><i>UCD Graduate Council:</i> Impressed with the actions that have already been implemented, such as an increase in shared library services, a transfer to digital format, and a reduction in duplication... However, according to the timeline suggested in the report, proposed projects would have to be implemented before the Report is properly vetted.</p> <p><i>UCLA COLASC:</i></p>

	<p>Report does not articulate principles that should determine the balance between centralized and local control of collections or services.</p> <p><i>UCR COLASC:</i> Suggests: Less duplication between campuses wrt specialties and materials. Storage at only 1 UC, or at a few University sites nationally. More electronic, more scanning, delays for print materials to be expected.</p> <p><i>UCSC:</i> 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.</p> <p>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.</p>
<p>5.2 Strategies that Address the Pricing of Academic Publications</p>	<p><i>UCD L&amp;S FEC, CPB:</i> 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 upon the intellectual freedom of the faculty.</p> <p><i>UCD GC:</i> 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.</p> <p><i>UCI CEP:</i> UC system has not adequately utilized its clout as an organization or as faculty to help control publishing costs for journals. CEP suggests that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UC improves the leveraging of its bargaining power through forming a consortium that includes other high-caliber universities.</li> <li>• 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..</li> </ul> <p><i>USCF EVC:</i> 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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shared support for cost of publications</li> <li>• New business models for scholarly societies</li> <li>• Innovative, rapid ways to communicate science outside traditional journals.</li> </ul>

<p>5.2.1 The Faculty Role</p>	<p><i>UCOLASC:</i>  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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p><i>UCSB CRIR:</i>  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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p><i>UCSD Academic Senate:</i>  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.</p> <p>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.</p>
-------------------------------	--

	<p><i>UCR COLASC:</i>  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) should be left behind.</p>
<p>5.3 Strategies to Recover Costs and Enhance and Diversify Revenue</p>	<p>Minimal response to these strategies. Some agree with charging for library services in some instances where appropriate. Some don't think it's a good idea to add additional fees for students, who have seen significant tuition increases in the past few years.</p>
<p>5.4 Strategies to Improve the Framework for Planning, Consultation and Decision-Making</p>	<p><i>UCOLASC:</i>  To not include UCOLASC in the list of Systemwide bodies involved in planning, consultation, and decision-making is a significant oversight. UCOLASC respectfully asks to be added to this list and to be engaged in ongoing discussions in a meaningful way.</p> <p><i>UCD CORCL:</i>  Opening a new systemwide office in OP would add unnecessary cost and duplicate work already being done by CoUL. It should also be noted that a centralized office for the UC Libraries closed only 5 years ago.</p> <p><i>UCD GC:</i>  Proposal to reconstitute a systemwide library office is incongruous with recent efforts to downsize the administrative structure and advises against its implementation.</p> <p><i>UCLA COLASC:</i>  Neither the campus committees or UCOLASC are part of the consultative process proposed... at the very least, UCOLASC should be – but so should the local committees – part of any action that affects the campus libraries.</p> <p><i>UCSB Academic Senate:</i>  Recommends that faculty be deeply involved in the implementation of the recommendations and the ongoing analysis of how best to use available resources.</p>