

Summary Chart of LPTF Comments Received from the Librarians Association of UC (LAUC)

Comments received from the following LAUC divisions:

- UCLA
- Irvine
- Davis (Comments are those of individual librarians and do not necessarily reflect consensus among LAUC-D members)
- Riverside

Policy	Comment
Overall	<p><i>Davis:</i> Implicit assumption seems to be that tech services (via NGTS) will be where many cost savings are realized</p> <p><i>Irvine:</i> Sounds like what we have been hearing in discussions about NGM, NGTS, etc. Not clear on SLASIAC role Is there an advocacy component?</p> <p><i>UCLA:</i> Recommend that LAUC's advisory role be observed throughout all phases of planning and implementation of Next Generation and System-wide shared library services.</p>
On faculty involvement (in general)	
5.1 Strategies for the Expansion and Management of Shared Services	<p><i>Davis:</i> Report refers to "electronic formats are readily sharable" -- not actually true, license agreements and digital rights management protection hinder ebook ILL sharing.</p> <p>Research assistance/instruction and collection development are interrelated -- but neither is developed in this document... leads to an abstract notion of collections, wherein efficiency becomes synonymous with cost cutting, and value becomes equivalent with increased numbers of units (books, journals, articles). Let's spend our resources more wisely.</p> <p>Shared service for special collections -- there's a need for a centralized conversion facility for old electronic formats (tapes etc) to standardize preservation.</p> <p>Shared mono acquisition has a huge amount of overhead associated with it that will be very costly.</p> <p><i>Irvine:</i> No mention of the infrastructure changes that will be needed to make further</p>

	<p>resource and service sharing possible. Collaboration takes a lot of energy and staff time too. It is hard to cut back and do more collaboration.</p> <p><i>UCLA:</i> We support the continued expansion and development of policies and practices that seek to avoid unnecessary duplication, provided campuses retain authority to decide when duplication is necessary to support individual campus needs.</p> <p>There is concern over the one-size-fits-all approach. A necessary degree of autonomy is needed to fulfill the individual needs of campus stakeholders.</p> <p><i>Riverside:</i> We support a System-wide collaboration and shared services. We recommend that before budgets are cut or reallocated consideration be given to the needs, resources, assets, and finances of the individual campus libraries.</p> <p>We agree with the report’s emphasis on preservation and access. We support the evolution of Technical Services as an integral part of Collections. This is the direction at UCR.</p>
<p>5.2 Strategies that Address the Pricing of Academic Publications</p>	<p><i>Irvine:</i> Have to continue to work with the faculty. Scholarly communication is their process. The costs are shifting, but some is shifting to the authors who are the faculty.</p> <p>Need to talk to our faculty and encourage them to publish in open access journals. They are very concerned about high citation counts, etc. We need to help them see the importance of moving to open access. Should be more direct and tell them which journals are unacceptable.</p>
<p>5.3 Strategies to Recover Costs and Enhance and Diversify Revenue</p>	<p><i>Davis:</i> A fee-based system for services for non-UC patrons is needed and would be used by outside researchers, agencies, etc. -- some campuses already have such systems but not all. Could be centralized with a central office to do fee recovery. (Again, licenses make it challenging).</p> <p><i>Irvine:</i> Guidelines on what levels of service we will provide for non-UC clientele. Ideas, including: partner more strongly with the Alumni Association. Tell them “Here is your chance to put your stamp on the collection, etc.”</p> <p><i>UCLA:</i> Some of the cost-recovery strategies outlined in the Interim Report have been successfully implemented at various campuses. However, concern remains over mandated system-wide implementation. Concern also remains over proposed assessment of student fees specifically designated to support the libraries when students are already facing steep increases.</p>

<p>5.4 Strategies to Improve the Framework for Planning, Consultation and Decision-Making</p>	<p><i>Davis:</i> Coordinating funding streams suffers from effect of rich campuses going off to get whatever they want anyway.</p> <p>We should look into building outside consortia as well – California, west coast, subject-specialty schools.</p> <p><i>Irvine:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Faculty think about their campus, not systemwide. - We have already been cutting the fat in our collection. There is little duplication on our campus. Not a lot of fat left to cut. - Shared purchasing will require a culture change <p><i>UCLA:</i> We support an increase in communication/ transparency between CoUL and COVC regarding shared services, and we recommend current channels of communication be utilized more effectively to achieve this goal. We do not concur that a central office for system-wide library planning is necessary to achieve this goal.</p> <p>We support governance and oversight of shared library services to remain vested with CoUL.</p> <p>There are concerns that the Interim Report suggests expanded roles for COVC, CoUL, SLASIC, Provost/EVP for Academic Affairs, and UCOLASC, but no greater or influential role for LAUC.</p> <p><i>Riverside:</i> We support CoUL’s continuation of governance and oversight of shared library services.</p> <p>LAUC members are in a strong position to comment on solutions because we work directly with our campus communities. Therefore, we recommend that LAUC’s advisory role be included throughout all phases of planning and implementation of System-wide shared library services.</p>
---	--