

DOCUMENT FOR DISCUSSION

Formal Oversight for UC-wide Library Service Programs

Prepared for discussion by the Systemwide Library and Scholarly Information Advisory Committee for their April 23, 2008 Meeting

Gary S. Lawrence
Director, Systemwide Library Planning

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper describes a proposed initiative to provide formal oversight for library-related services that are provided on a systemwide basis. The model that informs this proposal is based on the recommendations of the report of the Regents' working group on the roles of the office of the president and the subsequent work undertaken within UCOP to implement those recommendations.

2. BACKGROUND

The *Report of the Working Group on the Roles of the Office of the President*¹ identified the primary roles of the president of the University as its executive leader, and set out some organizational design principles for UCOP aimed at providing effective executive and staff support for these roles. In addition, the report treated at a schematic level those activities located at UCOP that do not directly serve the president in his executive role, but nonetheless provide important support for the UC system as a whole:

... Activities generally classifiable as universitywide support services should be reconfigured where feasible into one of two formats—(a) systemwide Service Centers, i.e., dedicated business units under accountable managers, whose mission is to provide high-quality services in the most cost-effective manner possible; or (b) Coordinated Local Functions, where substantial benefit accrues from alignment or coordination of consultative bodies across campuses, with integrated central support from UCOP where needed.

For both Service Centers and Coordinated Local Functions, incentives and accountability mechanisms must be redesigned to meet cost-benefit tests, designate knowledgeable administrators or bodies to be responsible, and ensure that the interests of the system as a whole are properly represented (p. 3).

The variety of services provided to and on behalf of campus libraries on a systemwide basis (including such services located elsewhere than UCOP) are viewed as fitting this description – systemwide centers that provide high-quality cost-effective services that should be continued and perhaps strengthened, but are understood to operate in support of the University as a whole rather than in support of the specific executive responsibilities of the president.

3. FORMAL OVERSIGHT OF SYSTEMWIDE SERVICE CENTERS

Current thinking about oversight for Systemwide Service Centers envisions development and incremental implementation of a consistent oversight model with the following characteristics:

¹ *Report of the Working Group on the Roles of the Office of the President*, Governance Committee of the Board of Regents, January 8, 2008, available at <<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/future/roleofOPrpt.pdf>>.

- Responsiveness to stakeholders (including but not limited to the users/customers/direct beneficiaries of each service)
- Independent review of the leadership and management of each service
- Independent review of the budgets and financial operations of each service
- Ensuring effective strategic and operational planning, including coordination with related services and Universitywide and campus operations and alignment with Universitywide strategies and priorities
- Clear delineation of responsibilities, decision rights, reporting responsibilities and communication channels as between Universitywide and campus executive leadership, the governing body, the directors of the services, and the host organizations' administration²

In most cases, application of these criteria leads toward creation of oversight boards (with responsibility for one or a related group of service centers) with membership drawn from key stakeholder groups, individuals with appropriate knowledge to provide necessary financial and managerial assessment, and campus and UCOP executive leadership with functional responsibilities for the University programs and operations served or supported by the services. In many cases, systemwide services already have formally established boards that are charged to serve all or some of the functions set out above (e.g., UC Press, some Student Academic Preparation and Educational Partnership [SAPEP] programs, many systemwide research programs); the intent is not necessarily to replace these existing boards, but where possible to transition them incrementally toward the general oversight model, while retaining the flexibility (for both existing and newly-established boards) to adapt roles, charges and memberships to accommodate the needs and requirements of each systemwide service.

4. SYSTEMWIDE LIBRARY-RELATED SERVICES

Within the broad definition of Systemwide Service Centers provided by the Report (and setting aside the fact that Service Centers often also provide the services associated with the Report's "Coordinated Local Functions" – a taxonomic quibble that need not concern us here), it would appear that the following are library-related services that might be considered for inclusion under the rubric of Library-Related Systemwide Service Centers:

1. The California Digital Library; CDL's services could be treated as a group, or some or all of its component services broken out for separate treatment. Two CDL services that have significant potential relationships with the campuses that lie partially outside the Libraries are:
 - a. CDL Digital Preservation Services
 - b. CDL Scholarly Publishing Services
2. Programs supported by the systemwide Resource Sharing and Shared Collections and Access Program funds, to the extent that it is necessary and desirable to treat these as separate from (but administered by) the CDL, including but not limited to:
 - a. Intercampus lending and borrowing and document delivery
 - b. Core-funded (Shared Collections and Access Program) databases
 - c. Shared Print programs and operations

² The Report of the working group envisions that "Service Centers and Coordinated Local Functions could well be managed at a campus or by a third-party vendor, rather than at UCOP—again, the preference is to locate such entities pragmatically as close to the source of activity or relevant, cost effective expertise as is practical and responsible" (p.3.)

- d. Shared Cataloging
3. Shared Library Facilities, including the Northern and Southern Regional Library Facilities³
4. The University of California Bindery⁴

It is important to understand that, while the systemwide library services enumerated above actively seek out and successfully benefit from advice and engagement with key stakeholder groups, there is no body that is *formally* charged with and accountable for the oversight functions set out in Section 3 above. Those specific functions are clearly related to general strategic planning for the UC Libraries under the leadership of the University Librarians and their Systemwide Operations and Planning Advisory Group (SOPAG) (which also represent one of the primary stakeholder groups for these services), with support from the systemwide library planning function of the CDL, and to the advisory functions of SLASIAC across the broad range of UC scholarly information activities of which the Libraries and the systemwide services are a foundational component. However, no group has been formally charged to provide the specific functions envisioned in the oversight model for systemwide service centers.

5. ALTERNATIVES FOR OVERSIGHT OF UC-WIDE LIBRARY SERVICE CENTERS

5.1. General principles

In addition to the points set out in Section 3 above, the following are assumed to be generally applicable principles for library service center oversight:

- The oversight body does not replace or substitute for the existing functions of either the University Librarians' Group or its advisory structure or of SLASIAC
- The composition of the oversight body may be different from that of any existing group, to ensure balanced representation of the constituencies and types of expertise set out in Section 3 above.
- The oversight body may (but need not necessarily) subsume the responsibilities of the existing Shared Library Facilities Board
- The oversight body would be charged and appointed by and report to the Chief Academic Officer of the University (currently, the Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic and Health Affairs)

5.2. Option 1: an expanded charge for SLASIAC

5.2.1. Advantages

- SLASIAC membership is already fairly closely aligned with the requirements of a model oversight body; most stakeholder groups are represented, and the group is charged by and reports to the Provost.
- SLASIAC understands the environment in which systemwide library services operate, and has been rationally supportive of the continued development of those services.

³ The regional library facilities are currently overseen by a Shared Library Facilities Board, appointed by the Provost with a specific charge and consisting of the eleven University Librarians, a faculty representative nominated by the Academic Council, and a representative of the Librarians' Association (LAUC); see <http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/about/slfb/index.html> for more information. The two RLFs are administered by the Berkeley and Los Angeles campuses on behalf of the system.

⁴ The Bindery, which provides binding services for all UC campus libraries, is located in Berkeley and administered by the Berkeley campus on behalf of the system.

- At least some of the expertise required of the oversight model is already represented on SLASIAC (e.g., some financial oversight expertise through representation by a campus budget and planning official; executive representation from executive/provostial, research, and IT areas).
- SLASIAC has a track record of effectiveness and credibility with UC senior management and the key stakeholder groups.
- Assignment of this responsibility to SLASIAC avoids the creation of yet another systemwide board and is likely to reduce (but not eliminate) the additional staff support responsibilities associated with the new oversight functions.
- Integration of the oversight-model responsibilities with the broad scholarly information oversight functions of SLASIAC helps ensure that service oversight is informed by UC-wide strategic vision.

5.2.2. Disadvantages

- SLASIAC membership may not now have the right balance of constituencies and expertise; successful exercise of oversight-model responsibilities may, for example, require additional financial expertise or expanded representation from the Libraries and/or other customer/stakeholder groups.
- SLASIAC's current practices and meeting frequencies may not be conducive to effective execution of oversight-model responsibilities.
- It is unclear how the broad advisory responsibilities of SLASIAC and the more operationally-oriented oversight responsibilities of an oversight-model board could most effectively be merged and balanced.

5.2.3. Possible solutions

- Rebalance SLASIAC membership to ensure appropriate representation for oversight-model purposes.
- Plan for more frequent meetings and an appropriately expanded agenda.
- Create a standing SLASIAC subcommittee to execute some or all of the oversight-model functions (e.g., review of budgets and financial statements; strategic service planning), reporting to the full committee as required. The subcommittee could be composed of a subset of SLASIAC members, supplemented by other constituency representatives as required (the SLASIAC Standing Subcommittee on Copyright Policy is a relevant model).

To illustrate how the oversight-model functions might be incorporated into SLASIAC's charge and operations, a draft revised charge is attached. This draft charge also attempts to clarify the relationship between SLASIAC's broad advisory role, its specific responsibilities in copyright and (prospectively) systemwide library service centers, and the relationship of its broad charge to the specific systemwide service centers that have been identified in the areas of scholarly publishing, broadcasting, and instructional support, as well as to suggest some additions to the membership that might follow from these more fully specified SLASIAC roles and relationships.

5.3. *Option 2: a new separate governing board*

5.3.1. Advantages

- Membership, leadership and staff support tailored to the requirements of the oversight model

- Issues of oversight of specific library-related services is clearly separated from and not confounded with SLASIAC consideration of broader scholarly information policy and planning issues; oversight functions might be executed more efficiently
- Cross-representation with SLASIAC and other advisory bodies (e.g., the Information Technology Leadership Council) could ensure appropriate linkage with stakeholder and leadership groups
- Provides a locus and channel to senior management focused more centrally on library issues, strategies and opportunities (to the extent that these can be manifested through oversight and strategic planning for the specified systemwide services).

5.3.2. Disadvantages

- Possible additional requirements for staff support, beyond the minimum required for successful execution of the oversight-model functions (e.g., additional meeting scheduling, support, and logistics), as well as additional administrative expense
- Yet another systemwide group, requiring time, attention and expenditure from its constituents' representatives.
- Limited scope of attention to existing systemwide services may limit ability to consider and engage with broader issues and opportunities.

DRAFT

Appendix A

Draft Revised Charge Systemwide Library and Scholarly Information Advisory Committee

Charge: The Systemwide Library and Scholarly Information Advisory Committee advises the University on systemwide policies, plans, programs and strategic priorities related to the acquisition, dissemination, and long-term management of the scholarly information, in all formats, created by or needed to support UC's world-class teaching and research programs. Within this broad domain, the Committee will seek to identify and recommend to the Provost opportunities to align relevant University programs and activities with each other and with systemwide plans, policies, and strategic objectives, and to identify opportunities for collaboration and consolidation that can strengthen programmatic efficiency and effectiveness. The Committee has special responsibility to monitor developments and advise the University in three areas, discussed further below: library-related services offered on a systemwide basis; matters related to copyright; and the creation and dissemination of academic information resources created by the UC community for the benefit of students, researchers, and the broader community.

- **Systemwide library programs and services.** Programs and services subject to the Committee's oversight under this charge at the present time include: the California Digital Library; CDL Digital Preservation Services; CDL Scholarly Publishing Services; Shared Library Facilities, including the Northern and Southern Regional Library Facilities; the University of California Binderies; and programs supported by the systemwide Resource Sharing and Shared Collections and Access Program funds (including but not limited to intercampus lending and borrowing and document delivery; core-funded (SCAP) databases; Shared Print programs and operations; and Shared Cataloging).

With respect to the specified programs and services, the Committee shall: review the annual budget and operating plan and other financial reports of the program, and advise the Provost on resource needs; annually review and advise the Provost regarding the director's performance and the effectiveness of the program's management; sponsor, oversee, review and advise on planning processes and outcomes and recurring service assessment programs; and report annually to the Provost on the financial and service performance of the program and its management and on strategic plans and priorities and progress in achieving them.

- **Copyright-related matters.** The Committee shall:
 - Monitor internal and external developments related to copyright law, policy and practice, and advise the University on copyright-related matters, particularly (but not exclusively) from the perspective of the effect of copyright on the University's academic program,
 - Monitor and advise on the development and maintenance of Universitywide copyright policies and practices.
- **Creation and dissemination of the University's academic information resources.** The Committee will monitor and advise on the development of policies, strategies, programs and services that support the University community in the effective creation, management and distribution of the products of their scholarship and research, with particular attention to

traditional and innovative publishing activities, broadcasting services, and digital instructional materials and services. The Committee's role includes close and ongoing liaison with organized systemwide service centers operating in this domain, such as the UC Press, UCTV, and UC College Prep, but does not supersede or overlap with the responsibilities of bodies established to provide independent governance and oversight for such services.

Membership and Appointments: The Committee is appointed by and reports to the Provost and Senior Vice President, Academic Affairs and works closely with the University Librarian for Systemwide Library Planning. All appointed members will serve a three-year term.

Although the primary criteria for appointment are functional, to insure the necessary breadth of input, the Advisory Committee includes individuals from all campuses of the UC System, and shall include:

- An Executive/Academic Vice Chancellor, who serves as Chair;
- A Research Vice Chancellor
- A Vice Chancellor/Dean of Undergraduate Education
- A Vice Chancellor for University Relations (University Affairs/University Advancement/External Relations/External Affairs)
- The Vice Chair of Academic Council, ex officio, and three additional Academic Senate representatives approved by the Council chair (normally representing the University Committees on Library and Scholarly Communication; Planning and Budget; and Computing and Communications);
- Additional faculty as needed to provide appropriate disciplinary perspectives;
- Additional campus administrators including one Information Technologist, one Dean, and one budget officer;
- 2 University Librarians;
- A LAUC representative; and
- Liaisons from other appropriate committees.

In addition, the following serve as ex-officio Advisory Committee members:

- Vice Provost for Academic Information and Strategic Services
- University Librarian for Systemwide Library Planning and Executive Director, California Digital Library
- Associate Vice President, Information Resources and Communications
- UC Budget Office Representative.
- Director, University of California Press, or his/her designee
- Executive Director, Strategic Publishing and Broadcast Initiatives, UCOP.

SLASIAC may, at the discretion of the Chair, appoint standing or ad hoc subcommittees or task forces with specific charges, which may be composed of SLASIAC members and additional faculty and campus administrators as needed to provide appropriate perspectives, either on an ongoing basis or to address specific policy issues before the subcommittee or task force.

Normally, standing subcommittees will be established to exercise, under the general direction of the Chair and the full committee, the specific responsibilities for oversight of copyright matters and systemwide library programs and services set forth in the committee's charge

Meetings: The Committee meets as required, but normally at least twice each year, at locations selected for the convenience of the Committee.

DRAFT

Appendix B

Current (2006) Charge Systemwide Library and Scholarly Information Advisory Committee

Charge: The Systemwide Library and Scholarly Information Advisory Committee advises the University on systemwide policies, plans, programs and strategic priorities related to the acquisition, dissemination, and long-term management of the scholarly information, in all formats, created by or needed to support UC's world-class teaching and research programs. This charge includes, but is not limited to, advising on systemwide long term planning for the UC libraries including the 10 campus libraries and the California Digital Library (CDL), strategies that will enhance and facilitate the transmission of scholarly and scientific communication in a digital environment, and legal, legislative, regulatory and policy issues that influence the effective provision of scholarly information services. As part its charge, the Committee will assume the responsibilities previously assigned to the Standing Committee on Copyright to advise the University on copyright-related matters.

Membership and Appointments: The Committee is appointed by and reports to the Provost and Senior Vice President, Academic Affairs and works closely with the Associate Vice Provost for Scholarly Information. All appointed members will serve a three-year term.

Although the primary criteria for appointment are functional, to insure the necessary breadth of input, the Advisory Committee includes individuals from all campuses of the UC System, and shall include:

- An Executive/Academic Vice Chancellor, who serves as Chair;
- A Research Vice Chancellor
- The Vice Chair of Academic Council, ex officio, and two additional Academic Senate representatives approved by the Council chair;
- Additional faculty as needed to provide appropriate disciplinary perspectives;
- Additional campus administrators including one Information Technologist, one Dean, and one budget officer;
- 2 University Librarians;
- A LAUC representative;
- A representative from the UC-managed Department of Energy Laboratories; and
- Liaisons from other appropriate committees.

In addition, the following serve as ex-officio Advisory Committee members:

- Associate Vice Provost for Scholarly Information
- Associate Vice President, Information Resources and Communications
- UC Budget Office Representative.
- A representative of the University of California Press

The Committee will effect its copyright policy responsibilities through a Standing Subcommittee on Copyright Policies. The Subcommittee is specifically charged with the development and maintenance of copyright-related UC policies. It will be chaired by the Committee Chair, and will meet at the Chair's direction to address issues related to its specific charge. The Subcommittee will be composed of:

- SLASIAC members:
 - One Academic Council representative (normally, the Vice Chair of Academic Council)
 - Three faculty
 - A Research Vice Chancellor
- A representative of the Office of General Counsel
- Additional faculty and campus administrators as needed to provide appropriate perspectives, either on an ongoing basis or to address specific policy issues before the Subcommittee

Meetings: The Committee meets as required, but normally at least twice each year. Meeting locations rotate between northern and southern locations, selected for the convenience of the Committee.