

Appendix G: Systemwide Library Budget Increase Scenarios

Draft 12/18/11; rev 1/3/12

Proposals for 25% increase (target \$3.89M); in priority order

Favor ideas that:

- Increase efficiencies
- Reduce costs
- Enhance services
- Answer the question: Why CDL and not a campus?
- Build on existing expertise, not something entirely new
- Support Council of University Librarians priorities (especially Next Generation Technical Services); other campus priorities

1. 21st Century Content and Collection Services Initiative

a) Description: To reverse the steep decline in systemwide content acquisition and propel UC Library collections into the digital future, systemwide collection funds should be replenished and deployed to launch a portfolio of collection development activities and services needed to support the UC Libraries 21st Century Collection. Funds would be managed holistically across content types, with supporting services needed for long-term stewardship of the collections.

b) Rationale:

- *Restore UC's competitive edge:* The dramatic decline in the CDL's content budget over the past 5 years due to budget cuts (an 85% reduction in funds available for new acquisitions) has diminished our ability to satisfy the demand for new systemwide content and is causing UC to lose its competitive edge relative to our peer institutions.
 - For example, UC library bibliographer groups requested more than 65 new resources for systemwide acquisition in 2011; only 6 of these requests could be accommodated.
 - As a consequence, acquisition of new content has largely reverted to the individual campus level, *widening the gap between the have and have-not campuses and undermining UC's historical success in leveraging collection expenditures* for the benefit of all campuses. Even the larger campuses are increasingly challenged relative to their peers in collection depth and breadth.
- *Directly benefit students and faculty:* Re-invigorating the CDL collection budget will provide a fresh boost to campus co-investment, stretching UC dollars and broadening collections in ways that *directly benefit students and faculty at all ten campuses, including recruitment and retention of faculty.*
- *Enable faster transition to digital monographs:* A re-invigorated collection budget will enable a faster transition to digital monographs, alleviating space pressures while

- simultaneously addressing the decline in monographic acquisitions, two key objectives identified in the SLASIAC Library Planning Task Force report.
- *Convert legacy collections to digital form:* Google’s retrenchment from the library digitization scene has created a gap in our ability to convert legacy collections to digital form, hampering retrospective collection management strategies; meanwhile, CoUL has prioritized additional public domain collections and orphan works for digital conversion. Centralized resources can be used to leverage and facilitate coordination of these activities across the campuses; e.g. to support the campuses in formulating and executing more targeted digitization strategies, possibly with grant funding.
 - *Support all digital formats:* The 21st Century Content Initiative should not be conceived as supporting traditional book and journal content only, but will also be deployed strategically to support emerging aspects of the UC Library 21st Century Collection that have become key priorities for the libraries. Important areas include digital newspapers, retrospective conversion of government documents, prospective born-digital government documents, and multimedia formats. Much of this activity would be conducted via collaboration and partnerships (e.g. HathiTrust, the California Newspaper Project), and potentially, grant support; but in order to facilitate such collaborations, UC must be in a position to contribute resources.
 - *Support open access publishing:* Funds would also be deployed to assist UC faculty seeking a transition to open access publishing, by reserving a portion of funding to support publication fees through a pooled systemwide fund (a strategy recommended by UC Scholarly Communication Officers). Open access support would be carefully measured against licensed journal expenditures to better understand the cost/benefit ratio of this shift, with a goal of reducing the burden of runaway journal licensing costs on the libraries over time.
 - *Reduce costs of collection management:* Coupling content acquisition and development with enhanced collection management services (e.g. digital asset management) will allow the libraries to deepen their investment in shared services to support collections, reducing the costs of collection management infrastructure across the system in alignment with Working Smarter goals.
 - *Support stewardship of at-risk digital content:* Some of these investments would be used to support long-term stewardship of at-risk digital content, potentially through one-time up-front payments. Up-front investment would yield dividends for the campuses, most of whom cannot afford to preserve digital content locally. For example, campuses are seeking economical and scalable solutions for long-term stewardship of digitally-reformatted video materials whose original analog versions are deteriorating. Models for this are under consideration.
- c) Content areas / strategic initiatives that would be served: (investments would be undertaken in concert with the UC Libraries through collaborative investment and decision-making)
- SLASIAC Library Planning Task Force / Scholarly monographs
 - Next Generation Technical Services (NGTS) (especially POT1: Digital Library Services) – digital conversion of key campus collections, supported via shared services
 - Digital conversion of legacy Government documents (in collaboration with HathiTrust)

- At-risk California newspapers (in collaboration with the California Newspaper Project)
- New forms of publication (born digital or reformatted) – video, GIS
- UCOLASC open access policies and request for support (if Rights Management Service not funded or as supplement with different emphasis)
- Online Instruction Pilot Project/UC Online Education (potentially) - content needs (including digital textbooks) and repository services, as identified

d) Functions:

- Content acquisition
- Digital conversion and reformatting
- Digital asset management / content repository
- Funding to support long-term stewardship of at-risk collections
- Shared cataloging (restoration of 1 position)
- Analysis of collection characteristics and reporting of impact

e) Resources needed:

- Budget for content acquisition and development: \$2 million
 - Funds would be used to seed campus co-investment in three categories of content development, managed holistically across content types and for acquisition as well as ongoing management:
 - Licensed collections (including prospective ebook acquisition)
 - May include instructional content needed for systemwide programs (online textbooks or other content needed to support UCOE)
 - Digitization / born-digital content
 - Open access matching fund (program to be developed in partnership with campus libraries using the Berkeley Research Impact Initiative model)
- Digital Asset Management System ???
- Staffing: (rough estimates, with benefits)

▪ Collection manager (MSP 1)	\$125,000
▪ Collection analyst (PSS 5)	\$110,000
▪ OA coordinator (.5 FTE) (MSP 1?)	\$ 60,000
▪ Digital content coordinator (PSS 5)	\$110,000
▪ Shared Cataloging support (LA IV at UCSD)	\$ 60,000
▪ [?Staffing needed to support DAMS?]	???
▪ Total:	\$465,000
- **Grand Total:** **\$2,465,000 +**

2. Rights Management Service

- a) Description: As the current scholarly publishing environment grows increasingly diverse, distributed and unsustainable, it is incumbent upon the University to protect and make widely visible the fruits of its academic labor or risk being divested of any control over this immensely valuable scholarly capital. Commercial publishers continue to maintain a great deal of control over both the intellectual property of our faculty and the license fees paid by our libraries. At

the same time, UC faculty members are increasingly determined to manage their copyright in ways that allow for maximum exposure and minimum gating of their research and teaching materials. Given the complexity and diversity of this intellectual property environment, we think it is crucial for UC to establish a system-wide ***Scholarly Communications & Copyright Resources (SCCR)*** office to provide faculty and students with expert consultation and contract negotiation services in the areas of copyright and intellectual property management. Furthermore, we see significant opportunity to extend the reach of this office to help manage IP/rights issues around the UC digital collection within the libraries and curricula developed for the UC Online Education initiative. Rights issues arise with every digital initiative from HathiTrust, licensed ebooks, textbooks, research data, digital assets from UC library collections and requests from rights holders for varying levels of openness or protection of their works and donations, making this service of strategic importance.

b) Rationale:

- Need for shared rights management capability specifically called out in UC Libraries NGTS and digital library services planning initiatives – would support more rapid deployment of shared digital library infrastructure currently hampered by an inability to manage rights effectively
- Need was articulated in earlier rights management report
 - Concern at that time was that need would overwhelm capacity due to limited resources
 - The current proposal would support a more robust, scalable service
- *Complements and leverages campus-based expertise*
- Provides a true service, not just a web page with overwhelming information
- Supports activities across many areas of strategic importance to the libraries, including emerging models of information management and dissemination
- *Helps UC remain competitive:* Better support for managing rights in data would improve grant success; similar services are increasingly being provided by peer institutions (e.g., Michigan)
- Could also support information management and policy needs of Online Instruction Pilot Project (OIPP) and other UC Online Education initiatives
- Would play a crucial role in the success of any faculty-led Open Access mandate initiatives at UC
- Provides better risk management and responsiveness as well as coordinated advocacy for reasonable rights policies and implementation mechanisms such as recent NIH, NSF mandates and Office of Science and Technology Policy requests for information on open data and publishing policies for publicly funded research

c) Content areas / strategic initiatives that would be served

- Faculty IP management (e.g. faculty-led open access initiatives, support for new publishing modalities)
- NGTS (POT1: shared Digital Library Services) : rights management for digital / digitized collections

- Online education: rights management for faculty created course content as well as content from other sources
 - Data management planning / data ownership, sharing and reuse
 - Existing services with significant rights issues: Web Archiving Service, OAC/Calisphere, UC Image Service
 - Electronic Theses/Dissertations (ETDs), media and other formats with particularly complex rights issues
- d) Functions:
- Policy development and implementation: policies, guidelines and best practices
 - Rights determination framework
 - Education and outreach
 - faculty requests for advice
 - library policy implementation
 - Issue tracking (“rights-watch”)
 - Advocacy / public policy – e.g. engagement with national discussions around access to publicly funded research
 - Tools and technologies
 - declaration languages
 - access management to support different rights statuses
 - model licenses and agreements
 - support for data management planning tool
 - tiered helpdesk function, from triage of basic questions to connection with appropriate legal expertise
- e) Resources needed:
- | | |
|--|--------------------|
| ○ Copyright lawyer | \$200,000 |
| ○ PSS5 staff (1 for outreach to faculty/students) (2) | \$200,000 |
| ○ Web developer – PA3 | \$125,000 |
| ○ Scholarly Communication Officer – MSP1 as liaison to the campus libraries/rights management groups | \$125,000 |
| ○ Technology infrastructure / overhead | ??? |
| ○ Total: | \$650,000 + |

3. Sustainability Planning Service – for CDL services and also at the campuses

- a) Description
- Provide a shareable general-purpose capacity for business analysis that can frame, inform, strategically plan, and operationally implement revenue generation methods to sustain information services and content.
 - Clearinghouse of knowledge and methods for fund-raising strategies, tactics, and leads dedicated to shared digital information services and content.
- b) Rationale

- Strengthen, and ultimately share, our ability to embed sustainability into all of our activities.
 - Attempts to develop this capability with existing resources have been inadequate, even with supplementary consultants; *making it a core part of operations would be more effective/efficient* and produce a more coordinated approach.
- c) Content areas / strategic initiatives that would be served
- UCOLASC scholarly publishing experimental initiatives
 - Curation / preservation of shared or campus-owned content
 - UC Digital Collection assets (e.g., UC Reprints Service)
 - Other emerging systemwide initiatives
- d) Functions:
- Value assessment
 - Business modeling and pricing (by audience; service) for cost-recovery and/or revenue generation
 - Marketing
 - Long-range business planning
 - Grant development / extramural support
- e) Resources:
- | | |
|--|------------------|
| ○ Business consultant | \$125,000 |
| ○ Development officer – carefully framed to bring in funds that would protect campus investments | \$100,000 |
| ○ Expanded marketing /communications staff | \$ 80,000 |
| ○ Marketing / communications collateral | \$100,000 |
| ○ Total: | \$405,000 |

4. Shared Library IT Infrastructure / Unified Webscale Management System

- a) Description: The establishment of a unified back end system to replace the myriad integrated library systems, digital content management systems, and electronic resource management systems run by the campuses and by CDL on behalf of the campuses. The effort could be devoted to acquiring a vendor system, building a system or a combination of buy/build. Given the different situations on each campus, migration to this service would need to allow for campus options on timing and use of functions. A first phase might be to consolidate/share some infrastructure components for library IT operations to provide a more consistent technical environment in which libraries could work collaboratively, including the purchase or rental of compute cycles, network, and storage for the UC libraries (“DuraSpace” for the UC libraries).
- b) Rationale:
- Goal of NGTS / CoUL long-range planning
 - *Eliminates investments in redundant campus infrastructure - supports goals of Working Smarter initiative*

- Complements other university initiatives in shared technology infrastructure: first phase could be a preliminary step
 - As identified by the Library Technology Advisory Group, there are several common IT needs that are redundantly procured by most – and in some cases all - of the UC libraries. This includes servers and storage that with contemporary technology and management methods could be made available as a shared “cloud” resource.
 - Creating a shared foundational infrastructure positions the library better to fill other shared/common technology gaps.
 - Speeds introduction of shared services and introduction of new services (patron driven acquisition, for example).
 - *Has potential to significantly reduce individual campus costs (licensing and staffing); is very scalable.*
 - *Has potential to reduce costs associated with trying to integrate various systems*
- b) Content areas / strategic initiatives that would be served
 - Next Generation Melvyl back-end functionality
 - Shared Electronic Resources Management System
 - Digital asset management system
 - Resource sharing
- c) Functions:
 - Phase 1: shared infrastructure
 - Virtual machines (a la Amazon)
 - Virtual storage (raw, rather than “curated”)
 - Application hosting
 - Phase 2: shared management system
 - Collection analysis and development
 - Management of electronic resources
 - Integration of content acquisition, content description, and content circulation in one system
 - Increased ease of exporting data to meet new and emerging discovery and delivery systems
- d) Resources:
 - Phase 1: Shared infrastructure (could be subsumed by phase 2):
 - VM cluster \$100,000
 - Shared Infrastructure manager \$150,000
 - Shared infrastructure system architect OR \$150,000
 - Amazon/DuraSpace acct & shared infrastructure mgr \$200,000
 - **Total: \$400,000 - \$450,000**
 - Phase 2: Shared management system. Projected resources needed for initial development/transition (2 years), then could reduce
 - Product manager \$ 90,000
 - Metadata analysts (3) \$270,000

▪ Programmers (2)	\$200,000
▪ Technical lead	\$125,000
▪ Licensing fees	???
▪ Total:	\$685,000+