



OFFICE OF THE LAUC PRESIDENT

April 6, 2005

TO: Michael Gottfredson, Chair, SLASIAC &
Executive Vice Chancellor, UC Irvine

COPIES: Gary Lawrence, Office of Systemwide Library Planning
The University Librarians

FROM: Terence K. Huwe, LAUC President

RE: LAUC Divisional Responses to the “Strategic Directions for Libraries and Scholarly
Information” Document

I have attached 10 distinct documents that summarize the discussions that have been held by the campus divisions of the Librarians Association of the University of California (LAUC). Please note that in the case of Berkeley, two distinct group discussions were held, and there is a supporting document by The Affiliated Librarians of the Berkeley campus, which is addressed to LAUC-B Chair Chris Tarr and follows LAUC-B's memorandum.

While the remarks and comments speak for themselves, there are some recurring themes in the reactions of LAUC members. First and foremost, many members recognized that this document was “about libraries, not librarians”—suggesting that LAUC would like to see more attention given to the evolving roles of librarians within the planning context. Second, many members had much to say about the relationship of local collection oversight in relation to shared collection initiatives that span the entire UC System. Third, LAUC members generally support the wide attention being given to the “crisis” in scholarly communications, and we are committed to working with University leaders to strengthen the role of libraries in finding solutions to the crisis. I also found it noteworthy that some faculty commentators at the Berkeley discussion made the point that campus-based bibliographers, selectors and reference providers operate within a robust, systemwide culture of communication and coordinated effort, while the faculty pursue curricular planning and dialogue along different lines. This suggests to me that within a culture of continuous strategic planning, librarians may have already learned a great deal about systemwide collaboration, and they might be regarded as an important resource group for the University as it pursues continuous planning for the University Libraries.

LAUC wishes to thank SLASIAC and the University Librarians for welcoming our input into this exciting planning process.

10 attachments



MEMORANDUM

TO: Terry Huwe, President, Librarians Association of the University of California
FR: Monica Singh, Chair, LAUC-B Committee on Professional Development;
Dean C. Rowan, LAUC-B Committee on Professional Development
DT: March 10, 2005
RE: Panel Discussion of *Systemwide Strategic Directions for Libraries and Scholarly Information at the University of California*

Part 1. Introduction

The LAUC-B Committee on Professional Development (PD) convened a panel on Wednesday, February 16, to discuss and respond to the April 2004 *Systemwide Strategic Directions* document. PD enlisted those involved in the creation of the document, Bernie Hurley, Ann Jensen, and Tom Leonard, to present their ideas about strategic directions for UC libraries, and to field questions from the audience. PD also invited Prof. Elaine Tennant to attend and to be prepared to provide a faculty perspective on the document. Approximately 43 librarians attended the discussion.

The remainder of this memorandum is organized into five parts:

Part 2. Summary

Part 3. Questions from the Committee on Professional Development

Part 4. The Political Dimension and Context for the *Strategic Directions* Document

Part 5. Salient Themes Emerging from the Discussion

Part 6. The Faculty Perspective

Part 2. Summary

As will be discussed in greater detail below, several important themes emerged from the PD panel discussion. The panelists clarified the purposes of the *Strategic Directions* document. The LAUC-B librarians in attendance expressed both admiration of the panelists' considerable achievement and criticism of aspects of the recommended actions.

The discussion might best be summed up in the following main points:

- The *Strategic Directions* document is intended to impress the highest levels of the UC administration with the libraries' continued achievements, goals, and objectives in the hope that there will be substantial support for libraries at the UCOP level.
- While libraries are the focus of the document, there ought to be more emphasis on librarians and staff in pursuing recommended actions.
- Berkeley's reputation to scholars and students rests in part on the uniqueness of the Berkeley library collections. This uniqueness must be maintained in the shared collection future.
- Collection sharing policies need refining so that immediate campus library users have optimal access to their libraries' collections.
- Collection development should reflect a balance of current curriculum and teaching, and the need for an enduring research-level collection.
- The level of cooperation and organization among the libraries and librarians is high.
- Library users need continued education regarding research skills and new technologies.
- Hard copy and electronic resources should complement each other.

These views are evidently shared, to varying degrees, by librarians and faculty alike.

Part 3. Questions from the Committee on Professional Development

In advance of the discussion, PD submitted a series of questions to the panelists, indicating general areas of concern or uncertainty regarding the *Strategic Directions* document. Those questions were:

- There has been something of a rumor floating about that the document was drafted for "political" reasons, presumably referring to state budget concerns. Can you please clarify, confirm, or deny this matter? How does the document's "political" nature invite us to regard its substance?
- We would like to see this discussion focus on the librarian as well as the Library, particularly since ours is the Professional Development Committee. Should we be discussing strategic directions and roles for librarians also? How about funding and time for continuing education for librarians in light of the strategic directions?
- Do the strategic directions indicate a need for further inter-campus tours/rotations to allow librarians to familiarize themselves with the people and divisions with whom we will share the future library? How might this be funded?
- The document appears to advocate a "do more with less" approach to progress. Are there alternative approaches, such as fundraising or lobbying those who handle the budgets?

Although these questions did not structure the progress of the discussion, they informed the panelist's presentations, and were largely addressed either explicitly or implicitly. Additionally, librarians in the audience touched on many of these themes as well.

Part 4. The Political Dimension and Context for the *Strategic Directions* Document

At the outset, Ann Jensen noted that the “political” dimension of the *Strategic Directions* document reflects the authors’ intention to speak to “the highest levels of the Office of the President,” as well as to state politicians. The document is intended to acknowledge that new technologies can lead to economies of scale in collection development. Admittedly, libraries have already been engaged in the kinds of actions recommended. In this respect, the document takes into account what librarians have already accomplished regarding sharing of collections, technology, and services. Because there is much competition for resources across all levels of the University of California, the document helps the libraries to make their case.

Bernie Hurley identified three intended audiences:

- University Librarians
- The Office of the President
- Library staff

He noted that the last push of this sort led to CDL. The document, therefore, is intended to continue the move forward.

Part 5. Salient Themes Emerging from the Discussion

A. Professional Development and the Centrality of Librarians to Libraries

An overriding LAUC-B concern related to the omission from the document of the significance of support staff, both librarians and staff, to the quality of our collections. Collections must be selected, processed, and made available by skilled staff members. Granted, there are scattered remarks in the *Strategic Directions* discussion regarding the importance of staff, but the document clearly emphasizes “libraries,” “collections,” “facilities,” “services,” and “digital materials,” rather than the professional skills and development of librarians. The recommended actions regarding outreach to faculty with respect to scholarly communication only implicitly involve library staff.

Thus, the document fails to make clear that a concomitant demand for staffing proceeds from the need to continue to fund and build collections. Instead, this staffing component is relegated to the notion of an unspecified “invisible infrastructure” to which no strategic directions directly apply. Professional development of librarians remains implicit in the document when it should be an explicit, high-priority recommendation. Librarians are essentially expected to carry out the recommended actions without being provided with the necessary tools. Furthermore, adequate levels of staffing are required to provide timely access to the collections.

Although the question of inter-campus tours and rotations by librarians and staff was only briefly addressed during the panel discussion, it is clear that these are among the professional development steps that should be taken. The sharing of collections, facilities, and services recommended by the *Strategic Directions* document entails a corresponding promotion of interoperability among personnel and organizational divisions.

B. Shared Facilities and Services

Addressing the *Strategic Directions* recommended action with respect to shared facilities, Bernie Hurley noted that there is now already one RLF board and that the recommended actions were designed to help ensure that SRLF Phase 3 is built in a timely manner. LAUC-B librarians expressed concern that this consolidation of the RLF boards could adversely affect the future of the persistence policy, a concern

related as well to shared collections (discussed further below). In response, Bernie noted that Berkeley indeed contributes significantly, but reaps benefits, too. For example, persistence is good for Berkeley librarians, as it insures that when another campus has been the first to place a book in storage, Berkeley can safely discard its copy, confident that the storage copy will persist.

With respect to shared services, he noted the “layered” services approach, permitting a central infrastructure (based at CDL), with local campus customization. However, it is unclear to LAUC-B librarians precisely which kinds of services are envisioned by the *Strategic Directions* document as most suitable for this “layered” approach.

C. Shared Collections

While LAUC-B librarians acknowledge the importance and longstanding tradition of sharing of materials, we also want Berkeley’s materials to continue to belong to Berkeley, signifying the special quality, breadth, and depth of the university’s research and educational missions. This significance is an important attraction to students and faculty to Berkeley.

Sharing can threaten certain areas of the collection. Copies of current and core materials, for example, are often requested by other campuses before enjoying substantial use here at Berkeley, where they were purchased. The result is degradation in service to Berkeley patrons. Two librarians noted that they routinely review all ILL requests in order to catch these kinds of requests. On the other hand, each campus may have its own demands for unique collections, for which it would be unfair or inefficient to expect other campuses to share the costs.

Bernie Hurley agreed that “shared collections” has indeed been a contentious issue in the evolution of the *Strategic Directions* document. The solution has been to establish “voluntary contributions with shared governance.” The ambiguous nature of “governance” has been clarified by an MOU, he reported. Additionally, some formats are better shared than others. Prospective monographic print materials may not be as amenable to a shared collection as digital formats.

D. Curriculum and Collections

An important theme of the discussion addressed the need for the evolving curriculum to drive the evolution of collection policies. Trends in research and teaching should inform, but not absolutely dictate, collection decisions. Libraries routinely engage in strategic planning, locally and statewide, but there is no similar curricular planning. We try to match our collections to what is being taught, but the effort is nowhere coordinated. Tom Leonard remarked that the libraries’ coordinated goals and operations vastly outpace any analogous coordination among the faculty respecting the curriculum. An ideal “real time” correspondence, then, between curriculum and collection would not likely be achieved. Furthermore, Berkeley’s research mission should also continue to inform collection practices.

Similarly, when one librarian asked whether the faculty who plan the curricula have any coordination across campuses, Elaine Tennant replied with an emphatic, “No!” The librarians’ largely informal coordination mechanism, exemplified in the way that groups of bibliographers confer and work together across campuses, is not practiced by faculty. Lack of curriculum coordination thus provides the libraries with very little on which to formulate a plan.

E. Information Literacy

An anecdote about a reference to Google Scholar appearing on a graduate student's web site prompted discussion about another issue inadequately addressed in the *Strategic Directions* document, the need for instruction and information for researchers regarding the quality of information resources. Tom Leonard responded that "Dan Greenstein [UL of CDL] is constantly thinking about how to provide better access tools." LAUC-B librarians note that knowledgeable librarians are nevertheless required to train researchers to identify, access, and use such tools.

Part 6. The Faculty Perspective

Prof. Elaine Tennant, representative from the UCB Senate Faculty Committee on the Library presented the faculty response to the *Strategic Directions* document. According to Prof. Tennant, the faculty appreciates the careful work represented by the document. In a spirit of congenial antagonism, however, she noted several concerns.

First, Berkeley provides more funding for shared collections than other campuses. The faculty worries that if the status of funding changes, then it will affect Berkeley's ability to continue to build its own collections. Specifically, there are finite funds for unique collections, the sorts of collections that come to represent a particular campus's strengths. Faculty perceives that funding of CDL is not enough to satisfy system-wide needs. There is a perceived risk of the current practice of voluntary campus contributions to shared purchases becoming a mandatory "tax."

Second, and following from the first concern, faculty would like a firmer voice in CDL's collection policies. For example, CDL presently collects few foreign language materials. If Berkeley's contribution were indeed to evolve into a de facto tax, then CDL's collection should look more like the Berkeley collection.

Third, the digital co-investment has been built up, but what if a campus wants to pull out? Do other campuses have to contribute more?

Fourth, as a consequence, shared collections are the most contentious area of the document, provoking questions about definitions of ownership and shared governance over retrospective collections. The faculty is uneasy about the tenuous status of heritage collections and unique collections, the very resources that attract researchers and scholars and contribute to Berkeley's high international ranking as a research university. Is there a risk that a heightened CDL collection sharing policy will result in a Berkeley collection that looks more like CDL rather than its once unique collection? Furthermore, the faculty has difficulty understanding why other campuses want collections to be "shared" when they are already "shareable." Why should we change the description of collections on deposit when there is already adequate access? To this last concern Ann Jensen replied that the shift in terminology is regarded by budget administrators as politically valid.

Finally, Prof. Tennant is an enthusiastic proponent of libraries and their central value to the success of a research university. She acknowledges that because libraries do not have well-developed donor bases and librarians do not have faculty status, the resulting lack of clout prevents library issues from being taken as seriously as they should be taken.



DATE: March 16, 2005
TO: Chris Tarr, LAUC-B Chair
FROM: Linda Vida, Chair, The Affiliated Libraries Administrative Group (TALAG)
RE: TALAG Remark on the “Strategic Directions” Document

On February 2, 2005, TALAG engaged in a discussion of the “Strategic Directions for Libraries and Scholarly Information” document (hereafter referred to as “the Document”). We are submitting the following comments for LAUC-B’s review and possible inclusion in its own discussion of the document, which will be sent to the LAUC Executive Board.

TALAG considered the Document with five questions in mind:

- 1) What might the strategic directions for librarians be and how do we get there from here?
- 2) What skill sets do librarians of the future need?
- 3) What kind of continuing education do you anticipate that we’ll collectively need?
- 4) What kind of systemwide collaborations seem possible under the principles of “Shared Collections” and “Shared Services”?
- 5) How do the Affiliated Libraries’ separate career recruitment strategies fit with this vision?

Our remarks are grouped under each question.

1. What might be our strategic directions for librarians and how do we get there from here?

In TALAG’s experience, each local community of library users has special needs and expectations, and the Document does not spend enough time recognizing this fact. In everyday life, the faculty and students who use local collections interact heavily with librarians, and this suggests that an emphasis on local outreach is crucial. The Document addresses very large strategies from a centralized viewpoint, yet neglects to discuss aspects of specialized collections and how the faculty and students rely upon them. The Document also does not recognize that faculty often choose their own approaches to solving problems in teaching and research and may devise their own “workarounds” to get things done. A healthy culture of research reinforces creative solutions at the local level, yet the Document addresses primarily large-scale initiatives.

TALAG believes that the Document does not focus enough on the potential that lies in the collegial relationship between faculty and librarians. The acceptance of technology in classrooms and research practices has increased the need for instructional services. Therefore TALAG envisions an expanded role for librarians, and recommends that this role be a topic for the Academic Senate and LAUC to address.

2. What skill sets do librarians of the future need?

TALAG believes that the specialized skills that librarians are expected to have are increasing and evolving, while support in this area remains a challenge. At the same time, some members of TALAG acknowledged a growing

need to work collaboratively with colleagues who are not librarians or trained as librarians, e.g., archivists with backgrounds in history, programmer analysts with library background, instructional and educational technologies, etc., and discussed how this may affect academic libraries in the future.

While the Document does frame a vision towards which the University can work, it does not sufficiently address the important necessity of emphasizing cross-functional teamwork, or the need to foster an organizational culture that makes that more possible.

3. What kind of continuing education do you anticipate that we'll collectively need?

Following up on No. 2, TALAG reaffirmed the need for a comprehensive training strategy for all library staff. For example, skills in digital asset management, programming and human factors (i.e., usability), should be dispersed among the academic and support staff to ensure that libraries thrive. Training alone, however, cannot take the place of a robust recruitment strategy for librarians. In short, the library staff (both academic and support) must grow with the University of California Libraries.

While TALAG endorses the principle that the California Digital Library can and should play a key role as a “toolkit provider” for collection managers and service providers, some participants suggested that the CDL alone cannot fulfill the demand for instructional services, collection development tools, and other innovations. Consequently, TALAG hopes that SLASIAC, the Office of Systemwide Library Planning, and the Council of University Librarians all work collaboratively to build staff capabilities at the campus level, even as they build digital libraries.

4. What type of systemwide collaboration seems possible under the principles of “Shared Collections” and “Shared Services”?

TALAG endorses shared collections and services as crucial goals under the “One Library, One University.” However, it must be made clear to policymakers at the campus level, the system level, and in state government that not all things can be shared. Several TALAG members felt that system-level planning initiatives must evaluate not only what can be shared, but also what cannot be shared. Research universities, in TALAG’s opinion, will continue to use library collections as a way of distinguishing themselves.

A user-centric approach to library services has at its base strong support of top-notch research and teaching. Toward that end, special collections of print and non-print materials will continue to exist and serve important roles. Therefore it is likely that librarians will continue to manage local collections and repositories even as centralized library planning extends its reach. This places the librarian in the difficult position of responding on one hand to local demands for high quality collections, and on the other to system-level initiatives that will influence local services greatly. TALAG believes that librarians and faculty members must be engaged in a mutual discussion of the balance between campus- and department-level information management and large-scale collaborations. Once again, this cross-functional collegial approach will help balance local needs with system-level challenges.

TALAG also felt that system-level collaboration is the wave of the future and will bring new opportunities. The minimal mention of librarians throughout the Document was cause for concern, as TALAG feels the need for people to do all this work will increase.

5. How do TALAG’s separate career recruitment strategies fit with this vision?

The overall thrust of the Document, in the words of one TALAG member, “is about libraries, not librarians.” Yet librarians conduct the following tasks, which are crucial to the University’s success:

- Analyzing, organizing and cataloging collections
- Providing access to information in all formats
- Teaching
- Facilitating creative solutions to scholarly communication

TALAG anticipates that this work will not go away but instead will increase. In order to respond, the University would benefit from revitalizing its recruitment efforts in the Librarian Series. Moreover, the California Digital Library should grow in size and outreach capability, but that growth should be linked with librarians who work in campus libraries.

The Affiliated Libraries Administrative Group (TALAG)

Architecture Visual Resources Library
494 Wurster Hall
Director: Maryly Snow

Continuing Education of the Bar
300 Frank H. Ogawa Plaza, Suite 410
Oakland, CA 94612
Director: Ruth Girill

Environmental Design Archives
280 Wurster Hall
Director: Waverly B. Lowell

Earthquake Engineering Research Center
Richmond Field Station 451
Director: Chuck James

The Ethnic Studies Library
30 Stephens Hall #2360
Director: Lillian Castillo-Speed

Giannini Foundation
248 Giannini Hall
Director: Susan Garbarino

Institute of Governmental Studies
109 Moses Hall
Director: Ron Heckart

Institute of Industrial Relations
2521 Channing Way
Director: Terry Huwe

Institute of Transportation Studies
409 McLaughlin Hall
Director: Daniel Krummes

Law Library
455 Boalt Hall
Director: Kathleen Vanden Heuvel

Water Resources Center Archives
410 O'Brien Hall
Director: Linda Vida



March 25, 2005

To: Terry Huwe, LAUC President

From: Bob Heyer-Gray, LAUC-D Chair

Re: "Systemwide Strategic Directions for Libraries and Scholarly Information" discussion at LAUC-D General Membership meeting.

Summary

LAUC-D General Membership Meeting held on Friday, December 3, 2004 from 10a.m. - noon was primarily assembled to discuss the "Systemwide Strategic Directions for Libraries and Scholarly Information" report. The meeting was fairly well attended (35 LAUC members total) and included all members of the library administration. The report was distributed well in advance of the meeting to encourage discussion of the document. The discussion, while not always on topic, was very good and sometimes lively. It was the kind of exchange that seems not to happen often enough. Even the tangents that the discussion took led to worthwhile exchanges. All in all, the discussion gave the LAUC members a greater understanding of the direction the libraries are headed. It also became clearer for many how this document impacts them as individuals and conversely how they too have an impact on the formation of strategic planning.

Introduction

I introduced the topic by noting that this report is intended to be the guiding document for the UC libraries and that LAUC statewide had asked divisions to discuss the report. Very broadly, what does this report mean for us as librarians and what does it mean for the UC libraries?

University Librarian, Marilyn Sharrow, then introduced the report and gave the attending LAUC members historical background information.

The websites and documents that LAUC members were provided in advance were:

http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/planning/library_strategy.pdf
<http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/planning/>
<http://www.slp.ucop.edu/initiatives/planningstructure.pdf>
http://www.slp.ucop.edu/consultation/slasiac/102902/Brief_History.pdf
<http://library.berkeley.edu/LAUC/fallassembly04/webcast.html>

While the discussion certainly touched on the four areas meant to be covered: Shared Services, Collaboration and Interdependence, Collection Management and Coordination and Scholarly Communication; the exchange on the whole flowed more like a conversation. Comments/Questions in bold stood out.

Discussion

The idea for the report came out of a University Librarians retreat from a couple of years ago.

The report gets to the heart of what the big issues are. It is meant to bring to the table (for librarians, faculty and administrators) these issues and describe what we are doing now, what we've done before, and what we hope to do in the future.

It's a good look at what libraries are accomplishing for campuses and their primary clientele.

The meat of the report is how are we going to handle electronic publications.

The organization of the UC libraries is unique with shared resources/services/features such as MELVYL, Request and 10 libraries with more than 30 million items. With such a shared collection breadth, 70% of ILL borrowing is from UC to UC.

The report notes that the UC libraries are faced with budgetary, technology and recruitment problems.

This report is a talking piece to get people focused on what the library issues are. Campus administrators got copies and the University Librarians talked with the Academic Senate Committee.

I was surprised by what the faculty panel at the LAUC Fall Assembly in Berkeley (comprised of library supporters, most of whom are on campus and/or statewide library committees) did not know about the libraries and library issues.

How the document was written depended on the audience. The initial audience was SLASIAC and it took a year to determine the focus. There are summaries for different groups. Ann Jensen was the statewide LAUC representative on this report committee.

The report was also written with the legislature in mind.

It takes a long time to evolve strategic plans. Often a plan is looking to the future but the future is already here with the issues being dealt with by CDL staff such preservation by Trisha Cruse and shared print archives by Nancy Kushigian.

It is important to maintain the highly collaborative activities with CDL.

The CDL was formed as a "co-library" and we all add to CDL staff by sharing our librarians. The report also shows how research libraries are changing.

The report presents the notion that the library plays a vital role in the educational enterprise but that there has to be sustainability and accountability. The UC libraries continue to need funding to provide this vision.

How can we continue to build a system-wide collection with breadth and depth?

There is a SLASIAC master planning project list, which gives a good indication of where we're going. This Master Planning Project list is located at:

<http://www.slp.ucop.edu/initiatives/planningstructure.pdf>

Why we are discussing this report after the fact, rather than before?

Various committees were asked to contribute. There is also an idea to create a version for library staff (non-librarians).

In discussing the finished report there needs to be discussion as to time frames for what we do next.

This report was designed to note these are the directions. Next is how we solve the issues. As an example, scholarly communication and collaboration with university presses is being explored. The University Librarians met with the UC Press and advised that it would be useful to have a librarian on the Press Board. This document is located in one space in time but cannot answer all issues but those seen at that point.

Terri Huwe, LAUC statewide president, in one of his opinion pieces noted that there is a short history of UC library planning that is very useful.

[An excerpt from this opinion piece: "The Office of Systemwide Library Planning has posted a very helpful historical overview on its Web site, titled "A Short History of Library Planning and Budgeting in the University of California, 1977-2002" (see <http://www.slp.ucop.edu/docs.html>). This document describes the creation of the "One University, One Library" principal that continues to guide library planning and policies throughout the UC system ... popularly known as the "Salmon Report"..."]

The RLFs do different things with storage. The UC Office of the President capital construction notes the legislature is willing to put money into Phase III at the SRLF but that is the last one for funding. Almost all campuses have their own binding operations.

IT cooperation with libraries is being viewed as vitally important. At UCD the Carlson Health Sciences Library and Medical Center Library are seen an important support for medical education. Many pieces of medical information technology include library resources. There is a chart of Medical Center's different units contributing to the School of Medicine and the library is one of 20 information technology units noted.

I like the first statement about what we as librarians do “enhance access ... improve availability ... ensure persistent access.” The nature of the work is the same but the challenge is bigger.

This is the first statement is from all the libraries mission statements and it's why we are here.

This is also in the message in UCD's capital campaign for the library

Details don't always go along with game plan. He is happy to hear about UC Press because we haven't signed license with them? **Our own faculty need to look at how they provide scholarly information.** Scholarly communicators need to consider how to avoid costs.

The LAUC Assembly afternoon program faculty speaker Robert Brubaker said that the scholarly communications message is not always welcomed. Peer-review is not peer-review.

Everyone one who did not attend the LAUC Fall Assembly should take a look at the Webcast (Available via Real Media format at <http://library.berkeley.edu/LAUC/fallassembly04/webcast.html>).

The hard part with sharing collections is when so much more is not on campus and/or electronic. **We need to get users to the right place.**

With shared collections we need to make access better. At UCR John Moore (a PNAS member with research experience in genetics and frogs research) more than 20 years ago looked at the library's process and did use studies of UCR collection and overlap areas (called the "pumpkin" papers). He recommended eliminating overlapping collections and getting a richer universe with less duplication.

The SLASIAC report does not address information literacy in detail although it does talk about (first bulleted item on pg. 7) students having difficulty distinguishing between kinds of authoritative information.

We should ask that this be added since this is an important activity for all the different departments.

I like the idea of the library as re-defining place, re-branding.

Google Scholar may have an impact. My own college-age daughter doesn't think of the library until told by her mother.

SFX can link to Google Scholar.

We should ask "Why do undergrads use Google over library resources?" It's not easy and cool to use...

We are in a transition time and that we are not there yet -- our systems are still evolving. As an illustration, look at how many different ways we have to find e-journals. Things have to get worse before they can get better.

It is not just the students -- it's the faculty. I know of a health sciences researcher who noticed that students did not go any earlier than 1999 and the researcher knew that seminal work was well before. It's the 1-click syndrome but students need to be told, "you need to dig a little deeper".

Long before we still had a very large percentage of students first coming into the library at the junior and senior level with no library use experience. Societal mores impact this.

We must continue to be helpful, be available and at least train some of the students.

Our systems are not easy to use. When we lost our design of MELVYL, we lost our local control. It is important to customize interfaces.

Where is the context? Interface matches their need.

Google Scholar has a federated search.

The engineering librarians division of ASEE did a content analysis study to determine core content. Results showed that close enough is acceptable.

We should make it clear that the libraries are paying for your "free" use.

We are trying to provide every possible way for looking and that we may present too many options.

The FRBR (Functional requirements for Bibliographic Records) has a lot of potential to get even more information from bibliographic records and has ways of customizing our own OPACS. For example, we can have an undergrad version pre-set for books in English from the last five years.

CDL's MetaLib development is creating an undergraduate portal (to replace CDL's SearchLight).

We should incorporate Google into instruction to discuss what's not found there. We are not doing everything we can to provide access to Web Resources. InfoMine is an example of efforts in this area.

We need to continue to support shared services that CDL is doing to make the systems understandable.



TO: Terry Huwe, LAUC President 2004/2005
FROM: Manuel Urrizola, LAUC-I Chair pro tempore 2005
RE: Report on LAUC-I discussions on *Strategic Directions for Libraries and Scholarly Information*
DATE: March 31, 2005

OVERVIEW:

On **June 24, 2004**, Gerald Munoff, University Librarian UCI, distributed to all library staff:

“... an important document that was recently approved by the UC University Librarians (ULs) and Systemwide Library and Scholarly Information Advisory Committee (SLASIAC). *Systemwide Strategic Directions for Libraries and Scholarly Information at the University of California*, is a strategic plan which was developed over the last three years by the University Librarians, and addresses the persistent problems of growth in scholarly publications and increasing demands for innovative library services by further expanding and deepening the resource sharing practices that have helped keep the UC libraries in the forefront of academic library service for over a quarter century. The UCI Libraries will be a full participant in these plans so it is important that we all read and study the report, and discuss its many issues and implications. This Fall the various aspects of the report will be discussed in a variety of meeting throughout the Libraries.”

Included was a summary of the development and content of the “report.”

On **Nov. 10, 2004**, UCI Library Council and LAUC-I jointly sponsored an Early Bird discussion on the Systemwide Strategic Directions. The agenda included: I. Introduction by Gerry Munoff; II. Summary report by AULs and other Library Council members and Q&A; III. Report from LAUC Fall Assembly Delegates: Judy Ruttenberg, Manuel Urrizola, and John Novak will report back on a panel discussion with members of SOPAG (Systemwide Operations and Planning Group) on this document. Because of time, item III of agenda never got covered.

On **Jan. 24, 2005**, Terry Huwe, LAUC President visited UCI. He spoke at a LAUC-I Executive Board meeting and a LAUC-I Membership meeting. At the LAUC-I Membership meeting, there was a 45 minute discussion on Strategic Directions. Board Members-at-Large John Novak and Kay Collins made a list of points covered by the discussion:

- Creating new jobs for library school graduates
 - Internships
 - Uniform systemwide programs
- Persistent access
 - Concern of librarians
 - Addressed by librarians
- Importance of librarians
 - Should be articulated in document.
 - Should be articulated by LAUC-I.

- Training
 - Apprenticeships
 - Systemwide training sessions
- Librarian expertise
- Cost of living
 - Needs to be addressed.
 - Disparity with CSU's
- Mentoring
 - Job skills
 - Scholarship
 - Research
 - Publishing
 - Librarians connection with scholarly communities
- Potential partnerships
 - Not mentioned in document.
 - With community colleges and CSU's
- One library
- UC Merced
 - Successful addition to UC
 - Library fundamental to University's success
- Models of success
 - Shared print collections
 - Virtual reference
 - ✓ Shared responsibility of all UC's for staffing
 - ✓ Collaboration
 - Shared cataloging
 - Government information
- Academic community

REPORT:

Shared services

- Virtual reference
- Cataloging
- Collections such as government documents
- System-wide training sessions
- System-wide internships

Collaboration and Interdependence

- Librarians connection with other scholarly communities
- Community colleges and CSU's
- CDL
- UC Merced

Collection Management and Coordination

- Unique collections versus shared or duplicated collections
- SRLF and NRLF

- Ownership issues of stored or shared collections
- Statistical issues of stored or shared collections

Scholarly Communication

- Scholarly journal
- Librarians connection and communication with other scholarly communities
- Role of LAUC

CONCLUSION:

Library staff and librarians were just briefly mentioned in the document. This fact was a cause of concern among many. Thus, the discussion at UCI focused heavily on the role of librarians and library staff in the strategic plan and the impact of shared services on staff issues.



Date: 22 March 2005
To: Terry Huwe, LAUC President
From: Janet Carter, LAUC-LA Chair
Re: "Systemwide Strategic Directions for Libraries and Scholarly Information at the University of California"

Following are comments and questions on the above document gathered during a brown bag session for LAUC-LA members, and later revised and collated by the LAUC-LA Committee on Library Plans and Policies, with the review and approval of the LAUC-LA Executive Board.

The issues are raised in the form of questions for consideration and they are arranged to correspond to the relevant sections of the original document.

OVERALL COMMENTS

While we appreciate the opportunity to comment on this document, we think that it is unfortunate that the LAUC representatives to SOPAG and SLASIAC were not permitted to communicate with LAUC members or even the LAUC Executive Board during the creation of the document. It is difficult to fulfill LAUC's advisory role without proper and sufficient communication. We believe that LAUC could have responded in a timely fashion had we had the chance to do so, and had we been given a deadline for response, even a short one. We hope that LAUC will be given the opportunity to fulfill its advisory role as other policy documents are developed (e.g., CDC shared print policies), by providing feedback on those documents while they are in draft form. That said, although we were not in a position to comment on the draft document, we hope that our current input will be useful.

A. General

The following questions represent critical issues related to staffing, resources, support for travel, equipment, software, and training, among others.

1. How will campuses address uneven off-campus access to resources, due to the fact that only 5 or 6 UC campuses have VPN?
2. How will campus libraries address the large and labor-intensive workloads associated with proxy-server-related issues, and noted in the strategic directions document?
3. How will the libraries address the issue of staffing as related to decreased budgets? What solutions or plans do the libraries have regarding this problem? (Note: The staffing issue is missing from the second paragraph of the Summary. Though it is discussed on pp.14 & 15, under the category of Shared Services, it is made secondary to technology issues. Yet, access relates directly

to staffing in the campus libraries. For example, Acquisitions staff must touch all records for materials, whether they are Tier 1 or Tier 2 items. The RLFs, too, need sufficient staff for policy-setting, planning and services.)

B. Shared Services

1. How will the libraries ensure sufficiently quick access to shared print materials so that undergraduates can get them during a quarter?

C. Collaboration and Interdependence

1. How will the campuses collaborate on cataloging expertise, especially for materials in languages other than English?

2. Some duplication of materials is necessary, but how much? How will the libraries collaborate and make decisions about this across campuses?

3. In what ways will the libraries increase collaborative efforts in regard to metadata-cataloging, administration, and copyright issues?

4. In what ways will the libraries provide increased support for UC-wide librarian groups, for coordination of collaborative projects and programs, e.g., information literacy and instruction?

D. Collection Management and Coordination

1. How can we avoid ending up with plain "vanilla" collections for all campuses? How do we reflect the diversity of individual campus curricular emphases and support general and common research needs, while at the same time avoiding unnecessary duplication?

2. How will the libraries document collection management decisions on each campus for easy access by all campuses? For example, when there was shared money to make purchases, sometimes decisions were made centrally but were not always documented locally. This made it difficult for those at other campuses to keep track and to comply with shared collection commitments.

3. In the 1st paragraph of the Summary, besides the existing bullets, print and other formats are not addressed separately. How can we ensure that all formats of materials will be addressed?

4. How will the libraries provide for sufficient depth of cataloging (adequate bibliographic access) to allow for online browsing of RLFs and other shared collections, so that materials are not too obscure to be identified easily by users? For example, would libraries be able to provide enhanced access to some complex materials through scanning tables of contents?

5. How can we ensure that 2 copies of some materials are stored in dim archives, so that one can circulate, rather than just being available to those who visit the archive in person?

6. How will libraries ensure that attention is paid to the larger scope of government documents and those of NGOs, local agencies, developing countries, and international organizations, not just U.S. documents?

7. How will the libraries ensure that area studies librarians are included in collection management discussions and decisions, regarding all sorts of collections, including government documents?

8. The Library of Congress and Yale University are working on persistent access to digital information for some licensed materials. Should UC follow LC's & Yale's models or should UC not pursue this area because others are already doing this work?

E. Scholarly Communication

1. In what ways should the libraries reach out to and educate faculty regarding the issues involved with this important and timely topic, including copyright and intellectual property?

2. What kinds of support will the libraries provide to library staff to develop various outreach and educational efforts? For example, faculty CAPA members might be invited to participate in panels or programs to discuss e-scholarship and its place in faculty peer review, including what is acceptable for tenure and what are some different means of peer-reviewed publishing.

3. How can the libraries best work with and refer to the highly useful web site for the UC Office of Scholarly Communication?

4. In what ways will NIH's new open archive of materials impact the libraries—i.e., the proposal that those receiving federal grant funds be required to provide open access to the results of their research?

5. How can the libraries best work with and refer to the SPARC directory of open archive journals?

6. How can we focus on expanding dissemination of all of this information, and establish more opportunities for librarians to come together and discuss these issues? For example, the libraries might consider providing venues and travel support for librarians to attend regional Northern and Southern UC campus discussions on scholarly communication models and other issues.

7. Can the libraries explore ways to make the jargon more intuitive for faculty comprehension, i.e., is the term 'scholarly communication' understood by all without specific explanation?



April 1, 2005

To: Terry Huwe, LAUC President

From: Jim Dooley, Chair, LAUC Merced

Re: LAUC Merced response to "Strategic Directions for Libraries and Scholarly Information"

From the beginning, planning for the UC Merced Library has been based on support for and reliance on the concept of One University, One Library. We have been concerned with the provision of information resources and services to our faculty, staff and students, rather than with questions of local collection size, comparative ranking, or "ownership." In this context, LAUC Merced strongly supports the planning framework contained in *Systemwide Strategic Directions for Libraries and Scholarly Information at the University of California*.

The members of LAUC Merced believe that we work in an environment characterized by collaboration, interdependence, and coordination of collections and services. We also believe that it is critical for the University Libraries to assert a leadership position in the development of sustainable modes of scholarly communication.

We do have some concerns regarding the report's rationale for the development of shared services. While it does discuss the creation of a "shared infrastructure," it doesn't explicitly include centrally provided services in this infrastructure. Such existing services as the Shared Cataloging Program, CDL Acquisitions, and UC e-Links, for example, will continue to be essential to support the envisioned collaboration and coordination. If anything, such central bibliographic services may well need to be expanded in both resources and scope. We also believe that the balance between central vs. local responsibility, as, for example, articulated in section 4.4.1 relating to digital preservation, may have to be reexamined in the light of ongoing experience.

Although the report addresses the technological aspects of shared services, it does not address the changing environment in which library staff will work to provide services. Similarly, while it addresses hiring and retention issues, it does not address ongoing needs for training and staff development. We feel that any effective planning framework must explicitly acknowledge the human resources dimension as it relates to current employees.

Despite these concerns, the members of LAUC Merced look forward to working to achieve the vision contained in this report.



March 31, 2005

TO: Terry Huwe, LAUC President

FROM: Michael Yonezawa, LAUC-R Division Chair

RE: Strategic Directions for Libraries and Scholarly Information report

A lengthy discussion ensued among Riverside's LAUC members regarding the report. Some members recognized that this document was based on a comprehensive plan and that the information and content were organized in such a way that it caters to audiences outside the libraries. It was also recognized that this was a problem solving report, focusing on financial and philosophical aspects rather than a stand-alone document that covers all aspects of library planning.

Other members were of the view that this document does not cover many areas including personnel and social aspects. Another comment was that this document was written by people who were far removed from the constituency. As a result the needs of the patrons tend to be left out reflecting the little niche in which they are in. Our response would be to include an addendum that covers the areas the membership and other groups and individuals identified as missing from the report.

However, some members argued that this document is not meant to cover such areas and that it is essentially a problem solving document and that it is all about funding - how to spend what we have wisely and how to justify increasing funding for the UC Libraries.

Overall, most members felt that this was an important document for LAUC to provide collective feedback on a local as well as systemwide level and welcomed the opportunity.

Regarding the concept of "Shared Services", members acknowledge the success of the Melvyl Union Catalog, UC-eLinks, Request, the Shared Cataloging Project and a multitude of systemwide services. However, members also expected to see some elaboration on such shared services such as:

- information literacy
- instruction
- information technology
- continuing education/skills development

Another general concern was that since there are 10 UC campuses, it is not possible to think our local users would truly have access to the necessary materials, e.g., print monographs, with out having a fair amount of duplication. It was stated, "libraries build their local collections based on the local teaching/research agendas of each campus". As long the duplication of programs, departments and research at each local campus continues, local libraries will continue to support their local clientele. However, it was also pointed out that the UC Libraries collaborate systemwide more when compared to other departments.

Regarding the concept of "Collection Management and Coordination", members recognized the problems of shortage of space and expressed concerns about the RLFs and the rejection rate, and the future of local collections and the long-term considerations of materials for areas like special

collections and archives. Members expressed several concerns:

- **how libraries will determine what is unnecessary duplication**
- **who will decides what to / and what not to duplicate**
- **determining what not to duplicate in terms of special collections and archives was dangerous where the very nature of the collections are based on original and unique documents.**

Regarding the concept of “Scholarly Communication”, members acknowledge the need to coordinate and collaborate efforts to develop a comprehensive systemwide plan. Members recognized the developments of the e-Scholarship Program and the OAC as building blocks for future activities. The discussion included the following comments:

- **What are our premier / fringe areas, and which areas can we claim to be ours?**
- **What about the citrus heritage collection, agriculture, entomology; will we have the support and cooperation of other libraries to build our unique collections?**
- **In addition to fostering local communication with faculty we need to develop detailed plans based on disciplines and subject areas systemwide.**

Respectfully submitted,

**Michael Yonezawa
LAUC-R Chair**



TO: Terry Huwe, LAUC President

FROM: Eric Forte, LAUC-SB Chair

RE: LAUC-SB to (SLASAC) Systemwide Libraries Strategic Planning Document

Summary

LAUC-SB feels the planning document is fundamentally sound, intelligent, and well communicated. The document is consistently vague, however, to the extent that it is difficult to truly assess exactly where and how the plan may lead.

Collaboration and Interdependence

Even if the report were not vague, implementation of any number of shared services and shared collections initiatives involves many and multi-faceted hurdles. LAUC-SB would like to re-emphasize the local challenges involved in various scenarios of shared collecting and services. "One University, One Library" is made especially difficult to implement when there are ten campuses, each with different bureaucratic, fiscal, and political realities. For any initiative, a coalition of only the willing and able weakens the whole; each campus' support for its library will be key is deciding if the willing are able, and each campus' vision of its role in the larger, UC-wide picture will decide if the able are willing. A truly-shared vision of the UC libraries must emerge, not only among library personnel and users, but among faculty at all campuses, as well as those who allot the money.

Shared Services and Collections

The general challenges listed above affect any initiative in shared collections or services. Additionally, while "shared" nearly always sounds good, we don't want to neglect making careful costs-benefit analysis to make sure each project is really worthwhile. We don't want to throw lots of money at projects that wither, whether due to evolving scholarly communication models, Google or Google-esque private sector initiatives, lack of buy-in from the academy, or plain hubris. For instance, there is much debate – some of it empirical—about the benefits of some of our publisher packages. Any time money is spent on items we neither want nor need warrants close inspection. Also, there are high expectations for the RLFs, which will require careful planning.

Technology

The report by nature is somewhat technocratic, and even in this sense, vague. For instance, the emphasis on "layered" services sounds nice, but has been heard before. It feels a bit heavy on sound bites.

Expertise/Human Resources

Who is doing the work? Acquiring and keeping the skills, mostly human, in the challenging recruiting environment of most of California is not addressed. Also not addressed is the shifting of current personnel to functions with new resources and models, especially in these shared projects.



To: Terence Huwe, President
Librarians Association of the University of California

From: Kenneth Lyons, Chair
Lucia Orlando, Vice-Chair
LAUC, Santa Cruz Division

Re: **Commentary from LAUC Santa Cruz on
*Systemwide Strategic Directions for Libraries and Scholarly Information***

LAUC-SC held its semi-annual general meeting on 9th November 2004, at which Chair Lyons provided an overview of the *Strategic Directions* report. The perceived problems and recommended solutions from the report were described, following which discussion took place amongst the assembled majority (18 of 27) of UCSC librarians. Commentary was wide-ranging, critiquing the report generally for the most part, rather than addressing the report's proposals on a point-by-point basis. Consequently, I have entered the comments under the appropriate headings but have also added an Overall category for comments applicable to the entire plan.

Overall

- Concern was expressed regarding a perceived lack of system-wide commitment to understanding and addressing local workload issues (eg, the impact of shared services on inter-library loan, particularly at undergraduate-focused campuses; on preservation and digitisation services; on the RLFs).
- Will unique needs of individual campuses be taken into account when implementing this plan, or will a uniform system be imposed to which all campuses must adhere?
- There will likely be problems with implementation of this plan due to inequitable application. It is widely acknowledged that the largest campuses are allowed to do as they please...
- To address the latter concerns, LAUC should play a greater role in the management of shared projects.
- There will be a greater financial and personnel impact on the campuses than CDL may recognise. For instance, uniform systems often need customisation at the local level (and may in fact not actually be very customisable).

•

Shared Services

- Undergraduates, with shorter timeframes than graduate students and faculty, usually need immediate access to holdings. Given the burden currently placed on inter-library loan, how will this constituency be looked after? There would also be an increased need for training of public-service staff to meet increased demand for these services.

Collaboration and Interdependence

- Larger campuses can afford more local resources. Will wide-scale sharing lead to a two-tier UC system, with the smaller campuses only able to offer shared services while the larger campuses have a full complement of both shared and local services?
- In light of this disparity in wherewithal, what then constitutes a financial fair share for the smaller campuses?
- UCSC is currently undergoing a campus-wide re-organisation and consolidation of computing services that will most likely result in substantial financial outlay to obtain services the library traditionally provided in-house. Such a financial commitment would seriously affect the library's ability to participate in system-wide collaborative initiatives.
- Small units (eg, maps, government documents, media, slides, special collections) need to be consulted for input into the strategic plan.
- Increased collaboration will likely necessitate increased responsibility on the part of librarians to understand the strengths and limitations of specific collections at each campus. What mechanisms exist (or will be put in place) for training staff—both initially and on an ongoing basis—to meet this need?
- There is scepticism that such a large-scale collaborative project can succeed without the full participation of the larger campuses. The demise of the proposal for a shared government-documents repository bodes ill for such an effort.

Collection Management and Co-ordination

- Are there proven cost savings in these plans? For instance, it is assumed that sharing collections will reduce costs by eliminating multiple copies of individual items but will such saving be negated by additional ILL costs...not to mention diminished services to patrons needing immediate access to holdings.
- Does a shared copy equal shared access? In other words, if an item is sent to an RLF from a particular campus, does that campus have more rights over the item than do other campuses? How would collection management decisions be made in such an environment? Who or what entity would decide what should be withdrawn from the shared collection? Would there be a mandate for campuses to withdraw items in the shared collection, or would this be voluntary? How will such decisions be conveyed to faculty (who may become increasingly frustrated as familiar materials are sent to storage)?

Scholarly Communication

- The crisis in scholarly communication must be recognised not as a 'library problem' but as one facing academia as a whole, necessitating the engagement of all constituencies in instituting effective and meaningful change. This means faculty should take a leading role in advocacy of alternatives.

31st March 2005



March 31, 2005

TO: Terry Huwe, LAUC President
FROM: Mary Linn Bergstrom, LAUC-SD Chair
RE: SLASIAC Document

The LAUC-SD membership met on Tuesday March 29, 2005 and discussed the [Systemwide Strategic Direction for Libraries and Scholarly Information at the University of California](#) [SSDL&SI UC] document.

Discussion followed the Section 4 Strategic Directions outline, addressing the Recommended Actions in each of the five sections:

- 4.1 collection management and coordination
- 4.2 shared facilities
- 4.3 shared services
- 4.4 persistent access to digital information
- 4.5 scholarly communication

The group was asked to consider positive aspects, concerns, and what, if any, other actions would be pertinent in regard to each of these sections and to the document as a whole. A summary of the discussion follows:

4.1.1 Collection management and coordination

Recommended actions

- *Develop a detailed planning and evaluation framework for shared collections in all combinations of formats that: a) explicitly specifies their key characteristics (e.g. physical location, access, and management policies); b) identifies costs and resource needs (e.g. processing, shelving space, and environmental requirements, access and delivery services, and requirements for infrastructure services such as bibliographic access and inventory control; c) assesses implications for campus operations, services, preservation strategies, and budgets; and d) identifies the affected the user communities and their use of the collections.*

Discussion:

How are these items prioritized? The sequence of actions isn't clear.

What is meant by d) identifying affected user communities and their use of the collections? It was suggested that this action could have the 'political' intention to reassure groups that are concerned about shared collections.

- *Apply the guidance provided by this framework to implement the development of shared collections.*

Discussion of section 4.1:

It was noted that since SLASIAC is the intended audience, not LAUC, the tone and level of recommendations was appropriate. The document serves as outreach to other audiences and is

couched in a way that they would understand. Overall the document is fairly 'text centric' and doesn't fully address the range of materials and formats – images, streaming video, sound - that exist and are emerging. While one member commented that shared cataloging is just as important as shared acquisitions and shared services, another cautioned that there might be concerns about shared collections at other campuses. The LAUC-SD members expressed endorsement of the value of shared collections. While some might feel that shared collections may lead to elimination of unique campus content, the creation of shared basic collections could lead to the availability of more resources for smaller unique collections at each UC library.

4.2.1 Shared facilities

Recommended actions

- *Consolidate the governance of the shared regional library facilities and ensure that they are fully integrated into planning and operations in support of the collaborative programs of the UC Libraries.*
- *Regularly review the policies, operations, and resource needs of the regional library facilities to ensure that they continue to support the UC Libraries' strategic directions.*

LAUC-SD members endorsed these actions.

- *Acknowledge that the scope for continued expansion of the regional library facilities is necessarily limited by site constraints, availability of capital resources in the context of UC capital program priorities etc., and began long range planning for this eventuality.*

Discussion of section 4.2

There was discussion interest in the status of librarians at shared facilities and their relationship to the campus libraries. There was discussion about the nature of services provided at the RLFs, and local library input into that public service provided by librarians and staff at RLFs to 'our' clientele. There was discussion about whether the RLFs are dim archives or are we moving to establishing them as the 12th and 13th Libraries?

The general sense of the membership was that we need to be attentive to the changes that might come with shared collections to staffing and to public and technical services. If these facilities become more public service focused, the consensus of the group was that high-quality service must be assured.

4.3.1 Shared services

Recommended actions

- *Develop a programmatic framework that leverages the collective resources of the UC Libraries to: a) more effectively manage and deliver essential ongoing services (e.g. for bibliographic control and access, and for acquisition, processing, and management of collections in all formats; and b) collaboratively develop, deploy, and support advanced user services.*

Discussion: The intent of this section seemed unclear. Other than an ILS, what 'advanced user services' are suggested here?

- *Develop and implement pilot programs to test concepts, refine planning, establish priorities, and clarify resource needs and sources.*

Discussion of section 4.3

In addressing shared collection and shared services there is no discussion of the privacy issues that would be raised. A question was raised as to whether this section implies that library IT staff will be consolidated in any way. If that is the case, there was concern about how individual campus IT projects would be managed.

4.4.1 Persistent access to digital information

Recommended actions

- *Develop a digital preservation infrastructure in collaboration with national and international efforts that adheres to established standards and open-source practices to: a) centrally preserve the at-risk digital information that we share a common interest in (such as scholarly journals and databases and web based government information); and b) facilitate the efforts of the campus libraries to preserve digital assets in which they take a unique interest (for example, selected collections of web-based materials, UC dissertations, digital materials produced by faculty for research or teaching, etc.)*

LAUC-SD responded positively to this recommendation.

- *Investigate the extent to which the digital preservation infrastructure may assist in the preservation for protection of deteriorating print materials. Coordinate closely with university units responsible for information technology records management and other units with the responsibility for the preservation of digital content to foster development of and support for a robust common information technology infrastructure that can meet the University's needs for the reliable archiving, management, and retrieval of digital information*

Discussion of section 4.4: A question was raised as to why UC should take this investigation on as a research project. Although this may be very beneficial, we do not have a history of strong coordination between library and campus IT units. More details on the rationale for this recommendation are needed. Staffing concerns, particularly the potential for staff consolidation was raised as well.

4.5.1 Scholarly communication

Recommended actions

Working collaboratively with faculty, management, the UC press, information schools, and national associations and bodies, the UC Libraries will develop and implement a program to provide leadership in the comprehensive alteration of the scholarly communication process so that it is economically sustainable and ensures the widest possible access to the scholarly record. The program will identify concrete steps and necessary resources, and should evolve along the shared services model, with the appropriate use of centrally provided services and collaboratively developed campus based efforts.

At a minimum, this program will provide:

- *Strategies and services to help faculty manage the copyrights in the words they create, including an expanded publishing services infrastructure based on the eScholarship program and partnership with the UC press to facilitate innovative dissemination of their works.*
- *Methods for communication and outreach to faculty to inform them about the economics and mechanics of scholarly publishing and their effect on both the distribution of scholarly work and on the quality of service provided by the UC Libraries.*

- *Establishment and operational application of library collection development and selection principles that account not only for scholarly value but also for service and economic sustainability.*
- *Applied research to identify and gather the data about characteristics of the publishing industry and its products and about UC Library operations and costs that are needed to help inform the publishing decisions of individual faculty, as well as the University's ongoing planning.*
- *Mechanisms to leverage individual campus and systemwide effort and expertise, resulting in a network of highly engaged and informed faculty, library staff, and academic administrators who can shape, support and effectively coordinate both campus and systemwide endeavors.*

While observing that there was not a great deal of emphasis on intellectual property rights, and that this section 'would be difficult', there appeared to be strong support from the membership. Does the significantly greater amount of detail in this section indicate that these actions are a higher priority?

Overall comments and reactions:

The general sense of the LAUC-SD membership was a positive reaction to the creation and distribution of the Systemwide Strategic Direction for Libraries and Scholarly Information at the University of California document.

Concerns expressed about the plan as a whole included:

This document is strongly technology-oriented. There was concern about shaping public services and an involvement in decision-making outside CD. Who – and what types of staff - will be the decision makers?

An overall weakness of the document is that not enough consideration is given to non-text formats. [observed in regard to section 4.1 as well]

Areas that were not addressed in this document that would require attention as the plan is carried out are outreach, instruction, and shared training.

Concerns about the integration of staff working in sites other than campus libraries, such as the RLFs or other 'shared' units, were reiterated.

It was noted that the document didn't discuss the things we are doing right now and will need to continue to do, ensuring that there are staff and resources to ensure continuity and high standards in maintaining our current work. There was interest in seeing if any savings generated by efficiencies in these shared systems would come back to campuses somehow. That would be an incentive to participate with energy and be creative in our thinking.



March 25, 2005

TO: Terry Huwe
FROM: Lisa Mix, LAUC-SF Chair
RE: Discussion of "Strategic Directions" Document

I am writing to summarize LAUC-SF discussions of the document entitled "Strategic Directions for Libraries and Scholarly Information at the University of California".

LAUC-SF members participated in a discussion of the document, initiated by UL Karen Butter, last September. All members of the Library staff were invited to participate in that discussion. Every member of LAUC-SF was present, and there was representation from different levels of Library staff (e.g. managers, cataloguers, programmers, and others). This brought a variety of perspectives to the table.

Since the Library-wide discussion in the fall, LAUC-SF has discussed the document informally; the members didn't see the need for another formal, in-depth discussion, as they had already voiced their opinions and concerns at the earlier meeting. Moreover, LAUC-SF members are involved in (in some cases leading) Library efforts concerning the major issues in the document: shared services; collaboration; collection management and coordination; and scholarly communication.

Additionally, the UCSF Library is currently undergoing strategic planning on a local level, and LAUC-SF members have been involved in that process. Some of the concepts from the "Strategic Directions" document have informed local strategic planning efforts.

Points that emerged from the Library-wide meeting included:

- €€The importance of collaboration in system-wide efforts in collection management and scholarly communication;
- €€Continuing efforts to position the Library as an integral part of the UCSF campus;
- €€Scholarly Communication -- continuing local efforts to inform the UCSF faculty about scholarly communication issues and to work with them.

LAUC-SF members have been heavily involved in efforts and initiatives surrounding these issues.

A great deal of the discussion focused on changes in scholarly communication. In

the past year, UCSF Library staff, including several LAUC members, have strengthened efforts to work with the faculty. Three LAUC-SF members sit on the Library's Scholarly Communications Task Force, recently formed to approach these issues in a focused way.

In a discussion of the "Strategic Directions" document at a recent LAUC-SF meeting, some members expressed concern that the document does not address staffing or the role of librarians. UC Libraries will need to recruit, retain, and develop excellent staff and librarians in order to move forward in the directions laid out in the report.

**Lisa A. Mix
Chair, LAUC-SF
Manager, Archives and Special Collections
Library and Center for Knowledge Management
University of California, San Francisco
530 Parnassus Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94143-0840
tel: 415-514-3706
fax: 415-476-4653
email: lisa.mix@library.ucsf.edu**