



systemwide level and this should be noted in the letter. This effort includes UC and fifty other research institutions. Data on expenditure per student has been examined and UC is not providing much support per student although UC gets more for its money. The potential savings resulting from pooling services such as licensing needs to be explored. How decisions are made about priorities for individual campuses versus systemwide priorities needs to be determined. The University Librarians do make decisions that are in the best interest of all the campuses. Investment decisions that support the system are made collectively by the ULs and an individual campus also determines what it needs. As the budget reductions continue, it will become increasingly important for libraries to make decisions that avoid damaging the collective. A dependable flow of income is needed to ensure that the entire UC system is efficient.

There is a concern that UC will have to rely on interlibrary loan rather than having resources somewhere within the system. One library spends close to three quarters of a million dollars to support interlibrary loan operations. The cost of acquiring something that can be easily accessed by students and faculty versus what is spent on loans should be examined. Over centralization will not allow the libraries to address their unique interests. Undergraduates are increasingly borrowing materials because they are more involved in research. The impact of the funding streams proposal on the libraries has not been analyzed.

Chancellors and EVCs will need to work with the librarians on decisions about the libraries' budgets. If CDL is underfunded, each campus library will be underfunded because of the resources CDL provides. In addition to collections, CDL provides a host of other services that are not always obvious and it would be difficult to restore the services if they are cut. The letter should state that it is important to maintain the investment in services. CDL is currently funded by UCOP and under the funding streams proposal, the tax paid to UCOP would include funds for CDL. While UCOP may value CDL, hard budgetary decisions will need to be made. CDL's budget is the largest 19900 fund expenditure of Academic Affairs so it is a target. It is important to state that it is a co- investment strategy. The more funding UCOP provides the more the campuses will invest. There are increasing returns to scale in resources which benefit every campus.

The libraries' increased access to indirect cost recovery (ICR) is an important issue and there should be more transparency related to this. Other institutions are allowed higher indirect cost recovery rates. The ULs need to ask the Chancellors for an increased allocation of ICR funds. Reductions in library budgets will have a negative impact when ICR rates are negotiated. It is not clear if the libraries are part of the administrative expenses which are capped at 26%. An analysis of faculty productivity and the support provided to the libraries would be valuable. The campuses that bring in more research grants should receive more funding for their libraries. One problem is that NIH policies have allowed UC to spend funds on things like buildings instead of support for the libraries.

#### **V. Library Planning Task Force**

- *Larry Pitts, Provost and Executive Vice President*
- *Dan Greenstein, Vice Provost, Academic Planning, Programs and Coordination*

There is a question of whether the Library Planning Task Force recommendations are overdue or are being made as a result of the budget situation. There have been increasing costs over the past several years. UC will be at a new base in its funding after the proposed budget cuts with a budget of \$2.5 billion. Libraries are asked to do more now including things that are more complicated. If the current status is maintained, it will cost \$50 million per year for the libraries to continue doing the work they do. The Library Planning Task Force was established to consider the changes that can be made. UC has taken on some centralized functions which has worked well and the question is can more be done centrally. Decreased acquisitions could have a significant positive impact although this may not be a

preferred strategy. Shared library services need to be pursued. UC as a system does more than other institutions in terms of shared resources.

The task force suggested a variety of ideas including how space is used. More work will be done in terms of how the proposals could be implemented. One library has been asked to reduce its budget by 25%. Implementation will occur in three phases. Some recommendations would require start up costs that UCOP could get loans for as long as the projects will be able to pay UCOP back. The goal is \$14 million in savings in year one and \$25 million in year two, with the goal of saving approximately \$52 million by the end of year three. The Provost stated that UC cannot maintain business as usual going forward and there is a need to be more realistic with respect to what libraries can do. The goal is to preserve the quality of UC including the libraries.

**Discussion:** There are a number of initiatives that UCOP is exploring in order to reduce costs and increase efficiency. These include shared purchasing services across several campuses, eliminating the multiple payroll systems, combining efforts to recruit non-resident students, and rolling duplicated services into a centralized service. There have been similar efforts to reduce the costs of academic programs such as the Education Abroad Program and the UCDC program. A focus has been on strengthening programs and placing programs into more sustainable and efficient positions. A member noted it does not appear that eliminating duplicative programs is discussed. There are services that make sense to provide on a systemwide basis although some could be done by the campuses which would give them more flexibility in how funds are used. UCOP has taken significant steps to reduce costs. Loans may not be the best mechanism to solve the space issue. Any loans would be paid back by the campuses, not necessarily by the libraries.

The Task Force report will be reviewed by the EVCs and the campuses, and as the recommendations are implemented there should be consultation with UCOLASC. In September a group will be formed to determine how to implement recommendations in phase one with the goal of beginning implementation in January 2012. The budget may impact libraries before they are positioned to manage reductions or benefit from shared services. The Task Force was able to build on planning already conducted by the University Librarians. The draft report will formally be evaluated by SLASIAC. The report will be finalized in the fall.

UCOP will consider ways to provide systemwide services that save the campuses' money and the savings could be added to increase CDL's budget. There need to be safeguards to ensure that functions best located at the campuses remain there and the implementation planning will need to examine this issue. Shared services need to be prioritized annually and adjustments made as necessary. The decisions about cuts to library budgets will be made by the campuses, not UCOP. There will be an 18% reduction of the UCOP budget and the goal is to be selective about what is cut.

The current budget situation could be used as an opportunity to achieve broader objectives such as open access. UC can make the decision to invest in different things. Faculty retention of their copyrights could be promoted again. Libraries will continue to evolve and increasing efficiencies should be done regardless of the budget situation.

## **VI. Update on Library Initiatives**

There is a working group on next generation collection services for libraries which appointed three task groups that will make recommendations on how to maximize systemwide efforts to benefit the individual campuses. One is looking at improving the systemwide financial infrastructure, another with exploring enterprise level collection management services and the final group is looking at new modes for organizing and providing access to digital materials, archives and special collection materials. There were forty recommendations that were prioritized with the highest priority given to recommendations that are aligned with recommendations from the Library Planning Task Force. One example is that UC

could sign a systemwide agreement to acquire shelf ready services. A task force is looking at doing more digital library services. Digitizing high use materials can be done more systematically. Google has digitized more than UC could have afforded although special collection and non-text materials are not included in this effort. Campuses have put small digitization projects in place and this could be done more systematically.

Infrastructure to manage data has been put in place by CDL. This is an expensive undertaking that is done more economically at a central level. The University of California data center is a direct response to NSF's mandate for data management. A tool has been developed for faculty to create data management plans. Rationalizing the print collections has been a focus of the ULs for many years and this needs to continue. UC is a leader in respect to looking at print collections but other research universities are in a similar position. There is also work on rationalizing retrospective print journal collections. An archive of single copies of journals in different parts of the country is being considered.

**Discussion:** Budget reductions will result in eliminating staff and further reductions in collections. One campus will consolidate libraries and other campuses may reduce hours or close libraries. Librarians are in the unfortunate position of having to eliminate collections they have spent years building. The goal is to not reduce the amount of scholarly content. The libraries have an important role with respect to supporting research and instruction. An analysis of how few staff are required to keep libraries functioning is being conducted.

## **VII. Nature Publishing Group (continued)**

Chair Schneider gave the ULs an update on the negotiations with Nature Publishing Group. Currently UC has a month to month arrangement with NPG. The message to faculty should emphasize that publishers cannot continue to raise the cost of licenses instead of just focusing on the current budget crisis. **Discussion:** At this time, UCOLASC members should not discuss the negotiations with faculty at their campuses. Chair Schneider did encourage members to think about issues that might cause concern among faculty. When NPG and UC reach an agreement, the proposal will be presented to Council for consideration. The committee should generate a Frequently Asked Questions document which addresses concerns that faculty will have.

Measures of success also need to be identified by UCOLASC. Measures of success will be for individual faculty, the campus, and the CDL. The public relations work will be very important. It will also be critical for it to be clear that this is a faculty driven initiative. CDL will put together a document that provides the background that faculty will need. The goal is to reach an agreement with NPG in March.

## **VIII. Campus Reports**

**Davis:** The head librarian has retired, the search is on hold, and an acting library is in place. There was an attempt last year to shut down the physical sciences library which the local committee was able to stop until a study could be conducted. The task force studying this will also look at the future course of the general library system. A preliminary report has been issued. The cost of repurposing this library has not been analyzed. A blue ribbon panel on Information Technology Excellence will develop a vision for the library that is fully integrated into the campuses information technology infrastructure.

**Los Angeles:** The librarian is pleased with the renovation of the research library. It is not yet clear how budget cuts will be managed. The faculty was not informed in advance about consolidation of collections and the reduction of duplicate materials.

**Merced:** A library committee has finally been formed. The campus does not yet have a collection and this needs to be discussed by faculty and the libraries. Offers of donations have actually been rejected. There is a question of where libraries should invest in light of increased use of electronic materials and

decreased use of print.

**San Francisco:** One library has been closed and the materials were distributed to several different places. One library at the Mission Bay campus has been converted into a teaching lab. A new teaching and learning center has been created in the main library with funds from an Assembly bill. The renovation cost \$25 million.

**Santa Barbara:** The search committee for the director of the library has sent recommendations to the EVC. There will be a new building with classroom facilities. An effort to increase faculty awareness of the connection between the libraries and online materials faculty access will be made.

**Berkeley:** The campus moved to electronic submission of dissertations and theses and there is an embargo of one or two years. The representative suggested that there should be a systemwide policy on the embargo. Having no embargo is not always viable. Any systemwide policy might need to come from the Council of Vice Chancellors. The analyst will research this.

**San Diego:** The UL has distributed information about the initial cuts that will be made including plans to close several libraries. There will be an issue related to collections. Faculty have been asked for recommendations to manage additional cuts. Symbolic ways to publicize that libraries are not protected are needed.

**Riverside:** The library acquired the Western Water Resource Center archive and it will be accessible in April. A donation from Congressman George W. Brown's collection has been received and funds to organize are being raised by the Brown family. The campus is celebrating reaching three million volumes. The committee discussed concerns about the costs of textbooks which students at Riverside are not allowed to request through interlibrary loan.

**Santa Cruz:** The campus library committee has proposed adding scholarly communication to the committee's name and charge. The representative asked UCOLASC to describe the scope of scholarly communication discussed by their campus committees and if there is anything that should not be discussed. Access to and distribution of the scholarly work is the primary focus, and communication and publication at the class level could be included. The library budget is going to have a 15.5% cut and it is not clear how this will be absorbed. The library is categorized as an academic support unit and is heavily taxed and the local committee is arguing that the library is actually an academic unit to reduce the tax on it.

**LAUC:** The LAUC president sent out a letter regarding the university online instruction pilot and its effect on libraries. There has not been significant publicity about the online pilot and it may be too late for the libraries to evaluate the pilot. There are external initiatives like these that the library will be forced to fund which is a concern.

## **IX. New Business**

A Google representative will be invited to UCOLASC's final meeting to discuss what faculty want including avoiding commercialization and giving UC more control about how the digitized product looks. Director Anderson indicated that Google is working closely with publishers. Google could be asked about their plans for the academic market if the settlement agreement is not approved. If the settlement is approved there will be restrictions for how UC can use works under copyright. Google's competitors would not have had access to orphan books and the estimates of how many books are in this category is not clear. Google has digitized over two million books from UC collections. Although Dan Clancy is no longer primarily involved with the Google Books Project, he may still be interested in meeting with UC. Director Anderson will help draft questions to give to the Google representative before the meeting.

Meeting adjourned at: 4 p.m.  
Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams  
Attest: Richard Schneider