July 18, 2011

Daniel Simmons  
Professor of Law Chair,  
UC Systemwide Academic Senate  
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor  
Oakland, CA 94607

Dear Dan:

RE: SYSTEMWIDE REVIEW OF THE LIBRARY PLANNING TASK FORCE REPORT

The above request was distributed to the Committee on Library and Scholarly Communications for review and comment; their detailed comments are attached. In summary, the Committee recommends the following:

1. Shared services across the campuses are critical to establish and this should be done as soon as possible, including a rapid move to electronic web sites and other electronic means by which the end user can download library materials, less paper storage (except for certain types of material, perhaps held at only 1 UC site), and improved ability to scan documents. Users will likely face some delays with these changes, but there is no way to avoid this in the current fiscal climate. Fees for services may be appropriate in some areas.

2. We believe that faculty would be willing to become engaged in this change process, but there is currently a lack of leadership on the campuses and systemwide in this regard.

3. New sources of revenues should be explored, but we should not count on this strategy alone.

4. Improving the existing framework for decision-making is needed. We need less duplication of effort across the UC system.

5. We are concerned about unequal access to library materials across the UC campuses (mentioned on page 7, at top and in note); creative ways of remedying this problem are needed.
6. We note that Figure 2 on p. 9 mentions Davis, Irvine, and San Diego in one bar graph, while the text says Davis, Irvine, and Riverside.

Sincerely yours,

Mary Gauvain
Professor of Psychology and Chair of the Riverside Division

CC: Martha Kendall Winnacker, Executive Director of the Academic Senate
Selyna Ehlers, Director of UCR Academic Senate office
June 17, 2011

TO: Mary Gauvain, Chair
    Academic Senate, Riverside Division

FROM: John Laursen, Chair
       Committee on Library and Scholarly Communications

RE: Systemwide review of task force on Library

The Committee on the Library and Scholarly Communications submits the following remarks concerning the task force report.

1. Shared services are absolutely the way to go. We should move rapidly towards electronic web sites that hold material from which the end user can download; less and less paper storage (except for certain types of material) perhaps at only 1 UC site (or better, several university sites in the U.S.); electronic dissemination in response to requests; improved ability to scan documents, etc. Users are going to have to face the reality of delays and less service, and plan ahead better. Fees for services may be appropriate in some areas and not others.

2. We think faculty would be willing to become engaged but there is a lack of leadership and clear focus regarding how the system needs to be changed. From the perspective of one field (entomology, for example), scientific journals that refuse to reduce publications costs and refuse to post articles rapidly for free and open worldwide access should be boycotted with progressive vigor - a nice way to start would be publication of costs and availability so PIs knew who to avoid and who to provide their product to (i.e. submitted articles). The same likely needs to be extended to books and other publication venues. Many scholarly disciplines will likely have their somewhat unique problems and concerns. But those who refuse to get on the train (open and inexpensive access) should be left behind.

3. Certainly new sources of revenues should be explored, but we should not count on this strategy helping us a great deal.

4. Improving the existing framework for decision-making is obviously needed and ties in logically with #1. We really need to continue to move towards less duplication of effort across the UC system (and possibly via sharing in with other universities). Just as we have relatively few departments in specialized areas across the UC system (e.g., only 2 departments of entomology, 1 each at Davis and UCR), perhaps libraries on different campuses could split up leadership on tasks regarding certain types of expertise / service.

We are also concerned about the provisions for unequal access across the UC's (mentioned on page 7, at top and in note). Perhaps some system for registering people at a campus that does not have access at a campus that does have access could be a creative way of remediying this problem.

We also note that Figure 2 on p. 9 mentions Davis, Irvine, and San Diego in one bar graph, while the text says Davis, Irvine, and Riverside.