

**Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication
May 2017 Report**

To: Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division

In the summer of 2016, approximately 80,000 titles (journal runs and monographs) were removed from the Science and Engineering (S&E) Library. The Senate passed a resolution responding to this event on November 8, 2016. In this report, the Committee on the Library and Scholarly Communication (COLASC) provides information about our activities this year that relate to this resolution and to the Science and Engineering Library more broadly.

Follow-up on November 8, 2016 Senate Resolution

The Senate resolution included three calls, two directed to the University Librarian and one to the Chancellor and CP/EVC. We report on what actions have been taken by administrators in response to those calls. In addition, COLASC has taken some actions in keeping with the spirit of the resolution and we report on those as well.

(1) Calls on the University Librarian to commit that such an action will not be repeated, and that the Academic Senate, Graduate Student Association, and Student Union Assembly will be adequately consulted and the faculty informed before making significant changes to the on-campus collections and archives of the University Library

During the November 18, 2016 Senate meeting, Librarian Cowell made a statement committing to a more effective consultation process in the future. To our knowledge, she has not made any public statements about avoiding large reductions to the print collections in the future. However, in multiple meetings she has assured COLASC that there are no plans for further large reductions in the print collections at the Science and Engineering Library, nor is there a plan for a large reduction in the print collections at McHenry Library. We believe that the spirit of the Senate resolution was to decry large-scale reductions in the print collections (especially with inadequate consultation), not to request that regular culling processes be suspended. However, in the face of the large reduction in the S&E print collections, it might be sensible to suspend culling those collections for a few years.

COLASC has had discussions with the University Librarian and with both associate university librarians concerning the consultation that occurred in May 2016. In our April 27, 2017 consultation with Interim CP/EVC Herbert Lee we also discussed this topic. All parties agree that consultation could be improved and will strive for that goal in the future. COLASC commits to enforcing the Senate's consultation policy, which closes committee agendas the first week of May. For any matters of substance, COLASC will also request that written supporting documents be distributed as part of the agenda to minimize the risk of miscommunication and to provide committee members time to carefully review the issues.

The original Senate consultation regarding the S&E Library collection reduction fell short in several regards. First, the consultation was requested very late in the year and past the Senate's typical cut-off date for consultations. Second, the description of the consultation topic referenced a pilot project related to de-duplication at the regional storage facilities, not de-duplication on the UCSC campus. Finally, no written materials were supplied to COLASC before or during the

consultation. COLASC provided multiple suggestions in response to the oral presentation (see the minutes from May 26, 2016¹), but given the timing and nature of the presentation, the consultation was impaired. If written supporting documents had been provided prior to our meeting in May 2016, we believe that COLASC would have been better able to ascertain the scope of the project and could have responded appropriately. In addition, we have been reminded that a high-level or abstract proposal that seems eminently reasonable when examined at that level can become decidedly less so after digging into the details. Going forward, COLASC is committed to requesting plans that are detailed enough to allow us to provide a more insightful analysis.

(2) Calls on the University Librarian to provide the faculty with a list of books removed from the Science Library, and take steps to reacquire (in print or online form) those books that the faculty consider extremely important

On January 27, 2017, the University Librarian provided the Senate a pdf list of books removed. We recently requested, and received, an excel version of that list, which allows for sorting, enhanced searching, and an accurate count of the number of titles. That list is available on the Senate webpage.²

Some Senators have asked whether some books could be pulled back from the Northern Regional Library Facility (NRLF) or Southern Regional Library Facility (SRLF) storage facilities. Contrary to COLASC's original understanding (as reported in the minutes from the May 26, 2016 meeting), none of the titles removed during the S&E project were sent to the regional storage facilities. Only some of the books removed have a copy in the NRLF or the SRLF; for those that do, the storage copies are owned by another campus. It is COLASC's understanding that it is against system-wide library policy for any books to be removed from the RLFs and sent back to a campus; a campus can't even ask for its own books back from the RLFs. Separately, there is no procedure for transferring books from one library to another. A system-wide policy change would need to happen before such requests could be granted. COLASC is willing to investigate what it would take to effect such a change; however, before doing so it would be helpful to know how much demand there is for such exploration. We suggest that interested faculty work together within your disciplines to examine the lists provided by the University Librarian and identify key texts (with copies currently in the NRLF or SRLF). COLASC can compile those lists, evaluate the scope, and then (if warranted) gather information about what steps could be taken to change policy.

The library is severely under-funded, compared to the other UC campuses and to our comparator universities. There are currently no funds set aside to reacquire the removed books. However, the library now operates under a demand-driven acquisition model³. Under this model, there are no longer collections librarians purchasing monographs to build the collections; all purchases are made only in response to requests from users. Therefore, if there are titles that are essential to

¹ The minutes may be viewed at <http://senate.ucsc.edu/committees/colasc-committee-on-library-and-scholarly-communication/colasc-minutes/2015-16-colasc-minutes/COLASC052616minutes.pdf>

² <http://senate.ucsc.edu/archives/Current%20Issues/Library%20Issues/Science%20and%20Engineering%20Library%20Consolidation%20Project/index.html>

³ The model may be viewed at <http://guides.library.ucsc.edu/generalcollections/DDA>

your current teaching or research that were removed from the collections, we suggest that you request that the library repurchase them. If you make any such requests, it would be helpful to COLASC if you would inform us (email COLASC analyst Le, kle11@ucsc.edu).

(3) Calls on the Chancellor and CPEVC to reaffirm the role of the University Library as a teaching and research library that is key to supporting faculty and student research as well as instruction.

During the November 18, 2016 Senate meeting, Chancellor Blumenthal made a general statement of support concerning the importance of the library to our academic mission (see draft March 8, 2017 minutes). COLASC consulted with Interim CP/EVC Lee during our 4/27/17 meeting and he made a general statement of support for the library. Interim CP/EVC Lee is also planning to discuss the library during his remarks at the Senate meeting on May 19, 2017.

We thank the Chancellor and Interim CP/EVC for these statements but note that an abstract statement of support is less reassuring than a more concrete commitment, one that acknowledges the importance of adequate funding and, ideally, dedicates more money to the library. Other than UC Merced (a campus that is still in its infancy), UCSC is the only eligible⁴ UC that is not a member of the Association of Research Libraries (ARL), mostly because the level of resources devoted to our library is not large enough for us to qualify⁵. Past COLASCs have generated plans for moving UCSC toward this goal, through gradually increasing the funding to the library, but none of these plans have been taken up by the administration. We invite the incoming CP/EVC to commit to supporting the library with funding that moves us closer to ARL membership and the associated research resources appropriate for a Research 1 university.

On-going Committee Business

Analysis of the S&E de-duplication project

Faculty concerns regarding de-duplication have focused both on the metrics used and overall availability of books that were removed. The following is a brief and preliminary analysis of the data shared by the University librarians (nb. the list of removed books is known to have some inaccuracies, so these analyses should be interpreted in that context). A total of 83,579 titles were removed. Of those, 17% are not owned by any UC library, while only 30% and 32% of titles have duplicates in the NRLF and SRLF respectively (by UC policy, there are no duplicates between the NRLF and SRLF). Of copies owned worldwide, 98% of de-duplicated titles have 21 or more copies available. On the one hand, there appears to be a high level of availability within the UC system (approximately 83%). Yet the number of titles that are not held by other UC institutions constitutes nearly 14,000 titles.

⁴ UCSF is not eligible because its Carnegie classification is “Special Focus Four Year: Medical Schools & Centers”; membership in the ARL is limited to doctoral universities with high or very high research activity.

⁵ ARL membership criteria include (a) similarity of parent institutions (e.g., Carnegie classification), (b) similarity of size (including volumes held, volumes added, current serial titles received, total library expenditures, total library material expenditures, number of professional plus support staff, and total salaries and wages of professional staff), and (c) “significant contributions to the distributed North American collection of research resources” (http://www.arl.org/storage/documents/publications/ARL_Membership_Procedures_Updated19Oct2016_NewBranding.pdf)

This brings up questions such as: If books are not available within the UC system, how does this impact accessibility? Is interlibrary loan (ILL) for those titles not held within the UC system possible? What is the difference in costs for UCSC to access (via ILL) books held worldwide in comparison to those owned by other UC institutions or held in the NRLF/SRLF facilities? How many of the books that are not easily accessible by ILL are available digitally?

We have heard anecdotally from some faculty about specific titles that were removed that are useful for current research and teaching. For example, a wide variety of undergraduate physics textbooks were removed, and the resulting on-site collection offers students a reduced variety in texts that cover topics germane to a number of introductory level physics classes. COLASC is interested in collecting any additional examples that faculty may be aware of (email COLASC analyst Le, kle11@ucsc.edu)

From COLASC's discussions with individual faculty, it appears that the changes that were made to the Science and Engineering Library during the de-duplication process may have affected both the research and instructional capabilities of faculty. A disciplinary analyses of the list of removed books could help COLASC to confirm or dismiss this assertion and we invite interested faculty to pursue such analyses and share them with COLASC.

We note that future plans for the S&E library also have the potential for impacts on the faculty. The need for faculty input at a meaningful level, whereby this input is sought in a broad, collaborative, and timely manner, goes beyond just the immediate needs of individual faculty. The new Science and Engineering Library is envisioned as a place of student education, learning, and interaction and it aims to provide adequate space and digital and core physical resources to facilitate this. Plans that are being drawn up for the new Science & Engineering Library will have major implications for how instruction and student learning is done at UCSC. As such, they may impact educational policy at UCSC for the foreseeable future. Shared governance means that it is essential for faculty to have a voice in shaping this future. This should be the province of not only COLASC, but it equally belongs within the purview of Academic Senate committees such as the Committee on Teaching, Committee on Educational Policy, and Committee on Faculty Welfare, as well as the Senate Faculty as a whole. COLASC urges the Library and the senior University Administration to seek such wide-ranging consultation with the Academic Senate throughout this process. Widespread distribution of any documents related to proposed renovations of the S&E Library would be a fine first start.

Faculty Survey

COLASC is working to design a survey for faculty, with a planned administration in fall 2017. Our goals are to build on the 2014 survey (see the minutes from April 28, 2016⁶), in part by asking directly about issues that were frequently mentioned in the open-ended responses to that survey. We want to amplify the voice of the faculty in providing input about services and resources that they are currently utilizing in teaching, research, and service, and services and resources that are not currently available but are desired. We also hope to gain some information about faculty priorities in the face of constrained financial resources. Example questions include the utilization of certain existing services and the potential utilization of services that could be

⁶ The minutes may be viewed at <http://senate.ucsc.edu/committees/colasc-committee-on-library-and-scolarly-communication/colasc-minutes/2015-16-colasc-minutes/COLASC042816minutes.pdf>

(re)introduced, such as book delivery to faculty campus mailboxes. Potentially, the survey might also gauge faculty attitudes toward moving to “fee for service” models for some services. At the same time, the survey will try to inform faculty of the financial tradeoffs involved in certain decisions, especially when reality is rather counterintuitive, (e.g., in many cases, the cost of two interlibrary loans will roughly cover the cost of purchasing the book). We hope that all faculty will respond to the survey when it is distributed.

Conclusion

The Library deserves praise for providing as many services and resources as possible in the face of extreme under-funding. Our praise extends to librarians and staff in all areas and at all levels, who in our experience are, to a person, working with diligence, patience, and ingenuity to provide the best service possible to all library users. The library as an institution is part of a changing landscape of how students and scholars access information. Libraries across the country are reducing their print volumes in favor of electronic copies and there are concomitant changes in space utilization toward study and collaboration space. We appreciate that our librarians, too, must actively look toward the future and think creatively about a vision for academic libraries in the 21st century.

At the same time, we believe that faculty, students, and staff must have a strong voice in creating that vision. Therefore, COLASC wishes to stress in the strongest possible terms the importance of broad, meaningful, and timely consultation about library issues: with the Senate, with student government organizations, and with the entire population of faculty, staff, and students. The library is central to our core missions of research and teaching; changes to library services and resources have the potential to critically impact our research and learning capabilities. For that reason, Senate consultation, in particular, must be robust if we are to honor the principle of shared governance. Such consultation fell short in this case, leaving many faculty and students feeling blindsided by the S&E Library events. We call on senior administration, including the interim and incoming CP/EVCs, to champion transparency and shared governance for all future library decisions (including any plans for a renovated Science & Engineering Library) and to remember that the library is not just another building, it is the lifeblood of our academic mission.

Respectfully submitted;

COMMITTEE ON LIBRARY AND SCHOLARLY COMMUNICATION

Dimitris Achlioptas

Chelsea Blackmore

Michael Cowan

Jennifer Horne

Karen Ottemann

Graeme Smith

Elizabeth Cowell, *ex officio*

Eileen Zurbriggen, Chair

May 8, 2017