COMMITTEE ON LIBRARY AND SCHOLARLY COMMUNICATION
Annual Report 2016-17

To: Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division

The Committee on the Library and Scholarly Communication (COLASC) is charged with advising the campus administration on local and systemwide library and scholarly communication policies. Scholarly communication is the modality by which research and creative work are made public, including publishing, technology, archiving, and copyright. The committee also advises on the administration of campus libraries and on matters concerning acquisition and management policies for collections. The committee meets biweekly to support this charge and to better understand and learn about the challenges [and opportunities] facing our libraries.

Science and Engineering Library
In the summer of 2016, approximately 80,000 titles (journal runs and monographs) were removed from the Science and Engineering (S&E) Library. A considerable amount of the committee’s time this year was spent responding to this event and discussing ways in which COLASC, the Academic Senate, and individual faculty might have a stronger voice in contributing to a vision for the future of the Science and Engineering Library.

Senate Resolution
During its November 8, 2016 meeting, the Senate passed a resolution responding to the removal of titles from the Science and Engineering Library. Members reviewed and reported\(^1\) to the Academic Senate on May 16, 2017 on the Library’s response and the aftermath of the resolution as appropriate to the committee’s purview. Please see enclosed COLASC report to the Academic Senate.

Consultations with University Librarian Cowell, Associate University Librarian, Collections & Services Scott, and Interim CP/EVC Lee
In order to better understand the administration’s thinking about the Science and Engineering Library, the committee consulted with Associate University Librarian Kerry Scott on November 10, 2016 and with Interim CP/EVC Herbie Lee on April 27, 2017. In the consultation with AUL Scott, the committee discussed the decision-making that led to the removal of titles and the processes that were used to determine which titles to remove. Because a complete list of titles removed was unavailable, the committee advocated that such a list be reconstructed, with as much accuracy as possible. In his consultation, CP/EVC Lee discussed national trends for libraries and how these might be incorporated into a vision for UCSC’s S&E library (see also CP/EVC Lee’s January 24, 2017 Tuesday Newsday article: A Reimagined Science and Engineering Library\(^2\)). The committee raised questions about the consultative process and expressed strong support for an improved shared governance process going forward.

Review of S&E Library Business Case Analysis

\(^1\) COLASC Report to Academic Senate re Science & Engineering Library Resolution – May 2017

\(^2\) Article may be viewed at https://news.ucsc.edu/2017/01/keynote-library.html
The committee reviewed the Science and Engineering Library Business Case Analysis (BCA) in Executive Session during its meeting on April 27, 2017. This report had previously been reviewed by the Advisory Committee on Campus Planning and Stewardship and approved by Chancellor Blumenthal. In our response, we discussed the unique nature of the library as compared to other single-use buildings on campus and advocated for a design and visioning process that involves all appropriate committees of the Senate (including, in addition to COLASC: CEP, COT, COR, CPB, CAAD, CER, CFW, CIT, CIE, and CPE) and the campus community more broadly. The BCA made a strong argument concerning the facilities challenges that must be addressed in a Science and Engineering Library renovation. However, the planned renovations go beyond merely providing additional study space and upgrading facilities; the renovations encompass a vision for the function of the library. The floor plans provided in the BCA suggest a vision that differs quite a bit from the current vision, yet the bulk of the BCA focused on different timetables for implementing this vision, rather than an argument for why this is the best vision for the campus at this time. The committee agrees that a new vision may well be warranted given the changing landscape for scholarly information in the 21st century. However, the campus community should be integrally involved in developing this vision. The committee does not have the authority to release the BCA itself but we strongly urge the CP/EVC to do so as soon as possible. We believe it is important to share this document openly in order to contribute to transparency and rebuild trust.

Review of Brightspot Consulting Report
The Library received a donation to commission the services of the higher education consulting firm Brightspot Strategy to analyze strategies to advance the success of undergraduate students in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) fields and suggest how the library and planned renovations might contribute to those efforts. The committee reviewed the Brightspot report and the accompanying interview data to learn more about students’ needs for library space, resources, and functions. Student “pain points” identified in the report included: not knowing where to find support, not feeling a part of the community, having no room for error in taking courses to progress in their major, and perceiving a lack of value in their degrees. Unfortunately, the report provided relatively little new information, in part because the number of students interviewed was small and the interviewees were not representative of the broad diversity of STEM majors. However, the report might be useful for communicating with potential donors.

Summary and Future Directions
There was a consensus among members that consultation with COLASC and the faculty more broadly concerning the removal of books from the S&E Library in 2016 was not sufficient, with resultant damage to the principle of shared governance. The committee is deeply concerned that plans for a renovated S&E Library are being developed without adequate input from and decision-making by the campus community. As detailed in our response to the S&E Library BCA, decision-making without adequate involvement of faculty and the Academic Senate creates a risk of further violations of shared governance. The committee recommends that a Task Force concerning the future of the Science and Engineering library be formed, to begin in fall
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2017. The task force should: (a) consist of faculty, staff, and students (graduate and undergraduate), (b) be highly visible (to include the Senate Chair and CP/EVC), (c) be clearly balanced between the different constituencies, and (d) have a limited purview, focused on the planned changes to infrastructure and services (unlike COLASC which has a broader charge that also includes diverse issues related to scholarly communication). The chair of COLASC, or another member, should be part of the task force. This task force can debate issues and issue a report. It is our belief that such a task force would enable honest, frank, and productive conversations about budget trade-offs and fund-raising imperatives that seem to underlie much of the decision making that has already happened with regard to the S&E library.

COLASC Faculty Survey
In 2014, the library conducted a faculty survey using modules from the company Ithaka S+R. In 2015-16 COLASC reviewed the results of that survey. It provided a wealth of information but was focused mostly on specific issues such as copyright and library management of faculty/researcher data sets. A review of the open-ended portions of the survey raised questions about faculty needs and values and the committee decided to conduct a Senate survey to learn more about faculty priorities. This year, the chair visited several departments (Film and Digital Media; Music; and Molecular, Cell, and Developmental Biology) in order to better understand some of the issues facing faculty in different disciplines. In addition, the committee consulted with Anna Sher (Assistant Director of Institutional Research, Assessment, and Policy Studies) and the Library’s Head of Assessment Greg Careaga to design the survey. For the most efficient use of faculty time and to maximize response rates, this survey will be administered in combination with a survey from COT. We encourage all Senate faculty to participate in the survey. COLASC members anticipate collaborating with Librarian Cowell to identify possible changes to better support faculty’s research and teaching needs based on the survey results.

Open Access 2020 Initiative (OA2020) and UC Pay It Forward Project
The Open Access 2020 initiative (OA2020.org) is an international initiative that aims to accelerate the transition to an open access publishing system from the current subscription system. This initiative invites universities and other stakeholders to publically make a commitment to principles of open access scholarship and to shifting the publishing model for scholarly journals from one that is subscription-based (libraries or individuals must buy a subscription to the journal or pay for individual articles in order to be able to read them) to a model that allows open access for everyone to all published articles (“Gold” open access). Open access fits well with scholars’ desires to share knowledge widely but there are challenges that must be faced in determining the best alternative business model. In Europe, most higher education institutions are public entities; therefore, their governments endorse and subsidize the open access publishing model. The situation is different for universities in the United States because there are unlikely to be any direct government subsidies for an open access publishing model.
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The UC “Pay It Forward” project was a large-scale study to review the institutional costs of moving to a Gold open access system, assuming a business model in which authors pay article processing charges (APCs) to publishers for each accepted manuscript. The Pay It Forward study was conducted in collaboration with Harvard University, the Ohio State University, and the University of British Columbia and received support from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation. The final report was released on June 30, 2016. The results of this project suggested a model in which each UC campus library would provide faculty a set amount (e.g., $1,500) per article to apply toward the APC to publish that article. This amount would ensure that the author would have the funds to pay the APC for at least one journal in their field. If the author wanted to publish in a journal with a more expensive APC, the difference in funds might come from an internal or external research grant, an institutional research fund (one not drawn from the library’s budget), or some other source (e.g., the faculty member’s own start-up, unrestricted research, or personal funds). The assumption is that faculty will be able to influence the price that publishers set for APCs. If taken up by the administration, the model proposed in the Pay It Forward report could have profound impacts on faculty who publish in journals. The committee agreed that many of these impacts lie outside the charge of COLASC and were, therefore, beyond our ability to adequately review. Our recommendation is that the report be reviewed by all relevant Senate committees, perhaps including: CAP, CFW, COR, CPB, GC, CEP, CAF, CAAD, and CER. The committee sent a memo to the Senate Chair requesting that she evaluate the advisability of a broader review of the report.

Scholarly Communication Statement and Access to Government Data

In the wake of U.S. federal government decisions to remove data (e.g., concerning climate change) from government agency websites, members discussed drafting a scholarly communication statement to indicate their support of continued access to these data sets and to the importance of open access to data more generally. A sub-committee researched the issue and after further discussion, the committee decided not to write its own statement, but voted to affirm the statement issued by the University of California, Office of Scholarly Communication and UC Libraries (Statement on Commitment to Free and Open Information, Scholarship, and Knowledge Exchange).

The University of California Curation Center (UC3), has developed a Data Mirror project to ensure that Federal research data continue to be available for retrieval and reuse, now and in the future. The Data Mirror website states: “The Data Mirror is a complete, and routinely updated, copy of the main Federal government research data portal. The Data Mirror points back to the ‘datasets of record’ on Federal agency websites for routine access. However, should these access paths become interrupted or inaccessible, Data Mirror also includes pointers to the UC3-managed copies, as well as additional registered replicas hosted by other institutions. Providing

7 The Pay It Forward project website may be viewed at http://icis.ucdavis.edu/?page_id=286
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11 The Data Mirror project website may be viewed at http://uc3.cdlib.org/data-mirror/
12 The data portal may be accessed at http://www.data.gov
alternative search and retrieval opportunities helps to ensure that these important data will remain available for study and use in perpetuity.”

**Letter to Faculty**
To facilitate communication about issues related to the library and scholarly communication, the 2015-16 COLASC wrote a letter summarizing the most relevant resources and issues, especially information that the committee felt might not be well disseminated currently. This letter was sent to Senate faculty on December 2, 2016 and posted on COLASC’s web page.

**Consultations**
*Consultation on Changes to Off Campus Access to Library’s e-Resources*
There are two methods for off-campus access of library electronic resources: the campus virtual private network (VPN) and the OCA proxy. In response to an increasing number of security breaches through the off campus access proxy, the Library considered modifications to access via this method. Beginning in fall 2017, users may log in to the off-campus OCA proxy using their gold password. On March 16, 2017, COLASC consulted on this issue and helped identify subsets of users (e.g., visiting scholars) who might need and be entitled to off-campus access but might not currently have a gold password.

*Consultation on the Redesign of the Library’s Website*
On April 13, 2017, the committee provided feedback on the Library’s planned redesign of its website, including search options and the design and layout of a landing page for faculty. The committee expressed the willingness to provide further feedback on the redesign, as needed.

*Consultation on 2017 Graduate Student Survey*
The committee consulted with Anna Sher (Assistant Director of Institutional Research, Assessment, and Policy Studies) concerning the 2017 graduate student survey. The committee reviewed the portions of the 2015 survey that were related to the library and suggested additions and changes for the 2017 survey. We look forward to reviewing the results of the 2017 graduate survey and consulting with the University Librarian about any possible changes to services or resources that might be suggested by the survey results.

**Review of Policy Changes and Official Correspondence**
*Review of Draft Revised Presidential Policy on Electronic Information Security*
The committee reviewed the draft of the revised Presidential Policy on Electronic Information Security (IS-3) on May 25, 2017. The committee noted the importance of responding aggressively and intelligently to the increasing risk of hacks and security breaches and is grateful for the work that went into developing this policy. However, the scope of the policy was unclear. The committee’s interpretation of the policy is that it is an effort to create infrastructure for electronic information security, without mandating how information will be tiered and categorized within that security infrastructure. The committee noted that if our interpretation is incorrect, there are concerns with the policy. COLASC believes that decisions about the classification of data into security tiers should remain with the Academic Senate and individual researchers, as has historically been the case. Faculty are best positioned to weigh and balance
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the needs for privacy with those for open access, and professional associations give researchers ethical codes that aid them in making those decisions. Additionally, the committee had questions about whether the policy would necessitate background checks for most or all faculty and graduate student researchers.

**Carry-Over for Academic Year 2017-18**

*Demand-Driven Acquisition Model for Collections*

The committee will review a report from Associate University Librarian Kerry Scott about the Library’s demand-driven acquisition (DDA) model in early Fall 2017. Of particular interest are: the difference in costs between the new (demand-driven) and old models, whether requested books are purchased, whether purchased books are checked out, how many requested books are used for teaching (i.e., put on reserve for courses), and how many DDA requests are for books that were removed from the Science and Engineering library in 2016.

*Library Funds for New Faculty FTEs*

Members plan to review the recently implemented (January 2016) library start-up policy that includes a combination of one-time funds and permanent augmentations to the collections budget for each new central faculty FTE allocated to the divisions.

*Open Access 2020*

The committee will consider reviewing both the Pay it Forward report and the OA2020 statement to decide whether to recommend that UCSC become a signatory to the OA2020 Initiative.
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August 31, 2017
COMMITTEE ON THE 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 Minutes from May 26, 2016), 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: Lists related to recent Science & Engineering Library consolidation project.
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 model. 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 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), UCSF is the only eligible1 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 qualify2. 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

1 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.
2 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)
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.

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 Minutes from April 28, 2016), 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 (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 underfunding. 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 blind-sided 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 life blood of our academic mission.
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May 10, 2017
Re: COLASC Review of the Science & Engineering Library Business Case Analysis

Dear Elizabeth,

The Committee on the Library and Scholarly Communication (COLASC) reviewed the Science & Engineering (S&E) Library Business Case Analysis (BCA) in Executive Session during our meeting on 4/27/17. The renovation of the S&E library represents an exciting opportunity and a major investment by the University. Thus, we appreciated the opportunity to review this document. While it is unclear whether the BCA was intended to address campus stakeholders, our reading of it raised many questions both about the consultative process in which plans for capital projects are developed on our campus and about the specific vision for the S&E library represented in the BCA. The committee believes it is extremely important that the BCA be released to the full campus community, and we urge the CP/EVC to do so as soon as possible. In addition, we strongly recommend that additional details about the administration’s vision for the S&E library be provided. These recommendations and further feedback are detailed below.

**Proposed Vision and Future of the Library**

The BCA makes a strong argument concerning the facilities challenges (e.g., mechanical, electrical, plumbing) that must be addressed in this 25-year-old building. The need for modern technological infrastructure is clear. The increased spatial demands are also clear, in that the number of students at UCSC has nearly doubled since the S&E library was built. However, the planned renovations go beyond merely providing additional study space and upgrading facilities; the renovations encompass a vision for the function of the library. The floor plans suggest a vision that differs quite a bit from the current vision, yet the bulk of the BCA focuses on different timetables for implementing this vision, rather than an argument for why this is the best vision for the campus at this time.

We would like to see such an argument, and we additionally recommend that the description of the vision be more explicit and detailed. For example, the BCA states that there is a “need for flexible, innovative spaces that support project-based, collaborative, and interactive learning” and advocates for “the emerging role of digital scholarship” (p. 4). How much demand is there on campus for this type of teaching or learning and these types of spaces? What does digital scholarship mean in the sciences and in engineering, and what is the demand for resources related to this type of scholarship? To what extent are these ideas driven by external vendor offerings or donor interests?

Some additional questions include the following. We would like to know the definition of terms such as “spatial flexibility” (p. 2) and “richly supported informal learning environments” (p. 4). What are examples of the “innovative information technologies” (p. 9) that an enhanced information commons would provide? What does it mean for processes of teaching and learning to have “high visibility” (p. 9) and why is this necessary or desirable? The BCA describes “an imperative to rebalance the space devoted to collections and the space devoted to users and services” (p. 4). In the wake of the removal of so many volumes from the S&E library in the summer of 2016, we seek clarification of this statement. Has this rebalancing now been accomplished? Or is further conversion of square footage from stacks to user study space planned?

There are several elements of the BCA that lead us to seek this clarification. The schematics show an area devoted to collections that comprises only a very small fraction of the Lower Level, smaller than the current situation. We have been told that this should not be interpreted literally (i.e., one can’t determine the number of bookshelves planned by counting the icons on the diagram) but the space devoted to stacks in the schematic is clearly smaller than the current amount of space devoted to stacks on that floor. In addition, a version of the schematic shared with COLASC in Fall 2016 gave seat counts for each floor. The total number of seats was 1836, which aligns closely with the number of...
seats envisioned in this BCA (1700, according to the goal on p. 9). Table 3 shows the number of bound volumes and associated square footage increasing over time (from 389,149 volumes and 31,132 sq. ft. on 6/30/13 to 405,418 volumes and 32,434 sq. ft. in 2013/14 to 568,108 volumes and 45,449 sq. ft. in 23/24), but the amount of square footage devoted to users is also shown as increasing. Both cannot happen, of course, which is why the square footage projected for 2023-24 shows a deficit of 40,783 square feet. Has the full deficit been eliminated through the recent removal of volumes? We are unable to assess this question because we do not know how many square feet were freed up through the 2016 action. If the full projected deficit has not been eliminated, how does the administration plan to deal with this problem?

In concurrence with the Senate resolution passed on November 18, 2016, we are currently opposed to any further large-scale reduction of the physical collections in the S&E library. We are worried by the goal to “efficiently manage the physical core collection” (p. 9) because efficiency (while a laudable goal in the abstract) is sometimes used as bureaucratic code for slashing positions or resources. Would it not be more accurate to use phrases like “responsible curation” or “responsible custodianship” (and, ideally, include definitions of these terms)?

One very important request is that more details be provided concerning the proposed funding sources for the BCA plan. The figures in the small boxes on the floor schematics suggest that the plan will cost an estimated $59 to $95 million if the final phase is completed by 2024. The plan implies that this funding will need to be raised from non-State sources. If so, we would welcome learning more about the specific fund-raising strategies (and possible target sources) that have a reasonable chance of eventually generating such a large amount.

Consultation Process
Although it might be standard practice for a Senate committee to review the business case analysis for a capital improvement project after it has already been approved by the Chancellor, we believe that such a process is inadequate for projects that involve the libraries. A library is unlike almost any other single-use building on a campus because it is used (potentially) by every member of the university. Moreover, the library (both as a physical space and as a set of operations based on its contents and staff) is vital to the success of our core missions of research and teaching. Therefore, in planning a new vision for the library it is essential that the entire campus community be involved and that this involvement go beyond mere consultation to include an actual role in decision-making.

Because decisions about library functions and physical space have implications for educational policy and research we believe it is a threat to shared governance if the Senate is not a partner in making these decisions. Senate consultation in this case should go beyond COLASC. Especially if the administration envisions the library as a space for diverse teaching and learning activities, both CEP and COT must be involved in the planning. Otherwise, choices about pedagogical practices may be limited and constrained by the physical plant decisions made prior to thorough consultation. Such an approach would threaten shared governance principles in which the Senate has plenary authority over decisions about educational policy and pedagogical practice. Because decisions about collections impact faculty research activities, COR should be involved in this review. Graduate students are key users of library services, so Graduate Council should also be involved. The larger planning and budgetary issues make it essential to include CPB in any consultations. Other committees that might wish to consult include CAAD, CER, CFW, CIT, CIE, and CPE.

In addition to much broader consultation with the Senate, other campus constituencies should be actively involved in decision making about the future of the S&E library. In particular, undergraduate and graduate students are major stakeholders. We therefore recommend wide outreach to students and close consultation with the Student Union Assembly (SUA) and the Graduate Student Association (GSA) to ensure that the physical facility meets the needs of both undergraduate and graduate students.

In order to ensure the Senate’s involvement in the planning process going forward, we request that the administration provide a detailed list of the next steps that will be taken, so that the Senate can best ascertain when and how to contribute to the planning. We are especially interested in knowing how concrete is the administration’s current vision for the S&E library and how committed to that vision they are. Is the floor plan in the BCA merely some rough sketches that were prepared as one possibility among many? Or is it the graphical representation of decisions about the future of the library that the administration has already made? We hope that there is still time for the Senate and other constituencies to make contributions to the vision for the S&E library.
Thank you again for the opportunity to review the BCA. We look forward to continuing to contribute to discussions about plans for the future of the S&E library.

Sincerely,

Eileen Zurbriggen
Chair
Committee on the Library & Scholarly Communication

c: Chancellor Blumenthal
CP/EVC Tromp
Divisional Deans
Senate Chair Einarsdóttir
Senate Executive Committee
Director Mednick
Dear colleagues,

The Committee on the Library and Scholarly Communication (COLASC) writes to share information that might be helpful to you. Please feel free to contact the committee with any comments or suggestions.

**Digital Scholarship Commons**
The new Digital Scholarship Commons opened last year on the ground floor of McHenry Library. It has eight new workstations with high end hardware and software that can support mapping, data visualization, and digitization of research materials. As a hub for digital scholarship on campus, the new Commons is also designed to be a first point of contact for creating digital course assignments or imagining a digital research project. Staff is available for consultation and you can reserve the new space for workshops or class sessions that encourage hands on learning for students.

**Library Support for Teaching**
The Library offers faculty a variety of teaching support services to help students develop the information literacy and data management skills they need to fulfill research assignments. In 2013, the Library began to support lower-division instruction exclusively with online tools supported by the Undergraduate Experience Team. You can work with your library divisional team to develop customized course guides, database tutorials, and other tools. For upper-division courses, in-person library instruction may be available on a case-by-case basis. Research assignment consultation is also available.

**Demand-driven acquisition**
The library has implemented a demand-drive acquisition model for purchasing books and monographs. This contrasts with an earlier model in which library acquisition specialists placed orders for books in various subject areas. The collections will now grow only in response to specific requests by library users (undergraduate and graduate students, faculty, and staff). Accordingly, individual faculty will need to make purchase requests related to the subjects you teach, in order to ensure that books necessary to support your students are on hand. You can do this by triggering purchases in Cruzcat or filling out the request form for books. Please note that decisions about journal subscriptions are made differently and are not following a demand-driven model at this time. Recommendations for new journal purchases can be submitted to the library divisional teams.

**Open Access and eScholarship**
The UC Academic Senate approved a system-wide open access policy on July 24, 2013. The goal of the policy is to ensure free public access to research articles authored by UC faculty. Faculty are requested to deposit author’s copies of their work in UC’s open access repository eScholarship, in other open access venues (such as PubMed) or in open access journals. The author’s copy is the final, accepted copy (typically in word format), not the page proofs or the final formatted version published by the journal. Last year, the UCSC Open Access Policy Team began sending emails to update faculty on their recent publications identified by the automated harvester to review for inclusion. Faculty can modify harvester settings to improve accuracy. Library staff are available to speak at department meetings to discuss the details of using eScholarship. [Open Access Information]

**Science Library**
To support student success in the STEM fields, the Library is raising funds for a large-scale renovation in collaboration with PBSci, Engineering, Student Success and other relevant partners. This past summer, the library removed materials from the Science & Engineering library that had not been checked out or re-shelved in the past five years. The immediate impetus for this project was the need to create additional
study seating for the large incoming class of undergraduate students; however, the project also supported
the library’s goals of maintaining working, rather than archival, collections of materials on campus and
creating collaborative learning space.

The number of books removed was more extensive than COLASC had anticipated. In addition, outreach
to science and engineering faculty was not successful in communicating the specifics of the plan for
culling the collection. On November 18, 2016, the Academic Senate approved a resolution that
condemned the dramatic reduction of the print collection, called for a commitment that such an action
would not be repeated, and asked the Chancellor and CP/EVC to reaffirm the role of the University
Library as a teaching and research library that is key to supporting faculty research as well as instruction.
COLASC is working with the University Librarian to supply the list of items that were removed and to
improve the consultation process for the future.

Contact
For questions or requests regarding research or teaching, the first point of contact is the library team for
your division:
- Arts and Humanities Team - artshumanities@library.ucsc.edu
- Science & Engineering Team - sciengineering@library.ucsc.edu
- Social Sciences Team - socsci@library.ucsc.edu

Other useful contacts include:
- Undergraduate Experience Team – Greg Careaga, uet-group@ucsc.edu
- Digital Scholarship - Rachel Debling, rdebling@ucsc.edu
- Special Collections and SantaCruziana - Elisabeth Remak-Honnef, remak@ucsc.edu

Please feel free to contact the committee with any comments or suggestions.

Sincerely,

/s/

Eileen Zurbriggren, Chair
Committee on Library & Scholarly Communication