

# **COLLECTIVE Feedback on Pre-Assembly Questions on CoUL Systemwide Plans & Priorities 2013-2016 Document**

[http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/groups/files/coul/docs/UC\\_libraries\\_priorities\\_2013\\_final.pdf](http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/groups/files/coul/docs/UC_libraries_priorities_2013_final.pdf)

## **Question 3**

### **Summary of CoUL Goals 2013-2016 in document:**

1. Enrich systemwide library collection.
2. Capitalize on technological opportunities to accelerate transition to a primarily digital environment.
3. Maximize discovery of & access to information resources.
4. Optimize & repurpose physical library space.
5. Expand engagement in scholarly communication.
6. Build & leverage expertise.

### **3. Drawing on LAUC members' operational experience and perspectives, which of the priorities listed in the document are feasible/practical with UC's existing resources/staffing/expertise?**

### **Comments on what IS likely feasible:**

#### **Staffing, Library Workforce, and Professional Development/Skills**

- Build & leverage expertise.
- Goal #6 (*leverage expertise*): In Priority A, Item 4, there is room for internal training.
- We need Goal #6 (*leverage expertise*) and improved communication to make the rest work.
- Building and leveraging staff expertise: Contingent on putting serious money & time into staff development.
- Survey skills: Developing effective surveys that produce useful results (consider what skills are needed & if we lack them).

#### **Collections**

- Identify, gather, and preserve cultural & scholarly heritage materials.
- Continue to invest in development of WEST multistate-managed resources collective.
- Goal #4 (*repurpose physical space*): Maximize shelf spaces by removing journal runs duplicated on multiple campuses.
  - UCSD & UCD projects to downsize physical holdings without losing access to their contents are good models.
  - RLF is a big issue for the document's audience. ULs are trying to coordinate which campus keeps what material and where, to make best use of RLFs. Because each campus' decision on space impacts other campuses & RLFs, this goal/priority is only feasible thorough systemwide collaboration.
  - SLASIAC Library Planning TF document should be consulted on this issue. It provides framework for removing materials.

#### **Technology**

- Goal #2 (*technological opportunities*) needs to fix Melvyl problems.
- Cross-platform searching.
- Contribute to enhancements in Next Generation Melvyl.
- Better communication tools for accomplishing these goals.
- Better mobile apps, developed collaboratively across campuses, but personalized for local needs.
- Digital preservation (consider what skills are needed & if we lack them).
- Developer & systems experience (consider what skills are needed & if we lack them).
- Database management (consider what skills are needed & if we lack them).

#### **Reference & Instruction**

- Contribute to enhancements of “Ask a Librarian” service.
- Provide just-in-time assistance by developing and providing shared instructional materials & tools at network level.
- Create cohorts of instruction specialists for basic information literacy classes; bibliographers teach subject-specialized classes.
- Integrate computer-assisted information literacy classes into university curriculum as requirement.
- Understanding research methods & needs (consider what skills are needed & if we lack them).
- Strategic ways to teach: Conveying information effectively & engaging users (consider what skills are needed & if we lack them).
- Ability to develop, implement, and troubleshoot technology tools (consider what skills are needed & if we lack them).
- Familiarity with tools our users use, such as electronic health records & specialized software.

## Space

- Optimize/repurpose library space (important that librarians have input on this process).
- Goal #4 (*physical library space*) may come last after other priorities are achieved or acted on.

## Scholarly Communication

- Goal #5 (*scholarly communication*): Priority A is feasible to a certain point, i.e. “I can help a few faculty with this, but not 200”.
- Goal #5 (*scholarly communication*) works well with #1 (*systemwide library collection*), #2 (*technological opportunities*), and #3 (*discovery & access*).
- Assist & support faculty as they explore and use alternatives to traditional methods of scholarly publishing.

## Other

- Knowledge management (consider what skills are needed & if we lack them).
- Marketing strategies for library services & resources (consider what skills are needed & if we lack them).
- All are practical / feasible.
- Bring in experts to do (more) data curation.
- All are feasible given prioritization and leadership.
- Librarian Steele clarified that the priorities adopted are done so with an understanding of feasibility and costs.
- Elements of plan that seem feasible and practical are those that librarians are generally already doing.
- Data curation (consider what skills are needed & if we lack them).
- Data management (consider what skills are needed & if we lack them).

## Comments on what ISN'T likely feasible:

### Staffing, Library Workforce, and Professional Development/Skills

- Potential issue that might stall a systemwide initiative: If we were to move to systemwide positions, it might mean that one campus needs more people to do work at the designated campus for that project, but local campuses don't want to give up staffing levels. We will have to think as one university, but people still guard local resources.
- Current challenges to systemwide work: 1) Funding levels vary across campuses. 2) We aren't standardized across the campuses (websites, ILSs, process, etc.). 3) Sometimes work is based on a volunteer model, which isn't sustainable.

### Collections

- Maximize digital library service capacities.
- Priorities in section B of Goal #3 (*discovery & access*) likely not feasible.
- The following activity has stalled due to lack of top-down direction: Goal #3.A.1: Gather & revise existing resource-sharing policies across campuses to clarify which materials will be shared, under which terms & conditions.
- The following activities have stalled due to lack of top-down direction: Goal #4.A.1-4: 1. Transform collection development practices. 2. Maximize shelf space across campuses & at RLFs by implementing a shared print in

place program. 3. Manage print collections on systemwide basis to make maximum use of all available UC library facilities. 4. Reduce unnecessary duplication among UC library collections by decreasing, as appropriate, overlap in library materials in all formats, de-duplicating holdings of RLFs, and exploring other strategies.

## Technology

- Develop mobile services to provide information resources wherever UC faculty, students, and staff are.
- At current staffing levels, many priorities, particularly those for new technology-driven initiatives, don't seem feasible.
- The following activity has stalled due to lack of top-down direction: Goal #3.C.1: Explore potential next steps in systemwide collaborations to develop online learning objects.

## Other

- There will likely be variety among individuals & campuses regarding feasibility of individual priorities & goals. Sharing strengths among campuses will help fill gaps.
- Support new modes of research that are more data-driven.
- Maximize library processing efficiencies.
- Nothing identified as unfeasible, but some priorities may be more challenging than others.
- "Going digital" doesn't mean less work: It takes more time, expertise, and ongoing maintenance to develop information literacy modules, online courses, etc., especially if librarians are expected to continue with current responsibilities simultaneously.
- Librarian Steele clarified that the priorities adopted are done so with an understanding of feasibility and costs.
- All the systemwide collaborations in this document focus on front end of librarianship—collections, reference, instruction. Overlooks how we can collaborate on administrative overhead. Having fewer ULs & AULs might make it easier to make decisions across system, and make us more cohesive. Current administrative decision making structure isn't very agile. Document doesn't address how it will fix that.
- There is no systemwide group for people outside bibliographers. We're trying to restructure and create new positions across the system, with no support built in. How will it be planned and implemented?

## General comments on resources/staffing/expertise:

### Staffing, Library Workforce, and Professional Development/Skills

- Need a knowledge-transfer system (to retain knowledge from retiring/resigning librarians).
- LAUC should consider question of requiring MLIS degree for professional librarians and considering revisiting/updating [LAUC Position Paper 5, The Academic Librarian in the University of California](#).
- UC library staff are dedicated and work hard, but some realism needs to be applied to demands made on them.
- Concern stated that "leveraging expertise" implies acceptance of cost cutting measures, especially those which result in cutting staff.
- Centralization of services such as UC3 is beneficial. However, it is also important for campus librarians & staff to gain expertise with services offered through UC3 and other centralized services. If these skills are not more widespread at all campuses in the next few years, UC librarians will lose out.
- Providing an inventory of skills & expertise among librarians & staff (similar to the cataloging skills inventory) would be useful.
- Will need to hire more professionals with additional degrees/experience in computer technologies and/or scholarly disciplines, and to help transfer these additional skills to other librarians.

### CDL

- CDL is part of UC System, but is a service provider as opposed to an individual campus. Nevertheless, 50% or more of document is about CDL's projects. There's disconnect between CDL and individual librarians in terms of actively promoting and utilizing CDL products. Although some effort has been made on campus level, systemwide plans are needed to fill the gap.
  - Emphasis on CDL is partly because of document's intended audience.

- ULs are negotiating what projects CDL takes on, and what would be the relationship of the projects with campuses. ULs are aware of challenge to retain connection between CDL and campuses who implement CDL's products.
- With many things changing overtime, it is also challenging to keep focus on the projects that are approved in the past.
- No institution can overcome digital resources issues without some help from collaborative/cooperative activities like CDL. To survive, thrive, and embrace the changing environment, it makes sense to have many CDL projects in the document.
- Training and leveraging are important to make the presented priorities, especially those CDL-related projects, more feasible. Also need to consider how to deal with additional tasks from CDL with limited number of staff.
- In addition to feasibility, appropriateness of priorities should be addressed.
- More communication needed to integrate what CDL products offer into librarians' expertise.

## **Other**

- UC workshops on eScience, data curation, and such need to be widely publicized, not just sent to a selected, high level group. A central 'repository' of such workshops and trainings would be useful and could spark similar activities at a local campus.
- IT infrastructure vital to success of each of priority. Therefore, cuts to campus IT budget have profound impact on UCSC where IT services are centrally managed.
- Principal issue isn't resources/staffing/expertise, it's leadership to achieve systemwide priorities.
- In order to move forward with centralizing workload, there will need to be even more oversight and communication in creating "one UC" structure and greater standardization.
- Campuses aren't going to wait for systemwide initiatives. For example, online instruction is a hot topic right now. UCSD is working with Coursera. Another UC campus is using EdX.