

***Library 21C:
Notes on New Directions for the University Library***

**LAUC University of California, Davis
Professional Issues Committee
Edited by David Michalski, Chair.**

This portfolio contains working documents and information concerning the transformation and improvement of the University Library at the University of California, Davis. This University Library 21C folder is a place to work out ideas that may be of use to decision makers. The documents are put forth in the effort to raise the status of the University Library to the level of research and education conducted at UC Davis.

Contents:

The New University Library / 2

New Trends in Reference Service / 4

Common Misconceptions about University Libraries and Librarians / 12

University Librarians at Research Institutions Today: An Informal Gallery / 13

Feedback: On the UC Libraries' Collection Development Committee's Content for the 21st Century and Beyond / 15

A Perspective on Restructuring Elements of the Library's Budget / 18

Ideas for Restructuring Library Personnel / 21

Goals and Visions / 24

The New University Library

Questions from LAUC-D Professional Issues
Chair 2009-10 David Michalski
michalski@ucdavis.edu
11-12-2009

Recent writing on the 21st Library has focused on the distribution of the research library's goals and values across society. Basic familiarity with database searching is widespread and technological advances have now allowed research to be conducted anywhere. Some have taken these achievements to mean libraries are becoming obsolete. Yet, research libraries still play a crucial role in the educational and research mission of the University. As we continue to construct a positive vision of the twenty-first century, one that best supports the University's mission. The questions below are intended as discussion topics for decision-makers, as well as library personnel in all areas, including access and reference services, collection development, technical services, instruction and administration. The Library is positioned to mobilize our shared institution values for the challenges to come.

--

How do the library's tools, resources and people best serves the University's educational mission?

The library has a central role in develop critical thinking, creativity, analytical ability. It instills intellectual independence and confidence, and in doing so, prepares students for lifelong learning.

The library encourages a global perspective and develops broad intellectual and cultural awareness through an active engagement with information. The library educates students about the various cultures of inquiry. It exposes students to controversy, disciplinary differences, and publications written for different audiences and purposes.

The library teaches the evaluation of these different forms of communication. It also teaches the way knowledge is created, distributed, and organized, in different historic periods. The library helps its users consult, evaluate and apply the most appropriate resources, regardless of format, document type, or genre.

--

How do the library's tools, collections and people support the university's research mission?

The library provides its users with widest access to the world's scholarly information, enabling the university the competitive edge world class access to information can offer.

The library contributes to the collection and documentation of specialized knowledge, and in doing so, allows for the possibilities of new discoveries and connections.

The library supports interdisciplinary research and innovative scholarship by providing people and tools aid that enable both the effective evaluation of information and the effective translation of these values between different disciplinary perspectives.

New Trends in Reference Service

David Michalski

Humanities, Social Sciences and Government Information Services Manager.

Peter J. Shields Library
100 Northwest Quad,
University of California
Davis, CA 95616
michalski@ucdavis.edu
July 8, 2010

The Qualitative Place of the Reference Desk Today

Even as we reach and serve more and more patrons remotely through new forms of tele-presence, the properly equipped and staffed Reference Desk remains an important part of both the 21st Century library and university. It not only serves as the symbolic center for our activities, it continues as the physical embodiment our mission to the campus. It is, of course, not our only point of contact. The Reference Desk is a site in a wider network of reference interactions made through both static and interactive online tools, virtual meetings and face-to-face meetings in offices and in class instruction, as well as in other public forums. Yet the Reference Desk, by virtue of its very immobility and permanence, is a central hinge between the library and its users. It serves as the anchor and dispatch center for all our flexible and mobile initiatives. It is our office and our laboratory, an open and public node where we can engage the climate of our researchers and the hub from which we embark in service of the university's educational and research missions. Both history and current events show space and materiality are still important in the construct of our social world, in fact, no less so in today's fast and liquid information environment. Ultimately, we occupy this space so that we are accountable to our public.

Spatially, the Reference Desk serves as an invitation to our users. It shows that we are employed in their interest. In my experience at Peter J. Shields Library at the University of California, Davis, I find patrons approaching the Reference Desk on which I serve for many reasons, for orientation, for resource discovery, and for conversations about the distribution and context of information. Situated at the center of campus, our Reference Desk is often busy. Every quarter, I meet new faculty and researchers, help new students with old problems and new assignments, and meet continuing students who have progressed from the academic novice to the intellectually engaged scholar. It is a mutually rewarding and challenging space from which to serve the campus and community.

New powerful tools and burgeoning resources in print and online have allowed the information environment to flourish. New possibilities, truly await today's scholars, but these advances also make the information landscape increasingly complex. In this environment, the Reference Desk is used increasingly to ameliorate the confusion encountered online. The opportunity to speak directly with the librarian offers patrons a clear and direct communication of their needs and their challenges. The Reference Desk provides the much needed space and time to listen and provide information and advice in a relatively unmediated way. Time and again I've seen the reference desk, staffed by knowledgeable people turn frustrated users back into hopeful researchers.

Undoubtedly, this commitment to our users contains costs, and its value is, like most knowledge, difficult to account, but beside counting the papers saved, insights sparked, or careers changed because of the fruitful interplay between librarians and researchers, the Reference Desk must also be recognized as a place to communicate our ethical responsibility to our users.

The rapport created there not only translates into future good will towards the library and university, but better research skills for the patron. Even when the patron approaches the desk to ask for known items or to access sets of pre-conceived information, the contact with the librarian often leads to new, more complex, questions, and sometimes, new research endeavors. New questions develop and new ways to organize projects take form, because reference is a more than a place of questions and answers. It is a space of translation, interpretation, and knowledge formation.

Face-to-face researcher-librarian interaction allows researchers to engage in embodied conversations in concert with the information world. Researchers can walk through their search results with the librarian as an interpretive guide or docent. It is a form of interaction that benefits both the researcher and the library as an institution. In the anthropological terms, it is a rich site for the transfer of cultures and skills. The librarian uses this interaction to impart search techniques, and convey the peculiarities of a discourse's publication and distribution. Pertinent information about the scope and coverage of available resources is also taught, all with a consciousness of, and reciprocity to the researcher's disposition. With an eye and ear to the situation at hand, to the patron's level of skill, the signs and postures of time and attention allow for in-situ adjustments. Communication strategy can be altered by assessing the value and comprehension of communication and instruction imparted. Information is not simply dispensed at the Reference Desk, but communicated in a humane manner. In the best circumstances, knowledge about the fuller social life of information can be discussed. The librarian can work to put the researcher's project in context with the wider intellectual environment. The new perspective built through conversations can lead to new paths of discovery.

Being there, being present, helps the library work in concert with faculty and students. In our large and complex Universities, perhaps uniquely, the librarian at the Reference

Desk is there to listen, to put a face in front of the machine. We perform as information consultants and counselors and the Reference Desk becomes the safe place for such communication. It is a confidential place away from the judgment of professors, a place to inquire, explore, learn and grow. It is where we teach novices not to be intimidated by the languages of scholarship. It is where we hear problems, and in the best cases, where we offer solutions and build confidence.

The librarian at the Reference Desk is also uniquely positioned to convey the institution's message and mission. She or he wears the University's public face, offering the best attributes of what is too often dismissed as mere customer service. In the University today we must strengthen our engagement with the public. This node is where the library as an institution can best learn from the populations it serves. It is a prime and unfiltered information gathering point for the library in its efforts to remain relevant to the University. Each conversation there informs collection development decisions, instructional needs, and outreach methods. The librarian on the Reference Desk records the core concerns and trends of our faculty and students. As such, the Reference Desk is generative of library and librarian expertise. It enables us as an institution to react, adjust, and think. A librarian confronted with the assignments and research projects learns the challenges of the engaged student or advanced scholar, and develops creative problem solving techniques as well as information that can be used to enhance the library and better support the University's mission.

The Reference desk is only one node in the overall provision of reference services, but it is unique in its extensibility, flexibility, and power. It creates conversations that build sustained relationships under the partnership of mutual inquiry and concern for the information experience. It is also the place where our commitment to our public is judged. And rightfully so, for if we can not be bothered to engage the public here, what faith will the public have in us across the screen?

From General Reference to Subject Specialty

Libraries and librarians have made great strides over the years to simplify access to resources by promoting to the general public good practices in the use and construction of databases and search engines. The society we serve has changed too. Information navigation skills are widely held, acquired by children at an early age, and mastered by adults who are compelled to learn the latest technologies to conduct the business of their everyday lives. Large databases are omnipresent and following inter-text citations is routine. More than ever, our social lives and social networks are influenced by our management and manipulation of digital social networks. Most new university students are no longer unfamiliar with things like Boolean searching, tags, faceted browsing, or the once arcane structures of databases. Great 'world-cataloging' initiatives like,

WorldCat, Google, and Youtube, are no longer sublime. They are the commonplace, practical and personal instruments of an expansive cognitive world.

These transformations have important implications for reference service. One positive effect of the diminished aura associated with database technology has been to liberate the librarian from some aspects of repetitive general instruction. The orientation work on the basic operation of information technology is less necessary. Rather than explaining how to construct search strings or how to combine or filter result lists with subject headings/tags or other limits, more attention can be paid to information literacy, on teaching patrons how to analyze and evaluate the content of search results, and to deciphering their relation within the topic of inquiry. Thanks to the popularity of database experience, time spent on teaching 'how to search', can now be devoted to teaching patrons 'how best to search' in respect to the particular research project at hand.

To be sure, reference communication still requires both general and specialized knowledge. General skills are not universally mastered. In fact, the populations we serve are diverse, both culturally and in terms of research experience. With popular information skills more widely distributed, however, it has been somewhat easier to teach people how to interact with our search tools, how to expand and contract results and how to discovery unforeseen links to like-documents. The emerging popular familiarity with relational databases makes it easier for patrons to transition from one interface to another. With such general skills in place, I can now concentrate on showing patrons how to trace a document's authority, provenance, and how one might uncover future citations or link to common vocabulary terms in related datasets. I still meet many patrons who are new to both academic research and complex database searching, but even in such meetings, these patrons increasingly demand both advice on how to use information technological and advice about the intellectual content of their results. The more difficult part for the reference librarian at a university has always been to situate the patron in the social life of information.

Even as general librarianship is made easier by the popularity of library/database skills, this later challenge has been made more difficult by the kind of tools emerging today. Many of the vast fulltext aggregator databases shield the scope of their contents from their users. Others offer seemingly arbitrary sets of documents based on publishers or unseen publisher agreements. The coherent subject orientated index and abstracting tool takes on new importance in such an environment, but even many of these have become unwieldy. Today the reference librarian needs to have a handle on the discourse, and better, a foot in the intellectual world she or he is charged to serve. Knowledge of a subject's own language or jargon, its intra-disciplinary fragmentation, the distribution and repudiation of its publishers is increasingly necessary. The librarian must position the research question within the diverse cultures of inquiry that make up today's university. If in years past, the librarian had concerned her or his self the

mastery of information science alone, the interrelation of information content with information structures no longer makes such an approach viable. Librarians are now often enlisted in the construction of literature reviews.

Today's researcher, undergraduate or professor, must confront vast displays of initial search results and from these make crucial decisions. The flatness of their representation lends the results the illusion of exchangeability and makes their use values harder to decipher. In this environment the subject grounded librarian is called upon to guide and interpret results, to provide context and relief in the horizontal displays of equivalency. For the advanced researcher or inquisitive undergraduate, the subject specialist librarian can serve as a cross disciplinary translator, one who can help lead the researcher who endeavors to enter new areas of exploration. The subject specialist/bibliographer, trained both formally and through ongoing collection development work, can make connections between schools, publishers, and intellectual movements. Librarians are often called upon to orient researchers in rapidly hybridizing fields of study.

The undergraduate especially benefits from this contextualization. After meeting with subject specialists, and walking the contours of their topic of inquiry, after situating their question within their field of study, and then situating their field within the larger information landscape, the student can engage their projects from firmer ground. She or he can then return with more thoughtful, intellectually informed questions and a better understanding of the history of ideas, the value of citations, and a more cogent understanding of the social organization of knowledge and how it relates to her or his project. In other words, the subject librarian can facilitate the progressive intellectual development of the student by helping the student to avoid repeating the same entry level queries.

Today's researchers want to speak with people who understand their complex language, projects and ideas. They like to meet with people who know the general authors, theories, tenets, and controversies which occupy them. This not only gives them the confidence that the library is acting as a powerful partner in their own mission. It allows them to interconnect to wider or related discourses.

To maximize quality reference service the Librarian needs to work in partnership with teaching faculty. She or he must have a familiarity with the work of the professors, an understanding of what their assignments are designed to teach, and how the class project fits into the course's wider disciplinary context. By reiterating course teachings in the context of the information environment a practical knowledge of information is fostered.

The rise in programs and departments on our campuses combined with the level of staffing currently supported by our budgets makes an ideal symmetry between subject

expertise and academic programs impossible to obtain. At the University of California at Davis, I am responsible to no less than ten programs across the Humanities and Social Sciences. I can not master the knowledge of all these areas, and the idea that I am a specialist in all of them diminishes the authority such a status ought to convey. Yet, to these programs, and to the work of the professors and students in them, I remain devoted, doing the best I can, based on the research, training, and reading I do to perform as a knowledgeable guide to the available resources and literatures. I know my colleagues across the University do the same. But there is no doubt, the need for subject specialty is growing just as our resources are being reduced.

In our challenging times, however, we ought not coil back from this responsibility, and concern ourselves only with generalities of research. Instead we need to restructure the library so that it becomes more effective at meeting this growing need. Posturing as if all information were of equal value, as if libraries were only responsible for the management of interchangeable info-widgets is to distort the complexity of the information landscape today. Instead, we must work at finding the best ways to teach and promote the contextual value of information, and do our best to support the practices and policies which add knowledge based assistance to the research process.

On Ubiquitous Instruction

Unlike our counterparts in the bookstores, corporate libraries and even some public libraries, education is central to our mission in the research university. The social promise of the university is to improve the society that supports it by making its members more knowledgeable, more inventive, more skilled, and wiser. As librarians we have a unique role in this mission. Our instruction differs from that of the lecturer or professor. Our teaching is at its core dialogical. Our pedagogy is based on a certain art of conversation.

There is no shortage of studies in the library literature on the “reference interview” or “reference transaction” as it is often called. The reference process has been meticulously analyzed by information scientists and planners who seek to break it into bits in the effort to locate the kernel, or coin of value passed from the librarian to the patron. The interview, however, is not like a vending machine. The student cannot simply pay for information and walk away. Our practice is better understood as a diagnostic one, one that assesses both the interpersonal and social context of each project, and leads to decisions, which attempt to enable not only access, but the incrementally improved ability of the patron to take possession of library as a tool and field in their quest to reorganize information as knowledge.

Librarians, who imagine their role reduced to the mechanics of information delivery, are often left with a sense of purposelessness. A symptom of this lack arises in the current

anxiety about the future. It surfaces in a discourse that depicts a contemporary competition between the librarian and the machine. Such questions about the future, dismiss the historic impact librarians and scholars have had on information technology since the profession began. Librarians have had prominent roles working to marshal the efficiencies of technology in the service of our core values. Today, we must reaffirm these efforts by translating our values and pedagogic mission into the info-space of the digital environment, not positioning our values against the digital realm. In part, this means imbuing our machines with the conversational and dialogic skills nurtured by our human practice. We ought to ask: How can people leaving library interaction (whether online or in person) be better prepared to discover and understand the information environment? How can our tools, websites and our people, not only provide easy access to known documents, but teach discovery techniques and the diverse ways in which information is organized? As heuristic devices, how can our tools train better researchers? It is no more appropriate for a search engine or catalog to simply churn out singular responses to a question than it is for a reference librarian to act simply as a medium for the exchange of information. Our exchanges must be value-added. Our catalogs and search tools must facilitate the construction of better formed questions and more sophisticated thinking. It is not an easy task to develop such tools and sites, and it is made even more difficult by a growing gap between search tool designers and librarians, but it is our professional charge and it is worth the effort.

One alarming consequence of treating our tools as simply location devices is the impact this outlook has on our own service roles. When the digital reference experience is diminished to a mechanical transaction, our own interviewing, listening and questioning skills tend to atrophy. Without use ours skills can be forgotten, and as I mentioned in a previous post, our disconnection can make us lose track of our public. With so many databases marketed as automatic, simple and direct we can be tempted to forgo the hard work education demands. We can forget that even our most powerful tools for indexing information are inadequate surrogates for teaching the social life of information. In exchange for expediency and mass capacity they can treat Works as the inert products of remote labor, as objects detached from authors and readers alike, as removed from cause or argument. We ought not to replicate this disregard.

Undoubtedly, the disintermediation of the information world has positively transformed the way knowledge is distributed and produced. Information seekers have more direct access to information providers and the mundane middling tasks of the librarian have largely evaporated. The trend towards disintermediation, however, does not dissipate the mediation of the intellect, which takes form in the course of learning. Technological immediacy does not substitute for the work of critical thinking. In the best instances it may support it, but in the worst instances it can disguise its necessity.

One of the foremost roles of the reference librarian has always been to persuade the patron to think out-loud, to state and restate, to read and question, and to read, write

and return with a deeper understanding. Unnecessary difficulties and formalities can not be tolerated, but where information is complex, it can not be represented as falsely simple. Instead, we ought to help our students acquire the skills appropriate to the challenges their projects face. At each stage, helping them see a little bit more by encouraging a deeper engagement with their topics.

Even when patrons come in demanding immediate results, my colleagues and I have discovered creative ways to widen their bibliographic imagination. I've met thousands of students over the years and no one approach can be applied uniformly. Not one reference conversation is the same as the next. Each takes on its own shape. Sometimes I am unsuccessful in my application of, what I like to call, ubiquitous non-invasive reference instruction. Some students cannot be bothered, sometime I become impatient, but with each encounter I try to improve. I try to learn more about the public I serve, and find better ways of providing the unique service reference librarians at a research university can provide. These include new ways of fostering critical thinking, information literacy, and new ways of expanding the potential of our collections.

By practicing and honing our unique form of pedagogy, in formal library classes, in the design of our online tools, and in our everyday interactions with our public we can renew our sense of purpose and positively support the educational mission of our university.

Common Misconceptions about University Libraries and Librarians

Students are so computer savvy that they don't need librarians to teach them how to use library databases.

This idea, which is common in the library world (where it is sometimes known as disintermediation) is equivalent to saying that students can read so they don't need professors to teach them anything. In order to use the library you need to understand the sociology and cognitive structure of academic literature. Knowing how to shop online has nothing to do with knowing how to conduct research.

The library is in competition with Google

From a reference librarian's perspective, Google is a useful tool, one among hundreds of digital tools and thousands of hard copy tools. Each one has its particular strengths. Google does many things well and others poorly or not at all. We use it when it is appropriate; but it is not competition, and not a "threat."

It's all online

This statement is actually true in some fields but absolutely untrue in others. Medicine is perhaps the discipline that has most fully converted to digital publication of research. Many other disciplines rely heavily on monographs (which are still more efficient and "better" from a library perspective on paper than they are online). In other disciplines, a majority of the key journals are still published in hard copy only without digital equivalents.

You're smart, you can do it

While a librarians degree is in some sense a general one, librarians develop considerable subject or other relevant expertise, often, but not exclusively by earning advanced degrees in academic disciplines. It is essential that the library nurture subject expertise to provide the best quality reference and research service, instruction and collection building. It follows that it is imperative to replace experts when they leave or retire.

Online materials are cheaper than hard copy equivalents

Sometimes this is true, sometimes not. In every case, there are ongoing technological costs associated with digital resources that must be balanced against the maintenance costs associated with hard copy collections.

University Librarians at Research Institutions Today: An Informal Gallery

The following are all currently serving as library directors at major research institutions whose libraries are all members of the Association of Research Libraries (ARL). The parent institutions themselves are all members of the Association of American Universities (AAU) comprised of 62 leading research universities in the United States and Canada. Membership in the AAU marks entry into the inner circle of Ph.D. granting institutions in the two above-named countries; and at the same time reflects a major international presence.

The privileges and benefits of inclusion in the AAU are legion, but membership also comes with clearly-articulated responsibilities—one of which is a regularly-demonstrated ongoing commitment to the broad range of library and information services required to support the academic mission of the members. The responsibility nicely captured by Philip G. Altbach: “Adequate facilities for academic work are essential—the most advanced and creative research and the most innovative teaching rely on access to appropriate libraries and laboratories, as well as to the Internet and other electronic resources.” Philip G. Altbach, “The Costs and Benefits of World-Class Universities” *Academe Online* 90, 1 (January-February 2004) <http://aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/academe/2004/JF/>. Last accessed 3 December, 2009. Notably, Altbach considers libraries to be of a piece with laboratories, and stresses that access to electronic resources is not by itself sufficient to support the curricular and research programs of AAU institutions.

The following brief listing makes no claim to represent any particular type of director; instead, it is a completely subjective selection of a few examples of research library directors from AAU institutions who exemplify, in somewhat different ways, Altbach’s sense of the responsibilities of research libraries. Some are leading scholars from specialized academic fields who have been tapped to direct university libraries at time of seemingly permanent fiscal crisis. Others have come up entirely through the professional ranks of librarianship, have proven records as able administrators and contributors to library associations and the professional literature. Those in a third group combine advanced academic training and active interest in a specialized field, hold subject doctorates in these, as well as professional degrees and long experience as practitioners.

The purpose of the list is to provide a starting point for thinking about the next University Librarian at UC Davis. Now that Marilyn Sharrow has formally announced her retirement, effective March 31, 2010, and our campus administrators have indicated their intent to continue our current interim arrangement of shared directorship, it is time to move decisively in this direction. We would need to do this under almost any circumstances, but the need for advance preparation is especially urgent in a time of

prolonged economic recession. This is not time to sit around and wait and see what happens.

Nancy L. Baker, University of Iowa
<http://www.lib.uiowa.edu/admin/baker/index.html>

Paul Courant, University of Michigan
<http://www.lib.umich.edu/users/pnc>

Deborah Jakubs, Duke
<http://library.duke.edu/about/depts/administration/university-librarian.html>

Anne R. Kenney, Cornell
<http://www.library.cornell.edu/sites/default/files/ARK3-cv.pdf>

Tom Leonhard, UC Berkeley
<http://www.lib.berkeley.edu/give/bene57/leonard.html>

Alice Prochaska, Yale University.
<http://www.library.yale.edu/about/librarian/index.html>

Karin Wittenborg, University of Virginia
Interview with Karin Wittenborg.
<http://www.degreetutor.com/library/librarians-online/karin-wittenborg>

Feedback:

On the UC Libraries' Collection Development Committee's Content for the 21st Century and Beyond.

March 22, 2010

David Michalski,

Social, Behavioral, and Cultural Studies Librarian

University Library, University of California, Davis

michalski@ucdavis.edu

See report:

Collection Development Committee's Content for the 21st Century and Beyond

http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/cdc/uc_collection_concept_paper_endorsed_ULs_2009.08.13.pdf

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this position paper. There are a number of positive ideas expressed here which deserve emphasis. In the first section headed "Definition," the positive recognition of the strength "derived from the diverse nature of the individual campus library collections" is especially cogent, as is the desire on the part of planners and developers to leverage this strength in order to better serve our campus constituencies. The synergy of the UC libraries, acting both collectively and autonomously, has made the system stronger over the years, stronger than any monolithically centralized entity could be. The question before us 21C bibliographers and library administrators is how to balance the positive effects of our collective energy and diversity.

As we re-focus our efforts to capitalize on the extent and scope of our collections, we must develop a system-wide view of collections that enhances, rather than obstructs our campuses in their efforts to respond to local needs. Empowering embedded librarians with the flexibility to cater to campus patrons and programs allows us to better leverage our resources and increase our collection diversity. The UC bibliographer today not only interfaces with authors and publishers, she or he participates in reference, instruction, and outreach. In meeting with faculty and students on a daily basis, she or he is engaged in subject specific knowledge communities the UC libraries are charged to support. In this position, bibliographers are uniquely situated to accommodate the local, while curating world-wide library resources. InterLibrary Loan, YBP's GobiTween feature, and social networking through our bibliographer groups has enabled us to work together in new and efficient ways. In our communications, we learn how much we have in common, but also how different the unique and innovative scholarship is on our different campuses.

Acting together, the UC libraries have had great success. We have been able to exert a force on the publishing market, to shape licenses, and reduce costs through our cooperation. At times, however, the big deal has diminished efforts to serve our constituencies. Centralized planning, or the view from 30,000 feet, in its remoteness and abstraction from both content and user concerns, scholarly practices and programmatic needs, has made us unnecessarily rigid in our efforts to prepare our libraries for the future.

New technologies can help create nimbleness, but they do not do so automatically. We must use our collective voice to demand that the publishing industry and its technologies to respond to the needs of the campuses, rather than forcing scholars to contort their research practices to the expediencies of the market. We must use our knowledge of the diverse cultures of inquiry practiced in research libraries today to guide the best designed information environment of tomorrow.

Our experience with electronic journal packages has illustrated some of the dangers of allowing publishers to set the terms of use or limit the conditions of discovery. As we move to other electronic formats we have the opportunity to build on what we have learned. As the report contends, the maintenance of a world-class UC Library Collection is an increasingly challenging in the digital environment. It requires agreements that are both financially sustainable and technologically flexible. It requires not only the integration of print and digital collections, but the ability to see across publisher portals. This position paper is also visionary in its extension of the scope of UC collection development. It acknowledges that library collections are increasingly born digital, and commits to developing systems to select and preserve electronic only content. As we move forward with this commitment, it is important that UC Libraries prepare financially and systemically for the ongoing management and long-term stewardship of the necessary material. This includes developing metrics that account for the real costs of digital access. The 21C library cannot rely solely on “cable” models of access, wherein we pay for information today, but forgo the rights and benefits of stable ownership when cyclical budget downturns “turn off” the broadcast.

In one section of the position paper, its authors state provocatively that “the new scholarly content includes blogs, research data, and a range of materials that will require curatorial engagement...” This interesting position requires further development. While blogs and new data sources are undoubtedly important primary source material, they will not substitute for the need to collect peer-reviewed resources. In a similar vein, the paper assumes that physical collections and research environments are diminished by emergent online projects. It is more likely that a hybrid library will exist for many years to come, and that different scholarly publishing and research communities will demand that the University remain flexible in its acquisition. The best research libraries of the 21C will prepare for the combination of formats and research practices. The diversity of scholarly practices employed by different disciplines

requires this, just as we continuously seek to develop the heuristic and interpretive tools and skills that allows for new innovative interdisciplinary work.

As we seek to positively shape the digital collection environment to come, we must also critically assess the amenities of print resources developed over centuries. The digital world has much to learn from their openness to boutique-selection, their browsability, the way they can be interlibrary-loaned, their sustainability, their readability. The 21C library must ask: How can the best aspects of print be merged with the best qualities the digital library? The UC Libraries then must actively contribute to the positive shape of this eBook environment. Along the way, however, we must also prepare to continue to support our current users and their current needs. Duplication of books may seem unnecessary and wasteful from the remote perspective but on our large campuses high use items require duplication. The important question opened by this paper is: How do we limit unnecessary duplication, and implement smart or strategic duplication? A book in hand is always more valuable than an unused and unwanted eBook.

Finally, this paper also reminds us of the increased necessity for bibliographers to partner with campus faculty and researchers, and the need for subject and format specialists to work even more collaboratively and be supported with more training opportunities. Support in this direction can help us make the next evolutionary steps toward building a more cohesive UC Library Collection.

A Perspective on Restructuring Elements of the Library's Budget.

This document is divided into two principal sections:

Context and History and *Collections Budget Restructuring Proposal*.

Context and History

The library's budget is divided into three principal sections: Personnel, Collections, Operations and Expenses. This overall budget has been essentially static since the early 1990s, despite escalating costs in each of the three areas. The library's strategy has been to prioritize collections and protect that sector of the budget as much as possible at the expense of the others. That long term practice has introduced some distortions in the budget. Specifically,

- For many years the collections budget has been supplemented with money saved by keeping as many FTEs vacant as possible. This practice was referred to in the 2008 ORMP report as the "collections subsidy." Relative to other UCs we have been significantly and chronically understaffed.
- In the recent economic crisis, the library has softened the blow to the collections budget by making unsustainable cuts to other areas, in particular the conservation and preservation budget (the money used to fix and replace damaged books and journals). Additionally there is no longer any money for the purchase of new computer equipment for staff or public use. As machines break or become obsolete, there is no capacity to replace them.
- For a variety of reasons, purchasing of materials on paper is more flexible than purchasing electronic media. The ease with which the library can purchase or decide not to purchase had copy materials has resulted in a steady transfer of money to fund digital commitments at a level that is proportionally greater (in some areas) than is justified by current state of academic publishing.
- Uncertainty as to the budget, specifically the existence or not of "one-time" money in any given year has led to an erratic pattern of discretionary purchasing (those items selected by the librarians). Money formally budgeted for such purchasing is held in reserve until it is clear that it won't be needed to meet multi-year contracts. The result is a famine or feast pattern of acquisitions that creates a variety of staffing and collection-building problems.
- Collections Background:
 1. The library has, in a sense, lived beyond its means for many years, supporting the collections at the expense of other elements of the library, and relying on "one-time" money for major ongoing expenses. The single largest collections bill, the Elsevier Journal Package, has not been included in the normal budget, but has been paid for out of such "one-time" money (i.e. the funds made available through keeping FTEs unfilled).

2. Most, if not all of that money will no longer be available.
 3. The cost of acquiring scholarly publications in whatever form always; we have several multi-year contracts with built-in cost increases.
 4. Thus, even a stable collections budget implies a significant reduction in purchasing power.
- Collections Philosophy:
Library acquisitions has always been about bringing in (or providing access to) a selection of the most fundamental and relevant scholarly and popular publications. A well-built collection covers the range of relevant subject areas, selecting areas of specialization in which it builds more deeply over time. A good library collection does not and should not seek to collect everything.

Academic and significant popular publications appear in a number of forms. Books, journals, magazines and newspapers may all appear in hard-copy or digital formats. Films are generally acquired in the current dominant format (DVDs at the moment.) A well-built library collection should purchase in all of these areas.

From a collecting perspective, the format acquired is less important than its content. However the economics of scholarly publication mean that very different rules apply to the acquisition of materials on paper or in digital format.

Collections Budget Restructuring Proposal: (*The Special Collections Department in the library necessarily operates differently from other types of Collection Development. This proposal does should not be understood as being directly applicable to Special Collections.)

Overview

The collections budget must be restructured such that it can provide the campus with the most appropriate balance of materials in good budget years and bad.

- Establish proportions of the collection budget for each broad area (*e.g.* Physical Sciences, Social Sciences, Arts). Because publication patterns vary within each area (some rely more heavily on journals than books, some are publishing more heavily than others in digital rather than hard copy formats) the experts in each area should determine how their budget should be divided among the different types of publications, media, and acquisitions models. Furthermore, specific amounts should be budgeted for discretionary purchases at the level of specific disciplines (*e.g.* ecology, sociology, French literature) in those fields where publishing models make such discretionary purchasing relevant and necessary.

Specific Issues in Restructuring the Collections Budget:

Online Resources:

We acquire online resources either as an individual campus or through systemwide purchases managed by CDL (the California Digital Library). Too often, CDL's interests do not closely enough match those of the needs and realities of this campus. We must determine what proportion of our budget should go to CDL commitments and not go beyond that. Currently, we are funding such commitments at the expense of other key areas of our collections.

The library must reconsider the nature of the contracts it signs. The two main relevant areas are one-time vs annual costs and numbers of simultaneous users. In the past, the library, and especially CDL has always preferred where possible to pay large one-time costs and reduce annual fees and to maximize the number of simultaneous users. While this is often appropriate, it may not always be the case.

- An expensive, highly specialized data set may be essential for a faculty member's current project, but of no other campus relevance. Rather than purchasing the data set up front and paying annual access fees indefinitely, it might be more desirable to subscribe to the database for a fixed number of years and then be done with it.
- Our major electronic journals packages provide for simultaneous access to every single article in each package by every single member of the campus community 24 hours a day. Obviously, this is more than we need.
- The tendency with electronic journal packages (as well as other types of electronic products) is toward size. The dominant model is that the best packages include the largest numbers of journals at the least cost/title. As a result the library acquires many titles of low quality and/or little campus interest. Even if the cost/title goes up the library should negotiate more selective packages that more nearly meet the campus's real needs.

Monographic Purchasing:

There are two principal types of monographic purchasing. Approval plans and firm ordering. An approval plan is based on a profile of interests the library has drawn up with a book vendor, or jobber. The vendor then selects books that match the profile and sends them to the library automatically. These books are heavily discounted, and there are costs associated with rejecting them. Firm ordering is done on a title-by-title basis by librarians with subject expertise, knowledge of the collection and the teaching and research interests of the campus. Once specific budget allocations are made, the approval plans should be revised.

- An approval plan essentially surrenders to a book vendor the decision of what goes into our library. The interests of vendors do not coincide with ours. It requires constant attention on the part of subject librarians to block efforts by the vendors to send the library unwanted material. Efficiencies and cost savings achieved through expansive approval plans may therefore be more apparent than real.

Ideas for Restructuring Library Personnel.

Personnel terms:

Library Administrator: Consists of people in three different job titles; the Librarian Series, the Assistant and Associate University Librarian Series and the University Librarian. The University Librarian is a senate title; the other two are non-senate, academic titles. Those individuals in the Librarian Series are not represented by a union. Educational requirements the same as a Librarian (see below)

Librarian: A non-senate, academic appointee in the Librarian Series. A member of the Academic Federation and is represented by the University Council – American Federation of Teachers (UC-AFT). Meets the American Library Association (ALA) educational requirement of a master's degree (vocational) from an ALA accredited institution. Many librarians have advanced academic degrees in addition to their required vocational degree.

Library Staff: Consists of staff appointments in 5 levels, (Library Assistant I-V). Library Assistant I-IV is represented by a union and Library Assistant V is not.

Situation:

In 2007/8 Library Personnel accounted for approximately 56% of the Library budget, materials accounted for approximately 35% and operating costs approximately 8%. The proportion of personnel costs have been increasing while the proportion of materials costs have been decreasing. On the face of this it would appear that the library is overstaffed, or at least spending too much for people and too little for materials. However as the Senate Task Force report *The Library in Crisis* notes, "The General Library budget has been static for the last fifteen years in nominal dollar Terms." (p.3) At the same time the report notes "As library funds tighten, collections can only be maintained at the price of reductions in staffing." (p.3) Since the report was issued a year ago last July, the library has taken additional budget cuts.

While the report notes that there has been reductions in personnel including both librarians and library staff a careful examination of where these reductions have occurred is warranted. Over the last 17 years there has been a 6% decrease in library administrators (16 to 15) while librarians have decreased by over 45% (49.25 to 27). Data for staff is not available for the last two years, however on page 3 of *The Library in Crisis* notes that from 1991/2 to 2006/7 there was a 30% reduction in staff and 9% increase in student workers. This trend to shift staff work to students is another

indicator of budget stress and attempts to deal with a long term flat budget and significant increases in costs of materials.

Over the years, library staff, excluding library administration, has decreased in order to shore up the Library Materials portion of the budget. However, the campus is utterly dependent upon library staff to make the library materials available. The staff acquires, catalogs, services, preserves and facilitates access to the collection for the campus. While seemingly simple, this is an immense task, requiring the skills, intellectual contributions and hard work of many people.

Observation: Library administration is staffed at a level that is not justified by the remaining library staff.

Additionally there is an administrative climate that centralizes all decisions at the very top. This failure to include librarians and library staff in the governance of the library has three effects. First, it isolates library administration from the rest of the librarians and from the library staff. This systematically deprives library administration of the benefit of centuries of experience from both librarians and staff. Also, since library administration has little or no contact with the majority of the faculty users, it deprives them of a critical understanding of how the faculty use the library. Second, it demoralizes the professional staff by failing to include them in the shared governance of the library. There are many committees and other such trappings of shared governance, however the vast majority of that are made are largely done prior to the pretense of consultation and reflect only the library administration perspective. Third, it paralyzes the decision making process by overloading the top administration with trivial detail and diminishes their ability to develop and articulate a library vision as well as developing strategic plans to respond to the changing budget situation of the campus and system. In attempting to control everything in the library, top library administrators have little or no real control because they have overloaded themselves and as a consequence little real administration gets accomplished.

Observation: The current centralization of decision making is counterproductive, inefficient and damaging to the institution which it serves.

Suggestions:

Reduce the administration to line ratio, transform library administration to a largely 'part-time' library administration. At the same time decentralize much of the decision making and reserve top library administration for strategic planning and policy development. Clearly there needs to be someone in charge of the library for administration and accountability. However the subordinate administrators need to be reduced. One University Librarian supported by two Assistant University Librarians, one

responsible for administration and one for collections and service is sufficient. We cannot afford to have such a large number of professional librarians who are only administrators. To meet this, all department heads should, like faculty, rotate administrative duties and while assuming such duties will continue to function in their assigned subject or technical area of responsibility. There can be some adjustment of additional tasks and responsibilities to compensate for the assumption of these duties. In those departments that have liaison responsibilities with academic departments the administrative duties will be split between internal library administration and collection development.

To accomplish personnel reviews, the General Library could adopt a system more like the faculty model. The particulars of procedure for this would be worked out between LAUC-D, Campus HR and Library Administration and will be in accordance with the current librarian MOU. Also, consideration should be made to eliminate the current administrator's stipend. While this is a minor amount of money it currently serves to divide librarians and further erode librarian morale.

As the library budget develops over the next decade, the ratio of administration to line should be kept the same. A formula similar to the formula that drives the increase of faculty FTE could be the model for library staffing with regard to library administration.

Goals and Visions**By Daniel Goldstein**

A. The library is explicitly mentioned in the Chancellor's vision statement in two places—under two of the six goals in the “Goals and Metrics” Section pp 6 and 8.

p. 6 under the Goal of **Foster a Vibrant Community of Learning and Scholarship: “Enhance and promote a prestigious, internationally ranked library that takes its due place as the intellectual hub of the university.”**

Goal 1: *Increase the number of librarians with subject expertise and the depth of that expertise.* You can't be an intellectual hub without people who have detailed knowledge of and can discuss authoritatively academic disciplines.

Metric: Has the number of librarians with such expertise and responsibility for those subjects increased?

Goal 2: *Increase in number and kind the ways in which the library interacts with the campus community, such that it becomes seen as a dynamic center of intellectual activities, not solely as a place to study and conduct research.*

Metric: Has the number of these programs increased? Add questions to various survey instruments already in use to document changed perceptions of the library. (See Instruments identified in the Metrics category for this section of the Vision Statement).

p. 8. under the Goal of **Drive Innovation at the Frontiers of Knowledge: “Create collaborative gathering places that promote both interdisciplinary discourse and a sense of scholarly community; create both physical spaces and virtual opportunities to reach across disciplines and include community leaders and policymakers in these environments (e.g., virtual communication tools, digests of faculty expertise, journal clubs, repurposed facilities, cultural venues and library spaces.)”**

Goal 3: *Have librarians organize and host “Frontiers of Knowledge” events in the library. (Consistent with Goal 2).* Subject Librarians' knowledge of disciplines is often different in kind than that of scholars working within those disciplines. They must know the overall shape, trends within and the boundaries of a discipline in order to build a collection. They are thus positioned, at least potentially, to identify and discuss emerging trends and research areas.

Metric: Was such a program developed in such a way as to be sustainable? Evaluate success through surveys of attendees.

B. The Vision Statement applies to the library in other places, specifically, the 6 “commitments” on p. 3.

p. 3. Inspire and support excellence, and the success and engagement of our students, faculty and staff to learn, experiment and achieve to their full individual and collective potential.

Goal 4: *Make Academic Excellence the principal goal and metric for all our activities.*

Metric: Do we make this the determining element of our decision-making process?

Goal 5: *Develop programs for instruction and reference in the context of goal four.* The object is not to simply to provide answers, but to educate patrons about the organization of knowledge in their areas of interest, about information literacy, research strategies and critical thinking. Doing so requires reliance on the expert knowledge of librarianship as well as of specific subject areas. It also requires long-term investment in following a particular course of action in these areas so that ongoing training and assessment can improve the quality of the services offered.

Metric: For instructional programs: Conduct end-of-quarter surveys of instructors and their students as to the value and effectiveness of instruction sessions offered. The survey will be most valuable after students have had to complete their assignments and after their instructors have evaluated their work.

p.3. Foster a bold and innovative spirit in our teaching, research and public service enterprises. We shall set a standard of excellence in all of our endeavors and reward creativity, risk-taking, collaboration, and entrepreneurial partnership, as optimal ways to encourage learning and pursue break-through discoveries and transformative ideas.

Goal 6. (In conjunction with Goal 7) *Reorganize the library in such a way as to facilitate the librarian-initiated exploration of new ideas, experimentation with new technologies and pedagogical and research methods.* One change that might facilitate this would be the creation of voluntary librarian/tech. partnerships in which a librarian could be paired with someone from the Systems department to work on realizing the librarian’s ideas for developing and exploring technologies.

Metric: An increase in the number of voluntary innovative programs initiated by librarians.

p. 3. Promote a community characterized by respect, integrity, openness and responsiveness and consultation and collaboration, in which we are invested in our collective welfare and the responsible, far-sighted stewardship of our resources.

Goal 7: *Reorganize the library such that it more successfully achieves the values listed here.*

Metric: “Increases in staff satisfaction and morale as measured by a range of human resource tools and surveys.” (p. 15 a Metric for Human resources under the

“Cultivate a Culture of Organizational Excellence, Effectiveness and Stewardship” goal.)
The LAUC-D survey of a couple of summers ago would serve as an effective baseline.

Goal 8: *Become smarter and more effective in our collection development activities in order to build the strongest possible, intellectually coherent and balanced and relevant collection for today and for the future?* The collection consists of electronic and hard copy elements; it consists of locally held and communally purchased materials; it consists of materials available locally and held remotely. Looking at the whole range of user behaviors, publishing trends, and developments within specific subject areas, we need to determine the best balance of resources for UC Davis, now and in the future and plan accordingly.

Metric: This goal should result in a new conceptual kind of collection development description for the department. Was such ever written? The extent to which it was successfully instituted would be reflected in increasing stability of our collection budget with more regular expenditure patterns (for discretionary items over the course of the fiscal year) and reduced amount of money transferred from one fund to another in the course of the year and reduced amount of year-end money

