

**Librarians Association of the University of California  
Spring Assembly 2008  
Wednesday, May 7, 2008  
University of California, Irvine  
Minutes**

Assembly called to order at 9:39

**University Librarian's Welcome: Gerry Munoff**

Irvine UL Gerry Munoff welcomed the Assembly to Irvine and offered brief remarks. The Irvine campus is currently undergoing over \$2 billion in construction projects. Over the next ten years enrollment is expected to grow by 50% to 27,000 students. Irvine anticipates 80-120 new faculty hires each year and many new undergraduate and graduate programs. The use of libraries is growing. The size and quality of staff is growing. The librarians are amenable to changes necessary to accommodate this growth. Gerry stressed that it is important to support professional development, citing UCI's support of \$1400 per librarian. Gerry remarked that the ULs are focusing on collaborations between campus libraries.

Julia Gelfand – welcomed the Assembly to UCI and provided brief information about logistics.

Greg Careaga conducted the roll call of divisions and delegates

Minutes of the Fall Assembly 2007 were approved with two corrections. Shirley Bigna was listed as present but did not attend. Sam Dunlap's name was misspelled as 'Dunlop.'

**President's Report – B. Heyer-Gray**

Bob's chief focus this year was to bring a greater emphasis to programs at Assembly. He developed programs to be thought provoking and forward-looking and to address some aspect of the future of librarianship.

Some bylaws revisions were developed this year. Those revisions are still being reviewed by UCOP. Ongoing collective bargaining has kept approval of the revision in abeyance. There is an expectation that the issue should be resolved soon.

Bob wrote a letter of concern to President Dynes. The letter focused on LAUC's firm commitment to keeping the peer review system intact.

Bob reported that the R&PD and Diversity Committees got special charges this year.

UCOLASC is focusing on a proposed subvention policy to promote publication of first monographs by faculty in the humanities and social sciences. The parameters of such a policy are still being discussed.

ULCDL search is in the latter stages. Three qualified candidates have been interviewed. CDL is negotiating with one candidate.

The LAUC Assembly travel grant helped four librarians attend this Assembly. Bob welcomed Judy Kammerer UCB, Josh Schneider UCB, Kai Yu UCB, Nicole Lawson, UCSC.

Finally, Bob thanked the executive board and the local arrangements committee for their work on the Assembly.

### **Committee Reports:**

Research and Professional Development Committee – S. Dunlap

Sam noted that it was a busy year for R&PD. There were six grant applications of which four were recommended for funding to UCOP. All four were funded.

The committee looked for methods to speed the grant process and also looked at mini-grants. LAUC mini-grants and a presentation grant program were proposed. UCOP has reviewed the proposals at multiple levels. The proposals are currently in front of Dan Greenstein, Vice-Provost for Academic Affairs, UCOP.

Lise Snyder asked about streamlining the grant process. Sam affirmed that research grants take precedence but all types of grants come before committee simultaneously. Lise asked whether a percentage of the budget should be set aside for mini-grants. Jeff Williams asked how much had been spent out on average over last 5 years and wondered whether we might estimate demand and set money aside.

Heidi Sandstrom asked if the process was different this year because of the timeline. Sam responded that local divisions reviewed proposals differently. Some campuses only the local R&PD representative read the applications while the entire executive board read the packages at other campuses though there is no requirement for the executive board to do so. Bob stated that the calendar was not affected.

Diversity Committee – Chimene Tucker

The committee is focused on gathering recruitment and retention statistics. Data gathering has been hindered because different campuses use different nomenclature. The committee is creating a glossary to be used with a survey. Once the survey is created and distributed, the committee is aiming for a 45 day turn around. Chimene noted that this has been a challenging charge. The committee's goal is to get the survey questions out by 5/31/08 and back by 7/20/08.

**Presentation by Gary Lawrence, Director, Systemwide Library Planning**

UCOP is changing. UCOP budget will be reduced by 20% and staff will be reduced by 23%. New units are being created in order to reduce redundancy and provide better support across the University. New units will cover research, budget, business services, legislative analysis, communication, and IT.

During the 2008/09 AY, more changes will occur. HR is being restructured. UCOP HR will be contracted to UCSF. Academic affairs is under review. Continuing education for the Bar is likely to move to a campus. Capital projects are under review. Other essential functions that are not core to Office of President mission like Strategic sourcing, CDL, and UC Press are also being examined.

The May revise is expected to be bad news but the University Library may have reason to be guardedly optimistic. CDL is reasonably well protected. CDL's role as a facilitator of system-wide collaboration is held up as a model. UCOP/Library relations not expected to change substantially.

LAUC's relationship with UCOP is not likely to change.

SLASIAC will sponsor town hall meetings on campuses regarding faculty role as authors in terms of scholarly communication (NIH, etc.).

**Presentation by Stephen Abram (SirsiDynix): *Heading for the 3.0 World: Technologies and Behaviors to Watch*** (<http://stephenslighthouse.sirsiidynix.com>)

Can academic libraries be more open? Can we be more open to our scholars, our researchers, our learning communities, to new technologies? Can we be more open to change? How? Are there technologies that we should be trying and piloting to see if they improve the library's mandate? Which ones are worth investigating? What are the emerging learning technologies? Are there different and improved ways to enhance our organization's missions? Can we enhance our research and learning communities and attract more funding and use? What about books, OPACs, databases and interfaces? What changes are happening here? Stephen Abram is an inveterate library watcher and strategic technology futurist for libraries. In this session, he shares the top technologies that we should think about 'playing' with and finding a way to make our libraries more open to our learning communities, publishing and research. Can we drive quicker adaptation to change in our own library culture? He will end with five suggestions to have fun with change and technology adoption.

Stephen's excellent presentation ran into the lunch hour and there was no time for Q&A. See Angela Boyd and Phoebe Ayers' excellent blog posts for more detail.

<http://laucassembly.blogspot.com/2008/05/heading-for-30-world-technologies-and.html>

<http://laucassembly.blogspot.com/2008/05/google-and-librarians.html>

<http://laucassembly.blogspot.com/2008/05/stephen-abram-pt-2.html>

Recessed for lunch 12:25.

Reconvened at 1:16 p.m.

**Presentation by Brian Schottlaender (UCSD): *Future of Bibliographic Control***  
([http://lauci.lib.uci.edu/springprogram2008/docs/Schottlaender\\_On\\_the\\_Record.LAUC\\_Statewide.2008.05.pdf](http://lauci.lib.uci.edu/springprogram2008/docs/Schottlaender_On_the_Record.LAUC_Statewide.2008.05.pdf))

The Library of Congress, in response to the evolving information and technology environment, convened the Future of Bibliographic Control Working Group to examine the future of bibliographic description in the 21st century. As a member of the working group, Brian will discuss the group's [final report](#) and the implications and ramifications of the report for the UC libraries.

Q&A:

Q: Was Google looking at text or media? How broad was the descriptive meta-data?

A: The project focused on text. Suddenly aware of importance of FRBRization. OCLC pushed non-text.

Q: Will local campuses do things differently?

A: Take fuller and earlier advantage of info provided by acquisitions vendors in cataloguing. Develop MARC to 'X' crosswalks. Need to think through how to get past MARC and use things like native XML. Parse responsibility for meta-data creation for non-text objects. Expose hidden collections.

Q: Strengthen LIS profession?

A: ALA Office of Accreditation should require that information organization be a requirement for MLIS. Work jointly with LIS faculty to create knowledge with benefit for operational libraries.

**Chuck Eckman (UCB): *Berkeley Research Impact Initiative (BRII) and SCOAP<sup>3</sup> (Sponsoring Consortium for Open Access Publishing in Particle Physics)***

([http://lauci.lib.uci.edu/springprogram2008/docs/Eckman\\_LAUCStatewide\\_7May2008.pdf](http://lauci.lib.uci.edu/springprogram2008/docs/Eckman_LAUCStatewide_7May2008.pdf))

[BRII](#), co-sponsored by UC Berkeley's Vice Chancellor for Research and the University Librarian, is an 18-month pilot project supporting faculty members, post-docs, and graduate students who want to make their journal articles open access.

[SCOAP<sup>3</sup>](#) is a consortium that will attempt to facilitate Open Access publishing in High Energy Physics. By re-directing subscription money, everyone involved in producing the literature of particle physics (universities, labs, and funding agencies) pays into a consortium (SCOAP<sup>3</sup>) which then pays publishers so that all articles in the field are Open Access.

Q&A:

BRII

Q: Is there a cap?

A: The project is well under the allocated budget of \$125,000.

Q: Were matching funds considered? Was there discussion of only supporting true OA journals and not hybrids?

A: There are disciplinary inequities. We didn't want to prevent access and we didn't want to affect faculty decision about where to publish. Yes, OA-only was discussed and adopted but was loosened to get buy-in from more faculty. It is an avenue to open discussion with publishers.

Q: Has this affected faculty decisions about where to publish?

A: It is too early in the pilot to really tell.

Q: Is this in the context of a broader policy?

A: There is no system-wide policy (initiative failed). There may be some campus efforts. The overarching goal is to make it easy for faculty.

Q: Are faculty asking librarians where they might publish?

A: The website lists OA options.

Q: Be aware of total cost of ownership.

A: That was considered.

SCOAP:

Q: How much will this cost libraries?

A: The overhead is minimal. Expression of interest expedited – overhead for that was low. Work concentrated in people negotiating with publishers. Economies should meet or exceed costs.

Assembly adjourned at 3:34.