REPORT OF THE BLUE RIBBON COMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY
University of California, Berkeley

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

I. TOWARD A NEW LIBRARY

There is a worldwide crisis in research libraries caused by an explosion of both cost and quantity of scholarly information. The Berkeley Library is by no means unique in being caught up in this crisis but it has in the past decade fared worse than those libraries it considers its peers.

- We recommend that the University restore the Library to its role as a leading research institution world-wide and to its proper place as a research complex at the heart of the intellectual community on this campus.

- We recommend that the Library make explicit the shift in emphasis toward providing comprehensive access to library and research materials whenever ownership and on-site availability of materials is not feasible.

One of the biggest challenges to the campus in the coming years will be to educate its user community to adapt to this fundamental shift in emphasis in the Library from being primarily a repository of materials to a gateway to information.

II. COLLECTING, ACCESS AND SERVICES

No library can any longer collect comprehensively. Selective growth in research and special collections, beyond the core collections, is the only principle that is even possibly sustainable, given budgetary realities on campus and the growth in the quantity and cost of scholarly materials worldwide. Therefore:

A. Collecting

- The campus must develop a more effective mechanism for deciding and articulating its academic priorities and for communicating these to the Library. At present our resources are spread extremely thinly over a greater number of Ph.D. programs than any of our peers.

- We strongly recommend that more systematic data collection be undertaken by the Library and that it be made a regular part of the periodic reviews of collection budgets. Furthermore, we believe that the Library should undertake in-depth (essentially zero-base) reviews in conjunction with the faculty every three to five years and that the data collected should be an integral part of these reviews.

- The campus must commit to formal cooperative collection-development and access agreements with partner libraries, both within and outside the UC System.

B. Access and Services

- In the future, the excellence of a Library will be determined as much by the quality of the access and services that it provides as by the scale of its collections.

- The campus must develop with its partner libraries convenient and rapid mechanisms for requesting and delivering materials.

- We recommend that the Library adopt the concept of a “decentralized library system” as opposed to the current concept of “a main library and branches.” The "Main Library" complex (Doe-Moffitt) currently serves as the "main" library only for certain fields of study in the humanities and social sciences. The branches are the “main” library for their respective disciplines. We have a *de facto* decentralized library system in which no one unit is a “main” library.

- We recommend the retention of an undergraduate library, housing a non-circulating reference collection and a short-term-circulating reserve collection of perhaps 100,000 to 150,000 volumes essential for undergraduate study, teaching, and general education.

C. Digitization

This area is still very much in flux. There is consensus that it will not save libraries money in the near future. There is the likelihood that it may do so in a few years.

- We recommend that the campus and the Library continue to provide vigorous leadership in the development and application of digital technologies to the area of scholarly information access.

D. Scholarly Communication

The current paradigm of scholarly communication is inordinately cumbersome and expensive. The pressures for change are strong, but the issues are extremely complex. They must be resolved on a nationwide, even an international, scale.

- We recommend that the Berkeley campus provide vigorous leadership, both on-campus and more widely, in encouraging the scholarly community to confront and resolve the complex issues involved in improving the modes of scholarly communication.

III. BUDGET

Our current Library budget is not consistent with our institutional goal if this goal is that the Berkeley Library remain one of the foremost libraries in the nation.

- Our collections budget is sorely inadequate according to any one of several criteria, as indicated by comparisons to our peers. Our estimate is that a minimal base collections budget consistent with our goals would require an augmentation of at least $3 million to the current base of about $7.4 million. This is a minimum request that would in fact bring only a $1 million amelioration to the current situation, since $1 million of it would make permanent the one-time bridge funding provided by the former Chancellor, $250,000 would make permanent The Vice Chancellor's initiative for digital materials, and $750,000 will be eaten up by the projected inflation in the cost of scholarly materials in the coming year. Clearly an additional augmentation will be needed in 1999-2000.

- The operations budget for the Library is no longer adequate to support the mission of the Berkeley campus, and the Library's service capabilities fall far short of what is needed. The extent of the shortfall depends on matters currently under study and negotiation, such as whether and how much of expenses for technology maintenance and upgrading and for seismic projects should be charged to the Library budget. We do not believe seismic expenses belong in the Library budget. Here, as with collections, either the budget must be increased or the expectations placed upon it, especially for continued library services, must be lowered.

- We therefore recommend an augmentation to the Library's base budget for 1998-99 of $4 million.

- The Library administration should have the flexibility to allocate fiscal resources as it sees most fit.

- The Library budget should be established in at least a two-year rolling budget cycle, giving the Library time to plan and to adjust. For the near future at least, a commitment needs to be made to annually increase the Library's rolling two-year base collections budget for inflation in the cost of scholarly materials.

We understand that annual increases of the magnitude recommended above are not sustainable over the long term under the current funding model for the campus.

- We recommend that the new University Librarian be given the mandate to create a task force to address this problem directly. This task force should provide a detailed analysis both of the impact of inflation and increased demand for equipment and services, and of the ways this impact can be minimized by (a) cooperative arrangements, (b) long-range digitization strategies, (c) selective cuts in acquisitions, in correspondence with campus academic priorities, and (d) concerted action with other libraries to exert pressure on publishers.

- We recommend that studies be undertaken to develop bases for the rational allocation of collection and operations funds to the various academic areas.

IV. ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICES

A. External: Between the Library and its User Community

The mission of the University Library is to meet the information needs of the faculty and students to the maximum degree possible within the limits of the resources provided to it by the campus administration. Thus strong channels of communication between the Library, the administration, and the faculty and students need to be in place. This communication must be grounded in the principle that:

- The University Librarian is ultimately responsible to the Chancellor for the management and performance of the Library and must have the authority to carry out this responsibility.

We propose:

- A regularly scheduled yearly process by which academic units (departments, schools, and other units) outline to both the appropriate deans and the relevant library units their major needs, immediate or foreseen, in the area of information access, in a brief document submitted early enough for use in the yearly budget process.

- A process by which these indicated needs, together with those put forward by the Library administration, are discussed and refined in consultations between the Library and the academic deans.

- The establishment of a new joint faculty-administration-library committee, which we will call here the Library Advisory Board (LAB). The LAB will be advisory to the senior campus administration and to the University Librarian. The LAB would be designed to:
  - i. Demonstrate and facilitate the joint involvement of the highest levels of the campus administration in the Library.
  - ii. Provide the University Librarian with a permanent mechanism which can be used for consultation and consensus building on major library projects, plans, and priorities.
  - iii. Enhance the involvement of faculty in the major issues before the Library.

- That the Academic Senate Committee on Library be strengthened and that its duties and responsibilities be made more explicit.

B. Internal: Within the Library

- It is imperative that the Chancellor give the new University Librarian the discretion, and the resources, to fill top management positions with suitable individuals, whether these can be recruited from within the University or need to be recruited from other institutions.

- We recommend that serious steps be taken to renew a sense of community and common purpose in the Library, within those areas where this sense has been eroded.

REPORT OF THE BLUE RIBBON COMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY
University of California, Berkeley

We are at a decisive moment for the future of our Library. The University must decide whether we will maintain The Library as a world class institution and ensure its ability to support the research and instructional missions of the campus. To do so will require an exceptional commitment from the larger University community. Following the period of campus budget cuts, the campus, in the past few years, has rightly given top fiscal and intellectual priority to rebuilding the strength and stature of its faculty. As a consequence the faculty is now well on the road to a renewal of its ranks and the recovery of its past distinction. But in these same years our Library has continued to suffer from severe neglect. Ten years ago the Library stood second in national rankings (volumes added). Today it is 8th, and less than 5,000 volumes above 10th. In total library expenditures we have dropped from 2nd to 7th. Since 1989 the buying power of the collections budget has deflated about 30 percent. (This represents 28,000 monograph volumes and 26,000 serials subscriptions in the current year, or a total of 182,000 volumes compared to what we would have bought over the decade had the funding model of 1989 still been in place). During the same period we have added 9 new Ph.D. programs to the campus, increasing demand upon these decreasing library resources while University Library budget cuts alone have reduced the number of librarians by more than one third. Total Library staff has declined by over 20 percent, but the demand for library services, with the arrival of the new digital-plus-print library, has if anything increased. Moreover, the Library will have suffered from three changes in its top leadership during this same period, and eight years of continuous budget cuts. Not surprisingly, morale in the Library is very low.

Despite its many problems, we should make clear that the Berkeley Library has nevertheless had a number of notable successes. Examples would include the successful integration of the biological sciences libraries; development of new technological systems for cataloging and tracking materials; initiation of a project to develop library performance standards; and development of a new Government Documents/Social Sciences reading room.

These successes, however, are not enough to overcome the unprecedented challenges facing the Berkeley Library and other research libraries around the country. The explosion in the volume of scholarly publication and its sky-rocketing costs since the 1980s are straining the budgets of all major research libraries and posing ever greater challenges in the areas of storage, access and preservation. Moreover, the advent of digital technologies—their cost as well as their social consequences—are rapidly reshaping the world of publication and current paradigms of scholarly communication. All research libraries are in a state of rapid and massive transformation as a result of these developments. In order for the University Library to stay abreast of these changes we need urgently to turn our attention and our resources to setting the Library on a viable path toward renewal and to restore it to its position of national leadership in defining the future of scholarly research and communication.

But without an increased commitment from the campus community, the Library will only continue a general decline relative to its peers.

I. TOWARD A NEW LIBRARY

At the core of any great library is its collections. There is the treasure chest of special collections like the Bancroft that cannot be found anywhere else. There is the war chest that provides a competitive portfolio of collections in the major areas of research and graduate teaching. And there is the hope chest of a good college library that provides the accumulated knowledge and wisdom for undergraduate learning. In the best of all worlds, these chests should be filled to overflowing, and they should be widely available for scholarship and teaching.

All university libraries, however, are now caught in the scissors of exponentially increasing quantities of scholarly materials and declining real purchasing power as the rate of increase in the costs of materials far exceeds the rate of increase in collections budgets. Berkeley is no exception, and it is faced with the need to make hard decisions about its collections. At the same time, we believe that the Berkeley Library cannot give up its traditional leadership role and its comprehensiveness in the areas of graduate student and faculty research without causing the campus simultaneously to abandon its role as a world-class research University. There are no easy solutions to this problem.

- We recommend that the Library make explicit the shift in emphasis toward providing comprehensive access to library and research materials whenever ownership and on-site availability of materials is not feasible.

- The campus community at large must take on the responsibility of educating its members as to the necessity and the means of adapting to the new model of the Library as gateway rather than repository.

Although substituting access for ownership may seem like a significant departure from policies of the past, it is really only a recognition of what has increasingly become true over recent decades. It has never been possible for any one library to collect comprehensively. Even if it had been possible, there would not have been enough space on most campuses to house all of the materials that would have been collected. Consequently, university libraries have always relied upon one another for help in those areas where they were weak, and many have had to rely upon off-campus locations to store part of their collections. What is new is that the explosion of scholarly materials and accelerating costs have increased the number of areas where it is difficult to keep up with the flow of material, and have put added pressure upon limited library space. There is simply too much to be collected, and too few resources to expend. Comprehensive ownership and on-site availability, then, is a chimera. However, a library can seek to provide comprehensive access by ensuring that faculty and students are able to get the materials they need in a timely fashion.

Ensuring access to a broad range of materials without owning all of them or without having them readily at hand on the Berkeley campus requires two interrelated steps. First, Berkeley must be in a strong position to offer other libraries access to materials that they want in return for their offering access to materials we want. This means that Berkeley must maintain its strong treasure chest of research-level collections and a very competitive portfolio of materials for research and teaching. Berkeley must continue to collect as a world class library. Second, Berkeley must develop a model of access—beginning with bibliographic and other search capabilities and proceeding through timely delivery of materials to researchers—that serves the needs of faculty and students, both here and at our cooperating institutions. This model must ensure not only current access, but also continuing and stable access. We must be sure that if we rely upon another institution's collections, then we will be able to do so far into the future so that we are not faced with a sudden loss of access to collections in that area. We must be sure that if we rely upon digital access for journals, we will have access in perpetuity to the material to which we have subscribed, in the same way that we do once we buy a printed version of the material. Because we cannot afford to own everything, we must develop institutional frameworks that will ensure long-term and easy access to materials.

The new model of access, which is already increasingly in evidence, will be different from the classic paradigm in which the library ordered a book, catalogued it, and placed it in the library so that the researcher could find it in the card catalog, go to the stacks, and take it out. There are, to be sure, many pleasures and some advantages (especially for some forms of browsing) in the old paradigm. Many remember, often with great fondness, the rows upon rows of card catalogs, the musty stacks of Doe Library, and the mysteries of the overflowing shelves filled with all kinds of books. But who would now give up the on-line catalogs with their search capabilities and instant information on whether a book is checked out in favor of the old card catalog? And how many of us have found that we can use the on-line abstracts and on-line journals that are now available, thus saving ourselves a trip to the library? The Baker service has also provided users with the ability to order materials from their desktops and have them delivered to their offices. And although we may complain when a book is at the Northern Regional Library Facility instead of in the stacks, we must remember that this facility has freed stack space for other, more heavily used materials. In these ways, access has certainly increased with new technologies and with new ways to manage library materials.

But new technologies will not solve all of our problems. Although many journals and even newspapers will eventually provide current issues on-line, many fewer will have digitized their back issues, and it may be a very long time before a substantial number of monographs and books are available on-line. How, then, can we provide access to these materials without collecting them ourselves? Indeed, many users have complained about how often they find that a book has been taken out by someone else, or is now in Northern Regional Library Facility (NRLF), or not even in the Berkeley University Library. This is probably inevitable given the enormous growth in knowledge and the limited storage space on campus. We propose, therefore, that the goal should not be to ensure that every book is always in the Berkeley stacks—an impossible goal in any case if books are to be used; rather the goal should be to ensure that materials can be obtained quickly by anyone who requests them. A reasonable operational definition of this goal would be that a very wide range of materials from many different sources would be identifiable through the electronic catalog and that these materials would be obtainable within at least 72 hours if they are not being used by another borrower. Once this is our goal, then the location, and even the ownership, of a book matters much less than the ability to get it, in some useful form, to the researcher. Books in NRLF become no different than those in other libraries if Berkeley has agreements with those libraries to allow direct borrowing.

The shift to a library focused upon access as well as ownership is already bringing about many changes in the patterns of use of the library and the kinds of services that are essential to efficient use of its resources. With the majority of our collections no longer stored on-site, and with ever-increasing amounts of valuable material accessible either on-line or through cooperative agreements, there is a danger that the Library will cease to function as a physical research center at the heart of the University. Indeed, over the past decade it has increasingly become little more than a pick-up and drop-off site, or (with the advent of Baker services) a mail-order house, rather than a center of study, especially for research scholars (principally faculty and graduate students). As a smaller and smaller proportion of our collections are to be found on the stacks, fewer and fewer research scholars actually visit the Library. At the same time, the dispersion of the sources of vital research materials (in the stacks, in storage, available through interlibrary loan, or, increasingly, available on line) has lead to a loss among all users of the sense of the Library as a site of knowledge integration. This has, in our view, had several detrimental consequences: 1) because fewer faculty researchers visit the Library, the on-going dialogue between librarians and faculty concerning collection development has all but collapsed, at least in Doe; 2) the absence of an integrated center of access to collections has led to a loss of a sense of intellectual community among research scholars—faculty, graduate students, and visiting scholars alike (again, especially for those scholars who depend on Doe); and 3) at the same time, faculty who use the Library experience increasing frustration as less and less material is immediately available, and they require increased knowledge of access systems and increased assistance in locating materials in a timely fashion.

- We recommend that the University restore the Library to its role as a leading research institution world-wide and to its proper place as a research complex at the heart of the intellectual community on this campus.

II. COLLECTING, ACCESS AND SERVICES

A. Collecting

The collections budget comprises approximately one third of the total library budget. Of that amount approximately two-thirds is currently devoted to the purchase of serials, and one third to the purchase of other materials (a typical ratio among our peers). The annual inflation rate in cost of scholarly materials is currently about 9 percent. Under these circumstances no university can sustain a library budget that would make it possible for it to collect comprehensively.

- Selective growth will be the key to maintaining a great research collection.

1. Collection Development

Berkeley should have research-level collections that make it possible to undertake in-depth scholarship in most areas where there are major teaching and research programs. With 121 graduate degree programs, however, it is not possible for Berkeley to own research-level collections in all of these areas. Consequently, Berkeley should choose to maintain research-level collections in those areas where its program of research or study has a high academic priority or where the collection makes strategic sense as part of a plan to cooperate with other institutions that will help us provide coverage of all research and teaching areas (typically areas where historically our collections have been exceptionally strong).

- At the core of our strategy is the requirement that Berkeley maintain a collections budget and a collections strategy that will make it an attractive partner for other great libraries facing the same dilemmas as Berkeley.

This requires even more attention to the pattern of collecting than before, because we must not only satisfy ourselves, we must satisfy others as well. It also requires that we identify areas in which our research-level collections make us strong and hence desirable partners for other libraries. Other parts of this report (see II.A.2, III.A., and IV.A. below) deal with the mechanisms whereby we can improve our ability to make decisions about collections.

Beyond or in addition to research-level collections, we must own (or have immediate access to) the following kinds of collections, which we will call, as a group, our core collections:

Essential reference collections
College level collections
High use collections

The essential reference collection would include all those materials that are necessary to begin a research project in an area and to identify major sources. The college level collection would be defined by the undergraduate teaching program. The high-use collection would be materials that, as the name implies, are requested on a recurring basis. This would meet the recurring needs of students and faculty. As we move toward interleaving our collection with those of other universities, some special steps will have to be taken to ensure that these collections are protected so that our students and other users can browse them and have quick access to them. This would probably mean that the essential reference collections would be non-circulating, and the college level and high-use collections would have a short-term circulation.

In short, the Library must move from a strategy of comprehensive ownership to comprehensive access and selective ownership. Ownership and access, however, should not be understood as competitive principles. They are complementary. The more extensive our collections, the more extensive our reach to other collections.

- The most fundamental principle is that Berkeley must have a substantial collections budget in excess of that needed for maintenance of the core collection.

- It must also have first-rate selectors, who are given time to do their job well, and receive strong guidance from the faculty. This must be a top priority.

The Library must be selective in what it chooses to collect, and in what it chooses to ensure access to. The eminence of a research library in the future will come to be judged as much by the quality of its collections as by the sheer number of items its owns. In this environment, the role of librarian/selectors is even more vital than it was earlier. The Library can waste significant amounts of money by collecting inappropriately.

2. Resource Allocation

The most important criteria for selecting collection priorities should be: 1) academic priority in the given area, and 2) the historical depth or breadth of a collection as an element of our attractiveness as a partner in cooperative agreements. The balance between these two criteria should be regularly reviewed by the Library and the Academic Senate Committee on Library. Major issues might also be brought to the Library Advisory Board (see IV.A.4 below).

One attractive method for guiding these decisions is the use of algorithms based upon various indicators of research and teaching needs. A number of universities and library professionals are experimenting with algorithms for the allocation of resources based upon factors such as FTE in each field, the number of graduate students or undergraduate majors in each field, number of Ph.D.s awarded, enrollments in classes, use-statistics keyed to call numbers in the library, the relative size and cost of the literatures of particular disciplines, or the total campus resources allocated to support research. The Berkeley Library, for example, has a Mellon Foundation project on “Performance measures for Research Library Collections and Information Services”, and Library staff have developed interesting ways to use information from GLADIS to track usage. The virtue of these exercises is that they provide decision-makers with much more data on the demand for library services. Properly employed, these data can help knowledgeable librarians and faculty reassess historical patterns of resource allocation, and they can suggest where changes might be made.

Algorithms can be useful because they can pinpoint areas where current allocations seem too large or too small based upon some formula. This may make it possible to identify areas where adjustments are in order, but it may also help to identify areas where non-formulaic considerations have been and, perhaps, should be paramount. We might, for example, want to continue collecting in an area where we have unusual completeness of materials or substantial continuity even though we have few students, researchers, or programs. Indeed, this kind of historical depth and breadth might be one of our comparative advantages as partners in collaboration. Another possibility is that the need for a minimum continuing level of support might justify a larger budget for an area with few currently enrolled students. One particularly valuable source of information about the level of library support in collections and service would be graduate student exit interviews in the various Ph.D. programs.

Algorithms may also miss one other very important possibility. When the campus wants to create a new program, past demand will typically not justify launching a new collection in that area. Yet this is precisely where a planning process can be most useful. In these cases, efforts should be made to determine the needs for a credible program in the area and the likely demands in the future. These costs should be determined at the outset and included as part of the academic planning process, so that the costs of the newly proposed area of study are fully understood.

- We strongly recommend that more systematic data collection be undertaken by the Library and that it be made a regular part of the periodic reviews of collection budgets. Furthermore, we believe that the Library should undertake in-depth (essentially zero-base) reviews in conjunction with the faculty (see Section IV.A. below) every three to five years and that the data collected should be an integral part of these reviews.

Most importantly, every graduate program on campus requires minimum levels of library (and other) support in order to maintain that program at the level of excellence in scholarship traditionally expected on the Berkeley campus. Comparison figures indicate that we are far behind our peers in this area. In 1995-96 our public peers spent on the average $110,000 on collections per Ph.D. program; our private peers, excluding Harvard, spent $180,000; we spent $82,500. Even after the augmentation proposed here (see Section III below), we would be spending only $100,000 per Ph.D. program in 1998-99, while our peers will doubtless have increased their budgets substantially since 1995-96. In the same year our public peers spent on the average $15,000 per Ph.D. awarded; our private peers spent $32,000; we spent $11,000. After the proposed augmentation we would be spending $13,000. Spending on operations looks no better.

The Library, in consultation with the administration and the Academic Senate, needs to determine the minimum level of support for a given Ph.D. program. If the campus is unable or unwilling to provide that level of support, then the campus should disband the program, for the good health of the campus. This is not appropriately a Library decision. The point here (and it is one made strongly by the External Advisory Committee as well) is that the campus must have a clear and well functioning mechanism for determining and acting upon academic priority decisions. This is an essential precondition to efficient decision-making in the Library, a point made emphatically by both the Library administration and the External Advisers.

- The campus must develop a more effective mechanism for deciding and articulating its academic priorities and for communicating these to the Library. At present our resources are spread extremely thinly over a greater number of Ph.D. programs than any of our peers.

3. Sharing and Working with Other Institutions

a) Benefits of cooperative collection development

We believe that a strategy of increased cooperation and sharing will enable us to maintain the extension of the collections under the inevitable budgetary constraints of the coming years. It can help to solve some of our current and future problems, but it is important to be clear about where it can help and how it can help. If prices of journals and monographs are unchanged by this strategy, then there are obvious cost savings that can be realized for materials that are not highly used. If the materials are used a great deal, however, then the costs of sharing will be greater than the cost of buying just one copy. This is why we have recommended that we must have a core collection of our own.

Economic considerations suggest that cooperation may not save libraries much money because journal prices will adjust upwards in the long run. Nevertheless, short-run benefits may be possible for those who cooperate first, and the cooperative model could be useful as a bargaining chip with respect to electronic licensing.

In addition, cooperation between institutions might provide some savings in personnel in highly specialized areas, as the specialization of selectors at one institution relieves other institutions of the need for that kind of expertise. One also might also profitably share the services of selectors where this would be physically feasible. This specialization and sharing should not be taken too far, however. Each institution will want to have selectors who know enough to make sure that major areas are covered either through on-site collecting or through some cooperative agreement.

Finally, we believe that even if sharing does not ultimately produce great savings, there seems to be a substantial sentiment to move in that direction as a means to enhance breadth of access in an era of declining purchasing power. And those libraries which fail to create partnerships will experience the worst of all possible situations—their costs for journals and monographs will increase but they will be unable to share these costs across libraries.

b) Possible partners

We see some potential benefits from sharing and cooperation, and most importantly, we see real opportunities to do so. The Consortium of Midwestern Universities and the University of Illinois offer promising models for creating more comprehensive access through direct borrowing and reciprocal borrowing privileges. And Berkeley has already taken significant steps in this direction. Since the 1970s we have participated in the cooperative collecting activities of the Research Libraries Group, a consortium of about 50 of the largest research libraries in the U.S. and abroad, and we also belong to the Center for Research Libraries. There seems to be ample precedent and successful models for increased cooperation.

- We propose that one important step towards better collaborative arrangements would be to create an efficient direct borrowing system between the Berkeley and Stanford libraries.

- We also propose, as does the System-wide Library Planning and Action Initiative (LPAI), that an efficient direct borrowing system be extended to all of the northern campuses of the University of California (UC Santa Cruz, UC Davis, UC San Francisco and UC Berkeley) and ultimately to the southern campuses as well. Other campuses have some very strong specialized collections, especially in the sciences, and they could make some very valuable contributions to a direct borrowing program. We assume (as does the LPAI recommendation) that some method will be devised to ensure that our contributions will be commensurate with our benefits.

- We also propose strategic cooperation with the California Digital Library.

Because the Berkeley Library already has a number of thriving digital libraries initiatives, there are many ways that Berkeley can contribute to this system-wide enterprise. But there are also problems attendant to meshing an established ongoing enterprise with a brand new one. Although we understand these, we strongly believe that in the long run Berkeley must be part of what promises to be an excellent way to obtain more resources for libraries and to exercise the market power that is needed to significantly shape the emerging field of digital publications.

c) Essential campus conditions for successful cooperation

Cooperative arrangements require detailed and careful negotiations culminating in written agreements. At a minimum, the following conditions are necessary before one can have successful cooperative agreements:

(1) The Berkeley campus must collect in important ways beyond its core needs. Our partner universities will likely also feel they must continue collecting in core areas. Thus the Berkeley campus must collect beyond these core areas in order to have something significant to share, something which other universities may feel they do not need to collect, since Berkeley does. This is a serious funding issue in the area of collections. In a number of areas Berkeley is already unable to maintain its cooperative collecting agreements because of declining purchasing power.

(2) The Berkeley campus must have in place (or have access to) selectors who are subject-knowledgeable, in order to carry out the collecting obligations which the campus takes on, and to coordinate the specifics of the cooperative arrangements with their subject-counterparts at other universities. This is a serious funding issue in the area of operations. There are important areas in which Berkeley presently has no subject-knowledgeable selector.

(3) There must be written detailed long-term commitments between the Berkeley Chancellor and the heads of the collaborating universities, which will give confidence that Berkeley and the other universities will uphold their commitments even during difficult budget years, in contrast with what happened in the past with some of Berkeley's collaborative arrangements. The most crucial part of such agreements will deal with precisely what will happen when campuses take budget cuts. Some earlier lower-level collaborative-collecting agreements fell apart because the units involved (both at Berkeley and at some of its partners) were confronted with having to cut core collecting in order to honor their collaborative collection agreements, and were unwilling to do this. Thus the Chancellor's agreements may need to involve the Chancellor setting aside a specific fund for collaborative agreements, and agreeing that this fund will be reduced only in parallel with a corresponding reduction by Berkeley's partners.

(4) Berkeley must develop jointly with its partners an ordering and delivery system that is constantly monitored for efficiency and effectiveness and that provides individual users with constant feedback on the disposition of their materials. For example, if a researcher orders on-line a volume from another library and it cannot be delivered within 72 hours station-to-station, the researcher must be notified promptly and informed about any alternative approaches that might make the volume available. More globally, use and service statistics should be monitored to make sure that materials are delivered quickly, to signal that high-use materials should be purchased by the campus, and to identify problems with suppliers, delivery systems, or other features of the system.

B. Access and Services

- In the future, the excellence of a Library will be determined as much by the quality of the access and services that it provides as by the scale of its collections.

Access will be as critical as ownership. Most innovative research occurs at the borders and in the margins of traditional disciplinary divides. Digital technologies greatly facilitate the possibilities for interdisciplinary research. The Library should begin to think of access not only in terms of focused disciplinary communities of users, but also in terms of the different levels of access and services required by different kinds of users.

- We recommend that the Library adopt the concept of a “decentralized library system” as opposed to the current concept of “a main library and branches.” The "Main Library" complex (Doe-Moffitt) currently serves as the "main" library only for certain fields of study in the humanities and social sciences. The branches are the “main” library for their respective disciplines. We have a *de facto* decentralized library system in which no one unit is a “main” library.

All evidence suggests that the affiliated libraries and the branch libraries (despite devastating cuts) have been more successful in meeting the service needs of research scholars than has the main library in Doe. These more focused and specialized libraries provide a much more direct means of communication between librarians and users concerning reference questions and issues of detail in collection development. Branches and affiliates also offer a sense of location and community for groups of scholars in related fields of research, a staging area for long-term research projects, and more efficient sharing of non-circulating, high-demand, high-cost resources.

The terms “main library” and “branch libraries,” in fact, do not accurately describe the actual structure of the Berkeley Library system. The Chemistry Library, for example, is not a branch library in the sense that it is duplicated in part elsewhere (as in the Sunset District "branch" of the San Francisco Library). It is the main library for chemistry graduate and undergraduate students and for chemistry faculty. Similarly, Doe-Moffitt is in fact a main library only for many disciplines in the humanities and social sciences, no more general and no less essential than any of the so-called “branches.” The fact is that we have, at Berkeley, a decentralized library system, whose collections are divided to serve focused communities of users. With regard to access services, the Library would be well advised to cease to think in terms of a “main” library with dependent “branches” and instead, to begin to think of all of its buildings as gateways of access rather than as material depositories—gateways designed to provide comprehensive access to reference and research collections for particular disciplines or for multidisciplinary clusters, such as “Humanities and Social Sciences,” “Art, Architecture and Design,” “Chemistry,” or “The Physical Sciences.”

There is pressure from some quarters to consolidate decentralized libraries in order to save money. But no one has been able to provide us with any careful analyses to demonstrate that money will in fact be saved by consolidation. We are not challenging the view that it might, but only saying that there does not appear to be a study of how it would do so in individual instances. Consequently, we have not been able to formulate general principles for where consolidation would be advisable. We would also refer here to the report of the Academic Senate Committee on Library entitled *Branch Libraries: Criteria and Procedures for Closure and Consolidation* of May 1994, endorsed unanimously by the Divisional Council on 16 May 1994, which came to a similar conclusion.

- Should individual proposals to consolidate decentralized disciplinary libraries be put forward, we recommend a detailed case-by-case analysis of the benefits (including a thorough cost analysis) and the losses involved in each proposal.

Most critically, at present a very serious "service gap" exists in the Doe-Moffitt complex between the collections on the one hand, and research scholars, undergraduates, and the general public on the other. Faculty and graduate students across the humanities and social sciences (including area studies) repeatedly report both insurmountable obstacles to accessing the research collections and increased difficulties in using the collections for undergraduate teaching. The Library should consider a major reorganization of the Doe-Moffitt complex to better serve the research and teaching needs of the faculty and the study needs of students.

- We recommend that the faculty and administration work with the Library to develop plans for the reorganization of Doe-Moffitt. These might include, for example, the creation of a Faculty-Graduate Student Reading Room and Research Complex in the Humanities and Social Sciences on the second floor of Doe, centered in the old reference room at the North end. This would offer research scholars in the humanities and social sciences a comparable facility and level of service to that currently provided to some other disciplinary areas by the branch libraries.

This complex would create a space for research scholars to work in the Library. It could make available specialized reference tools and higher level of services (both digital and print) designed for, but not restricted to, faculty, graduate students and visiting research scholars. It would articulate with a general reference collection. The reading room would provide research scholars with access to costly reference collections, paging services from the research collections, interlibrary loan services, an attractive reading room, and individual reserved shelving for research scholars. The second floor of Doe would become a gateway into the main library for humanities and social sciences research scholars.

We are aware that some plans in these directions are already under discussion. What we are proposing is a modification and expansion of these plans. We foresee at least three very positive benefits of creating an adequate research space within the Library for faculty in the humanities and social sciences:

(1) The renewal of an on-going daily dialogue between faculty, research librarians, and selectors, which will enhance the quality and strategic relevance of the collections. This could, moreover, lead to a more enhanced sense of scholarly community and greater faculty-graduate student dialogue within clustered disciplines.

(2) More rapid socialization of faculty and graduate students to the new research instruments and to new work habits that are becoming necessary as the Library, for reasons of space constraints, is forced to rely increasingly on paging from off-site storage or partner libraries. Users at these levels can no longer expect to find the majority of books stored on-site. For busy, high-use borrowers this can be especially irksome. However, by actually conducting their research in the Library rather than using it as a pick-up and drop-

off site, new technologies and strategies will become more quickly known and adopted. Moreover, as a greater percentage of research occurs in the Library (as opposed to the office or home), there will be less of an urgent need for faculty to check books out, increasing their availability to other scholars. What faculty will lose in immediacy of access (the inevitable constraint of off-site storage), they will regain in increased likelihood of availability.

(3) Creating tiers of access to services (as opposed to collections), could make it possible for the Library to restrict access to some higher-cost services (e.g., reserve shelving or passwords to high-cost data bases) that may be essential to research scholars, but less so to most undergraduate students and the general public.

Similarly, the Moffitt Library could be conceived as an undergraduate gateway into the main library. The Moffitt Undergraduate Library should house a non-circulating reference collection and a short-term circulating reserve collection of perhaps 100,000 to 150,000 volumes (perhaps duplicating volumes in the main stacks) essential for undergraduate study, teaching, and general education. It could provide reserve services for course materials in large undergraduate courses, attractive study areas, access to the main stacks, instructional reference services, and the media center. Such a Library, focused upon undergraduate needs, might also help to alleviate what we are told is the current over-use of branch and affiliate libraries as undergraduate study areas. (We note that a faculty-library task force was recently appointed to study the function of Moffitt Library.)

C. Digitization

There is no doubt that digitization is rapidly transforming scholarly communication—from text composition to publishing, acquisition, storage and conservation. How rapidly, and with what consequences, is more difficult to predict. It is likely that within the next decade many if not most serial publications will be available in electronic form. Some even predict that this will be true of all textual matter. The implications of these transformations for collection development and access services will be very complex. It is probable that the scenario outlined above will need to be radically revised within five to ten years. Our belief in the likelihood that radical changes lie ahead has led us to suggest measures that are both prudent and yet responsive to the increasing opportunities of new technologies in our current circumstances.

It should be noted that the general consensus of the national library community is that digitization will not—at least not in the near future—provide substantial recurring savings. The principal benefits of digital collection development are in the value that it adds to a document—multiple-user access, constant availability, enhanced search capacity, on-line access—and in the savings that will result from reduced processing costs, reduced damage and theft, and reduced storage costs.

- We recommend that the campus and the Library continue to provide vigorous leadership in the development and application of digital technologies to the area of scholarly information access.

The Library has been in the national vanguard in developing and adopting digital alternatives to print collections, in establishing shared platform standards, and in evolving electronic instruments that enhance access and use of the print collections. This is valuable both to the scholarly community at large and to the campus. The Library currently receives more than $1 million in extra-mural funding for digital collection and access projects.

In terms of the actual acquisition of digital materials, however, we seem to be lagging behind. The Library reports that it currently spends approximately 3 percent of its collections budget on digital materials, and almost all of this comes not from the base budget but from a special one-time allocation made by The Vice Chancellor for digital materials. This is well below the national average for research libraries, which is nearer to 7 percent. It is probable that library expenditures in this area will need to increase substantially in the future.

The Library strategy in relation to digital and on-line information will inevitably be driven by the market. We propose that the following six criteria be used to determine our acquisitions in digital and on-line media:

Is it an academic priority?
How many could potentially benefit from its use?
Can we acquire a critical mass—i.e., will the acquisition be large enough to be of use?
Does the digital or on-line form add value, is it more useful than the printed form?
Can the cost of the collection or acquisition be sustained over time?
Can we be ensured permanent archival access to serial materials we subscribe to, even after a subscription is discontinued?

D. Scholarly Communication

No single issue jeopardizes the future health of our Library more than the very high costs and extraordinarily high rate of inflation of some scholarly publications, especially certain serial materials. The scholarly community must begin to confront this problem head on—that is, as the primary producers, as well as the primary consumers of these materials. The area of scholarly copyright, publication, peer-review, and editorial subsidies to publishers must be thoroughly re-examined. The University should lend its support to the efforts of the American Association of Universities to change the paradigm of scholarly publishing.

- We recommend that the Berkeley campus provide vigorous leadership, both on-campus and more widely, in encouraging the scholarly community to confront and resolve the complex issues involved in improving the modes of scholarly communication.

The Library alone cannot solve these problems, but, while the national scholarly community is working on their solution, we suggest that the University Library and the California Digital Library use their purchasing power strategically to help encourage the reduction of the cost of scholarly publications. We should seek to "own" the increasing number of free and low-cost scholarly journals (of good quality), to raise their visibility, and to support them in ways which will help make them the journals of choice in their subject.

In those subjects in which there are not sufficient low-priced journals, the University and the campus should assist faculty members (perhaps in a consortia of universities) to establish new journals, preferably digital-only, slightly subsidized (space, computer, and some secretarial assistance) by the University. The Library would make an essential contribution by archiving such journals so as to reassure authors that their contributions will still exist 50 to 100 years from now.

III. BUDGET

(Summary documentation in this area can be found in Appendix D.)

In the short time we have been able to study the problem, we have not been able to derive objective principles, either on our own or by consultation with outside experts, that enable us to quantify exactly what our collections and operations budgets should be or to assess precisely the damage done by recent budgetary difficulties. However, we believe the following conclusions (reinforced by the report of the External Advisers) to be tenable:

- Our collections budget is sorely inadequate according to any one of several criteria, as indicated by comparisons to our peers.

- The operations budget for the Library is no longer adequate to support the mission of the Berkeley campus, and the Library's service capabilities fall far short of what is needed. It is possible that this problem can be further ameliorated by administrative relocations. The extent of the shortfall depends on matters currently under study and negotiation, such as whether and how much of the expenses for seismic projects and for technology maintenance and upgrading should be included in the Library budget. However, here as with collections, either the budget must be increased or the expectations placed upon it, especially for continued library services, must be lowered.

- We therefore recommend an augmentation to the Library's base budget for 1998-99 of $4 million.

- The Library budget should not be thought of only in the categories of collections and operations, and the Library administration should have the flexibility to allocate fiscal resources as it sees most fit at a given time, although we make some suggestions below.

- The Library budget should be established in at least a rolling two-year budget cycle, giving the Library time to plan and to adjust.

Without a significant adjustment of the base budget of the Library, we will face the following choices:

(1) Compromise our research and/or instructional capabilities somewhat across all disciplines. We consider this choice unacceptable as it undermines the quest for excellence which is the hallmark of the Berkeley campus.

(2) Scale back our ambitions as a major research university with a large set of academic programs. That is, the campus could decide to narrow its intellectual focus, and close departments or otherwise reduce support for particular scholarly areas—cf. Section II.A above. (UC Berkeley supports Ph.D. programs in more fields than any of our peers, sometimes in almost twice as many fields.)

Obviously, neither choice is attractive. The point is simply that our Library budget is not in line with our goals, and one or the other must change.

We recognize that it is not possible over the long haul to sustain the kind of growth in budgets for scholarly information access that is recommended in this section. Libraries are currently in a period of transition and have been so for at least fifteen years. This transition has brought with it a series of new expenses—expenses for preservation, storage, electronic information, and rapidly rising cost and quantity of print materials in certain areas—that have impacted library budgets in extraordinary ways. The situation must force the academic community to recognize that we cannot go on doing business in this area as before. Some reconception of the needs in the area of scholarly information at a major research institution and of the means for supplying them will be necessary during the next few years, in order to bring the cost of meeting these needs into balance with the funding mechanism that must supply them. We want to highlight that the way of dealing with this issue that we propose here is not sustainable over the long term, and that the academic community at Berkeley (and throughout the country) must accept this fact and begin to devise ways to deal with it. We have made some suggestions in the various sections of this report as to ways one might begin this reconception. These should include both reducing costs and increasing external revenues and endowments. This should be an on-going campus responsibility across the next few years and engage the energies of the highest level of campus leadership.

We would also point out, however, that the percent of the campus General & Educational (G&E) budget represented by the Library budget (all funds, all libraries) has declined gradually but continuously over the years, from 5.26 percent in 1981-82 (the earliest year for which we have a figure) to 3.56 percent in 1996-97. The gap between the growth in the campus G&E budget and the growth in the Library budget has widened particularly precipitously since 1990-91. The average percent for the years 1981-89 was 4.65 percent; that for 1990-97 was 3.96 percent. Part of the cause was doubtless the budget crisis in the state and the abandonment of the Voigt-Susskind formula for the funding of libraries in the UC System; part of the cause in the most recent years is probably the targeting of budget increases to faculty salaries. We are not sure how to interpret these figures, since we do not know where the growth in the campus G&E budget occurred. We realize that the entire campus suffered with and through the budget crisis, but the Library seems to have suffered more.

The Library is one of the fundamental resources of the University. Its support and efficient functioning are crucial to almost all other areas of the University. The Blue Ribbon Committee has come to the conclusion that in both collections and operations additional measures are needed: (a) an increase in financial support for the Library and (b) improvement in the efficient use of those funds.

A. Collections

- To support its designated mission, the Library collections budget needs a permanent base adjustment.

The Library's mission includes the functions of a major research and instructional library. Examining the budgets for other institutions with similar goals reveals the following: the average collections budgets for 7 public peer institution libraries two years ago was $9 million; that of 7 private peers $11.1 million. (These are Association of Research Library statistics for 1995-96; 1996-97 figures are not yet available.) Two years ago the Berkeley Library's base was about $7.1 million. We will have slipped even further behind in the subsequent two years. That our goals cannot be achieved at this level seems already acknowledged by the former Chancellor's augmentation of the Library's base collections budget with one-time bridge funds.

While forces in play (e.g., content available in digital form) will no doubt significantly effect library practices, cost savings from such developments will require a profound change in scholarly publishing practices as well, and hence are not likely to occur in the immediate future. In the meantime, the cost of scholarly information continues to grow at an increasing rate. The University of Michigan (with a 1996-97 collections base budget of

$10.6 million) was planning an increase of 8.1 percent in its collections budget for the current year; University of Washington had a 1996-97 base of $8.6 million with an increase of 10.5 percent that year. Once again, we call attention to the number of Ph.D. programs a collection is supposed to support. Michigan lists 90, Washington lists 66, Berkeley lists 121. Our library resources are spread extremely thin. The need to establish academic priorities to guide Library collecting is paramount. Otherwise, we will soon have little more than core collections in all areas.

Our estimate is that a minimal base collections budget consistent with our goals would require an augmentation of at least $3 million to the current base of about $7.4 million. This estimate assumes that fiscal discipline in our collections activities will nonetheless need to continue, and does not take into account the relatively large number of academic programs we offer, in comparison with our peers. It also does not reckon "catch-up" needs of materials not bought from 1990-98 (cf. the opening paragraph above). These materials are likely to have been lost to this Library forever.

Note that this is a minimum request, which both the External Advisers and the Academic Senate Committee on Library support**.** This request would in fact bring only a $1 million amelioration to the current situation, since $1 million of it would make permanent the one-time bridge funding provided by the former Chancellor, $250,000 would make permanent The Vice Chancellor's initiative for digital materials, and $750,000 will be eaten up by the projected inflation in the cost of scholarly materials in the coming year. Clearly an additional augmentation will be needed in 1999-2000.

- For the near future at least, a commitment needs to be made to annually increase the Library's base collections budget, and the Library budget needs to be given each year as a rolling budget cycle of at least two years.

The Library administration needs time to engage its users in a rational planning exercise in the area of collection development, based on a careful campus determination of academic priorities. Given that no sustainable increase to the base budget can cover the actual increase in costs of scholarly materials, at least at the current rate, planners need to be looking forward at least two years to answer questions such as: in which areas should collecting be reduced, where should resources be shifted from one area to another, for what new programmatic initiatives do we need to begin collecting, where is attrition in academic staffing foreseen that would allow reallocation of support in collection development to new areas? As in the planning of proper allocation of faculty resources, this kind of planning involves substantial lead times. Thus the necessity of at least a two-year cycle.

We do not presume to propose here what the precise figure for annual augmentation to the collections budget should be. We would suggest that it might be predicated on a number of factors, such as the increase in the cost of scholarly materials, new programmatic or technological initiatives undertaken by the University, the governor's budget increase for the University. What is important is that there be some reliable figure so that the Library, in cooperation with its partner research institutions, can plan such things as serial subscriptions and/or cancellations and the partitioning of area coverage in collection development.

In the current climate of collection development at the major research libraries of our peer institutions, it would seem that a figure for annual increase should be in the region of 5 to 8 percent. (This figure is still under the projected increase in cost. The struggle to maintain the extension of the collections can perhaps be helped by increased cooperative collection development—see section II.A.3. above—in both print and digital areas.) Over the past 6 years the average increase of the 7 public peer institutions for which we have data is 5.3 percent per year. (Berkeley and UCLA depress this figure considerably.) The average increase of the privates is 6.3 percent. Berkeley's average increase in these same years has been 2.3 percent. (These figures are for the institutionally-funded base budget, excluding one-time funding or funding from other sources. If these were included, the figures would be 5.9 percent for the publics and 7.4 percent for the privates. Figures from the past two budgetary years for our peers are not included. Columbia University, in its recent response to a review, is counting on annual increases of 8 percent in coming years, as it has been over most of the 1990s.) We believe that the precise figure should be left to subsequent negotiations between the Library, the Senate Committee on Library as a representative of faculty and students, and the campus administration.

We note that the Berkeley Division Academic Senate Committee on Library and the Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation have independently made both these proposals. They have asked for a $3 million increase to the Library's base budget for next year (excluding operations), a $2 million increase in the next year, a "minimum three-year formula for inflationary increases", and a "three-year budget". In our interviews with top library administrators, even those not involved in collection development said the most serious immediate crisis in the Library is in collections. This was echoed in recent conversations with others who know the Berkeley situation well, and who were considered for the post of University Librarian in 1994. The perception even in 1994 was that the collections budget was one of the two most serious issues in need of remedy. That is even more so now. To bring some remedy to this situation will be an important factor in our imminent efforts to recruit a new University Librarian. (The other current most serious issue is in the area of external and internal communication mentioned in Section IV below.)

We understand that annual increases of this magnitude are not sustainable over the long term under the current funding model for the campus as a whole.

- We recommend that the new University Librarian be given the mandate to create a task force to address this problem directly. This task force should provide a detailed analysis both of the impact of inflation and increased demand for equipment and services, and of the ways this impact can be minimized by (a) cooperative arrangements, (b) long-range digitization strategies, (c) selective cuts in acquisitions, in correspondence with campus academic priorities, and (d) concerted action with other libraries to exert pressure on publishers.

- We recommend that studies be undertaken to develop bases for the rational allocation of collection and operations funds to the various academic areas. A base budget exercise should be done in the near future, leading to a distribution of collection-development funds to various academic areas that is arrived at by some rationally defensible method (see Section II.A.2. above).

As far as the Blue Ribbon Committee has been able to learn, the Library collections budget at Berkeley is allocated on a historical rather than synchronic basis. Therefore, developing a sound foundation for allocating resources would allow yearly funding and expectations to proceed in an orderly and rational manner. This allocation of resources should be based on the teaching and scholarly goals of a great university, while providing for some flexibility reflecting the varied practices of different disciplines.

The proposed studies might include an examination of how the areas by which collections budgets are allocated are defined, with the goal of mapping them more closely onto disciplinary areas where possible. This would enable disciplinary priorities to be applied more clearly to the allocation of collection-development resources.

The benefits of rational planning are hard to assess in advance. Our suspicion is that this exercise will help fine-tune allocation, rather than reveal an opportunity for significant cost-savings. However, of necessity we reserve judgment until after the exercise is completed.

B. Operations

This is a more difficult and complex area to quantify than collections. However, we believe the following overall conclusions (again reinforced by the Senate Committee on Library and the External Advisers) to be tenable and conservative:

- The operations budget for the Library is no longer adequate to support the mission of the Berkeley campus. The extent of the shortfall depends on matters currently under study and negotiation, such as whether and how much of expenses for technology maintenance and upgrading and for seismic projects should be charged to the Library budget. We do not believe seismic expenses belong in the Library budget.

- In view of this, we strongly recommend, for the short term, that no further shifts or reductions in this area be enforced in the Spring semester of 1998, before the new management has been chosen and installed and new processes of consultation inaugurated (see Section IV below).

- We recognize a need for the new University Librarian to be able to effect some renewal in the librarian corps.

- The increase in the collections budget recommended above has implications for the operations budget as well.

The main points as we see them are these:

(1) The Berkeley Library is not by any measure over-staffed, at least in terms of number of FTE of career staff. Comparison with peer institutions indicates that it is considerably under-staffed, although level of service expected and delivered at comparison institutions is impossible to quantify.

(2) The funds allocated to the non-personnel operating costs at Berkeley are demonstrably low when compared to similar institutions.

(3) The allocation of resources, particularly of personnel, has in recent years been distorted by two major factors: a) random ravages of retirements under the Voluntary Early Retirement Incentive Plan (VERIP), combined with an inability to rehire due to budgetary constraints and b) the need, as manifested by the allocation of resources within the Library, to stay in the forefront of new technological opportunities in library science (on-line catalogs, web interfaces, sharing of metadata between libraries).

(4) The operating budget of the University Library includes the considerable expenses of two exceptional special collections—The Bancroft Library and the East Asian Library—which must be considered national treasures. Relatively large and expensive special collections such as these are not on the budgets of most of the institutions to which we compare ourselves.

(5) The allocation of operational resources to various disciplines is *ad hoc*. For example, the ratio between the number of librarians and the number of faculty and students in the sciences suggests the need for an examination of what the proper staffing levels in the science libraries should be.

(6) Inadequate funding causes serious waste. For example:

(a) Rapid turnover of under-paid temporary staff results in poor service and a large waste of the time of permanent staff, who must continually train replacements.

(b) Much staff energy can be wasted when staff have inadequate supervision, which can happen in particular when there is rapid turnover of supervisors with the supervisors knowing they are only temporarily in the position.

(c) Waste in collection development, when there is no knowledgeable selector available to make wise selections.

(d) Waste in the availability of collections, when no subject-knowledgeable staff (especially in some foreign languages) is available to process the materials which the Library has received.

(e) Waste of valuable student and faculty time, when they cannot obtain adequate reference help or access to materials.

Much evidence available to us indicates that the Berkeley Library is underfunded in the area of professional staff—at least as far as numbers of people is concerned. Compared to Stanford and Columbia—institutions with much smaller student bodies and a much smaller number of graduate programs—its ratio of librarians to faculty is very low—down from 1 to 8 to 1 to 14 in this decade. Berkeley has far fewer professional librarians than these institutions. Figures on the dollars spent on library operations per Ph.D. program and per Ph.D. awarded indicate that our operations dollars, like our collections dollars, are spread far too thin.

The number of professional librarians at Berkeley is down by over one-third in the current decade. Total Library staff is down by over 20 percent. Total Library career staff per Ph.D. awarded is .49 per Ph.D. at Berkeley compared with .67 at our public peers and 1.32 at our private peers. Library career staff per Ph.D. program is 3.55 at Berkeley; 4.98 at our public peers; and 7.87 at our private peers. Total Library professional staff (librarians) per Ph.D. awarded is .20 at Berkeley, which ranks dead last among our peers and is number 98 out of the 108 institutions reporting.

Finally, and conclusively, one should point out that Berkeley is the ONLY INSTITUTION, among 14 public or private peers, to have actually, in nominal dollars (without adjusting for inflation, but including range adjustments), CUT ITS PERSONNEL COSTS (by some $425,000) between 1990 and 1996. (The average increase in personnel costs for the public peers was 21 percent over those same years, and 26 percent for the privates, while Berkeley was -2 percent. The average increase in the budget for supplies and expenses was 50 percent for the publics [computing expenses for equipment are here], 59 percent for the privates, while Berkeley was 17 percent.) The figures show clearly that, in comparison with both our public and private peers, we are at present parsimonious rather than profligate in our allocation of resources to these areas. Either our peers are being unnecessarily spendthrift, or we are starving our Library.

The Library budget request gives figures to the effect that it would take over $1 million simply to balance the operations budget, if all items currently charged to it are to remain there. The bottom line, here as with collections, is that either the budget must be increased or the expectations placed upon it, especially for continued library services, must be lowered.

Immediately in the coming year serious study must be given to how to reduce the gap between the total library operating expenses and the funds—principally 19900 funds—budgeted to support these expenses. At present 90 percent of the Library's 19900 funds are taken up by the fixed, inflexible area of personnel costs. (See the Library's budget presentation of January 1998.) This leaves next to nothing for the crucial areas to be covered under supplies and expenses. One should also study the issue of the presence within the Library personnel budget of internal units providing functions which at many other universities are provided by campus-wide units outside the library. Examples might be human resources, certain computer functions, and space planning and capital projects.

The decrease in resource allocation has been disproportionately more severe in some "branch" libraries than in Doe, and yet they seem to be operating more effectively and to have better communication with and approval from their constituents. A factor in this effectiveness appears to be that the branch libraries each have a single librarian who is responsible for the overall operation of the branch, whereas the Doe Library has a variety of responsible persons with no one overall coordinator. Therefore, we recommend that all decentralized units of our Library, whether now designated as "branch" or "main", operate with a single librarian responsible for overall operation of the unit.

- As with collections, we believe that the Library should establish a rational basis for allocation of the operations budget based on the teaching and scholarly goals of a great university (cf. Section II.A.2 above).

The establishment of such a "rational" basis should involve gathering and comparing data to see what various formulas would suggest. Here, as with collections, one should not take a rigidly formulaic approach, but should articulate why one deviates from it. Areas where the current pattern of allocation of personnel resources might bear particular scrutiny include the following. While other institutions (e.g., see the Columbia Action Plan of this year) are recognizing the increased need for subject specialists offering information-access advice for both print and digital media, Berkeley's Library has been relentlessly cut in this area by separations and retirements in recent years.

The Library has made the strategic decision to protect the Teaching Library and the Library Systems Office from similar cuts consequent to its assessment that these are the most strategically important units for the maintenance of library services in the present and future. Professor Calvin Moore's Commission on Campus Computing will presumably have some recommendation to make as to how the Teaching Library might appropriately be related to an eventual Office of Instructional Technology on campus, and as to whether that Office should be part of the Library or separate from it. The Library assures us that, although the number of FTE assigned to the Systems Office may look large, the actual expenditures assigned to it are no larger than those at our peers, when similar functions are assigned to their systems units. It has figures to back up this assertion. In any case, technology has played an important role in achieving economies that have allowed the Library to weather the last five years of budget cuts.

Also in the matter of the Library Systems Office, the Library points out (as do people outside Berkeley) that Berkeley was one of the first to move to an on-line catalog, and it did so when there was no system to buy, thus having to develop its own, GLADIS. We are told that the current circumstances are still not favorable for moving to a commercially available system in place of GLADIS. Experience at Stanford and UCLA seems to bear this out. At some point in the future, however, perhaps no more than 2 to 3 years away, the Library will need to consider moving to a new cataloguing and technical processing system, at a probable cost of $2-3 million, in 1998 dollars. On the evidence of conversations with the External Advisers and with librarians outside Berkeley, we are considered a leader in the planning and development of the digital library of the future.

Still on the issue of staff deployment, we refer to the Berkeley Senate Committee on Library's "Statement Concerning the UC Berkeley Library" of 9/17/97 (and the recent Columbia Action Plan), which emphasizes the importance of such mundane items as the condition of and access to the shelves and the print items on them, the rapidly increasing needs for reference instruction in both digital and print sources by inadequately prepared students coming out of our public schools, the increasingly uninformed reference "desk staff" as subject specialists retire or separate and the remaining ones are shifted to positions they are ill-equipped to fill, and the high rate of student turnover in ill-paid front-line positions. These are all public service, as opposed to technical service, issues. To increase the likelihood that books will be on the shelves, we recommend that the Library consider shortening the faculty loan period to four months or one semester. At this point, we once more adduce the importance of skilled selectors for advice on both reference and collecting. In an era when even major research libraries cannot collect comprehensively, it is through the individual selector that the Library gets the most detailed feedback from faculty and students on the issue of deployment of library resources. If this role is unfilled or improperly filled, or if communication between selector and faculty and graduate students is not functioning properly, a library can waste significant amounts of money by collecting inappropriately. Even the best of vendor plans requires careful supervision by knowledgeable professionals. Such issues concerning level of public service are hard, if not impossible, to quantify, but they are highly important to the user community.

- We recommend that funding of personnel for national treasures such as the Bancroft Library and the East Asian Library be re-examined—or at least treated separately in assessing the operational expenditures of the Berkeley Library relative to our peers.

Many, if not most, of our peer institutions do not fund such wonderful but expensive national treasures. Specialized research facilities such as the Bancroft and East Asian libraries are appropriate scholarly adornments of a great university, but allocation of 19900 funds to their collections and operations should be scrutinized closely and be evaluated annually as a proper allocation in the overall teaching and scholarly goals of the University. One might recommend that 19900 funding for such units be substantially in proportion to the direct contribution that they make to campus teaching and research programs, and that endowments be sought aggressively to fund at least part of their regular budgets, for example, endowed positions for top management. On a related matter, we recommend that an examination should be made as to whether any of the current affiliated libraries (and their budgets) should be brought under the wing of the University Library. It would seem at a minimum that their resources should be incorporated in the campus catalog, GLADIS, contrary to the present situation, where only some materials from these libraries are included in GLADIS.

IV. ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICES

A. External: Between the Library and its User Community

A larger base budget and reasonable yearly budget increases are the first steps toward enabling the Library to cope with the increasing costs of collections, the needs for improved services, and the changing nature of the Library. But even with a larger budgetary allocation, the Library will continue to face the extraordinary challenges of exponential growth in scholarly materials, rapidly changing technology, and exorbitant increases in the costs of scholarly publications. For the foreseeable future, even apart from budgetary stringency, the Library will have to deal with many difficult decisions about collections, access, and services. In this climate, the Library needs a method for campus consultation that will provide the University Librarian (UL) with thoughtful and well considered advice, while always ensuring that the UL retains the authority needed to carry out his or her responsibilities.

- This method must be grounded in the principle that the University Librarian is ultimately responsible to the Chancellor for the management and performance of the Library and must have the authority to carry out this responsibility.

This principle is fundamental, but another is equally important:

- The mission of the University Library is to meet the information needs of the faculty and students to the maximum degree possible within the limits of the resources provided to it by the campus administration. Thus strong channels of communication between the Library, the administration, and the faculty and students need to be in place.

Individual academic units currently engage in some very useful and successful consultation with selectors and unit heads in the Library concerning collections and operations in disciplinary areas. This should be encouraged and supported, but more regular communication is needed, especially about larger-scale planning and resource-allocation decisions. At the moment, we believe that the University Librarian does not have a regular and effective way to collect, aggregate, and utilize information on the library needs of faculty and students. This not only reduces the Librarian's ability to make the right decisions; it also makes it less likely that he or she will enjoy the support of faculty, students, and staff once decisions are made.

The Berkeley campus needs a method whereby the faculty, the deans, and the Library can work together to provide information about academic priorities and library needs. Because no such regular method currently exists, the Library has no structured way of knowing about changes in academic priorities, and the faculty is often perplexed by decisions made by the Library. This new method must occur within a fixed yearly schedule and a structure that ensures, in particular, that both the Library and the academic units jointly address the issues surrounding information access and develop a common understanding of them. Moreover, it should provide a mechanism for campus consultation whereby the University Librarian can develop a consensus on solutions to these major issues. This method should complement the existing mechanisms of consultation about collections and operations between the library committees of the individual academic units and the relevant selectors and unit heads in the Library.

We propose a new process to facilitate communication and consultation that will provide a means whereby the needs of individual units are developed, refined, and ultimately communicated to the Library and the campus administration.

We propose:

1. A regularly scheduled yearly process by which academic units (departments, schools, and other units) outline to both the appropriate deans and the relevant library units their major needs, immediate or foreseen, in the area of information access, in a brief document submitted early enough for use in the yearly budget process.

2. A process by which these indicated needs, together with those put forward by the Library administration, are discussed and refined in consultations between the Library and the academic deans. This would occur in separate consultations between academic deans in each area (e.g., Humanities, Biological Sciences, the various Professional Schools) and the relevant Associate University Librarians, selectors, and other library personnel. This would be designed to enhance the role of the academic community in relation to library priorities by involving both the academic units as a group, and the academic deans.

3. The results of the consultations between the academic deans and the Library would be sent both to the University Librarian and to the Senate Committee on the Library (COL).

4. The establishment of a new joint faculty-administration-library committee, which we will call here the Library Advisory Board (LAB). The LAB will be advisory to the senior campus administration and the University Librarian. The LAB would be designed to:

    i. Demonstrate and facilitate the involvement of the highest levels of the campus administration in the Library.
    ii. Provide the University Librarian with a permanent mechanism which can be used for consultation and consensus building on major library projects, plans, and priorities.
    iii. Enhance the involvement of faculty in the major issues before the Library.

How this Advisory Board would be constituted and structured to achieve these goals will need to be precisely worked out, in consultation with the Academic Senate and the administration. We would strongly recommend, however, that it should be relatively small, with overlapping three-year terms, and that it should build upon the base of the Senate Committee on Library. We also recommend that appointments to the LAB should be made by unanimous agreement of the Chair of the Academic Senate, The Vice Chancellor, and the University Librarian, and that efforts should be made to cover diverse academic areas in the appointments of the faculty and deans. For example, the Library Advisory Board might include:

Two faculty members drawn from the Senate Committee on Library
The University Librarian and another top Library administrator
The Chancellor or his delegate and perhaps one member from the Office of Budget and Planning
Two academic deans

The inclusion of the Chancellor (or The Vice Chancellor) would be an important step towards indicating the seriousness with which the administration takes library issues. Having faculty members drawn from the COL would recognize the important role played by the COL in library policy and operations. The academic deans would provide another faculty perspective on the Library, from the point of view of those who must decide academic priorities within their units.

The advantages of these proposals are several. Foremost is that the user community would have some knowledge of, and some authoritative input into, the major resource decisions confronting the Library administration. The user community would also be aware (via its selectors, via written feedback from the deans concerning the allocation process analogous to the reports on instructional full-time equivalent [FTE] allocation, and perhaps through other informational methods) of the constraints within which the Library is operating, and the trade-offs involved in the decisions which must be made. And the Library would have a structure and a schedule for bringing major resource and policy decisions before an authoritative advisory body (the LAB), composed of all the relevant parties.

We now give a more detailed analysis of the current situation and its problems, together with more detailed outlines of the proposed new procedures.

At present, faculty guidance to the Library comes primarily through three mechanisms. The administration (which on the academic side is essentially entirely made up of faculty members) is the main source of guidance with respect to campus-wide budgetary and administrative matters. The present Senate Committee on the Library, technically speaking, advises the Chancellor and is intended to provide a faculty perspective with respect to major policy issues, including the Library's budget request. Individual departmental library committees provide guidance, with a greater and lesser degree of effectiveness, on what materials should be collected in their subject area, and on related local matters.

Guidance from the administration takes place almost exclusively at the highest level, between the Chancellor's office and the University Librarian and senior Library staff. There is no structured, regular process for conversation between deans and any part of the Library.

The Senate Committee on Library, too, converses on a formal basis almost exclusively with the highest levels of the Library administration. While it is supposed to provide guidance about major library policy issues, in past years it has frequently lacked the opportunity or the information to do so effectively. Furthermore, it is not charged with any specific responsibilities, and it has little explicit authority. It is understandable that, in some past years at least, it has put little energy into its work.

Communication between departmental library committees and selectors is good in many cases, especially in the branches, where the selector’s responsibility and their subject-expertise overlap well with the department’s fields of study. Communication works well in these cases because the selector is physically present where the faculty and students are wont to work, and because in these cases the stakes are clear and immediate. So we will say little more here about this level, other than to point out that there presently are a number of highly unsatisfactory situations on campus where there is simply no subject-knowledgeable selector available.

We feel that communication between the Library and the faculty needs to be strengthened by two means:

(a) by establishing a structure and a schedule for direct communication between the academic units and the deans and the Library.

(b) by establishing a strong new faculty-administration-library committee (the LAB) charged with advising the University Librarian and the Chancellor about major issues within the Library such as space, operations, collections budgets, digital technology, etc.

We now discuss these two means in more detail.

1. Communication between deans and the Library.

At roughly the same time as academic units submit their requests for temporary academic support (TAS) to their dean (let us say late November/early December) they should also submit a brief “library needs” statement describing what they see as their major needs in the area of scholarly information access. (This statement might include academic computing needs as well as library and information needs.) This statement should focus on the coming year, but should also try to look forward to future years. This statement should not be elaborate (around 1-2 pages), and it should not be concerned with detailed matters of collecting, which should proceed through the departmental library committees and the proper selector.

These statements will serve to alert both the deans and the Library to adjustments that need to be considered in library services for various reasons. These reasons might include new programmatic initiatives, the needs of new faculty members present or foreseen (and the decreased needs in areas where faculty have retired or left and programs have been downsized), the changing nature of the library materials available, or simply major areas of dissatisfaction with library services.

These statements of library needs should go simultaneously to the relevant deans and to the relevant Associate University Librarians (AULs), librarians, and selectors in the Library. Each dean should then get together with the relevant librarians (say, in late January) to discuss the views of the Library and the academic units, and to prioritize the various needs based upon the overall academic planning goals of their various divisions and colleges. This would also be an opportunity for the Library staff to educate the deans about the state of the Library.

2. The Library Advisory Board.

The mandate of the Library Advisory Board would be to provide advice to the University Librarian, The Vice Chancellor, and the Chancellor about the best way to satisfy the information-access needs of the campus as a whole. The conversations with the top Library administration which this arrangement would require would set up a structure and schedule according to which the Library could consult with the faculty and the administration on major resource and policy decisions.

The LAB would be charged with important responsibilities. Its members would be expected to devote a substantial amount of time to their responsibilities and to consider not just the needs of their own limited constituency group, but rather the needs of the campus as whole. They would also need some staff support from the Chancellor's office. We believe that the commitment for rotating members (faculty and deans) should be for three years (similar to the Service Advisory Boards proposed for UCLA, where they ask for a four-year commitment from the faculty, or to the Wisconsin Library Committee, where the commitment is also for four years, and to the University of Washington's [Library] Faculty Council, whose terms are for three years). The recommendations of the LAB would be advisory to The Vice Chancellor and the University Librarian, but its advice should be taken extremely seriously.

Furthermore, the Library should have the responsibility for bringing major issues to the LAB. The Library must constantly be educating the members of the LAB about the major issues which the Library is debating internally, so that the LAB can advise intelligently.

As another responsibility for the LAB, whenever the faculty submit a proposal for a new academic program or a major change in an existing program, the proposal should describe in detail the support from the Library that will be needed for the program, and how that support will be funded (e.g. what other library activities will be discontinued in order to free resources for that support). Such programmatic proposals should be sent to the LAB, which should work with the Library administration to evaluate the effect on the Library if the proposal is carried out, and to make recommendations about this to the Academic Senate at large and to the campus administration.

- We also recommend that the Senate Committee on Library (COL) be strengthened and that its duties and responsibilities be made more explicit.

The COL should be more explicitly charged with the responsibility of advising on all important decisions of the Library bearing on academic policy. This means in particular that the Library should regularly bring before the COL all the important policy decisions it is facing.

We recommend that in order to best carry out its responsibilities, the COL should establish a system of standing subcommittees which are specifically charged with various areas of responsibility. The membership of these subcommittees might well include non-members of the main Committee (including students and members of the administration). As appropriate, certain members of subcommittees might even be assigned to participate in various meetings of Library administrative committees, if the Library felt that this would be useful.

We also recommend the following:

1) The COL should establish a strong relationship with the academic departmental library committees. The COL should facilitate periodic joint meetings between each AUL and the departmental library committees in the AUL's subject area.

2) The COL should ensure that when proposals are made concerning library activities which will especially affect certain campus academic units, those units are consulted throughout the process of developing the proposals. Every effort should be made to enlist the support of the affected units for the final proposal. The proposal should, in any case, not go forward without the units' comment.

3) The COL should maintain strong ties with the Librarians Association of the University of California, Berkeley (LAUC). It should also attempt to establish ties with the library assistants, an important group which seems to have been neglected in the past.

4) The COL should be a strong advocate and educator on the Library's behalf, both to the campus administration and to the faculty and students. This function would include establishing regular methods for informing the faculty and students about important Library issues.

5) In recognition of the importance of the mission of the COL, its Chair should be an *ex officio* member of the Divisional Council.

B. Internal: Administrative Practices within the Library

As our foremost recommendation in this section, we submit that:

- It is imperative that the Chancellor give the new University Librarian the discretion, and the resources, to staff top management positions with suitable individuals, whether these can be recruited within the University or need to be recruited from other institutions.

The past decade has been a difficult one for the Library administration, because of eight years of continuous budget cuts and the resulting loss of a substantial portion of the Library staff. There has been next to no budgetary provision for the hiring of new personnel. This has necessarily had a demoralizing effect on the remaining staff, as they have had to both take on heavier burdens and accept major shifts in their assigned responsibilities, in ways that often seemed completely beyond their control and that sometimes took them outside their areas of specialized knowledge as well. Moreover, most top administrative positions have had to be filled internally, sometimes with candidates reluctant to take on responsibilities for which their technical skills and experience did not best suit them.

As the Library moves to revitalize its cadre of professionals, we have a related recommendation to the campus administration: namely that it arrange that the Offices of Human Resources in both the Library and the campus give stronger support to the Library administration in effecting the appropriate assignment, classification, and appointment of Library personnel, including the possible disciplining of those not performing at the level required by their job.

We will now mention some management methods and issues that might be looked at by the incoming Library administration, with a view toward improving the relations between staff and senior administration within the Library, and thus increasing the effectiveness of the Library. These have come to our attention from discussions with many Library staff members in a wide variety of situations, some initiated by us, some by Library staff.

Difficult, often unpopular decisions have had to be taken in recent years. Decisions under such circumstances are bound to bring forth unhappiness. It is tempting to second-guess them and grumble that things should have been done a different way. We recognize this problem and do not intend to carp about individual decisions in the past. Still, there is little disagreement that internal communication within the Library has not been good in the most recent years, and that this problem has led to considerable feeling of alienation within the Library staff.

- We recommend that serious steps be taken to renew a sense of community and common purpose in the Library, within those areas where this sense has been eroded.

We believe that the Library can make the most effective use of its very talented staff by fostering collaborative leadership in a climate of mutual trust. Especially in times of hardship, it is essential for leaders to cultivate the trust of their troops. This requires consulting widely, and giving evidence that the opinions of the rank-and-file are listened to and taken into account. We must report that there is a wide-spread belief among the staff that this is not currently happening. There is a need to rebuild a sense of shared ownership and a sense of community and teamwork throughout the Library. This is not just the responsibility of top management. It also means that members of middle management must work for the good of the Library as a whole as well as for their own units.

Decisions should be made by a thorough and coherent process which is transparent enough that it is seen to be thorough and coherent by the staff, the faculty and students, and the campus administration. If this is the case, all groups will be more likely to respect the decisions that have been made, even if they may not always agree with them. We foresee that the process recommended under IV.A. above will help to ensure this.

Staff responsibilities should be assigned in a clear fashion, and decision-making concerning how best to carry out those responsibilities should be primarily in the hands of those carrying the responsibility. In other words, decision-making should be as decentralized as feasible. But there should be a clear structure for evaluating how well the responsibilities are being carried out. ("The incentives for effective management are strongest when decisions are made by the organizational level which bears the preponderance of costs and benefits of alternative actions." *Voice of the Senate*, August 1996, page 3.) Likewise, there should be incentives and encouragement for innovation and experiment (when carried out with the above consultation), and these incentives should be coupled with clear criteria for testing and evaluating the results of the experiments.

We heard comments from many librarians that the advancement process, as it is actually carried out, involves insufficient evaluation of their performance in their principal campus assignment, with excessive emphasis being placed on professional activities such as service to national library organizations, publication, etc. Unusual effectiveness in their principal campus assignment seems to receive inadequate recognition. Without implying that activities such as professional service to national library organizations, publication, etc. should be discouraged, every effort should be made to structure the advancement system for librarians so as to provide the proper balance between such activities and the quality of performance in the principal campus assignment. This will require a real and prompt effort to develop more effective tools for measuring the quality of performance at the level of the individual units.

A substantial level of stability and predictability are needed in order for an organization to run smoothly. Major reorganizations should be made infrequently, and only when there will be strong benefits. See the urgent recommendation under III.B above that no substantial shifts or reductions of staff be undertaken until a new management team is securely in place and has consulted broadly.

When new positions are to be created or vacant ones filled, these should be well-publicized. There should be open recruitment and applications should be solicited from the current staff.

While the problem of seriously ineffective staff members does not seem to be a widespread problem for the Library, it is a corrosive one. The Library administration must maintain a persistent and well-guided effort to alleviate it. Serious performance standards must be set and performance evaluations must be done on schedule, with broad input from the user community served by the staff member.

In order to keep the Library staff better informed about faculty priorities and concerns, we recommend that librarians be invited to be non-voting members of appropriate Academic Senate committees (beyond the Senate Committee on Library and the Library Advisory Board), as is done in some other universities.

Respectfully submitted,

Professor and Dean Anthony A. Newcomb, Chair

Professor in the Graduate School
Daniel E. Koshland, Jr.

Professor Henry E. Brady

Professor Marc A. Rieffel

Professor Carla Hesse

Professor Robert Wilensky

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Background and History of the Blue Ribbon Committee

Appendix B: Charge to the Blue Ribbon Committee

Appendix C: Report of the External Advisors

Appendix D: Summary documentation pertaining to the Library Budget.

Note: The Blue Ribbon Commitee Report with a complete set of the Appendices is available at the Reserve Desk at Moffitt Library. The Appendices are also available upon request.

APPENDIX A

Background and History of the Blue Ribbon Committee

The Vice Chancellor and Provost Carol T. Christ appointed the Blue Ribbon Committee on the Library (BRC) under the chairmanship of Professor and Dean Anthony Newcomb in June 1997. The BRC was charged with advising the Chancellor, The Vice Chancellor, and the University Librarian on how The Library should respond to the challenges, choices, and opportunities of information access in the coming decade by proposing principles to guide library planning at Berkeley. The charge to the Blue Ribbon Committee and a list of its members are provided in Appendix B to this report.

The BRC met fourteen times from August 1997 to March 1998, including meetings with University Librarian Peter Lyman, Deputy University Librarian Sue Rosenblatt and the Library's Chief Scientist Bernie Hurley. The BRC held a joint meeting with the Academic Senate Committee on Library in March 1998 to discuss a draft of this report, and Chair Newcomb met periodically with the Chair of the Senate Library Committee and the University Librarian. Chair Newcomb and members of the BRC met with members of the Library Administrative Group, with the Associate University Librarians, with the Executive Committee and members of the Librarians Association of the University of California, Berkeley, with the Affiliated Librarians, and with the Special Assistant for Library Planning and founding Librarian of the California Digital Library in the Office of the President. Chair Newcomb held an "early bird meeting" open to all members of the Library staff, and held open meetings sponsored by the Graduate Assembly and the Associated Students of the University of California. All academic departments in the schools and colleges were offered an opportunity to have a member of the BRC attend one of their faculty meetings. A large number of departments accepted this offer and many members of the faculty and Library staff spoke individually with members of the BRC informally as well. The BRC received over 600 electronic mail messages and other correspondence. Chair Newcomb alone held nearly 200 meetings with groups or individual members of the Library staff, the faculty, and the student body.

In addition to the materials provided with its charge, the Blue Ribbon Committee obtained reports, data, and articles from many sources, most particularly from University Librarian Peter Lyman, from Michael Rancer, Director of Financial Planning and Administration in The Library, and from the head librarians of several libraries of peer institutions.

Three External Advisors to the Blue Ribbon Committee visited the campus on March 16 and 17, 1998. Their report can be found in Appendix C. Both the External Advisors and the Blue Ribbon Committee received a compendium of reports from the University Librarian, including a progress report entitled "The UC Berkeley Library in the 1990s", which is available for consultation upon request.

The Blue Ribbon Committee focused on information gathering during the fall semester. Subcommittees were formed to work on specific areas, and further information and data were collected by the subcommittees in January. A first very rough draft of the Blue Ribbon Committee's report was completed in early February and was shared on a confidential basis with the External Advisors, the Library administration, and the members of the Academic Senate Library Committee. A revised report was discussed with the Senate Library Committee at the joint meeting in on March 10, 1998.