AGENDA

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF DECEMBER 3, 2009 DIVISIONAL MEETING (Attachment 1)

II. ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM THE DIVISION CHAIR – Elena Fuentes-Afflick
   • Acknowledgement of Service for Outgoing Committee Chairs

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM THE CHANCELLOR – Chancellor Desmond-Hellmann

IV. SPECIAL ORDERS
   Consent Calendar: Committee on Committees Recommendations for Academic Senate Committee Appointments for 2010-11

V. REPORTS OF SPECIAL COMMITTEES: None

VI. REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES
   A. Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication (COLASC) – Richard Schneider, Chair of UCOLASC and Vice Chair of COLASC and Karen Butter, University Librarian
      • The future of Libraries, Scholarly Communications, and Publisher Agreements (Attachments 2, 3, and 4)
   B. Committee on Faculty Welfare – Jacque Duncan, MD, Chair, Committee on Faculty Welfare

VII. REPORT ON UCSF FUNDRAISING AND THE UCSF STUDENT FUNDRAISING CAMPAIGN – Carol Moss, Vice Chancellor for Development and Alumni Relations; Joseph Castro, Vice Provost for Student Academic Affairs; Mark Boone, Senior Director of Development, School Programs, UCSF Development and Alumni Relations

VIII. PETITIONS OF STUDENTS: None

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS: None

X. UNIVERSITY AND FACULTY WELFARE: None

XI. NEW BUSINESS

XII. ADJOURNMENT
Meeting of the San Francisco Division  
Elena Fuentes-Afflick, MD, MPH, Chair

MINUTES  
Thursday, December 3, 2009

The meeting of the San Francisco Division was called to order by Chair Fuentes-Afflick on December 3, 2009 at 3:30 p.m. in the CL 506, the East Asian Reading Room in the Kalamovitz Library. A quorum was present.

Approval of Minutes from June 18, 2009  
The minutes of the June 18, 2009 Division Meeting were approved.

Announcements from the Division Chair  
Chair Fuentes-Afflick welcomed the Chancellor and made these announcements:

- President Yudof has restated his intent that the furloughs last no more than one year.
- Senate members including the Chair and Kit Chesla sat in on the budget determinations for 2009- to keep the faculty’s concerns upfront.
- The Academic Freedom Symposium will be held on January 13, 2010 from 1p.m. to 5 p.m. in HSW 301. David M. Rabban, JD, Professor of Law at the University of Texas at Austin and Chair of the American Association of University Professors Academic Freedom Committee will be the keynote speaker.
- The ceremony to give Honorary Degrees to Japanese-American Students whose UC enrollment was disrupted by WWII and internment camps, is being held on Friday, December 4, 2009 from 2 p.m. to-5 p.m. at Mission Bay.
- Chair Fuentes-Afflick provided an overview of the UC Commission on the Future and it’s five working groups: Size and Shape, Education and Curriculum, Access and Affordability, Funding Strategies, and Research Strategies. UCSF Working Group Representatives will liaise with the appropriate Senate Committees to make ensure broad representation. An open forum on the Commission will be held on December 8, 2009 at Mission Bay.
- Roland Henry, Vice Chair of the Committee on Committees (COC) explained the importance of Senate service and proper matching of interests with committee work. He encouraged people to respond to the 2010-2011 Call for Service as thoroughly as possible.

Chancellor’s Announcements  
The Chancellor addressed the Division and outlined her role, priorities and outcomes, action plan, and priorities. Her five priorities include: patient/health, discovery, education, people and business. The Chancellor closed her remarks with a request for feedback from the faculty. She emphasized the importance of intellectual input and energy in shaping the future of UCSF.

Reports of Standing Committees  
Committee on Faculty Welfare – Jacque Duncan, MD, Chair  
Chair Duncan began by giving some background on the UC Retirement System (UCRS). Before the economic downturn, UCRS was in good shape. However, due to the downturn, contributions will need to be restarted. There has been much concern and discussion and contributions have been postponed until April 2010.
In order to address these concerns, a Post-Employment Benefits Task Force has been established and Listening Sessions were established to hear faculty and staff concerns. From those sessions, a letter was drafted to Interim Provost Larry Pitts explaining the faculty’s position, and requesting he visit an upcoming Committee on Faculty Welfare meeting so that faculty can be further involved in the changes to UCRS.

**Petitions of Students**
None received.

**Unfinished Business**
None.

**New Business**
None.

There being no further business, Chair Fuentes-Afflick adjourned the meeting at 4:59 p.m.

Senate Staff:
Shilpa Patel, Sr. Senate Analyst
shilpa.patel@ucsf.edu; 415/514-2696
June 4, 2010

Re: Informational Update on a Possible UC Systemwide Boycott of the Nature Publishing Group

Dear UC Divisional Chairs and Members of the UC Faculty,

UC Libraries are confronting an impending crisis in providing access to journals from the Nature Publishing Group (NPG). NPG has insisted on increasing the price of our license for Nature and its affiliated journals by 400 percent beginning in 2011, which would raise our cost for their 67 journals by well over $1 million dollars per year.

While Nature and other NPG publications are among the most prestigious of academic journals, such a price increase is of unprecedented magnitude. NPG has made their ultimatum with full knowledge that our libraries are under economic distress—a fact widely publicized in an Open Letter to Licensed Content Providers and distributed by the California Digital Library (CDL) in May 2009. In fact, CDL has worked successfully with many other publishers and content providers over the past year to address the University’s current economic challenges in a spirit of mutual problem solving, with positive results including lowering our overall costs for electronic journals by $1 million dollars per year.

NPG by contrast has been singularly unresponsive to the plight of libraries and has employed a ‘divide and conquer’ strategy that directs major price increases to various institutions in different years. Their proposed new license fee is especially difficult to accept in a time of shrinking UC library budgets and with the many sacrifices we all continue to make Systemwide. Capitulating to NPG now would wipe out all of the recent cost-saving measures taken by CDL and our campus libraries to reduce expenditures for electronic journals. More information about the UC Libraries’ concerns, including a history of previous unsustainable price increases from this publisher and others, is available on the CDL’s Challenges to Licensing page at http://www.cdlib.org/services/collections/current/challenges.html

UC Libraries have already taken a stand against NPG. After recently acquiring Scientific American, NPG doubled the institutional site license fee and raised the price of an institutional print subscription seven-fold. In response, UC Libraries, along with numerous other institutions throughout the country, discontinued their license to the online version and reduced the number of print subscriptions. As a first response to the current NPG proposal, UC Libraries plan to forgo all online subscriptions to any new NPG journals. But more drastic actions may be necessary.

What can UC Faculty do to help?

UC Faculty and researchers author a significant percentage of all articles published in NPG journals and are a major force in shaping the prestige of its publications. In the past six years, UC authors have contributed approximately 5300 articles to these journals, 638 of them in the flagship journal Nature. Using NPG’s own figures, an analysis by CDL suggests that UC articles published in Nature alone have contributed at least $19 million dollars in revenue to NPG over the past 6 years—or more than $3 million dollars per year for just that one journal. Moreover, UC Faculty supply countless hours serving as reviewers, editors, and advisory board members.

Many UC Faculty now believe that a larger and more concerted response is necessary to counter the monopolistic tactics of NPG. Keith Yamamoto, a Professor and Executive Vice Dean at UCSF (yamamoto@cmp.ucsf.edu) who helped lead a successful boycott against Elsevier and Cell Press in 2003 (http://www.libraryjournal.com/article/CA379265.html), has begun to assemble a group of Faculty that will help lead a UC Systemwide boycott of NPG. This means that unless NPG is willing to maintain our current licensing agreement, UC Faculty would ask the UC Libraries to suspend their online subscriptions entirely, and all UC Faculty would be strongly encouraged to:
Decline to peer review manuscripts for journals from the Nature Publishing Group.
Resign from Nature Publishing Group editorial and advisory boards.
Cease to submit papers to the Nature Publishing Group.
Refrain from advertising any open or new UC positions in Nature Publishing Group journals.
Talk widely about Nature Publishing Group pricing tactics and business strategies with colleagues outside UC, and encourage sympathy actions such as those listed above.

We clearly recognize that the consequences of such a boycott would be complex and present hardships for individual UC researchers. But we believe that in the end, we will all benefit if UC can achieve a sustainable and mutually rewarding relationship with NPG. In the meantime, UC scholars can help break the monopoly that commercial and for-profit entities like NPG hold over the work that we create through positive actions such as:

- Complying with open access policies from Federal funding agencies such as the NIH (http://publicaccess.nih.gov).
- Utilizing eScholarship, an open access repository service from CDL (http://www.escholarship.org/publish_postprints.html).
- Considering other high-quality research publishing outlets, including open access journals such as those published by PLoS and others.
- Insisting on language in publication agreements that allows UC authors to retain their copyright (http://osc.universityofcalifornia.edu/manage/retain_copyrights.html).

A full list of journals currently licensed from NPG by UC Libraries is attached. We will keep you informed as this situation progresses, including the possibility of canceling all NPG titles. Please feel free to contact the University Librarian on your campus with questions or concerns, or any of us. You can also communicate your concern to key contacts at NPG. The managing director of NPG, Steven Inchcoombe, and other members of the executive committee can be reached at exec@nature.com.

Sincerely,

Laine Farley
Executive Director
California Digital Library
University of California, Office of the President
laine.farley@ucop.edu

Richard A. Schneider
Associate Professor, Department of Orthopaedic Surgery
University of California – San Francisco
Chair, University Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication
rich.schneider@ucsf.edu

Brian E. C. Schottlaender
The Audrey Geisel University Librarian
University of California – San Diego
Convener, University Librarians Council
becs@ucsd.edu
CC:
Henry Powell
Professor of Pathology
University of California, San Diego
Chair, Academic Senate

Daniel Greenstein
Vice Provost for Academic Planning, Programs and Coordination
University of California, Office of the President

Thomas Leonard
University Librarian
University of California – Berkeley

Helen Henry
Acting Co-University Librarian
University of California – Davis

Gail Yokote
Acting Co-University Librarian
University of California – Davis

Carol Hughes
Acting Co-University Librarian
University of California – Irvine

Deb Sunday
Acting Co-University Librarian
University of California – Irvine

Gary E. Strong
University Librarian
University of California – Los Angeles

R. Bruce Miller
University Librarian
University of California – Merced

Ruth M. Jackson
University Librarian
University of California – Riverside

Karen Butter
University Librarian & Assistant Vice Chancellor
University of California – San Francisco

Sharon DeDecker
Acting University Librarian
University of California – Santa Barbara

Lucia Snowhill
Acting University Librarian
University of California – Santa Barbara

Ginny Steel
University Librarian
University of California – Santa Cruz
Number of journals: 67

Includes: 25 Nature-branded journals
42 academic and specialist journals

Note: NPG publishes 85 journals in total, including titles not licensed at UC. For a complete list of publications, see http://www.nature.com/siteindex/index.html

Nature
Nature Biotechnology
Nature Cell Biology
Nature Chemical Biology
Nature Genetics
Nature Geoscience
Nature Immunology
Nature Materials
Nature Medicine
Nature Methods
Nature Nanotechnology
Nature Neuroscience
Nature Photonics
Nature Physics
Nature Protocols
Nature Structural & Molecular Biology
Nature Reviews Cancer
Nature Reviews Cardiology
Nature Reviews Drug Discovery
Nature Reviews Genetics
Nature Reviews Immunology
Nature Reviews Microbiology
Nature Reviews Molecular Cell Biology
Nature Reviews Neuroscience
Nature Reviews Rheumatology

American Journal of Gastroenterology
American Journal of Hypertension
Bone Marrow Transplantation
British Dental Journal
British Journal of Cancer
Cancer Gene Therapy
Cell Death & Differentiation
Cell Research
Clinical Pharmacology and Therapeutics

EMBO Journal
EMBO reports
European Journal of Clinical Nutrition
European Journal of Human Genetics
Evidence Based Dentistry
Eye
Gene Therapy
Genes & Immunity
Heredity
Immunology and Cell Biology
International Journal of Impotence Research
International Journal of Obesity
ISME Journal
Journal of Antibiotics
Journal of Cerebral Blood Flow & Metabolism
Journal of Exposure Science & Environmental Epidemiology
Journal of Human Genetics
Journal of Human Hypertension
Journal of Investigative Dermatology
Journal of Perinatology
Kidney International
Lab Animal
Laboratory Investigation
Leukemia
Modern Pathology
Molecular Psychiatry
Molecular Therapy
Neuropsychopharmacology
Obesity
Oncogene + Oncogene Reviews
Pharmacogenomics Journal, The
Prostate Cancer & Prostatic Diseases
Spinal Cord
Below is an overview of online journal subscriptions and license fees managed by the California Digital Library for the entire UC System. Individual UC campuses also purchase many journal subscriptions locally and those figures are not included here. Please consult with your University Librarian for more information about online journal subscriptions at each of the ten campuses.

- Amount spent for online journal licenses for UC Systemwide: $24.3 million
- Current number of online journals for UC Systemwide: 7,846
- Average UC cost per journal:
  - Life and health sciences: $4,142
  - Physical sciences and engineering: $6,814
  - All journals (includes social sciences and humanities): $3,103
- Current average UC cost per Nature Publishing Group journal: $4,465
- Proposed average UC cost per Nature Publishing Group journal for 2011: $17,479
- Increase in UC Library materials budget from 2005–2009: 7.46%
- Increase in major journal package license fees from 2005–2009: 15%
- Reduction to UC Library materials budget in 2010: -$1.9 million
- Current number of journals licensed from Nature Publishing Group: 67
- Increase in Nature Publishing Group license fees from 2005–2009: 137%
- Proposed increase in Nature Publishing Group license fees for 2011: 400%

In 2010, CDL successfully reduced the cost of many major licenses by 15% or more in response to the current economic downturn. Virtually all publishers with whom we have concluded agreements in 2010 have cooperated with us to address UC’s budget challenges.

---

1 Includes research journals licensed directly from publishers only. More than 30,000 journals are available systemwide including aggregated databases.

2 A small percentage of this increase is due to licensing additional journals from these publishers.
Public statement from Nature Publishing Group regarding subscription renewals at California Digital Library (CDL)

For all enquiries, please contact:
Grace Baynes
Corporate Public Relations, Nature Publishing Group
T: +44 (0)20 7014 4063
E: g.baynes@nature.com

June 09 2010

CDL’s letters to the UC Divisional Chairs and Members of the UC Faculty, dated June 4th, 2010, has today been brought to our attention, and to the attention of scientists and librarians around the world. This has been a shock to us at NPG, in terms of the sensationalist use of data out of context, misrepresentation of NPG pricing policies, and the fact that we were under the impression we were in an ongoing confidential discussion. It is with great regret we therefore have to publicly address, in detail, all the allegations contained in the letter. It is our hope in doing so that we can move back to discussions in good faith, and correct the already negative effects of this letter on scientific communication. We have had no information from CDL that they were under the impression that discussions had broken down. Negotiations began back in 2009, our last face-to-face meeting was May 14th, and the current agreement runs until the end of December 2010.

The implication that NPG is increasing its list prices by massive amounts is entirely untrue. We have been publishing our academic site licence pricing for several years on our librarian gateway. Dollar list price increases have been reasonable (averaging roughly 7% over 4 years), and publicly available throughout. A 7% cap on annual list price increases is currently in place.

The complication with CDL is that they have been on a very large, unsustainable discount for many years, to the point where other subscribers, both in the US and around the world, are subsidising them. The origins of this discount can be found in the lack of clear definitions around consortia and ‘single institute, multisite’ subscribers, as well as previous accommodations of CDL’s budget limitations.

If we regard CDL as a consortium of multiple libraries (not least suggested by CDL’s membership of International Coalition of Library Consortia (ICOLC), and the libraries’ ARL listings), the CDL discount on list price is 88%. By their own figures, CDL receives average discounts of 55% from publishers. After several attempts, we are now trying to bring them close to a 50% discount (although this leaves CDL on better terms than many other consortia). We do recognise the situation can be viewed from different perspectives, and we remained committed to ongoing discussions.

NPG stands by its position that CDL is paying an unfair rate. Again, by CDL’s own figures, the average cost of an NPG journal was $4,465, well under the price of many major STM titles. NPG titles reflect the most highly used, and most high impact journals in science. NPG adds huge amounts of value to the very best quality original research, and this situation was simply not sustainable. It is our belief NPG titles represent excellent value for money, whether measured by cost per download, or perhaps more accurately, cost per local citation.

Our own projections show CDL will be paying roughly $0.56 per download under the new prices. This represents incredible value for money across any publisher’s range of titles. We now call on CDL to reveal how much it spends with all the major publishers, and how this translates into cost per use, and/or other indicators of value. If NPG represents poor value for money, we will work with CDL to readjust their pricing. If, as we expect, NPG represents good value for money compared with other publishers, even at the new proposed pricing, we want to work with CDL to have this reflected in our agreement. We sincerely hope that no boycotts will occur, not least because it is detrimental to the advance of science, but we will not be bullied into continuing CDL’s subsidy by our other customers.

We are confident that the appointment of Professor Keith Yamamoto and other scientific faculty to lead the proposed boycott, will mean they will be in a position to assess value with a rigorous and transparent methodology. We specifically recognise the value faculty add to the publishing process, not only through authorship and peer review, but as the user group we aim to service efficiently and effectively. NPG journals are, and always have been run by scientists, for scientists. Nevertheless, while recognising this value as critical to our existence, we are utterly confused by the claims that UC authors have contributed $19 million in revenue to NPG over the past six years. We look forward to learning more about those calculations.

Many of our other customers, editors, authors and peer-reviewers have been alarmed by claims from CDL. We would like to confirm our ongoing commitment to cap site licence list price increases for 2011. We would also like to assure customers that CDL is the only consortium with a legacy pricing issue which requires an adjustment of this size, to bring pricing into line with other customers, and ensure fairness across our customer base, in the US, in the west, and around the world.

We must also take this opportunity to address CDL’s calls for increased compliance with funder mandates, more self-archiving, and authors retaining copyright. These are positions that NPG has actively supported and encouraged since 2005. However, we believe our colleagues at PLOS would agree that publishing high quality manuscripts, in journals with a high rejection rate, is an expensive business, and requires either high subscription fees, or high article processing charges, to be profitable.

To conclude, we are disappointed that CDL has resorted to using misinformation in inappropriate contexts to create publicity with the threat of a boycott, as part of a negotiating tactic, when NPG’s intention has always been to reach a fair agreement. As of today,
Response from the University of California to the Public statement from Nature Publishing Group regarding subscription renewals at the California Digital Library

June 10, 2010

The University of California appreciates the full and detailed response provided by Nature Publishing Group (NPG) to the informational letter recently shared with the University of California Faculty. As NPG has requested, we are providing a response of our own, attempting to answer in order the points that NPG has raised.

The UC letter that has been circulated was issued not from the California Digital Library (CDL) alone, but jointly from CDL, the UC Libraries, and the University Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication (UCOLASC), which is made up of Faculty representatives from each of our ten campuses. The letter was intended to be an internal informational update to alert our Faculty to the challenges surrounding the renewal of our site license with NPG for 2011. Our Faculty library committees have explicitly requested that they be consulted on major negotiations and journal cancellations. We also wanted to provide information on a separate grass-roots initiative developing among a group of senior Faculty who are concerned about the proposed price increases that NPG had presented to CDL. As this letter was issued by a large public university, we are not surprised that it made its way to the press, though that was not our intent.

To begin, CDL has a different impression of our last meeting in May to which NPG refers. While CDL had not yet proposed a counter-offer to NPG, we were led to understand quite explicitly that no counter-offer was possible, that ‘this was the price,’ and that the NPG offer had a firm deadline. NPG suggested to us several times that canceling journals was our most likely opportunity to achieve the cost controls we sought. The demeanor was markedly different from other publishers with whom we regularly conduct negotiations. As to the confidential nature of these discussions, again our communication was to our own Faculty community, with whom we have an obligation to consult in the course of internal business.

Contrary to what NPG claims in their response, the UC letter does not state, and nowhere implies, that NPG has increased its list prices by 400%. Rather, the letter states that NPG proposes to raise our site license fees by that amount. Any misrepresentation on this point is solely attributable to NPG. Whether the historical, published price increases by NPG have been reasonable—or whether they even mirror reality—is another and more debatable matter. On the first point, an increase of 7% per year translates to an increase of 40% over five years. Few, if any, library budgets have gone up at even a fraction of that amount over a comparable period (the materials budget of the UC Libraries increased by 7.46% between 2005 and 2009 and is now slated to decrease during the next few years). In other words, 7% increases compounded annually are budget busting (also note that 7% is more than three times the average US rate of inflation for the past few years).

In our most recent negotiations, nearly all publishers from whom we license content have worked with us to meet the significant budget challenges presented by the current economic downturn, significantly reducing fees in many instances. We would be acting in bad faith in our dealings with those providers if we turned around and accepted an increase of the magnitude that has been proposed by NPG. Moreover, doing so would completely negate the savings reductions achieved to date, which still fall short of cuts being absorbed by UC libraries.
On the second point, the past price increases of NPG journals at the University of California are instructive about the tactics of NPG. Between 2005 and 2009, NPG increased their licensing fees to the University by 137% (granted this included some new titles, but truthfully not enough to warrant such a dramatic price increase). Even when our license was placed on a new and, we believed, more stable footing in 2008, our fees still increased by 5%. But now, NPG claims that their proposed 400% increase is to make up for “an unsustainable discount” that they have provided UC all along. We find this to be an implausible explanation given the remarkably large sums of money others and we already pay to NPG every year. The notion that other institutions are subsidizing “our discount” is nonsensical. If anything, other institutions are simply paying too much.

NPG also refers to their proposed new license fee as a 50% discount off of list price, but this is misleading and has been taken out of context. First of all, NPG is free to set list price at any amount they want, so in many ways this is a meaningless number. Most academic institutions receive substantial discounts off of list price. Historical subscription patterns in the context of long-standing journal agreements tend to be the main determinants of price (as indeed they were for our original NPG agreement). But we recognize that NPG has a different perspective on this issue and welcome their commitment to authentic discussions.

The question of how to determine value is also a complex matter. Indeed, the UC Libraries have devoted significant resources to studying this issue. While we agree that NPG publishes very high quality content, so do many other publishers, at more reasonable costs. The Fact Sheet appended to our Faculty letter indicates that the current average price of NPG journals at UC is appropriately aligned with other content licensed at the University, whereas the new proposal from NPG would position its journals as significant outliers. While there is no question that cost per use for NPG journals at UC is low, the characteristics of these journals must also be taken into account to ensure that like is being compared with like. As many observers and analysts have noted (including those in *Nature* such as Andrew Odlyzko, [http://www.nature.com/nature/focus/accessdebate/7.html](http://www.nature.com/nature/focus/accessdebate/7.html)), the marginal cost to a publisher of increased online usage is very low in comparison to first-copy costs. There are many extrinsic factors that drive usage in today’s digital environment, most of which bear little relation to a publisher’s internal cost structure. We look forward to working with NPG to determine a fair assessment of value as we continue discussions.

We appreciate that NPG recognizes that the scientific community is both its core audience and its major stakeholder. And we agree that NPG has been a leader in adopting the “green” publishing policies that many scholars seek today and commend them for these forward-looking perspectives. With respect to our attempt to assign a monetary value to the contributions of UC researchers to the NPG enterprise, we would be happy to share with NPG how we arrived at this estimate and to learn if NPG has a different way of calculating such figures. We note here only that our estimate made no attempt to factor in the value of peer review, editorial or advisory board service by UC Faculty, or the contribution value of UC articles in other NPG journals besides *Nature* itself. In fact, we would welcome more transparent means of determining what UC Faculty contribute and how this virtually free labor gets factored into revenue calculations or potentially could be used to offset subscription rates.

We have also frequently sought a dialogue with publishers about new business models needed to sustain high quality online publication. In an earlier era, journals were supported by more diversified sources of revenue, such as page charges, personal subscriptions, advertising, and the like. In today’s site license
environment, a significantly higher percentage of a publisher’s revenue now depends on institutional library budgets. Using grant funds to support article processing charges for open access publication is intended in part to address this, as is the suggestion that journals with extremely high rejection rates consider charging submission fees. Unfortunately, we have found publishers largely unwilling to engage with libraries or authors on these issues despite repeated attempts on our part to enter into such conversations. UC would welcome an opportunity to have such conversations with NPG.

In summary, the CDL, UCOLASC, and UC Libraries categorically reject the notion that we have resorted to misinformation or distortion of any sort, as well as any suggestion that we sought to engender premature publicity. We included accurate information, not misinformation, in an internal communication intended for our Faculty. As the UC Libraries contemplate budget reductions of 20% or more over the next two years on top of reductions already taken in 2010, we are faced with difficult choices and seek publisher partners who are willing to work with us over the long-term. That being said, we want to emphasize that the UC letter represents the deliberations of many Faculty committees and librarians across the UC System who unanimously felt that UC needed to take a stand on this issue as a matter of principle and not merely as a budgetary consideration. Plainly put, UC Faculty do not think that their libraries should have to pay exorbitant and unreasonable fees to get access to their own work. A key concept in our letter is that UC ultimately wants to reach a "sustainable and mutually rewarding relationship with NPG" but Faculty and librarians feel that this cannot be achieved with the present proposal from NPG. Thus, we stand by our letter and look forward to a productive dialogue with NPG on these issues.