

LIBRARY COMMITTEE  
MINUTES OF MEETING  
December 15, 2010  
Morrill Hall room 238A

[In these minutes: proposed committee merger; strategic priorities for the university libraries; open access; committee agenda]

[These minutes reflect discussion and debate at a meeting of a committee of the University of Minnesota Senate; none of the comments, conclusions or actions reported in these minutes represent the views of, nor are they binding on, the Senate, the Administration or the Board of Regents.]

PRESENT: Neil Olszewski (Chair), Wendy Lougee, Danielle Tisinger, J. Woods Halley, John Logie, Elizabeth Fine, Ronald Hadsall, David Zopfi-Jordan, James Orf, Michael Hannon (for Joan Howland), Michelle Englund, Jonathan Binks, Jennifer Alexander, Monica Howell, Bradford Clemens

REGRETS: Mary Beth Sancomb-Moran, Bill Sozansky, Joseph Spanjers, LeAnn Dean, Vicki Graham, David Fox

ABSENT: Robert Muellerleile,

Professor Neil Olszewski called the meeting to order and welcomed those present.

**Proposed Merger of the Senate Library Committee and Senate Committee on Information Technology**

Professor Olszewski stated that Professor Kate VandenBosch, chair of the Senate Consultative Committee, informed him that an ad hoc group had been asked to look at the Senate committee structure to see if there were any redundancies or gaps. The group discussed the organization and operation of several committees, and proposed the merger of the Senate Committee on Information Technologies (SCIT) and the Senate Library Committee (SLC). Professor VandenBosch asked Professor Olszewski to seek feedback from the SLC. Professor Olszewski stated that it was his understanding that the SCIT did not have much enthusiasm for the merger, and that he did not favor it as the committees have significantly different charges. Professor John Logie asked if there was a representative from the SLC on SCIT and visa versa. Professor Olszewski responded that there were not currently reciprocal members. Danielle Tisinger noted that in the past she had filled this role for the SLC. Committee discussion followed about the necessity of having two individuals attend both meetings. A motion was made and approved to convey to Professor VandenBosch that the SLC did not want to merge with the SCIT, but that it did want to have a member of the SLC sit as an ex officio on the SCIT and a member of the SCIT sit as an ex officio member on the SLC. Professor Olszewski stated he would forward the committee's recommendations to Professor VandenBosch.

### **Strategic Priorities for the University Libraries**

Wendy Lougee, University Librarian, began her presentation on strategic priorities for the University Libraries with an article about a contest created to improve the way scientific information is communicated and used. The contest is sponsored by Elsevier, a leading global publisher of scientific, technical, and medical information. She brought this to the committee's attention because it captures some of the changes in the publishing industry including publishers requiring or encouraging the submission of data with articles, functionality making the data executable, and the encapsulation of the articles and the data in one copyright agreement. She noted this relates to the SLC's previous discussion about open access because data itself is not copyrightable, but some publishers are asserting a right to incorporate the data in their copyright agreements.

Next, Ms. Lougee referred the committee to the report, *Strategic Priorities for University Libraries*. Ms. Lougee explained that the report was the result of the Provost's request that colleges and academic units develop a "blue ribbon" committee/report process to provide a framework to guide the next three years planning. The Libraries responded by bringing in a series of experts to speak on critical themes, and sponsored targeted presentations on these topics. Workgroups then worked on priority goals, ultimately resulting in the campus report, *Strategic Priorities for University Libraries*. She went on to state that the framework for the plan is the knowledge lifecycle – discovery, use, creation, and dissemination. This recognizes the Libraries' dual role as an academic agency and service agency and reflects the shift from supporting products (collections) to also supporting processes around knowledge use and sharing.

Next, Ms. Lougee highlighted some of the major forces and trends that impact the Libraries' planning. She noted:

- Price inflation in publishing well above the CPI or Higher Education Price Index
- Changes in the publishing industry
- Complexities of access: Libraries must now integrate different publishers systems into a coherent whole.
- At-capacity collection storage: Ms. Lougee highlighted the fact that the University Libraries are out of space. She noted they are already renting two storage sites and she anticipates this will increase.
- Demands of virtual users: There has been significant growth in demand for electronic reference services, and the University is part of a coordinated network of reference services.
- Lean Staffing: Ms. Lougee pointed out the Libraries' staff numbers are far fewer than those of peer research libraries.

Professor Jennifer Alexander asked how the "Get It" service compares to previous services such as Libraries to U. Ms. Lougee stated that the previous service for books was independent of the catalog systems. The "Get It" service allows you to enter the catalog, make your selection, and all of the forms are pre-populated. The "Get It" service is seamlessly integrated, simpler to use, and very popular. It allows the Libraries to purchase fewer duplicate copies of books, as users can get rapid delivery from any library on campus.

Professor Olszewski asked what it means to be a virtual user. Ms. Lougee responded that it refers to people using the Libraries' electronic content or online services (e.g., reference). These are primarily campus users, but may also include some public users. She noted that the University's licenses prohibit sharing electronic content with unaffiliated users, but these licenses allow members of the public to come into the University Libraries and use a workstation to access this content. Professor Woods Halley asked if alumni could use the electronic content. Ms. Lougee responded that they do not have access, but there is a companion license with the alumni association allowing members access to a core group of approximately 5,000 journals. Additionally, residents of Minnesota have access to the Electronic Library of Minnesota ([www.elm4you.org](http://www.elm4you.org)) that is funded by the state and allows access to approximately 7,000 journals and 300 newspapers. She noted adding alumni for all of the University Libraries' licenses would be exorbitantly expensive and require the negotiations of hundreds of contracts. Professor Alexander asked if there was a special service relationship between the University Libraries and the state government. Ms. Lougee responded that the state government libraries are served by the state funded service Minitex (a division of the University Libraries). She stated that there is some discussion about potential closure of a state agency library and the University has been asked to put in a bid to provide services to them. The University Libraries would help the agency review their licensed content and then would provide reference and research services by contract.

Ms. Lougee next discussed the Libraries' strategic direction with regard to content and collections. She stated the trends are toward looking collectively at collections (i.e., coordination among multiple institutions). For instance, collectively licensing content, collectively managing physical content, and jointly looking at how many physical copies are needed (for example, within the Committee on Institutional Cooperation, CIC). She also mentioned looking jointly at investment in digitization and contributions to the Hathi Trust digital preservation program.

Ms. Lougee noted that one of the strategies under content and collections is to refine the collecting profiles to align with contemporary campus priorities. She is hopeful that the college blue ribbon commissions will provide some information about the directions of the collegiate programs.

A committee member asked how the University Libraries decide which members of the CIC retain particular collections. Ms. Lougee responded that storage space is problematic at many of the CIC member institutions. Several recent studies assessed models to determine how many copies are necessary to serve various size communities or regions. In very simplified terms, some of the models and algorithms suggest that a distributed network on the order of seven to twelve copies might serve the country under the right circumstances and type of material conditions. Ms. Lougee also mentioned a shared storage model being considered by the CIC. Where there is a full digital file as primary access and digital preservation back up, the CIC is considering a coordinated strategy whereby print journals from specific publishers would be stored in a central location and serve CIC libraries.

Ms. Lougee next discussed the strategic priority of access – enabling information discovery and delivery. She stated that a recent assessment indicated the majority of users who come to the University Libraries’ content arrive at it via Google. To enable access, the Libraries have designed systems that match the information to the Libraries’ license and the user’s identity, and then show the user options for delivery. The Libraries are also enhancing information discovery by customizing the way content is delivered. Through the University’s portal, the Libraries tab delivers a customized “view” of the library (core content, services, relevant staff) based on the user’s discipline affiliation. Additionally, discipline customized web sites have been system-generated for every course, and the faculty members using the websites can further personalize them.

Ms. Lougee noted enabling access to information requires streamlining the path between the search for information and its delivery. Professor Halley expressed concern that the Libraries’ new web site and efforts to customize content delivery actually make the website more difficult to use and are an example of “mission creep” by the Libraries. Ms. Lougee replied that the redesigned web site used an extensive process of usability testing and focus groups. Professor Olszewski noted that there is a learning curve with all new systems. Professor Halley commented that the new website takes the place of instructors who previously assisted students in learning to use the Libraries. He also questioned whether it was appropriate for the Libraries to create course websites. Ms. Lougee stated that there has been a very positive response to the course sites and for some courses it is the only web presence. She stated these sites identify the relevant library resources for the course and provide a link to library staff member. Professor Olszewski suggested discussing this issue further at a future meeting.

Comment [DZ1]:

Next, Ms. Lougee discussed the strategic theme of research and scholarship. She stated that in 2006 the Libraries received a significant allocation to enhance the collections. Much of this was focused on acquiring content to improve productivity and enhance scholarship. For instance, the humanist community benefited from the purchase of primary source materials in digital form that enabled new research; many backfiles of journals were acquired in digital form. The Libraries are also assisting the University community with issues around publishing, copyright and data through education and consultation services. Ms. Lougee noted that there is interest in undertaking campus publishing or moving existing publishing to a local platform. She recognized the possibility of mission creep in this area, and stated the Libraries would only undertake publishing services if a viable economic model could be developed in partnership with departments. She noted further that many libraries are taking on some publishing functions for society and association publishers as a way of bringing non-profit competition to the market place. But she emphasized this is an exploratory issue for the University of Minnesota Libraries. Ms. Lougee also noted that the Libraries would continue to be engaged in the issues of author rights and open access.

Next, Ms. Lougee discussed the Libraries’ strategic directions for teaching and learning. She stated the Libraries work with individual faculty as they are developing new courses in order to incorporate student learning outcomes with the course assignments and projects. They are also working with the Office of Information Technology to assess the

myriad services that support instruction and how well they integrate with instructor workflow. She noted there is significant demand for instructional support for lower division undergraduate courses. However, the Libraries do not have the capacity to staff these. They have, therefore, created online instructional modules for particular courses. Assessment of these strategies indicates that the online modules are equally and, in some cases more effective than the in-person programs. Ms. Lougee also noted that the facilities serve an instructional role. There are three SMART Learning Commons sites in the Libraries that bring together academic, writing, and library support. This is a collaboration with the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education.

Professor Halley reiterated his concern that the Libraries should not be involved in course development particularly in a time of stringent resources. Ms. Lougee explained that they are not developing courses, but are responding to specific requests from individuals who are developing courses. Professor Halley acknowledged this difference, but asked why the Libraries are involved in student learning outcomes. He believes this is a faculty responsibility. Ms. Lougee explained that one of the student learning outcomes is students' ability to find and evaluate information, and she stated this is a legitimate outcome area for the Libraries' involvement. Ms. Tisinger stated that student-learning outcomes are the responsibility of the whole University. All libraries play a role in teaching students to use and analyze information, and faculty should not be required to do this on their own. Professor Olszewski commented that student outcomes are a University wide issue and the Libraries contribute to achieving this goal.

Professor Halley next asked about the Libraries instructional programs. Ms. Lougee listed several of the programs.

- Basic research and discovery skills
- Assisting students in finding relevant resources in their subject area
- Documentation and citation
- Copyright issues
- NIH open access mandates, publisher policies
- Literature review specific to particular areas

Professor Halley noted that each of these is related to library use.

Ms. Lougee next discussed some of the external forces causing the Libraries to make critical choices and the impacts of these choices. For example, she stated as space constraints require collaboration with other universities, the University of Minnesota Libraries and the campus must make choices about the proximity of resources. Additionally, reliance on other institutions will prompt a different type of governance. For instance, participation in the Hathi Trust brings cost-effective efficiencies to the University, but it also means 52 institutions must agree on the management of the resource. This requires compromise and thinking about the long-term best interest of the entity not just the institution. Ms. Lougee noted that the *Strategic Priorities for the University Libraries* report would be sent out to all faculty with a link for comments.

Professor James Orf asked if there would be an opportunity to access new journals related to interdisciplinary activity in light of the challenges facing the Libraries. Ms. Lougee

stated the Libraries are still adding journals, but the answer is not easy because publishers are trending toward aggregated offerings. Ms. Lougee noted there are a number of publisher mergers that increase the costs of the packages and publishers are also adding functionality to their packages in order to justify increased costs.

Professor Halley acknowledged that Ms. Lougee's presentation was not a "budget presentation," but expressed frustration that it did not include any statistics. He stated that it is difficult to understand the resource implications without information on relative costs of the strategic plans. Professor Olszewski noted the committee could revisit areas where it has specific questions, and ask for more information on those areas.

#### **Follow up on Open Access**

Professor Olszewski informed the committee that he had spoken to Professor VandenBosch about the progress of establishing an ad hoc committee to create an open access policy for the University. He indicated that Professor Gary Balas was initially selected to chair the committee and recruit subcommittee members, but he stepped down. Currently, there is not a committee chair so Professor Olszewski informed Professor VandenBosch that he would seek a chair and committee members from the SLC. Professor Olszewski explained the charge of the ad hoc committee would be to establish an open access policy for the University. Ms. Lougee reminded the committee that it recommended to the FCC that a faculty-led committee be established to review the draft policy SLC proposed and work towards adoption and implementation of an open access policy at the University of Minnesota. Also, the committee could address issues such as implementation and exceptions to the policy and informing the campus community. Monica Howell volunteered to participate on the committee. Professor Olszewski indicated he would also participate.

#### **SLC Agenda**

Professor Olszewski noted the committee and Ms. Lougee had expressed interest in the issue of space, preservation, and collections management. Professor Olszewski suggested establishing a subcommittee to consider this issue and report back to the full committee. Professor Olszewski also suggested the topic of how the University can gain leverage with the publishers in order to gain more favorable pricing. Professor Olszewski noted the University provides many free services to publishers such as editorships and reviews, and the University could publish a list of "bad actors" whose journals are overpriced. Professor Olszewski suggested creation of a subcommittee to consider this topic. He also suggested inviting a representative from one of the publishers to educate the committee on the publishers pricing structure and to make the publisher aware that the University is paying attention to the issue. Ms. Lougee expressed doubt that a publishing industry representative would come if invited, but several committee members supported making a request. Bradford Clemens asked if it would be possible to discuss the pricing issues with other Universities. Ms. Lougee noted that the CIC does enter into joint licensing agreements, but must take care not to engage in coordinated efforts to control the market. Professor Halley asked if the publishers engaged in illegal monopolistic pricing. Ms. Lougee indicated Justice Department inquiries had previously focused on publisher mergers and the potential impact on pricing, but no action was taken

and the mergers under investigation did not occur. Ms. Lougee noted that the issue is not necessarily monopolistic pricing, but rather a question of inflationary pricing and inflexible models employed by the publishers.

Professor John Logie asked to what degree the Libraries are indexing open access journals that are delivered free via the Internet. Ms. Lougee responded that the Libraries link to some titles, but are not indexing them. Professor John Logie commented that to the extent possible he stopped publishing in print journals that are not freely available on line. He noted the path to leverage comes from libraries and the CIC indexing the open access materials. Ms. Lougee stated that other indexing services pick up open access content, and she does not see a compelling need for another indexing service when the existing infrastructure is providing this. She noted however, that if a liaison librarian points out a freely available title that fits the collection, the Libraries can catalog it, and a link is created for it. Committee discussion followed about the methods for searching for open access materials and whether the Libraries catalog them.

Professor Olszewski asked committee members if there were any other areas they would like the SLC to consider. Professor Halley noted that the publishing issue is related to open access and asked if there was a subcommittee on open access. Professor Olszewski stated he thought it would be better not to have an SLC subcommittee on open access because it might overlap with the work of the FCC's planned open access subcommittee. Also, he hoped an SLC member would participate on the FCC's open access subcommittee to provide good communication with the SLC.

Professor Ronald Hadsall suggested the SLC should address the issue of at-capacity storage space because it is a local issue where the committee can make an impact. Ms. Lougee suggested it might be helpful for the SLC if she provided background information on the issue and then the committee could better decide on next steps. Professor Olszewski confirmed with the SLC that they would like to consider the issue of storage space at the February meeting, and stated that he would also like to pursue the issue presented by changes in the publishing industry.

Ms. Tisinger noted that funding for collections is a local issue related to storage space, publishing, and open access. And she asked how the faculty could help shape this discussion. Professor James Orf remarked that the issue of increasing publishing costs goes directly to the budget and may not easily be separated for committee consideration. Professor Halley stated he supported addressing the publishing issue.

It was decided that in February the SLC would consider the topic of managing collections in a world of finite space. Ms. Lougee noted that this includes the policy and resource questions related to collection management and space. In March the committee would like to hear from someone from the publishing industry. Ms. Lougee noted that the Libraries have data on faculty who have editorial roles, and some faculty editors could be invited to speak to the committee. Professor Elizabeth Fine noted a local action that can be taken on the publishing issue is raising awareness among faculty. Professor Olszewski

agreed that it would be important to pursue creating some type of awareness program for the University community

Mr. Clemens remarked that lack of storage space is an old issue and asked if there was information on how other institutions have handled it. Ms. Lougee responded that Universities often add buildings. Other typical solutions are digitizing, reformatting, and compact (space saving) shelving. In order to shape the February presentation and discussion, Professor Olszewski asked committee members to e-mail their specific questions about storage space to Dawn Zugay, [zuga0001@umn.edu](mailto:zuga0001@umn.edu). Professor Logie indicated he was interested in knowing how much of the University's collection is "long tail" being preserved for the 0 -1 users relative to numbers from 2 to infinity. Professor Olszewski indicated it would be important to know how much of the collection is unique.

Hearing no further business, Professor Olszewski adjourned the meeting.

Dawn Zugay  
University Senate Office

Follow Up: The University Senate Bylaws require the SCIT and SLC chairs or their representatives to attend one another's committee meetings. Going forward, Professor Ted Higman will be attending SLC meeting and Professor Olszewski will be attending SCIT meetings.