LIBRARY COMMITTEE
MINUTES OF MEETING
November 9, 2011
238A Morrill Hall

[In these minutes: committee review; coordinate campus library reports; discoverability; Libraries' budget update; committee business]

[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, Bill Sozansky, Mary Beth Sancomb-Moran, Owen Williams, LeAnn Dean, David Fox, Evan Roberts, John Logie, Michelle Englund, Joseph Spanjers, Susan Geller, Monica Howell, Elizabeth Fine, Jennifer Alexander, Mary Ford, Jon Binks, Phil Buhlmann, Ronald Hadsall, Suzanne Thorpe (for Joan Howland), David Zopfi-Jordan

REGRETS: Robert Muellerleile,

ABSENT: Ted Higman, Bradford Clemens, Vicki Graham

GUESTS: Professor Vernon Cardwell and Frank Douma, Committee on Committees

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

Committee Review
Professor Vernon Cardwell a member of the Committee on Committees (ConC) explained that part of the ConC's charge is to conduct a review of Senate committees to ensure that their charges are current and of the right scope to reflect committee concerns, that the committees are functioning effectively, and that the committee membership and composition allows the committee to carry out its charge. He stated the review is an opportunity for the Senate Library Committee (SLC) to communicate with the ConC, and provide feedback for how to improve the effectiveness of the committee. He indicated those committee members who wanted to share information privately could e-mail him or the ConC chair, Professor Joanna O'Connell. He further explained that the ConC members would draft a report, and share it with the SLC. If the report recommends any changes in committee structure, charge, or membership, the recommendation would be sent to the Senate Consultative Committee and then to the University Senate.

Professor Cardwell asked the SLC if their ex officio membership was appropriate. Professor Olszewski indicated that in 2009-10 the SLC formed an ad hoc committee that reviewed its charge and membership. The ad hoc committee concluded the ex officio and faculty membership were appropriate. Last year, however, there was sometimes poor

attendance by faculty at the SLC meetings and this impacted the richness of committee discussion. Professor Olszewski suggested that having more faculty on the committee might help alleviate this problem. Professor Phil Buhlmann indicated that the meeting time is difficult and cuts across both the 10:00 and 11:00 class times. Professor Fox agreed that expanded faculty membership would help ensure there were enough faculty members at each meeting and would allow members flexibility in their attendance. Professor Logie cautioned the committee should not be made so large that it could not conduct business in the ninety-minute meeting time. He suggested that no more than one faculty member be added.

Professor Cardwell noted the ConC tries to balance membership across the disciplines, and asked if the SLC was satisfied with the units represented. Professor Olszewski stated he believed it was appropriate. Wendy Lougee noted that it had changed over time.

Professor Cardwell next asked about student membership. Professor Olszewski responded that this year all of the student positions were filled, and that student participation and attendance had been good.

Frank Douma, ConC, joined the meeting.

Professor Cardwell asked whether the charge adequately reflects the work done by the SLC. Ms. Lougee stated from the Libraries' perspective the charge is quite broad, but the "facilities, services, and collections" language in the duties section of the charge does not capture many of today's issues such as publishing and knowledge management. Professor Jennifer Alexander thought the word "services" encapsulated the topics mentioned by Ms. Lougee. Professor Olszewski agreed that the duties and responsibilities section of the charge seemed quite broad.

Professor Cardwell noted that the ConC uses the charge to recruit new members to the SLC and suggested making the charge more dynamic or perhaps including a preamble to the charge. Professor Logie stated the charge should be more explicit about the SLC's responsibility to drive policy change. Professor Susan Geller suggested including active words such as "participate" and "engage." She also stated the SLC's partnership and collaboration roles with the Libraries were not reflected in the charge. Professor Alexander noted that the ad hoc committee had considered whether the SLC had lost its advisory capacity and become a listening committee. Professor Cardwell asked committee members to send him their ideas for the charge. Professor Douhma emphasized the confidentiality of the process.

Coordinate Campus Library Reports
Morris- LeAnn Dean provided the committee with a PowerPoint presentation on the University of Minnesota Morris (UMM), Rodney A. Briggs Library. She discussed its mission, collections, and special collections. She highlighted the growing number of digital collections, the children's literature collection and teacher education resources, the Indian Boarding School Collection, and the West Central Minnesota Historical Research Center.

Ms. Dean also discussed the services, staff resources, challenges, strengths, unique characteristics of the UMM Library, and future plans. One service she highlighted was UMM's personal librarian program that began this year.

Challenges faced by the UMM Library include a decrease in its budget since 2000 and annual expenditures equaling only 47 percent of its peer colleges, the "Morris 14." The library facility is also inadequate in terms of health and safety, technology infrastructure, and collaboration space, Ms. Dean stated.

Some of the UMM Library's strengths discussed by Ms. Dean include being part of the University of Minnesota, cooperation in U of M system-wide database purchasing, Minitex, and an energetic team of librarians. With regard to its unique characteristics, Ms. Dean noted that Academic Assistance, Disability Services, Career Center Resources, and the Writing Center are all located in the Library. She also noted the history of the campus as the Morris Industrial School for Indians.

She stated the UMM Library's future plans include development of a Learning Commons and a 2014 capital bonding request for building renovation

Rochester
Mary Beth Sancomb Moran provided the SLC with information about the University of Minnesota Rochester (UMR) Library. She stated UMR is the newest of the UM campuses. It began in 2008 in the top two floors of a shopping mall. The library is a large room in the former food court. It is a virtual library with only 50 books. All of the students have laptops. Most of the students' research is done on-line. The UMR library relies heavily on Minitex for resource sharing. The vast majority of book requests come from faculty and these are filled within 48 hours. The Rochester campus is growing and the UMR Library is interested in collaboration and leveraging the power of the Twin Cities Libraries.

Duluth – Bill Sozansky provided an update on the University of Minnesota Duluth (UMD) Library. He noted it is currently facing many challenges. The enrolment at Duluth increased rapidly from 7,000 to 11,000 students. There are many new programs at UMD, but the Library has fewer staff (a net loss of one-and-a-half positions). The inflation cost of materials is between five and seven percent, and the UMD Library's budget was cut by five percent last year. He feels the Library cannot continue to cut staff and materials.

Mr. Sozansky also reported that there is new senior administrative staff at UMD and the UMD Library is currently reviewing and aligning its strategic plan with that of the new administration.

Other programs and trends Mr. Sozansky highlighted include:
- Digitizing local resources such as the diaries from the Glensheen collection
- Scanning more local tribal documents

- Good success with the "get it" service for moving material around the campus
- Trends in electronic usage have increased
- Print usage is stable but flat
- Librarians now receive more on-line questions than in-person questions.

Crookston – Owen Williams updated the committee on events at the University of Minnesota Crookston (UMC) Library. Highlights from his update included:
- Staff – 1.75 professional librarians; 1.5 para-professionals
- Long history of using technology, for example, only one-fourth of the book collection is in print
- Purchasing more e-books
- UMC has record enrolment with the largest percentage of growth in on-line students
- UMC Library is focusing on digitizing important and rare documents, and making the documents searchable
- All the University of Minnesota campuses are moving to a new library system

Professor Olszewski asked Mr. Williams to elaborate on the new library system. He and Ms. Lougee explained that the all the University of Minnesota Libraries are migrating to the "Alma" enterprise system. This is an integrated library system that supports: acquisitions, cataloging, electronic resources management, digital collections, and circulation.

Discovery System
Professor Olszewski asked Ms. Lougee to further explain the "discovery system" mentioned in the October update the Libraries provided to the SLC. Ms. Lougee explained that historically library catalogs were catalogs the primary discovery tool describing locally owned resources. Over time, catalogs have come to include a variety of digital content provided by numerous publishers and other vendors. Last year, the Libraries' analyzed data flows in and out of the Libraries' web services to determine user preferences for searching, and recognized that the Libraries' catalog is not the main tool used. There are now new types of discovery services that aggregate information from publishers and vendors and enable efficient, well-integrated searching across system/services. The Libraries have been engaged in the process of selecting a "discovery" service. This would be a vendor-hosted "unified webscale discovery system," similar to the approach Google or other search engines use in gathering data together from disparate sources across the web into a central index for single search. The library-oriented version of this discovery tool will allow users to search local catalog and digital content information, massive aggregations of pre-indexed article information, and, where possible, full-text sources all from a single interface. Currently a final assessment of options is underway as a precursor to an RFP. Professor Olszewski suggested and Ms. Lougee agreed it would be helpful for the SLC to provide input on the vendor packages.

University Libraries Budget Update
Next, Ms. Lougee gave a PowerPoint presentation on the University Libraries' budget. She began her presentation with an overview of the budget model and process. She

explained that cost pools submit a budget and biennial compact in the fall and colleges submit one in the spring. These document priorities for investment and significant financial concerns, and respond to budget model requirements. Because FY13 is the second year of the biennium, there is no compact. Cost pools' budgets are "attributed" to colleges based on the relevant metric such as consumption (energy), identified cost driver (grant income), and common goods (some information technology services).
Cost pool budgets are charged proportionally, based on a metric, to the colleges. She went on to state that the Libraries recognizes that true cost attribution by college is not possible so it uses weighted head count as a surrogate metric. She reviewed the slide titled "College Weighted Headcounts" and noted that the Libraries pay for other cost pools too.

Ms. Lougee next reviewed the Libraries' FY12 cost pool elements and highlighted the three stages of building the cost pool: FY12 Operations and Maintenance allocation to the Libraries, charges associated with consumption (utilities and debt services), and other cost pool charges attributed to the Libraries budget (UM admin units, technology, facilities, research, library). The total Libraries' budget charged to colleges is the sum of these three stages ($49,508,306), while the Libraries' actual budget is $36,063,497.

Ms. Lougee next discussed the Libraries revenue components and base expenditures budget. She noted the Libraries are very lean with respect to operations costs and that much of the budget is devoted to content. Professor David Fox asked how this compares to the Libraries peers. The general breakdown of component costs is similar to peers, although operating revenue is somewhat lower for Minnesota. All research libraries are experiencing shifts. For example, with increased electronic content, fewer staff are needed for reshelving, bindery work, or other print-based activities. There are, however, new areas of investment such as digital preservation and systems development to make sense of digital content sources and systems.

Professor Olszewski asked what constitutes access services. Ms. Lougee stated they are composed of circulation, document delivery, and facilities services.

Ms. Lougee next turned to recent budget reductions in the FY10, FY11 and FY12 budgets. She stated as a result of these budget reductions there has been reductions and reconfiguration of staffing, further migration of the server infrastructure to the Office of Information Technology, elimination of journal delivery service, and cancellation of some journals. Professor Olszewski asked how the Libraries determine which journals to cancel. Ms. Lougee stated Libraries' discipline liaisons take part in a review based on use and cost data, and engage the relevant disciplines with questions.

Ms. Lougee also stated that due to inflation the Libraries have lost approximately 38% ($4 million) in collection purchasing power over four years. This has eroded the additional funds the Provost provided for collections. She also emphasized the loss of the six liaison librarians who support academic programs. She stated infrastructure support has been modest with reliance on one-time funds.

Next, Ms. Lougee addressed the Libraries three significant financial concerns: collections, preservation and storage, and enterprise system migration (Alma). Professor Evan Roberts asked whether the cost of e-books is a purchase cost or a subscription. Ms. Lougee stated some are owned and some are "leased" subscriptions. She further explained that some of the purchases are user driven based on the number of times the item is used.

Professor Buhlmann asked how publishers set their pricing. Ms. Lougee explained it is based on impact factors and what the market will bear. It is not necessarily correlated to journal size. Professor Logie asked if there is a mechanism to help users find a way to e-copies of publications published with creative commons licenses. Ms. Lougee responded that Libraries could not catalog all free items, but are seeking ways to bring content to discovery systems.

With regard to the enterprise system migration, Ms. Lougee indicated the Libraries are absorbing the one-time cost of the migration implementation and believe the new system will result in significant savings for the campus.

Next, Ms. Lougee outlined the Libraries' priorities under the six-year capital plan. They included renovation of Wilson Library, the environment for rare books, and collection storage. She indicated Wilson could be repositioned to make it a center for scholarship, learning, and study. Professor Olszewski asked if there is a six-year planning document that could be shared with the SLC. Ms. Lougee stated she would e-mail the SLC a PowerPoint presentation on the topic.

SLC Agenda
The SLC discussed the list of potential agenda items submitted by committee members following the October meeting.
- The topic of orphan works was discussed last year and would not immediately be on the agenda
- Author pay model for publication and its impact on the Libraries and broader University community would be considered at the December meeting
- Creating a subcommittee to develop an understanding of the challenges and opportunities libraries face in the future will be considered at the December meeting
- The Creative Commons and how it promotes free access to information would be considered in the spring
- The Libraries communication of available resources to users would be taken up in the spring
- A discussion of new federal data management requirements and how the Libraries are handling this would be taken up in the spring

Old Business
Professor Olszewski stated that in its on-line vote the SLC unanimously approved making the Open Access Committee a subcommittee of the SLC. He stated he would contact

former Open Access Committee members to determine their interest in continuing on the subcommittee, and then contact SLC members to determine their interest in participating.

Professor Olszewski shared Provost Sullivan's response to the April SLC letter regarding space for the Libraries' physical collection and resources for collection preservation. In his letter, the Provost stated that he has discussed these issues with Ms. Lougee and they are receiving attention. The Libraries have reallocated support for preservation and options for storage are being pursued. Additional environmental storage and the preservation of the print collection will be a priority in the capital planning process.

Hearing no further business, Professor Olszewski adjourned the meeting.

Dawn Zugay
University Senate Office