

Minutes*

Faculty Consultative Committee
Thursday, March 2, 2000
1:00 – 3:00
Room 433 Johnston Hall

- Present: Fred Morrison (chair), Linda Brady, Susan Brorson, Mary Dempsey, Roberta Humphreys, Mary Jo Kane, Leonard Kuhi, Joseph Massey, Judith Martin, V. Rama Murthy, Paula Rabinowitz
- Absent: Les Drewes, Richard Goldstein, Stephen Gudeman, David Hamilton, Marvin Marshak, Jeff Ratliff-Crain
- Guests: Executive Vice President Robert Bruininks, Vice President Christine Maziar, Professor Robert Seidel (Chair, Senate Library Committee), Dr. Thomas Shaughnessy (University Librarian)
- Other: Liz Bouget (Minnesota DAILY), Professor Charles Campbell, Florence Funk (Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost), Maureen Smith (Institutional Relations)

[In these minutes: the intellectual future of the University; bookstores task force; North Central Association visit; the Campus Club]

1. Intellectual Future of the University

Professor Morrison called the meeting to order and welcomed committee members and guests. He began by explaining that the first hour or so would be devoted to a discussion about the Libraries, where they are and where they are going and then turned the meeting over to Dr. Shaughnessy. Dr. Shaughnessy began by providing some background information about the Library:

-- The annual operating budget for the libraries is approximately \$25 million, placing it in the top 15 research libraries in North America. In terms of operating budgets the University of Minnesota Library falls in the middle compared to other institutions in the Big Ten.

-- Collections on the Twin Cities campus, including the Law Library, total approximately 5.5 million volumes. In this context, the U of M Library ranks 17th in North America (this includes both public and private).

-- There are 90 professional librarians on the staff. In total there are 380 staff.

-- The Library lends about 240,000 books and periodicals to other libraries and is ranked first in lending. In terms of borrowing from other libraries, the University of Minnesota Library ranks 56th (that number is expected to go up).

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

-- In the last 4-5 years the State and the University have invested \$120 million new dollars in library construction. One hundred million of that is on the Twin Cities campus and \$20 million on the Duluth campus.

-- A system-wide Task Force was established to look at the funding needs of the Library. (The Task Force Report was distributed.)

-- The Task Force recommended a total of \$10 million recurring dollars to fund all the University libraries. The Libraries received \$1.2 million in one-time funds and \$600,000 in recurring funds. Dr. Bruininks pointed out that in the 1998 request the University worked very hard on the Digital Library Initiative and the Library received \$500,000 (one-time) as well as additional money through the compact process. Adding it all together, he said, the Library got about a quarter of the distance it needed to travel.

Trends that have an impact on the Libraries:

-- The continuing consolidation of scholarly publishing in the hands of fewer and fewer publishers. The more and more libraries cut back on subscriptions, the higher the publishers raise the prices. SPARC, a group funded by libraries, is trying to bring publishing back from the commercial publishers and put it in the hands of the scholarly societies (where it was originally).

-- The increasing dependence in libraries on telecommunications, internet and the campus infrastructure.

-- The growth of distance education.

The future of the Libraries:

-- Increased monies will be put towards electronic resources. Dr. Shaughnessy predicted that in five years at least 60% of all requests for journal articles will be delivered electronically.

-- LUMINA will be replaced by a new system. All U of M Libraries and MnSCU will be on the same system. The new system is expected to be in place within eighteen months.

-- Librarians will become much more involved in teaching, particularly information literacy.

-- The Library will go much more in the direction of multimedia.

-- More collaboration with other libraries, especially with the CIC institutions.

-- There will be a shift away from the ownership of collections. The Library is buying less and less because of inflation. While the Library will own fewer resources it will be emphasizing access.

Dr. Shaughnessy then asked for a few minutes to talk about what "ticks him off." The question he raised is "who owns the libraries?" He talked about how the Library has never recovered from a cut in its budget several years ago and the loss of twelve positions. What about the colleges' stake in the Libraries, he asked? Whatever stake they did have is now gone under IMG. The colleges impose

technology fees on its students but the Libraries do not get any of that fee even though it is technology dependent. He said he met with MSA leadership to talk about a student fee for the Libraries. They indicated that while they love the Libraries they could not recommend it because the students are paying off the remodeling of Coffman.

Does the FCC own the Library? No, he said. The report was sent a year ago but nothing happened. This point was refuted and members said that they did in fact talk about it. Every year the chair of the Senate Library Committee gives an impassioned speech on the perils of the Library, he went on to say, but it seems to have no impact on the faculty.

Next, Dr. Shaughnessy talked about his frustration regarding the capital campaign. At one of the meetings regarding the campaign he suggested that the Libraries be the official giving target. He was told that that couldn't be done. At a meeting of the deans he raised this same idea; one of the deans suggested that the faculty's giving priority should be graduate student stipends. Why is it that there can be a giving priority for graduate student stipends, but not for the Libraries? The University will not be able to attract graduate students or faculty if it does not have a decent Library, Dr. Shaughnessy said. Dr. Bruininks interjected that the Development Council has talked about rolling out a capital campaign activity aimed at faculty and staff next year. He said that from his perspective he sees no reason why these issues shouldn't be revisited but believes that there needs to be some consensus from the faculty.

Dr. Shaughnessy noted that another problem he has is that he does not have access to the alumni database.

At this point in the discussion a couple of the Committee members raised the following issues:

-- There is no place to put coats or a place to sit and read in the Library. The building is not user friendly.

-- One Committee member was told that after the renovation of Walter Library about 1/3 of the collection would come back. Dr. Shaughnessy responded that it is estimated that there are about 500-600,000 volumes in the science collection that includes the very old materials. The Walter renovation will have space for 400,000 volumes. The 200,000 volumes left over will be easily retrieved, he said. A request was made to Dr. Shaughnessy to give priority to returning the books over the journals.

-- The centralization of the Libraries contributes to the lack of ownership, one committee member said. Dr. Shaughnessy responded that funds were not available to maintain all of the branches.

-- Is the archive facility really going to be accessible, it was asked, or is it going to be as accessible as the Harvard depository? Faculty will be able to go down into the facility and retrieve materials, Dr. Shaughnessy responded.

-- Another Committee member suggested naming reading rooms as a means of fundraising and if there would be a way for each college proportionally to give a percentage of the technology fee to the Library on a recurring basis. It was recommended that the idea of the technology fee be forwarded to the Budget Advisory Task Force.

The discussion then moved on to talk about the role of the Friends of the Library. Dr. Bruininks suggested "we think creatively about the role and perhaps faculty and staff might be invited to be members of this entity." Originally, the Friends of the Library was a mechanism to give outside people access to the Library; it could be much more than that.

One Committee member asked what will be done about the \$10 million that is needed. Dr. Bruininks said that several roads will need to be taken to get there. This area needs to be a major priority in the biennial request. The Library is part of the core infrastructure of the University in the broadest sense and is a State resource. The newly appointed Budget Advisory Task Force will be considering a number of ideas with respect to this issue. The faculty need to be brought into the planning process, he added.

Professor Morrison thanked Dr. Shaughnessy and Professor Seidel for meeting with the committee.

2. Other Business

A. Bookstores Task Force

The Committee unanimously approved the following motion:

1. The Bookstore Task Force, appointed by the FCC, shall consider the future of the bookstores, including issues such as the role of the bookstores on campus, "outsourcing" (leasing to private companies), public/private partnerships, and the relationship with local bookstores. The task force will focus on the Twin Cities campus bookstores, but it should take into consideration the effect of its recommendations on other campuses.
2. The task force report will be submitted to the FCC by the end of spring semester 2000. At that time, the task force may recommend that its work be continued by a joint subcommittee of SCEP and SCFP.
3. The task force shall be headed by the vice chair of the FCC (Professor Hamilton). Its faculty and student membership shall be drawn from the University Senate and shall include at least three student members plus faculty representing units that utilize bookstore services in different parts of the TC campus (West Bank, East Bank, AHC, St. Paul). In addition, members shall be drawn from the bookstore staff (two), the library staff (one), University administration (one), and relevant members of the business community (one).

B. Visit by the North Central Association

Dr. Bruininks distributed materials regarding the NCA Focused Visit (March 13-14); the Libraries 1999-2000 compact and a draft letter from the President regarding the President's Sesquicentennial Conference Series that will highlight ways the University of Minnesota is exploring interdisciplinary research and teaching across intellectual and institutional boundaries to create a more connected, cohesive campus.

With respect to the NCA Focused Visit, Committee members were reminded that the FCC is scheduled to meet with the evaluation team from the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools, Commission on Institutions of Higher Education (NCA-CIHE) on Monday, March 13, 3:30 - 4:45.

C. The Campus Club

Next, Professor Morrison inquired about the status of the Campus Club. Professor Rabinowitz reported that it was decided:

- To open the Campus Club in the lobby of Northrop next year;
 - Try a different catering operation every month;
 - Sometime this spring, an event will be organized by Astronomy on the topic of the "universe" and held in the lobby of Northrop;
 - Address the issue that there is no place to "hang out." The group plans to research campus clubs around the country, in comparable universities, to find out what has worked for them.
- Florence Funk provided an overview of the status of the employees of the Campus Club.

D. Infrastructure

Professor Humphrey directed Committee members' attention to her email regarding the issues regarding the infrastructure including computer security system administration, web access/maintenance, etc. Dr. Bruininks suggested Professor Humphrey call Associate Vice President Cawley to address the issues she raised. This led to a discussion about "common goods."

Last, Professor Martin reported that SCEP is discussing looking at the impact of semester conversion.

Hearing no further business, Professor Morrison adjourned the meeting.

-- Vickie Courtney