

LIBRARY COMMITTEE  
MINUTES OF MEETING  
MARCH 1, 2006

[In these minutes: Senate Chair's Meeting Update, Library Budget Update, University Digital Conservancy, SMART Commons]

[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: Lael Gatewood, chair, Jonathan Binks, LeAnn Dean, Suzanne Thorpe for Joan Howland, Wendy Lougee, Liz Benson Johnson for Bill Sozansky, David R. Brown, James Orf, Leon Satkowski, Otto Strack, Danielle Tisinger, Susan Wick, Danny Kim, Ellen McKinney,

REGRETS: Mahmoud Sadrai, John H. Anderson, Andrea Berlin, Elaine Challacombe, Juliette Cherbuliez, Annia Fayon, Kate Lohse, Magdalena Ramirez

ABSENT: Owen Williams

GUESTS: Eric Celeste, Associate University Librarian for Information Technology; Phillip Harold, co-director, University Digital Conservancy; Beth Kaplan, co-director, University Digital Conservancy, Karen Williams, Associate University Librarian for Academic Programs, Karl Lorenz, Associate Program Director (COAFES)

I). Professor Gatewood called the meeting to order.

II). Members unanimously approved the February 1, 2006 minutes.

III). Professor Gatewood reported that at the Senate chair's meeting on February 28<sup>th</sup>, Senate committee chairs expressed an interest in the Library, particularly as it relates to how the new budget model will impact it. Additionally, comments concerning the importance of representation on the committee by the various constituencies across campus were mentioned.

IV). University Librarian Wendy Lougee reported on the following:

A). Ms. Lougee distributed a handout outlining the Libraries' 2007 Compact request and funds received. She reported that the Libraries received approximately \$2.3 million (out of a request for \$3.7 million). Funds were designated for a salary program and security, with \$1.5 million available for compact strategic priorities.

A significant amount of the funding request for research infrastructure and outreach was earmarked for additional positions to provide for both science support on campus and

health science outreach across the state. The Library is roughly 100 FTE smaller than peer research libraries. It is likely this portion of the Compact request will be supported as the Library decides how to appropriate the monies it received. Other components of the request are also priorities: the Digital Conservancy, IT infrastructure.

Comments and questions regarding the budget information that Ms. Lougee shared included:

- Please comment on the funding plans for the Libraries' salary equity program, which was intended to bring compensation for the Libraries' academic staff more in-line with the market. Ms. Lougee noted that this was a three-year program, which was front-loaded in the first year for half of the cost of the entire program. As a result, Library academic staff salaries have been brought to within approximately six percent of market. The Library needs to conduct additional research to determine the direction the market has moved within the last year in order to decide where it needs to make strategic investments and then determine the rank among priorities.
- How will the Libraries' collection mirror the University's strategic planning initiative? Ms. Lougee stated that the University's strategic initiatives will be considered when deciding how to allocate monies for the collection. The Libraries must provide for the core resources in all disciplines as well as then assessing where program strengths need to be further supported.
- Please clarify what is meant by 'clinical outreach' in the Compact request. Ms. Lougee stated that the Library requested funding support for support services for health practitioners in areas served by the Area Health Education Centers (starting in the Hibbing area) and also support for consumer health information in the metropolitan area.
- Is the Library doing anything to increase its external funding initiatives? Ms. Lougee stated that within the past year the Library hired a full-time development officer and also hired a director of communications. This is in addition to a part-time person who coordinates the Libraries Friends group activities and events. Additionally, with the past year Friends of the Libraries events have been stepped-up. While development efforts are a major focus of the Libraries, these efforts will never fund the core operations of the Libraries.
- Has the Library explored the possibility of grants to help fund some of its initiatives? Ms. Lougee stated that grants, to a degree, are a funding opportunity for the Libraries, which it pursues. The Library will continue to look to grants in targeted areas to supplement its major funding sources. In the past grants have come from the Mellon Foundation and federal programs for libraries.
- Did the Library receive any one-time, non-recurring funding as part of its 2007 Compact request? No, stated Ms. Lougee, the Libraries did not receive any one-time funding allocations.
- Is it possible the Library would receive money from academic compacts for collaborative initiatives? According to Ms. Lougee, while it is always possible the Libraries could be included in academic compacts, there are none that she is aware of.

- Are publishers, particularly those outside the United States, starting to make available journals previously only available in print format, available electronically? Ms. Lougee stated that the majority of publishers now make journals available in electronic form in addition to print, including foreign publishers. In the reductions in collections made over the past few years, foreign acquisitions were generally more likely to have been cut. However, wherever cuts were made and titles were later found to be important to campus programs, content has been restored.

B). Ms. Lougee reported that she followed-up on the committee's request to find out how it could most effectively provide input to the Research Infrastructure Task Force, a task force in which she participated. It was suggested that the committee respond to the task force's draft report, which will be available on the web soon. Or, in the meantime, if individual members would prefer, they can send their comments to Ms. Lougee or either of the Research Infrastructure Task Force chairs, Professor Stephen Campbell or Professor Marc Jenkins.

Ms. Lougee stated that where the current version of the draft report mentions the Libraries, it tends to emphasize the importance of the collection. She stated that while the collection is important, technology, which provides access to the collection, is also critical.

V). University Digital Conservancy (UDC) Co-Director Philip Herold briefly recapped the Library's digital conservancy efforts, which were shared with members at the committee's February 1<sup>st</sup> meeting. He noted that the UDC is a set of systems, which will house the University's digital content. Types of content that will be housed in the UDC include:

- Institutional research and academic output.
- Print resources that were previously deposited in the University Archives and which would be priorities for digitization.
- Discipline or domain-based collections - e.g. AgEcon Search.

Besides housing digital content, the UDC will provide additional stewardship functions to facilitate the preservation and long-term access of information. This initiative is currently in its infancy.

As follow-up to last month's presentation, UDC Co-Director Beth Kaplan distributed a handout, *Defining the University Digital Conservancy*, and solicited members comments and questions regarding this initiative.

- How will decisions be made regarding what discipline-based content will be housed in the UDC? Associate University Librarian Eric Celeste stated that while formal mechanisms for putting content in the UDC are in the process of being developed, he believes that the process will likely evolve more informally as disciplines become increasingly accepting of this type of scholarly communication. He stated that the UDC plans to use AgEcon Search as a model for moving other discipline-based archives into the UDC.

- Many faculty members have both electronic content as well as print materials, which might warrant preservation. Will a faculty member's entire work, both print and electronic, be able to be deposited in the UDC? Ms. Kaplan stated that the UDC closely affiliates itself closely with the University Archives, which currently handles print resources. Both the UDC and the University Archives share the same perspective in terms of looking at a collection of work as a documentary whole. Therefore, both electronic and paper formats will be considered for archiving (either in the University Archives or the UDC).
- Have there been any discussions around the UDC capturing WebCT content? Ms. Lougee stated that this issue has been raised and that she and Steve Cawley have discussed the University's interest in managing and sharing learning objects. While WebCT content could be included in the UDC, it is unclear whether this is the most appropriate place to store this type of information. Mr. Celeste added that the thought of capturing WebCT content is very interesting, but it is important to realize it is not a simple process. Ms. Lougee also noted that another consideration regarding putting WebCT information in the UDC has to do with the fact that a fair amount of this content could have copyright restrictions. The goal of the UDC is to have its content available without restrictions, and, therefore, the conservancy may not be the most appropriate venue for this type of content.
- A suggestion was made to explore the possibility of securing seed grant money, and using these funds to collaborate with other units that are already soliciting faculty ideas around digital content.

Professor Gatewood thanked UDC guests, Eric Celeste, Philip Herold, and Beth Kaplan for attending today's meeting. Mr. Celeste ([efc@umn.edu](mailto:efc@umn.edu)) volunteered to be a point of contact for member's UDC comments around the scoping discussion document, which was distributed earlier. He also added that this document was created to facilitate discussion within the committee, and should not be circulated outside. Once input has been received from Senate Library Committee members, a final draft of this scoping document will be drafted and distributed to the faculty at large.

VI). Associate University Librarian for Academic Programs Karen Williams introduced the next agenda item, a SMART Learning Commons update. She began by noting that the SMART Learning Commons (SMART LC) is a collaborative effort between several University partners (College of Agriculture, Food and Environmental Sciences, College of Natural Resources, College of Human Ecology, and the University Libraries) whose goal it is to support and enhance student learning on the Twin Cities campus.

In the spring of 2005, the original SMART LC partners drafted a joint Compact proposal to grow the SMART Center. Funding for this proposal was granted. Shortly thereafter a decision was made to expand the effort even further, and, as a result, the partnership base was broadened to include the Multicultural Center for Academic Excellence, Center for Teaching and Learning Services, Online Writing Center, Disability Services, College of Biological Sciences, and University Counseling and Consulting Services.

Associate Program Director (COAFES) Mr. Lorenz provided members with an example of how the Center would be brought to undergraduate students. Of particular note, was that students will not have to seek out its services, but rather these services will be provided for them through their registration and cohort experience. Mr. Lorenz referred members to the handout, *Creating A Culture of Learning: SMART Learning Commons Update*, for additional information/examples.

The long-term goal of the SMART LC is to have the University community view it both as a physical place, and as a spectrum of services, which will support the University's goals. Additionally, the objective is to create a meaningful, managed collaborative where partners work to identify needs and brand those needs under the SMART LC label so that students can easily find the resources they need. Along these lines, it will also be important to establish satellite centers.

Ninety-seven percent of students surveyed thus far have indicated that they found the SMART LC either very helpful or helpful. While a decision was made to start by focusing on the group with the greatest needs, undergraduate students, there clearly exists a demand for expanding the Center's services to other groups as well i.e. graduate students.

The SMART LC is faced with the challenge of identifying additional collaborators to promote the efficient use of resources that, in many cases, already exist. Since its implementation, the SMART LC has been diligent about looking at theory and where it has been practiced effectively.

Before taking members comments and questions, Ms. Williams noted the importance of identifying space for a SMART LC and SMART LC satellites. The original funding received will be used to build a space in Magrath Library.

Member's comments and questions following the SMART LC presentation:

- How will students find out about the SMART LC and where it is located? Mr. Lorenz stated that selective broadcast messages would be used to share this information. The goal is to rollout the information as the need announces itself. The plan is to start by having a small name tent with a plaque that offers the services of a SMART Learning Consultant in the Magrath Library. In addition, there are plans to conduct periodic, short surveys as a means to introduce the initiative. Every effort is being made to think strategically about building the SMART LC/student relationship. Ms. Williams added that the SMART LC also has a website (<http://smart.umn.edu/>), which lists scheduled events for the SMART LC and other relevant information, and that a comprehensive plan for marketing and communications is being developed.
- Will the various advising units be asked to help communicate information about the SMART LC? Yes, in fact recently there was a meeting to discuss how to involve the advising staff in spreading the word about the SMART LC. The SMART LC has a collaborative working group, which sets the direction for this

- initiative, on which there should be an Academic Advisory Network (AAN) representative.
- The SMART LC could provide a venue for the new College of Education and Human Development and General College to think creatively about how they plan to move forward. Mr. Lorenz agreed that another goal of SMART LC is to research what learning is, and how learning should be provided. He noted that collaborative efforts are underway with the Multicultural Center for Academic Excellence to identify how to be supportive of GC students.
  - Is data being collected on the type of services are being sought at the SMART LC? Yes, data is being captured, and there are plans to capture even more.
  - Rather than earmarking resources to deal with students' poor research capabilities after the problem already exists, proactive efforts should be taken to teach students proper research methodologies from the onset. Mr. Lorenz noted that the SMART LC plans to teach students how to navigate research along with providing writing support. The SMART LC collaborative working group is always open to suggestions where it can be more effective.
  - There appears to be a link between the background work done by the SMART LC and the type of information the UDC is attempting to capture. The SMART LC should share its findings with the UDC for archival purposes.
  - SMART LC representatives should be in contact with the groups that are working on establishing the new colleges as part of the University's recent restructuring.

In closing, Professor Gatewood suggested the committee think about how the SMART LC initiative should be promoted and marketed. Suggestions or comments should be forwarded to either Karl Lorenz ([klorenz@umn.edu](mailto:klorenz@umn.edu)) or Karen Williams ([kaw@umn.edu](mailto:kaw@umn.edu)). Professor Gatewood thanked Mr. Lorenz and Ms. Williams for their presentation.

VII). Future agenda items:

- Strategic Positioning and relevant Task Force Reports, particularly the reports on Research Infrastructure and Collaborative Research.
- Mellon Foundation Grant update – Wendy Lougee.
- Further discuss the idea of the Library as a broker to support interdisciplinary thinking. Ms. Lougee suggested members also review the Graduate Reform: Discipline Evolution Task Force Report since it addresses the role of the Library in facilitating interdisciplinary work.

VIII). Hearing no further business, Professor Gatewood adjourned the meeting.

Renee Dempsey  
University Senate