

LIBRARY COMMITTEE
MINUTES OF MEETING
NOVEMBER 5, 2008

[In these minutes: University Libraries Report: Compact Update, Google Settlement Update, University Debit System Update, MNCAT Plus Update; Library Communication Strategies]

[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: James Orf, chair pro tem, LeAnn Dean, Wendy Lougee, Bill Sozansky, Juliette Cherbuliez, Isaac Fox, Stephen Gross, Jennifer Gunn, Anatoly Liberman, Danielle Tisinger, David Zopfi-Jordan, Monica Howell, Jonathan Lundberg

REGRETS: Jay Hatch, Suzanne Thorpe, Owen Williams, J. Woods Halley, Farzad Sadjadi

ABSENT: Jonathan Binks, Nora Paul, Zhirong Zhao, Nellie Marshall

OTHERS ATTENDING: Mary Beth Sancomb-Moran

GUESTS: Kate Brooks, Linda Eells, Marlo Welshons, Karen Williams

D). Professor Orf, chair pro tem, called the meeting to order, welcomed those present, and asked members and guests to go around the table and introduce themselves.

Professor Orf stated that agenda item IV, the discussion on the May 2008 resolution on University strategies related to dissemination of scholarly works, would be held over to the December 3rd meeting.

II). Members unanimously approved the amended October 1, 2008 minutes.

III). Wendy Lougee provided the committee with a University Libraries Report and highlighted the following:

- The Library's compact/budget hearing took place on October 28. She explained that the process gives units an opportunity to highlight their strategic initiatives and priorities, and share their significant financial concerns.

The Library's needs were documented as collection inflation, support for geospatial data, and a salary program. In addition, per instructions from the University, the Library laid out how it would deal with a 1% funding reduction.

During the compact/budget hearing there was discussion about the uncertain financial situation faced by the University. Since this hearing, the Library has been informed that all units will face a minimum 1% mandated cut. In addition, the Library has been asked to model various scenarios for further cuts. Given the difficult economic times, this raises the question of how deep the cuts will be and how the Library will be impacted in terms of relative cuts. As the Library works on its models, it will focus on areas where the impacts will be felt the least, and where further efficiencies can be gained. The administration has informed all units that any savings from the Retirement Incentive Option (RIO) program cannot be put towards the mandated 1% cut. The Provost did underscore, however, that despite difficult financial times that strategic investments will still be made.

- Ms. Lougee provided the committee with information on the recently filed Google settlement proposal. As background information, Ms. Lougee noted that the Authors Guild, the Association of American Publishers and a handful of authors and publishers filed a class action lawsuit against Google related to the Book Search program. The suit dealt with whether Google could digitize in copyright books in copyright in order to use that digital text to drive a search engine.

While the settlement does not address the copyright issue, the plaintiffs agreed to settle under two key principles:

- Return revenue to rights holders.
- Offer broadest access to in-copyright works.

In order to accomplish these goals, a non-profit registry, Book Rights Registry, will be created to record rights and handle revenues. This settlement, noted Ms. Lougee, opens up a segment of the published literature allowing Google to display in-copyright materials that are out of print. Post settlement, libraries that participate in Google's digitization efforts will be able to:

- Get both out-of-copyright and in-copyright digital copies back for placement in their Shared Digital Repository.
- Create search tools.
- Create services for disabled users.
- Make replacement copies.

In addition, Google, post settlement, will launch new services, e.g. free viewing in public libraries, institutional subscriptions for the higher education community, creation of two research corpus sites for data mining and analysis purposes.

This settlement, noted Ms. Lougee will open up nearly 70% of literature published in the U.S. (roughly titles published between 1923 – 1960's), which is currently not viewable in Google, and thereby creating fully searchable digital versions of millions of books.

Examples of benefits resulting from this settlement include but are not limited to:

- Access to a large body of books.
- Institutional subscription will allow individual and course uses.

- Everyone through the public library system will have access to this content, and individual purchases will be made available at a low cost.

Examples of risks associated with this settlement agreement include but are not limited to:

- Uncertainty around which publishers will participate.
- Some restrictions will be placed on use of library digital copies.
- Creation of a market that may impact fair use decisions in the future.

A member asked whether there was any connection between this Google agreement and other Google applications the University is looking at licensing. Ms. Lougee explained that there is a suite of Google applications that part of the campus is already using for collaboration, and the institution is considering licensing some of these tools more broadly. Use of Google applications raises interesting policy questions given that the work would be done on 3rd party servers, and in their environment. Would it be appropriate for a faculty member, for example, to store his/her data at Google? What protections does the University have in terms of security, liability, and privacy? The Office of Information Technology (OIT) is working with the Office of the General Counsel (OGC) to explore these issues from a legal standpoint, but these questions also raise policy questions.

Ultimately, noted Ms. Lougee, this settlement will require institutional and partner decisions be made, and agreements with Google be revised. The CIC provosts have appointed a small group to re-negotiate the agreement with Google in light of the settlement. For more information on the Google settlement, Ms. Lougee encouraged members to visit the Google Books website at <http://books.google.com/googlebooks/agreement/>.

- The University's new debit system that supports the Libraries' photocopying operations continues to not meet the functionality of earlier systems. While every effort is being made to permanently correct these problems, in the interim, an after hours service has been put in place to address problems that occur after hours. In addition, the Library has negotiated to retain the card reader systems in certain library locations. Ms. Lougee encouraged anyone having printing problems to approach the closest staff person for assistance. Library staff can access offline printers to assist users if the debit system is not functioning.
- Since the October meeting when concerns were expressed about the new MNCAT Plus interface to the Libraries Catalog was voiced, Ms. Lougee reported that Professor Cherbuliez met with library staff to help the Library better understand the MNCAT Plus concerns associated with known-item searches. The Library is aware of the problem, and has a group working to resolve it. The earlier interface (MNCAT Classic) is still available for use.

IV). Ms. Lougee introduced the next agenda item, the Libraries communication strategies with the University community. To begin, Ms. Lougee introduced today's guests, Kate Brooks, assistant librarian, Linda Eells, associate librarian, Karen Williams, associate university librarian for academic programs, and Marlo Welshons, director of communications.

Ms. Williams provided the committee with a brief overview of the responsibilities of the University's library liaisons (librarians assigned to work with individual disciplines/departments), which include:

1. Collection development and management.
2. Active involvement in the teaching and learning arena.
3. Support for programs and processes related to scholarly communication.
4. Creation of digital tools.
5. Provide reference services.
6. Provide outreach services.

Every academic department, noted Ms. Williams, has a library liaison assigned to it.

Ms. Williams, using examples, illustrated the roles and responsibilities of library liaisons:

1. ARTstor (<http://www.artstor.org/index.shtml>) was used to demonstrate how library liaison's responsibilities in the collection development and management arena have changed. Unlike many acquisitions in the past, ARTstor is not a static purchase; it represents a growing body of art images. Further, it has the capacity for individuals to add images. Hence, if a faculty member creates a digital collection of images that he/she would like to share, this person would work with his/her library liaison to upload these images to share with the larger community.
2. Given that library resources are often not particularly straightforward in terms of how they should be used, library liaisons are often called upon to develop special handouts (<http://www.lib.umn.edu/research/instruction/modules/lsamp-articles/>), or conduct workshops/attend classes to teach students how to use library resources. Library liaisons are working hard to integrate information literacy, a set of competencies students need in order to be effective information consumers and creators in an information society, into courses and the larger curriculum, e.g. Student Learning and Development Outcomes. Liaisons are working to create tools and assignments to help faculty support student learning outcomes - (<http://www.lib.umn.edu/research/instruction/modules/lsamp-articles/>).
3. A by-product of the journal pricing crisis in the last two decades has led the Libraries to create a website (<http://www.lib.umn.edu/scholcom/>) to answer the multitude of questions generated by scholars regarding publishing issues. The Scholarly Communication Collaborative, which is comprised of a group of library liaisons, maintains this site. Highlighted on this site is the NIH requirement for public access to NIH-funded research articles (<http://www.lib.umn.edu/scholcom/NIHaccess.phtml>), which provides step-by-step instructions for depositing an article in PubMed Central. Alternatively, noted

- Ms. Williams, a faculty member can contact the Libraries for assistance in submitting their work.
4. Ms. Williams noted that the Libraries offer a copyright support services. The website, which is maintained by library liaisons was highlighted (<http://www.lib.umn.edu/copyright/>), and it was also noted that in addition to the website, the Libraries are happy to attend classes at the invitation of faculty to present copyright information.
 5. Increasingly, library liaisons are collaborating in the development of digital tools. Ms. Williams shared examples: the Undergraduate Virtual Library (<http://www.lib.umn.edu/undergrad/>), EthicShare (http://blog.lib.umn.edu/lib-web/news/2008/01/u_of_ms_ethicshare_project_pil.html), and an Aerospace Engineering and Mechanics blog (http://blog.lib.umn.edu/frans005/aem/2008/10/politics_and_science.html).
 6. Library liaisons also provide services in support of campus outreach to broader audiences. Liaisons work hard to make their community outreach mesh with other campus efforts and priorities, e.g. History Day (<http://wilson.lib.umn.edu/historyday/>).

Professor Orf requested that a list of library liaisons be distributed to the committee. Ms. Williams indicated that she would send this list to Renee Dempsey, Senate staff, who will distribute it to the committee.

A member commented that a potential gap in library liaison services seems like to be in the interdisciplinary centers. This person added that another problem for many in the University community when trying to locate resources or information is not knowing what it is called, which makes finding it difficult. Ms. Williams stated that she appreciates these comments and that she will take them back to share with her colleagues. As a starting point, a booklet, *A Faculty/Instructor Guide* (<http://www.lib.umn.edu/research/instruction/guides/FacultyGuide.pdf>), provides teaching and learning resources that are available to faculty, noted Ms. Williams.

Next, two library liaisons, Kate Brooks and Linda Eells, each shared information on projects they are working on which demonstrated the varied nature of their work. This fall, noted Ms. Brooks, she and Professor Juliette Cherbuliez collaborated on a project to help keep graduate students stay current in terms of the information they collect and how to best manage their information. The model they created was originally intended to help graduate students visualize the research process, and to emphasize that the Library can come into the research cycle at any point.

Ms. Brooks stated that she works hard to stay apprised of technologies that will help scholars do their research, and to keep their information current and organized. An example of this type of technology is Zotero (<http://www.zotero.org/>), noted Ms. Brooks. Zotero is a web-browser extension that functions like citation systems, e.g. RefWorks.

This application, however, takes RefWorks to the next level because it allows users to tag articles with words that mean something to them, and allows them to categorize and manage their own folders.

Next, Linda Eells provided the committee with information on a project she is working on which grew out of a conversation with an extension educator. The project, the Born-Digital Extension Publications Project, seeks to create policies, determine appropriate standards, and develop a technical infrastructure for a repository of born-digital, and subsequently reborn-digital (converted from print), agricultural resources that may be readily scaled to involve other national and international partners. The goal is to make this information available long after its creation, at a stable address, in a stable form. Studies have quantified the magnitude of "link-rot," the decay of access to on-line resources overtime, and it is significant in terms of the percentage of references that are no longer accessible.

Moving on, Marlo Welshons, communications director for the Libraries, shared information on how the Library communicates with faculty and students. She noted that library liaisons serve as valuable extensions of the Libraries' communications office. Every interaction a liaison has with faculty and students is an opportunity to learn about faculty and student needs. Key findings from an AHC communications audit that speak to the value of library liaisons revealed that the most effective and high-impact communication is face-to-face.

Beyond the library liaisons, noted Ms. Welshons, current communication vehicles used by the Library to communicate with faculty and students include:

- Welcome letter sent from the University Librarian to new faculty.
- *Faculty/Instructor Guide* (information contained in the guide is also available through other venues--e.g. liaison meetings).
- Library participation in New Faculty Orientation.
- Participation in Welcome Week activities for new students as well as participation in other orientation programs--e.g. for graduate and international students.
- Provide workshops to students--e.g. Unravel the Library.
- Publication of the on-line Graduate Research Guide (<http://www.lib.umn.edu/graduateguide/>).
- Communication materials sent to directly to faculty:
 - *continuum*, the magazine of the University of Minnesota Libraries, which is published twice a year (<http://www.lib.umn.edu/publications/continuum.html>).
 - News and Events newsletter, which is published three times a year.
 - Publicity related to specific events throughout the year, which is targeted to different faculty.
 - College e-newsletters, <http://staff.lib.umn.edu/communications/email/deans/07fall/>, which are intended to highlight the support available to faculty in the specific colleges.

Ms. Welshons stated that given she is relatively new to the Libraries, she is spending a significant amount of time thinking about best strategies for engaging and informing faculty and students about the Libraries. Specifically, Ms. Welshons wants to be able to measure the success of the different strategies that are undertaken. Additionally, she would like to explore new methods for reaching out to faculty and students, e.g. Facebook, YouTube. In closing, Ms. Welshons encouraged members to contact her with their communication observations or alternative communication strategies.

In light of time, Professor Orf suggested that this discussion be carried over to the December 3rd agenda.

V). Hearing no further business, Professor Orf adjourned the meeting.

Renee Dempsey
University Senate