

LIBRARY COMMITTEE
MINUTES OF MEETING
FEBRUARY 19, 2003

[In these minutes: Welcome, Budgetary Plans , Digital Library Lab , Dewey Move Update, Copyright Update]

[These minutes reflect discussion and debate at a meeting of a committee of the University of Minnesota Senate or Twin Cities 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.]

PRESENT: William Phillips, Chair, LeAnn Dean, Sue Engelmann, Wendy Lougee, Bill Sozansky, John H. Anderson, David Brown, Elaine Challacombe, Lael Gatewood, Jill Gidmark, Leon Satkowski, Thomas Scanlan, Ray Wakefield

REGRETS: Joan Howland, April Schwartz, Owen Williams, Jennifer Alexander, Isaac Fox, Victoria Iwanij

OTHER(S): Suzanne Thorpe, C. Barry Carter, David Lenander

GUEST(S): John Butler, Digital Library Development Lab

I). Professor Phillips called the meeting to order and welcomed all those present.

II). BUDGETARY PLANS : Ms. Lougee provided members with an overview of the budget proposal that was submitted to the provost's office earlier this week. Recent cuts were not done differentially, but rather there was a 2.5% across the board cut to all University units. Fortunately, the formula used to calculate recent cuts included tuition so the Library did not get hit as hard as it could have if the cuts had been based solely on state support.

The Library is faced with a two-fold problem:

- Finding cash to give back this year.
 - Dealing with base reductions for next year in the same amount.

Monies for this year were taken largely from funds with balances such as project money, operational funds, , travel and supplies, student support, and an \$80,000 cut in collection spending. The impact from a user perspective will not be particularly visible for the first round of cuts.

Like many large organizations, the Library budgets above its base allocation. This means that the Library budgets for more than it has, knowing that lapse dollars, when positions are vacant, will sustain the budget. With the overall base being reduced, however, the Library will no longer be able to generate the necessary

level of lapse dollars. In addition, there are a number of areas where the Libraries have experienced significant inflation. Hence, the real quantifiable problem for the Library in 2004 is approximately \$600,000 more than the cut mandated by the provost's office (for a total of approximately \$1.2 million).

Proposed permanent cuts by the Library include:

- \$225,000 in efficiencies such as changing work flow and types of cataloging, reducing the number of service points in buildings, using technology to streamline some routines, reducing the geographic duplication of collections, etc. Implications for users would include slightly diminished access options in catalogues, increased distance needed to travel to get materials, etc. Staff implications include training to put new routines in place. Ms. Lougee also noted there would be costs associated with new technology applications.
- \$575,000 reduction in program support including a \$96,000 permanent reduction to the collection, reduced staffing at service points, possibly reduced library hours, etc. User implications: Longer queues for help, fewer staff to build the collection and work with the departments. Increased workload is a major implication for the staff.
- Estimated savings of \$75,000 by implementing cost recovery measures – Ms. Lougee noted the Library currently spends about \$85,000 subsidizing its income operations. The goal is to reduce the subsidy and possible actions under review include:
 - Reducing expenses in copy services by reducing hours.
 - Increase fees to external users. Currently, the University is one of the lowest priced urban research libraries in terms of borrowing privilege fees - \$60 for an individual, \$30 for alumni association members and \$250 for a corporation.
 - Introduce a book delivery fee comparable to fees for article delivery.
 - Estimated savings of \$85,000 by slowing down the Library's investment in its technology infrastructure. Examples include: slowing the replacement cycle for servers, reducing staff development and reducing the resident training program by 1 FTE.

Ms. Lougee praised the Library staff for their ideas to reduce costs while trying to minimize the pain to the user community. Members were asked to contact Ms. Lougee with comments concerning cutbacks they perceive may have political implications and how best to approach these concerns.

III). Professor Phillips introduced Librarian John Butler from the Digital Library Development Laboratory (DL

Lab). Mr. Butler distributed handouts related to the Libraries' strategic digital library initiatives. To begin, Mr. Butler explained that the DL Lab addresses issues of information resource discovery, retrieval and use and will collaborate with partners on campus to accomplish its initiatives.

Mr. Butler referred member to a handout that summarized a national survey effort dealing with the quality of library services. He explained how to read and understand the charts contained in the handout.

DL Lab goals include:

- Provide a robust and integrated information experience.
- Add value to each component of the DL Lab's information environment.
- Build an architecture that integrates with campus services and learning communities.
- Make effective information services scaleable and extensible.

The three themes that run through the DL Lab's goals are:

1. Integration of library resources.
2. Enhancing access to resources.
3. Increasing personal control for end-users.

Future undertakings for the DL Lab include:

- Systematic integration of content resources, in a customized way, into on-line course environments.
- Portal integration and services.
- Personal control options to allow users more control over content they need.
- Open URL linking technologies that would allow end-users to link more directly from one source to another.
- Cross-resource search engines.
- Alternative and experimental interfaces.

Mr. Butler concluded his presentation and asked the committee if they had any questions and welcomed comments and suggestions from members.

- A member expressed a concern over the slow response time on the part of the network. Associate Vice President and CIO of the Office of Information Technology Steve Cawley noted that certain databases are just slow no matter how much horsepower is behind them. Mr. Cawley did say that the University also faces a network issue and a proposal is on the table to upgrade the network at a cost of approximately \$20 million. However, in light of the budget situation, the chances of the University investing the entire \$20 million needed for this project are slim. Mr. Butler added that many of the resources the DL Lab provides access to are not hosted on this campus. If anyone experiences an on-going problem with a particular resource he/she should report it to the DL Lab to investigate.
- Ms. Lougee commented that while many libraries have invested in building digital content, the next frontier is how to make the most of the content that exists. She also added that the challenges that face the DL Lab are more of a design issue as opposed to a technology task. Increasingly many users come to the Library remotely and the DL Lab needs to determine how to give these users a quality experience versus chaos.

Professor Phillips thanked Mr. Butler for attending today's meeting and providing the committee with information on the DL Lab.

IV). DEWEY MOVE UPDATE: Ms. Lougee stated that at the outset of the Dewey move proposal, there was concern over the number of books being moved into storage. Ultimately, a decision was made to downsize the project by about half or 160,000 books. Very few complaints or concerns have been received to date from faculty. The move is underway and the Library is on track to have the move completed by May 31, 2003.

A member asked if more books would need to be moved next year. Ms. Lougee stated that by moving 160,000 volumes this year allows for 3 – 6 years of growth. A significant space issue remains though because only 2 caverns were built under Andersen Library instead of three. To get another cavern built before the Library runs

out of space is unlikely. Projections will be forthcoming concerning the collection system-wide in order to better understand the problem the Library is up against in terms of space.

Professor Phillips thanked Ms. Lougee for her update.

V). COPYRIGHT ACT: Ms. Lougee shared some of the recent changes in copyright law:

- The Sonny Bono Copyright Extension Act – This act is likely to make materials stay out of the public domain for a longer period of time.
- The Digital Millennium Copyright Act's (DMCA) anti-circumvention clause – This clause prohibits the use by technical means to undo encryption of content or security protections for content in order to exercise fair use.
- The Teach Act – This act allows use of materials in distance learning environments that were previously prohibited. The Teach Act also introduces some new responsibilities.

Mr. Butler noted that the DMCA and the Teach Act incorporate strong assertions about institutional copyright obligations. For the University this means the need to have a copyright policy. Currently, the University does not have a copyright policy. Secondly, both of these pieces of legislation call for institutions to adapt educational programs for their communities with respect to copyright requirements.

Implications for the Library include:

- Resource sharing – many electronic licensing agreements stipulate how the Library can use the content it purchases. By and large, the area of inter-library loans have either been prohibited in license agreements or obstacles have been put in place to make resource sharing much more difficult. The Library is in a difficult position in terms of its ability to share information it invests in.
- Preservation – If a library had a deteriorating copy of a book it could, in the past, get a replacement copy or reformat the copy of the book to create an acid-free paper copy. It is unclear at this point if

libraries have the same rights when it comes to digitizing materials.

- Economy of scholarly communication – To what extent should the Library abide by guidelines that are a supplement to the copyright law in terms of fair use for such things as course reserves? Is it possible to use materials for multiple terms? There are a lot of questions surrounding this issue but no case law to fall back on. How much institutional risk does the institution want to support? Ms. Lougee noted that the institution may be prohibited from using materials that their faculty have published if the copyright is held with a publisher.

Mr. Butler stated that a task force has been established at the Libraries to develop an overarching fair use policy. In the past the University typically has turned its back and ignored provisions given to the institution in the statute, particularly related to fair use. Fair use, if taken at its word, is a very ambiguous statute that is subject to quite a bit of interpretation and difficult to administer. With the development of a fair use policy, there will be a shifting of the burden of being informed to the faculty. A member expressed a concern regarding faculty being unaware of fair use practices.

The committee continued a brief discussion regarding this issue.

VI). OTHER BUSINESS:

- Ms. Lougee distributed an article of potential interest.
- Professor Phillips recommended at the March meeting the committee discuss what it can do to offer support to the Library. He asked that members start thinking about what action the committee could take along these lines. Additionally, Professor Phillips asked Ms. Lougee her thoughts on what the Library Committee can do to assist the Library.
- A member requested that Ms. Lougee present to the committee at its next meeting the Library's long-range strategic plans so that members would have an opportunity to offer input.

VII). Hearing no further business, Professor Phillips adjourned the meeting. Professor Satkowski reminded members that the March meeting will be held in Rapson Hall and will be followed by a tour of the Architecture Library.

Renee Dempsey

University Senate