

LIBRARY COMMITTEE
MINUTES OF MEETING
March 12, 2014

[In these minutes: Wangenstein Library scholarship; Open Access Policy Update.]

[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: Jennifer Alexander (Chair), Brandon Adams, Michelle Brasure, Phil Buhlmann, John Butler, LeAnn Dean, Michelle Englund, Mary Alice Ford, Judith Garrard, Wendy Lougee, Neil Olszewski, Daniel Pesut, Luke Plutowski, Evan Roberts, Matthew Rosendahl, Mary Beth Sancomb-Moran, Marlo Welshons

GUESTS: Emily Hagens, Lois Hendrickson, Janice Jaguszewski

OTHERS: Connie Lenz (for Joan Howland),

REGRETS: David Fox, Vicki Graham, Ronald Hadsall, Bo Hu, David Schulist

ABSENT: Owen Williams

WELCOME

Professor Alexander called the meeting to order and asked for introductions.

INTRODUCTION TO THE WANGENSTEEN LIBRARY

Janice Jaguszewski, Director and Associate University Librarian for the Health Sciences, began by giving members basic information about the Wangenstein Library (WL):

- The collection contains approximately 80,000 volumes. The volumes predate 1930 and they were put together starting in 1950. The scope has not changed, but consideration is being given to bringing in later works.
- The collection has an emphasis on science and technology, and bringing the humanities and sciences together.
- They have been creatively integrated into undergraduate curriculum, and last year over 50 classes visited and incorporated materials from the library.

Lois Hendrickson, acting curator, Wangenstein Library, discussed the research and interdisciplinary scholarship taking place at the library. Many users are looking outside the sciences to understand the social and cultural meanings of sciences and technology. Examples include:

- History of chronobiology – 17th Century plant sensitivity to light.
- Role of Vesalius as a surgeon, beyond his role as anatomist.
- Vivisection and relationship to women’s social group activists.

- Jacqueline Wolf of Ohio University used the WL resources in her writing of a book-length history of cesarean sections in the US.

She explained there is a broad range of students who visit the library because “biology” is a broadly used term and includes both natural history and science. Within the WL, they strive to teach students how to use raw materials and about the materiality of books. They also have artifacts and have an exhibit each year at the State Fair. She distributed a handout that detailed narrative assessment results from students, dated March 2014. The questions and responses include:

- What do you think was the most useful thing you heard about in WL? What do you wish we had spent more time talking about?
 - “I wish we had more time to look at and talk about all of the books.”
 - “The most useful part was experiencing something new. I had never seen or handled documents like that, and it made me more comfortable in doing that.”
- What do you think was the least useful thing you heard about in the WL?
 - “Nothing. My time there was very useful. In fact I wish we had more time to continue with the tour.”

The listed WL’s areas of strength:

- Medical Professions
- Specific Diseases and Bodily Concerns
- Natural History
- Medical Technology
- Sites of Medicine

The current collection development consists of:

- Continuing to add to collections of distinction, such as anatomy atlases.
- New areas have emerged as faculty needs and scholarship change.
- Books on Asian medicine with an emphasis on Chinese and Japanese.

Ms. Hendrickson introduced Emily Hagens, doctoral candidate, History of Medicine and co-curator of the Downton Abbey exhibit at the WL. She is studying 16th century Italian, non-professional, medical communities. Medical recipe books show the provenance of the recipes, who people interacted with to get the information, and who was giving out the information. They are dynamic texts and some are in English, but she has focused on the Italian recipe books. She noted that other than the physical collection, the staff of the WL is invaluable. A catalog can only tell you so much and the staff has helped her to expand the basis of her study.

Members explored pieces that the WL staff had on display in the meeting room and discussed the collection with Ms. Hendrickson and Ms. Hagens.

OPEN ACCESS POLICY UPDATE

Professor Olszewski provided members with an update on the Open Access Policy after it was presented at the March 6, 2014 Faculty Senate Meeting. He said that it had favorable audience reception, though he noted that it was presented before the President's State of the University Address and he was not sure that members had enough time to fully examine the policy.

Ms. Welshons suggested that an addition be made to the FAQ that includes answers to questions about the technical implementation of the policy. She said that if the Faculty Senate passes it, there would be more opportunities to answer questions through the policy process.

Ms. Lougee noted that they were asked why books were not included in the policy and this should be clarified in the FAQ. She explained that not all books are produced in digital format and the faculty keeps the copyright. She added that the Libraries could hold briefing sessions.

Members discussed that questions related to the cost of implementation cannot yet be answered, but they agreed that the faculty should not have the burden of depositing their works.

- Professor Olszewski commented that a review process is built into all administrative policies.
- Ms. Welshons added that policy owners could decide the metrics and points of review.
- Professor Alexander mentioned points of interest such as traffic, number of articles deposited, trend of developing use, and cost.
- Professor Garrard noted that it would be important to isolate a metric that will show the benefit of the policy. Ms. Lougee added that studies of other institutions have shown an increase in impact factor, in some cases an 80% increase for open access articles and a reduction in student costs.
- Professor Roberts said that the annual review process for faculty would be an opportunity for harvesting works to be deposited.

Professor Alexander said that she would draft a letter to senators inquiring if they have more questions and propose that the policy go for action in May. Hearing no further business, she adjourned the meeting.

Jeannine Rich
University Senate Office