

LIBRARY COMMITTEE
MINUTES OF MEETING
MARCH 8, 2004

[In these minutes: Options in the Era of Electronic Publishing, 2005
Librariesπ Compact Overview]

[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: Ray Wakefield, chair, LeAnn Dean, Wendy Lougee, Bill Sozansky, Owen Williams, John H. Anderson, David R. Brown, Elaine Challacombe, Robert Dexter, Lael Gatewood, William Phillips, Leon Satkowski, Thomas Scanlan, Jim Thill

REGRETS: Sue Engelmann, Jill Barnum, Isaac Fox

ABSENT: April Schwartz, Erin Wais

OTHERS: Suzanne Thorpe for Joan Howland

GUEST: Doug Armato, director, University Press

I). Professor Wakefield called the meeting to order and asked all those present to introduce themselves.

II). Professor Wakefield called on Doug Armato, director, University Press to lead a discussion around the topic of options in the era of electronic publishing. In Mr. Armato's opinion, too many options exist today in electronic publishing without a system in place to manage them.

Mr. Armato began by providing members with the historical background regarding scholarly communication in North America. He highlighted the following:

- The system of scholarly communication in North America is unique in that it is highly distributive, collaborative and independent. In contrast, the United Kingdom's system consists of primarily two monolithic, almost monopolistic bodies of scholarly publishers, Cambridge and Oxford. The system in Europe has always been commercial and non-competitive. In the United States and Canada, however, the system developed very differently. The system developed whereby many campuses hosted individual presses and costs and decision-making were shared. Under this model there has always been a lot of innovation, competition and individuality. Also, the North American system has been more economical for the customer/end-user. There is concern that the North American system will begin following the European model of commercial publishing as non-profit presses, such as university presses, continue to be defunded.
- There has been a crisis in scholarly publishing for approximately 30 years. The system worked best when there was a high degree of federal funding in the system. In the late 1970s, federal funding to research libraries began being reduced. As a result, the system changed in its economic essentials. In the late 1970s most presses received approximately 80% of their revenue from library sales; currently, that number is estimated at 19%. While libraries remain important they are no longer a significant part of the scholarly book market. Library budgets have become significantly strained at research library institutions, but even more strained at non-research library institutions. Scholars at non-research library institutions have had to get their materials through inter-library loans or front their research bills by purchasing their own books. As a result, university presses across the country are distributing their books through individual purchases by scholars as opposed to library purchases. In the past, university presses were largely institutionally supported. As presses are becoming more self-supporting, many are failing to serve their academic constituencies as well as they once did.
- Over the years the system has changed from one in which scholars wrote books to be published by scholarly presses and then made available to libraries, to a system where the market plays a broader and broader role. In Mr. Armatos' opinion, this market influence has been very worthwhile. He added that overall university presses have become better publishers for being aware of the market of not simply

scholar authors but scholar readers as well. As presses turn further away from publishing purely for reasons of disseminating knowledge and more and more toward market approaches, a strain is increasingly being felt by the faculty in terms of where they can get projects published, etc. Additionally, library budgets are being harmed because as the market shifts away from libraries supporting publications, prices are inevitably going up although not as fast as commercial publishers.

Based on this information, it is Mr. Armato's opinion that the real issue is not the need for digital options but the need for a digital system for disseminating scholarship. There needs to be a system that is truly a partnership among faculty, libraries and presses. Until such a system is created, users will not be as well served as they should be. Although the bulk of scholarly communication is moving to the web, many publications largely remain unavailable, and, therefore, information is not being disseminated as it could under a true partnership system. An obstacle to developing a digital system is ironically a characteristic of the North American system itself, the fact that scholarly communication is highly distributed. Currently, there are approximately 90 university presses across the country run by 90 different university administrations. Another obstacle is the principle of management by budget, which occurs at many institutions of higher education whereby university presses are managed as individual budget lines. Until universities stop viewing faculty, libraries and presses as individual budget lines, they will never be able to create a system of scholarly communication, which, Mr. Armato believes, could be less expensive than the current system and more effective in disseminating knowledge.

Comments/questions from members:

- Is the fact that presses receive only approximately 19% of their revenue from library sales primarily attributable to a market decrease in purchases by libraries, an increase in purchases by individuals or a combination of both? In Mr. Armato's opinion, it is a combination of many factors. Over the past three decades, presses have been asked to be largely self-sustaining. The average university press receives subsidy at approximately 12% of the budget. Therefore presses have increasingly pushed to open other markets.

There has been a change in the orientation of scholarly presses away from serving primarily libraries and scholars and opening up to other fields. A side effect of this transition is that the buying power of libraries has become less important.

- Ms. Lougee noted that Mr. Armato will be President of the Association of American University Presses (AAUP) next year. She asked Mr. Armato to comment on what the AAUP is doing in order to collectively bring about change in this highly distributed age. Mr. Armato stated that because university presses are so highly distributed it is difficult to come up with a single solution. Within the AAUP, there are different ideas on how to proceed. Mr. Armato noted that he believes the AAUP needs to move aggressively toward wider dissemination through digital means. An element that plays a role in which faction people believe has to do with the wealth of the press. Many wealthy presses see no reason to change the system. Increasingly the AAUP believes its best option for bringing about change is to work more closely with Association of Research Libraries (ARL). Last year the AAUP and ARL jointly drafted principles to build on a partnership between the two associations. One issue the two associations need to address is e-reserves. Pedagogically there is every reason to believe e-reserves are an excellent idea and a way to serve the community.
- Mr. Armato was asked to comment on recent legislation that has been introduced to make all federally funded research materials available to the public at no charge. This legislation suggests the eagerness to confront the issues, noted Mr. Armato, but doubts such an initiative would be broad-based enough to change the system. A system that allows access to certain materials only through digital means or only through print would never work. The only viable system would be one that integrates all materials for dissemination.
- Is the collaboration between the AAUP and ARL the start of a process, which will meet the needs of libraries, university presses and scholars? What can this Committee and other interested parties do to be effective in bringing about change? Mr. Armato stated an important movement that helped bring this issue to the forefront is the Modern Language Association's (MLA) report on the crisis in scholarly communication. The MLA brought together representatives from the ARL and AAUP to discuss their report. The AAUP has been encouraging scholarly associations to join AAUP and to participate in

their debates. Mr. Armato is doubtful whether actions on the part of individual campuses or even within individual consortia will be as beneficial as working through the national associations. Both the MLA and the AHA have been very active to date. The goal is to bring as many scholarly associations on board as possible.

- A CIC report exists that speaks to the vast disparity in perceptions and value systems between scholars and institutions with respect to reward systems. What role should the scholar play in this process? Scholars are embedded within institutions that have priorities and oftentimes these institutions view electronic mediums as too risky. Mr. Armato believes that all parties need to be represented in scholarly communication dissemination discussions. Technologically it is possible to have the author factor (i.e. physical presence of a scholarly work), and still have digital dissemination by converting library editions to be both digital and physical.
- Why do many department chairs and administrations continue to assume that a published book is essential for promotion and tenure whereas rank and file faculty believe the opposite? Mr. Armato believes that everyone has their own crisis. His concern is after all is said and done the end result will be a multitude of fragmentary systems versus one comprehensive system for dealing with scholarly communication in a digital age.
- At the request of a Committee member, Mr. Armato was asked to explain the University of Chicago Presses' BiblioVault Project. He noted that BiblioVault is an electronic repository for backlist and current university press titles (<http://www.bibliovault.org/>). Ms. Lougee commented that the original motivation of BiblioVault was not so much to distribute materials electronically, but rather to give publishers a venue to do print on demand. In addition, Mr. Armato stated that the California Digital Library (CDL) is another interesting project - <http://www.cdlib.org/>. When asked about the Committee's opinion concerning digital dissemination of faculty works, Ms. Lougee responded that the Committee has not taken a position thus far but has been in the process of educating itself about this complex issue.
- Would it be feasible for university presses to try and create a new model/system by applying for grants, and, if not, where should the critical initial investment come from? Mr. Armato stated that creating a new model cannot be done without some level of seed or

- investment money but first a consortia of research libraries, scholarly associations and presses need to come together to decide what the model should look like. Mr. Armato indicated he is optimistic that once a model is developed, the consortia would create a funding base that would allow the model to be sustainable.
- How do faculty involve themselves in the scholarly communication crisis? Mr. Armato believes working through the learned societies and scholarly associations is the best way to become involved. Because the current system is so highly decentralized and fragmented, there is not a lot that can be done on individual campuses, but there is a lot the national associations can do.
 - Are junior faculty at a disadvantage to getting published by university presses? Is this a factor that keeps scholarly communication dissemination in a state of perpetual crisis? Mr. Armato believes it is important for university presses to remember they operate under a mission statement, and as long as presses live up to their respective mission statements, they will make great strides in solving these issues. Additionally, getting published has more to do with one's field than the stature of the scholar, he noted. Funding is another factor that plays a role in getting published. If steps are not taken to disseminate scholarship purely based on the worth of the scholarship, then there exists the very real possibility a class system will develop or these materials will be published commercially with the likelihood of cost spirals.

Professor Wakefield thanked Mr. Armato for leading today's discussion on the crisis in scholarly publishing.

III). Next, University Librarian Wendy Lougee distributed two documents: 1). the *Report of the CIC Summit on Scholarly Communication in the Humanities and Social Sciences* for members information, and, 2). a draft of the Compact for the Twin Cities Libraries (FY 05). Ms. Lougee highlighted the following from the Compact document:

- There will be cuts in fiscal year 2005 to realize the reductions that were instituted at the beginning of the biennium. This will include a mix of across the board cuts of State funds as well as targeted cuts with the possibility of other reductions as well.

- The Library has incorporated a yearly alert into its Compact, which is an indication of where the Library plans to come back next year to request funding.
- In addition to the Library's goals established for 2003 - 2004, it has added another goal for 2004 - 2005, which is to have the Library viewed as a strategic asset of the institution rather than strictly a service agent.
- Collection resources continues to be a high priority. The inflationary rate has decreased from 12% in FY04 to 8.55% in FY05. However, the weakened dollar lessens the purchasing power for many disciplines when purchasing from publishers and vendors outside the United States, in particular Western Europe and the UK. To maintain the University's current commitments with journals and electronic content and to sustain its level of book purchases, the Library would need approximately \$800,000. In planning for potential increases in collection funding that is likely to be more modest (or flat), the Library will need to engage in more journal cancellation and reductions in monograph allocations. For every \$100,000 in necessary retrenchment, library cancellations translate into 226 social science journal titles, 165 medical titles or 746 humanities titles to be cut. The Library has already seen a diminution of 8,000 journal titles over the past 5 years. Ms. Lougee noted that the Committee may want to comment on this situation.
- The Library continues its efforts to build its digital infrastructure. Technology is very pervasive in what the Library does. Over the past few months, the Library has launched a number of initiatives which have been very successful e.g. Find It, RefWorks, etc. The Library has made a request for \$65,000 to be put towards licensing costs and staff support to sustain these new initiatives, etc.
- Ms. Lougee highlighted the new undergraduate support programs. Next, the Library plans to focus on how to better serve faculty and graduate students. At the Committee's next meeting Ms. Lougee plans to share survey information, which illustrates the differences between what undergraduate students expect from the Library versus graduate students and faculty. Additionally, the Library will be turning its attention to how it can provide more customized services to different disciplines.
- From an organizational perspective the Library is concerned about:

- The current budget model does not provide a stable funding stream for common goods.
- The Bio-Medical Library's significant reliance on income from document delivery services, which is used to subsidize collections and services. This document delivery service is being jeopardized by reduced libraries' collection support and the increasing number of restrictions on electronic content for use in delivery services.
- A decrease in its income from overdue books, photocopying, etc.
- Non-tuition generating units are being asked to cover all salary increases internally. For the Libraries this translates into \$480,000.
- As collection strength decreases, the Library has seen a parallel increase in requests to borrow materials from other institutions. So far in 2004, the increase is over 30%, translating to increased costs of \$100,000.
- Regarding the physical infrastructure of the Library, Ms. Lougee noted the following:
 - The BioMedical Library is slated for renovation and is on the capital priority list for 2008.
 - The Library has been asked to seriously consider consolidation of library space in St. Paul.
 - In the not too distant future, a third cavern will be necessary under Andersen Library.

The only financial request the Library put in its Compact related to facilities is a request for something akin to the funds allocated to the Office of Classroom Management (OCM) to upgrade classrooms. The Library has put forth a request for \$75,000 to provide recurring support for replacement of furnishings in library public spaces.

- The preliminary data regarding the University Library's ranking compared to the top 100 research libraries in the United States does not look good. As noted earlier, the Library's rankings for monographs have dropped considerably. For FY05, the Library is requesting \$1,364,368. It is Ms. Lougee's understanding that the Provost has \$4.5 million in new money to be allocated for student directed initiatives and another \$4.5 million in new money for academic priorities. Ms. Lougee would like to see the Libraries garner support as an academic priority.

Comments/questions from members:

- Is there any movement on the part of the administration to adjust the IMG model to better reflect the common goods? There is a sub-group of the Deans working on alternative budget models replied Ms. Lougee. The strategies used to address State budget reductions have sufficiently impacted the IMG model that it is no longer functioning as intended. However, an argument could be made to look at the distribution of indirect costs and/or the distribution of royalties as a source of funding for the Libraries because the Libraries contribute to both of these.
- In light of the fact that the Library receives a very low percentage of ICR (indirect cost recovery) funds, how does it compare to other institutions? In terms of whether the University is any different than its peer institutions really varies from institution to institution. It is not uncommon for universities to not allocate monies to attributed cost centers. A member suggested incorporating a statement into the Compact indicating that the University is not supporting the Library in terms of ICR dollars to the level they should be.
- One member asked about the status of the royalty income Vice President of Research David Hamilton allocated to the Libraries. Ms. Lougee noted that this was a \$500,000 annual commitment for a period of four years. There is no guarantee of continuation after this four-year period. These funds have allowed the Libraries to diminish by half its planned journal cancellations. It was suggested to Ms. Lougee that she incorporate a statement into the Compact expressing concern that these funds are a temporary remedy for a commitment that will endure.
- What programs/initiatives are considered worthy of receiving funding for academic priorities? Ms. Lougee believes that most are found in institutional and academic priority programs, presidential initiatives, faculty hires, etc. A member stated that there should be a statement in the Compact noting that academic priorities require a grounding in library support.
- Professor Wakefield suggested the SLC draft a letter again this year in support of the Library. Ms. Lougee noted that the Compact process may be completed in the next 6 - 8 weeks. Another member asked

whether the letter the Committee drafted last year had an impact. Ms. Lougee noted that the Libraries had not received new cuts this past year and did receive some new money for new initiatives. Professor Wakefield thinks it is the Committee's duty to act in support of the Library.

- Who is the audience for the Compact? Is there an audience outside of the University e.g. Legislature? The audience is primarily the Provost and the administrative staff that review the budgets.
- A member suggested instituting a fee for some of the services the Library currently offers for free. According to Ms. Lougee, two areas have been suggested for fees:
 - Lumina To U ≠ the book delivery service.
 - Interlibrary loans.

Another member suggested that the Library should receive a portion of the technology fees like they do at UMD. Ms. Lougee noted that the technology fees on the Twin Cities campus are generated at the collegiate level rather than centrally so negotiations would need to take place with each school/college.

Professor Wakefield will draft a letter to the Provost on behalf of the SLC. This letter will be distributed to members electronically for their feedback prior to the next meeting. It was suggested that a similar letter be drafted and then sent to the Deans.

IV). Hearing no further business, Professor Wakefield adjourned the meeting.

Renee Dempsey
University Senate