

Senate Library Committee (SLC)
October 15, 2019
Minutes of the Meeting

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 reflect the views of, nor are they binding on, the senate, the administration or the Board of Regents.

[**In these minutes:** Welcome and Introductions; Committee Orientation; Review of SLC Annual Agenda; Print Collection Management: Challenges and Strategies]

PRESENT: Gautam Ray (chair), John Butler, LeAnn Dean, Ryan Greenwood, Michael Hannon, Kristin Janke, Anup Joshi, Wendy Lougee, Peter Marchetto, Anna Milone, Karen Monson, Joanne Richardson, Matthew Rosendahl, Mary Beth Sancomb-Moran, Marlo Welshons, Rhiannon Williams, Keri Youngstrand, Sandra Zhou

REGRETS: LeAnn Dean, Rodney Williams

ABSENT: Abby Skapyak, Margaret Sucher

GUESTS: Mary Miller, director of collection management and preservation, University Libraries

1. Introductions

Chair Gautam Ray called the meeting to order and asked for a round of introductions.

2. Committee Orientation

Next, Geanette Poole, senate associate, University Senate Office, provided the annual [committee orientation](#). The orientation is provided in order to describe the responsibilities and charge of the committee, familiarize members with meeting logistics, and outline the function and structure of University Senate Governance.

3. Review of Annual Agenda

Ray then briefly described the agenda for the coming year. He noted that based on the results of a [survey](#) sent to committee members in August of 2019, the committee's work will be organized around two main themes:

- Increasing the efficiency of libraries
- Innovation and new spaces

4. Print Collection Management: Challenges and Strategies

Mary Miller, director of collection management and preservation, University Libraries, began her [presentation](#) by explaining that she views collections management in terms of a collection's life cycle, which includes the activities of acquisition, cataloging, use, preservation, and transfer to rare or possible withdrawal.

Miller next listed the essential questions that the Libraries must ask in order to develop collection management and preservation strategies and policy:

- How do we prioritize on-site storage?
- How do we prioritize for preservation?
- How do we make these decisions in a consortial or national context?

Miller then described policies that have directed the work of the Libraries in the recent past. Given that the Libraries of the University of Minnesota constitutes the only research library in the state, Miller said, retention decisions have to be made that honor the archiving role that the University has in the state and in the Big Ten Academic Alliance (BTAA) Libraries.

The Libraries recently worked with OCLC (an international library network with a database of library holdings), to analyze the comparative scarcity of print monograph holdings in its collections, Miller said. Results of the analysis indicated that for over 40% of the University's monographs, 15 or fewer institutions in North America hold a copy of the same monograph, Miller explained, which means considerable thought must be given to the scarcity of a monograph before it is withdrawn from a collection. The analysis also showed that over 48% of the Libraries' collection is not in the [HathiTrust](#) (a partnership of academic and research institutions with millions of titles digitized from libraries around the world) which suggests the need for digitization.

Miller next turned to projects that the Libraries has recently undertaken that reflect their strategies and policies for collections management:

- Assessing print collections for scarcity
- Ensuring access to licensed digital content
- Reducing collection footprint strategically by withdrawing duplicate volumes
- Ensuring access through print resource sharing
- Ensuring access through shared digital libraries
- Enhancing cataloging data to enable more accurate comparative analysis

Wendy Lougee, dean, University Libraries, to provide context, noted that the number of volumes in the Twin Cities campus has been reduced from 8.3 million to 7.6 million over the past two years.

Lougee then shared information regarding the Big Ten Academic Alliance (BTAA) Libraries, and its rich history of collaboration. She noted that, on September 20, 2019, the BTAA Libraries issued a [statement](#) regarding their commitment to “coordinated stewardship of the print scholarly record.” Lougee listed other collaborative efforts among the BTAA Libraries which include resource sharing, licensing, the non-profit HathiTrust (which started as the Google digitization project) and the Big 10 Geoportal for research data that has a spatial component.

Lougee noted that while the BTAA Libraries are united in taking a collective, interdependent approach to problem solving, celebrating the distinctiveness of each of the institutions' collections is also part of the equation. Further [analysis](#) conducted by consultants suggests that the BTAA Libraries are well positioned to take action toward forming an interdependent

resource Lougee continued. There's an underlying tension of autonomy versus consolidation, Lougee said, and the consultants' report suggests a three-part strategy for moving forward collectively:

- As a group, establish policies
- Improve resource sharing among institutions and their systems for identifying and delivering needed content(build intelligence into the systems)
- Create stronger awareness of library holdings across the BTAA.

Lougee noted that a paradigm shift is occurring in collections management; *access* to materials is becoming the most important factor, more so than the size of collections.

Lougee invited John Butler to address some of the complex technology issues that will need to be addressed by the BTAA Libraries. Butler said it cannot be assumed that all Big 10 universities will be making the same technology decisions and purchases in the future, so any interdependent design would have to embrace techno-diversity. Miller added that smaller state and regional organizations are adept at collective purchasing and resource sharing because financial constraints have made it necessary, whereas the larger, better funded institutions may be less practiced in those areas. She suggested that much could be learned from Minitex and similar organizations who are accustomed to incorporating such strategies.

Michael Hannon asked how the legal aspects of collaboration would be handled considering that each institution has its own office of general counsel, licensing agreements, etc. Lougee said that *individual* institutions may well have unique content licenses or interpretations of copyright law, and the conditions specified in licenses will have to be addressed in creating delivery systems. Butler noted that the members of the Big 10 have a history of working successfully in other ways to leverage purchasing power and could apply that knowledge to the issues that might arise around copyright.

Ray thanked the presenters and then reminded committee members to attend, if they could, the upcoming interviews of finalists for the dean of libraries position. As there was no further business, Ray adjourned the meeting.

Geanette Poole
University Senate Office