

## **Senate Library Committee Meeting Minutes**

Wednesday, February 10, 2010

10:15 ~ 11:45 a.m., 238A Morrill Hall

These minutes reflect discussion and debate at a committee meeting of the University of Minnesota Senate or Twin Cities Campus Delegation; none of the comments, conclusions, or actions reported in these minutes represents the views of, nor are they binding on, the Senate or Delegation, the Administration, or the Board of Regents.

**Present:** Jennifer Gunn (chair), Danielle Tisinger, James Orf, Jay Hatch, Joan Howland, Jonathan Binks, Monica Howell, Suzanne Thorpe, David Zopfi-Jordan, J. Woods Halley, Jennifer Alexander, Wendy Lougee, Elizabeth Fine, Isaac Fox, LeAnn Dean, Bill Sozansky, Anatoly Liberman, Michelle Englund, Shannon McCrindle

**Regrets:** Mary Beth Sancomb-Moran

**Absent:** Owen Williams, Stephen Gross, Manami Bhattacharya, Timothy Germain, Jonathan Lundberg

Chair Gunn called the meeting to order at 10:20 a.m. followed by welcome and introductions.

Chair Gunn asked members for a motion to approve November and December 2009 committee meeting minutes. Professor Halley objected to the fact that the minutes were three and two months late, respectively. He also stated that the minutes should be revised to identify the speakers. Professor Hatch reminded members of a previous suggestion to introduce oneself before speaking. A motion was made that speakers identify themselves prior to speaking. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously. Halley added that he thought the minutes were to be distributed University-wide across campus. Renee Dempsey, University Senate Office, said that the senate office does not have a University-wide email list. She said there are many in the community that complain about getting too much email and that because it is posted on the committee's public website, minutes are available for those who wish to read them. Member suggestions include making a University-wide announcement once minutes have been posted and sending out a reminder twice a year to the community of where the minutes can be found.

Approval of the minutes will be postponed until they have been revised to reflect speaker identification.

### **Senate Library Committee (SLC) Charge Ad Hoc Report**

Professor Jennifer Alexander, chair, ad hoc subcommittee on committee charge and scope, offered a summation of the report (distributed to members via email) outlining the charge and scope of the Senate Library Committee. An ad hoc committee was formed on November 6, 2009 and charged to examine the Senate Library Committee's charge and composition, with special attention to three general areas: 1) the role of the committee, 2) the scope of the committee's charge, and 3) the composition of the committee and to determine if the committee's composition matches its scope.

The charge given to the Senate Library Committee in University Senate by-laws, section G, is as follows:

The Library Committee represents faculty, academic professionals, Civil Service staff, and students that use the University library system.

### **Membership**

The Library Committee shall be composed of 12 faculty/academic professional members, 1 civil service staff member, 4 students, and ex officio representation as specified by vote of the Senate. Members shall be nominated by the Committee on Committees with the approval of the Senate. Academic professionals members must also be eligible to serve in the Senate. The civil service member shall be appointed by the Civil Service Committee and shall not be a library employee.

### **Duties and Responsibilities**

- a. **To make recommendations** to the Senate on all matters concerned with the policies and administration of University libraries.
- b. **To advise** the directors and other heads of University libraries.
- c. **To evaluate** University-wide library facilities, services, and collections.
- d. **To recommend** to the Senate Consultative Committee such actions or policies as it deems appropriate.

### **Findings of the Ad Hoc Committee ~ Jennifer Alexander**

Professor Alexander provided details of the committee charge ad hoc committee to members. She stated that the ad hoc committee considered the SLC's role in recent history as well as the role it might play in the future in the summation of their charge. The ad hoc committee concluded that the SLC has had almost no role in advising the University Senate or in the larger University or academic community. Information made available to SLC members during committee meetings is valuable, and committee discussions illustrate how broad a variety of viewpoints the University libraries must engage, but beyond providing its own members with information and the opportunity for discussion, admittedly on critical issues, the SLC has done little. It has not made a recommendation to the University Senate in some time, the one exception being to request a rules change to allow additional ex officio members to be added to the committee roster. In the last year the SLC took one outside action. It sent a letter to Provost Sullivan in February 2009 in support of the University Libraries' budget compact, to which he replied in an email that he appreciates SLC support for the libraries and respects how crucial the

University Libraries are for scholarship and research, but that all units are being asked to make cuts. The ad hoc committee concluded that the SLC has simply been a forum for discussion and a recipient of information distributed by the libraries and other sources connected with scholarly research and publishing, but has not acted in the advisory capacity mandated by its charge in recent history. The SLC did not make significant recommendations to the University Senate, nor did it advise the University libraries or evaluate library services, facilities, and collections. It was determined that the SLC has a good deal more room to represent the constituents of its charge and have vital input into matters that affect the libraries, the constituents and the University as a whole.

### **Committee Overlap**

Alexander said that after consulting with SLC members, two committees were identified as having some overlap with the SLC; the Senate Committee on Information Technology (SCIT), and the Senate Research Committee (SRC).

Overlap with the SCIT may lie in its interest in the delivery and management of content or information. Delivery in the libraries is almost exclusively through information technologies. SCIT's charge closely resembles that of the SLC, but with a difference the ad hoc committee thought important: SCIT is charged not only with recommending on matters concerning information technology; it is also charged with promoting the further use of information technology, and with seeking new ways to deploy and advance information technologies. Minutes of recent SLC meetings reveal that SLC members are concerned about the use of information technologies, and SCIT's charge to advance information technology, without regard to the ends to which they are put, would not reflect the larger interests in the libraries expressed by SLC members. This indicates an area of possible conflict between the charges to SLC and SCIT, and thus also indicates that the SLC has the scope to consider more general goals of the libraries within the academic and scholarly enterprise and is not restricted, as is SCIT, to considering the delivery or management of information.

Overlap with the SRC may lie in the role of the University libraries in providing access to published materials, and other materials, necessary to coordinate and advance research. In reviewing the charge to the SRC, the ad hoc committee did not see overlap in duties and responsibilities. Instead, the two committees appear to have a parallel mission: the SRC, to promote the development of knowledge; the SLC, to help make knowledge available. Administratively, the two committees do have somewhat different constituencies, the SRC being more closely tied to academic matters through a closer relationship with the Faculty Consultative Committee, and the SLC having a broader constituency, with more non-faculty representatives and reporting to the University Senate through the Senate Consultative Committee. The ad hoc committee noted that neither charge, to the SLC nor to the SRC, specifies the general purpose of its object; in other words, the mission of the University libraries or of university research is not specified in the committee charges.

### **Committee Composition**

The ad hoc committee concluded that the composition of the SLC does reflect its charge. However, they do have a concern about the role of ex officio members. The SLC has many ex

ex officio members representing library units that do not report to the University Libraries, many of them from coordinate campus libraries. This brings a concern that the large presence of library professionals as ex officio members may bias the committee toward considering library issues from the inside perspective of professional library science and dilute its ability to function as an innovative and independent faculty advisor to the University Senate. The ad hoc committee recognized that the charge does cover the coordinate campus libraries, although several have their own campus advisory committees, but the SLC has spent little time discussing their issues. The SLC should decide what should be the composition of the roster of ex officio members and what their role is, and, if it so desires, make a recommendation to the University Senate for a change in the roster or composition of its ex officio membership. It may be that the committee should request an increase in the number of faculty members to balance the high proportion of librarians on the roster. Both the composition of the committee and ex officio membership are matters of University Senate by-laws, and changes must be made through a vote of the University Senate.

### **In Conclusion**

Professor Alexander summarized that the SLC's charge gives both the scope and the responsibility to be a more active representative of faculty, staff, and student interests in the University libraries than it has been in recent years. Issues to consider include copyright and academic freedom, publishing rights, marketing or promotion of the libraries, libraries' funding, and the mission of the University Libraries. It does not see a need to amend the substance of the committee's charge, although the committee may wish to change its composition. There is a need for the SLC to fulfill its existing charge more vigorously and with greater imagination.

Professor Hatch raised an issue of timeline when it comes to input, response and action on any given subject. He offered as an example a statement regarding authors' rights and copyright issues that was sent to the Senate Consultative Committee for action two years ago. They are still awaiting a response to that as well as other items sent some time ago. He pointed out that to push forward with advocacy and suggestions for change takes time and energy. He suggested there be someone, or a small group, responsible for monitoring the continuation and progress of committee efforts. Hatch added that it seems if issues or initiatives are addressed at meetings toward the end of the academic year, they are generally dropped or forgotten about by the time the committee resumes meeting in the fall. He sees the committee's role as having been reactive to campus community issues rather than proactive.

Professor Alexander suggested listing action items on the minutes to make them easier to track. Ms. Lougee suggested listing issues pertinent to the SLC and its constituents in a way that illuminates the links between the issues and showing the bigger picture created by those links. Alexander added that they could create a thematic list of action items that is organized in a way that highlights the substance of what the SLC does. Ms. Howland said that the committee should first determine what issues are appropriate for them to talk about and act upon before making action item lists.

Professor Halley said he has not heard any discussion of budget priorities and thinks it would be natural for the committee to review the budget and discuss the appropriateness of listed budget priorities. He said they would then be able to forward any comments or requests for action to

the Senate Consultative Committee. Halley said he would like to see the cost of items such as software presentations and review its cost to results value. Ms. Lougee responded that she has brought the overall components of the University budget to the committee for discussion on a regular basis. She stated that in the past she gave a breakdown of budget priorities and shared annual statements, reallocations, etcetera and said the committee had fairly substantive discussions about the budget and review in the past. Halley said that he did not recall that. Professor Orf said that he did recall budget presentations to the committee in the past. Professor Hatch said it might be useful to form a committee subgroup to look at the basic budget plan, extract the information pertaining to the SLC and its constituents, and report the findings back to the SLC. The committee can then decide if they want to forward any input regarding the information. He thinks that could be more substantive and could provide recommendations that are useful more so than trying to make decisions on the material after a brief review during a committee meeting.

Director Sozansky from Duluth stated that he found the committee meetings to be useful and informative but he does not think the information garnered by the committee is being shared with constituents effectively. He said that coordinate campuses are responsible for setting their own goals. One issue in question is whether coordinate campuses should have access to all of the collections that the Twin Cities campus has. Sozansky said Duluth has between 80 and 100 faculty members in medicine and pharmacy that have access to the Twin Cities collections and the librarians play a large role in facilitating that use. Sozansky noted that he disagrees with the sentiment that too many ex officios make for a problematic committee. He thinks their expertise is a useful component in the committee. Chair Gunn said she interpreted the sentiments about ex officio members not that they are interfering, but that the committee relies too heavily on them. She added that the number of faculty/staff on the committee is almost balanced with the number of ex-officios. She said this could create an uncomfortable situation or conflict if staff were addressing certain library issues in front of their supervisors. Ms. Howland thinks the academic environment encourages the community to rely on the expertise of others and does not think they should stop relying on the expertise of others.

Chair Gunn said that it would be a good idea to look at the budget. She stated that budget planning for FY11 is currently taking place and the SLC should review that and recommend priorities. Ms. Lougee said FY12 would probably be worse financially more significant budget cuts. She stated that the University's FY11 budget plan includes an average budget reduction of 2.75%. Lougee said the libraries are currently working with a preservation consultant to see what the needs are currently and what they will be in the future and the SLC should review that information.

Mr. Binks said that the University has extraordinary librarians and the committee's biggest issues are national issues. He continued that it behooves the committee to talk about open access, Googlization, publishing policies and pricing pressures all of which are national issues. He thinks the committee needs to get up to speed on what the national issues are and the conversations around those issues. He said looking to other universities to see if they are talking about strategic planning and priorities or to see if they understand the current issues could be a good gauge as to where the SLC stands in that area. He said the SLC could learn from their collegiate peers on innovation and organizational excellence. He added that he sees layers of

information for the committee to investigate and possibly gain a broader perspective. Ms. Howland agreed and Alexander noted that Binks' sentiments are the same encouraged by the ad hoc committee, for the SLC to take a much more influential role in national and global issues. Professor Halley thinks those are good ideas but said conversations with the committee do not turn out anything substantive. Binks disagreed and said that he thinks the committee simply does not go the distance with their efforts. Other possible issues of interest included tapping into faculty passions and interests and looking at other universities' missteps to avoid making the same mistakes. Professor Hatch thinks the primary activity at this time should be to set goals and priorities and Ms. Lougee agreed that focus is paramount. Chair Gunn stated that it is difficult for the SLC to get too deep into issues with only an hour and a half per month to discuss and work on them, that homework or working subcommittees might be needed.

Hatch questioned if the issue is the composition of the committee or the interactions of the committee. He thinks it is how he interacts with the members and makes use of the topics at the table that matter. Halley stated that other Senate committees are not experts on all issues but that they invite experts to their meetings to learn from and help direct the committee and thinks the SLC could benefit from that model. Ms. Thorpe asked who sets the agenda for meetings and thinks that person would drive the direction of the committee. Chair Gunn stated that the chair sets the agenda each meeting but with the input of the committee when asked for their items of interests at the beginning of the year. She added that she thinks all members should be responsible for contributing agenda items--that the agenda should reflect a committee consensus. Gunn does not think librarians should be excluded on agenda item input but that there is a need for faculty input as well to ensure that they represent a well-rounded base of their constituency.

**Speaking to the collaboration between campuses, Ms. Dean stated that it is important for coordinate campuses to receive information on system-wide issues of intellectual property and open access.** She said it is necessary to discuss the thinking and processes of the Twin Cities campus and how that might relate to coordinate campuses. There could be beneficial outcome from the committee taking positions on issues that would reach across the board to coordinate campuses. Even though the coordinate campus reporting structure differs from that of the Twin Cities, they share system-wide issues such as intellectual property and the responsibility of libraries to share with each other. It was suggested for future discussion that the committee consider whether the SLC should be advising coordinate campus libraries even though some have their own advisory committees. They should decide what the relationship is between the SLC and coordinate campus libraries, what it should look like and whether the SLC is meeting the coordinate campuses' needs. Professor Orf suggested topics be filtered to the Twin Cities campus from coordinate campuses for them to collaborate and bring their issues to the Senate.

Professor Halley suggested subcommittees to review the budget; clarify the SLC's structure, jurisdiction and composition; issues on open access. Orf asked if they would all be permanent subcommittees. Halley thinks the budget subcommittee would be a permanent, ongoing structure but that a timeline for open access review is difficult to determine at this time, but that it would probably last for a while. Gunn recommended making them all temporary at this time. Hatch asked if the subcommittees are allowed to invite others outside of the SLC to participate. Gunn said that is allowed but the participants are usually those that offer expertise that does not exist within the subcommittee already. She thought that would be a good idea. **Professor Orf**

asked if subcommittee goals could be more specific, having members attend meetings with a more concrete focus and purpose of what they are going to do. Halley agreed that more action by the SLC was needed instead of just discussion of issues.

Chair Gunn made a motion to establish three subcommittees as follows:

1. Budget
2. SLC composition, structure and jurisdiction
3. Open access

The motion was seconded and passed unanimously. The committees are charged with the discovery and compilation of information pertinent to the SLC with recommendations for action. Chair Gunn asked that Professors Halley, Hatch, and Orf to work on the budget subcommittee. Howell, Binks, McCrindle and Gunn would work on the open access subcommittee. Members of the current ad hoc committee on the charge would continue to consider the SLC composition, structure and jurisdiction. Lougee reminded the committee that budget can only be evaluated with attention to the University libraries' programmatic priorities. Gunn drew the budget subcommittee's attention to the "University Libraries Update" that Ms. Lougee had given the SLC in October, 2009, which identifies the Libraries' five priority themes. Ms. Howland added a comment she had made several times throughout the discussion, that policies for the Law Library are the sole purview of the dean as dictated by the American Bar Association accreditation requirements, and that the SLC and the University Libraries have no jurisdiction over it.

Ms. Lougee was to present on the Google Books Library Project and Gunn did not want to cut it short and asked if she could present next month. Lougee said the information is timely and she distributed an update document to members. Lougee mentioned the Hathi Trust and Gunn suggested members go online and find the five library sponsored discussions on the topic. She said she would send the URL out to members via email. Gunn encouraged members to look back at the document on the same topic that Lougee distributed last fall.

Hearing no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 12:00 p.m.

Lisa Towry  
University Senate Office