MINUTES
University Library Committee
Tuesday, October 14, 2014
1:00 pm – 2:00 pm
Memorial Library Room 362

Attendees

Voting Members

Faculty
- Karl Broman, Biostatistics and Medical Informatics
- Daniel Klingenberg, Chemical and Biological Engineering
- Eneida Mendonca, Biostatistics and Medical Informatics
- Larry Nesper, Anthropology
- Mary Trotter, Theatre & Drama

Staff
- Ron Harris, English
- Darcy Little, Latin American, Caribbean and Iberian Studies

Students
- Nilay Vaish

Non-Voting Members
- Steven Barkan (LCC Liaison), Director, Law Library
- Phillip Braithwaite, Budget, Planning & Analysis
- Michael Enyart, Business Library
- Carrie Nelson, College Library
- Ed Van Gemert, Vice Provost for Libraries
- Alan Wolf, CIO Office

Also Present
- Jeannette Casey, Mills Music Library
- Deborah Helman, LCC, Wendt
- Lee Konrad, GLS, Library Exec Group
- Anna Lewis, MERIT
- Lesley Moyo, GLS, Library Exec Group
- Nancy Graff Schultz, GLS, Library Exec Group
- Natasha Veeser, GLS, Communications
- Lisa Wettleson, GLS, Steenbock

Approval of ULC minutes from September 9, 2014
No changes
Minutes approved
Announcements
Darcy Little is joining the committee as a University Staff representative.
Nilay Vaish is on the committee as a student representative.
We expect more students will join at next meeting.

Discussion item #1: Strategies for developing a consolidation plan for campus libraries

Agenda Notes from Ed Van Gemert:

The Provost has directed me to provide campus with a plan for the consolidation of libraries as a method for strengthening funding for library collections. The idea is to reallocate funds by identifying efficiencies through the consolidation of services and spaces.

Link to the list of campus libraries

Questions/areas of advisement for the ULC at this time are:
  • How to define the basic principles that will guide decisions about consolidation?
  • What are the specific service and space questions we need to ask? What data points need to be collected to address these questions?
  • Who needs to be involved in the planning?

Discussion:

Ed Van Gemert: Our current provost is a huge advocate for libraries and will be an ally in support of budget needs; she wants to develop the plan for funding support for collections in conjunction with a plan for increased efficiencies.

There is little doubt that we could seek efficiencies in how we do our work and in the physical footprint of libraries - over time.

This planning for a more efficient library operation is completely separate from the 2-4-6-budget exercise currently underway.

Consolidation is a long-term plan; will require additional storage, which is supported by administration, but can't happen quickly.

Ed will pull together a group to develop this plan and is asking ULC for advice specifically about the charge for that group, any particular guidelines or suggestions for leading that group in the right direction or making it more effective, and the types of representation that should be on this group.

Larry Nesper - what's the sense of the magnitude of the change/consolidation?
Ed: We really don’t have clear specifics, but for the sake of coming up with an idea, you could consider that the average salary for GLS staff is $52.8K; if we were to adjust relative to the $1M we need each year for collections, we’re looking at 18-20 people; the goal is to achieve the change through attrition and strategic allocation of positions.

This has to be considered in addition/relation to the potential 2-4-6 cut; if we do end up needing to cut 6% in the near future, we may be rushed to consolidate some services or locations sooner than we will otherwise.

The goal is to have a system that supports a strong central library; eg. a really strong science library and a strong humanities/social science library; libraries like music and art and business with a particularly unique function would probably need to continue.

Steve Barkan: At some point specific parameters should be set for what this proposed group needs to accomplish.

We need to clarify what the charge to this group would be; what are the goals? is there anything out of bounds? the more guidance provided, the easier it will be for the group to make it happen; eg: we need to reduce by X staff; we need to cut by X dollars; we need to reduce X space

Implementation of this plan will take longer than 3-5-years—storage space needs to be developed and staffing changes will need to be made over time; but the development of the plan should happen quickly; the provost wants a plan before committing to the collection funds; it would be best to get a group together in the next week and consider getting a plan together as soon as possible - 6 months?

Data we might need to consider:
foot traffic, circulation, usage

Michael Enyert: look at cost accounting - what's it cost to operate X library for X hours? beware of consolidations that don’t actually result in much savings

Since savings are primarily in staff and equipment, it may not be much for one small library

We also need to consider costs associated with consolidation

It seems like most people can see that the library services don't need to be spread to many locations, but the library we end up with has to enable the campus services and access needs.

Verona I (off-site storage) opened on the 6th - Verona I doesn't have enough room to take additional material related to more consolidation; Verona II - already under discussion; it may be possible to arrange for consolidations of some smaller libraries without Verona II, but not the big plan.
The Chancellor and Provost both really want a campus plan that goes beyond just GLS libraries: 26 of the 48 listed libraries are L&S.

Provost and the Chancellor will make the ultimate decision based on advisory committee and others' reports, perspectives.

Ed is picturing a group comprised primarily of library staff, but it will require representation from a variety of perspectives; could include a ULC rep or others.

Ed has contracted with Office of Quality Improvement for help with this activity.

It might be a good idea to solicit volunteers for the committee and ask them to provide a rationale for their inclusion, then develop a set of people that represent various perspectives and based on their skills and experiences.

**Discussion item #2: Strategies for developing an Open Access policy for UW-Madison and/or UW System**

Open Access policies for Kansas and Minnesota (draft) were distributed with the agenda: [http://policy.ku.edu/governance/open-access-policy](http://policy.ku.edu/governance/open-access-policy)  
[http://www.policy.umn.edu/Policies/Research/SCHOLARLYARTICLES.html](http://www.policy.umn.edu/Policies/Research/SCHOLARLYARTICLES.html)

Ed has had discussions with the Provost about open access.

This discussion is not about broader issues or plans to disrupt the existing publication process, but rather about the possibility of a policy that would require, in one way or another, a final, peer-reviewed version of a document to be placed into a repository somewhere.

Karl Broman: The primary issues: 1) we need somewhere to put these documents, and 2) we need to help researchers modify their agreements with publishers to make this possible.

Lee Konrad: The local UW System repository is currently an option for #1.

Ed Van Gemert: We currently have informal/unstructured support for #2.

Eneida Mendonca: Embargo seems like it could play a significant role in enabling deposits.  
Aren’t we already successfully shifting to a model like this in some disciplines?

Rather than trying to address the embargo period, we should focus on getting a copy openly available.  
We should work on retaining the right to put a copy in our own repository.

This issue may be primarily science-journal-article-focused; for monographs in the humanities and social sciences, open access books are lagging models.
Karl: Starting with scholarly articles makes sense.

If an article is going to be in a repository like PLOS, it's good enough and doesn't need to also be held here. The bottom line is that we want to be able to retain the output of our campus-produced materials to keep in a repository that could allow things to be used for teaching, learning, and research.

We should separate this discussion about an open access policy from encouragement to publish in an open journal.

Do we want to ensure that access is open to the world (as opposed to just to our campus community)? Probably after some embargo period we should expect it to be open to the world.

The time is right. We currently know of at least 44 other campuses having similar discussions right now.

Michael Enyart: What's the advantage to the authors to make sure their work is available somewhere open access?

Alan Wolf: Citation analysis shows larger readership.

NIH (and 14 other agencies) policy requires open publishing.

How do people know which articles to send to the repository? The U Minnesota draft policy leaves that question open.

Ed is recommending a small working group to look into this. The group could consider guidelines—deposit in an open repository is obviously necessary when funder requires it, but when else?

Deb Helman: Most copyright transfer agreements are now tending to address this issue, especially in the sciences. You can also just write it into the agreements if they don't. IEEE and American Society of Civil Engineers have changed their copyright transfer agreements and no longer allow people to post and have started issuing take-down notices.

What we're talking about is separate from cost-of-publishing issue. This is not about where researchers choose to publish, just about depositing a copy somewhere that will be open.

Could a working group craft some language for a the faculty senate?

Karl: should this be at the System level or Madison?

Ed: System-wide policy might be seen as having more impact and might be easier to accept. It would make sense for Madison / Milwaukee to drive the policy.

If we do this at the System, we need to involve more groups.

It could be useful to have a student voice in here too.

Have we considered publication of industry-funded research? eg. white papers or technical reports specifically developed for a company?
Deb: There usually seems to be an opt-out option in other campus policies for when needed

The institutions we’re looking at as models for this kind of policy involved some significant campus conversations. Some people don’t have an initial positive response; it seems important to have this conversation.

Enieda has observed this initial reaction and agrees; there’s a tendency to see things labeled "open" as lower quality so the goals of this policy need to be made clear.

ACTION: Ed will assign 2-3 people from the library staff to the working group.

Karl will lead a working group; Eneida will help.

ACTION: Anyone else interested email Karl.

Adjourn.