DRAFT MINUTES

University Library Committee
Monday, October 19, 2015
11:00 am – 12:00 pm
Memorial Library Room 362
Minutes prepared by Julie Arensdorf

Attendees

Voting Members

Faculty
• Yang Bai, Physics
• Sabine Gross, German
• Daniel Klingenberg, Chemical and Biological Engineering
• Mary Trotter, Theatre & Drama
• Linda Graham, Botany

Academic Staff
• Ron Harris, English
• Carol Pech, School of Medicine & Public Health

Students
• Sean Owczarek

Non-Voting Members
• Julie Arensdorf, Memorial Library
• Steven Barkan (LCC Liaison), Director, Law Library
• Phillip Braithwaite, Budget, Planning & Analysis
• Ed Van Gemert, Vice Provost for Libraries
• Carrie Nelson, College Library

Also Present
• Karl Broman, professor in Biostatistics and Medical Informatics
• Deborah Helman, LCC, Wendt
• Lesley Moyo, GLS, Library Exec Group
• Natasha Veeser, GLS, LCC
• Doug Way, GLS, Library Exec Group
• Nancy Graff Schultz, GLS, Library Exec Group
Welcome and Introductions

Approve September minutes
- Minutes were approved

Review updates to FPP Chapter 6 - Ron Harris
- Ron Harris: Last May at the Faculty Senate meeting, several faculty proposed changes to the Chapter 6 governance committees—many Chapter 6 governance committees were not operating with quorum. These changes will be addressed at the November faculty senate meeting:
  - The ULC would no longer nominate a representative to the Campus Planning Committee
    - We currently have a member whom we have not yet appointed
  - Should ULC members be elected or appointed?
    - This is specific to faculty nominations
  - Memorial Library Committee would be abolished
- Discussion ensued:
  - Helpful to have someone on Campus Planning Committee, especially with the possibility of major construction in the future.
  - Sometimes difficult to get faculty to serve if not appointed, though these should be limited.
  - Filling spaces on the Memorial Library Committee has been difficult, though without it there are concerns about representing the humanities and social sciences.

→ Action Item:
Ed will communicate to University Committee and Faculty Senate:
- Point 1: We wish to maintain representation on the Campus Planning Committee
- Point 2: Some interest with elections, but okay with maintaining appointment for ULC members. Would want to know details/circumstances
- Point 3: No overwhelming desire to maintain the MLC; positions are difficult to fill, and much overlap with University Library Committee.

Open Access policy initiative discussion - Karl Broman and Doug Way
Karl Broman, Professor in Biostatistics and Medical Informatics, and was on the ULC the last three years
- Karl: Last year we had a working group to establish an Open Access Policy. The basic idea of this policy is that the University would retain the right to distribute journal articles that faculty publish, so that the articles would be both retained in a University repository, and made widely available.
- Karl: Currently, faculty, staff, and student authors have full copyright, and the University does not have any rights over that material
- Karl: Committee included: Karl Broman, Eneida Mendonça – faculty member from Biostatistics & Medical Informatics, Julie Schneider – Head of Ebling Library, Doug Way – Library Executive Team, Jason Fishbain – Chief Data Officer from the CIO Office, Brianna Marshall – Digital Curation Coordinator for the Libraries, and Martin Foys – English Department.
- Karl: Wrote a draft policy. Will require library staff time and some enhancement to the current University repository, Minds@UW. Both the Vice Chancellor for Research and
Education, Marsha Mailick, and the Provost have expressed interest in this policy and have staff looking at it, but not entirely clear where to go next.

- Daniel: Is the motivation for coming up with this policy the federal mandate for open access?
- Karl: This is separate from any federal mandate. As part of the WI Idea, it’s important that faculty’s research work be made widely available; allows the University to retain and distribute research widely; it will also help faculty to better understand what their rights are, and that their work does not need to be simply given away to a publisher
- Mary Trotter: I would recommend that we create a specifically-worded resolution that expresses not only our support, but also potential obstacles, and that we vote on this in November.
- Karl: I spoke with Legal Services, and they are happy to be involved with this at the end to work out final wording, but they were not eager to be involved at this stage.
- Daniel: The resolution should make clear the different elements at play, and what this resolution specifically addresses.
- Doug: We’re putting the pieces in place today so that we’re ready to act soon should this get passed.
- Ed: We have a repository today, it does exist. So, the content could be similar to theses and dissertations that are currently being stored.
- Karl: The resolution would be a list of whereas’s where you say why you want a policy of this form, with a “be it resolved” with an addendum that is this draft policy. What would the ULC want to resolve? The University should adopt an open access policy along the lines of that attached?
- Ed: I like the approach that it’s a University adoption.
- Mary: All the work that you’ve done for months would be in the ‘whereas’s”—it answers a lot of questions for the faculty senate: this is why you want it.

Consolidation report update and discussion - Ed Van Gemert and Lesley Moyo

- Lesley: Since the distribution of the draft report, we’ve had two campus forums held in Memorial, with a third scheduled for next week Tuesday at Steenbock. We’re open to scheduling additional forums as needed. Continuing to receive feedback via a Qualtrics survey as well: 122 graduate students, 54 faculty members, and others
- Lesley: Key priorities: overwhelmingly people want the expansion of electronic access, followed by subscriptions to more databases and journals, and the third: retention of subject specialist librarians to support department work and research
- Lesley: Also receiving robust qualitative feedback re: perspectives on collections, service models, spaces, and staff support. We’ve received feedback that the report is fairly dense; would like the executive report to be more digestible.
- Ed: We need to continue to be an advocate and a voice for students’ needs around spaces, content, and community. Secondly, there’s the question of how many libraries we will have on campus. It’s difficult to say at this point, but the executive summary has to be re-crafted to reflect that we will have a smaller number of libraries on campus than 42. The campus-wide master planning will also help us to determine what that number is. We’ll do our best to reflect that desire for certainty and clarity.
- Daniel: If you acknowledge up front that everyone wants to know the number, but that this report will not address the number or the timing or the dollars, then readers of this document will not read it trying to find that.
• Sean: I’m very glad to hear about a new executive summary and advocating for the students. I’m not sure the concern has been as much for numbers, but how they can avail themselves of the process going forward. How is the library making sure that I am apprised of the process, and what opportunities will be available to express feedback?
• Sabine: Could this be added to the library website?
• Ed: Absolutely, we will.
• Carrie: At which point should we be notifying our campus governance groups of the public forums?
• Ed: Now is the time. I’ve sent it off to the leadership of each of the governance groups on campus, inviting them to the forums and asking them to send it on to their membership.
• Lesley: The location of the next listening session is next Tuesday at Steenbock Library room 340 from 2:30-3:30pm.
• Ed: Lesley and I will incorporate these points into the executive summary, and will bring this back to the ULC in November.

Meeting was adjourned at 12:06pm.