DRAFT MINUTES

University Library Committee
Monday, November 16, 2015
3:00 pm – 4:00 pm
Memorial Library Room 362
Minutes prepared by Julie Arensdorf

Attendees

Voting Members

Faculty
• Yang Bai, Physics
• Linda Graham, Botany
• Daniel Klingenberg, Chemical and Biological Engineering
• Neil Kodesh, History
• Mary Trotter, Theatre & Drama

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

University Staff
• Darcy Little, Latin American, Caribbean and Iberian Studies
• Joan Weckmueller, IT/Academic Technology

Students
• Sean Owczarek

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

Also Present
• Karl Broman, professor in Biostatistics and Medical Informatics
• Nancy Graff Schultz, GLS, Library Exec Group
• Lee Konrad, GLS, Library Exec Group
• Lesley Moyo, GLS, Library Exec Group
• Julie Schneider, LCC, Ebling
• Doug Way, GLS, Library Exec Group
Approve October minutes
Approved with two corrections:
Linda Graham is faculty, Carol Pech is Academic Staff

OA Policy draft and resolution update
- Julie Schneider recommended including “supplementary material,” not just journal articles
- Linda Graham: Typo in the 6th paragraph, 3rd line: “with” should be “which”
- Karl Broman: To review, the University would hold the right to distribute journal articles that faculty authors produce to enable broader access to those articles and to keep copies for archival purposes.
- Karl: Policy as written and proposal only cover faculty—do we want to cover academic staff and/or students? Other universities have focused solely on faculty. Main value of including academic staff is that current policies treat faculty and academic staff jointly. Disadvantage is that it’s more work to also get buy-in from academic staff and additional governance groups. Currently policy treats students the same as academic staff, but students are not all employees of the University, and there may be issues of the University asserting copyright over non-employees.
- Carrie Nelson & Mary Trotter: We need to be mindful of non-employee students who may feel pressure to submit; this is something that should be investigated before students are included.
- Dan Klingenberg: If the main reason is the Wisconsin Idea, and not a federal mandate, then there seems to be no reason to exclude academic staff.
- Joan Weckmueller: I think if you include academic staff, you should also include University staff, so we should just use the term: Staff.
- Karl: Following this resolution, we would try to get this on an upcoming Faculty senate discussion. Ultimately, we would like the Vice Chancellor for Research and Graduate Education to approve this, and so this would need to go through the appropriate governance groups; consulting with staff governance will be part of the process. The time required to adopt this policy should not be multi-year. The important part is really educating the people involved—faculty, staff, and students. This policy would cover any paper that has a faculty member as a primary author, and the University would request its deposit in a University repository. The policy as-written has no repercussions for faculty who do not comply or who opt-out.
- It was decided to submit the policy as-is with the addition of this amendment to the resolution:
  - Whereas much of the research at the University is conducted by staff and students,
  - Therefore be it further resolved that the inclusion of academic staff, university staff, and students in such a policy be carefully considered in consultation with the appropriate governance groups.
- Dan: All in favor of approving the open access policy draft with the amendment: All; Opposed: None

Discussion/endorsement of the Draft Consolidation Report
- Ed Van Gemert: The recommendations represent the trajectory of the path forward for libraries into the future. If a non-GLS library wants to continue to use the term
“library,” they are welcome to. However, I cannot guarantee that there will be funding for all 42 libraries into the future. Each academic department has a different perspective on the facets of consolidation moving forward—not every department approaches this the same way.

- Ed: Business, Geography, Chemistry, the School of Human Ecology, Engineering, and Health Sciences are all moving forward with some of the recommendations in the report. It would be very helpful to have a University Library Committee endorsement of the recommendations in the report, but we need to get this right. This is a 3-5 year project in concert with Facilities Master Planning, and this is an iterative process. Consolidation will not immediately save us money; it will cost us money. This consolidation report cannot end up like the 1965 report, which was never acted upon.

- Lesley Moyo: The feedback we are receiving indicates concern for and engagement with the libraries, not necessarily pushback. Main takeaways from listening sessions and several hundred online responses (which are consistent with recommendations):
  - Importance of acquiring online resources
  - Presence of academic librarian within department
  - Importance of student study space and community; need for repurposing spaces

- Ed in response to question from Yang Bai: We are working to acquire online access to back issues of journals and monographs in order to move these items off the shelves and rely on online content.

- Sean Owczarek: There was going to be a new draft of the executive summary of the report—is that finished? It seems premature to endorse the report without the new executive summary.

- Ed: We do not have that yet. I’m asking for an endorsement of the recommendations in the report, which are fundamental to our moving forward.

- Sean: Electronic resources also appears first in the online survey, so I wonder if more people checked that box, simply because it appeared first. Would it be possible to get access to some of the raw data?

- Carol Pech & Dan: I think it would be helpful for us to have access to some of the raw feedback data if possible.

- Ron: Many of the things you tell us here are not mentioned in the report. It’s important that anything you’re planning to do, and which you’ve revised based on feedback sessions, is reflected in the report.

- Carrie: Could we vote on just endorsing the five recommendations?

- Sean moved, Carol seconded. The ULC voted to endorse the five recommendations listed below, but to wait to endorse the entire report until the executive report is revised:
  - 7 in favor: Yang Bai, Daniel Klingenberg, Mary Trotter, Carol Pech, Sean Owczarek, Joan Weckmueller, Darcy Little
  - 1 opposed: Linda Graham
  - 1 abstention: Ron Harris

- **Recommendations** (*see copy of full report on Consolidation website*):
  - Reduce the physical footprint of locations with circulating print collections through a phased approach
  - Create a consolidation implementation team
Explicitly define a unified campus-library system which clearly identifies specific libraries as “campus libraries”
- Develop and implement an administrative model that supports a unified campus-library system
- Actively reinvest in storage facilities, e-resources, and the renovation of library spaces

**Update on the review of the library's Federal Depository Regional status**

- Doug Way: We have been a regional depository library for a little over a decade. If the materials go through the Government Printing Office, we get it, and we keep it forever. We also provide services: reference, interlibrary loan, consultations to other depository libraries, and managing withdrawals.
- Doug: Wisconsin has two; there are five regional depository libraries within the CIC, and this is based on congressional districts and geography
- Doug: Advantages to maintaining this status: prestige and access to certain materials in print, statutory publications. Disadvantages to maintaining this status: loss of some control, and reliant on Milwaukee Public Library.
- Doug: We could look at broader, regional alternatives (e.g. working with U of Minnesota), instead of a state-based approach. And there could be a few print items that people might miss, but they could access them electronically or in microfiche.
- Doug: In light of our budgetary and space situation, it does not make sense to remain a regional depository, but to instead become a *selective* depository library. We’ve been conducting a process to check in with stakeholders, and will be conducting a campus forum to get feedback from key constituencies on campus who make use of government publications, and to make sure they understand what the implications are.
- Carol: I would be curious to hear what other CIC libraries are doing—is this a race for the door?
- Doug: Minnesota and Maryland are very invested in this program, and they are not going anywhere. Iowa and Nebraska are considering changing their regional depository status.
- Doug: Wisconsin Historical Society Library manages the withdrawal list that we have to go through; part of their mission is to retain this type of print material, and it has been the regional depository library since the 19th century.

*Meeting was adjourned at 4:03pm.*