MINUTES
University Library Committee
Monday, December 14, 2015
2:00 pm – 3:00 pm
Memorial Library Room 362
Minutes prepared by Julie Arensdorf

Attendees

Voting Members

Faculty
• Linda Graham, Botany
• Sabine Gross, German
• Daniel Klingenberg, Chemical and Biological Engineering
• Neil Kodesh, History
• Mary Trotter, English

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
• Jack Dorr
• 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
• Nancy Graff Schultz, GLS, Library Exec Group
• Deborah Helman, LCC, Wendt
• Florence Hsia, History of Science, Integrated Liberal Studies, MLC
• Anna Lewis, LCC, MERIT
• Lesley Moyo, GLS, Library Exec Group
• Julie Schneider, LCC, Ebling
• Natasha Veeser, GLS, LCC
• Doug Way, GLS, Library Exec Group
Approve November minutes
Approved with no corrections

Discussion about the future of the Memorial Library Committee with its current chair Florence Hsia

- Daniel Klingenberg: Received request from University Committee on whether Memorial Library Committee should continue. At our October 19 meeting, we reached the consensus of “No overwhelming desire to maintain the MLC; positions are difficult to fill, and much overlap with University Library Committee.”
- Florence Hsia: Memorial Library Committee does have a slightly different charge than the ULC, which is more broad, covering all libraries and services on campus. Memorial Library is the primary research library for humanities and social sciences, so it covers a lot of disciplines, languages, and geographic regions. Given current financial and space restrictions, there are particular challenges for these academic disciplines.
- Florence: MLC could review, gather reports and make recommendations they would pass on to the ULC, since you don’t have time to gather this only meeting once each month. MLC and ULC could also make joint recommendations. I am asking for ULC support in continuing the MLC, and detailing the relationship between the two committees.
- Sabine Gross: I don’t see the needs of humanities and social science researchers adequately reflected in the ULC’s conversations and have been receiving requests from faculty regarding concerns with electronic resources.
- Dan: One of the concerns was that it’s difficult to get people to serve on the committee.
- Florence: I have only been the chair for two months. Finding people to serve on a committee in October is difficult; I would like to ask people over the summer. Got a 75% yield rate this year. Faculty also don’t want to serve on a committee that’s not going to do anything. I don’t see finding members as an obstacle.
- Carrie Nelson: Could this be a humanities and social sciences library services committee, rather than a Memorial Library committee? The concerns seem to be less about the building. There might be a better way to engage faculty, whether through a subcommittee or some other way.
- Ed: The enthusiasm for this committee has been lacking, so Dr. Hsia’s energy is appreciated. One way we could address this would be a subcommittee of the ULC that focuses on humanities and social sciences issues and collections. This is a governance issue, too: The ULC is a chapter 6 committee in FP&P, but the MLC is commissioned in faculty legislation, and I’m not sure why.
- Marry Trotter: What is the original charge? At some point, it must have seemed necessary to have a separate committee for Memorial Library
- Steve Barkan: Wouldn’t it be to our advantage to have more faculty involvement in libraries, rather than fewer? If we eliminated the MLC, we would need to ensure that we expand the focus of the ULC first.
- Sean Owczarek: As the MLC is now, it’s more of a reporting structure. I would recommend that the MLC have its agenda and charge for the year set out.
- Florence: If the MLC gets folded into the ULC, the meetings get longer, and is that going to be effective and efficient? Though the MLC may be an artifact of what
Memorial Library was in a previous era, and humanities may be more reflective of the current situation.

- Sabine: In general, the library wants and needs to move away from being defined geographically. Though Memorial Library may be the exception, because it functions as an exception—it’s the flagship library with Special Collections.
- Mary: The MLC’s charge already addresses this: “Reviews and advises the Memorial Library Administration on policies related to collection development, collection evaluation, and bibliographic activities, especially in the humanities, social sciences, and general reference.” The ULC is dealing with so many macro issues surrounding how the University library system is functioning, and this is a time of important changes for the humanities and social sciences fields in terms of library functions.
- Florence: I am in History of Science, so I can attest that there are similar collections issues in the sciences. Not a good idea to close a governance structure when there are people who are willing to actively participate. There are 6 faculty members (3 humanities, 3 social sciences) on the committee, a graduate student, an undergraduate, and ex officio library staff members.
- Dan: It seems prudent to keep this committee functioning, especially during consolidation, at least for a while, but to reconsider all of these sub library committees after consolidation is complete. Perhaps as part of consolidation, we should be considering these committees and how they’re structured. It doesn’t seem that we have an issue with the MLC continuing.
- Ed: Over the break, we could get together and figure out coordination between the two committees, and minimize overlap.
- Mary: Motion to move that the ULC express its support for the continuance of the Memorial Library Committee, and that we look forward to discussing with the committee over the next semester better ways of communication and collaboration.
- Sean: Second.
- Sabine: Third.
- Dan: Call to a vote: All in favor: unanimous; none opposed. This amendment should be communicated to the faculty senate.

Discussion/endorsement of the revised Consolidation Report

- Revised report available at libraries’ Consolidation Planning page
- Ed: In November, you approved the recommendations in the report. As you will see in the communication timeline, Lesley and I have met with numerous groups across campus. In the preamble, I tried to summarize some of the things I’ve heard since the release of the report. Lesley and others have rewritten the executive report since it was first released. We also met with the Associate Vice Chancellors for Research and Graduate Education, and they were concerned with the elimination of the words “special purpose libraries” as a designation for some of the smaller campus libraries, so we reinstated that. Some of them wanted to be reestablished as campus libraries. Those libraries are going to continue existing, but there are libraries on campus that still have a departmental focus. What I’m asking for today is an endorsement of the report, and I will be taking the report to the Provost to move from planning to implementation. Implementation means continuing discussions with academic departments in repurposing space and the location of print materials and rethinking spaces and services and how they’re provided. One
thing that is not included is working with Facilities Planning for a Campus Libraries Facilities Master Plan.

- Lesley: Thanks to Ron, his comments were very useful in revising the executive summary. Included more examples within the executive summary to illustrate concepts such as "21st century library," and the ways in which these administrative models might impact how we approach collections. Also discussed how this compares to our peers, and how this will facilitate greater collaboration with peers. Also described how we will ensure thoughtfulness when developing solutions for individual constituencies (e.g. geographic distribution of libraries across campus). I also provided access to all of you for the Qualtrics data that we have been receiving.

- Sabine: One suggestion – on the second page of Ed’s preamble, insert the word “levels” to improve clarity: “Staffing [levels], however, [compared] with other peer institutions remain relatively high at Madison.”

- Florence: Major issue discussed has been the feedback mechanism and the listening sessions not being well attended, and having listening sessions during peak teaching times did not encourage attendance. Also, many people don’t know about the survey—perhaps it could be better communicated through social media or linked from the Libraries’ website. If we have ~300 responses to the surveys, and a campus of 40,000+, that’s less than a 1% response rate. Also, there was a question about how the data from the survey will be folded into the implementation process moving forward.

- Ed: I tried to reflect three recurring points in the preamble discussion about 1) short-term expenditures, & long-term reallocation of resources and staffing; 2) timeline for library closures; 3) while we discuss improved services in the report, patrons see things being taken away. As a comparison, for strategic planning, we had about 700 responses to our survey.

- Lesley: The strength of this survey is the qualitative feedback we’re receiving. Responsibility of the implementation team will be to look at that feedback carefully and work out solutions.

- Jack Dorr: Only 15 undergraduates responded to the survey; I would feel much better if we had more responses from undergraduates. We should put this on the library website.

- Carol Pech: We could reach out to the survey center for the next phase of this to get feedback for the implementation phase.

- Ed: We have used them in the past for strategic planning, and have worked with the Office for Quality Improvement throughout this process.

- Dan: With the second and third groups of libraries, there could be more opportunities for feedback. Also, opportunities for people who physically use the spaces to provide feedback. I think as the ULC we should endorse the step to move into the implementation phase.

- Mary: I move that we endorse the UW-Madison Libraries Consolidation Report

- Ron: I second

- Sean: I don’t think we’ve had enough discussion within this committee, though consolidation is already happening and we’ve already agreed on many of the points.

- Sabine: Amendment: We endorse the report in principle and as a framework with the understanding that the concerns raised here today be taken seriously and that feedback be solicited broadly in the implementation phase.

- Mary: I accept that friendly amendment. I call the question.

- Carol: I second
• All in favor: 8
• Opposed: 2
• Abstention: 1
• Dan: The motion passes.

Meeting was adjourned at 3:18 pm.