MINUTES
University Library Committee
Tuesday, May 12, 2015
1:00 pm – 2:00 pm
Memorial Library Room 362

Attendees

Voting Members

Faculty
- Cécile Ane, Botany & Statistics
- Karl Broman (Chair), Biostatistics and Medical Informatics
- Josh Calhoun, English
- Kyung-Sun Kim, School of Library and Information Studies
- Daniel Klingenberg, Chemical and Biological Engineering
- Mary Trotter, Theatre & Drama

Staff
- Ron Harris, English
- Allison Kaplan, School of Library & Information Studies
- Darcy Little, Latin American, Caribbean and Iberian Studies

Non-Voting Members
- Steven Barkan (LCC Liaison), Director, Law Library
- Michael Enyart, Business Library
- Ed Van Gemert, Vice Provost for Libraries
- Carrie Nelson, College Library

Also Present
- Julie Arensdorf, Memorial Library
- Nancy Graff-Schultz, GLS, Library Exec Group
- Deborah Helman, LCC, Wendt
- Lee Konrad, GLS, Library Exec Group
- Anna Lewis, MERIT
- Doug Way, GLS, Library Exec Group
- Lisa Wettleson, GLS, Steenbock
Approval of ULC minutes from April 14, 2015
Approved with one change.

Open Access Working Group - Update

Karl Broman: this group is continuing its work to develop and institute a policy that would reserve the right for the university to publicly post faculty-authored articles.

Karl met with Marsha Mailick, Vice Chancellor for Research & Graduate Education. She was both supportive and helpful and we’ll want to continue to work with her. As the grad school structure evolves, all policies are being impacted and re-shaped so it’s hard to know where this will fit in. It will be important to keep in touch with all parties. Ideally we would have faculty, staff, and students participate in developing and approving this plan. Peer institutions have focused on faculty, but that’s not necessarily the best thing to do, especially here.

Karl is rotating off the Library Committee but will continue his leadership of the Open Access Working Group over the summer to work out details with legal, etc. Their goal will be to make enough progress over the summer to convene a few major public meetings in late summer or early fall.

We should see if there are opportunities to connect with campus Scholarly Publishing Symposium (planned for February ’16).

We’ll also try to incorporate staff and students.

Eneida Medonca is remaining on the ULC next year and is on the working group, so we’ll still have that connection.

Committee Wrap-up for 2014-15

Thanks for the work from those rotating off of the Committee: Karl Broman, Michael Enyart, and Karen Britland/Josh Calhoun. Ed presented them each with a copy of the next Go Big Read book Just Mercy, by Bryan Stevenson.

So far we know of 6 people joining the committee for next year: Yang Bai (Physics), Sabine Gross (German), Julie Arensdorf (Memorial Library), and three students whose names we’re getting.

This is the last meeting of the year.

Library Consolidation Planning – Discussion

General Update on Working Group Activity

Ed – The working group has been meeting twice a month. Among the people on the group are Deb Helman (in attendance at the meeting) and Phil Braithwaite (ULC member).
It’s not easy to determine what counts as a “library” because, as it stands, it could include any group or space that decides to refer to itself that way.

The working group started with the idea that some libraries will be giving up staff, collections, and/or space while others will be absorbing staff, collections, and/or space, so we need to start by understanding the staff, collections, and space as they are currently used.

Library services are delivered and received differently than they were when our current model for space and service delivery was developed. We’re also faced with diminished resources that require us to find opportunities for savings where we can. It’s always beneficial for folks to have variety of options for places to study, but it’s time to review if they are set up in the best way.

In March, the working group did data collection. They interviewed managers and sometimes staff from 30+ libraries and collected information about: how their collections are used, how services are provided and used, how permanent staff spend their time, and how student staff spend their time. The interviews lasted about 2 hours each.

In April the working group began analyzing data. They started by developing a set of criteria they needed to evaluate:

- What’s the feasibility of moving any part of a library’s collection?
- What’s the perceived readiness – considers some of the cultural and political issues; how ready are staff, users, etc. to consider a change?
- What’s the perceived support? Is there money to do the work of the change? Do stakeholders actually want a change?

Descriptions of each library related to these criteria have been compiled. It’s likely that there’s some set of libraries that are more ready to move forward and when they’re identified, the working group will associate them with a recommended implementation schedule.

The working group is hosting an open forum to provide a status update on Thursday, May 14 at 2pm.

**Academic Staff Assembly Resolution Related to the Consolidation Planning**

Ed: Someone on campus was concerned that the consolidation planning was being done “in the dark” and developed a resolution related to this to put before Academic Staff Assembly.

The original resolution included some strong evaluative language and some inaccuracies about the planning process so far, but the Assembly came up with an amended version that saved the kernel of value/truth in the original. [need link to approved version of the resolution]. The bottom line is that we want to make sure the report of the working group goes through governance.

Some staff spoke up on behalf of the amended version or against the resolution altogether.

Ed: To be clear: it’s not going to be the library that puts shared governance at peril. We will honor shared governance.

ULC is the libraries’ shared governance tool and we represent our governance groups. Ed would like to see in the Fall that ULC members present the recommendations in conjunction with libraries; could be a good way to send a signal that we’re working on this together.
We can be confident that the work of the working group has been good and data-based.

**How Should We Proceed to Ensure Appropriate Governance Involvement?**

Steve Barkan: What does it mean to “provide input”? how does that relate to consultation? This is rather ambiguous.

Ed: and where does consultation cross into shared governance decision-making? At the end of the day, the decisions will be made by the Chancellor and Provost; we’re advising and making recommendations.

Steve: The resolution asks the ULC to provide feedback; the real question is who’s making the decision? We should be as explicit as possible about what is happening and what we mean by these terms.

Josh Calhoun: What do we mean by “making a recommendation”?

Ron: You’re writing a management report to the Provost now, then what happens?

Ed: The proposal should come to ULC before going to the Provost.

Karl: The consolidation of libraries feels similar to closing post offices. The US postal service needs to close some offices and no one wants their office closed. As soon as someone hears about the potential for some libraries to close, they may get concerned. The lesson to take from this is that we should have better and more clearly articulated all the groups’ roles all along the way. The slides are doing that well now; they clearly show all the opportunities for input throughout the process.

Perception is important. The original resolution said we didn’t have a voting ULC member involved in the working group and generally indicated the ULC hasn’t been involved. Philip Braithwaite is not a voting member of ULC, but has been an active participant in the working group and we had one lengthy discussion about the consolidation planning at ULC and are getting regular updates, but not enough people were aware of that.

When the report is complete, it will be valuable to say the ULC has contributed.

Based on the Assembly resolution, Allison and Ron have the obligation to take the recommendation to the Academic Staff Assembly.

So would the process look something like this?

1. Share initial draft and have a discussion at ULC and provide a copy of the draft to the Provost at that time
2. make changes based on ULC advice
3. share with broader governance groups
4. share with Provost

Allison: The concern being raised is that the report will go to the Provost before being reviewed and edited through ULC. We should have the working group bring the report to ULC first and get ULC comment and changes, then have public forums, then go to governance assemblies, then have everything go to the Provost.
So here’s the better process:
1 – draft report to ULC (in May – a public document)
2 – incorporate ULC changes
3 – public forums and other shared governance groups (In sept and oct)
4 – incorporate changes
5 – come back to ULC with final recommendations (nov)
6 – bring it to provost

Allison – libraries are uniquely positioned and impacted in some ways because their work impacts so many and across departments – the system is campus-wide and can have a big impact.

Ed: 1) there’s a widespread keen interest in the libraries that’s not always apparent; 2) in the past we haven’t had issues that required so much process for some reason; this must just be different and bigger scale

Anna Lewis: As we finalize the process, we should make sure we have all the governance groups covered including both staff groups and students.

Lee Konrad: It’s still a bit unclear what qualifies as a governance issue and what’s just an administrative decision? Is it the scale of the impact? Where is the line on what qualifies as requiring shared governance as opposed to administrative decision-making?

Josh: The working group is advising the Provost. The governance groups can also provide advice and the Provost can weigh them.

Ron: If the managers and governance groups agree, that’s helpful information; if we don’t see agreement, that’s also useful information for the Provost.

Ed: It’s hard to know how quickly the campus community will be able to move as a whole and we’ll need to balance this with moving the libraries forward and making resource decisions. For example, there are some libraries/departments that are well into plans to make changes and are already planning to put resources into the work to make the changes.

Karl: It seems like individual cases when a particular community is ready to make a change, they can go ahead; it’s more the libraries where the community isn’t ready that requires the careful complete decision-making.

Unfortunately, some of the decisions at an individual library level impact others. Plus, the best and most efficient way to manage the process is to consider all the libraries together.

Cécile Ane: Is it feasible for some places to move ahead without the complete plan being ready?

Karl: Does the ULC want to hold a special summer meeting to make progress before Fall?

The information from the working group will be coming to ULC in the next few weeks. It’s draft at that point.
Allison: there’s some question about how public various drafts and documents are/can be; is it necessary to share the full report beyond the ULC at this initial stage?

Ron: We should ask the working group to come up with a clear and revised plan for how to roll the plan out to whom and when.

Communicate the recommendation of ULC to the working group and have them come up with a communication plan

Mary Trotter: Or should ULC meet again soon – eg. make some kind of statement in writing before May 22 (end date for 9-month contract people)

Anna: It would look nice to have some sort of formal vote from ULC; that would give the working group enough time to come up with a detailed rollout plan

Nancy Graff-Schultz: As the working group comes up with the plan, it’s a good idea to also come up with a clear and standard mechanism for collecting and accessing feedback from all our advisory groups. Organizing all the feedback for review and analysis can get really messy and complicated otherwise.

Carrie Nelson: If we have a draft version of the report come to ULC, will it be public at that point? What do we mean by “public”? If someone asks for this, we could give it to them.

It seems like we should be clear about what information is “public” and a plan for making it happen once. We don’t currently have a place we post and share “working documents” for the committee. This can get complicated. We should be prepared for there to be a great deal of interest in this. The working group should look carefully at this.

There’s not an easy way for us to all get together again after the Working Group develops a communication/process plan, so what can we agree about now?

Motion to provide the following guidance to the Library Consolidation Working Group:
The Library Consolidation Working Group should develop a detailed plan for how and when information about consolidation planning and recommendations are communicated to stakeholder groups and the public. The Working Group should also develop a detailed rollout plan for getting feedback from the campus community and governance groups before submitting a final recommendation to the Provost. The rollout plan should incorporate the following steps in the following order:

1 – provide a draft report to ULC
2 – incorporate ULC changes into the report
3 – convene public forums and ensure revised draft is appropriately shared with governance groups
4 – incorporate changes based on feedback from the forums and governance groups
5 – come back to ULC with final recommendation
6 – bring recommendation to Provost

Both of these plans should be shared with members of the ULC for feedback as soon as they’re available. Motion seconded. Motion approved.

Adjourn