

## University Library Committee

### University Library Committee

May 6, 2008 Minutes

PRESENT: Melissa Baird, Deb Carver, Alisa Freedman, Julie Haack, Andy Karduna, David Levin, Alex Mathas, Eric Mentzel, Gina Psaki, Dev Sinha

GUESTS: Andrew Bonamici, AUL for Instructional Services; Mark Watson, AUL for Collections & Access; JQ Johnson, Director, Scholarly Communications & Instructional Support

The meeting was called to order by Dev Sinha, chair, at 11:05 a.m. The March 3 minutes were approved. Dev expressed the committee's gratitude to the Provost for allocating discretionary funds to fill the gap for journals in the coming year.

#### Report from Authors' Rights Task Force - JQ Johnson

On May 14, the UO Senate will consider the task force [report](#) and motion which gives recommendations for UO authors as they publish in journals and are at the point of negotiating their copy rights. The task force members include JQ Johnson, Andrew Karduna, Alexander Mathas, Elizabeth Peterson, Dev Sinha, and Chuck Williams. JQ stated that the goal was to plan the implementation of the resolution that the Senate passed in February. That resolution had three parts:

- 1) greater faculty education in the area of authors' rights
- 2) recommendation that all faculty members use an author's addendum
- 3) the Senate President convene a small group to look at implementation

A question facing the task force was whether the UO should adopt a specific author addendum. The task force concluded that because of the difference in disciplines that the UO should not require a specific addendum. The task force also recommends that conversations on authors' rights be held in the various departments on campus. JQ will work with subject specialists and department heads to implement those discussions. The library will also investigate bringing speakers to campus. e.g., Carl Bergstrom from the University of Washington, who is known for his work on citation impact. JQ added that next spring the "Teaching with Technology" seminar plans to focus on open access for text books.

A summary of other recommendations in the report include the expansion and visibility of scholars' bank and a creation of a database on faculty publications. The campus community has little awareness of their colleagues' publications. It was suggested that the ULC take a lead role in how to make that information available to faculty. Alex asked whether there would be any way to create a database listing the kinds of agreements campus authors have done. JQ responded that could be difficult to do. Julie stated there is a group in Chemistry that sends a list of all faculty publications - so it is possible we already have the tools in place. There are also profiles on Community of Science, which might be a good source for data mining. However, that database is never up-to-date as people tend to not update their profiles on a regular basis. It was suggested that Academic Affairs might be able to help put this information together because of its annual review of tenure cases.

Gina made a motion to endorse the task force report; everyone was in agreement. The ULC will stay involved with the Senate

motions.

The May 14th Senate meeting minutes covering the task force's motion can be found [here](#). (link not yet live)

#### Weeding to Storage - Mark Watson

Knight Library is at capacity in terms of the physical collections. There are areas in the stacks where space is tight which makes it very difficult to shelve returned books. These items are being stored in a separate overflow area on the fourth floor. The subject specialists have worked over the past several months to identify a set of rarely used titles that the library is proposing to "weed to storage," that is to move them to an interim storage facility. The proposal also includes suppressing the records for those titles in the online catalog to eliminate the need to page from storage. Before proceeding further with this [proposal](#), the library would like to get feedback from the ULC.

The ULC voiced concern with suppressing the titles from the catalog, in particular the bound journals. Deb added that if the subject specialists have been very careful in selecting titles to be stored, there should not be many requests for retrieval. Gina suggested that the data the library gathered on use of these materials may not be accurate. For example, she often uses these materials but does not check them out. She added that she had consulted several faculty members about the issue of suppressing entries from the catalog, all of whom rejected the idea as utterly contrary to the mission of a research library. The cost of retrieval from a storage facility is a criterion that has to take second place to the transparent provision of information about our holdings. There was a question on how the cost of retrieving books from storage compares to ILL/Summit; Mark responded that storage would likely be more costly. There would be a charge assessed each time a book had to be retrieved. A suggestion was made to put next to the item record that the book has been moved to storage and prefer that it first be requested through ILL/Summit. However, Deb feels it is not always a good idea to ask faculty and students to go through ILL if our library currently has the book. Melissa asked if using compact shelving might be a better choice than temporary storage. Deb responded that compact shelving is very expensive and has some load-bearing issues.

The committee suggested that subject specialists talk to their departmental reps to see if their faculty would want to review the list of proposed titles to be moved to storage.

To summarize the "weed to storage" discussion:

- 1) Committee generally supportive
- 2) Library will not suppress titles
- 3) Subject Specialists to give their departmental rep the opportunity to review list of titles
- 4) Subject Specialists to identify what titles should possibly be removed from the list
- 5) Implement a mechanism for reviewing and analyzing material being retrieved

Deb briefly discussed a related topic, the planning of a Regional Library Service Center (RLSC) which is a storage facility for several Orbis libraries (UO, OSU, PSU, OHSU, Reed). It is a very inexpensive way to house important, but little used titles. This project is supported by the Chancellor and Provosts and is on the list for state funding. It would be extremely beneficial to have faculty lobby for this facility. Deb will provide additional information to the committee.

#### Strategic Vision - Deb Carver and Dev Sinha

This is a continuation of the agenda item from the [March 3](#) meeting. Deb distributed copies of the library's first, comprehensive annual report. The report provides a good picture of our funding and major initiatives and provides the necessary background for understanding issues facing the library. Another document available to the committee is the library's [strategic priorities](#) which was submitted to the Provost earlier this spring. These two items, in addition to Dev's list of possible priorities, should help with the committee's discussion on which key areas to focus on in the short-term and long-term.

The seven priorities included in Dev's document include:

1. Better utilize Scholars' Bank
2. Electronic formats of theses

3. Customized library interface web pages
4. Initiate a publishing consortium for faculty and administrators
5. Information and technology services subcommittee
6. Funding/Lobbying
7. Staffing/Hours (some concern with 7 pm closure on Fri/Sat)

Deb pointed to the three post campaign priorities which could also be a focal point for the ULC:

- extending the Learning Commons to other parts of the library
- creating a 21st century Science Library
- putting together initiatives to support research across campus - which addresses funding.

Dev would like to include "space issues" as a priority. Deb added that the way the library is being used is changing all the time. We need to assess how space is being used and if we are making the best use of our space. Are there other services we could be providing? An example of space being underutilized is that of faculty studies. There are many rooms never being used. This creates tension with students who are searching for a place to study when they see these small rooms unoccupied. David expressed concern with the physical deterioration in the Math Library - leaking roof, lack of environmental controls. As mentioned above, RLSC falls within the space concerns. Because this kind of facility is not something that appeals to donors, it is important to get the campus involved in seeking support from the State.

Further discussion focused on how to get faculty to speak out in support of the library's key issues - e.g., attending departmental meetings, campus-wide emails, presence on web pages. How can the library market itself and lobby Salem for more funding?

Three new priorities emerged from this discussion:

8. RLSC/Space Utilization
9. Keeping track of faculty publications - involve Academic Affairs
10. Information sharing - how to educate faculty/disseminate information

Dev asked that a discussion board be set up on Blackboard for the committee members to submit more ideas and comments on these 10 categories. There will be one more meeting to reach consensus on which priorities to focus on in the coming year.  
[note: the next ULC meeting has been scheduled for 6/11 @ 2:00 p.m.]

The meeting adjourned at 12:30 p.m.

Submitted by

Sheila Gray

Maintained by: Sheila Gray, [youremail@uoregon.edu](mailto:youremail@uoregon.edu)