

# MINUTES

---

University Library Committee

Tuesday, February 17, 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
- Kyung-Sun Kim, School of Library and Information Studies
- Daniel Klingenberg, Chemical and Biological Engineering

#### *Staff*

- Ron Harris, English
- Allison Kaplan, School of Library & Information Studies
- Darcy Little, Latin American, Caribbean and Iberian Studies
- Joan Weckmueller, DoIT Academic Technology

#### *Students*

- Nilay Vaish

### Non-Voting Members

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

### Also Present

- Jeannette Casey, Mills Music Library
- Deborah Helman, LCC, Wendt
- Lee Konrad, GLS, Library Exec Group
- Anna Lewis, MERIT
- Lesley Moyo, GLS, Library Exec Group
- Nancy Graff Schultz, GLS, Library Exec Group
- Natasha Veaser, GLS, Communications
- Lisa Wettleson, GLS, Steenbock
- Doug Way, GLS, Library Exec Group

## **Approval of ULC minutes from January 20, 2015**

One correction

### **Announcements**

- Shakespeare First Folio exhibit coming in Fall '16: [link to news release](#)
  - Susan Barribeau worked to make this happen with campus partners
  - Don't announce until Feb 22
  - Will partner with Chazen because we don't have the security needed at the library
  - A major undertaking, will incorporate k-12/public libraries
- Fundraising outreach:
  - Ben Strand with Elisabeth Owens have put together an initial group to look at outreach for fundraising opportunities
  - We'll convene a group in Chicago to help us think through advancement/development opportunities
  - We're likely to add people as the group progresses

### **Open Access Policy Working Group - Update**

Karl Broman: The Open Access Policy working group has met once. The goal is to develop a policy that will enable the university to collect and distribute campus scholarly articles. Based on the first meeting, it looks like the UMN policy could be easily migrated to our environment.

The University Committee is meeting with Ed and Karl next week to find out where this kind of policy would come from: graduate school? Regents?

Library needs to review logistical issues: determine support needed from libraries and plan for that.

Working group meeting again in two weeks

### **Alternative Revenue Generation Recommendations - Discussion**

Lesley Moyo: We convened 8 people (even before the budget news came out) to consider possible opportunities for additional revenue generation for the libraries. The group brainstormed ideas for revenue generation based on: our experiences, CIC schools, other partners/contacts. We're bringing forward a set of ideas now; there are many others, but these seemed most immediately viable/valuable to consider.

The document describing this initial set of ideas has been shared with the Provost and was circulated to ULC before the meeting.

**Levy a library "tax" on all campus giving.**

The Provost encourages us to continue looking into this, but has heard concern from other campus administrators that the funders may not like this and that there is a campus sense that libraries are no longer used/needed. We see we need to educate people about what services the libraries are providing and will work on this too.

Cécile Ane: Would this discourage some donors from giving? Would it be possible to take the tax primarily on unrestricted gifts?

We can be confident that the Chancellor won't be doing anything to jeopardize donors.

The library will at least going to continue investigating this option.

We should find out what U of Illinois has done and how and why that seems to work.

### **Arrange for library funds out of research overheads**

The portion of the research overhead funds that goes to libraries is a set amount that becomes a part of the general base fund to the library. The portion of research overhead funds that exceeds a set quantity (~\$57M) is allocated primarily to research units (the Capital Exercise). We could try to: 1) increase the overhead rate with the intention of a new allocation to go to libraries; 2) adjust the allocation of the overhead so that the library receives more when research goes up; or 3) consider a method for charging the research units that receive the overhead funds.

NOTE: We should consider trying to get the Provost to the ULC.

Anna Lewis: This idea seems to have the most sound philosophical basis. We should look at how other schools do this. NC State is one to look into. As library services become so integrated and seamless, it's more important to specify how specific resources are being used to support research.

If we were just supporting undergraduate education, it would be much easier to reach the funds we need for collections. Research-focused collections are expensive. As research and research funding increase, and our related subscription costs are going up, the libraries don't receive an associated increase in funding.

Daniel Klingenberg: If we had to threaten a fee for article access, the faculty would be able to see the value of directing a cut of research funding to libraries.

Ron Harris: It seems to be unusually difficult to get funding for libraries on this campus. It may help to integrate library-related fund development into the other campus discussions about funding/allocation models.

A provocative and lively conversation related to the pros and cons of eliminating the library Elsevier subscription ensued. The library currently spends \$2M/year on Elsevier subscriptions.

### **Add a student fee to support libraries**

The technology fee is calculated as a portion of tuition. The libraries got some of this as base in the past, but no longer. We can make one-time requests against the tech fee, but that's it. A \$100 Segregated fee equates to \$4.3M/year. Other university libraries have this kind of thing in place. Recent additions to segregated fees have involved approval from the students.

It could make sense to fund some of the transitions from collections spaces to study/collaboration spaces.

### **Processing fee for "lost" items**

Lesley: When items are long overdue, we consider them "lost" at which time patron borrowing privileges are impacted. When the item is subsequently returned, all fines are currently forgiven. The time and effort involved in processing the surprisingly large quantity of items this happens with seem to warrant a non-refundable fee.

### **Other Revenue Generating ideas**

We're not giving up on anything right now; most ideas are smaller scale than these.

Anna Lewis: There are some concerns about the pass-down fees. Instead of broad contributions by all, we end up hitting the users with lots of little fees that could discourage use and access.

Lesley: If we're successful with some of the other large options, we might not need to implement so many of these smaller scale ideas.

**ACTION:** Please email Lesley with any input on the document or other revenue generation ideas.

## **Budget Update**

Ed Van Gemert: For the most current information, see the Chancellor's comments. The libraries have done the 2/4/6 exercise and are planning for a 6% cut.

At this morning's WLA legislator briefing, there were reports that many people including legislators are unhappy with the budget proposal and we should expect to see continued discussion and movement.

What would flexibilities mean to the libraries? It isn't clear, but an example could be the remodeling projects that are hung up because we have 101 money set aside and it's problematic to carry funds over; hiring contractors would make things go faster and probably cheaper.

## **Adjourn.**