

# MINUTES

University Library Committee

Thursday, Feb. 15, 2018

9:00 am – 10:00 am

Memorial Library/Special Collections, Room 984

*Minutes prepared by Michael Cohen*

**(\* denotes members in attendance)**

## **Voting Members**

### ***Faculty***

- Cecile Ane, Botany and Statistics \*
- Catherine Arnott Smith, Library & Information Studies\*
- Yang Bai, Physics
- Lisa Bratzke, School of Nursing \*
- Sabine Gross, German \*
- Eneida Mendonca, Biostatistics and Medical Informatics
- Sarah Thal, History \*
- Alessandro Senes, Biochemistry

### ***Academic Staff***

- Cid Freitag, DoIT \*
- Carol Pech, School of Medicine and Public Health

### ***University Staff***

- [2 vacant positions]

### ***Students***

- Jesse Hocking
- Melissa Juvinall\*
- Andrew Pietroske

## **Ex Officio Members (non-voting)**

- Ian Benton, College Library\*
- Philip Braithwaite, Budget, Planning, & Analysis \*
- Michael Cohen, Cataloging & Metadata Services, Libraries \*
- Florence Hsia (MLC Liaison), History \*
- Dennis Lloyd, Director, University of Wisconsin Press\*
- Bonnie Shucha (LCC Liaison), Law Library
- Ed Van Gemert, Vice Provost for Libraries \*

## Also Present

- William Aylward, Classical & Near Eastern Studies
- David Bordwell, Comm Arts (emeritus)
- Ben Brewster, Comm arts (emeritus)
- Gary Brown, FP&M
- Ryan Engel, Learning Support Services
- Jim Escalante, Art
- Nancy Graff Schultz, Assoc. Dir. for Administration
- Deborah Helman, Director of Science & Engineering Libraries
- Chris Hooper-Lane, Interim Director of Ebling Library
- Lea Jacobs, VC for Research and Graduate Education
- Jim Jonas, MERIT Library
- Lee Konrad, AUL for Technology Strategies and Data Services
- Carrie Kruse, Dir. of College Library
- Jan Miernowski, French & Italian
- Lesley Moyo, AUL for Public Services
- Kathryn Sanchez, Spanish & Portuguese
- Brenda Spychalla, Co-Director of MERIT Library
- Margaret Tennessen, FP&M
- Kristin Thompson, Comm Arts (honorary fellow)
- Natasha Veaser, University Relations Specialist
- Anne Vila, French & Italian
- Doug Way, AUL for Collections and Research Services
- Susan Yackee, LaFollette School of Public Affairs

## Agenda

Time	Topic	Outcome	Process
5 min	Announcements	Share Announcements, approve minutes	ULC members will share announcements and approve minutes from the meeting on 12/6/17
15 min	Library Facilities Master Plan - Summary	Share information	Carrie Kruse (Library Facilities Master Plan Working Group) will share recommendations and provide context
5 min	Library Facilities Master Plan - Peer Institutions	Share information	Florence Hsia (chair of Memorial Library Committee) will highlight peer institution experiences
25 min	Library Facilities Master Plan	Discussion	ULC members question and discuss

10 min

Library Facilities Master Plan -  
Communications

Share information

Ed Van Gemert will outline the  
communication plan for reaching  
stakeholders and soliciting feedback

- Announcements:
  - Representatives of the Faculty Libraries Working Group will present a panel discussion on “The Future of the Open-Stack Standing Collections of the Memorial and Kohler Art Libraries” at 2:00 PM on March 16 in Elvehjem room L140
- Minutes: Approved with corrections
- Library Facilities Master Plan - Summary (Carrie Kruse)
  - The Plan will be released soon (pending Campus approvals)
    - Note: Final report was released Feb. 20, 2018
    - See: <https://www.library.wisc.edu/wp-content/uploads/2018/02/15H1L-00-SD-Master-Plan-Final-Report-2-2018forweb.pdf>
  - The Plan is being sponsored jointly by the Libraries and FP&M
  - The Libraries are committed to maintaining browsable research collections on campus while at the same time providing adequate study and collaboration spaces
  - We need to do a better job of connecting the Facilities Plan with the Collections Plan -- <https://www.library.wisc.edu/staff/coll-dev/policies/libraries-campus-collections-plan/>
  - The final report balances many factors
    - User experience
    - Facilities assessment
    - Future growth
    - Shared print agreements (especially with BTAA)
    - Ongoing library consolidation
    - Flexibility in collaborative spaces
    - College Library’s role in providing foundational services
  - Gary Brown reviewed this project in the context of campus master planning, which takes into account
    - Land use capacity
    - Suitability of buildings to support programs
    - Benchmarking with peer institutions
    - Funding sources
    - All master plans change over time
- Library Facilities Master Plan – Peer Institutions (Florence Hsia)
  - The December 2017 Town Hall presentation made some assertions about “peer” comparisons that can be challenged
  - A similar brightspot consulting project at UW Davis gathered considerably more faculty input

- Comparisons of VSF with other “off campus” shelving facilities do not consider distance from campus or user spaces within those facilities
- Library Facilities Master Plan – Discussion
  - Full discussion deferred until March ULC meeting
  - Sabine Gross summarized major themes from campus responses received to date; see her notes below
  - Comments from ULC guests in attendance
    - Lea Jacobs: The Plan does not acknowledge that research needs in the Arts & Humanities differ from those in STEM
      - Sabine: Memorial & Kohler (along with Historical) offer unique research opportunities that should be preserved
    - Jan Miernowski: Users space vs. collections space is a false dichotomy – both are needed and collections space is user space
    - Jim Escalante: Kohler is an important part of Arts faculty identity and visibility
    - Anne Vila: On campus collections are part of teaching as well as research
- Library Facilities Master Plan – Communications: Deferred

## Summary notes for ULC meeting on Feb 15, 2018

Sabine Gross, Chair, ULC

Since presentation of the preliminary Consultants’ Report, aka “Libraries Master Plan” in December, Ed van Gemert and I have both met with a number of constituents, and I have received a steady stream of comments.

Feedback received is mainly from humanities and arts, also some SS, and focused overwhelmingly on a few areas of concern:

### I. Design and Recommendations:

1. Elimination/reduction of open stacks in Memorial Library (while adding holdings from other libraries): open access to books on the shelves is seen as a necessity for humanistic disciplines and as a major asset of our campus and libraries, which cannot compete with other peer institutions in other ways. It is the equivalent of a research lab – the consultants’ report relegates it to storage space. There’s a sense that the consultants have been dismissive of the requirements of humanistic scholars (as in the phrase “struggle to accept digital access”), of the continued need for non-digital artifacts, and of the significant difference between actual print objects and their digitization [a widely held view], thus their irreplaceability in many ways in areas of hum/arts.

2. Design of Verona facility to maximize access – e.g. provisions for shuttle bus, reading room, convenient and efficient delivery of individual or extensive requests to campus.

3. Proposed closing of Kohler Arts Library. Kohler is seen by many constituents as deeply embedded in Arts/Humanities practices and the Chazen environment – teaching, museum, research (details mentioned: research need for multiple editions, significance of subtlety of color reproduction), but also an asset in that it provides public access and exhibition space (both of which are in short supply; their expansion is presented as one of the goals of the proposed master plan).

(There are other persistent concerns, but since they aren't directly connected to the Consultants' report, I'll bracket them for now: Questions re gathering data on e-use vs. print use and the weight they're given; reservations and complaints about current print management strategy that privileges electronic texts; lack of understanding that scans and pdfs often can't replace the material print object. Availability of digital browsing/shelf list may partially address the issue: faculty will want to see/try it, and then weigh in; also repeated expressions of need for faculty involvement in deaccessioning decisions and practices)

I see no problem in moving forward with most of the consultants' recommendations while incorporating concerns in important areas where the consultants' report disregarded their own findings, discriminated against humanistic disciplines, minimized the discovery value of browsing, or didn't respond to specifics of our campus both in terms of site-specifics and culture. For instance: A re-design of Memorial Library is definitely a desirable project and could easily incorporate more compact shelving to increase stacks along with other goals stated.

## II. Concerns with procedure:

1. Not enough input solicited, haphazard, no great interest in consulting users (e.g.: before suggesting drastic changes to MemLib, the consultants didn't bother to meet with MemLib committee). As a result, numerous faculty and other campus users started providing input, via a steady stream of comments to me since December, but also via the petition that is currently circulating (700plus signatures so far), and via forming a Faculty for Libraries Working Group whose convener, Lea Jacobs, Vice Provost for Research in the OVCGRE, is here today.

2. Consultants' report is at odds with the libraries' stated position e.g. on the importance of open-access to stacks and browsing. The preliminary report shows little awareness of the importance of browsing as open stack use, and from what I've heard, attempts by steering committee members to point this out to the consultants were not welcomed.

3. There was no faculty representation on the steering committee that worked with the consultants. (ULC had one representative on the steering committee - Carole Pech, Academic Staff, Medicine and Public Health)

4. Murky process: It was not clear initially how this would proceed – including process of approval/adoption – even to FP&M and library representatives. This is being clarified, presumably Campus Planning Committee is the final step.
5. The Consultants' Report has been named "Master Plan" – what makes it that? When does a report become a plan?

### III. Additional points:

1. Do we want to welcome a new VP Libraries with a plan that s/he had no say in, but is supposed to carry out?
2. Ullrich Langer, Lea Jacobs, and I spoke with the University Committee 3 days ago; Ed is scheduled to speak with them next week. So far: UC is sufficiently concerned with lack of faculty input (both as users and to respect faculty governance) that they are considering a charge (to this or a specially formed committee) to provide an assessment of the consultant's report. We'll have to wait what they decide. [Update: UC issued a memorandum of clarification on February 28, 2018]
3. ULC needs to see the final report before offering any kind of statement. [Update: Consultant's report released on February 20, 2018, along with additional materials provided and option for providing comments. Not accompanied by a general message to faculty/campus community.]
4. 'Don't worry, this can all be addressed in the implementation, and plans always change' is not good enough as a response at this point: that stance will not reassure the hundreds of faculty, grad students, and staff members who are concerned about this report becoming the Master Plan. There is a strong desire to see the concerns documented and expressed as the consultants' report is discussed and as the plan moves forward.
5. Input and ULC involvement is a form of constructive dialogue and input: this – collecting responses and making sure they become part of the discussion and of planning – is indeed the ULC's task. ULC has not sufficiently carried out this role recently, and we were remiss in not planning for it. It's good to have this process happen now.