University Library Committee
Tuesday, November 12, 2019
9:00 – 10:00AM
Memorial Library, Mendota Room 330T
Minutes prepared by Cameron Cook

(* denotes members in attendance)

Voting Members

Faculty
• Catherine Arnott Smith, Information School *
• Lisa Bratzke, School of Nursing*
• Duncan Carlsmith, Physics *
• Richard Chappell, Statistics
• Sean Fain, Medical Physics*
• Alessandro Senes, Biochemistry *
• Sarah Thal, History*
• Amy Trentham-Dietz, Population Health Science
• Anne Vila, French & Italian*

Academic Staff
• Cid Freitag, DoIT *
• Carol Pech, School of Medicine and Public Health*

University Staff
• Jordan Hanson, University Relations*
• Theresa Pillar-Groesbeck, Theatre & Drama

Students
• Saad Draga
• Andrew Pietroske*
• Kristen Whitson*

Ex Officio Members (non-voting)
• Philip Braithwaite, Budget, Planning, & Analysis*
• Lisa Carter, Vice Provost for Libraries*
• Cameron Cook, Digital Curation Coordinator, Libraries*
• Ellen Jacks, Grants & Public Services Librarian*
• Daniel Kapust, MLC liaison
• Dennis Lloyd, Director, University of Wisconsin Press*
• Bonnie Shucha (LCC Liaison), Law Library*
Also Present
Carrie Kruse, Florence Hsia, Michael Cohen, Carrie Nelson, Chris Hooper-Lane

Agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 min</td>
<td>Approval of minutes &amp; Announcements</td>
<td>Minutes approved.</td>
<td>ULC members will approve minutes from the meeting on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 min</td>
<td>ULC Charge Update</td>
<td>Will bring information back for feedback next month.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 min</td>
<td>Campus Planning Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 min</td>
<td>New business/Wrap up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minutes
Motion to approve. Approved.

Announcements
Carrie Nelson -

ULC charge update
Working draft - https://uwmadison.box.com/s/ydwqvyy64ikhl3bduo1wkhesvnmpfwka

Looking for feedback regarding:
- To whom is ULC making recommendations?
- What is the role related to staff, students, and faculty?
- Meaningful review suggests two things:
  o Charge should be reviewed based on external input, not just internal.
  o To whom do we report, who do we advise?
    ▪ University committee? library administration? Both?
  o Would like role to be on of mediating, communication; to advocate for the Libraries to ULC constituencies.
    ▪ If this is proving difficult, ULC should go to the university committee and ask for better direction or access to communicating to said constituencies.
- Lisa ran into Jane Richards who noted that this communication challenge is typical to campus. I was suggested to find a way to communicate, but to not fret too much as it is extremely challenging on this campus and past solutions so far have not been fruitful.
  o Suggested that a listserv may not be the right direction, but instead for the representative role to get the word out through secretary of faculty newsletter, word of mouth, websites, etc.
  o Comment: The use of Libraries depends greatly on the discipline, that is the driving force behind communicating to our constituencies. Is there a better way to communicate to those constituencies?
    ▪ Newsletters
• ULC could host forums
  o Comment: Could we not go to the university committee and ask for a better method of communication? The University Committee needs to hear that this is really an issue. Past discussions in the Libraries have been exacerbated by lack of communication, so it would be better if we could ask for a new method.
  o Comment: A website or newsletter are not useful if no one is using them, so commenter seconds going to University Committee to ask for different communication method. Forums would also need advertisement and wide distribution, so again would be better for having a new communication method.
  o Comment: Lack of communication makes faculty governance less impactful
  o Comment: Without direct communication, rumor mill takes over. It’s better to have input over the communication.
  o Comment: We have huge populations on campus, which asks the question – what is important to share in communication; what rises to the top?
    ▪ How do we tailor the message to each constituency?
    ▪ Do the student representatives represent all undergraduate and graduate students versus their individual departments? Or do you report to ASM as another avenue? ASM also has communication issues.
      • Comment: Reading the charge – student representatives do represent all students.
• ULC attendees are in favor of communicating to university committee to ask about communication methods.
• To whom does ULC report/advise?
  o Primary advisory role is the Vice Provost-Libraries position.
  o For campus-wide issues that necessitate actions, university committee would expect that ULC would advise them, e.g. Open Access topics
  o Annual report is a concrete deliverable of ULC.
  o Comment: Is it the charge left open for ULC to advise whomever is necessary?
    ▪ For any library issues on campus, this group can be an advisory committee to anyone.
    ▪ Should we create a set of rules/policy to govern the committee that would be subsidiary to charge?
    ▪ Comment: include a list of “to include, but not limited to” under section 1, to provide more guidance and context without leaving too vague as to who ULC advises.
• Question: Does ULC always report to faculty senate?
  • Every year, ULC reports to University Committee
  • For faculty senate, we only report if something is necessary to bring forward
  • Comment: faculty senate is a go-to for many faculty for information; it’s an important mechanism in governance.
  • Comment: Traditionally ULC does present a report yearly to faculty senate, but this year has been delayed
    o Will add to charge
UW-Madison Libraries 2021-27 Capital Plan Request

- Lisa presented to Campus Planning Committee
  - To be included in upcoming processes, Libraries needed to present to the Campus Planning Committee (CPC).
  - Due to timing this semester, Lisa had to present to CPC prior to presenting to ULC – though, moving forward Lisa would like to present to ULC first on important issues like this one.

- Note: Numbers at the bottom of slides are suggested budgets along with suggested funding lines and construction timelines
- Facilities Master Plan page - [https://www.library.wisc.edu/about/administration/facilities-master-plan/](https://www.library.wisc.edu/about/administration/facilities-master-plan/)
- See slides, available in ULC Box - [https://uwmadison.box.com/s/248b0t5qbuauqmpdl6c2ioqdjniqxpiolo](https://uwmadison.box.com/s/248b0t5qbuauqmpdl6c2ioqdjniqxpiolo)

- UW-Madison Libraries Overview
  - 3 Million logged visits to our spaces every year – currently more than Rec. Sports receives.
  - Physical collections largely unduplicated through BTAA.
  - Partner with campus to solve space and fiscal challenges.
  - This campus deserves inspirational spaces that bring value to this university.
  - The Facilities Master Plan provides a compass for how the Libraries may develop and suggests opportunities.
  - Library spaces currently underutilized due to poor seating configuration, aging infrastructure, etc.
  - Memorial, Steenbock, College (which are slated in master plan to remain on campus) received C & D ratings in infrastructure.
  - Consolidation is an ongoing project.
    - Have freed up 90,000 sq. ft. for campus, which is bigger than the space the Libraries is using for College Library.

- Libraries Facilities Master Plan
  - Use is changing.
    - Users deserve consistent basic services, specialized services for constituencies, and support for new modalities of scholarship.
  - Three significant projects are needed for the plan.
    - Verona expansion
    - Memorial Reconstruction
    - South Hub Library

- Rethinking Library Space
  - Hub model redistributes and balances highly used campus space, shifts managed stewardship of local collections to off-campus locations. Utilizes high density shelving with temperature/humidity control that is better suited to the long-term care of our distinctive collections.
  - Prioritize patron use and space. Plan allows for improving Libraries services with greater impact and efficiency, even with reduction in space.
  - Verona 2 is critical link
- Will allow university to address aging infrastructure, increase sustainability, and free up campus spaces for learning, collaborative scholarship, interdisciplinary work.
  - Library systems has made a commitment to the university to reduce on-campus storage by 62%.
    - Consolidating collections to strategic collections
    - To support teaching, research, learning on campus – need to acquire robust collections. Over the next 25 years we will add 1.3 million volumes.
    - Different disciplines have different needs and different research methodologies – the library system can support these needs and methodologies even with collections off-campus.
    - Better for stewardship of the volumes is needed.
      - Our spaces are full and lack appropriate controls for stewarding the collections for the long-term. Value is over 862 million for our collections of rare and irreplaceable items.
  - Astronomy, Math, and Physics (AMP) Library is currently being consolidated, Astronomy/Math are moving into Physics space.
    - Necessary to invest in some of our challenges – to address sound/power, seating/wayfinding, infrastructure.
  - College Library Renovation
    - College is one of the first libraries that students encounter on campus; vital part of undergraduate research experience.
    - Partnerships have allowed for some renovations, but plan suggested to continue with investment until all deficiencies are addressed.
    - Comment: There are a lot of services for campus that are located in inefficient or inappropriate locations, it would be great to start to center those services in our libraries
      - The Libraries do partner with many services on campus and often can highlight those services at opportune times while then flexing space back to study space during high-need times.
    - Open Book Café –
      - Doesn’t meet concession needs for Union currently.
      - Could offer more space for programming and student organizations.
  - Rethinking Memorial Library
    - We need design studies to better understand cost.
    - Need drafts to entice donors.
    - Need to support extensive teaching opportunities and research.
    - Micro-climates within building endanger the long-term support of our collections.
      - Our secluded spaces endanger students studying alone while being hard to secure and costly.
    - Future:
      - Well-articulated study spaces
      - Environments that inspire and are productive
      - Support interdisciplinary work
• Better highlight our collections and resources
  ▪ Phase 1:
    ▪ Renovate the 1950’s section to highlight original features, move entry to original location, and provide 16,000 sq. ft on the 2nd floor for vibrant research commons.
  ▪ Phase 2:
    ▪ Address deferred maintenance issues that risk our collections, address electrical and plumbing issues, and construct new stacks.
  ▪ Final slides aligns mission and vision of library with chancellor’s goals and summarizes project goals.
  ▪ Comment: The buildings are aging, renovation is necessary. However, what about access to collections? Does the suggested plan turn our spaces into student unions?
    ▪ We still need to provide access to resources. With this plan, we can provide better and more efficient access for our patrons.
    ▪ We need to create more flexible, multi-purpose environments. Studying, classrooms during the day that can be used for other engagement purposes at other times.
      • Trying to get more use out of our space rather than the static space we currently have.
      • However, keeping collections near is important, it’s important to find a balance.
  ▪ Question: How do you access Verona 2?
    ▪ Ordering, office delivery. Not browsable, items are stored by size – which is Harvard style shelving that is most efficient use of space.
    ▪ Comment: Georgia Tech & Emory – have nice model of two rooms at shelving facility – one that is for day visits for scholars, one that can be booked for longer-term projects where researchers can have larger volumes of items for research projects to support browsing/study.
      • Question: Is that considered for Verona 2?
      • We don’t have a design study yet. These questions raise the importance of design studies for us.
      • We can better discuss options and get feedback once we have a design study.
    ▪ Difficult conversation for our campus – what do we do for low- and middle-use items, that are not replicated digitally? How do we decide what stays and what is stored off-site? This is the conversation to have with constituencies. It’s a conversation we can’t have until we have a design study to begin the process.

Comment: Would like to push back on rhetoric around Memorial Library, against ‘warehouse’ and ‘book storage’. That is not how faculty view Memorial and during the original conversations, low-use was ill-defined. Those are often the collections that will be most critical to future research.
  • Comment: Regarding the amount of space being listed as ‘demolished’ on the slides - this was the frustration with the original facilities master plan. Browsable stacks are critical to
the future of researchers and faculty are trying to retrain students to use the libraries in this way.

- We will need to come back to these discussions, to come back to what stacks mean for the future. It is important for us to be able to understand and hear from faculty about the need for browsable stacks, however we need to provide better conditions for collections. We are not taking care of them the way they need to be, so the change of stack space is just as critical to our collections as it is to student use space.

**Takeaways**

- Review working draft of the ULC charge
- Transforming Library Spaces
  - Managed, preservation quality shelving facility
  - Enhanced student spaces (College Library and AMP)
- Re-imagining Memorial Library
  - Design studies for fundraising
  - Based on conversations with stakeholders