

University Committee on Libraries (UCL)
Minutes of the Meeting of February 16, 2007
7:30 – 9:00 am, Café DeGrasta

.....

UCL Members. Present: John Weber (Chair), Heidi Ardizzone, Charles Barber, Edmund Edmonds (ex officio), David Leighton, Parker Ladwig, Brian Pitts, Andrew Sommese, David Smith, Laurence Taylor, Jennifer Younger (ex officio). Absent on Leave: Susan Blum. Absent: Semion Lyandres, John Robinson, Gordon Wishon (ex officio), Ashlee Wright.

Guest: Nigel Butterwick.

Call to order at 7:30 by Chair, John Weber.

1. Welcome and Agenda Review

Weber welcomed the committee members to the first meeting of the year. The next meeting will take place Thursday, March 8, 2007, at 7:30 am at Café DeGrasta.

2. Approval of Minutes from December 8, 2006, Meeting

Pitts motioned to approve the December 8, 2006, UCL meeting minutes. The motion was seconded by Barber and passed unanimously.

3. Chair's Report – John Weber

Weber called for volunteers to serve on the Foik Award Committee. He gave an overview of the award and mentioned the administrative support available. He also mentioned that the previous award winners would serve on the committee. Edmunds, Pitts, and Weber volunteered to serve.

4. Director's Report – Jennifer Younger

Younger handed out samples of the four winning bookmarks designed by Art, Art History, and Design students to celebrate the Fiesta Bowl funding given to the University Libraries. She mentioned that the library is currently recruiting for two faculty positions: a Music Librarian, and a Reference/First Year Experience Librarian. She mentioned an article from the Chronicle for Higher Education, "Are Editors Out of the Tenure Process?" (January 5, 2007) which among other things discusses the format a dissertation should take – electronic vs. print, and whether the dissertation should be considered the same as a book. There were questions about UMI Dissertations Publishing which makes abstracts of dissertations available electronically. This is also different from how some dissertations are available via Google.

Younger discussed the library budget assumptions for fiscal years 2007/2008 and 2008/2009. The Elsevier journal package were renewed in the fall 2006 for the calendar years 2007 and 2008; Wiley for calendar years 2007, 2008 and 2009; and Oxford for its usual one year, 2007. Each publisher has individual requirements and the contract negotiations with Elsevier and

Wiley in particular are very time consuming. In addition, the Elsevier and Wiley packages have lesser inflation rates for multiple year agreements. Thus, the multiple year renewals are to ease the library workload and contain inflation. Also, the library has been involved in improving use data gathering, preparing for an electronic resources management system called Verde, and completing a journal vendor switch to Harrassowitz. As a result, there are no plans for cost-analysis of these specific packages for FY 2007/08. There are also no plans for library-wide journal cuts, although subject selectors may individually choose to do so outside the Elsevier and Wiley packages. Within the packages we have a limited opportunity to "trade" titles so that we have formal subscriptions to more highly used titles and can cancel subscriptions to lesser used titles, if we maintain our over all spending rate. The timing for journal cancellations was also mentioned. Usually discussions begin about 18 months before cancellations go into effect –such that, e.g., the cost-analysis for journals and journal packages should be done in fiscal year 2007/2008 for the fiscal year 2008/2009 budget which pays for the 2009 calendar year subscriptions.

Younger announced that an international student movement for free culture, Freeculture.org, in collaboration with the Alliance for Taxpayer Access (ATA), declared February 15, 2007, a “National Day of Action” for students that support open sharing of scientific and scholarly research findings on the Internet. The Federal Research Public Access Act was introduced last year by Senators John Cornyn and Joseph Lieberman and is awaiting reintroduction in the 110th Congress. UCL members were not aware of Notre Dame students who had participated.

5. University Libraries’ Cooperative Agreements

Younger distributed an initial list of cooperative agreements for the University Libraries. It was compiled from submissions by library faculty. One of the points is to demonstrate that the library is leveraging its resources. Weber asked which agreements were the most important and how the balance between what the library contributes and what it receives is described. Younger mentioned the Northeast Research Libraries Consortium as an important example. The library saved more than 10 times its annual membership fee on just one deal (Web of Science). Original cataloging in cooperation with OCLC was another example of where the library gets many times over what it contributes. Younger said the Michiana Academic Libraries Consortium (MALC) was not initially on the list because although the member libraries share the same library catalog software, there are four different underlying databases. However, it will be added as there are some cooperative aspects in sharing policies with the potential for a union catalog.

Other suggestions and questions followed. Weber suggested including the year an agreement started. Another asked who the audience was for this list: UCL, the library, someone else? Weber suggested this information could be an important focal point for the 2006-07 UCL’s annual report and that it might also be used in discussions with the Academic Council. Edmonds offered to include the cooperative agreements of the Law Library. Smith suggested animating the descriptions and grouping the agreements as major or minor. Sommese suggested including the amount of funding and time involved. Younger also thought that the scale might be helpful. Ladwig suggested characterizing the agreements as internal to the University vs. external, external being of more interest. Pitts asked whether there were any cooperative agreements with Indiana University-South Bend. Younger replied that there is an agreement among Indiana’s academic libraries for reciprocal on-site borrowing. Edmonds mentioned local agreements

where paralegal students could use the Law Library's resources. Younger mentioned the Alliance for Catholic Education masters program as another local example where Notre Dame students use St. Mary's education collection. Ardizzone suggested including the net gain and the good-will generated, for example by participating with OCLC.

Smith suggested that the list could be displayed as a matrix using the descriptive elements deemed most important. Younger concluded this initial discussion by describing the paradigm shift from cooperative agreements as a supplement to a library's activities to one where the library depends on those agreements. As an example, Butterwick mentioned the RapidILL program, recently introduced by the library as a way to obtain articles from participating institutions in less than 24 hours for a cost similar to traditional interlibrary loan.

6. Copy Services in the University Libraries

Barber mentioned a concern received from a colleague who has experienced problems in using the copiers in the Hesburgh Library. The colleague suggested that the copiers are poorly maintained and that there is little help when needed. Younger explained that copiers used to generate revenue such that a staffed copy center was provided for patrons. In recent years, however, revenues declined substantially and the copy operations have had to be subsidized. As a result, the library removed its staffed copy center. The library then had to find a vendor to support self service copy services, but the vendor required that the library buy the machines. The machines are about 5 years old and still in good condition.

Overall, there is only a complaint every 2 or 3 months. Occasionally the user will think the machine is not working when it is only "sleeping." The library's vendor does provide a 4 hour service turn around during the work week. There are about 7 or 8 public machines in the Hesburgh Library (and 1 in most of the branch libraries). Sommese asked what changed the economics. Younger said that online access was the main factor. With the closing of the staffed copy center, however, the library is not losing money now. Someone pointed out that the machines do not accept departmental accounting codes. Younger said that with a \$5,000 deposit, a department can make an arrangement with the library for copy cards for departmental use. She said there would be an opportunity to review the library's copier services next year because the contract will be up for renewal. She also noted the installation of the library's Knowledge Imaging Center, a large scanner recently made available to library patrons in the Hesburgh Library reference area. Committee members agreed on the desirability of incorporating scanning services and other new technology.

Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 9:00.

Respectfully submitted,

Parker Ladwig
Acting Recorder