

# University Library Committee

March 3, 2008

Minutes

PRESENT: Melissa Baird, Deb Carver, Howard Davis, Alisa Freedman, Julie Haack, Andy Karduna, David Levin, Eric Mentzel, Gina Psaki, Dev Sinha, Tze-Lan Sang, Mary Tucker

GUESTS: Andrew Bonamici, Associate University Librarian for Instructional Services; Mark Watson, Associate University Librarian for Collections and Access

The meeting was brought to order by Chair D. Sinha at 9:05 a.m.

## Report on Undergraduate Research Awards

Melissa reported that the Undergraduate Research Awards Committee received 15 outstanding applications and has selected four recipients. The four awards were from the History Department. The majority of applications were from the humanities and social sciences, with one submittal from the sciences. Andrew added that the Geology paper was an excellent paper, but did not have the range of library research that the other papers had. The committee is recommending to that student to consider publishing it in Scholars' Bank. The top two winners will receive \$1,000 awards and the other two will each receive a \$500 award. The library will host an awards luncheon in the spring. The committee agreed that undergraduate research needs to be acknowledged throughout the campus and should be an institutional priority. Gina suggested that the committee members bring this to their senator's attention. Andrew thanked Gina and Melissa for taking the time to serve on the committee this year.

## Senate Resolution

Mark stated that during 00/01, the ULC put forth a Senate resolution on copyright and publications. This year's Senate has decided to take action on that resolution. See text below from the minutes of the 2/13/08 Senate meeting. The university has the opportunity this spring to make progress on these important issues. The ad hoc working committee appointed by the Senate will include Dev, JQ Johnson (Library), Elizabeth Peterson (Library), and Chuck Williams (Tech Transfer). Deb added that this is perfect timing as this year NIH has a requirement that PI's make their research publicly available. See [white paper](#). She added that faculty need to start thinking about this, especially if they will be seeking funding from NIH. Dev will keep the committee updated on the working group's progress.

\*\*\*\*\*

**US07/08-17 concerning an initiative to protect rights of faculty authors of scholarly publications.** Senator Elizabeth Peterson, library, brought the following motion to the floor:

*Whereas*, trends in scholarly publishing make it increasingly important for faculty to consider copyright issues and rights of the authors of scholarly publications

**Moved, that the University of Oregon University Senate:**

- **A) Encourages all faculty who publish scholarly works to study the issues of copyright ownership and liability, for example as laid out by the Association for Research Libraries SPARC initiative (<http://www.arl.org/sparc/author/>)**

- **B) Recommends that if faculty sign a copyright transfer agreement for their work they should include an Author's Addendum as part of the transfer, retaining rights at least to archive their own work and to continue to use their own work in their teaching and research; suggested addenda include the Science Commons addenda at <http://scholars.sciencecommons.org/>**
- **C) Directs the President of the Senate to establish an ad hoc working committee, that shall**
  - o **a. foster educational opportunities for UO faculty related to copyright and copyright liability during spring term 2008.**
  - o **b. propose additional steps to implement this resolution, implement Senate Resolution US00/01-5, and protect the rights of university authors. Such proposals should include at a minimum whether a UO-specific Author's Addendum should be recommended or required.**
  - o **c. report to the full Senate no later than 28 May 2008.**

Senator Peterson explained that the motion encourages all faculty members to study issues of copyright, ownership and liability, and recommends that faculty sign an authors' addendum to retain some ownership of their work to use in teaching and research. It also directs the president of the senate to establish a task force in spring term to provide educational opportunities for faculty on copyright issues and to implement the motion. The motion builds on recommendation from the Library Committee that resulted in the 2001 legislation, but puts some "teeth" in the motion. She noted that other universities, such as the University of Illinois, passed the Author's Addendum, which allows authors to reproduce their work in other ways, such as putting scholarly papers on a website, or blog, but makes it illegal if transferred to journal publishing. The idea is to help authors to understand their rights and be more informed about what transfer of copyright means. ,

Librarian JQ Johnson added several more points. The first point is that that when one thinks about scholarly publishing the most striking thing is that it is heterogeneous -- what constitutes publishing means different things in different fields. He said that this motion is a recommendation; it allows a faculty member to take into account discipline specificity and allows people to operate in a situation in which they know they need to protect rights. The second point is that copyright is very complex, and that is why there is a recommendation for a working committee. The third point is that there is very clear trend that relates to these issues. Harvard passed a resolution similar to this one recently clearly focused on protecting faculty rights to use their work in the future. Mr. Johnson commented that we really are in a situation where there is a national trend.

With discussion dwindling, the question was called. **Motion US07/08- 17 regarding the initiative to protect the rights of faculty authors of scholarly publications passed by voice vote, with one dissenting voice.** President Sayre indicated he will name an ad hoc working committee on the issue at the next meeting.

\*\*\*\*\*

#### One-time Funding

Deb reported that Provost Brady has a small amount of discretionary funds (\$200,000 - \$500,000) which has not yet been allocated. She has asked the deans to provide recommendations for a one-time allocation. Library Administration has discussed a proposal to invest that money in our journal subscriptions. Because the library has not received any inflationary funding, another serials cancellation will be necessary this coming year. This one-time funding could help forestall the cancellation process for one year. There is some expectation that the new budget model to take effect next year might factor inflation into the library's beginning budget, which could potentially put an end

to the serial cancellations process that the campus has taken on during the past several years. The process of canceling journal subscriptions is very time consuming, for both faculty and library staff. Ninety percent of journals are in electronic format. Many are bundled into packages including both the electronic and serial version which makes it very difficult to cancel. With electronic versions, the library is able to track use patterns and do a better job of analyzing where best to put our resources. With this usage information being readily available, if the library is forced to make cancellation decisions in the future, the process will not be as time consuming as there will be data showing which journals are used the most.

Julie asked whether we could use this one-time investment as a leverage to get additional money, for example, asking departments to match the allocation with existing funds, or possibly through fundraising efforts. Deb responded this might be possible, but given the time constraints we have for presenting the proposal to the Provost (within the next two week), she felt there would not be enough time to explore how to incorporate a match into the proposal.

There is a sense that morale on campus is low due to the athletic facilities discussions and putting the campus through another cancellation process could damage morale even more. Gina made a motion to support the one-time allocation proposal to forestall a journal cancellation. Everyone voted in favor. Deb and Mark will draft the proposal and ask for ULC input. [3/20/08 update: Provost Brady has awarded \$225,000 in response to this proposal.]

### Strategic Planning

Dev distributed a handout "Strategic Planning for the Library Committee" which is a list of suggestions he put together on how the committee could help improve library services. He encouraged the committee to brainstorm ideas and at the next meeting, the group will select areas to focus on. The five areas Dev suggested include:

- 1) Better utilizing current resources (e.g., Scholars' Bank)
- 2) Reducing costs (journals/publishing)
- 3) Increasing profile and revenues (fundraising/reach out to general public)
- 4) Anticipating future needs (communication via video)
- 5) Attracting and retaining skilled personnel (explore recruitment/retention issues; collaboration between librarians and teaching faculty)

Mark agreed that Scholars' Bank is underutilized and supports Dev's suggestion for exploring a variety of uses for SB and how to encourage use by faculty and students.

Andrew commented on using video to communicate to the broader public. The campus currently has some of these tools in place. The UO Channel, which is maintained by the library, provides video content (e.g., lectures and films) with the purpose of outreach to the entire state. Much of this video is archived in Scholars' Bank. The library is also getting ready to launch a U-tube presence - showcasing lectures, performances, student productions and alumni events.

Deb commented that this committee typically focuses its efforts on traditional library services - the purchase and retention of library material. There has not been a lot of discussion on technology as it relates to education. The Educational Technology Committee has not been active for close to two years, so at this time, the campus does not have a strong leadership presence in this area. The ULC could use this opportunity to play a visible role on the direction the campus should go in terms of educational technology.

Several other suggestions that the committee provided included:

- Having students in the sciences put their posters in Scholars' Bank.
- Partnering with Admissions to add more video to web content.
- Working with the graduate school to post theses and dissertations in SB.
- Display more useful resources on the library's home page - e.g., subject specialists linking their resource page. This could also be helpful to high school students in their research.
- Make "use of library" class available to all students, possibly by incorporating a library component into one of English Department's writing classes.
- Promote to teaching faculty that they can arrange to have one of their class periods in the library, where a subject specialist or reference librarian can provide students an overview of the library resources.
- Open access text books would benefit the students. This issue cannot be addressed by one campus. We would need to reach out to other library committees and senates, possibly by working within an established consortia such as GWLA (Greater Western Library Alliance).
- Increase fundraising efforts and profile. How do we bring awareness to the citizens of Oregon about the academic needs of campus? Deb responded that these issues are being discussed in preparation for the next UO campaign. Priscilla added that the Development Office is always looking for funding opportunities within academic departments.
- When a position is endowed, a set amount of that money should be directed to the library to help fund library resources to support the position's research.

Dev will send the committee a summary/expansion of these ideas. At the next meeting, he would like each committee member to provide their top three choices on where they would like to have the ULC direct its attention.

The meeting adjourned at 10:40 a.m.

Submitted by  
Sheila Gray

#### ACTION ITEMS:

1. Carver/Dev draft one-time funding memo for ULC review.
2. Dev to distribute summary of planning strategies.
3. Committee members to select 3 strategies to advance and volunteer to work on.
4. Gray to schedule spring term meetings.
5. Continue discussions on Senate resolution/ad hoc working committee.