

University of Oregon Libraries  
**University Library Committee (ULC)**  
Winter Meeting, 2014–2015 Academic Year  
Tuesday, January 27, 2015  
3:30–5:00 p.m.  
Rowe Conference Room, 115H, Knight Library

**MEETING MINUTES**

**Present:** Jack Boss (Music and Dance), Denise Gigliotti (East Asian Languages), Mark Horney (Center for Advanced Technology in Education), Tim Jenkins (Physics), Adriene Lim (Dean of Libraries), Debra Merskin (Journalism and Communication), Jimmy Murray (UO Libraries), Gordon Sayre (English), Christopher Sinclair (ULC Chair; Mathematics)

**Guests:** Sara Brownmiller, Shane Turner, Mark Watson, Laura Willey

**Absent:** Richard Chartoff (Chemistry), Amy Lobben (Geography)

**Records Release Incident**

Adriene provided the committee with an update of the records release incident:

- The incident is still a developing situation; because it involves personnel matters and is now being reviewed by an external investigator, many details cannot be discussed publicly yet.
- A large data breach occurred, with a release of information related to records and communications about students, faculty, staff, and community members.
- Records management is part of the Libraries' responsibilities, which brings distinct differences in processing and service protocols when compared to the University Archives.
- An external investigator is meeting with people to try to establish what happened and why. The investigator is carrying out the process at the University's direction, not at the Libraries' direction, although the Libraries are fully cooperating to ensure that this type of incident does not happen again. In fairness to all involved, we must await the findings of the investigation before further discussion of details.
- Public records could still be protected for various reasons. In other universities, records management is performed elsewhere on campus, not at the library. There are permanent and non-permanent records. The Archives receives permanent records, but not all of them would be placed in open archives. Most information would be public record, while other information would be redacted.
- The ongoing investigation is not related to patron records at all; that accusation, wherever it is being made, is a complete falsehood. The investigation is isolated to determining the nature and extent of the data breach itself, and why it happened. Laura Willey, Manager of Access Services, explained the Libraries' policies and procedures regarding the protection of patron information: Staff are required to sign a confidentiality statement and read the ALA statement on confidentiality of circulation records. Staff receive instruction to refer to General Council anyone who

comes in with a search warrant. We do have a confidentiality waiver that our users can choose to sign for very particular cases: These waivers do not mean that anyone can ask for the patron's record; instead, they are used to track the location of particular journals/articles, again with the patron's consent. This waiver is not used very often.

#### **Committee discussion:**

- Shouldn't all the information have been cleaned up before it arrived at the library? If the administration wants to protect certain information, shouldn't they be responsible for doing the review? More details will be forthcoming about this aspect of the Incident after the investigation is completed.
- Is it the case that the university is asking the Libraries or a few individuals to "fall on the sword"? Who is responsible? This is why an external investigation is so important, because we need to determine exactly why and how the breach happened.
- Some members of the Senate are defending the Libraries; others have lost faith in the Libraries. It is understandable that the Libraries needs to hold off on revealing details during the investigation, but is there anything that can be shared now? In tomorrow's Senate meeting, the president will make a statement about the incident, and Adriene may also be asked to share remarks.
- Given this committee's charge, if library policy issues come forward at the Senate meeting, someone should state that the ULC should be the one to look into it, to review and draft policies, then bring them forward to the Senate. Adriene is a proponent of shared governance and would like more input and participation from the ULC. The committee may need to meet more frequently to help the Libraries' with its policy review.
- The Libraries' policies on privacy are on the Libraries' website:  
<http://library.uoregon.edu/policies/patronprivacy.html>

#### **ULC Commitment Level**

- Current tier: Chris could not find online or in the charge what the committee's current "tier" level of time commitment is, so we need to ask about this at the Senate. Someone else believes that it is Tier 1, but that perhaps it could be moved to a different tier. Chris will check on this with Committee on Committees.
- At the next meeting (February 24), it would be appropriate to meet to decide what action, if any, the committee would take. The members agreed to meet at that time.
- Adriene appreciated the continued support of the ULC members.
- It would be nice if, the next time we meet, someone from Johnson Hall, such as the Provost, would attend.
- **Open Access Publishers' Fees**  
Adriene asked if ULC members were aware of the Libraries' former support for open access publishing fees. Some ULC members were aware of this, but some were not. The program, which paid for some individuals' publishing fees, was based one-time funding, so was not sustainable, and has ended. The distribution of the funds was very science-heavy, which could have had something to do with how word got out about the opportunity.

- Instead of trying to revive the program as it was before, the Libraries could instead consider buying memberships that would offer discounts to more faculty authors. Open Library of the Humanities was discussed as one example. There was general agreement that this was of interest to ULC members.
- The Libraries will propose a model at a future meeting.