

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN SENATE

Committee on the Library
(Final; Information)

LB.10.01 2009-2010 Annual Report

The Senate Committee on the Library (SCL) met monthly from September through April (except for January; May meeting scheduled 5/7/2010). Additional meetings were arranged while conducting the review of the University Librarian. In November, the Committee met at the Oak Street high density storage facility, and in February the committee met jointly with the Information Technology committee. Items of significant effort this year include:

I. Review of the University Librarian

University Librarian Paula Kaufman was reviewed in her role as Dean of Libraries during the 2008-2009 academic year. SCL should have been an active part of that review from October 2008 on. Instead, we were contacted in March 2009, making it impossible for us to carry out our statutory requirement of soliciting broad, campus-wide input. Per request of former Provost Linda Katehi, we undertook such broad review early in fall semester 2009. 236 members of the campus community responded to an electronic survey (while hard-copy was available, no one made use of this option). We sent a report to the Library Executive Committee (the statutory route), and they requested that we send the unabridged report to the Provost (then Robert Easter), which we did on November 24, 2009. While the content of our report remains confidential, it is a matter of public record that Dean Kaufman's appointment as University Librarian was renewed. Our recommendation for future reviews of the University Librarian, to avoid the missed opportunity to participate in the review encountered during 2008-2009, is to have the Provost's Office notify SCL and the Library Executive Committee at the same time that the Dean's review is started, so that an orderly advisory process as already mandated by University statute (Article VI, Library, paragraph e) and Library Executive Committee Standing Policies can be followed.

II. New Service Models

The ongoing revision of operating procedures, space allocations, personnel assignments, and content access in the Library is being carried out through a process dubbed "New Service Models." The Library excludes collection development (including the purchase, licensing, and preservation of books, journals, databases, and other items) from NSM's review and revitalization of service and process. That collections themselves are not at issue is poorly understood. Significant tensions exist between the Library and stakeholders in the humanities and social sciences, international/area studies, and Applied Health Studies. There are difficult issues facing the biological sciences as well. Different communities view the Library in very different lights. For some, it is simply a content provider. For others, it is a central part of their personal and professional identity. For some, the tangible form of the information (print vs. electronic) is of intense concern; others only care about information access, and consider the medium irrelevant. We have been kept abreast of developments through regular reports from the University Librarian and Library staff. We have also given advice on how to manage the process to ensure that no single voice dominates the discussion and that all areas of the campus are given adequate means to advocate for their needs. Apparently, other campuses and universities are now scrambling to make adjustments similar to those under consideration here, based on the severe budget pressures faced by most if not all universities.

Because we started earlier, we have had over one year of thorough (and sometimes contentious) deliberation.

III. Trends and Opportunities in Scholarly Publication

Publication using web-enabled technologies is becoming more common, as is use of such licensing approaches as Open Access. MillerComm speaker Kenny Crews, from Columbia University, had a lively discussion with SCL on balancing the characteristics of the various approaches to publishing with the needs of authors, libraries, universities, and the many types of readers. His drumbeat, however, was that, regardless of what arrangements are made, authors must keep a copy of their publishing, licensure, or copyright transfer agreements to avoid future difficulties. Sarah Shreeves, in charge of the IDEALS repository, advised SCL on the growth of the repository and on the need for greater awareness on campus of copyright and licensure issues. Using a modified version of a survey implemented at the University of Minnesota, the CIC is spearheading an environmental scan that seeks to determine the extent to which institutions and individuals are prepared to move to more open publishing models. Because of differences in use patterns of theses, draft manuscripts, and papers, it is not clear that a single model across campus is either possible or desirable.

IV. Other Items

Delivery of items from the Oak Street High Density Storage site takes 2 business days, and notification of where items in transit are may be delayed by the current structure of computer processing (much information is batch processed at midnight rather than being sent into the internet in real time). Web pages describing delivery policy have been updated to more clearly explain the delivery timeline. While more rapid access may be desirable, the costs in equipment and personnel to provide quicker turn-around do not appear to be available at this time.

Thesis electronic deposit into IDEALS was coordinated with the Graduate College. When first made available, 80% of graduate students chose electronic deposit, and many of those who stayed with paper indicated that this was because of hard-copy long-since prepared or not wishing to be part of possible start-up glitches. IDEALS worked so well that the Graduate College is moving to making electronic deposit mandatory within 1-2 years.

A joint meeting with the Senate Information Technology Committee was held in January. Library requests for student fee funds were a major part of the discussion (no information was then available on CITES requests for fee funds).

Senate Committee on the Library

Alexander Scheeline, Chair
Brooke Davitt
Hao Feng
Mark Hasegawa-Johnson
Harriett Green

Paula T. Kaufman (*ex officio*)
Marcus Keller
Gayle S. Magee
Patrick Maher
Mary Mallory

David Olsen
Maryline Parca
Amir Toumaj
Reneé Trilling