RESEARCH LIBRARY COUNCIL

Minutes of the February 6, 2015 Meeting
Room 2601
Du Bois Library

Present: Billings, Cable, Dougherty, Ganz, Kalmakis, Kinney, Maloy, May, Morales, Muriel, Ogilvie, Russotto, Schafer, Schmidt, Schweik, Shimpach

Absent: Degenhardt, Elsden, Hayes, Rothstein

Guests: Button, Lewellen, Sin, Wallace (for Hayes), Warner

A. Comments of the Chair – Arthur Kinney
   Prof. Kinney introduced the topic of library space and said that the Library is turning into something similar to a student union. He had suggested in a previous meeting that RLC talk about what a library should be and what it is, and has been working on a statement regarding alternative use of library space. He commented that we are in a period where libraries are transitioning.

B. Approval of the December 5, 2014 minutes
   Ms. Billings suggested that on page 2, section F, the second sentence of the third paragraph be modified to say “Works are pulled and shipped to the Internet Archive located at the Boston Public Library where the works are digitized.”

   There was a motion to approve the minutes as amended, which was moved and seconded. The amended minutes were approved unanimously.

C. Comments of the Director of Libraries – Jay Schafer
   Mr. Schafer welcomed everyone back after the holiday break.
   Governor Baker issued a state hiring freeze due to the state budget having a deficit of $750 million. The university is not under the state hiring freeze, but decided to implement its own hiring freeze, which includes all non-faculty positions. This impacted the Libraries, which have two positions in the search process and two more they hope to have in the search process. The freeze seems to be thawing, as it appears there will not be any 9C cuts.
   Prof. Kinney asked what the open positions are. Mr. Schafer said they are a half-time Learning Commons position, a Special Collections and University Archives position, a three-year term position to work with Open Education initiatives, and the head of Information Resources Management (IRM). The initial search for the head of IRM failed, so the Libraries are seeking permission to reopen the search.
   Information Technology is undergoing a strategic planning process, with several subcommittees. There is library representation on at least three of these subcommittees. Mr. Schafer and Ms. Button are on the research subcommittee and there are three groups in that area. Mr. Schafer said it is essential that the Libraries be represented in this very important planning process.
   The Five College Library Annex site in Northampton was found to be lacking in some aspects that would increase construction costs. Therefore the Five Colleges are seriously exploring another site very close to the university and will hopefully have a contract on that land shortly. The goal is to break ground in June or July.
   Staff in the Makerbot Innovation Center are undergoing training in 3D imaging. Mr. Schafer said this is an interesting new service for the Libraries and passed around examples of the 3D models that have been made. Ms. Schmidt asked if there is any thought to using other materials. Mr. Schafer said he thinks the machines are only for plastic. The cost of each machine is about $2,500, but it depends on the size of the machine. Students will be charged for the filament, but not the infrastructure, and they will be told ahead of time how much the cost is for their project. Faculty from a broad range of disciplines will be attending training sessions in the coming week. Ms. Warner said the sessions are on Tuesday and Thursday and are full. Ms. Button said about 17 departments will be attending these training sessions.

D. Comments of RLC Members
   It was asked whether the new signs encouraging people to use the revolving door have been successful. Mr. Schafer said there have also been new heaters installed, and that the employees at the information desk and the building monitors desk have been impressed with how warm it is, except for the times when it is busy and people
use the regular doors as well. He said there is a real wind tunnel effect in the building and it is even worse when the temperatures are so low. He hopes the revolving door will help with that, too.

E. LibQual Survey – Rachel Lewellen

The Libraries will be administering the LibQual Survey, a web-based survey developed by the Association of Research Libraries, this spring. The Libraries used this survey in 2004, 2007, and 2011. The survey allows the Libraries to compare survey responses to those of other schools’ and to look at how the responses change over time. All active faculty, all graduate students, and a sample of 3,000 undergraduates will be surveyed. The invitation will be coming later this month, along with an incentive coupon for a free beverage at the Procrastination Station. Questions will focus on individuals’ desired level, minimum level, and perceived level of service, and a comment box will be included. Mr. Schafer said the comments are even more useful than the numerical results.

It was asked if this is an anonymous survey. Ms. Lewellen said it is confidential, not anonymous. Each participant receives a unique URL in order to take the survey, but the results are not connected to the email addresses.

Mr. Schafer encouraged everyone to take a few minutes to fill out the survey.

F. Use of Library Facilities – Arthur Kinney

A draft “Statement Regarding Alternative Use of Library Space” was presented to RLC.

Comments from RLC members:

The use of space should be aligned with the mission and goals of the Libraries, and these have expanded enormously. Mr. Schafer said it can be fuzzy what the mission and goals are. Collaboration started when OIT was brought into the building, and that collaboration expanded with student-focused services such as the Learning Commons and the Learning Resource Center. Where something might come into question is if it’s only perceived as office space instead of student and faculty interaction. Exactly what is collaborative use of the space can be defined by different people differently.

Constructing new space is expensive and goes on the students’ “credit cards” so we want to be responsible about not hoarding space, but the Library shouldn’t become a collage of swing spaces.

Unless there is a substantial investment, Mr. Schafer is confident we’ll always have six stacks floors with 1-1.5 million books. Prof. Kinney asked how clear that is to the university. Mr. Schafer said it’s fairly clear to anyone who knows the building or has seen the 2010 master plan. To the average person, however, it’s not obvious.

Prof. Kinney asked Prof. May if the Writing Program is appropriate in the Library. Prof. May said it’s untraditional but appropriately aligned. Ms. Schmidt said considering how librarians collaborate with a unit is how she sees if it fits in the Library and that there is a lot of collaboration with the Writing Program. Prof. May said getting students familiar with the Library is a good thing. Ms. Schmidt agreed with this and also said students becoming familiar with a librarian is a good thing. Mr. Schafer said if the Writing Program is here, the instructors will be coming here as well. Ms. Button said students can be referred to librarians by the Writing Program as appropriate.

Mr. Schafer said the Provost has said she’d like the Academy at Amherst located in the Library. This is her concept for a home for research-active faculty after they retire. It would be a place where they can do their research and present seminars to the campus on their research. Prof. Kinney asked if they would have offices here. Mr. Schafer said he didn’t think there would be offices. Prof. May said the model is the Academy at Johns Hopkins. Mr. Schafer said Betsy Dumont has formed a study group of retired faculty to work with this investigation.

Mr. Schafer said the 7th floor, which has been under the supervision of IT for many years, is being revised as the home of Academic Computing and the location for the office of the new Associate Provost for Instructional Innovation. This is a much more central location for the IT staff.

Prof. Kinney asked Mr. Schafer if it would help him to have a review process for the use of library space or whether this should be on a case-by-case basis. Mr. Schafer said it would be helpful as things come up to have the input of RLC members, with the understanding that these decisions are largely administrative. The master plan, which may need to be updated because it was created in 2010, specifies what space is taken up in the Library.

Ms. Schmidt pointed out that there is more than one library on campus. It was suggested the term “library facilities” could be used in the library space statement. Ms. Billings suggested that the second paragraph should say “destination of choice” to parallel the campus strategic plan.

Mr. Schafer and Prof. May attended a campus planning committee meeting at which a student experience master plan idea, UMakeUMass, was introduced. This master plan studies current facilities and the needs for better social, residential and academic space for students. Feedback from students is being requested through social media.
There was a motion to approve endorsing the “Statement Regarding Alternative Use of Library Space,” which was moved and seconded. The statement was unanimously endorsed.

This topic will be discussed at the March meeting.

H. Proposed Open Access Policy from Research Council – Jay Schafer
The Research Council has been actively pursuing and studying a proposed open access policy. The proposed policy was endorsed by the Research Council and forwarded to the Faculty Senate Rules Committee. The Rules Committee has asked RLC to take a look at the proposed policy, make comments, and approve, endorse or not endorse the policy. There has been some inspection by legal counsel to look at conflicts with existing policies. The only caution is in regard to intellectual property issues around patents and trademarks. As soon as information is made public it starts the clock on a patent process and we want to make sure materials are not made openly available until the inventor has gone through the patent or trademark process. None of the information would be open until the article was published. The thinking is it would be easier for faculty to send a copy to the publisher and one to the institutional repository at the same time. Faculty would need to be clear about how long they want the embargo period to be. Prof. Kinney asked why the policy is just for journals and not books. Prof. May said we are starting with one thing at a time. Mr. Schafer said one discussion at the Rules Committee meeting was on the roll-out process and how best to involve faculty in the proposed policy. The proposed policy is supported by the Provost, Vice Chancellor Malone, and the Faculty Senate Rules Committee. We need to make sure to communicate with faculty what exactly the policy is, the implications it would have, and what rights they would retain, especially as there are more federal mandates. This policy is not cutting edge for academic institutions; we are following some very strong leads from institutions like MIT, Harvard, Princeton, and UC Berkeley.

Comments from RLC members:
Who can provide advice on what to sign or not sign? Mr. Schafer: We would provide faculty with a statement to give the publisher saying the university has non-exclusive rights. A waiver from the university’s license is available.

At the UMass Medical School, after an open access policy went into effect, there was pushback from a small number of people who were editors from some of the journals. The journals’ interests may not be perfectly aligned with this policy. Ms. Billings commented that times have changed since then and a lot of the research is publicly available.

Is there some value for having material available before it is in print? Mr. Schafer: That would be the author’s choice.

Ms. Billings: Post peer-reviewed manuscripts in the repository can contain a link to the complete document.

Ms. Dougherty: Journals and books are very different. The business model is changing everywhere. For journals, it’s a good idea. For books, it’s much more complex because the labor is much more complex.

Mr. Schafer: One of the goals of the policy is to create a collection of work by UMass Amherst faculty and promote our faculty’s research.

Was Laura Quilter involved with this? Is the university allowed to authorize a translation, have a public performance, or reprint a collection as a one-off volume? Ms. Billings: Yes, Laura Quilter was involved. This is exactly the same policy as Harvard uses. It needs to be non-exclusive and irrevocable. An author could have a Creative Commons license and specify that they don’t want derivatives made. Prof. Ogilvie: The policy provides the university with not only the non-exclusive right to distribute, but a non-exclusive right to do anything.

Prof. Kinney: Has the letter gone out to faculty? Mr. Schafer: Not yet. It will go out in the next month.

Can this policy be mentioned outside of RLC? Mr. Schafer: Yes. It’s been approved by the Research Council and was distributed at the Faculty Senate meeting.