

Stony Brook University Senate Library Services Committee
Minutes
September 10, 2009

Present: Hongshik Ahn, Bushra Butt, Fiona Grady, Julitta Jo, Wolfgang Quitschke, Robert Shrock (Chair), Floris Cash, Bill Godfrey, Stephen Koch, Lindsey Levitan, Judith Lochhead, F. Jason Torre, Linshu Wang, Andrew White, Lindsey Levitan

Special Quest: Provost Eric Kaler

Agenda:

1. Introductions
2. Overview of External Library Review by Provost Eric Kaler
3. Report of the Chris Filstrup, Dean & Director of University Libraries (written report submitted).

Meeting commenced at 10AM in the University Senate Offices, Psychology Building B.

1. Introductions

Welcome Back:

The meeting was opened by Committee Chair, Prof. Bob Shrock. He welcomes back all the past members and extended his appreciation and welcome to the new committee members. A special welcome was extended to Dr. Eric Kaler, Provost and Special Guest. After the general welcome, all members introduced themselves, stating their name and department.

Committee Charge:

After the general welcome, Prof. Shrock explained the new meeting procedures, and the reasoning as to why the group was meeting in the Senate Offices. He explained that as a Senate committee had previously requested that their charge be changed as per the suggestion of Dean Filstrup, see below:

***Charge:** This Committee shall advise on all aspects of libraries and advise the appropriate administrators on the operation of the campus bookstores.*

However, after review and discussion then President, Bernard Lane, felt it was appropriate to keep the current charge as listed above but to allow the group to take what mandate it chose from the suggested new charge. This was sentiment that was shared by new Senate President, Michael Swartz, as well, both of whom emphasized the oversight aspects for the committee's coming academic year.

As such, the group's oversight responsibilities made meeting in a third party area more objective and fair, however, our previous need for AV access (one of the contributing factors in meeting at Melville Library) would be addressed by new University Senate President, Michael Swartz. He also explained that since the group would be meeting "in camera," or in private for some of its meetings, it was no longer practical to meet elsewhere. However, the committee would meet with Melville Library leadership at other times as necessity dictated or once an alternating schedule was created (to be decided upon at a later date).

Collection Development Situation:

Finally, Prof. Shrock reviewed some of the issues that the committee had been dealing with at the end of the previous academic year. He outlined the problems faced by the increasing need for more monies to

address all aspects of the collection development budget but that in particular the group had been concerned with the need for additional resources to purchase research materials still only available in the traditional analog (paper) format. He emphasized this issue by referring to a memo sent by Helene Volat, Full Librarian, on behalf of some of the Library Selectors, in which the Librarians were concerned that they would not be able to adequately provide the support needed to facilitate proper instruction across the all disciplines.

Overview of External Library Review by Provost Eric Kaler:

At this point, Dr. Kaler was asked to comment upon the funding situation.

Dr. Kaler stated that he had held the Library as harmless as possible since coming to Stony Brook, and that he had also been as generous in such funding as the current financial situation within the University and SUNY system could allow, but that the committee could not expect that to continue. No further funds were available, and he was now focusing his energies on funding sensible and logical solutions to address the problems. Two ways in which he felt the problems could partially be addressed were in the areas of 1) Better Management of resources, including elimination of duplicate services; 2) Identifying and meeting Stony Brook's unique research needs with the possible elimination of extraneous resources. He invited the committee to be part of this effort in the future. He went on to explain that this was the primary reason for his bringing in the independent, outside consultants to review the Melville Libraries, see charge note below:

Dear Members of the Library Services Committee,

Provost Kaler has informed me of the names of the people who will serve on the external review committee for the library and their charge. The charge consists of three parts:

- 1. Evaluation of the organization and management of the library.*
- 2. Benchmarking of resources and their allocation, particularly in regards to print vs. electronic resources.*
- 3. Commenting on the relationship between Melville and the HSC library.*

The people on the review committee are

*Susan Brynteson (Chair)
Vice Provost and May Morris Director of Libraries
University of Delaware Library*

*Anne Kenney
Carl A. Kroch University Librarian
Cornell University Library*

*Brinley Franklin
Vice Provost, University Libraries
University of Connecticut Libraries*

*James Neal
Vice President for Information Services and University Librarian*

Columbia University

They will be here Mon. Sept. 28 and Tue. Sept. 29. Provost Kaler said that he knows that that Monday is a holiday, Yom Kippur. Our committee is provisionally scheduled to meet with the external review committee on Monday. He will give us some more details at our meeting tomorrow.

He further explained the details of the meeting, reviewing the above listed charge and explaining that some of the details were still being worked out with the assistance of Chris Filstrup and others in the Library. The report would be due three weeks from the reviewer's departure and that it would be made available to the committee. He further went on to explain that there would also be an oral, exit summary report given to him personally on Tuesday before the group's departure, but that only some of that would be made available to the group. He closed by sharing his experience based opinion that scholarly publishing was changing and that as the University Press system changes with it, the University will need to evolve as well, and look very closely at such things as tenure requirements because it may not be realistic to think the traditional measures for success in the tenure process were still applicable, i.e. like publishing a book.

He then opened the conversation up for questions.

Q: When would the reviewer schedule be set and will the group get substantial time to meet the reviewers? The answer was it was still in process and the last of the details were being ironed out.

Q: Will the reviewers visit all the Health Science Library? The answer to this was that it was an interesting idea but the group had some time constraints and it was unlikely.

Q: The question of resource sharing with BNL as outlined in Dean Filstrup's report was raised. The questioner asked if more could be elaborated on. Dr. Kaler responded that the concept of resource sharing with the BNL was his idea, and came from the distinct feeling that a significant cost saving could be made for the two entities by pooling resources. He went on to explain he has not data on this but that he had a gut feeling it would but that they still needed to work out the details of folding in BNL faculty and researchers; the details were still being worked out and there existed some resistance to the idea by all involved parties.

Member Point: It was then pointed out that within his reference to the evolution of scholarly publishing models, there is still a substantial amount of materials that are only available in paper format and that in some disciplines, the paper format are the sole package for this needed information, such as Musical Scores. Dr. Kaler agreed with this statement and stated his feeling that the LSC would be in a good position to assist in the assessment of collection development needs for the campus, but that as the discussion ensues some areas will be exceptions to whatever the final policies become. **Note: Discussion Point to be addressed at a later date after the review.**

Member Point: Another member pointed out that Library services such as ILL do cost money even when dealing with other SUNY Libraries, and asked how such obstacles would be dealt with. To which Dr. Kaler responded that when he is faced with a problem he prioritizes, and then makes his decision, and it would be up to library leadership to do the same in all areas under them.

The discussion continued touching further upon such areas as the current "In sourcing" model being used in the library where the technical aspects of other libraries are completed by SBU Libraries. Additionally, the group talked about a more radical bargaining method whereby New York State joins with regional states to work with each other to obtain better deals with scholarly publishers and content providers; the

response was that this is not allowed under current legal licensing but it is an area to explore when legally possible.

10:30AM Dr. Kaler thanked the group and departed.

The discussion about electronic resources service providers continued with an explanation by Andrew W. and anecdote about private schools which have walked away from the larger conglomerate database providers and were able to continue services to patrons, see Cornell: <http://www.library.cornell.edu/scholarlycomm/resolution2.htm>

Library Dean & Director's Report

The following report was sent to committee chair, Bob Shrock, by Chris Filstrup, and reads as follows (the committee discussion comments on each pointed are highlighted in bold):

This is an update on library activities over the summer.

1. We brought up a new version of the online cataloging system, the first in the nation to do this.

Library representatives from Melville explained when asked that this point referred to the Library migrating to version 20, the first in the nation to do so. HSL members pointed out that they were still on a version 18 and would not be moving forward at this time as the system did not offer significant changes for their users. The discussion was furthered with an explanation of the 'hosted' vs. 'direct' catalog model was explained. It was also explained that SUNY manages catalog for many of the college campuses and is still working on the larger catalog migrations and update, deciding to only upgrade to even number versions; the Melville library is using an older version as well to deal with its in sourcing work.

2. The SUNY negotiating team of which I am the chair met several times with Elsevier. We are close to an agreement. The key components are: 1) a five year inflation sequence of 2-4-5-5-5%; Elsevier's initial offer was the same as the current license -- 5% per year for five years; each percentage point is worth about \$70K to the SUNY system. 2) SUNY Central is contributing \$930K/year to the license; this should be sufficient to keep all 59 campuses in the new license. How this subvention is distributed among the individual campuses and will it reduce our significant increase (c. \$440K/yr) is the next negotiation.

The committee reviewed this point with the assistance of HSL advisory team members who reviewed the past licensing costs under the previous license, and asked for further information on the Cornell decision, see above link. It was pointed out that it was the SUNY center Provosts who previously had said that the centers could not walk away from the table when the ceiling price hit in spite of the other campuses consensus on the strategy.

3. As part of an overall strategy to move technical services such as cataloging from the smaller, two-year campuses to the Center libraries, the library has signed a contract with Fulton Montgomery County Community College to catalog their materials for them. This work will be done on a server which hosts FMCCC's catalog. Binghamton and Buffalo have similar arrangements with smaller SUNY libraries.

The members discussed the extra work that this new initiative might be adding to the existing backlog of work that catalogers already had within Melville Library. Discussion on this point ensued with members increased concern exhibited over the lack of funding and the possible personnel issues involved in this decision.

4. Technology Learning Teaching (TLT) invested about \$100K in high tech collaborative furniture and equipment at the north end of the second floor of the Science and Engineering Library. It's a pilot to assist group learning.

5. Janet Clarke is leading a multi-university effort to design a library for the proposed SBU campus in Korea.

The question was posed as to why such an endeavor was being undertaken and if this would affect the workflow and resources to the SBU Libraries as a whole. No answer was available but it was pointed out that this is part of a larger multi-university initiative and that the planning and funding were coming from various involved partners. A final plan would be forthcoming.

6. The new library at Southampton, though lacking some furniture and equipment, opened on schedule. As soon as we make some hires, it will be open almost as many hours as the main library. We received a gift of \$100K for collections there, and we expect another \$200-300K to accept and catalog a large library that used to belong to the poet H.D. (Hilda Doolittle).

7. The BNL library consolidation is on hold until BNL restarts the initiative. The recent influx of federal funding seems to have tempered their interest. BNL scientists will be added to SBU personnel rolls on a person-by-person basis, not en masse. The numbers will be few enough that they will not affect our electronic content licenses.

See Provost's comments above.

The committee's time ended and the meeting was adjourned prior to discussion of points 4 and 7. In adjourning, the group decided that it wanted to see any documentation that was given to the external reviewers, and that all members would do their best to participate in the planned session with the reviewers. It was also further explained that the planning was being done by a number of parties, all of whom were being allowed to make suggestions, making the process both open and fair.

Immediate Action Item: Obtain copies of documentation provided external reviewers in time for the meeting on the 28th of September (Note: Meeting time was subsequently made for 12:45-2PM on the 28th). On last check, the paperwork issue was still under discussion.

Meeting adjourned 11:20AM

Meeting Minutes submitted by: Jason Torre