ASSOCIATION OF SOUTHEASTERN RESEARCH LIBRARIES

Fall 2014 Membership Meeting
Meeting Minutes
November 19-20, 2014
Hyatt Atlanta Midtown | Avalon Room
125 Tenth Street, N.E.
Atlanta, GA 30309

Participants

Auburn University: Bonnie MacEwan
College of William and Mary: Carrie Cooper
Duke University: Robert Byrd
East Carolina University: Jan Lewis
Emory University: Yolanda Cooper, Lisa Macklin, Lars Meyer
Florida State University: Julia Zimmerman
George Mason University: John Zenelis
Georgia Institute of Technology: Kathy Tomajko
Georgia State University: Laura Burtle, Tammy Sugarman
HathiTrust: Mike Furlough
Ithaka S+R: Roger Schonfeld
Johns Hopkins University: Elizabeth Mengel
Kilpatrick Townsend & Stockton LLP: Andrew Pequignot
Louisiana State University: Stanley Wilder
Tulane University: Lance Query
UNC Chapel Hill: Carol Hunter
UNC Charlotte: Jay Raja
UNC Greensboro: Beth Bernhardt

University of Alabama: Lou Pitschmann
University of Alabama at Birmingham: John Meador
University of Central Florida: Barry Baker
University of Florida: Judith Russell
University of Georgia: Toby Graham
University of Kentucky: Terry Birdwhistell
University of Louisville: Bob Fox
University of Memphis: Sylverna Ford
University of Miami: Chuck Eckman
University of Mississippi: Julia Rholes
University of South Carolina: Kate Boyd, Tom McNally
University of South Florida: Bill Garrison
University of Virginia: Carla Lee
Vanderbilt University: Jody Combs
Virginia Commonwealth University: John Ulmschneider
Virginia Tech: Julie Speer
ASERL: John Burger, Cheryle Cole-Bennett

Wednesday, November 19, 2014
1) **Welcome and Introductions**
   ASERL President Tom McNally called the meeting to order at 1:12pm. He recognized new Deans: Toby Graham (UGA), John Meador (UAB) and Stanley Wilder (LSU) – as well as guests. Each participant was given 20 seconds to introduce themselves and share something happening in their library, ask for assistance with an issue, etc. as an icebreaker.

2) **Presentation & Discussion: Aftermath of the GSU Decision: Practical Realities, Possible Future Impacts** – *Laura Burtle, Georgia State University Library; Lisa Macklin, Emory University Libraries; Andrew Pequignot, Kilpatrick Townsend & Stockton LLP*
   The panelists noted the overall decision from the Appellate Court appears to be favorable for libraries. However, the 1 chapter/10% guidelines provided by the district court – which some

ASSOCIATION OF SOUTHEASTERN RESEARCH LIBRARIES
c/o Georgia State University Library – Administration Suite, LS7
100 Decatur Street, SE
Atlanta, GA 30303-3202
Telephone: 404-413-2896 | **Web:** www.aserl.org

people thought were too specific – are now voided. The checklist GSU had been using is now out of date. Lisa Macklin discussed the prospect of compulsory licensing – if the work can be licensed then the universities must pay for it. This would remove any options for fair use. The group also discussed the relationship between universities and university presses. These publishing contracts should be reviewed, as some Ups are very conservative in their contract language. It was noted that the American Association of University Presses (AAUP) supported the publishers who were suing GSU -- feels like universities are arguing against themselves.

When asked about the impact of ASERL's amicus brief, noted the GSU appeal was very close, and could have gone a variety of ways. ASERL's brief was effective in establishing some key points that resulted in a mostly-good decision for GSU, especially in establishing that GSU practices are within the norms for the profession, Additionally, ASERL's amicus brief was one of two briefs that focused on the spectrum of transformative use in fair use evaluations. This may have fended off a binary interpretation of transformativeness (e.g., a use must transform the original work in some way in order to be a fair use). Had the court decided differently on this point, much of the overall decision would have been different.

3) **Presentation / Discussion: HathiTrust: Forecast for the Future, Ways ASERL Can Help** –
Mike Furlough, HathiTrust.
Mike is newly installed at HathiTrust, previously at Penn State and UVA. He described key accomplishments in HT's history and his expectations for future developments. His PPT is available at: http://www.aserl.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/12/M_Furlough_ASERL_11_2014.pdf

4) **Panel Presentation & Group Discussion: Pros and Cons for Joining HathiTrust, plus Other Ways Libraries can Support Mass Digitization** – *Carla Lee, University of Virginia; Bonnie MacEwan, Auburn University*
Bonnie and Carla discussed their reasons for joining HathiTrust – largely to support long-term sustainability of the electronic corpus, but also to provide access to disabled users and surrogates for brittle/damaged books. Non-members can also provide access to HT's content for visually impaired users and to limited access to out-of-copyright materials. (Non-member access to materials that are out of copyright are limited to single page downloads whereas members can download full content.)

HathiTrust has a commitment to preserve specific formats, and is seeking to collect new publications as well as foreign publications. Carla has found HathiTrust to be stronger in History, English – less in Science & Technology.

Auburn is just in the process of joining HathiTrust and has partnered with the Disabilities department on campus to help fund the membership costs. Auburn is also looking to link to HathiTrust's digitized FDLP content rather than retaining local print copies.

At this point, UVA has not weeded much of its collection based on the availability of e-content via HathiTrust. Auburn expects to heavily weed their FDLP collection.

Judy Russell noted that UF and FSU employed a membership model that allows other academic libraries in the state to have access to some HT content and services while splitting the UF/FSU costs among a larger group of libraries.

Carrie Cooper noted that it was difficult to get the detailed holdings data needed to get a price quote from HathiTrust. Perhaps a simpler membership model would be easier to manage and communicate to prospective new members.

5) **Group Discussion: The Whys & Hows: Optimizing In-House Resources for Digitization.**
Opening Comments: Kate Boyd, University of South Carolina, Lars Meyer, Emory University
See PPTs at: http://www.aserl.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/11/ASERL-why-digitize.pptx and
http://www.aserl.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/12/L_Meyer_ASERL_Nov_2014.pdf

Kate and Lars highlighted the benefits of in-house digitization, notably the ability to provide more/better access to heavily used materials, and to highlight rare and unusual content held by the library. Digitization can also help protect fragile materials that might get damaged during physical use.

The presenters noted that more assessment on usage of digitized content is needed to establish benchmarks (how much usage is "good"?). They also seek comparisons between the use of digital content versus the physical counterparts. Ideally, such assessment could link usage of digitized materials with student success metrics.

Lars noted ongoing technology changes are challenging, as well as the need to store more and more digitized content. The costs for digital storage and for staffing to create, describe, and manage these collections in the long germ are not well documented. Lars noted that Emory is currently spending more to create new content than to create metadata for e-content – a change from the not-too-distant past.

At this point, both Emory and USC manage and store most of their digital content in-house. Emory may store content with HathiTrust in the future as an additional layer of safekeeping. USC expects to keep those services in-house for the foreseeable future, and is in the process of being TRAC certified.

Thursday, November 20, 2014
The meeting was called to order at 8:30am. John Burger read a message from Julia Zimmerman regarding the shooting that took place at the FSU Library overnight. For obvious reasons, Julia returned to Tallahassee soon after the news broke.

6) **Discussion Tables: Open-Ended Conversations with Colleagues about Emerging Topics in ASERL Libraries.**
Members self-divided to discuss the following topics:
- Interest in a Shared / Cooperative ILS
- Library as Place – Events & Community Engagement Strategies
- Interest in a Multi-Institutional Assessment of Monograph Collections
- Assessment strategies with links to student success
- Research Info Management Systems & Networking Platforms
- Use of Faculty Impact Metrics/Tools (InCite, SciVal, PlumX, etc)
- Retraining subject liaisons for new roles (schol-comm, data management, etc.)
- Ad hoc discussion, Library Security - in light of the FSU situation

Following the discussions, Carrie Cooper reported that there was interest among the Shared/Cooperative ILS group in holding an in-person meeting to discuss the options, and

possibly invite vendors to demonstrate their capabilities. She is offering to host such an event at College of William and Mary sometime in Spring 2015.

7) **Small Group Discussions: ASERL's Membership Criteria: What Makes a Library a 'Research Library'?**
Tom McNally provided a brief overview of the topic as the basis for the discussions. ASERL's expenditure threshold is increasing by an average of $185,000 per year – faster than most library budgets. Two members have already fallen below the threshold; others are not far off. In the past, the threshold has served members well to help maintain library funding. Funding realities are such that the threat of loss of ASERL membership is no longer a sufficient argument to increase a declining budget. As an aside, the membership criteria used by the Greater Western Library Alliance (GWLA) were also shared with the group to help fuel discussions.

Discussion reports:
- There was unanimous agreement that being a 'research library' isn't just about money. These libraries share similar missions, values and programs. Members pointed out that it is critical that ASERL stay focused on these critical commonalities.
- Members were concerned that changing membership criteria may lead to long-term unpredictability for membership. They agreed it was important for ASERL to have the ability to control growth and ensure members share key principles in order to maintain a strong community of interest.
- There was support for the concept of "*once a member, always a member.*" Once a library has been admitted to ASERL, they can remain a member as long as the library is actively contributing to the organization's programs.
- Other thresholds/markers for evaluating membership might include criteria other than Total Library Expenditures, such as the institution's overall investment in research activities, investment in special collections, level of digitization activity, the percentage of the budget that the library receives from the institution, Carnegie classification for research activity, and a fair balance of borrowing/lending transactions (to ensure a library doesn't over-rely on borrowing collections from others.)
- The goal is to retain members, especially those who have been contributing for a long time. There is concern that if a library participates in one of the print retention programs and loses its ASERL membership, what happens to the retention commitments? Such a loss could weaken the larger initiative.

Sylverna Ford (U-Memphis) closed the discussion by sharing her perspective from a library that is at risk of losing membership. They are in the probation period; their university is currently facing a $25 million deficit. As a result, there is no way she can expect the library to get the $1millon needed to reach the expenditure threshold. They actively participate in a number of ASERL programs, are long-standing members, and they want to continue. She worries that if they lose ASERL membership the lack of any threshold/benchmarks might accelerate the de-funding of the library.   She urged ASERL to develop criteria that do not rely solely on budget data for membership.

8) **Presentation / Discussion: Analyses of Ithaka's Local Surveys on ASERL Campuses** – *Roger Schonfeld, Ithaka S+R.* PowerPoint available at: http://www.aserl.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/12/R_Schonfeld_ASERL_11_2014.pdf
Roger described the findings from the recent local surveys on 8 ASERL campuses, and explained that the Ithaka is more interested in providing data that enables libraries to plan for the right strategies for future services. This includes addressing the needs of faculty and their

research practices, and ensuring that collections, formats, and discovery tools are aligned to meet user needs.

Roger also noted that Ithaka will be launching a new tool to assess library services from the student perspective in the future. UNC-CH was a pilot project for this endeavor. The goal is to gain a clearer understanding why students attend the university and what they expect to get out of the university's libraries.

Ithaka will offer workshops on various facets of these topics starting at ALA Midwinter.

9) **Late Breaking News, Project Announcements, etc.**
   - Deeply Rooted Digital Collection – PowerPoint available at: http://www.aserl.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/11/Deeply_rooted_samples1.pptx. Stephen Cunetto and John Burger highlighted some content that has been pledged for this collection. The Deeply Rooted collection will be hosted by the Digital Public Library of America, using a metadata schema created by the University of Minnesota for their DPLA-hosted content. Additional content will be sought from ASERL libraries in Spring 2015.

   - Nominees are sought for ASERL 2015 Board Slate – Board descriptions available at: http://www.aserl.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/11/ASERL_Board_Position_Descriptions.pdf; Board service MOU is available at: http://www.aserl.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/11/ASERL_Board_Service_MOU.pdf.

     ASERL needs three people to serve on the Nomination Committee as well as volunteers for upcoming Board vacancies – 2 at-large members and a President-Elect. John Burger noted that those who serve on the Nominations Cmte, cannot also be on the Board slate.

   - The ASERL Board recently established new policies for Record Retention, and Whistleblower Protection to comply with IRS requirements.

   - Scholars Trust - Judy Russell gave a brief update on opportunities for participation in Scholars Trust, particularly as they relate to the Land Grant institutions for agriculture journals. Judy is also reaching out to HBCU-Land Grant institutions to invite their participation. Clemson had previously expressed a willingness to corral interest for retaining journals related to Architecture. Members were asked to consider if there might be other disciplines that would be good candidates to expand Scholars Trust.

   - ASERL Annual Report – The goal is to highlighting the programs/services as well as the value of membership and a desire to offer more transparency regarding ASERL's finances. This report is available via the ASERL website. Additional printed copies can be made available if desired.

   - ASERL Spring 2015 Membership Meeting will take place May 5-6, 2015. Location to be determined. Miami was suggested; other suggestions are welcome

Meeting Wrap-Up / Questions & Answers / Adjourn
Tom McNally adjourned the meeting at 11:45am.