



**ASERL Fall 2015 Membership Meeting  
November 19-20, 2015**

Renaissance New Orleans Arts Hotel | Room: Patrons III-IV  
700 Tchoupitoulas Street  
New Orleans, LA 70130-3612

**Participants** -- Se Appendix.

**Thursday, November 19, 2015**

- Welcome & Introductions – Stanley Wilder, ASERL President  
Stanley called the meeting to order at 1pm, welcoming attendees. Attendees were asked to introduce themselves and to share something that was either going on at their institution or something that was of interest to them.
- Presentation / Discussion: To Cut, or Not to Cut? What happens if you discontinue a 'big deal' journal package?  
Steve Knowlton (U-Memphis) detailed their process for reevaluating cost pricing model against backfiles and use. They found it to be less expensive to open new subscriptions for a smaller number of titles, rather than a blanket renewal of a large subscription package that contains titles that get little to no use. There was some increase in ILL transactions as a result of discontinuing some of the subscriptions. Overall, they have found the decision to cut the bug package to be a good one.

Stephen Cunetto (Mississippi State) reported their cost assessment was not similar to that of U-Memphis. They found their costs per use would make direct subscriptions higher than the big deal subscription and were unable to discontinue the large package.

John Meador (UAB) reported that there are reasons beyond budget to keep “big deal” packages – primary political. For example, a large STEM package seems to be a “must have” for a research library. John returned access to a Big Deal package that had been cut by the previous administration, receiving much support from the teaching faculty. The cost of this subscription is being covered by the university; it is not coming out of the library budget at this time. John felt he was able to secure very favorable pricing from working with high-level executives in the publishing firm, rather than the local sales reps.

There was discussion about relying on use statistics as a measure of value. Some little-used titles might be extremely important to particular disciplines. Also – it was questioned whether every “use” really indicated use, or might it just be repeated access to the same content (using access like a filing cabinet, rather than photocopying and reusing, just download again).

The effect of cutting titles on ILL was also questioned – how to anticipate impact on ILL costs later? While the institution may initially save on subscription costs, obtaining those titles via ILL can increase costs in that area. Steve K responded that U-Memphis monitors their ILL usage by tracking link resolvers.

The comment was made that the inability to share cost models – even among ASERL membership – makes it more difficult to negotiate with large publishers, as librarians are risk averse in this area. There is a sense that publishers have a great deal of information about libraries when negotiating pricing, much more information than libraries have. There was discussion about whether the confidentiality / non-disclosure clauses in these proposals carry much legal weight.

- Small Group Discussions: Attendees broke into small group discussions, and meeting adjourned at 4pm

#### **Evening events:**

- Tours of Howard-Tilton Memorial Library, Tulane University
- ASERL Members' Reception, hosted by Tulane University Libraries -- Tulane President's Residence, 2 Audubon Place, New Orleans.

#### **Friday, November 20, 2015**

Re-convene: Stanley Wilder reconvened the meeting at 8:35am

- Discussion / Review of ASERL Strategic Priorities & Progress toward Goals

- "Reflection" discussions – ASERL's Strategic Priorities

There was general consensus that ASERL's strategic plan was on target and relevant. Some suggestions to review the document for possible overlap in some initiatives where it might be better to simplify/focus. ASERL might benefit from reducing the number of initiatives in a planning document.

Some areas that were considered vague, for example what is meant by "Collection Development initiatives." Some expressed a desire for more activity reporting from ASERL.

It was suggested that the plan examine ways to address the changing nature of staffing within research libraries.

- Feedback on Participation Levels in Existing Programs

There was consensus that attendees were generally satisfied with the pace of progress with both of ASERL's print archiving programs -- Scholars Trust and the Collaborative Federal Depository Program.

- Feedback on the Collaborative Federal Depository Program: There was some discussion on the need to re-energize the government documents initiative. John pointed out that at the

current pace; the goal of having two Centers of Excellence for each agency is unattainable, as such, the program may need to redefine “success”. Rather than trying to establish new centers, the program might focus on gap-filling for existing centers.

Space was again noted as a factor - space limitations may affect an institution’s ability to commit to the program.

Lack of awareness of the program was noted. A presentation to the deans/associate deans as to what it means to be a Center of Excellence would be beneficial. There are a number of new deans since the program was implemented and some may not be fully aware. In addition, personal contact with each of the deans could generate additional interest in the program.

- Feedback on Scholars Trust: There may not be clear understanding of the program’s intended purpose and how far down into the institution that information has been shared. Institutions may lack information about discard decisions.

#### Feedback on New Programming Ideas (Rosemont, VPO-Diversity, VPO-Special Collections),

- Positive comments on the Rosemont document, the overview was helpful. Overall, while most felt it was a worthwhile initiative, though if participation means an increase in funding and/or staffing, then want to keep our current pace. Additional funding was an over-whelming impediment. There was interest in learning more and staying engaged. Attendees would like to see a business plan, detailing expectations and what we would get for additional costs of participation. If we choose not to participate in Rosemont at this time, the Scholars Trust program could continue as is.
- New Metrics pilot. Positive support, identified as a top priority. Some desired ways to tie these measures to student success, and/or find measures that feed new business. Not data for comparing, but to contribute to the university’s mission. Quantative/qualitative – desire to find a way to use existing data to tell our story better. Integrating data effectively. Working collaboratively with the data we already have to tell stories.
- VPO Diversity/ VPO Special Collections  
Diversity continues to be as a very important initiative, over Special Collections. The recommendation was made for ASERL to create a Task Force comprised of deans to address diversity, rather than a VPO. Or, ASERL might create a combination of the two, general oversight of a VPO but integrated with a Deans Task Force.

ASERL might consider holding a diversity unconference – learning from each other – similar to the Scholarly Communication event held earlier this year.

- Feedback on Initial Long-Term Budget Projections: The group agreed the budget projections were in line with the benefits provided by ASERL.
- One additional project was suggested: Monograph assessment program. 8-10 libraries have expressed interest in using the GoldRush tool from the Colorado Alliance of Research Libraries. Participating libraries would evaluate overlap in holdings and then determine what is rare/unique, and for which retention commitments could be made. This data would be used to identify areas of interest for future programming. This project may evolve to be similar to Scholars Trust.
- Presentation / Discussion: Libraries Helping to Control Costs for Higher Ed: Support for Open Educational Resources & Library-Licensed Content in Instruction – Carrie Cooper, College of William & Mary; Christina Hillesheim, Mississippi State Univ Graduate Student Association President

Carrie introduced the topic, sharing information about a program that she held at W&M with Cable Green from the Creative Commons. During this program she learned that there is a law that students must be told what the textbook will cost be before they register for the class. She had been unaware of this law and subsequently found that W&M was not in compliance.

She noted that OER materials may not easy to find, and there is a general misconception that open textbooks are sub-par.

Christina Hillesheim is a strong proponent of OERs. OERs are beneficial to graduate students because most often their parents aren't paying for their education, they may have children of their own, and may have lower paying jobs (graduate assistants, etc.) OERs can also be valuable to undergrads because of the higher number of classes they take, but also because the intro STEM class texts are higher in cost.

How can deans help, or support the OER initiative – possible incentives:

- Offer stipends to faculty to review the OER texts, or grad students familiar with the field could review the texts as well.
- An incentive for students could be to offer of free printing services within the library.
- Libraries can create OER webpage on their sites where students/faculty can get more information about OERs.
- Library liaisons can be a good resource in sharing information about OERs with faculty.
- Offer incentives for faculty who write textbooks to ensure that their books become OERs.
- Libraries can offering publishing services/software, or offering a graduate assistantship to support faculty publishing.

Christina felt there is a strong need for basic education on the topic. Many faculty are unaware of OERs and would benefit from workshops geared toward their needs.

It was suggested that libraries establish an OER committee with library faculty/student reps to provide additional perspectives/collaboration on these resources.

How to build a staff structure to provide this kind service within libraries? Learning the publishing industry – how to publish, in what format, incorporate interactive video, or other support services. Many textbooks include curriculum support services – tests, class plans, etc. – that are the basis for why a faculty member might choose that text. Having the right tools is necessary in selling the idea of OERs to faculty.

The comment was made that some institutions may get pushback from their institution in adopting OERs because the institution receives a percentage of the sales of textbooks from local bookstores.

- Late Breaking News, Project Announcements, etc.
  - ASERL's Annual Report was in the meeting packet. This is the second year for the publication. It is also available on ASERL's website.
  - Update – ASERL Hosting & Business Service Agreements. John reported that the ASERL Board has approved contracting with Amigos to manage our bookkeeping services, with a July 1, 2016 start date. He also anticipates that Emory University will be our hosting service, providing HR/benefits for ASERL staff. An agreement is currently under review.
  - Update – “Deeply Rooted” Digital Collection. Beta testing is currently underway for the ingest of metadata. The service will use the Digital Public Library of America (DPLA) for hosting metadata and search service. Future development will be around ‘exhibitions,’ a function used by DPLA to highlight specialized content.
  - Update – National Strategy for Coordinated Print Retention Programs. Discussed earlier. John Burger and Judy Russell will attend the Rosemont meeting at ALA midwinter.
  - Updating ASERL's History? See <http://bit.ly/1MuMPAj>. John Ulmschneider suggested that as ASERL approaches its 60<sup>th</sup> anniversary, we might consider publishing an updated history of the association. He had recently digitized a 1966 publication that had detailed the first 10 years of ASERL development and noted that some of ASERL's original founders are still alive. There was strong interest in preserving the history of ASERL -- to know our past, to envision our future.

Many expressed the importance of capturing the oral histories of our original founders and other retirees while we still have them. John B. suggested seeking a grad student that is an oral history specialist to assist in the project, and if libraries are willing to contribute a small amount of funds for this effort, ASERL might provide matching funds. There was overwhelming support for this project.

- Your Pics Needed: ASERL's Holiday Card: John reminded attendees to send in their photos for the holiday card. The theme is “new library spaces”.
- Others -- Judy Russell reported that there will be a meeting of the Land Grant institutions. Paul Wester from the National Archives will be the presenter.

Adjournment: With no new business, Stanley Wilder adjourned the meeting at 10:55am.

Appendix.

## Participant List

ASERL	John	Burger
ASERL	Cheryle	Cole-Bennett
Clemson University	Maggie	Farrell
College of William & Mary	Carrie	Cooper
Duke University	Deborah	Jakubs
East Carolina University	Jan	Lewis
Emory University	Yolanda	Cooper
Florida International University	Anne	Prestamo
Florida State University	Julia	Zimmerman
George Mason University	John	Zenelis
Georgia Institute of Technology	Bruce	Henson
Georgia State University	Tammy	Sugarman
Johns Hopkins University	Liz	Mengel
Library of Virginia		
Louisiana State University	Stanley	Wilder
Mississippi State University	Stephen	Cunetto
North Carolina State University		
Tulane University	David	Banush
University of Alabama		
University of Alabama at Birmingham	John	Meador
University of Central Florida	Barry	Baker
University of Florida	Judy	Russell
University of Georgia	Toby	Graham
University of Kentucky	Diedre	Scaggs
University of Louisville	Bob	Fox
University of Memphis	Sylverna	Ford
University of Memphis	Steve	Knowlton
University of Miami	Chuck	Eckman
University of Mississippi	Julia	Rholes
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill	Richard	Szary
University of North Carolina at Charlotte	Anne	Moore
University of North Carolina at Greensboro	Beth	Bernhardt
University of South Carolina	Tom	McNally
University of South Florida	Tom	Cetwinski
University of Tennessee - Knoxville	Rita	Smith

University of Virginia  
Vanderbilt University  
Virginia Commonwealth University  
Virginia Tech  
Wake Forest University

Donna	Tolson
Jody	Combs
John	Ulmschneider
Tim	Pyatt