ASSOCIATION OF SOUTHEASTERN RESEARCH LIBRARIES

Meeting Minutes

ASERL Fall 2010 Membership Meeting Minutes
November 17 - 18, 2010
Durham Marriott Hotel
Durham, North Carolina

Participants:

Air University: Jeff Luzius
ASERL: John Burger
Auburn University: Bonnie MacEwan
Clemson University: Kay Wall
College of William and Mary: Bea Hardy
Cornell University: Anne Kenney
Duke University: Deborah Jakubs, Aisha Harvey
East Carolina University: Larry Boyer
Emory University: Xuemao Wang
Florida International University: Laura Probst
Florida State University: Julia Zimmerman, Becca Bichel
George Mason University: John G. Zenelis
Georgia Institute of Technology: Catherine Murray-Rust
Georgia State University: Nan Seamans
Mississippi State University: Harry Llull
North Carolina State University: Susan Nutter
University of Alabama: Millie Jackson
University of Memphis: Sylverna Ford
Tulane: Lance Query
UAB: Jerry Stephens
UNC Chapel Hill: Sarah Michalak
UNC Charlotte: Stanley Wilder
UNC Greensboro: Rosann Bazirjian
University of Central Florida: Barry Baker
University of Florida: Judith Russell
University of Georgia: Bill Potter
University of Kentucky: Terry Birdwhistell
University of Louisville: Diane Nichols
University of Miami: Bill Walker
University of Mississippi: Julia Rholes
University of South Carolina: Beki Gettys
University of South Florida: William Garrison
University of Tennessee: Linda Phillips
University of Virginia: Carla Lee
Vanderbilt University: Connie Dowell
Virginia Commonwealth University: John Ulmschneider
Wake Forest University: Lynn Sutton

Wednesday, April 21, 2010

Call to Order
ASERL Board President John Ulmschneider called the meeting to order at 1pm ET. Welcome & Introductions included the new dean at U of Kentucky (Terry Birdwhistell) and the retirement of Eileen Hitchingham from Virginia Tech. He also offered thanks Deborah Jakubs and her staff for assistance with local arrangements for this meeting, to the three ASERL libraries in the area that offered tours of their facilities, and to everyone who took part in the morning poster sessions.

Presentation/Discussion: 2CUL: A Model of Deep Collaboration. Anne Kinney (Cornell)
Anne likes the theme of the meeting: collaboration. The origins of 2CUL (Cornell and Columbia) stemmed from conversations with Jim Neil at Columbia seeking to create transformative and enduring partnership. When fully implemented, 2CUL would represent about 30% of shared resources, funding and collections.

Why these two? Both are research universities; Ivy League, NY State connection; each have been in collaborations previously; both have been innovative but also faced with budgetary challenges. Good that they are not in the same city—250 miles and worlds apart. They received two years of start up money from Mellon to launch 2CUL. This is NOT a merger.

Goals—increase productivity and responsiveness; reduce duplication; enhance quality. Focus: To create collective collections; share backroom functions; offer technology enhancements; and develop a new business model to support all the above.

Challenges: institutional identity & faculty acceptance; Better sense of overlaps and gaps; financial restrictions; delivery mechanisms and outreach. Question is how will this enhance the delivery of services. To focus on overlaps between the two still needs much more data; do the endowments permit this? Donors have actually responded well to the initiative; Anne thought that the hardest challenge would be to provide local reference assistance.

It is imperative to realize real savings from this collaboration. What are they committing to for both institutions—need to understand what the agreement really means. Pulled out duplications at each, but about duplications between the two—that will have to be resolved. Both institutions are acquiring less foreign language collections. Can they deliver materials in 24/48 hours consistently?

➢ First Year Progress—they have hired a shared Slavic bibliographer—paid for and located at Columbia—he provides deep reference expertise for Cornell faculty. He is actually spending more time with Cornell faculty than with Columbia, at least during this first year. Coordinating a purchasing plan for South Asian Studies—American schools are only collecting 10% of the output of India—seeking to avoid duplication and enhance the overall percentage of coverage.

Potential other areas—Latin America & SE Asia; beginning overlap examination—they currently overlap about 35% to 37%. Becomes a sizeable collection of 18M volumes.

Also functioning on Backroom Functions: shared tech processing; collective negotiations with vendors for content and metadata; connections with other libraries in other countries. Backroom Challenges: System of credits for work done on behalf of others; standard definitions of good enough; budget & funding streams; shared backend system.

➢ First Year Progress: creating a pre-order online form tool; reciprocal cataloging pilot for Turkish language materials; Chinese mainland vendor pilot; White paper on 2CULTech Services in 2015—what will tech service look like then—how much will be e-books; prepare cataloging, etc?

Technical Infrastructure: Both universities provide local cyber-infrastructures; can they bridge IR's across institutions; layering services on top; re-imagine academic computing—what is the role of the library in this domain?

➢ First year Progress: Decided not to build a joint archival repository—less mature than other operations & still committed to what they are doing; looking at a business workflow requirement for e-archives; cooperating on web archiving and data management; each party is supporting Haithi Trust and Duraspace.

Business Planning—integrating major integration of operations and services is hard; must reduce cost of overall library activities; would like to increase revenues.

➢ First Year Progress; developed process for comparing budgetary operations; identified end goal in targets for cost avoidance & savings—looking at saving 15% across the two institutions—that would be $11.4 M; submitted six joint grants.

Lessons Learned:
1. Bringing two organizations together to preserve old library models is not a good idea
2. Got to be about doing more with less—but more than just saving money;
3. Enabling prerequisites for radical collaboration are key
4. Appreciating cultural difference and need for face time; doing a lot of Skyping & video conferencing, but also meet quarterly face to face
5. Early wins are needed
6. Importance of trusted third party at the table

What will success look like?
o Need buy-ins from other departments.
o Need to expand services and collections & doesn't infringe on competing with the other schools.
o From "me and thee" to "we"
o Resolve governance, co-ownership, budgetary, legal andinstitutional issues.
o Shared measures for success and impact—having Ithaka look at hiring.
o Looking at metrics & cost avoidance.

Can 2CUL provide a model for others? Suggests we stop measuring success by money spent, should focus on increasing the levels of scholarly resources collected and preserved, and addressing challenges at the University. One area needs to be addressing attrition and graduation

Questions for Anne—
Do you share Title VI centers? No
How has the grant money be focused? Use of Ithaka for planning/consulting, plus equipment purchases and consultants for IT & other areas
Do you see other good models?
o CA system, especially thinking thru print repositories;

- o TRLN is excellent model. How does our distance make this different for ASERL?
- o CIC

Any other advice? Be pretty modest about what you want to achieve.

Presentation/Discussion
Overview of TRLN's Programs & Services. Mona Couts
TRLN is "too old to be cool" – the organization goes back to cooperative collection development agreements created first in the 1930's. Provided shared online catalog; truck to deliver materials; extended borrowing materials; licensing databases; staff training; expedited doc delivery; long history of trust and interaction & this along with location have help our success.

Other highlights:
- ➢ 1995: One provost talked about the "boldness" of the TRN initiative;
- ➢ 2007: TRLN openly "embraced ambiguity."
- ➢ Today, collections are 70% unique; only 2% of items are shared across all four libraries. Users can easily find out what all have & get it quickly.
- ➢ Started a single copy archive program—pilot—625 titles and 25K volumes;
- ➢ Succession planning—TRN Library Management Academy;
- ➢ Currently have 3.75 staff but have strong support from all of the directors.
- ➢ Digital TRLN has gone into maintenance mode;
- ➢ TRLN United—one collection, one community. What stops us from treating the 15M collection as one? Users still have to borrow from one another thru ILL and there are different procedures at different schools.
- ➢ E-books are breaking the collaborative collection agreements; share expertise; looking at ways to assign metadata across the libraries; projects must to be need driven.
- ➢ Looking at cooperating on research on African-American history.
- ➢ Search TRLN has given people faith that we can make collaboration work.

Overview/Discussion: Galileo Knowledge Repository: A Model for ASERL Collaboration?
Catherine Murray-Rust, Georgia Tech
 Call for participation; looking for others to participation in the Galileo Knowledge Repository (GKR). Georgia tech is providing IR services using D-Space to others on an outsource basis. Currently includes 10 schools in Georgia. Repository holds conference papers, ETDs, etc. GKR has grant funding for initial operations that will last for two years. Seeking additional participants for long-term sustainability and reduction of duplication of effort. Catherine will distribute additional information and call for participants as a follow-up to the meeting.

Update: Civil War Digital Project. John Burger
Hoping to have a demo of the portal but not quite ready. Distributed a list of items selected for digitization under this project; hoping to recruit additional participants.

Small Group Discussions: Desired Outcomes for Additional "Deep Collaboration" Activities within ASERL
See attached summary.

Report from ASERL Membership Committee – Lynn Sutton, Kay Wall, Barry Baker, Bill Potter
Questions from our previous meeting—should we expand our geographic area? Should we create a category of invited participants? The Membership Committee suggested a change to the bylaws -- Section 2.4 Applications and Election to Membership (see handout). There was

discussion about the 30 day revocation invite. Referred back to the Committee for further consideration and possible revision.

Discussion: Future Hosting for ASERL. John Ulmschneider, Lance Query.
Over the summer the Board charged a Task Force to consider options for hosting ASERL – whether to continue the arrangement with LYRASIS, modify it, or relocate to another host organization. The TF recommended that ASERL be housed at a member library to help staff better understand the day-to-day workings of research libraries. The Baord concurred with this recommendation. After discussion, the ASERL membership supported the Board's decision, with two abstentions.

Recess: At 4:50pm, the meeting was recessed for the night.
_____

Thursday, November 18, 2011

Re-convene: John Ulmschneider re-convened the meeting at 8:36am ET.

Membership Committee:
Membership offered a revision to the November 17 proposal regarding invited members: *"The status of these members will be reviewed by the Membership Committee every three years to ensure they continue to contribute to the Association's missions and goals, with recommendations forwarded to the Board of Directors. The ASERL Board of Directors will review the recommendation of the Membership Committee and take action as needed."*
Motion approved by 26 votes—1 opposed; 1 abstention. Bylaws will be amended to reflect this change.

Presentation: Keeping Research Data Safe (KRDS). Neil Beagrie (conference call from UK)
See the KRDS handout. The issue of how research data is retained and preserved has become a hot topic.

Background: Computational science is morphing into data-intensive science in many areas; increasing focus on research data in UK universities; faced with major budget cuts and growing interest in shared services.
KRDS produced a three-part cost model based on 8 case studies and 13 costs surveys; benefits taxonomy (link to costs);

Cost variables include service agreements and preservation choices; number of acceptable files formats; metadata; inflation, equipment, etc.

Service agreements – Getting stuff in and out costs more than keeping it. Accession cost is much higher than preservation due to staffing requirements; preservation costs decline over time. Economies of scale are important.

Show of hands for those doing data curation now: George Mason; Duke, Virginia, Vanderbilt, Clemson, Florida State (others?). Duke noted that researchers have a lot to do and archiving their data is not one of them; at Duke they are having the subject librarians to discuss this with their departments. They offered a "Data Across the Disciplines" meeting to help foster interest and collaboration. John B mentioned Purdue was successful in getting a research grant proposal that included funding for data curation at the library.

Discussion: 2010 ASERL-HBCU Exchanges.
Participants agreed there was benefit from the exchanges, would like to continue partnership with HBCU Library Alliance in future.

Program Updates:
1. Journal Retention Program—Aisha Harvey (Duke)
   Aisha is ASERL's first-ever Visiting Program Officer; working with ASERL 20% of her time. She talked about how much she has learned from the experience.
   ➢ Proposed Retention Agreement is in effect until 2035 focused on retaining journals held by ASERL libraries. See the draft MOU – minor changes since April.
   ➢ Hoping to identify best practices. OCLC has agreed to review the 583 field—this field will be used to identify when a local item is part of the ASERL journal retention project. She has also asked that OCLC to create an ASERL identifier
   ➢ Aisha noted that any titles that Duke has committed to TRLN's Single Copy Program will be extended to ASERL
   ➢ Difficulties: Diverse capacities for retention or process have become a barrier. In particular—see item 8.1: items retained for program will not be generally circulated from the facility.
   Discussion: There seems a hesitancy to commit to this. Why? The issue comes down to trust. Why can we not trust that others are adhering to their promise to keep items? This is a director/dean issue. We have to trust that others are going to do what they say. Conservative members of the staff will hide behind the nuances of this agreement.

2. Proposed Guidelines for Managing FDLP Collections—Judy Russell (UF).
   This is the 1st anniversary of the project; Deans FDLP Task Force met before this meeting. Draft was circulated broadly after the April meeting. Surveyed wide swath of the community for feedback and held a summit in Atlanta. The Summit produced a list of "Parking Lot" items to be discussed which have been resolved by the TF.

   Handouts include list of the SuDoc scheme with listing of institutions who have decided to be COE for a line. Seeking many more volunteers to complete this list. Cataloging FDLP materials for the Center of Excellence is a requirement of participation.

3. ASERL ITDIG Program – see handout.

4. Survey of Resource Sharing – see handout.

5. Kevin Smith: Copyright & IP Rulings
   a. GA State University lawasuit re: e-reserves: Deals with ongoing infringement, filed by Oxford and Sage. GSU adopted a new copyright policy use. As a state institution, they cannot be held liable for things done in the past. Injunction only applies to future action. Both sides have filed for summary judgment—plaintiffs were denied in its entirety. Summary judgment was granted for two issues—only contributory judgment will be decided. Providing the electronic reserves or course management system is not by itself contributing. Is there continuing and ongoing abuse of the fair use policy? Slightly higher standard because it is a state institution. Publishers files a motion for reconsideration based on that fact that the "judge got it wrong" not likely to succeed. Plaintiff wants to do more discovery also. GSU filed a motion to dismiss the case—under that current stance, the state institution cannot be held liable for

contributory infringement. He sees no signs that they are going to settle. Trial if it happens should be late spring or early summer. Looking a lot better for universities.

It was noted that the Copyright Clearance Center is paying part of the legal fees & she doesn't feel that this is an appropriate use of the money we pay them. Kevin noted that they are actually paying 50% of the legal costs, which is lots and lots of money. Do you think individual customers should write a letter? It was suggested that ASERL could draft a letter.

b. Duke to support COPE: Duke will provide funds to faculty if they decided to publish in an open source journal. Looking to provide an incentive to publish in an open access. Author is not eligible if grant money is available. U-Florida also has a fund, but Deans insisted that it could be used to fund even in not totally open access journal such as the Oxford model.

c. Copyright Office News: Congress recently gave higher education institutions more leverage regarding copyright exceptions for DVDs. They have not changed the definition of fair use—only the Supreme Court can do this. What Congress has done is give the ability to extract small portions of copyrighted materials; compilations of film clips are acceptable also. Must cite all sources. This exception does NOT include students, except film students.

d. UCLA lawsuit regarding digitized video: UCLA digitizes complete DVDs and load in their course management system. They have been challenged, stopped for awhile, but now have started up again. Kevin feels that UCLA's argument of fair use is very strong. Impact on the market—you can show it to one class assembled in person, why not this way? Taking precautions—only when it is part of a teacher's syllabus and plan. To be determined…

Wrap-Up/Questions
Spring meeting—April 26-27: Atlanta or Nashville?
Please complete online form to provide feedback on this meeting.

Adjournment
The meeting adjourned at 11:55AM.