ASSOCIATION OF SOUTHEASTERN RESEARCH LIBRARIES

a s e r l

Fall 2013 Membership Meeting
Meeting Minutes
November 19-20, 2013
UNC Charlotte City Center, Room 1104
320 East 9th Street
Charlotte, NC 28202

Participants

Auburn University: Bonnie MacEwan
Clemson University: Kay Wall
College of William & Mary: Carrie Cooper
Duke University: Robert Byrd
East Carolina University: Jan Lewis
Florida International University: Anne Prestamo
Florida State University: Julia Zimmerman
George Mason University: John Zenelis
Georgia Tech: Catherine Murray-Rust
Georgia State University: Tammy Sugarman
Johns Hopkins University: Barbara Pralle
Louisiana State University: Elaine Smyth
Mississippi State University: Stephen Cunetto
Tulane University: Lance Query
University of Alabama: Jason Battles
UAB: Jerry Stephens
University of Central Florida: Barry Baker

University of Florida: Judith Russell
University of Georgia: Bill Potter
University of Kentucky: Mary Beth Thomson
University of Louisville: Bob Fox
University of Memphis: Sylverna Ford
University of Miami: Yolanda Cooper
University of Mississippi: Julia Rholes
UNC Chapel Hill: Sarah Michalak
UNC Charlotte: Stanley Wilder
UNC Greensboro: Rosann Bzairjian
University of South Carolina: Tom McNally
University of South Florida: Bill Garrison
University of Tennessee: Steven Smith
Vanderbilt University: Connie Dowell
VCU: John Ulmschneider
Virginia Tech: Brian Mathews
Wake Forest University: Lynn Sutton

Staff & Guests

ASERL: John Burger, Cheryle Cole-Bennett
Education Advisory Board: Matthew Pellish

IBM: Laura VanTine
Wake Forest University: Jim Dunn

Tuesday, November 19, 2013

1) **Welcome and Introductions**
   ASERL President Lynn Sutton called the meeting to order at 1:03pm. Participants introduced themselves. Electronic clicker devices were distributed and Lynn explained how an electronic polling system would be used to gather audience perceptions during the strategic planning & budget discussions.

2) **ASERL Strategic Planning & Budget Updates**
   Tom McNally provided an overview of the draft changes to ASERL's Strategic Plan (see handouts), noting that the document reflects the organization's foreseeable strategic directions rather than representing a larger strategic planning document. He noted that each President-Elect will have the responsibility of reviewing the plan annually to make sure it is up-to-date and reflects

the priorities of the organization. The draft was circulated to membership prior to the meeting; no additional comments were raised in response to Tom's draft.

Meeting participants were polled for their responses to two strategic planning questions - one pertaining to overall satisfaction with ASERL membership, the second pertaining to the growth of ASERL programs.

MEMBER INPUT QUESTION 1: Overall, are you satisfied with the value you get from your membership in ASERL? **26 Responses**
- very satisfied **92%**
- somewhat satisfied **8%**
- somewhat dissatisfied **0%**
- very dissatisfied **0%**

MEMBER INPUT QUESTION 2: ASERL's programming has grown significantly in recent years. Do you support further programmatic growth in the future (and the higher costs that are likely to be needed from members to support that growth)? **22 Responses**
- Yes, I strongly support further growth of ASERL programs **32%**
- Somewhat support further growth – but need to balance competing funding priorities **59%**
- I'd prefer ASERL's programs to stay approximately the same **9%**
- I am unhappy with the changes in ASERL – I would prefer ASERL to return to a small, inexpensive networking organization **0%**

Lynn Sutton and John Burger next gave an overview of proposed budget document (projections through June 30, 2017), and noted the impact created by the recent loss of two member libraries (Air University and the University of Maryland.) John explained that no additional loss in membership is expected, but the budget uses a model of $n-1$ to provide some cushion in case of unanticipated loss. Any funds unused in a budget year would be deposited into ASERL's discretionary fund for use by the Board.

John also reviewed the software maintenance expenses for the Journal Retention Needs and Offers (JRNL) database and the Collaborative Federal Depositories Program Disposition database. These programs have an estimated ongoing maintenance cost of approximately $12,750 per year. Three scenarios were presented for raising the funds to cover these maintenance costs. John clarified that – if approved – the budget change would take affect FY 2014/2015.

Participants reviewed the three software maintenance funding scenarios via small group discussions at each table, after which members used clickers to respond to the following poll questions.

MEMBER INPUT QUESTION 3:   In general, do you support modest annual increases in dues for ASERL? **25 Responses**
- Yes **80%**
- No **0%**

> - Maybe **20%**

> MEMBER INPUT QUESTION 4: Considering this budget proposal in particular, would you support this level of dues for the coming years? **24 Responses**
> - Yes **88%**
> - No **0%**
> - Maybe **13%**

> MEMBER INPUT QUESTION 5: Are you willing to pay extra to support the continued maintenance of the software tools for ASERL's gov-doc and journal retention programs? **23 Responses**
> - Yes **78%**
> - No **4%**
> - Maybe **17%**

After general discussion, Jerry Stephens made motion to accept Budget Scenario 1, with seed money for the software maintenance fund to be billed in Spring 2014. This motion included only the "one-time seed money" identified within scenario 1 – it does not represent the additional $350 annual surcharge in the dues schedule for subsequent years. Bonnie McEwan seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Because the 2014/2015 budget had been approved previously by membership vote, Jerry Stephens made a second motion to amend the 2014/2015 budget, to increase dues by $350 per institution, and to approve the annual maintenance for the succeeding two years. Bonnie McEwan seconded. This proposal would build the software maintenance fee into a line item in future budgets, to establish a continuing stream of funding to support software maintenance costs into the future. Passed unanimously.

A vote to approve the proposed 2015/2016 and 2016/17 budgets will be conducted at the April 2014 meeting. John will amend the proposed budget to include the line for software maintenance approved at this meeting.

3) **Webcast: Analysis of Oral Arguments in GSU e-Reserves Appeal**
   In the lawsuit brought against Georgia State University by Cambridge University Press, Oxford University Press, Sage Publishing, and funded largely by the Copyright Clearance Center, GSU prevailed 94 out of 99 items in question. Nonetheless, the plaintiffs appealed the court's decision, and in April 2013 ASERL filed an amicus brief in support of GSU. Oral arguments in the publishers' appeal of the ruling took place this morning (11/19/2013) in Atlanta. GSU hosted a webcast of an expert panel to analyze the morning's arguments. See http://bit.ly/1fcsOvu for the recording of the webcast.

   The panel noted that although the policy that GSU had adopted was very similar to those implemented at many other institutions and approved by some publishers, the Appeals Court judges expressed skepticism about the validity of the GSU policy and process. On the other hand,

the judges noted it would be difficult to write an injunction about the use of books that have not yet been written. No date for the ruling from the appeals court is known.

4) Panel Presentation/Open Forum: Financial Outlook for Higher Education, and Impact on Research Libraries

Mathew Pellish, Director of Strategic Research for the Education Advisory Board, opened the discussion noting that American higher education is a business model under threat. Moody's downgraded the industry as a whole in early 2013 – this decision has been questioned by other financial analysts.

He also discussed MOOCs and the Gartner hype cycle: The initial wave of excitement about MOOCs has quickly led to a "trough of disillusionment". It remains to be seen how MOOCs will fit in to the long-term strategy for higher education. Their sustainability remains a significant unanswered question.

James Dunn, Chief Investment Officer Wake Forest University, followed with a wide-ranging discussion about the role of finance in higher education. He noted that – in financial terms – non-profit 4-year institutions outperform for-profit schools and two-year institutions. Performance-based funding models are becoming more common for state-funded colleges and universities, adding new complexities for campus financial managers. He also noted the downgrading by Moody's equated to a loss of revenue for colleges and universities, as funds are now more expensive to borrow. Challenges in student retention, at-risk populations, and declining high school graduates also pose risks for universities. He spoke eloquently about the ROI for universities as very different than other sectors – outcomes are frequently about long-term relationships, student success, and civic good rather than dollars & cents.

5) Member's Reception – at Levine Museum of the New South, 200 East 7th Street, Charlotte. Hosted by UNC Charlotte Libraries.

Wednesday, November 20, 2013

6) Late Breaking News, Project Announcements, etc.

- **Environmental Scan from Collaborative Federal Depository Program**
  Julia Rholes and Cheryle Cole-Bennett gave an overview of the preliminary results of the survey conducted with Government Documents Coordinators and Deans/Directors of the Centers of Excellence libraries. Approximately 70% of the COE Coordinators and 60% of the Deans/Directors had been interviewed to date. The expectation is that all COEs will be represented in the final report. The preliminary report is available on the ASERL website.

  Participants were also polled as to their support for a Summertime Summit to be held for Government Documents Librarians in 2014 -- five years since the last time the librarians under the CFDP program. Response to the idea was lukewarm -- approximately half of the participants supported the idea.

- **Expansion of ARL Position Description Bank**
  Judy Russell provided an update about the ARL Position Description Bank, which now contains more than 1,000 job descriptions. Judy thanked ARL for making the program available beyond their membership. There is no cost for non-ARL libraries to use the system, though an existing ARL member has to serve as the liaison for non-ARL users. ASERL is the first consortium outside ARL to add users. Brian Keith (U-Florida) and Tiffany Allen (UNC Chapel Hil) will serve as ASERL's liaisons. Registration is easy and hopefully ASERL deans/directors will promote the program to their HR Departments.

  Jason Battles commended the service, noting the University of Alabama had been a beta user and found it to be very helpful in developing position descriptions.

  Judy also provided a brief update to JRNL (Journal Retention Needs Lists) database. She reported that there were currently 27 registered users with 51 holding locations. Most of the retention data has been migrated from the spreadsheet to the JRNL software to permit better manipulation of data.

- **Follow-up from ASERL Summertime Summit on Data Management Roles for Liaison Librarians**
  John Burger reporting strong attendance at the Summit, and participants asked that this type of event be held every-other year in the future. He noted many librarians seem to be struggling with these new roles. John also noted that confluence of Open Access and Data Management as topics needs to be resolved – the two are distinct and different matters. The Summit Planning Committee suggested ASERL create a Visiting Program Officer (VPO) for data management in 2014. The ASERL Board has voiced preliminary support for the concept.

- **"Deeply Rooted" Collaborative Digital Collection for Agricultural & Rural History**
  John noted there are several projects involving Ag-related content involving ASERL libraries, and this seems to be causing confusion:
    o ASERL's Ag Journals project – seeking to retain print versions of "core" journals related to agriculture as a field of study;
    o ASERL's Ag Documents project – seeking to divvy-up retention of legacy print documents published by the USDA;
    o The Land Grant History project created by history professors in partnership with APLU, to document the history of land grant institutions;
    o ASERL's new Agricultural / Rural History Shared Digital Collection project, tentatively called "Deeply Rooted."

  For the last item, Mississippi State has agreed to provide staffing to lead the project development within ASERL. John noted there is emerging consensus that a separate portal for this project is not needed; instead the metadata with be provided to DPLA. ASERL deans/directors agreed with the overall concept, assuming that the ASERL content can be "siloed" within DPLA so that ASERL members' content could be discovered as a distinct collection. John & Stephen Cunetto will post a call for Steering Committee members to help plan / implement this project in early 2014.

- **Reciprocal Reference Agreement Pilot**
  John Burger & Bonnie MacEwan are co-chairing the development of the reciprocal reference agreement pilot program. Twelve ASERL libraries are participating -- a larger group than

originally expected. The Steering Committee is having some problem with mission-creep -- in addition to sharing legacy print reference materials, there have been suggestions to look at shared staffing models. John & Bonnie are attempting to keep the project focused on on discrete, manageable phases.

- **Resource Sharing Best Practices Survey**
  John Burger gave an update on the resource sharing best practices study, conducted this past summer & fall. This is an update to the baseline study conducted in 2010. Nearly all libraries reported increased ILL transactions with fewer staff. Some are using technology to assist with the increased workload; others report staff are taking on additional roles and responsibilities. John noted that as libraries continue to build shared retention agreements, access to legacy materials could lead to an increasing demand for ILL services. He also noted many ILL staff are concerned that their jobs have changed so much they struggle with professional identity issues. The data from this survey will be published by the study team in future professional publications.

- **Cooperative Collection Proposal for Print Monographs**
  John noted the Collection Development group is considering options for a prospective agreement to divide responsibilities for collecting print monographs for the future. Such an agreement would likely be similar to the Journal Retention agreement and the Collaborative Federal Depositories Program – a library would agree to be the "center" for collecting print monographs in certain specified subject areas. Still under development – more info to come.

- **UNC Greensboro's Libraries' Support for High Impact Practices**
  Rosann Bazirjian reported on the UNCG Libraries' Support for High Impact Practices report – identifying 12 practices determined by UNCG leadership to have "high impact" on student success, and how the library supports each. She noted the document was fairly easy to put together and has been highly beneficial for the library to document how it impacts student retention and other important indicators of success.

- **Future Meeting Topics?** Lynn Sutton and John Burger asked participants for suggestions for future ASERL presentations or programs.
  - Best practices in development / fund-raising
  - Innovations in library instruction / information literacy (core curriculum – 4 competencies and how does the library get out in front of this)
  - Library support for stress management techniques for students
  - Panel presentation university presses to showcase collaborative work with libraries
  - Methods for demonstrating the link between the library and student success. (John mentioned that GWLA has completed a 3 year study on the topic of student success so this is high on the list)
  - Online literacy programs
  - Library innovation with QEP and SACS accreditation, including sharing of ASERL libraries' submissions to SACS. It was noted there have been a number of changes to the accreditation process over the past 5 years -- research success is a focus in addition to student success. John suggested that there might be interest in holding a pre or post conference in conjunction with an ASERL meeting to address the issue – or possibly a lunch & learn session at a future meeting.

7) Presentation/Discussion: "The Impacts of Retail Technologies & Services on Library Users"
Laura VanTine (IBM Global Consultancy for Retail) led off the program discussing the evolution of customer service with the retail industry: Customers want to be known not just as a customer but as a person. They want to be heard and know that the retailer has responded. They want to collaborate with service providers, working together with the seller to build a new product. The overall experience is important to building long-term relationships between provider and consumer.

Laura noted that "omni-channel" shopping is the ultimate goal for retailers. Definitions –
- Single channel shopping is defined as going to the local retailer – only using one mode (in this case, the brick/mortar outlet).
- Multi-channel shopping – going to multiple store outlets but to each individually, no inter-relationship between stores.
- Cross-channel is where a consumer purchases an item online but can return to the store – the online and local experience are integrated.
- Omni-channel -- when a retailer provides a seamless experience between online and physical-world experiences. The user doesn't think about a channel or a touch point, everything about the brand is interrelated.
- "Showrooming" is an offshoot of this – consumers shop for an item in a physical retail outlet to get a "real world" test of an item, but then compare prices and make purchases online. The retailer who provides the physical showroom does not necessarily see the benefits in purchases.

Laura asserted the art of retailing has now become the art & science of retailing. Retailers are using social media to identify trends – to analyze key terms from social media sites like Facebook and Twitter to document and forecast user wants and needs. She noted there is so much data it is challenging to analyze and glean the "best" info. Laura provided two brief videos that provided compelling real-world examples of how these ideas are being put into practice.

Brian Mathews shared his experiences with the psychology of consumer environments and applying retail market experience into the Virginia Tech Libraries. He explained there are ways to rearrange spaces to feature items of interest and ways to sequence the location of materials to trigger behaviors – for example, featuring a particular product to create interest.

In terms of physical space, Brian noted that shape, color, texture, harmony, repetition, balance, contrast, shapes, and surprise all contribute to a user's experience. He believes the "retail library" needs to be flexible with space, and find ways to reprogram spaces quickly to respond to real-world events, making them more interactive for users.

Brain talked about visual cues within libraries – when you look at a desk or service point, what does it look like? Does it express the intent of the use you anticipate? What does it mean to have the staff member standing or sitting? Does it invite a quick transaction or a longer-length interview? What behavior(s) are you trying to foster or encourage?

He noted some libraries are embracing the "store in a store" concept – offering writing centers and / or boutique services within the library. Others are adopting retail practices like visual merchandizing – using cabinets to display items that are available for loan that are difficult for a customer to describe or explain (e.g., computer adapters, laptops, etc.)

Inspired by emerging practices at Nordstrom's, some libraries are experimenting with point of need services – library staff walk through the stacks with an iPad to provide on-the-spot assistance. Other libraries are equipping study tables with built-in computer monitors to facilitate group interactions.

Brian can foresee libraries providing different spaces and equipment between daytime and evening hours to meet varying user needs. Libraries might also make changes in their spaces possibly during the semester – changes pre/post midterms, right before finals, etc.

Brian offered that libraries might be a good match for users' interest in "showrooming." Since libraries generally don't have an interest in if/where a purchase is made, libraries could be a good place for users to try things out, and then users can have the option to go elsewhere to procure them.

In the future, users may come to expect personalized spaces that allow them to change lighting, adjust wall art, color for a customized work environment. Brian also noted there is much talk about user driven spaces, but what about user driven websites?

Questions/discussion
It was noted that there is tension between traditional library values regarding patron confidentiality versus the data needed for this level of personalization. This is potentially a huge impediment for librarians to undertake these kinds of changes.

If libraries try to "up their game" – to create environments where there is something for everyone – does this also conflict with libraries' "traditional" roles? Is our role to provide/preserve collections or is it to provide useful and inviting space? This is a tough sell when seeking funding – libraries need funding for collections in addition to funding to develop spaces and other services.

In terms of traditional library roles, Brian noted that research has shown users want visual cues that they are in a library – they expect and enjoying seeing books or visual cues when in a library.

There was also discussion that nowadays a library's primary interaction with their users is online rather than a physical presence. Many libraries focus first on their physical environment, and see the web environment as supplementary – should this be reversed? How can libraries ensure relationships endure between online services and physical spaces?

Some participants noted the loss of serendipity in searching – the ability to simply browse the collections, lamenting that the techniques learned by older generations are no longer in use in today's libraries. Some "virtual brose" tools provide some sense of this, but it often feels unsatisfying.

8) **Meeting Wrap-Up/Questions & Answers/Adjourn**
John announced the Spring 2014 Membership Meeting/Annual Meeting will be held in Tampa, Florida, April 23-24, 2014.

With no additional questions or announcements, Lynn Sutton adjourned the meeting at 11:51am.