

***Will Need an Intro Paragraph Here.***

### **Summary of Past Accomplishments (Melissa)**

In the years from 2000-2013 the Faculty Senate Library committee (FSLC) met several time per year to advise OSU Libraries (OSUL) faculty on key issues including, but not limited to: (1) meeting the learning, instruction, and resource needs of students, faculty and staff; (2) formulating library policies in relation to circulation, budgets, services, and development of resources for instruction and research; (3) interpreting the needs policies of the library to the University; and 4) identifying and addressing issues regarding scholarly communications, including holdings of both print and electronic journals and books. The FSLC has acted upon issues affecting the Library and its community, including Library support for new programs (Category I curriculum proposals), library funding transfer policy, revision of the library research study room policy, the library collection conspectus, library budget issues (including journal cuts), and ARL status, which are described in more detail below.

- Category I Curriculum Proposals and the Library Funding Transfer Policy: This project, begun during the AY 1999, was an effort to document the amount of money required for purchase of library materials needed to support new academic programs and departments (Category I curriculum proposals). There had been no mechanism in place in the curriculum proposal process to ensure that funding for library materials was forthcoming from either the sponsor of the new program or the central administration. Consequently, any new materials purchased come out of the library's regular acquisitions budget. The Library Funding Transfer Policy, which was approved by the Library Committee during AY 2004 and made operational in AY 2005. The policy called for the transfer of reoccurring (for four-years) or non-reoccurring (one-time only) funds from the academic unit(s) submitting a Category I proposal to the Library following final Board approval. Issues surrounding the implementation of the new policy, which required the development of a new Library Fund Transfer Form (developed in collaboration with the Office of Budget and Fiscal Planning), were finalized. The implementation of this procedure was an important accomplishment of the committee.
- Advocacy for the Libraries during Redesign and OSU 2007 Processes Over multiple years, the FSLC strongly advocated for the Libraries during the 2007 redesign process, particularly seeking to persuade administrators to re-designate the library as an academic and not administrative unit on campus. Committee members attended Senate forums and meetings with President Risser in order to express concern about the future of the Libraries. The FSLC urged the OSU Redesign Team to treat the Libraries as an academic unit with a new reporting structure and that the Libraries be protected from further budget cuts.
- University-Wide Open Access Policy: As part of a multi-year effort, FSLC members worked with OSUL faculty to draft a university-wide policy for open access of scholarly communication. This policy was based on policies in place at other universities, applies to journal articles and conference proceedings, and allows for the deposit of the final, peer-reviewed (pre-typeset) manuscript into ScholarsArchive@OSU. Input was sought from faculty around campus via presentations at departmental faculty meetings, a campaign to raise awareness was developed including a presentation to the Faculty Senate, and other open forums. OSU's legal counsel was asked to review the policy. The final version of the Open Access Policy was brought before the Senate for a vote and passed unanimously.
- Library Budget Analysis The FSLC has been in ongoing consultation with OSUL faculty regarding budget issues. The collections budget especially is a key issue for the FSLC because it directly impacts the OSU community's ability to access scholarly communication necessary for research and academics. The rising cost of serials has been an especially pressing and critical issue. The FSLC has helped the OSUL faculty by providing community feedback and by researching budget issues.

In AY 2012, the FSLC helped draft and provided feedback on the collections budget report for submission to the Provost's Office as part of an ongoing discussion of OSUL's funding. The report outlines OSUL's collections budget challenges, assesses the impact of OSU's growth on collection needs, and proposes funding models for future collection growth.

In AY 2005, The FSLC reviewed the percentage of funding the Library receives each year compared to the total University budget. An initial comparative examination was made of the percentage of support provided to OSU's library compared to library funding of our peers. A similar comparison with peer institutions was made in AY 2000.

- Scholarly Communication: Scholastic publishing, funding for serials, and scholarly communication has been an ongoing issue addressed by the FSLC. In AY 2004, the FSLC helped study the serials crisis and issued a report to the Executive Committee and the Faculty Senate. The study presented the problem of serials costs to the faculty. The Executive Committee, with the support of the Faculty Senate, formed the Task Force on Scholarly Communication for AY 2005 and the chair of the FSLC served on the task force. A report from the task force was presented to the Faculty Senate.

The FSLC also helped develop and publish a four article series on issues related to Scholarly Communication in OSU This Week to raise awareness on this issue. These articles have been archived on the Library Committee Website as well as the Valley Library website.

- Research Study Room Policy: The FSLC helped evaluate and revise the Research Study Room Policy to optimize room usage and helps review applications for room assignments and study carrels.
- Library Research Travel Grants: Since AY 2005, FSLC members have helped select winners of the Library Research Travel Grants, until funds were completely expended in 2013. The FSLC collected information on publications, presentations, and other outcomes from research supported by grants and compiled a summary report documenting the impact of the grants on the scholarly output of OSU faculty, especially in the humanities. The FSLC has advocated for re-instatement of the grants with an awareness that a new funding needs to be found.
- Undergraduate Research Awards: Since AY 2007, FSLC members have helped select the winners of the Undergraduate Research Awards, are given annually to two undergraduates, one in the sciences and one in the humanities, whose submitted research papers exhibited the most diverse and effective use of library personnel, resources, and trainings.
- Providing input to OSUL from the academic community: Over the years, the FSLC has consulted on many issues affecting OSU Libraries, including:
  - trial and implementation of the 24/5 plan (open 24 hrs 5 days per week)
  - trial and completion of the Learning Commons on the 2nd floor
  - the scan and deliver service
  - potential collaborations between OSU and UO libraries to expand visiting borrowers' privileges and reducing redundancy in collections
  - reviewing the Valley Library website
  - the Library Strategic Plan and progress in implementation
  - implementation of charge for printing services

## **Comparison to Peer Institutions (Justin)**

Oregon State's Office of Institutional Research identifies peer institutions for the purposes of planning and benchmarking. The majority of them (12 of 17) have an equivalent to the FSLC, which for the purposes of this section means a committee that serves as a liaison between a university library and its faculty governing body. That includes committees with multiple purviews including libraries. The OIR differentiates three tiers of peer institutions.

### Strategic Planning, "true," or "Orange" Peers:

Three of the four Orange Peer institutions—Colorado State, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, and Washington State—have equivalent committees. Oklahoma State does not have a library committee, but a representative of the Faculty Council serves on its Library Advisory Committee.

### “Next Tier” Peers (aspirational):

Four of the six Next Tier peer institutions have an equivalent committee. Colorado State and Washington State (which are cross-listed as both Orange and Next Tier peers) have Faculty Senate library committees. The University of Tennessee and the University of California, Riverside have Faculty Senate committees for Library and Information Technology. Iowa State and North Carolina State do not have Faculty Senate library committees.

### Top Ten Land Grants (aspirational peers):

(Note that OIR does not list ten institutions, and specifies that Cornell and UC Berkeley “were excluded because they are much higher levels.”) Five of the seven listed peer institutions have a Faculty Senate library committee. Three of those—University of California-Davis, University of Florida, and University of Illinois—have committees devoted specifically to libraries. Ohio State and Pennsylvania State have committees devoted to libraries as well as information systems and other areas. Two of the top land grant peers have no equivalent committee: the University of Wisconsin and Purdue University. (Purdue has a University Resources Policy Committee that includes the library within its purview.)

FSLC committee members compiled a list of other institutions not listed as strategic peers that do have equivalent committees, including potential regional or aspirational peers such as the University of Oregon, Portland State, the University of Washington, and Stanford University.

### **Input from FSLC Members**

The FSLC initiated an informal online survey of faculty who served on the committee at some point during the past 5 years. We asked the following two questions:

*Please provide general comments on how you viewed your experience in the FSLC. (E.g., What did you appreciate most? What could be improved? What do you see as the value of the FSLC?)*

*Please provide any thoughts on useful changes to the goals/scope/structure of the FSLC moving forward.*

Responses to the first question were consistently favorable and primarily conveyed appreciation for the role of the FSLC in exchange of information between the library and faculty. For example, one committee member responded that “having clear communication lines between stakeholders is an obvious and valuable role for the FSLC” and another noted, “I learned about the mission and services of the library, which I appreciated”. While there is not a formal protocol for distributing information received in the FSLC more broadly, one respondent emphasized that information that they received during the FSLC was commonly shared to other faculty in an informal manner. They noted that this informal information exchange was “very helpful when, for instance, I hear others in my dept. discussing something about the library--I actually do know how it [LIBRARY BUDGET] works, and can explain why it's done the way it is, which usually mollifies people”. Comments also reflected that the FSLC plays a worthwhile role in contributing to Library “policy and decisions, such as long-term study rooms and undergraduate research awards” and providing feedback over a time period when “the importance of providing access to electronic forms of publication” has been increasing.

Only three responses were received for the second question. Two of these reflected a need to formalize the role of the committee both in terms of the role the FSLC serves more broadly to faculty (“a formalization... in terms of how the information exchanged within the committee is then passed on to other faculty”) and in terms of how the FSLC responds to the needs of the Library (clarifying “what the library staff want from the committee”). The final respondent noted that the “skyrocketing cost of journals is motivating major changes in the publishing industry” and emphasized that this may be an area that the FSLC could more actively engage in moving forward (e.g., though “facilitating visits by experts on these questions to help educate the faculty and student body”).

*Will need a concluding paragraph here.*