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The Library Committee advises the University Librarian in (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 communication (e.g. print and electronic journals and books). The Committee consists of nine Faculty members, ideally providing a broad representation of academic disciplines, and three Student members, including at least one undergraduate and one graduate student, and the University Librarian, or designee, as an ex-officio, non-voting member. One faculty member may be retired.
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Resources

- John Willinsky's talk on open access
- FY 2009-2010 OSU Libraries Budget
- U.S. Open Access Policies: Report to the OSU Faculty Senate Library Committee
- Proposal for Increased Funding for the Library Research Travel Grant Program
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Scholarly Communication Articles

- Overview of Scholarly Communication Issues
- Escalating Costs of Journals [full text]
- Escalating Costs of Journals [OSU This Week version]
- Uses and Misuses of the Journal Impact Factor [edited long version]
Thank you for your interest in Open Access at OSU. On the next page, you will find a draft open access policy. We (the Faculty Senate Library Committee) are currently soliciting feedback on the draft from faculty across campus. There are three avenues for feedback:

1. Attend an open forum:
   a. Wed, 17 April, 11:00 AM-12:00 PM, LPSC 402
   b. Tues, 23 April, 2:00-3:00 PM, Valley Library Willamette Room

2. Send email to <Open-Access@oregonstate.edu>

3. Leave a comment through the library committee website:
   
   https://secure.oregonstate.edu/facultysenate/committees/ec/open_access/

**CONTEXT:** There is an increasing move towards providing public (open) access to research and scholarship conducted at universities, motivated in part by open access mandates from federal agencies. The NIH has required funded investigators to deposit manuscripts into the PubMed Central open access repository for several years; and through a recent memorandum, the Obama administration’s Office of Science and Technology Policy now requires a similar action for investigators funded through other federal agencies, including the NSF and the USDA. An OSU open access policy would position our faculty to comply with these emerging requirements, and greatly expand the accessibility of their articles. OSU would be the first major land grant university, as well as the first university in the Pacific Northwest, to adopt an open access policy, although units such as CEOAS, College of Forestry, and OSU Libraries have previously passed their own open access policies.

Please note that this draft policy is based closely on policies already in place at other universities, including Kansas, Georgia Tech, University of California at San Francisco, Duke, Harvard, and MIT. Furthermore, OSU’s Legal Counsel has reviewed a prior draft and offered suggestions. Because the issue of open access is just now receiving attention on a national scale, publisher policies regarding open access are in flux, though there is a distinct trend towards allowing more open access through institutional repositories (such as ScholarsArchive@OSU). However, to be as flexible as possible, library staff will be sensitive to publishers’ embargo periods when depositing articles into ScholarsArchive@OSU. **Faculty may continue to publish in the journals of their choice**, and waivers to OSU’s open access policy will be available.

Finally, there is an FAQ to accompany this policy draft. The FAQ provides further details on some of the language choices, as well as how the policy will be implemented. The FAQ can be found through the Library’s Center for Digital Scholarship:

http://cdss.library.oregonstate.edu/open-access

Thank you for taking time to review this policy and provide your thoughts.
In recognition of Oregon State University’s land-grant mission, the Faculty is committed to disseminating its research and scholarship as widely as possible. In addition to the public benefit of such dissemination, this policy is intended to serve faculty interests by promoting greater reach and impact for articles. Based on these guiding principles, the Faculty adopts the following policy: Each Faculty member grants to Oregon State University permission to make available his or her scholarly articles and to reproduce and distribute those articles for the purpose of open dissemination. In legal terms, each Faculty member grants Oregon State University a nonexclusive, irrevocable, royalty-free, worldwide license to exercise any and all rights under copyright relating to each of his or her scholarly articles, in any medium, and to authorize others to do the same, provided that the articles are not sold for a profit. This policy is not intended to alter a Faculty member’s claim of copyright ownership of his or her scholarly article.

The policy applies to all scholarly articles authored or co-authored while the person is a member of the Oregon State University Faculty and completed after the adoption of this policy. At the request of a Faculty member via an online form, the OSU Faculty Senate Library Committee, as the Provost’s designate, will waive application of the license for a particular article, or delay access to a particular article for a specified period of time.

To assist the University in distributing the articles, each Faculty member will provide an electronic copy of the accepted (post-peer review, pre-typeset) manuscript of the article at no charge to the appropriate representative of the OSU Libraries in an appropriate format as may be specified by the OSU Libraries (such as PDF). The OSU Libraries may make the article available to the public in its open access repository.

In coordination with the Provost’s office, the Faculty Senate Library Committee will be responsible for interpreting this policy, resolving disputes concerning its interpretation and application, and recommending changes to the Faculty from time to time. The Library Committee will report back to the Faculty Senate within three years on the impact of this policy.
Library Committee

Membership – 2013-2014

Kari Miller, Chair '15
Marit Bovbjerg '14
Hsiou-Lien Chen '14
Bruce Geller '14
Sebastian Heiduschke '15
Stacey Lee '15
Oscar Montemayor '15
Yi-Cheng Su '16
Christopher Nichols '16

Recreational Sports
Biological & Population Health Sciences
Design & Human Environment
Microbiology
Foreign Languages and Literatures
Education
Educational Opportunities Program
Food Science & Technology
History

Student Members -
- Jack Bellville
- TBA
- TBA

Ex-officio: University Librarian (Faye Chadwell)

Executive Committee Liaison – Chris Bell
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Membership – 2012-2013

Marit Bovbjerg, Chair '14  
Rich Carter '13  
Kira Hughes '13  
Hsiou-Lien Chen '14  
Bruce Geller '14  
Sebastian Heiduschke '15  
Stacey Lee '15  
Kari Miller '15  
Oscar Montemayor '15

Biological & Population Health Sciences  
Chemistry  
Forestry  
Design & Human Environment  
Microbiology  
Foreign Languages and Literatures  
Education  
Recreational Sports  
Educational Opportunities Program

Student Members -  
- TBA  
- TBA  
- TBA

Ex-officio: University Librarian (Faye Chadwell)

Executive Committee Liaison – Kate Hunter-Zaworski
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Membership -- 2011-2012

Stacey Smith, Chair '12
Naomi Hirsch (v. Williams) '12
David Myrold '12
TBA (v. Brown)
Rich Carter '13
Kira Hughes '13
Marit Bovbjerg '14
Hsiou-Lien Chen '14
Bruce Geller '14

History
Environ Health Sciences Center
Crop & Soil Science
Chemistry
Forestry
Public Health
Design & Human Environment
Microbiology

Student Members -
-
-
-

*Ex-officio*: University Librarian (Faye Chadwell)

*Executive Committee Liaison - Jon Dorbolo*
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Membership -- 2010-2011

Tara Williams, Chair '12  English
Alan Acock (v. Schwartz) '11 Human Development & Family Sciences
Elizabeth Thomas '11 Academic Success Center
Hua-Yu Li '11 Political Science
Stacey Smith '12 History
David Myrold '12 Crop & Soil Science
Lindy Brown '13 Academics for Student Athletes
Rich Carter '13 Chemistry
Kira Hughes '13 Forestry

Student Members -
-
-

Ex-officio: University Librarian (Faye Chadwell)

Executive Committee Liaison - Starr McMullen
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Membership -- 2009-2010

Tara Williams '10, Chair
Lee Sherman '10
David Noakes (v. Armas) '10
Alan Acock (v. Schwartz) '11
Elizabeth Thomas '11
Hua-Yu Li '11
Stacey Smith '12
Miranda Smith '12
David Myrold '12

English
News & Communication Services
Fisheries & Wildlife
Human Development & Family Science
Academic Success Center
Political Science
History
College of Science
Crop & Soil Science

Student Members -
- Heather Bennett
- Jeffrey Breitenfeldt (grad)
- Jimmy Rosacker (undergrad)

Ex-officio: University Librarian (Karyle Butcher)

Executive Committee Liaison - Kate Halischak
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Membership -- 2008-2009

Lee Sherman ’10, Chair
Nabil Boudraa ’09
Paul Roberts ’09
TBA (v. Yamamuro) ’09
TBA (v. Armas) ’10
Tara Williams ’10
TBA (v. Schwartz) ’11
Elizabeth Thomas ’11
Hua-Yu Li ’11

News & Communication Services
Foreign Languages & Literatures
Zoology
English
Academic Success Center
Political Science

Student Members -
- TBA
- TBA (grad)
- TBA (undergrad)

Ex-officio: University Librarian (Karyle Butcher)

Executive Committee Liaison - Kate Halischak
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Membership -- 2007-2008

Nabil Boudraa '09, Co-chair
Lee Sherman '10, Co-chair
TBA (v. Engle) '08
Michael Boock (v. Wheeler) '08
TBA (v. Walker; v. Kerkvliet) '08
Paul Roberts '09
Jerry A. Yamamuro '09
Rob Armas '10
TBA '10

Foreign Languages & Literatures
News & Communication Services
Foreign Languages & Literatures
Zoology
Civil, Construction & Environmental Engineering
Services for Students with Disabilities
News and Communication Services

Student Members -
- TBA
- TBA (grad)
- TBA (undergrad)

Ex-officio: University Librarian (Karyle Butcher)

Executive Committee Liaison - Len Friedman
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### Membership -- 2006-2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Molly Engle '08, Chair</td>
<td>Public Health/Extension Admin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evan Gottlieb '07</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah Rubel '07</td>
<td>College of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Witbeck '07</td>
<td>English Language Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Boock (v. Wheeler) '08</td>
<td>Valley Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexis Walker (v. Kerkvliet) '08</td>
<td>Human Development &amp; Family Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nabil Boudraa '09</td>
<td>Foreign Languages &amp; Literatures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Roberts '09</td>
<td>Zoology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry A. Yamamuro '09</td>
<td>Civil, Construction &amp; Environmental Engineering</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Student Members**
- TBA
- TBA (grad)
- TBA (undergrad)

*Ex-officio*: University Librarian (Karyle Butcher)

Executive Committee Liaison - Len Friedman
### Library Committee

**Membership -- 2005-2006**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Academic Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Molly Engle '06, Chair</td>
<td>Academic Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Beach '06</td>
<td>Institutional Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Ashkenas '06</td>
<td>Fisheries &amp; Wildlife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melodie Putnam '06</td>
<td>Botany &amp; Plant Pathology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evan Gottlieb '07</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah Rubel '07</td>
<td>College of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Witbeck '07</td>
<td>English Language Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Kerkvliet '08</td>
<td>Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat Wheeler '08</td>
<td>Oceanic &amp; Atmospheric Sciences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ex-Officio: University Librarian - Karyle Butcher

### Student Members

- TBA (Graduate)
- TBA(Undergraduate)
- TBA

### Executive Committee Liaison

- Moira Dempsey

---
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Membership -- 2004-2005

Gary Beach '06, Chair
Molly Engle '05
Mo Healey '05
Robert Wheatcroft (v. Gartner) '05
Linda Ashkenas '06
Melody Putnam '06
Evan Gottlieb '07
Deborah Rubel '07
Michael Witbeck '07
Ex-Officio: University Librarian - Karyle Butcher

Institutional Research
Public Health
History
Oceanic & Atmospheric Sciences
Fisheries & Wildlife
Botany & Plant Pathology
English
School of Education
English Language Institute

Student Members
- Christopher Adams (Graduate)
- Avinash Reddy Beeram (Undergraduate)
- TBA

Executive Committee Liaison - Mike Quinn
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Membership -- 2003-2004

Ken Winograd '04, Chair
Mark Edwards '04
Dianne Erickson '04
Bob Rost '04
Barbara Gartner '05
Mo Healey '05
Linda Ashkenas '06
Gary Beach '06
Melody Putnam '06

School of Education
Sociology
Science & Mathematics Education
Extension & Experiment Station Communications
Wood Science & Engineering
History
Fisheries & Wildlife
Institutional Research
Botany & Plant Pathology

Ex-Officio: University Librarian - Karyle Butcher

Student Members
- Adam Taylor (Undergraduate)
- TBA (Graduate)
- TBA

Executive Committee Liaison - Mike Quinn
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Membership -- 2002-2003

Mark Edwards '04, Chair
Heidi Brayman Hackel '03
Lawrence Landis '03
Ajoy Velayudhan '03
Dianne Erickson '04
Bob Rost '04
Ken Winograd '04
Barbara Gartner '05
Mo Healey '05

Sociology
English
Archives
Bioresource Engineering
Science & Mathematics Education
Extension & Experiment Station Communications
School of Education
Forest Products
History

Ex-Officio: University Librarian (Karyle Butcher)
Student Members -
- TBA
- TBA

Executive Committee Liaison - Dianne Erickson
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Membership -- 2001-2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heidi Brayman Hackel '03, Chair</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Horne '02</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darlene Judd '02</td>
<td>Entomology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia Twohy '02</td>
<td>Oceanic &amp; Atmospheric Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence Landis '03</td>
<td>Archives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ajoy Velayudhan '03</td>
<td>Bioresource Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Edwards '04</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dianne Erickson '04</td>
<td>Science &amp; Math Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Rost '04</td>
<td>Ext &amp; Exp Sta Communication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ex-Officio: University Librarian (Karyle Butcher)

Student Members -
- Christine Armer
- TBA

Executive Committee Liaison - Dianne Erickson
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Membership -- 2001-2002

Lawrence Landis '03, Chair
Mark Larson (v. Leahy) '01
Dianne Erickson (v. Rubert) '01
Mina Ossiander (v. Yu) '01
David Horne '02
Darlene Judd '02
Cynthia Twohy '02
Heidi Brayman Hackel '03
Ajoy Velayudhan '03

Archives
Crop & Soil Science
Science & Math Ed.
Mathematics
Chemistry
Entomology
Oceanic & Atmospheric Sciences
English
Bioresource Engineering

Ex-Officio: University Librarian (Karyle Butcher)

Student Members -
- Christine Armer (Graduate Student)
- Cynthia Ross
- TBA

Executive Committee Liaison - Vicki Tolar Burton
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Membership -- 1999-2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence Landis '00, Chair</td>
<td>Archives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Beach '00</td>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidi Brayman Hackel (v.Wade) '00</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Larson (v. Leahy) '01</td>
<td>Crop &amp; Soil Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Rubert '01</td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaio-Ling Yu '01</td>
<td>Foreign Languages &amp; Literatures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Horne '02</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darlene Judd '02</td>
<td>Entomology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia Twohy '02</td>
<td>Oceanic &amp; Atmospheric Sciences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ex-Officio: University Librarian (Karyle Butcher)

Student Members -
- Christine Armer (Graduate Student)
- TBA
- TBA

Executive Committee Liaison - Vicki Tolar Burton
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Agendas

2014

- February 14, 2014
Library Committee

Agendas
2013

- February 26, 2013
- October 31, 2013
Library Committee

Agendas
2012

- February 13, 2012
- May 14, 2012
- October 24, 2012
Library Committee Agendas 2011

- February 7, 2011
- May 9, 2011
- October 21, 2011
Library Committee

Agendas
2010

- October 11, 2010
- May 12, 2010
- February 16, 2010
Library Committee

Agendas

2009

- November 11, 2009
- June 3, 2009
- February 4, 2009
Library Committee

Agendas
2008

- September 4, 2008
- June 11, 2008
- May 28, 2008
- May 14, 2008
- April 23, 2008
- April 9, 2008
Library Committee

Agendas

2007

- February 21, 2007
Library Committee

Agendas

2006

- December 1, 2006
- October 12, 2006
- March 13, 2006
- February 27, 2006
- January 30, 2006
Library Committee

Agendas

2005

- December 12, 2005
- November 7, 2005
- October 3, 2005
Library Committee

Agendas
2004

- November 1, 2004
- October 4, 2004
- March 2, 2004
- February 3, 2004
Library Committee

2003 Agendas

- October 30, 2003
- October 1, 2003
- May 29, 2003
- April 24, 2003
- March 13, 2003
- February 27, 2003
- January 30, 2003
Library Committee

2002 Agenda

- November 21, 2002
- October 17, 2002
- June 04, 2002
- May 15, 2002
- April 17, 2002
- March 13, 2002
- February 21, 2002
- January 17, 2002
Library Committee

2001 Agenda

- January 22
- February 26
- June 12
Library Committee

2000 Agenda

- February 24
- May 25
- October 25
- November 29
Faculty Senate

Library Committee

1999 Agenda

- December 7
- October 28
- January 20
Library Committee

1998

Agenda

- November 17
Library Committee

2013 Minutes

- October 31, 2013
Library Committee

2012 Minutes

- February 13
- May 14
- October 24
Library Committee

2011 Minutes

- February 7, 2011
- May 9, 2011
- October 21, 2011
Library Committee

2010 Minutes

- October 11 2010
- May 12 2010
- February 16 2010
Library Committee

2008 Minutes

- November 11, 2009
- May 6, 2009
Library Committee

2008 Minutes

- June 11, 2008
- May 28, 2008
- May 14, 2008
- April 9, 2008
Library Committee

2007 Minutes

- February 21, 2007
Library Committee

2006 Minutes

- January 30, 2006
- February 27, 2006
- October 12, 2006
- December 1, 2006
Library Committee

2005 Minutes

- December 5, 2005
- November 07, 2005
- October 3, 2005
Library Committee

2004 Minutes

- October 4, 2004
- April 8, 2004
- March 2, 2004
Faculty Senate

Library Committee

2003 Minutes

- December 2, 2003
- October 31, 2003
- October 1, 2003
- May 29, 2003
- February 27, 2003
2002 Minutes, Library Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

Library Committee

2002
Minutes

- October 18, 2002
- March 13, 2002
- February 21, 2002
- January 17, 2002
Library Committee

2001 Minutes

- November 28, 2001
- October 18, 2001
- June 12, 2001
- April 18, 2001
- February 26, 2001
- January 22, 2001
Library Committee

2000 Minutes

- November 29, 2000
- October 25, 2000
- September 21, 2000
- May 25, 2000
- April 27, 2000
- March 30, 2000
- February 24, 2000
- January 27, 2000
- December 7, 1999
1999 Minutes, Library Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

Faculty Senate

Library Committee

1999 Minutes

- December 7, 1999
The Faculty Senate Library Committee (FSLC) met three times during 2012-2013, once per term, to advise OSU Libraries (OSUL) faculty on key issues regarding the needs of the OSU community, library policy and budget, and scholarly communication. The committee's members also served on a variety of subcommittees to assist OSU Libraries faculty in developing policies, communicating the Libraries’ budget needs to OSU administration, and selecting winners of OSUL awards.

**Accomplishments:**

**University-Wide Open Access Policy:**
FSLC members (Marit Bovbjerg and Rich Carter) worked with OSUL faculty (Michael Boock and Shan Sutton) 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. We sought input from faculty around campus via presentations at departmental faculty meetings, a presentation to the Faculty Senate, and open fora. We also asked OSU’s legal counsel to review the policy. The final version of the Open Access Policy was brought before the Senate for a vote in June, and passed unanimously.

**Library Awards & Research Rooms:**
FSLC members served on three additional subcommittees, in conjunction with OSUL faculty:

1. **Library Research Travel Grants** – Bruce Geller and Hsiou-Lien Chen (worked with Shan Sutton, OSUL faculty)
   a. Awards were made to Neal Davidson, for travel to the Irish National Library in Dublin; to Karen Holmberg, for travel to Delaware and Oyster Bay; and to Rick Setterston, for travel to Chapel Hill, NC and Berkeley, CA.
   b. The funding for these grants has ceased; they will not be offered next year unless an alternate funding stream can be identified. The FSLC notes that not offering these grants will disproportionately affect faculty in the humanities, in whose fields research grants are not common.

2. **Undergraduate Research Awards** – Kari Miller and Dan Dowhower (worked with Michael Boock and Cheryl Middleton, OSUL faculty)
   a. These 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. All of the submissions reflected creativity, care, and expansive usage of library services and materials by undergraduate students in a wide array of topic areas. Two papers in particular represented an elevated level of proficiency, and the committee unanimously selected Hannah Mahoney’s paper, "A Global Affair: Understanding 1960s Geopolitics Through the 1964-1965 New York Worlds Fair" for the Humanities Award, and Sarah Wright’s paper, "Grapevine Leafroll Associated Virus-3 (GLRaV-3) Seasonal Titer Changes and Effects on Pinot Noir Fruit in Oregon." They received their awards – which include a small scholarship – at an awards banquet held in the library rotunda during spring term.
   b. Finding a donor to endow these undergraduate awards is a high priority for the University Librarian (Faye Chadwell).

3. **Long-term research rooms** – Marit Bovbjerg and Stacey Lee (worked with Lori Hilterbrand, OSUL faculty)
a. In addition to several dozen short-term study rooms, available on a first-come, first-serve basis to anyone affiliated with OSU, the library reserves a few long-term research rooms for use by faculty and advanced doctoral students. There is an application process for these long-term rooms, during which the applying faculty member or student must demonstrate a need for protected space within the library. Three of these rooms were vacant as of the start of winter term 2013; Drs. Bovbjerg and Lee met with Ms. Hilterbrand to review the applications and selected two faculty and one doctoral student: Lynn Dierking (12 month), Thomas Bahde (12 month), and Christopher Dunn (90 day).

b. The 90-day room is again vacant; Stacey Lee will work with Lori Hilterbrand again (over Summer term) to review applications once it has been advertised.

Issues and Agenda Items for the 2013-2014 Library Committee:

- Work with the OSUL faculty to develop the library’s curriculum, currently in its early stages. Courses to be offered will include topics relevant to students of all levels, in all disciplines, such as data management and documentation.

- The library faculty have identified an issue regarding access to library online resources that is becoming more prevalent: namely, that an ONID account is required for access to such resources. There are people with legitimate need for access who nonetheless do not "qualify" for an ONID account. These include non degree-seeking students and retired faculty members. Next steps to address this issue are not yet clear.

- The College of Forestry is developing online, open-access journals for publication of student research (graduate and undergraduate, on any topic, though probably science-related), with the intention that the editorial boards and peer-reviewers also be comprised largely of students. As these students will, in turn, need mentoring, there may be a role for the FSLC.

- There is a library-funded RFA for development of an open-access, online textbook; the deadline is mid-September. There may be a role for the FSLC, as this is a new kind of endeavor for the library.

Membership - 2012-2013:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chair</th>
<th>Biological &amp; Population Health Sciences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marit Bovbjerg ‘14</td>
<td>Biological &amp; Population Health Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich Carter ‘13</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kira Hughes ‘13</td>
<td>College of Forestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hsiou-Lien Chen ‘14</td>
<td>Design &amp; Human Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Geller ‘14</td>
<td>Microbiology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebastian Heiduschke ‘15</td>
<td>Foreign Languages &amp; Literatures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stacey Lee ‘15</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kari Miller, ‘15</td>
<td>Recreational Sports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oscar Montemayor ‘15</td>
<td>Educational Opportunities Program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graduate student member: Daniel Dowhower

Ex-officio: University Librarian (Faye Chadwell)
Executive Committee Liaison: Kate Hunter-Zaworski
The Faculty Senate Library Committee met three times during 2011-2012, once per term, to advise OSU Libraries (OSUL) faculty on key issues regarding the needs of the OSU community, library policy and budget, and scholarly communication. The committee's members also served on a variety of subcommittees to assist OSU Libraries faculty in developing policies, communicating the Libraries' budget needs to OSU administration, and selecting winners of OSUL awards.

**Accomplishments**

**OSUL Collection Budget**

The committee helped draft and provided feedback on a collections budget report that Faye Chadwell, University Librarian, will submit 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. The committee contributed to the collection budget report in the following ways:

1. Committee members Stacey Smith and Rich Carter served on a collections budget subcommittee with OSUL faculty Faye Chadwell (University Librarian), Jennifer Nutefall (Associate University Librarian), Jane Nichols (Collection Development Librarian), Andrea Wirth (Collection Development and Science Librarian), and Steven Sowell (Head of Collections and Resource Sharing). The subcommittee drafted the report during one meeting in January and via e-mail circulation from February to May 2012.

2. The committee, as a whole, commented on drafts presented at the February and May meetings and the subcommittee incorporated this feedback into the finalized report, completed in May of 2012.

**Open Access and Scholarly Communication**

In the fall of 2011, the committee discussed OSUL's ongoing efforts to develop an open access policy for OSU with the goal of eventually presenting it for approval by the Faculty Senate. Although other projects drew away the committee's attention for most of the academic year, the committee hopes to pick up this conversation again in the fall. OSUL did make one significant step toward this goal: OSU signed onto the Berlin Declaration on Open Access to Knowledge in the Sciences and Humanities during 2011.

During the spring 2012 quarter, the committee as a whole discussed the boycott of Elsevier, one of the world's largest academic publishers. Elsevier's sponsorship of the Research Works Act (RWA), a proposed federal law designed to restrict open access to taxpayer-funded research, generated a worldwide boycott. Scholars refused to author or referee scholarship for Elsevier journals. The boycott highlighted the importance of educating OSU faculty and graduate students about authorial rights and open access and the committee took the following action:

1. Stacey Smith met with OSUL's committee on Scholarly Communication and Open Access to draft a press release about Elsevier's relationship to open access and the boycott. In the middle of this process, Elsevier, under pressure from the boycott, withdrew sponsorship from the Research Works Act and made the press release unnecessary.

2. The committee decided that, in lieu of the Elsevier boycott press release, we would work with OSUL's Scholarly Communication and Open Access committee to create a FAQ about authorial rights and open access to appear on OSUL's website during the upcoming Open Access Week.
Library Awards

Committee members served on two OSU Library Committees to evaluate award applications and select winners:

- Library Research Travel Grants – David Myrold and Bruce Gellar
- Undergraduate Research Awards – Naomi Hirsch

The committee also revisited last year’s unsuccessful request to the Provost's Office to increase funding for the Library Research Travel Grants. We decided that we would look into funding opportunities with the College of Liberal Arts and the Office of Research, but concluded that we needed to increase the number of applicants for the awards to make future proposals more successful.

Issues and Agenda Items for the 2012-2013 Library Committee

- Work with the OSUL Committee on Scholarly Communications and Open Access to draft an open access and authorial rights Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) page for posting to the OSUL website during the 2012 Open Access Week, October 22–28.
- Continue discussing an open access policy for OSU.
- Follow-up with Faye Chadwell (University Librarian) on ongoing collections budget discussions with the Provost's Office.
- Consult with OSUL faculty about strategies for advertising the Library Research Travel Grants, with an eye toward generating more applications and more funding.

Membership - 2011-2012:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stacey Smith, Chair '12</th>
<th>History</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Naomi Hirsch (v. Williams) '12</td>
<td>Environmental Health Sciences Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Myrold '12</td>
<td>Crop &amp; Soil Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBA (v. Brown)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich Carter '13</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kira Hughes '13</td>
<td>Forestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marit Bovbjerg '14</td>
<td>Public Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hsiou-Lien Chen '14</td>
<td>Design &amp; Human Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Geller '14</td>
<td>Microbiology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student member: Laura Cray (Graduate Student)

Ex-officio: University Librarian (Faye Chadwell)

Executive Committee Liaison: Jon Dorbolo
During the 2010-2011 academic year, the Faculty Senate Library Committee met each term to carry out its responsibility of advising OSU Libraries in the three areas outlined in its standing rules: (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 communication (e.g. print and electronic journals and books).

Accomplishments:

- Met with and provided feedback on candidates as part of the search process for the new Donald and Delpha Campbell University Librarian/OSU Press Director.
- Met with accreditation team member Steve Rollins (Dean, Consortium Library, University of Alaska-Anchorage) to discuss library-related issues as part of NWCCU accreditation site visit.
- Collected information on publications, presentations, and other outcomes resulting from research supported by past Library Research Travel Grants, then compiled report summarizing findings. Based on those findings, requested funding increase for the LRTG program (from $10,000 to $20,000 per year) from the Provost; final decision will be made as part of the summer budget discussions.
- Assisted OSU Libraries with the following activities:
  - Assigning study carrels (OSUL: Cheryl Middleton; FSLC: Hua-yu Li)
  - Evaluating Library Travel Research Grant applications-three awards in fall and four in spring (OSUL: Jennifer Nutefall, FSLC: Stacey Smith and Elizabeth Thomas)
  - Reviewing Undergraduate Library Research Award applications-two awards (OSUL: Jennifer Nutefall; FSLC: Lindy Brown)
- Consulted on critical issues affecting OSU Libraries, including:
  - Full implementation of the 24/5 plan (keeping the library open for 24 hours 5 days of the week) after last spring's trial
  - Completion of the Learning Commons on the 2nd floor
  - LibQual survey results and next steps
  - Open Access and the Scholars' Archive (including a possible resolution on Open Access for the Faculty Senate's consideration)
  - Budget needs and priorities
  - Scan and deliver service

Issues and Agenda Items for the 2011-2012 Library Committee:

- Continue to support (and increase awareness of) Open Access initiatives, with particular attention to how non-STEM disciplines may be affected.
- Consider the possibility of an Open Access initiative similar to those in use at MIT, Harvard, and the University of Kansas.
- If necessary, follow up on request to Provost for additional funding for the Library Research Travel Grant program; if that request is approved, work to implement promised changes to the program.

Membership - 2010-2011:

Tara Williams '12, Chair  
Alan Acock (v. Schwartz) '11  
Elizabeth Thomas '11  
English  
Human Development & Family Sciences  
Academic Success Center
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hua-Yu Li '11</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stacey Smith '12</td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Myrold '12</td>
<td>Crop &amp; Soil Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindy Brown '13</td>
<td>Academics for Student Athletes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich Carter '13</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kira Hughes '13</td>
<td>Forestry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Ex-officio: Interim University Librarian Faye Chadwell*

*Executive Committee Liaison: Starr McMullen*

(Associate University Librarian Jennifer Nutefall also attended meetings to advise and consult with the FSLC.)
During the 2009-2010 academic year, the Faculty Senate Library met each term to carry out its responsibility of advising the University Librarian in the three areas outlined in its standing rules: (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 communication (e.g. print and electronic journals and books).

**Accomplishments:**

Assisted the Valley Library with the following activities:
- Assigning study carrels (VL: Cheryl Middleton; FSLC: Elizabeth Thomas)
- Evaluating Library Travel Research Grant applications – 9 submissions, 3 awards (VL: Faye Chadwell, FSLC: Stacey Smith)
- Reviewing Undergraduate Library Research Award applications – 4 submissions, 2 awards (VL: Jennifer Nutefall; FSLC: Tara Williams)

Consulted on critical issues affecting OSU Libraries, including:
- The trial of the 24/5 plan (keeping the library open for 24 hours 5 days of the week)
- The creation of the Learning Commons on the 2nd floor
- Possible uses for space opening up on the 4th floor (faculty research commons, graduate student work space, etc.)
- Open Access and the Scholars’ Archive
- Collaborations between OSU and UO libraries on expanding visiting borrowers’ privileges and reducing redundancy in collections
- ASOSU proposal to make course materials available on reserve in the library

Had website for FSLC resources created (currently posted: library budget presentation and John Willinsky’s talk on open access): [http://oregonstate.edu/senate/committees/library/res/index.html](http://oregonstate.edu/senate/committees/library/res/index.html)

Formed a subcommittee to focus on Open Access issues (Chair: Lee Sherman, Members: David Noakes, Dave Myrold, and Jeff Breitenfeldt)

**Issues and Agenda Items for the 2010-2011 Library Committee:**

Provide feedback on the library realignment and on the hiring process for the new University Librarian after Karyle Butcher’s retirement in the fall

Support proposal to provost to expand funding for Library Research Travel Grant program (from $10,000 to $15,000)

Continue to support (and increase awareness of) Open Access initiatives

**Membership – 2009-2010**

Tara Williams ’10, Chair
Lee Sherman '10
David Noakes (v. Armas) '10
Alan Acock (v. Schwartz) '11
Elizabeth Thomas '11
Hua-Yu Li '11
Stacey Smith '12
TBA (v. Smith) '12 (Miranda Smith left OSU in February 2010)
David Myrold '12

Student Members:
Heather Bennett
Jeffrey Breitenfeldt (grad)
Jimmy Rosacker (undergrad)

Ex-officio: University Librarian Karyle Butcher
Executive Committee Liaison: Kate Halischak (Associate University Librarians Faye Chadwell and Jennifer Nutefall also attended meetings to advise or consult with the FSLC.)
During the 2008-09 academic year, the Faculty Senate Library met monthly to carry out its responsibility of advising the university librarian in the three areas outlined in its standing rules: (1) meeting the learning, instruction, and research needs of students, faculty, and staff; (2) assisting in the review of library policies as they relate to circulation, budgets, services, and development of resources for instruction and research; and (3) interpreting the needs of the library to the university.

Accomplishments:

Launched a series of articles on open access/scholarly communication in *Life at OSU*. The first three articles were published in May 2009 (“Journal Cancellations Hinder Access to Research”), June 2009 (“Rights Help Propel ‘Greener’ Publishing”), and July 2009 (“OSU Librarians Move Boldly Toward Wider Access”):


Participated in a forum on campus for Heather Joseph, executive director of SPARC, who met with faculty members to discuss trends in the open access movement nationally and internationally.

Hosted Pat Hawk, director of the Office of Sponsored Programs for the OSU Research Office, as a guest speaker to brief the committee on NIH open access policies and rules.

Committee members Elizabeth Thomas and Tara Williams served on the Library’s Faculty Travel Grant Committee and Undergraduate Research Committee, respectively.

Issues and Agenda Items for the 2008-09 Library Committee:

Continue the open access article series in *Life at OSU* through 2009-10. Linda Lamb, manager of the Office of Publication and Outreach in COAS, has offered to format the articles and compile them into a booklet for campus dissemination.

A new subcommittee on open access and scholarly communications will support the work of the Library as it implements its Open Access Plan.

Membership -- 2008-2009

Lee Sherman '10, Chair, Office of Research Communication
Nabil Boudraa '09, Foreign Languages & Literatures
Paul Roberts '09, Zoology
Tara Williams '10, English
Hua-Yu Li ’11, Political Science
Elizabeth Thomas ’11, Academic Success Center
Jennifer Nutefall ’11, Library

Ex-officio: University Librarian Karyle Butcher
Executive Committee Liaison: Kate Halischak
During the 2007-08 academic year, the Faculty Senate Library Committee struggled with leadership vacancies, unfilled positions and member illness. Consequently, the committee did not convene until spring term. At that time, Nabil Boudraa (Foreign Languages and Literatures) and Lee Sherman (Office of Research Communications) volunteered to co-chair the committee. The committee met twice monthly for the remainder of the academic year to carry out its responsibility of advising the university librarian in the three areas outlined in its standing rules: (1) meeting the learning, instruction, and research needs of students, faculty, and staff; (2) assisting in the review of library policies as they relate to circulation, budgets, services, and development of resources for instruction and research; and (3) interpreting the needs of the library to the university.

**Accomplishments:**

Decided to make open access/scholarly communication (the on-going issues of scholastic publishing, funding for library serials, and public access) the primary focus of the FSLC over the next two years.

Reviewed prior committee work on open access/scholarly communication, including the accomplishments of the Faculty Senate Task Force on Scholarly Communication (2004 -2005).

Assessed the current status of scholarly communication both at OSU and at other universities nationwide. To that end, the committee held a teleconference with Harvard University professor Stuart Shieber, who led Harvard’s groundbreaking movement to mandate open access for its faculty. Shieber is the director of Harvard’s new Office for Scholarly Communication.

Laid the groundwork for a university-wide campaign for 2008-2010 (working title, “Access for All”) with the goals of (1) raising awareness; (2) garnering support; and (3) moving toward a university policy on open access. The committee will meet once over the summer to agree on a basic framework for the campaign.

**Issues and Agenda Items for the 2008-09 Library Committee:**

Bring key partners/stakeholders to the table as “resource persons” to provide expertise and support to the campaign. These would include (but not be limited to) the director of the Office of Research Communications; a representative of the Research Office; one or more library liaisons from academic departments heavily engaged in research and scholarly publishing; and the science librarian. The committee will look at the possibility of following Harvard’s lead by spearheading the creation of an Office for Scholarly Communication at OSU.

Finalize plans for the “Access for All” campaign.

Launch the campaign in a systematic, coordinated effort on numerous fronts for maximum and continuous visibility.

**Other topics to keep on the radar:**
Capital Campaign: Keep current with the university's planned capital campaign and how this effort will positively impact the library.

Strategic Plan: Review the implementation and progress of the library's strategic plan.

**Membership -- 2007-2008**

Nabil Boudraa '09, Co-chair, Foreign Languages & Literatures
Lee Sherman '10, Co-chair, Office of Research Communication
Michael Boock '08, Library
Paul Roberts '09, Zoology
Jerry A. Yamamuro '09, Civil, Construction & Environmental Engineering
Rob Armas '10, Services for Students with Disabilities

Ex-officio: University Librarian (Karyle Butcher)

*Executive Committee Liaison: Len Friedman*
The Library Committee (LC) met in the fall (October 12, 2006) and winter quarters (February 21, 2007) in the Castles Room, Valley Library. At neither time did we have voting quorum. The LC did not meet in the spring quarter as there was not a time during which a voting quorum could be convened. For most of the fall term, the LC had a vacancy which was not filled.

Members of the LC assisted Valley Library staff with the following activities:

- Cheryl Middleton, Reference Librarian and Alexis Walker, LC, assigning study rooms;
- John Pollitz, Associate University Librarian, and Michael Witbeck, LC, reviewing 10 applications and awarding three Undergraduate Library Research Awards;
- John Pollitz; and Alexis Walker, LC, reviewing and awarding Library Travel Research Grants.
- Jane Nichols, Social Sciences and Humanities Librarian, and Molly Engle, Chair LC, reviewed Valley Library website.

The Chair met with Mike Quinn to discuss LC activities on two occasions, October 26, 2006 and in the winter term. The concerns were lack of attendance by identified members and the apparent lack of interest of faculty and students. The LC did not fill the student seats in the 2006-2007 year.

Topics of discussion included continuing the discussion of open access, local archival of faculty intellectual property in addition to publishing in peer reviewed venues, and how to best engender conversation among members. Although members were enthusiastic and supportive about using email to conduct conversations, that did not materialize.


1. Discuss with Karyle Butcher the role of the LC from her perspective
2. Identify the value that the LC provides to the Library as the Library has an in house advisory group.
3. Continue the discussion of open access.
Library Committee

Annual Report
2005-2006

Committee Members and end of tenure year:
Molly Engle '06, Chair
Gary Beach '06,
Linda Ashkenas '06
Melodie Putnam '06
Evan Gottlieb '07
Deborah Rubel '07
Michael Witbeck '07
Joe Kerkvliet '08
Pat Wheeler '08
Moira Dempsey served as liaison to the Executive Committee
The committee was unable to recruit student members even with much encouragement.

In addition to the above appointed members, the members of the Task force on Scholarly Communication were invited to join the committee as voting members. These included:
Bonnie Allen, OSU Libraries
Gary Beach, Office of Institutional Research
Michael Boock, Valley Library
Rich Carter, Chemistry
Alexis Walker, Human Development and Family Sciences
Ken Winograd, School of Education.

Also, the following Librarian members sat as Ex-Officio members: Karyl Butcher and John Pollitz.

Evan Gottlieb was on sabbatical for the Spring 06 term and did not attend. Joe Kerkvliet resigned his membership in the Spring 06 term. Alexis Walker was unable to attend due to other commitments. Deborah Rubel was out on maternity leave. Ken Winograd was on a year long sabbatical.

The committee met monthly from October through June. The focus of the committee’s work this year was to integrate the Task Force on Scholarly Communication with the Faculty Senate Library Committee. That was accomplished by inviting the Task Force members to attend meetings and become members of the committee.

Accomplishments for the 2005 - 2006 academic year.

1. Merge the Task Force for Scholarly Communications with the Faculty Senate Library Committee.
2. Revise Standing Rules to reflect the Committee’s broadened scope of work.
3. Develop and publish in OSU This Week a four article series on issues related to Scholarly Communication. These articles have been archived on the Library Committee Website as the Valley Library website.
4. Develop a list of journals in which faculty publish for Horticulture, Public Health, Forestry and Wildlife, Chemistry, COAS, Botany and Plant Pathology, and Economics. Other Departments will be reviewed as they are scheduled for graduate and undergraduate academic reviews.
5. Reviewed Library Strategic Plan and progress in accomplishing that plan.
6. Planned an editors’ meeting for fall 2006

Recommendations for 2006-2007
1. Follow up with Pat Wheeler re: the editors' meeting.
2. Continue to monitor and advise the Library re: the strategic planning process.
3. Develop journal impact/cost lists for those departments undergoing academic review.
4. Continue to provide the OSU faculty with timely information on open access and scholarly communication issues.
During the 2004-05 academic year, the Faculty Senate Library Committee continued to fulfill its responsibilities of advising the University Librarian in the three areas outlined in its standing rules: (1) meeting the learning, instruction, and research needs of students, faculty, and staff; (2) assisting in the review of library policies as they relate to circulation, budgets, services, and development of resources for instruction and research; and (3) interpreting the needs of the library to the University.

**Accomplishments:**

1. Library Funding Transfer Policy: The new Library Funding Transfer Policy, which was approved by the Library Committee during the 2003-04 academic year, required additional work in 2004-05 to make the policy operational. The new policy calls 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. The amount is based on the Library Evaluation that is required of each new Category I proposal. 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.

2. Library Strategic Plan: The Library Committee reviewed the Library's new strategic plan. The Library's plan outlines three goals: digital libraries, academic success, and community outreach. During this discussion and review of the new strategic plan, it was pointed out that the biggest impact on faculty has been, and will be, the shift to electronic journals.

3. Retired Faculty Serving on OSU Faculty Senate Committees: The Faculty Senate Executive Committee requested input on the idea of utilizing retired faculty on understaffed Faculty Senate committees. The Library Committee is not, and has not been historically, understaffed. However, the Committee voted to support this proposal from the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. The following statement was added to the Library Committee's Standing Rules: "One faculty member may be retired."

4. Library Communication With Academic Units: The Library Committee discussed the need for better communication to and from faculty and students in academic units with regard to Library needs. Surveys were conducted by the Library staff. Positive feedback was received from faculty. It was determined that most issues that arise get addressed quickly. The Library Committee agreed to communicate issues with their constituents, and the Library expressed a commitment to improving methods of advertising its services and holdings.

5. Library Issues: The following Library issues were discussed: (1) noise in the library; (2) food and drink in the library; and (3) vandalism in the study rooms. The Library Committee discussed these issues and recommended that the Library take appropriate steps to ameliorate these problems.

6. Long Term Research Study Rooms: The chairperson of the Library Committee worked with the Library in the evaluation of faculty and graduate student applications for a limited number of Long Term Research Study Rooms. The number of applications always exceeds the limited number of rooms available. This evaluation occurred twice: Fall Term 2004 and Spring Term 2005.

7. Library Budget Analysis: The Library Committee began to review the percentage of funding (the beginning operating budget) that the Library receives each year compared to the total University budget. In addition, an initial comparative examination was made when the percentage of support that
is currently provided to OSU's library is compared to the library funding support received by our peers.

8. Library Travel Grants: Two members of the Library Committee, Linda Ashkenas and Deborah Rubel, volunteered to help screen applications for the Library travel grants.

9. Scholarly Communication: The on-going issue of scholastic publishing, funding for Library serials, and scholarly communication which the Library Committee addressed in 2003-04 was pursued independently by a special Faculty Senate Task Force on Scholarly Communication during the 2004-05 academic year. The chairperson of the Library Committee served on this Task Force. A report from the Task Force was presented in June to the full Faculty Senate. A determination will be made in early Fall Term 2005 on whether to have the Task Force continue into the 2005-06 academic year as an independent group of University representatives, or to fold this effort into the charge of the Library Committee.

**Issues and Possible Agenda Items for the 2005-06 Library Committee:**

- **Faculty Senate's Task Force on Scholarly Communication:** Discuss the integration of the Task Force with the Library Committee as a sub-committee, or continue to support the efforts of an independent Task Force with representatives from the Library Committee.

- **Library Funding Transfer:** Monitor the new Library Funding Transfer policy and procedures to ensure that the Library receives the funds specified in their Category I Library Evaluation following Board approval.

- **ARL Membership:** Continue to assess the deficiencies in the Library that prevents the Library from joining the Association of Research Libraries. Recommend to the central administration that steps be taken to address these deficiencies, which are primarily resource related.

- **Indirect Costs:** Ascertain how changes in the indirect cost revenue will impact the Library.

- **Capital Campaign:** Keep current with the University's planned capital campaign and how this effort will positively impact the Library.

- **Strategic Plan:** Review the implementation and progress of the Library's strategic plan.

**Library Committee: 2004-05**

- Gary Beach '06, Chair
- Molly Engle '05
- Mo Healey '05
- Robert Wheatcroft (v. Gartner) '05
- Linda Ashkenas '06
- Melody Putnam '06
- Evan Gottlieb '07
- Deborah Rubel '07
- Michael Witbeck '07

Ex-Officio: University Librarian - Karyle Butcher
Executive Committee Liaison - Mike Quinn
Student Members -- Christopher Adams (graduate)
  -- Avinash Reddy Beeram (undergraduate)
  -- TBA
During the 2003-04 academic year, the Faculty Senate Library Committee continued to fulfill its responsibilities of advising the University Librarian in the three areas outlined in its standing rules: 1) meeting the learning, instruction, and research needs of students, faculty, and staff; 2) formulating library policies in relation to circulation, budgets, services, and development of resources for instruction and research; and 3) interpreting the needs and policies of the library to the University.

Accomplishments:

1. The proposed procedure, Category I Processes and the Allocation of Resources to the Library Procedure, to compensate for the additional load on the library to support the new programs, was recognized by the committee. Sometime in the winter, it appeared that earlier initiatives to implement this procedure were languishing in the approval process. The Library Committee formally approved this procedure, and then the committee wrote a letter to the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, advocating that the procedure be implemented. Shortly afterwards, the procedure was approved by the Curriculum Council, and it was agreed to and implemented by the Office of Academic Programs and the Office of Budget and Fiscal Planning. The implementation of this procedure is an important accomplishment of the committee.

2. During the year, the committee, with the support of Valley librarians, studied the serials crisis. Our study culminated in a report to the Executive Committee and then the Faculty Senate. The study presented the problem of serials costs to the faculty. In the report, there is a recommendation for a university-wide task force to continue the study of this problem and to facilitate action to address the problem. The Executive Committee, with the support of the Faculty Senate, has formed the Task Force on Scholarly Communication for the 2004-05 academic year. This advocacy by the committee was perhaps the most significant accomplishment this year.

3. The Library Committee met once a month during the academic year. Routine business included information items, during which time librarians explained library processes (e.g., how collections are determined; how Category I budget allocations for departments are determined). The library also solicited input and advice from the committee (e.g., feedback to the strategic plan).

4. The chairperson of the Library Committee worked with the library in the evaluation of application for study rooms in the library.

Issues and possible agenda items for the 2004-05 committee:

- **Faculty Senate's Task Force on Scholarly Communication**: Keep the Library Committee informed and up-to-date on the progress begun last year with regard to the exorbitant cost of serials. This effort will continue this year with the establishment of the new Faculty Senate Task Force.

- **Library Funding Transfer**: Ensure that the Library receives the funds specified in their Category I Library Evaluation; i.e., the funds necessary to purchase new monographs or subscribe to new serials when a new degree or certificate program are approved by the Oregon State Board of Higher Education.

- **OSU Libraries Budget**: I would like to compare the support the OSU Libraries receives as a percentage of the total OSU expenditures and then apply this analysis to OSU's peer institutions. (Karyle has sent me some material which I have not had time to review yet. Also, for the current fiscal year, the OSU Libraries has received an increase in their base budget. This is in direct contrast to the budget allocation process last year, when the Library was essentially forgotten, and the new BAM did not adequately fund the OSU Libraries resource needs; i.e., there was a decrease in the OSU Libraries'
Library Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

- **ARL Membership**: Determine out how close we are to applying for ARL Membership.
- **Student Members**: Make sure that the committee is represented by both graduate and undergraduate students.
- **Indirect Costs**: Track what is happening with indirect costs, especially in the context of the current study on campus of this issue.
- **Strategic Plan**: Review implications in the OSU Libraries Strategic Plan, especially if the library makes the big push to electronic over paper.
- **Capital Campaign**: Keep current with University's capital campaign.

Library Committee: 2003-04

Ken Winograd ’04, Chair
Mark Edwards ’04
Bob Rost ’04
Barbara Gartner ’05
Mo Healey ’05
Linda Ashkenas ’06
Gary Beach ’06
Melody Putnam ’06

School of Education
Sociology
Extension & Experiment Station Communications
Wood Science & Engineering
History
Fisheries & Wildlife
Institutional Research
Botany & Plant Pathology

Ex-Officio: University Librarian - Karyle Butcher
Executive Committee Liaison: Dianne Erickson
Student Members
- Adam Taylor (graduate)
Library Committee

Annual Report 2002-2003

During the 2002-03 academic year, the Faculty Senate Library Committee continued to fulfill its responsibilities of advising the University Librarian in the three areas outlined in its standing rules: 1) meeting the learning, instruction, and research needs of students, faculty, and staff; 2) formulating library policies in relation to circulation, budgets, services, and development of resources for instruction and research; and 3) interpreting the needs and policies of the library to the University.

Accomplishments:
In consultation with the University Librarian, the committee spent much of its time strongly advocating 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. While the implementation of the current plans from the 2007 process remain unpredictable, the committee's advocacy appears to have had some influence. We are pleased that the current plans do call for the library to report to administrators on the academic side of the organizational structure.

The committee discussed with library staff the following issues:
* identifying core services of the library,
* identifying potential areas of budget cutting,
* methods for obtaining user information from students and faculty
* development of shared collections with University of Oregon.

The committee also used one meeting to provide feedback to the library staff who are re-designing the library’s web-page.

In response to a request from the President of the Faculty Senate, the committee developed a statement expressing the faculty’s understanding of the library’s centrality to the mission of the university:

The library gives meaning to the very word “university,” connecting OSU to the universe of learning, even as it supports and builds our very sense of an OSU community. In so doing, the library enables the university to achieve its central purpose: the discovery and dissemination of knowledge. The library is a profoundly democratic space in the university where information is available to all, whether users are students walking the stacks or researchers searching the catalogs online. As the heart of the university, the library is both a central place on campus for scholarly exchange and an engine that powers that exchange as the university pursues its mission to serve the state of Oregon and beyond.

The committee worked hard to recruit student members to the committee, but the ASOSU never designated any student members, although at least three qualified applicants submitted the proper paperwork to ASOSU.

Respectfully submitted by:

Mark Edwards
June 14, 2002
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Ex-Officio: University Librarian (Karyle Butcher); Associate University Librarian (Bonnie Allen)

Executive Committee Liaison - Dianne Erickson
During the 2001-02 academic year, the Faculty Senate Library Committee continued to fulfill its responsibilities of advising the University Librarian in the three areas outlined in its standing rules: 1) meeting the learning, instruction, and research needs of students, faculty, and staff; 2) formulating library policies in relation to circulation, budgets, services, and development of resources for instruction and research; and 3) interpreting the needs and policies of the library to the University. After consultation with the University Librarian, the committee also advocated for the Libraries during the budget crisis and OSU 2007 redesign process.

Recall Policy
The committee responded to a motion by Senator Wrolstad at the June 2001 Faculty Senate meeting; he proposed changing the Library's policy to allow patrons to directly contact each other when recalling an urgently needed book. After discussion and consultation with the Head of Circulation and the Associate University Librarian, the committee recommended maintaining the current policy for both legal and practical reasons. The committee forwarded this recommendation to the Executive Committee and encouraged the Circulation staff at the Valley Library to make more widely known its willingness to directly contact holders of recalled books on behalf of a patron who urgently needs a checked-out book.

Review of Research Study Room Policy
The long-term study room application process is working well; all 10 rooms are currently occupied, and each round of applications yields more qualified candidates for these rooms. The short-term rooms (90-day loan periods), however, continue to be requested in numbers far exceeding the supply of 32 rooms. We asked Circulation to survey current holders of those rooms and discovered that 40% of patrons holding or waiting for rooms are graduate students who have not yet taken their orals (although such students were not originally intended to be included among those eligible for the rooms). After discussing the possibility of asking all patrons to share study rooms, the committee proposed that only faculty and post-orals doctoral students be eligible for the rooms. This new policy went into effect June 10, though the Library will honor existing holds.

Suggestion for 2002-03: Evaluate demand for short-term rooms once the Circulation staff has worked through the existing waiting list and publicized the new policy.

Shared Collections and Other Circulation and Access Issues
The committee responded to several Collections and Circulation initiatives, approving plans to circulate bound journals, convert to electronic-only notification of overdue books, and test JSTOR on a limited basis.

We discussed access vs. ownership of materials, applauding the Libraries' efforts to provide access to more materials while cautioning about the difficulties students and faculty face when the Library doesn't own the materials. Faculty cannot place such items on reserve, and the 3-week period with one renewal is often insufficient for faculty and graduate students who must rely heavily upon ORBIS. We discussed possible changes to ORBIS loan policies, but it would be difficult to implement any changes since the consortium has 16 members. The committee reviewed ORBIS statistics by call number to evaluate usage, but several call number ranges are omitted and grouped only as "Not in Table." The University Librarian suggested that heavy ORBIS usage within a particular field is perhaps a Collections, rather than an Access, issue.

An initiative to share collections with the University of Oregon met with strong committee support, and we encouraged the University Librarian to include a committee member on the task force. The committee also supported the idea of a future joint meeting of the FSLC and the comparable UO committee.

Suggestions for 2002-03: Invite John Helmer, head of ORBIS, to speak with the committee. Place a committee member on the OSU task force to work with UO, and hold a joint meeting of the FSLC and the
comparable UO committee.

**Advocacy for the Libraries during Redesign and OSU 2007 Processes**
Throughout the year, committee members attended Senate forums and meetings with President Risser in order to express concern about the future of the Libraries. To understand the current reporting structure, we reviewed the Peat Marwick Report and consulted with the University Librarian on standard reporting structures for her peers at other institutions. In December, we sent a letter to the OSU Redesign Team urging that the Libraries be treated as an academic unit with a new reporting structure and that the Libraries be protected from further budget cuts.

The committee invited Becky Johnson, Chair of the Steering Committee of OSU 2007, to meet with us to provide information about the process and to hear concerns specific to the FSLC. Based in part on this conversation, faculty from the Libraries and from the FSLC formed a Library Satellite Team to participate in the OSU 2007 process. Two members from the FSLC are serving on the Team, and the FSLC has been active in helping draft and reviewing the goals of this Satellite Team. The committee has met with Loretta Rielly, co-chair of the Satellite Team, and will continue to review all major documents produced by that group.

**Suggestion for 2002-03:** Remain in close communication with the Satellite Team.

**Faculty Senate Resolutions**
At the June Senate meeting, we presented two resolutions that grew out of this advocacy. Both passed without amendment.

Resolved, That the Faculty Senate reaffirms its 1999 commitment to the Library.

Resolved, That the Faculty Senate supports the establishment of the Libraries as an academic unit separate from Information Services, and it recommends: 1) a new reporting structure so that the University Librarian reports directly to the Provost, and 2) re-evaluation of the title of the University Librarian.

**Other Senate Charges for 2001-02**

*Category I proposals:* The committee awaits a proposal from the Curriculum Council.

*Indirect Cost Discrepancies:* Our charge had been to meet with candidates for the position of Vice Provost of Research to discuss the distribution of indirect costs funds. Because Rich Holdren (with whom we discussed this issue last year) was appointed Vice Provost of Research for a fixed term through June 2003, there did not seem to be ample occasion to revisit this matter.

**Suggestions for 2002-03:** Monitor Category I Proposals procedure and Indirect Costs Distribution.

**Other Issues and Informational Items**
The committee revised the standing rules to encourage broad representation of academic disciplines within the committee’s membership. The University Librarian circulated a draft of the Libraries Vision Statement, to which committee members responded individually with concerns and suggestions, and she kept us posted on the Libraries' status as a potential member of ARL. Currently, ARL has declined a site visit to OSU any time during the next three years. Librarians announced to the committee various digital, information management, and grant initiatives.

**Suggestion for 2002-03:** Continue to advocate for the increased institutional support necessary for consideration by ARL, and participate in any informal visit by an ARL representative that may be arranged. Provide new members of the committee with an orientation to the committee’s work and to the complex budget and reporting structure issues we have addressed this year.

Heidi Brayman Hackel, chair
June 13, 2002
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Extension & Exp Station Communications
Graduate Student
During the 2000/01 academic year, the Faculty Senate Library Committee continued to fulfill its responsibilities in three areas outlined in its standing rules: (1) meeting the learning, instruction and research needs of students, faculty and staff; (2) formulating library policies in relation to circulation, budgets, services, and development of resources for instruction and research; and (3) interpreting the needs and policies of the Library to the University. The committee members discussed and acted upon several issues over the course of the year, including revising the Library's research study room policy; Library support for new programs (Category I curriculum proposals); other Library budget issues (returned overhead funds, Technology Resource Fees, serials costs increases and remedial actions, the 1999 Faculty Senate resolution to boost the Library budget to 4% of the university's budget); and new library printing services and prices. The Library staff shared numerous informational items with the committee, and the committee met with the accreditation team member reviewing Standard 5 - libraries and information resources.

**Research Study Room Policy Revision**

The Library Committee met during July to complete proposed changes to the policy in time for it to be implemented during spring term. The committee discussed the results of a May 2000 survey taken of 70 current and prospective study room users. The committee recommended that 10 of the study rooms be set aside for long-term use, with assignment based upon a formal application. Three representatives from the Faculty Senate Library Committee and the Library would review the applications. The remaining 32 rooms would be assigned for 90 days on a first-come first-served basis. During the fall term, three people requested research study rooms on a long-term basis.

Suggestion for 2001/02: review the policy during the year (with input from the Library's Access Services staff) and make adjustments as necessary.

**Library Support for New Programs (Category I Curriculum Proposals)**

This was another issue that continued from 1999/2000. The piece that needed work was the implementation of a mechanism for transferring funds to the Library when Category I proposals indicate need for additional library resources to support a new program. As a part of this discussion Curriculum Council chair Leonard Friedman and member Gary Beach attended the committee's November meeting. They stated that this was a procedural issue and should not go to the Faculty Senate. In a subsequent meeting between Friedman and me, Friedman said that the Curriculum Handbook needed revising to reflect the library assessment and the source of funds for library materials. Friedman felt that the Curriculum Council should take the lead and get revisions made in time for the 2001/02 academic year. Beach indicated that he was still in the process of devising a mechanism for transferring funds.

During the year, colleges and departments proposing new programs were made aware that the Library component in their proposal was to be funded. Some agreed to come up with the funds; others objected. This is a change in culture from the Library component being overlooked or ignored previously.

Suggestion for 2001/02: determine what changes the Curriculum Council has made to the curriculum handbook regarding library funding and Category I proposals.

**Other Library Budget Issues**

Karyle Butcher indicated that the Library's annual share of indirect cost funds had been static for several years - around $400,000 (approx. $422,000 for FY 2000/01) -- and wanted to see if this could be increased, since the university's research funding had increased during the same period. The Library Committee chair formed a subcommittee to look into the issue. The subcommittee met in January with Rich Holdren, interim vice-provost for research, to discuss how the university allocates indirect cost funds. According to Rich, the Library's share is 3% of the funds (approx. $17 million for FY 2000/01). Based on this formula, the amount received by the library should have been approx. $510,000 -- $88,000 more than the amount actually...
received. In checking with some of OSU's peer institutions' libraries, I determined that very few receive a set percentage annually.

Suggestion for 2001/02: follow up with the Budget Office on any discrepancy between what the Library receives in indirect cost funds in FY 2001/02 and what the Library's share should be based upon the Research Office formula (3% of the total amount allocated). Discuss distribution of indirect cost funds with candidates for the vice-provost for research position.

At several meetings Karyle Butcher discussed her activities with SPARC (Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition), an international alliance of more than 200 college and research libraries that encourages competition in the scholarly publications market. SPARC encourages editors of scholarly journals to consider alternatives to the for-profit publishers, many of which increase journal subscription prices by 10-12% annually. Karyle suggested that the FSCLC could prompt OSU faculty who were editors or editorial board members of scholarly journals to consider approaches to keeping journal costs down through negotiating lower subscription prices, using a non-commercial publisher, etc. The committee supported this approach but took no formal action on it during the year.

Bonnie Allen shared with the committee her three-year projections of the collections budget to illustrate the impact of inflation (especially serials costs) on a stagnant budget.

On the issue of the Faculty Senate's 1999 resolution to increase the library's budget to 4% of the university's general and education budget, I compiled a list showing how the libraries at OSU's peer institutions fared under this formula. OSU was at 2.4% in the comparison. The mean was 2.9%, the high was 4% (Purdue), and the low was 1.9% (Michigan State). The latter still had a library budget almost twice that of OSU. I compiled and shared with the committee a list comparing the U.S. News and World Report's top 26 engineering schools for 2001 with their libraries' 1999 (most recent available) Association of Research Libraries (ARL) rank. More than half of the universities' libraries were in the ARL's top 25; nearly 70% of the universities' libraries were in the ARL's top 50. This information was shared with the Library Committee and Steve Hiller, the accreditation team member reviewing the Library.

Library Printing Services and Prices
Due to the significant costs in providing free laser prints to users of the Library (800,000 copies at $70,000 for AY 1999/2000), the Library administration made a decision to charge for printing at the beginning of the 2000/2001 academic year. After discussion, the Library Committee supported this course of action.

Accreditation
The committee met with Steve Hiller, the accreditation review team member responsible for Standard 5, on April 18. Several of the issues that the committee discussed with Steve pertained to funding. The Library's inability to keep up with the escalating costs of journals and the ensuing cuts were a major concern. The committee felt that there needed to be a better definition of "top tier" than that used by U.S. News & World Report. The university is adding or expanding programs but not providing enough funding enhancement to adequately support them, particularly for library resources. As an example, OSU has committed to make its College of Engineering a top 25 school, but it has not addressed library resources needed to achieve this goal. The committee also discussed the Faculty Senate's resolution to increase the Library's portion of the university budget to 4% within 6 years and the unlikelihood that this would be achieved.

Other issues discussed with Steve Hiller included disparities among academic departments (i.e., funding); and the university's process for student and faculty/staff involvement in major decisions.

Other Issues and Informational Items
Among the other issues discussed by the committee and presented by the Library staff were ARL status (the Library Committee continues to support the Library gaining ARL membership); the purchase of various databases and other electronic resources, such as Jstor, NetLibrary and the Web of Science; move of library materials to remote storage; a University of Maryland Libraries exhibit on library costs; OSU's participation in ARL's LibQual survey; OSU's digital library initiative; the impact of OSU's branch campus in Bend on library services; and the public relations campaign to heighten awareness of the Library's food and drink policy.

Lawrence A. Landis, chair
16 July 2001
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During the 1999/2000 academic year, the Faculty Senate Library Committee fulfilled its responsibilities in the three areas outlined in its standing rules: (1) meeting the learning, instruction, and research needs of students, faculty and staff; (2) formulating library policies in relation to circulation, budgets, services, and development of resources for instruction and research; and (3) interpreting the needs and policies of the library to the University. The committee members discussed and acted upon several issues over the course of the year, including Library support for new programs (Category I curriculum proposals); revision of the library research study room policy; the library collection conspectus; library budget issues (including journal cuts); and ARL status.

**Library Support for New Programs**

This project, begun during the 1998/1999 academic year, 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) over the past 15-20 years. There is currently no mechanism in place in the curriculum proposal process to ensure that funding for such library materials is 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.

Gary Beach, who headed this project, was able to complete the review of category I proposals back to about 1990 and determined that no funds (from either academic units or central administration) had ever been transferred to the library to support any new programs. He drafted a resolution for consideration by the Library Committee and directed to the Faculty Senate and the Curriculum Council, which would recommend that library funding needed for a Category I proposal be moved from the departmental budget to the library for three years.

Gary was unable to complete the refinement of the resolution by the end of the academic year. The Library Committee will complete this project during the 2000/2001 academic year.
Research Study Room Policy
Library Committee member Heidi Brayman Hackel brought up to the committee the library’s policy of limiting the use of research study rooms to one term, which she felt was too short. Another issue was the lack of use of the study rooms once they were assigned. The committee discussed various alternatives, such as providing a range of choices for length of time, setting aside study rooms exclusively for faculty use, and graduate students sharing study rooms.

A subcommittee was formed to look at the issues in more detail and make recommendations to the full committee on changes to the research study room policy. By the end of the academic year, the subcommittee had completed a survey of users of the research study rooms and had recommended setting aside a portion of the study rooms for long term use, with faculty and graduate students applying for them. A committee consisting of Library Committee members and library faculty would review the applications. The remaining study rooms would be allocated term by term on a first-come, first-serve basis. All study rooms would be monitored for use. This project will be completed early in the 2000/2001 academic year.

Library Collection Conspectus
Beginning in February 1999, the Library conducted a collection conspectus, which is an evaluation of all aspects of its print collection. The primary purpose of the conspectus was to determine the collection’s strengths and weaknesses through comparison with given bibliographies. Library staff provided the committee with periodic updates on the conspectus.

At the March committee meeting Bonnie Allen and other library staff within collection development presented an overview of the project, as well as discussion of the major subject areas covered in the project: business, liberal arts, biological sciences, agricultural sciences, and physical sciences. Bonnie concluded the presentation by explaining how the results from the conspectus would be utilized, such as in helping to determine acquisition priorities, analyzing Category I proposals, compiling accreditation reports, and in fund raising efforts.

Library Budget Issues
Several budgetary issues were discussed by the Library Committee over the course of the year, the most significant being journal cuts needed to offset the spiraling costs of these materials (10% increases annually over the past several years). One of the primary concerns of the committee was how the cuts would be equitably spread across academic departments. Library staff indicated that equity would be achieved in part through the budget allocation formula for departments and whether or not a department has in its departmental collection titles slated to be cut. Other means of lessening the impact would be to look at what other universities in the state have and cut those titles found at multiple institutions, dropping the paper version in favor of the electronic version, and leveraging of purchases through consortial arrangements.

Gary Beach regularly provided the committee with detailed information on the status of the library’s budget, particularly in terms of achieving the goal of 4% of the total university budget within six years, as well
as the likelihood of future budgetary increases.

**ARL Status**
The library's ARL status has been an ongoing topic of discussion for the committee for several years. During the year, Karyle Butcher met with ARL officials, who determined that OSU was a stronger candidate for admission than previously thought. ARL has also looked at changing some of its criteria. During the spring, President Risser signed a letter supporting OSU's nomination for ARL membership.

Karyle also briefed the committee on SPARC (Scholarly Publishing Automation Research Consortia), a group of publishers, libraries and scholars working to reduce the high costs of journals by encouraging faculty to publish in electronic format. This is seen as competition for ARL and may reduce the prestige associated with ARL membership.

**Other Issues**
During the winter, library administration decided that in order to recover some of the costs of printing from computers in the Information Commons (estimated to be $70,000 annually), it would need to institute a printing charge. After discussing the issue at two meetings, the Library Committee voted to recommend to the library administration a .07/page charge.

The committee also discussed whether or not the library should pass on the charges for activating study room data ports. After considerable discussion, it was decided to gather additional data on this issue and write a TRF proposal for funds to underwrite these costs.

Karyle Butcher kept the committee updated on other initiatives, such as membership in the Big 12 Plus libraries consortium.

The committee chair served on the accreditation team that compiled the self-study report on the Library and Information Services.
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Mark Larson (v. Leahy) '01
Steve Rubert '01
Shaio-Ling Yu '01
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Cynthia Twohy '02
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Student Member -
- Christine Armer (Graduate Student)
At the February FSLC meeting I was asked to send examples of existing university and college open access policies. Below are links to open access policies at MIT, Kansas and Harvard. Other policies can be found at a Simmons College wiki: http://oad.simmons.edu/oadwiki/Unanimous_faculty_votes. Open access policies that have passed in the U.S. over the last three years all contain similar elements and language. Stuart Shieber, Professor of Computer Science in the School of Engineering and Applied Sciences at Harvard and the Harvard Office for Scholarly Communication’s faculty director, has written a model open access policy that includes language that is shared by most of the university and college-level open access policies that have passed. The model policy includes annotations about why each element is included: http://osc.hul.harvard.edu/sites/default/files/model-policy-annotated_0.pdf.

For example, each of the university and college policies I looked at include a license granting certain copyrights to the institution for the purpose of making the scholarly research freely available online.

- MIT statement: Each Faculty member grants to the Massachusetts Institute of Technology nonexclusive permission to make available his or her scholarly articles and to exercise the copyright in those articles for the purpose of open dissemination. In legal terms, each Faculty member grants to MIT a nonexclusive, irrevocable, paid-up, worldwide license to exercise any and all rights under copyright relating to each of his or her scholarly articles, in any medium, provided that the articles are not sold for a profit, and to authorize others to do the same.

- Kansas statement: Each faculty member grants to KU permission to make scholarly peer-reviewed journal articles to which he or she made substantial intellectual contributions publicly available in the KU open access institutional repository, and to exercise the copyright in those articles. In legal terms, the permission granted by each faculty member is a nonexclusive, irrevocable, paid-up, worldwide license to exercise any and all rights under copyright relating to each of his or her scholarly articles, in any medium, and to authorize others to do the same, provided that he articles are not sold for a profit.

Most policies ask faculty to deposit the “final version of the article; that is, the author’s manuscript with any changes made as a result of the peer-review process, but prior to publisher’s copy-editing or formatting” to an open access repository operated by the library.

MIT’s policy passed unanimously in March 2009. In the two years since the policy was passed, approximately 2800 faculty articles have been deposited in MIT’s open access repository.

Policy: http://info-libraries.mit.edu/scholarly/mit-open-access/open-access-at-mit/mit-open-access-policy/

FAQ: http://info-libraries.mit.edu/scholarly/mit-open-access/open-access-at-mit/mit-open-access-policy/mit-faculty-open-access-policy-faq/
Implementation details: Authors asked to self-deposit articles or email copy to library.

University of Kansas also passed its policy in 2009 and became the first public institution to do so. The policy has since been revised to include implementation responsibilities and details.

Policy: https://documents.ku.edu/policies/governance/OpenAccess.htm

Implementation details: Policy calls for faculty to “provide bibliographic information and an electronic copy of each article within 30 days of publication to the [Library].” Library offers "full-service" and "self-service" options to make articles available in KU ScholarWorks (KU's open archive of scholarly work created by its faculty).

Harvard College of Arts and Sciences passed the first college-wide open access policy in the country in Spring 2008. Other Harvard schools and colleges have since passed similar policies.

Policy: http://osc.hul.harvard.edu/sites/default/files/model-policy-annotated_0.pdf

FAQ: http://osc.hul.harvard.edu/policies

Implementation details: Office for Scholarly Communication established in Harvard University Libraries in order to implement Harvard University policies.

OSU colleges and units have passed three OA policies:

College of Oceanic and Atmospheric Sciences passed its policy in March 2010.

Policy: http://www.coas.oregonstate.edu/media/Open_Access_Policy.pdf

Implementation details: COAS faculty work with the COAS Publications/Outreach Manager to ensure articles are deposited to ScholarsArchive@OSU, the university’s open access institutional repository.

Geosciences department passed its policy in April 2011. It is almost exactly the same as the COAS policy. It is not yet available online.

Library Faculty passed its policy in March 2009.

Policy: 
http://ir.library.oregonstate.edu/xmlui/bitstream/handle/1957/10850/Library%20Faculty%20Open%20Access%20Policy%2020091113%20revision.pdf?sequence=7

Implementation details:
http://ir.library.oregonstate.edu/xmlui/bitstream/handle/1957/10850/LFA%20Guidelines%20for%20Open%20Access%20Mandate%2020091218%20revision.docx?sequence=8

College of Forestry is currently (May 2011) considering the following policy:
Proposed Open Access Statement for the College of Forestry:
In keeping with a 100+ year history of making research publications available on request, faculty in the Oregon State University College of Forestry support this college-wide open access policy: Beginning July 2011, we encourage our faculty to have a digital copy of the author’s final version of each scholarly article deposited to the ScholarsArchive@OSU (http://ir.library.oregonstate.edu/) as soon as possible after publication.

Explanation/why needed: The policy is a statement of support for making the research of the College more widely available and more broadly disseminated on the web, not only to colleagues and peers but also to students around the world and to the citizens of Oregon and beyond.

The policy also allows Forestry Communications to work with the OSU Libraries on behalf of faculty in the college who want to contribute to furthering access to their research by contributing publications to the ScholarsArchive@OSU (SA@OSU). Without a policy, the onus remains with the faculty member to investigate copyright issues associated with each publisher before posting articles online.
Proposal for Increased Funding for the Library Research Travel Grant Program

Request:
The Faculty Senate Library Committee and OSU Libraries are requesting a $10,000 increase in funding for the Library Research Travel Grant (LRTG) program. This program is the only significant source of institutional support for OSU faculty who need to travel to libraries, archives, or collections to conduct research. Based on statistics collected over the last five years, this increase would allow all meritorious proposals to be fully funded and would allow the LRTG program to expand, increasing the ability of faculty across the university to do original, high-impact, and high-visibility scholarship.

While most science and engineering researchers come to OSU with substantial support for labs, equipment, etc., similar support is not readily available for scholars in the social sciences (including business) and humanities. The LRTG program is an important source of research support because no university library is capable of meeting all the needs of its faculty, especially when they have to travel to specialized collections. As part of her LRTG-funded research, for example, Professor Anita Helle traveled to gain access to “sound tapes of Sylvia Plath and Ted Hughes at the British Sound Library and small press publications...non-circulating, non-digitized, yet essential items.” As she notes, “the variability of copyright internationally (free use in the European Union and in the US deriving from two different legal traditions) means that many kinds of materials of interest to scholars will not likely be available in digitized forms anytime soon.” Professor Sally Gallagher’s travel research grant allowed her to study government documents in Syria’s national library, including transcripts of the President’s speeches. She also gained access to news from popular presses, including English-language Syrian newspapers, so she could study the editorial and opinion page debates versus the official government debate over the role of new technologies in Syria. As she said in her application letter, “Very little of this material is available outside the country.”

Background:
The LRTG program was founded in the 1990’s and is funded entirely through the Provost’s Office. There are two application cycles, one in the fall and one in the spring; a committee that includes representatives from OSU Libraries and the Faculty Senate Library Committee reviews the applications and makes award decisions. At the current funding level of $10,000 per year, the committee is able to award a total of five applicants a maximum of $2,000 each. If funding were increased as requested, we would be able to double that.

Access:
Since 2005, the LRTG program has received applications from faculty in 16 different areas across the university: anthropology, art, economics, English, ethnic studies, extension, foreign languages, history, horticulture, music, political science, philosophy, sociology, speech and communication, women studies, and zoology. These applications requested access to resources all over the world.

In that time period, the LRTG program has awarded $59,609. However, the unmet demand remains substantial, and the committee must often award partial rather
than full support (amounts have ranged from $400 to $2000, with 62.5% of funded applicants receiving less than the maximum amount).

**Impact:**
Because the LRTG program funds research on materials only available in specialized collections and archives that would otherwise be inaccessible, it enables faculty to do original research that they would not be able to do without this support. While we were not able to contact every previous grantee, we were able to compile partial figures on outcomes from 19 recent recipients. Those outcomes include 26 presentations and talks, 29 journal articles, 4 book chapters, 15 monographs and edited collections, and 3 grants, among others (see Appendix A). (link Appendix A – pages 3-8 – as a PDF)

If the funding were increased by $10,000, OSU Libraries would be able to increase the individual funding cap to $2500, a level more commensurate with current travel costs, and to fund most, if not all, meritorious proposals. OSU Libraries would also commit to improving the marketing for the LRTG program to maintain the competitive nature of the application process (including creating a more compelling web presence); to encouraging applicants to demonstrate how their proposed research would impact students and/or the OSU community; and to reporting regularly and in detail to the Provost on the specific outcomes enabled by the awarded grant funds.

This analysis demonstrates well the successful impact this program has wielded in support of OSU’s commitment to academic excellence in research and teaching. Increased funding of the Library Research Travel Grant program also supports the University’s initiative to invest in our faculty in order to strengthen faculty research and scholarship and improve the teaching and learning environment at OSU.

*Prepared by the Faculty Senate Library Committee, 2011*
Appendix A

Library Research Travel Grant Program 2005-2010: Research Outcomes

Conference presentations and invited lectures:


Nabil Boudraa, talk on Kateb Yacine’s Nedjma as a founding text in Maghrebian Literature in "Relire les classiques africains" panel, North Eastern Modern Language Association (NeMLA) annual conference, New Brunswick, April 7-10, 2011.


Sebastian Heiduschke, OSU Center for the Humanities talk.

Janet Lee, ‘Beyond courage and economic enlightenment’: Australian Feminist Miles Franklin’s unpublished marriage protest stories," National Women’s Studies Association (NWSA) annual meetings, Denver, CO (November 2010).

Janet Lee, “‘Writing Red’: Miles Franklin's unpublished plays (Chicago, 1906-1915) NWSA annual meetings, Atlanta, GA (November, 2009).
Janet Lee, “Experts at the geography of hell: Domestic sites and sororal subversions among the First Aid Nursing Yeomanry in World War I.” NWSA annual meetings, Cincinnati, OH (June 2008).

Janet Lee, “Miles Franklin on American manhood and white slavery: The case of ‘Red Cross Nurse,’” Hawaii International Conference on the Arts and Humanities, Honolulu, Hawaii (January 2007).

Janet Lee, ““Miles Franklin in Chicago, 1906-1915,” NWSA annual meetings, St. Charles, Ill (June 2007).


Janet Lee, “‘This was life!’: Accidental modernism and inadvertent feminism in women’s stories of the Great War,” annual meetings of the Pacific Sociological Association, Pasadena (April 2003).

Janet Lee, “‘Our shining, beckoning danger’: Memoirs of World War I First Aid Nursing Yeomanry,” NWSA annual meetings, Minneapolis, MN (June 2001).


Janet Lee, “Biography at the Limits of Representation” annual meetings of the Pacific Sociological Association, Portland, OR (April 1999).

Rebecca Olson, "Heroic Tapestries and the Tudor Court," Renaissance Society of America Annual Meeting, March 2011.


Journal articles:


Janet Lee, “FANY ‘Other Spaces’: Toward an application of Foucault’s heterotopia as


Susan Shaw, “I Am Woman: Southern Baptists and Feminism,” Baptist History & Heritage (Spring 2010).


Book chapters:


Monographs and edited collections:


Sally Gallagher, Making Do in Damascus (forthcoming from Syracuse University Press)

Paul Kopperman, “Regimental Practice” by John Buchanan, M.D.: An Eighteenth-Century Medical Diary and Manual (forthcoming from Ashgate)

Janet Lee, Comrades and partners: The shared lives of Grace Hutchins and Anna Rochester (Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 2000)


**Grants:**

Dahong Zhang, 2009-2011 (Principal Investigator), National Science Foundation, Dissecting Recruitment of Actin into the Contractile Ring, $220,000

Sebastian Heiduschke, L.L. Stewart Grant

Rebecca Olson, Renaissance Society of America Research Travel Grant (one of nine selected in a highly competitive, international contest)

**Other outcomes:**

Sebastian Heiduschke: brought an East German director and his film to Corvallis for two screenings at the Darkside Cinema.

Shelley Jordon: *Anita’s Journey*, a hand-painted animation based on her mother-in-law Anita Greenstein’s experience in hiding in Berlin during WWII.
Overview of Scholarly Communication Issues

Members of the Faculty Senate Library Committee are presenting a series of articles discussing scholarly communication. Last year the Task Force on Scholarly Communication issued a report to the Faculty Senate that documented the threats to “an open and sustainable system of scholarly communication” (http://oregonstate.edu/dept/senate/committees/other/tfose/final_report/).

This series of articles will expand on the work of the Task Force by continuing the public dialogue about this critical issue affecting campuses worldwide. The first article, by Joe Kerkvliet, describes the extensive cost comparisons documented by leading economists and provides links to work that the Task Force and Library Committee have been doing comparing the cost of non-profit and commercial journals in which OSU researchers have been publishing. When subscription and cost per page data are compared the results are both enlightening and sometimes surprising. Building on this comparison research, Molly Engle and Alexis Walker address the uses and misuses of the journal impact factor. They provide a coherent definition of impact factors and explain the conditions that go into journal impact calculations.

Open Access journals have been widely touted as a new model for peer-reviewed scholarly publication which offers an alternative to high-priced commercial journals. Learn more about this and how it may offer new publishing opportunities in Michael Witbeck’s article, the third in our series. The final article will describe the ScholarsArchive@OSU (http://ir.library.oregonstate.edu/dspace/index.jsp), the campus repository which provides a venue for dissemination and long term conservation of digital scholarship. Michael Boock and Melodie Putnam will provide an update on campus efforts to address scholarly communication on a local level but with national and international implications. Additional information on the cost of journals, including cost comparisons for specific scientific fields can be found at the OSU Library Web site at http://osulibrary.oregonstate.edu/scholarly_communication/.

John H. Pollitz
Associate University Librarian for
Public Services and Innovative Technology
Oregon State University Libraries
**Escalating Costs of Journals**

In early 2000, the average scholar at a university such as Oregon State University read about 130 journal articles each year, up from 100 a decade earlier. While scholars read more journal articles, they subscribe to fewer journals, from an average 5.8 personal subscriptions in 1975 to 2.2 in 2002. In other words, scholars are increasingly reliant on libraries to quench their thirst for access to timely research.

Yet libraries are increasingly challenged to provide scholarly journals for university faculty and students because of increasing journal prices, an expanding number of journals, and shrinking budgets. For several decades, library budgets have not kept pace with either overall inflation or price inflation for journal subscriptions. Annual subscriptions for a few journals cost as much as $20,000. Most journals cost less, but subscriptions still commonly exceed $1000 per year. Between 1986 and 1998, real prices for academic journals doubled, while real acquisition budgets rose by only 50 percent and the number of academic journal titles increased by 60 percent. These trends have continued or accelerated the last decade.

Libraries have responded to the increasing difficulty of providing access to journals by cost cutting. Overall, libraries have cut the number of books purchased by 26 percent and cancelled more journal subscriptions than they have added, cutting the total number of journal subscriptions by 6 percent. Libraries are also experimenting with more effective ways to deliver timely scholarly research, including group purchase agreements, package discounts, and shared databases.

While innovations in library purchasing may help, they will not deal with the fundamental problem of escalating journal prices. Some researchers contend that the problem lies in increased dominance of the journal publishing industry by commercial publishers, rather than nonprofit journals published by professional organizations. For example, Theodore Bergstrom, an economist at University of California Santa Barbara has found that the six most cited economics journals listed in the Social Science Citation Index are all nonprofit journals with library subscription prices averaging $180 per year. In contrast, the five most cited commercially published journals cost an average $1660 per year. Measuring the value of a journal in terms of the citations a typical published article receives, Bergstrom also contends that nonprofit journals are a better bargain. Bergstrom estimates that a library could spend less than 10 percent of its subscription budget on nonprofit economics journals and these journals would contain 60 percent of all articles cited in economics. In contrast, spending 80 percent of its budget on commercial economics journals would yield only 33 percent of all cited articles. Bergstrom has found similar commercial/nonprofit differences in chemistry, agriculture, mathematics, physics, and medicine. See the OSU Library Web site (below) for price comparisons for specific journals in which OSU faculty publish.

With evidence of monopolistic pricing on the part of commercial journals, Bergstrom and others urge scholars help discipline commercial publishers to price more like their nonprofit counterparts. One possible remedy is the expansion of nonprofit journals, either by the sponsoring professional organizations publishing more pages in their flagship, general interest journals or facilitating publication of specialized papers in satellite journals. Another suggested remedy is support for electronic journals. Some electronic journals are designed to directly compete with large commercial publishers.
Others have pledged to charge libraries lower prices and may help cover expenses by charging submission fees to potential authors. A third potential remedy is for libraries to pay close attention to the cost effectiveness of journals and cancel subscriptions to overpriced journals whose articles obtain few citations per subscription dollar. Finally, Bergstrom and others argue that scholars can help rein in high commercial journal prices by using their clout as editors and referees and considering a journal’s pricing policy in deciding where to submit new papers for publication.

Actions by scholars may be part of the solution, but Phillip Davis, a Cornell University librarian, argues that libraries must also be proactive. He urges libraries to pay attention to cost and relevancy in selecting journals, to explore means of paying for information only when it is used, and to accelerate information exchange with other libraries. Davis also suggests that that libraries consider providing incentives for campus scholars to submit papers to cost-effective journals and, perhaps, to charge scholars for journal access to increase awareness of the true cost of obtaining information. Additional information on the cost of journals, including cost comparisons for specific scientific fields can be found at the OSU Library Web site at http://osulibrary.oregonstate.edu/scholarly_communication/.

Joe Kerkvliet
Department of Economics,
Oregon State University

REFERENCES:


Faculty Speak Out on Publication Issues: Escalating Costs of Journals

Over the next four issues of OSU This Week members of the Faculty Senate Library Committee will be presenting a series of articles discussing scholarly communication. Last year the Task Force on Scholarly Communication issued a report to the Faculty Senate that documented the threats to “an open and sustainable system of scholarly communication” (http://oregonstate.edu/dept/senate/committees/other/tfosc/final_report/). The forthcoming series of articles will cover four topics: cost of journals, journal impact factors, open access journals, and the OSU campus repository for digital scholarship.

In early 2000, the average scholar at a university such as Oregon State University read about 130 journal articles each year, up from 100 a decade earlier. While scholars read more journal articles, they subscribe to fewer journals, from an average 5.8 personal subscriptions in 1975 to 2.2 in 2002. Scholars increasingly rely on libraries for access to timely research.

University libraries face increasing challenges due to a synergistic combination of increasing journal prices, expanding number of journals and shrinking budgets. Annual institutional subscriptions for journals often exceed $1,000 and some cost as much as $20,000. Between 1986 and 1998, real prices for academic journals doubled and the number of academic journal titles increased 60 percent, while real acquisition budgets for libraries rose only 50 percent. These trends have continued or accelerated during the last decade.

Libraries have responded to this situation by cost cutting. Overall, libraries have reduced the number of books purchased by 26 percent and journal subscriptions by 6 percent. Libraries are experimenting with more effective ways to deliver timely scholarly research including group purchase agreements, package discounts, and shared databases.

However, innovations in library purchasing will not deal with the fundamental problem of escalating journal prices. Some researchers contend that the problem lies in increased dominance of the journal publishing industry by commercial publishers rather than professional organizations. Theodore Bergstrom, an economist at University of California, Santa Barbara, found that the six most-cited economics journals listed in the Social Science Citation Index are all nonprofit journals with library subscription prices averaging $180 per year. In contrast, the five most cited commercially published journals in the same field cost an average $1,660 per year. Bergstrom contends that nonprofit journals are a better bargain and estimates that a library could spend less than 10 percent of its subscription budget on nonprofit economics journals, which would contain 60 percent of all articles cited in economics. In contrast, spending 80 percent of its budget on commercial economics journals would yield only 33 percent of all cited articles. Bergstrom found similar commercial/nonprofit differences in chemistry, agriculture, mathematics, physics and medicine. See the OSU Library Web site (below) for price comparisons for specific journals in which OSU faculty publish.

With evidence of monopolistic pricing on the part of commercial journals, Bergstrom and others urge scholars to help discipline commercial publishers into price structures more inline with their nonprofit counterparts. One remedy is increased support for nonprofit journals and for open access electronic journals. Additionally, libraries must pay close attention to the cost effectiveness of journals and cancel subscriptions to overpriced journals. Finally, Bergstrom and others argue that scholars can help rein in
high commercial journal prices by using their clout as editors and referees and by considering a journal’s institutional pricing policy in deciding where to submit new papers for publication.

Actions by scholars may be part of the solution, but Phillip Davis, a Cornell University librarian, urges libraries to be proactive by paying attention to cost and relevancy in selecting journals, to explore means of paying for information only when it is used, and to accelerate information exchange with other libraries. Davis also suggests that libraries consider providing incentives for campus scholars to submit papers to cost-effective journals and, perhaps, to charge scholars for journal access to increase awareness of the true cost of obtaining information. Additional information on the cost of journals, including cost comparisons for specific scientific fields can be found at the OSU Library Web site at http://osulibrary.oregonstate.edu/scholarly_communication/.
Uses and Misuses of the Journal Impact Factor

Most faculty members have heard the term, *impact factor*, yet many can neither define it nor describe its relation to scholarly communications.

According to the Institute for Scientific Information, a journal’s *impact factor* is “the average number of times articles from the journal published in the past two years have been cited in the Journal Citation Reports in a given year” \(^1\). The institute adds “The impact factor is calculated by dividing the number of citations in the Journal Citation Report for a given year by the total number of articles published in the two previous years. An impact factor of 1.0 means that, on average, the articles published one or two years ago have been cited one time. An impact factor of 2.5 means that, on average, the articles published one or two years ago have been cited two and a half times.”

The impact factor has risen to an elevated status. Many believe that the higher the impact factor, the higher the quality of the journal. Faculty members want to publish in the best possible outlet for their work. Sometimes the journal with the highest impact factor is the best outlet, sometimes it is not. Newly emerging online and open access journals, which are not yet well-established, will inevitably be rated "low impact." Therefore, the use of the high-impact factor index tends to inhibit scholars, especially junior scholars, from publishing their work in alternative, less expensive publications. As with any metric, the impact factor is only as good as the conditions under which it has been created. Perhaps surprisingly, many influences (conditions) affect its computation. These conditions include: journal subject content, the average number of authors per article, the type of journal, the type of article, and journal size (average number of articles published annually).

How do these conditions affect the calculation of the impact factor? Journals in fundamental life sciences (e.g., biochemistry and cell biology) and neurological science *on average* have higher impact factors than do journals dealing with earth or biological sciences, which, in turn, have higher impact factors than do journals dealing with social or computer sciences. Impact factors vary more within fields than between fields. Because authors tend to cite their own work, articles with more authors are cited more often than are articles with fewer authors. Generally speaking, then, the greater the number of authors, the greater the number of citations, and the greater the journal’s impact factor.

Type of journal and type of article both affect the calculation of the impact factor because short articles tend to be cited more quickly than longer articles and review articles tend to be cited more often than other article types. Journals that publish letters tend to have higher impact factors than those that publish only full-length feature articles. Recall that only the preceding two years are considered in the impact factor formula. For this reason, articles that are cited relatively quickly after publication increase a journal’s impact factor. Journals that publish only review articles or that publish a special issue of review articles tend to have very high citation rates (and thus higher impact factors) than do journals that publish only feature articles. Even the single

---

\(^1\) Retrieved from http://jcr01.isiknowledge.com/JCR/help/h_glossary.htm#JCR_year_g
publication of a review issue will increase the impact factor over a two- to three-year period because of the frequency with which review articles are cited. Journals that publish fewer than 35 articles annually typically have more variable impact factors than those that publish 150 articles or more. According to Amin and Mabe (2000)\(^2\), impact factors for small journals vary as much as ± 40% from year to year whereas impact factors for large journals vary as much as ± 15% annually.

The Faculty Senate Library Committee’s recommendations for the use of impact factors are:

- Because of disciplinary differences, comparisons of impact factors are only appropriate within the same subject area.
- Because average number of authors per article is correlated with the impact factor, the size of a journal within a given field should be considered when assessing the impact factor.
- All things being equal, rapid-publication outlets and journals of review articles should be expected to have higher impact factors than journals that publish full-length articles. The type of article published in the journal, then, within a given field, should be considered in interpreting the impact factor.
- Because a journal’s impact factor is likely to vary from year to year, especially for smaller journals, caution should be exercised in drawing conclusions regarding a change in the impact factor of a journal in any given field. Rather than using single-year impact factors, it may be preferable to use an impact factor average over a period of five years.
- Because of variability in impact factors, Amin and Mabe (2000) proposed that “journals with impact factors that differ by less than 25% belong together in the same rank” (p. 5).
- Amin and Mabe (2000) also suggest that “The use of journal impact factors for evaluating individual scientists is even more dubious, given the statistical and sociological variability in journal impact factors” (p. 5).

Amin and Mabe (2000) state very clearly that, “Impact factors, as one citation measure are useful in establishing the influence journals have within the literature of a discipline…they are not (emphasis added) a direct measure of quality and must (emphasis added) be used with considerable care. Additional information on journal impact factors, including comparisons for specific scientific fields can be found at the OSU Library Web site at [http://osulibrary.oregonstate.edu/scholarly_communication/](http://osulibrary.oregonstate.edu/scholarly_communication/).

Molly Engle  
Chair, Faculty Senate Library Committee and  
Associate Professor of Public Health

and

Alexis Walker  
Member, Scholarly Communications Task Force

---

Petersen Chair in Gerontology and Family Studies, and Professor, Human Development and Family Sciences
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Library Committee

February 14, 2014 ~ 1:30-3:00 PM
The Valley Library Kelly Conference Room (4633)
Agenda

1. Sub-Committee Updates
   a. Long-term research rooms – Cheryl Middleton, Stacey Lee
   b. Undergraduate student award – Cheryl Middleton, Bruce Geller

2. Open Access
   a. Updates on where our Open Access work from last year stands (supported by a copy of last year’s Open Access Document) – Marit Bovbjerg, Shan Sutton
   b. Open access publishing and textbooks at OSU – Cheryl Middleton, Faye Chadwell
   c. Textbooks – Cheryl Middleton
   d. University of Minnesota Grant – Shan Sutton

3. Other Library News/Updates – Faye Chadwell, Shan Sutton, Cheryl Middleton
   a. Changes in physical library spaces
   b. Building collections & data storage

4. New Business
Library Committee

February 26, 2013 ~ 3:00-4:00 PM
The Valley Library Willamette East Room
Agenda

1. Sub-committee Updates
   a. Long-term research rooms (Stacey and Marit)
   b. Undergraduate student award (Dan and Kari)
   c. Travel (Bruce and Hsiou-Lien)

2. Open Access Update (Marit and Rich)

3. Other Library News/Updates (Faye, Shan, Cheryl)

4. New Business?
Library Committee

October 31, 2013 ~ 1:00-2:30 PM
Kelly Conference Room – 4168 The Valley Library
Quarterly Meeting

Agenda

1. **Welcome, Introductions, and Mini-Tour**

2. **Updates** (Faye, Cheryl, Shan)
   a. Strategic Plan
   b. Budget
   c. Libraries Office/space changes (Disability v. E-Campus)

3. **Standing Subcommittees**
   a. Study Rooms
   b. Undergrad Research

4. **Other News/Initiatives**
   a. New Faculty Outreach (Faye)
   b. Open Resources
   c. Library curriculum
   d. Experiential Learning
   e. Emeritus/Community access
   f. Archiving of Print Journals

5. **Any additional items**
Library Committee

**February 13, 2012 ~ 2:00-3:00 PM**
Kelley Conference Room (Room #4168), 4th Floor of Valley Library

**Agenda**

1. Welcome and brief introductions
2. Discussion of [OSUL budget proposal](#) (appx. 45 min)
3. Discussion of Elsevier boycott and ongoing open access initiatives at OSU (appx. 15 min)
Library Committee

May 14, 2012 ~ 1:00-2:00 PM
Kelley Conference Room (Room #4168), 4th Floor of Valley Library

Agenda

- Welcome and brief introductions
- Updates from Stacey Smith on Elsevier boycott and open access questions from last quarter
- Report by Jennifer Nutefall, Associate University Librarian, on travel grants awarded in 2011–12
- Briefing by Faye Chadwell, University Librarian, on ongoing OSU Library personnel, budget, and space issues
- Updates and discussion of OSU Library collections budget proposal
  - Note: We may circulate the revised version of the proposal ahead of the meeting. If this is not possible, we'll discuss the planned changes to the document and make arrangements to circulate it for the committee’s commentary via e-mail later in the quarter
- Planning for next year
Library Committee

October 24, 2012 ~ 3:30 PM
The Valley Library Room 4960
Agenda

3:30 Welcome & Introductions

3:40 Update on Open Access
   - Review of FSEC meeting 10/9/12 (Rich, Faye... also Michael or Shan?)
   - Description of Scholars Archive (Faye)
   - Request for subcommittee volunteers
   - Reminder – Friday’s lecture

4:00 Standing Subcommittees
   - Brief descriptions (travel grants, study rooms, undergrad research)
   - Volunteers?

4:10 Update on budget request (Faye)

4:30 Other library news (Faye)
   - Strategic plan
   - New faculty orientation
   - NW Library Alliance–new card catalog system

4:45 New business
   - Category I proposal funding?

Information Items to Review:
   - Library Committee 2011-2012 Annual Report
   - Collections Budget Comparison Report
   - Open Access Policy
     - OSU Overview
     - Examples:
       - A Model Open-Access Policy
       - Utah State University
Library Committee

February 7, 2011
3:00-4:00 PM ~ The Valley Library 4142
Agenda

1. Discussion of progress on and goals for open access initiatives (Faye Chadwell & Michael Boock)

2. Updates on the library service quality survey and scan and deliver (Jennifer Nutefall)

3. Tour of new Learning Commons

Note: For those of you who would like to know a little more about open access before the meeting, these short pieces from "Life @ OSU" (by former FSLC chair Lee Sherman) give great overviews of the key developments and issues:

- Scholars Archive gives global access to OSU research
- OSU librarians move toward wider access
- Magic Dome of Learning
  - (The talk by John Willinsky mentioned in this article is also available at http://oregonstate.edu/media/cftzlz.)
Library Committee

May 9, 2011
3:00 - 4:00 PM
Drinkward Conference Room – The Valley Library

Agenda

1. Proposal for Increased Funding for the Library Research Travel Grant Program
2. U.S. Open Access Policies: Report to the OSU Faculty Senate Library Committee – Michael Boock
3. OSU Libraries budget and how the FSLC might help to advocate for an increase
4. LibQual survey results
Library Committee

October 21, 2011
12:00-1:30 PM
Drinkward Conference Room (#4960), The Valley Library
Agenda

- Welcome and introductions of members
- Review and discussion of the committee’s standing rules (see below)
- Overview of standing FSLC responsibilities, including carrel assignments, library research travel grants & undergraduate research awards
- Suggestions for FSLC agenda items this year from all members
- Update from Stacey Smith on last year’s proposal to increase the Library Research Travel Grant and discussion of future fundraising possibilities
- Updates from University Librarian Faye Chadwell and Associate University Librarian Jennifer Nutefall regarding:
  - the OSU Libraries budget
  - the merger of University Archives and OSU Special Collections
  - resource and collection sharing
  - OSU Libraries’ role in teaching and engagement
- Continuing last year’s discussion about how to improve funding for the libraries' collections budget and the role that this committee (and faculty more broadly) can play in that process. We’ll review the collections budget PowerPoint presentation that OSU Libraries staff showed us last year.
- Continuing last year’s discussion of open access and the role that the committee might play in securing the University’s approval (via the Provost’s signature) for the Berlin Declaration. See details on the Berlin Declaration.

Library Committee Standing Rules
The Library Committee advises the University Librarian in (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 communication (e.g. print and electronic journals and books). The Committee consists of nine Faculty members, ideally providing a broad representation of academic disciplines, and three Student members, including at least one undergraduate and one graduate student, and the University Librarian, or designee, as an ex-officio, non-voting member. One faculty member may be retired.
Library Committee

October 11, 2010
Agenda

- Member introductions
- Review of standing rules (below), including reconsideration of provision for retired member
- Overview of standing FSLC responsibilities, including carrel assignments, library research travel grants & undergraduate research awards
- Suggestions for FSLC agenda items this year from all members
- Update on the University Librarian search
- Update on the 24/5 plan (Jennifer Nutefall)
- Discussion of Open Access week events (Faye Chadwell)
- Overview of the Center for Digital Scholarship and Services (Michael Boock)

Library Committee Standing Rules
(http://oregonstate.edu/senate/committees/library/sr/index.html)
The Library Committee advises the University Librarian in (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 communication (e.g. print and electronic journals and books). The Committee consists of nine Faculty members, ideally providing a broad representation of academic disciplines, and three Student members, including at least one undergraduate and one graduate student, and the University Librarian, or designee, as an ex-officio, non-voting member. One faculty member may be retired.
Library Committee

May 12, 2010
2:00-3:00 PM
The Valley Library – Room 4142
Agenda

1. Report on the 24/5 program; publicity links are below
   - The Daily Barometer
   - Gazette-Times
2. Updates on other issues/projects
3. ASOSU proposal regarding reserves for course readings
Library Committee

February 16, 2010
4:00-5:00 PM
Drinkward Conference Room (#4960), Valley Library

Agenda

1. Welcome
2. Approve minutes from last meeting
3. Info on Resources website for the FSLC
4. Update from Lee Sherman on Open Access Subcommittee
5. Update from Jennifer Nutefall on Undergraduate Research Awards, planning for the 2nd floor learning commons, and assessment program
6. Update from Faye Chadwell on scholarly communications work and collaborative opportunities related to managing collections
7. Discussion of proposal to allow UO faculty the same on-site library privileges as OSU faculty (details below)-Karyle Butcher and Cheryl Middleton

Proposed OSU/UO Collaboration Agreement

1. We will give each other’s faculty checkout access to any items that we give to our own, and at the same loan period and fine structure.

2. We will not provide Interlibrary Loan privileges to each other’s faculty.

3. We will provide Summit borrowing to each others’ faculty so they can pick up their Summit items at either location. (They just have to remember which record they used to make the request, just like any other Summit Visiting Patron.)

4. While our report addressed site-to-site borrowing via ILL, this isn't specifically included just yet as a service. Let’s agree that if any faculty wants something via ILL that the other site wouldn't normally lend via ILL, we’ll contact the collection manager.
Library Committee

November 11, 2009
3:00-4:00 PM
Kelley Conference Room on the 4th floor of Valley Library
Agenda

1. Committee member introductions and discussion of interests/reasons for joining FSLC

2. Discussion of standing FSLC responsibilities: study carrel assignments, travel grants, research awards, etc.

3. Brief overview of library (including budget and strategic plan) - Karyle Butcher

4. Issues on which the library would like FSLC feedback/help this year - Faye Chadwell and Jennifer Nutefall

5. Preliminary discussion of ideas for use of fourth floor space in Valley Library: Faculty research commons? Graduate student workspace? Other possibilities?

6. Adjourn
Library Committee

June 3, 2009
3:00-4:00
109 Gilkey Hall
Agenda

1. Approve May 6, 2009 minutes

2. Report from Faye Chadwell on the OSU Open Access Plan

3. Discussion of committee’s role in support of Open Access Plan (including possible creation of an OA subcommittee)

4. Review of the year’s accomplishments, including:
   - The launch of Open Access article series in Life at OSU
   - Report on student research awards (Tara Williams)
   - Report on faculty travel grants (Elizabeth Thomas)

5. Announcement of newly appointed committee chair and members

6. Report from University Librarian (Karyle Butcher)

7. Adjourn
Library Committee

February 4, 2009
3:30-5:00
4142 The Valley Library
Agenda

- Please review the following documents prior to the meeting:
  - Recap of the article - Economic Implications of Alternative Scholarly Publishing Models: Exploring the costs and benefits
  - Article - Open and Shut - Changing the paradigm
  - Article - Congressional Hearing Over Public Access Filled With High Drama
  - Report - Faculty Attitudes and Behaviors Regarding Scholarly Communication: Survey Findings from the University of California
Library Committee

September 4, 2008
3:30-5:00 – The Valley Library Drinkward Room

Agenda

- Approve June 11 minutes
- Introductions
- Chair will outline a proposed action plan for 2008-09 and 2009-10, followed by discussion
- Open Access Faculty Survey questions will be finalized; plans for administering the survey will be made
- 11:00 – Pat Hawk of the OSU Research Office will talk to the committee about the NIH Open Access experience and share her thoughts on a campus-wide open access initiative; please review the Open Access Campaign document
- Library director’s report
- Adjourn
Library Committee

June 11, 2008
3:30-5:00 – The Valley Library Drinkward Room
Agenda

1. Approval of May 28 minutes (attached)
2. Begin developing questions for our faculty survey on open access/scholarly communication
3. Sketch out a plan of action for next year’s priorities and goals, including:
   - Filling all vacancies on FSLC
   - Conducting the faculty survey and analyzing the results
   - Identifying a faculty researcher to be the “face” of OSU’s open access campaign
   - Finalizing the desired outcomes of an effective “Access for All” campaign at OSU
   - Brainstorming steps to achieve those outcomes
4. Report from Library staff
Library Committee

May 28, 2008
3:30-5:00 – The Valley Library Drinkward Room
Agenda

1. 3:30: Approval of May 14 minutes (attached)
2. 3:33– 4:45: Discuss where we are and where we want to go on the issue of open access, based on the information we have gathered from Stuart Scheiber of Harvard, Pat Wheeler of COAS, Michael Boock, Faye Chadwell, OSU Research Office, FSLC Task Force and various supplementary readings. The committee will:
   - Establish desired goal(s) (short-term and long-term) for OSU regarding open access/scholarly communication
   - Set timelines for achieving this/these goal(s) over the next two years
   - Determine necessary steps for achieving goal(s)
   - Assign specific task(s) toward achievement of goal(s)
3. 4:45 – 5:00: Report from Library staff
Library Committee

May 14, 2008
3:30-5:00 – The Valley Library Drinkward Room
Agenda

1. Approve minutes from last meeting
2. Discuss conversation with Stuart Scheiber
3. Nabil will report on April 14 conversation with former FSLC member Pat Wheeler (COAS) about previous FSLC work on scholarly communication/open access
4. Report from Library staff
5. Long Term study rooms
Library Committee

April 23, 2008
3:30-5:00 – The Valley Library Drinkward Room

Agenda

1. 3:30 - 4:00: Discuss Michael Boock’s notes from his conversation with Stuart Scheiber of Harvard (attached) and finalize a list of questions to ask Dr. Scheiber.
2. 4:00 - 4:30: Conference Call: Stuart Scheiber, Harvard Computer Science professor For background, please read (from Michael):
   http://www.fas.harvard.edu/home/news_and_events/releases/scholarly_02122008.html
3. 4:30 - 4:45: Lee and Nabil will report on our April 14 conversation about previous FSLC work on scholarly communication/open access with former FSLC member Pat Wheeler (COAS)
4. 4:45 - 5:00: Report from Library staff
Library Committee

April 9, 2008
3:30–5:00 – The Valley Library Drinkward Room

Agenda

1. Discuss the current status of scholarly communications/open access at OSU and other U.S. universities, such as Harvard, which has taken the lead in mandating that faculty deposit their articles in the institutional archive.
   a. Michael Boock will report on his communications with Harvard – as background, please review the article at http://www.libraryjournal.com/info/CA6532658.html
   b. Faye Chadwell will report on her work with the national scholarly communications group on trends/issues/concerns at other universities - as background, please review the article at: http://poynder.blogspot.com/2006/01/changing-paradigm.html
   c. The FSLC will have an opportunity to weigh in on the next steps that should be taken to move this issue forward at OSU and come up with a workable plan, particularly for the next academic year. For those of you not familiar with the FSLC series of articles from ‘OSU This Week,’ please review the articles and reviews available from the FSLC collections in ScholarsArchive@OSU: http://ir.library.oregonstate.edu/dspace/handle/1957/1747.

2. Report from the Library (Librarian designee)
Library Committee

Agenda
March 13, 2006

I. Welcome and Announcements
   Introductions
   Amanuensis

II. Old Business
   1. Approval of Minutes - December
   2. Scholarly Communication
   3. Library Strategic Plan
   4. Other

III. New Business
   1. Faculty input re: archiving intellectual property
   2. Other

IV. Report from the Library (Librarian designee)
Library Committee

Agenda
December 1, 2006

I. Welcome and Announcements
   Introductions
   Amanuensis

II. Old Business
   A. Approval of Minutes June, October
   B. Scholarly Communication
      i. Continue to gather impact statements from departments
      ii. Archiving committee material—needs to come from the FS office to the archive site
   C. Library Strategic Plan
   D. Other

III. New Business
   Faculty input re: archiving intellectual property

IV. Report from the Library (Librarian designee)
Library Committee

October 12, 2006
Agenda

Attendees: Molly Engle (chair), Michael Boock, Michael Witbeck, Karyle Butcher (ex-officio)

I. Welcome and announcements
   Michael Boock agreed to serve as amanuensis for today’s meeting.

II. Old Business
   Approval of minutes June.
   June minutes will be approved at the next LC meeting.

III. New Business
   A. ScholarsArchive@OSU institutional repository

      Michael Boock reported that Larry Landis, University Archivist, spoke to Faculty Senate Executive Committee. They asked Larry to present at the November Faculty Senate meeting about storing intellectual capital in the university’s institutional repository – ScholarsArchive@OSU.

      Molly Engle suggested that we use Survey Monkey to solicit information about faculty interest in depositing pre-print articles and other research such as gray or fugitive literature in the repository. Agreed that survey should go out after Larry Landis’ presentation.

      Agreed that the Library Committee should identify handful of faculty with an interest to serve on a focus group to discuss the institutional repository. The Library will handle lunch.

      Topics will include range of use for institutional repositories and potential uses of ScholarsArchive for storing and enabling access to research conducted at the institution.

      Agreed that a librarian should present on institutional repositories at a lecture series event such as TRIAD or Dean’s Council under the Library Committee’s auspices.

      FSLC may wish to publish another series of articles in OSU This Week; the library will do publication/impact factor reviews for the departments within Health and Human Services. Molly Engle will send Michael Boock information about the department publications.

   B. Library Advisory Committee is sponsoring a student research award. They would like an LC member to serve on the review committee.

      Michael Witbeck will notify John Pollitz that he is willing to serve on the review committee.

   C. Meeting times

      Agreed to hold one more meeting this term and possibly move to quarterly meetings rather than monthly.

   D. Committee members

      Four LC faculty committee members and 3 students are needed. Committee members should solicit members and have them contact Vickie. Michael Boock will ask a Crop Science professor if he’d be interested in serving.

IV. Report from the librarian
   Karyle Butcher reported that an individual tore paintings from the library walls.
Karyle reported that the Library is engaged in assessment activities and asked that the LC consider how the Library assesses its value.

Karyle also asked that LC consider student use of social networking sites such as Facebook and MySpace.
Library Committee

Library Committee
Agenda
March 13, 2006

I. Announcements
   ▪ Amanuensis for April

II. Old Business
   A. Approval of February 27, 2006 minutes
   B. Scholarly Communication Task Force Updates
      1. Forest Science (Putnam)
      2. Economics (Kerkvliet)
      3. Botany (Putnam) attached
      4. Public Health (Engle) attached
      5. Horticulture (Engle) attached
      6. Curriculum/Graduate Council responses (Beach)
         ▪ administrative decision or through academic programs?
         ▪ list of departments having program review
      7. Annual Editors/Society officers meeting
         Editor list to Gary? (Wheeler)

   8. OSU this Week Articles
      Update (Wheeler)

   9. Other old business not mentioned above

C. New Business
   A. Library Strategic Plan attached
   B. Other new business not mentioned above

D. Report from the Library (Librarian designee)
Library Committee

Library Committee

Agenda
February 27, 2006

I. Announcements
   - Amanuensis for March

II. Old Business
   A. Approval of Minutes for January 30, 2006
   B. Vote on change of Faculty Senate Library Committee Standing Rules Revisions (attached)
   C. Scholarly Communication Task Force Updates
      1. Forest Sciences (Putnam)
      2. Economics (Kerkvliet)
      3. Curriculum/Graduate Council responses (Beach)
         - administrative decision or thru academic programs?
         - list of departments having program review
   D. Annual Editors/Society officers meeting
      1. List of society officers?
      2. Other meeting plans? (Wheeler)
   E. Articles in OSU This Week
      1. Introduction (Politz)
      2. Cost of journals (Kerkvliet, Carter)
      3. Impact Factors: (Engle, Walker)
      4. Open access (Witbeck)
      5. OSU Institutional Repository: Michael Boock & Melodie Putnam
      6. Schedule (attached) (Wheeler)
   F. Other old business not mentioned above

III. New Business
   A. Helpful hints for Faculty Senate Committees (Engle)
   B. Report of meeting with Faculty Senate President (Engle)
      - Need for continued TF/Committee overlap and institutional memory; TF members need to fill out committee interest forms in spring (Engle)
      - IFS venue for articles on Scholarly communication
   C. Chronicle Article (February 7) (Engle)
   D. COAS Journal list (attached) (Wheeler)
   E. Review of journals used for COAS publications (attached) (Wheeler)
   F. Other new business not mentioned above

IV. Report from the Library (Librarian designee)
Library Committee Agenda
January 30, 2006

I. Announcements
   - Moira Dempsey has been appointed to the Committee as Liaison to the FSEC
   - New Introductions as needed
   - Amanuensis for February

II. Old Business
   A. Approval of December 5 minutes
   B. Faculty Senate Library Committee Standing Rules revision
   C. Task Force on Scholarly Communication - reports updates
      1. Botany and Plant Pathology (Putnam and McCune)
      2. Fisheries & Wildlife (Ashkenas)
      3. Forest Science (Putnam)
      4. Economics (Kerkvliet)
      5. Public Health (Engle)
      6. Horticulture (Engle)
      7. Curriculum/Graduate Council responses (Beach)
   D. Annual Editors/Society officers meeting
      1. Meeting plans (Wheeler)
      2. Putnam Library Committee membership (Engle)
   E. Articles in OSU This Week
      1. Cost of journals (Kerkvliet, Carter)
      2. Open access (Witbeck)
      3. OSU Institutional Repository: Michael Boock & Melodie Putnam
      4. Impact Factors: (Engle, Walker)
      5. Copyright issues: ??
      6. Other venues (Kerkvliet)
   F. OSU Forum on Publication Practices
   G. Collecting statistics on faculty changes in paper subscriptions, number of faculty who are associate editors, and what journals faculty review for. (Tabled from Dec 5--Kerkvliet)

III. New Business
   ■ Review of Library strategic plan

IV. Report from the Library
Library Committee

Library Committee
Agenda
December 5, 2005

1. Announcements
   1. Introductions of Task Force on Scholarly Communication Members
2. Old Business
   1. Approval of Minutes of November 7 meeting
   2. Task Force on Scholarly Communications interface with Library committee plan of work for 2006.
3. New Business
4. Report from the Librarian
5. Other
Note-taker: Evan Gottlieb

1. Approval of October minutes (attached)
2. Old Business
   1. Task Force for Scholarly Publication - continuation of discussion
      http://oregonstate.edu/dept/senate/committees/other/tfose/
3. New Business (if time allows)
   1. ARL Membership
   2. Plan of work for the 2005-2006 academic year
4. Report from the Librarian
Library Committee

Library Committee
Agenda
October 3, 2005

1. Welcome, Introductions, Expectations
2. House keeping
   a. Meeting times for the rest of the year
   b. Minutes taking
3. Student Members
4. Old Business
   a. Role of the Committee (see Standing Rules)
   b. Task force on Scholarly Communication (see Final Report)
   c. Other
5. New Business
   a. Long term Research Study Rooms (request from John Pollitz)
   b. Plan of work for the 2005 - 2006 academic year
   c. Report from the Librarian
Library Committee

Agenda
November 1, 2004
Drinkward Room - 4th Floor, The Valley Library
3:30-5:00 PM

Approval of 10-04-04 Minutes
Retired Faculty Serving on Faculty Senate Committees
Faculty Senate Executive Committee Meeting with Committee Chairs: Assessing Committee Agendas for AY 2004-05
OSU Libraries Strategic Plan
New Library Funding Transfer Policy
October 4, 2004 Agenda, Library Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

Library Committee

October 4, 2004
Agenda

INTRODUCTIONS

1. **New and Returning Members** (G. Beach)
   - **Handout**: Library Committee Membership List (Review and Update)
   - Questions: Why were you interested in serving on the Library Committee?
   - Are there particular issues that you would like the Library Committee to address during the coming year?

2. **Student Members** (G. Beach)
   - Need to add student members. The Library Committee allows for three Student members, including at least one undergraduate and one graduate student. (Submit names of student(s) who might be interested in serving on the Library Committee to Beach.)

INFORMATION

3. **Library Committee Standing Rules** (G. Beach)
   - **Handout**: Library Committee Standing Rules (Last changed in March, 2002. Should there be any changes to the wording?)

4. **Faculty Senate Task Force on Scholarly Communication** (G. Beach)
   - This discussion was begun by the Library Committee last year under the leadership of Ken Winograd. The Task Force is to conclude its work by the end of the academic year. Beach and Bonnie Allen will be among those serving on the Task Force.

5. **Long Term Research Study Rooms for Faculty and Doctoral Students** (G. Beach)
   - Beach is representing the Library Committee, working with Lorraine Borchers, to review the applications for six study rooms in the Valley Library building.

   - The Business Affairs Office is, or will be, conducting a cost analysis study of the Library operations during the 2004-05 fiscal year.

DISCUSSION

7. **Library Strategic Plan** (B. Allen)
   - **Handout**: Library Strategic Plan
   - Committee members should review in October. Comments/observations should be noted for the November meeting.

8. **Library Budget: FY 2005** (B. Allen)
   - **Handout**: Library Budget and Comparison with OSU's Peer Institutions

9. **Library Funding Transfer Policy** (G. Beach and B. Allen)
   - **Handout**: Category I Process: Allocation of Funding to the Valley Library
   - Suggestion: Revise the policy. Recommend the establishment of a University level "Library Contingency Fund" that can be used to fund the need for monographs, serials, and other library materials for up to four years following the approval of new academic degree programs.
March 2, 2004 Agenda

1. How the library does category one evaluations

2. Review and evaluation of library fund transfer procedure proposal draft

3. Debrief of Ken and Gary’s visit to the Executive Committee, on the subject of library funding…and discussion of next step

4. Other items
February 3, 2004 Agenda

Agenda

1. Provide feedback re. the lib vision statement re. the strategic plan as well as the draft response to the 2001 accreditation report which had a recommendation that library resources be improved.

2. The consideration and organization of lib committee-sponsored forums and survey related to the "Elsevier" problem

3. Re-consideration of faculty senate resolution to increase funding for library.
Library Committee

October 30, 2003
Agenda

3:30 pm - 5:00 pm Drinkward Room -- fourth floor of the library

1. Library research travel grants (Bonnie)

2. Explanation of library's capital plan (Karyle)

3. How materials get added to collections (Bonnie)

4. Other agenda items (see note below) (Gary)

Note: Gary Beach, a member of the committee who missed our first meeting, emailed me several interesting potential agenda items. I have asked him to pose three of these, which he described to me in a recent email. FYI.

(3) Transfer of Funds Associated with New Degree Programs: There is an unrealized process by which funds for monographs and serials are suppose to be transferred from a given academic unit after a Category I proposal to establish a new degree program has been approved by the Oregon State Board of Higher Education. For example, there are literally dozens of new degree programs that have been approved during the past ten years. However, to date, not one cent has been transferred to the Valley Library so that the library materials required for the new program can be purchased and made available for student use once these new degree programs are activated. A detailed Library Evaluation is required of each new Category I proposal. As part of the evaluation, the Library indicates if the current collection is adequate or inadequate to meet the needs of the proposed degree program. If the collection is in any way inadequate, the Library Evaluation will indicate whether reoccurring or non-reoccurring funds are required to meet the proposed program requirements. Since no funds have actually been transferred in the past, the Valley Library has had to absorb these additional costs out of their already limited budget. Bonnie Allen, Gil Brown (Director of Budget and Fiscal Planning), and myself have discussed the establishment of a process by which these fund transfers can take place, but to date, nothing has been implemented. I believe the time has come to activate this important part of the approval process for any new academic degree program.

(4) Accreditation: In the Spring of 2004, OSU will have a site visit by an evaluator from the Northwest Association of Schools, Colleges, and Universities--OSU's accrediting body. In preparation for this site visit, OSU will need to submit to NASCU early next year a response to one of the recommendations we received during our full accreditation site visit in 2001; i.e., inadequate resources to support the library operation. The Library Committee could be instrumental in contributing to OSU's response to this recommendation. Bob Burton, Assistant Provost for Academic Programs is taking the lead in drafting a response to this and four other recommendations. The library related recommendation OSU received ("recommendation" is a kind, benign word NASCU uses to identify a major deficiency that needs to be seriously addressed) reads as follows:

5. The Committee recommends that the University take appropriate steps to ensure the adequacy and sufficiency of library collections and resources to support education and research, especially at the graduate level (Standards 5.A.1, 5.A.2, 5.C.1).

(5) Library Budget: Back in 1996 or 1997, I forget which year, the Faculty Senate passed a resolution (that I had written) to increase the budget for the Valley Library from approximately 2% of the total University
budget to 4%. The 4% figure is approximately the percentage OSU's peer institutions contribute to support their library operations. This 2% increase (from 2% to 4%), would as I recall, have effectively doubled the Library's budget from just under $8 million to just over $15 million. This Faculty Senate supported resolution to improve the Library's meager budget was to be phased in by the University over a three biennium (6-year) period. It would be interesting to know if this resolution has been taken to heart by the central administration, and if the new budget allocation model (BAM) has, or will, result in increased funding for the Valley Library.
Library Committee

October 1, 2003
Agenda

1. Welcome and introductions

2. Review and discussion of the committee's purpose

3. Set times for future meetings

4. Consideration of committee's agenda for year

Last spring, at our last library committee meeting, the group brainstormed some possible agenda items for this year's committee. Some ideas for next year's committee:

- The committee should monitor these upcoming campus changes in plan 2007 - and the budget.

- We should invite the new president to talk, but during the screening process ask the candidates what they've done for libraries at their universities. (Mark will collect ideas for questions to ask candidates.)

- We may want to arrange a meeting with our counterparts at UofO to discuss the shared collections and other issues.

- We should find ways to ensure students are involved in the library.

- We can ask students what/how to use the library.

- Use internal, targeted, surveys from the faculty and students to gauge library use/needs, and to help to identify the important needs.
May 29, 2003 Agenda, Library Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

Library Committee

May 29, 2003
Agenda

Review and approve minutes from last meeting.

Old business:

1. Update on library's position in university structure in light of "path of distinction" plan that has emerged from the OSU 2007 process:

"The University Library, headed by the University Librarian, will separate from Information Services and report to the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, effective July 2003, with a charge to improve principally through private resources the quality and value of library services such that OSU qualifies for national recognition by 2007-08, such as by the Associated Research Libraries or another appropriate entity. The library will be served by a management council and business center shared with other units."

2. Update on shared collections with U. of O.

3. Discuss the kind of information the library needs on faculty and student use of services and facilities. Discuss methods for obtaining that information, especially if there is anything needed beyond the current Library User Survey led by Bonnie Allen.

New business:

1. Discuss role and goals of FS Library Committee next year - ideas for next year's committee

2. Thanks to 'term-limited' members and student member of the committee.
Library Committee

April 24, 2003
Agenda

Review and approve minutes from last meeting.

Old business:
1. Update on library's position in university structure and on memo to provost

2. Discuss the kind of information the library needs on faculty and student use of services and facilities. Discuss methods for obtaining that information.

3. Review of library's budget, either current or anticipated, depending on what is available from library staff.

New business

Next (and last) meeting date: May 29, 2003
Library Committee

March 13, 2003
Agenda

1. Update on memo to the provost
2. Discuss how we can best advocate for strengthening the library's budget
February 27, 2003

Agenda

1. Discussion with Julia Blixrud from the Association of Research Libraries

2. Finalizing statement about centrality of libraries to university

   I will move that we accept the following statement, having altered it in light of feedback from some committee members. We can entertain minor alterations if needed, but should probably move on to other topics.

   "The library gives meaning to the very word "university," connecting OSU to the universe of learning, even as it supports and builds our very sense of an OSU community. In so doing, the library enables the university to achieve its central purpose: the discovery and dissemination of knowledge. The library is a profoundly democratic space in the university where information is available to all, whether users are students walking the stacks or researchers searching the catalogs online. As the heart of the university, the library is both a central place on campus for scholarly exchange and an engine that powers that exchange as the university pursues its mission to serve the state of Oregon."

3. Update on request from Bruce Sorte that this committee help prepare materials for negotiating with current administration on implementing and re-implementing the resolutions passed by Faculty Senate in Spring 2002:

   - moving library out of Information Services and recognize it as an academic unit
   - having library represented at "Dean" level by University Librarian
   - needing OSU to invest more in library

4. Review of library's current budget, if available.

5. Remaining Winter and Spring term meetings

   March 13    April 24    May 29

http://oregonstate.edu/dept/senate/committees/library/
Library Committee

January 30, 2013

Agenda

1. Briefly review topics of last two meetings and plans for remainder of year.

2. Report from library staff regarding current status of the library, especially in light of potential further budget cuts at OSU.
   - Discussion of library’s key services
     - Question: Which key services must be maintained?
     - Question: Which key services can be and should be maintained without charging students, faculty, departments, etc.?
   - What information does the library need from students about key services, and how can we advise/help them to obtain that information?

3. Continued discussion of library’s centrality to university.

4. Remaining Winter and Spring term meetings:
   - February 27
   - March 13
   - April 24
   - May 29

http://oregonstate.edu/dept/senate/committees/library/
November 21, 2002 Agenda, Library Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

Library Committee

November 21, 2002
Agenda

I. Approval of Minutes of October meeting (5 minutes)*

II. Identifying key services to protect/maintain during budget reductions (25 minutes)
   * issue suggested by University Librarian at our last meeting

III. Requests from President-elect of Faculty Senate (Bruce Sorte) (25 minutes)

   He has asked the Faculty Senate Library Committee to:

   a) identify a few criteria that would help to monitor success/failure at implementing the resolutions passed by the Faculty Senate last Spring.

   b) create a statement by the faculty which articulates why we think the library is the 'heart' of the campus.

   c) continue to evaluate the library's budget (apart from Information Services' budget.)

IV. Organizational structure of library (10 minutes)

V. Library study rooms - easing restrictions on use. (5 minutes)

VI. Location of next meeting to be announced; scheduled for Thursday, December 12 Could we meet from 4:00-5:00pm? Will we have a quorum if we meet then?
Library Committee

October 17, 2002
Agenda

1. Welcome and Introductions

2. Discussion of Highlights in orientation packets:
   - review of major topics of discussion, decisions in 2001-2002

3. Report on state of Library and areas for support from the Committee
   - preview of major topics for this academic year
   - suggestions for other new business to address this year

4. Confirming of proposed meeting times for fall term meetings (11/21 and 12/12)

Note: While some of our meetings might run 90 minutes, this one will end at 4:30; hence, we'll begin promptly at 3:30.

Faculty Senate Library Committee:
Mark Edwards '04, Chair  Sociology
Heidi Brayman Hackel '03  English
Lawrence Landis '03  Archives
Ajoy Velayudhan '03  Bioresource Engineering
Dianne Erickson '04  Science & Mathematics Education
Bob Rost '04  Extension & Experiment Station Communications
Ken Winograd '04  School of Education
Barbara Gartner '05  Forest Products
Mo Healey '05  History

Ex-Officio: University Librarian (Karyle Butcher)

Student Members -
- TBA
- TBA

Executive Committee Liaison - Dianne Erickson
1. Review and approval of minutes of the April and May meetings

2. Discussion of two proposed resolutions to be presented at the June 6 Faculty Senate meeting (see below)

3. Update on ARL application status

4. Update on Library Satellite Team for OSU 2007

5. Discussion of the Vision Statement (available on our committee website under the May agenda)

6. Announcement of new chair for 2002-03

Below are the two FSLC resolutions (which I based on our ongoing discussions about OSU 2007) as approved by the Executive Committee on Friday. Because the EC dropped much of the language that I submitted, I will send as a separate email the earlier versions so that we can discuss strategies for presenting the resolutions at the Faculty Senate meeting on Thursday.

Library Committee Resolutions
Presented to the Faculty Senate June 6, 2002

1. Support for increased funding of the Libraries

   Whereas, The Faculty Senate resolved in 1999 to support increased funding for the Libraries with a target of 4% of total University expenditures by the year 2004-05,
   The faculty of Oregon State University supports increasing the funding of the Valley Library and recommends that the University commit to increasing the percent of expenditures dedicated to the library to attain a level of at least 4% of total expenditures by the year 2004-2005. (March 4, 1999, Motion 99-546-01); and

   Whereas, The Libraries have not made sufficient budgetary gains since the 1999 resolution to approach this target; be it

   Resolved, That the Faculty Senate reaffirms its 1999 commitment to the Library.

2. Re-positioning of the Libraries

   Whereas, The library is clearly an academic unit both historically at OSU (before 1994) and nationally at our peer institutions;

   Whereas, All libraries in the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) are academic units;

   Whereas, The Libraries are central to the teaching and research mission of the University; and

   Whereas, The faculty of the Libraries contribute significantly to the teaching of undergraduates; be it

   Resolved, That the Faculty Senate supports the establishment of the Libraries as an academic unit
separate from Information Services, and it recommends: 1) a new reporting structure so that the University Librarian reports directly to the Provost, and 2) re-evaluation of the title of the University Librarian.
Library Committee

May 15, 2002
Agenda

1. Review of minutes of April Meeting

2. Discuss recommendation on Study Room Policy

   Current policy
   Research study rooms are available for a 90-day loan period for faculty and doctorate students. These rooms may be shared by patrons. Key cards are checked out at Circulation, and holds may be placed at Circulation. In addition to the general research study rooms, there are ten long-term research study rooms that are assigned based upon a formal application, which is available online (.pdf) or (.html), or at Circulation.

   Suggested revision with changes in italics
   Research study rooms are available for a 90-day loan period for faculty and for doctoral students who have passed their oral preliminary examinations. These rooms may be shared by patrons. Key cards are checked out at Circulation, and holds may be placed at Circulation. Doctoral students must demonstrate their post-orals standing by presenting a letter from their department to the Circulation staff. In addition to the general . . . .

3. Discussion of proposed Vision Statement (distributed at April meeting and attached: http://www.orst.edu/dept/senate/committees/library/agen/reports/05152002vision.html)

4. Discussion of Peat Marwick Report (copies sent by campus mail in early May)

5. Discussion about OSU 2007 with co-chair of Library Satellite Team, Loretta Rielly

6. Update on U of O/OSU shared collections

7. Discussion of fundraising ideas
April 17, 2002 Agenda, Library Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

Library Committee

April 17, 2002
Agenda

* ORBIS: stats on faculty use
* Review of satellite team proposal for OSU 2007 (see email from Loretta Reilly sent 4/9/02)
* Study room policy: demographics of current holders and waiting list
* OU/OSU shared collection project: update
* Distribution of Library vision statement
March 13, 2002 Agenda, Library Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

Library Committee

March 13, 2002
Agenda

1. Review of minutes of February Meeting
2. Reports from committee members who've attended Faculty Senate Forums with President Risser
3. Report on numbers for Indirect Costs and total E&G budget (Karyle)
4. Discuss OSU 2007 Strategic Vision with Becky Johnson, Chair of the Steering Committee
Library Committee

February 21, 2002
Agenda

1. Review of minutes from January Meeting (available online on Faculty Senate page)

2. Reports from committee members who have attended Faculty Senate Forums with Risser

3. Update from the Library on the budget and OSU 2007 process

4. Plan meeting with Vice Provost for Research on indirect costs

5. Discuss recommendation for large-scale university funding for library

6. Discuss ORBIS policy for faculty

7. New Business
January 17, 2002 Agenda, Library Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

Library Committee

January 17, 2002
Agenda

1. Update on our letter sent to Redesign Committee, 12/10/01 (Heidi)
2. Update on budget cuts (Karyle)
3. Discussion of collaboration with U of O (please read & consider attached letter) (Karyle)
Library Committee

January 22, 2001
Agenda

1. Review/approval of November minutes
2. Committee vacancy (replacement for Shiao-ling Yu for remainder of academic year)
3. Ongoing discussion items
   a. Category I proposals
   b. indirect costs redistribution
   c. status of ramp up to 4% of G&E budget
4. Technology Resource Fee (TRF) funds
5. Announcements and discussion items from Library staff
6. Adjourn
1. Review/approval of January minutes

2. Library happenings/items from Library staff

3. Ongoing discussion items:
   a. Indirect cost redistribution -- discussion of subcommittee's Feb. 22 meeting with Rich Holdren
   b. TRF funds
   c. Category I proposals
   d. ramp up to 4% of G&E budget

4. University of Maryland Health Sciences and Human Services Library exhibit on library costs

5. March meeting date

6. Adjourn
June 12, 2001 Agenda, Library Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

**Library Committee**

**June 12, 2001**

**Agenda**

1. Follow-up to accreditation

2. Library happenings, including the COCC/OSU partnership for the OSU- Cascades Campus, the library's fall in-service day, a collections report, and initiatives for the upcoming year (digital collections, stacks maintenance and space issues, building supervisory capacity)

3. Budgetary issues updates (the latest on Category I proposals, indirect costs, etc.)

4. Committee chair for 2001/02
February 24, 2000 Agenda, Library Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

Library Committee

February 24, 2000
Agenda

1. Review and approval of January 27 minutes
2. Library support for new academic programs -- discussion of 1999/2000 Category I curriculum proposals
3. Study room data ports
4. New member orientation packets
5. Other business
6. Next meeting -- March 30, 3:30-5pm (Library collection assessment presentation and discussion)
May 25, 2000 Agenda, Library Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

Library Committee

May 25, 2000
Agenda

*Approval of April 27, 2000 meeting minutes
*Report of the Study Carrel Use Subcommittee (Brayman Hackel, Armer, Butcher) and continuation of the discussion on use of the carrels
*Continuation of the Category I proposal discussion and resolution to the Faculty Senate (Beach)
*Alternate meeting time for June meeting; discussion of additional Summer committee meeting(s)
Library Committee

October 25, 2000
Agenda

1. Approve minutes of September 21 meeting
2. Announcements from Library staff
3. 2000/2001 annual report
4. Research study room policy update
5. Printing update
6. Category I curriculum proposals
7. Serials cost increases and cancellations/SPARC
8. Indirect costs redistribution
9. Status of ramp-up to 4% of university budget
10. Adjourn
Library Committee

November 29, 2000
Agenda

1. Welcome

2. Review/approval of October minutes

3. Discussion of/update on other ongoing agenda items
   a. serials cost increases and cancellations/SPARC
   b. indirect costs redistribution (volunteers still needed for a subcommittee to address this issue)
   c. status of ramp up to 4% of G&E budget

4. Announcements from Library staff

5. Discussion of Category I curriculum proposals with Leonard Friedman and Gary Beach

6. Adjourn
December 7, 1999 Agenda, Library Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

Library Committee

December 7, 1999
Agenda

- review of minutes
- introduction of associate librarians, overview of their responsibilities
- ARL status
- collection assessment
- budget update
- science journal
- strategies for dealing with expensive titles
- library fundraising
Library Committee

October 28, 1999
Agenda

ARL status (Karyle Butcher)
collection assessment (Karyle Butcher)
budget update (Gary Beach & Karyle Butcher)
library support for new programs (Gary Beach)
annual report (Gary Beach)
library-related research proposals (Karyle Butcher & Rita Leahy)
Preliminary Agenda:

Introductions
Announcements
Library Open House
E-Board Request
Budget Update for FY 1999-00
Library Committee Membership: Need for Student Members
Information Services Task Force Recommendations
(continuation of our discussion and recommendations that were begun at our December meeting)
Meeting Dates for February and March

Future Agenda Topics:

ARL Membership Plan
Library Committee Standing Rules: Review and Update
Planning the Future of the Valley Library: Strategic Plan
Library Committee

November 17, 1998
Agenda

I. Introduction and Announcement Items

(1) Welcome and Introduction of New Members
(2) Meeting Minutes: October 13, 1998
(3) Schedule December Meeting

II. Information Items

(1) Orbis: Faculty Borrowing Period for Books
(2) CLA/History Memos: Library Program on Assessment
(3) Library Overdue Fee Structure
(4) Information Services Ad Hoc Committee
(5) New OUS Budget Model and OSU Allocation Procedures

III. Discussion Items (Continued from October)

(1) Library Budget: FY 1998-99
(2) Information Services Budget Deficit: Faculty Senate Task Force Report and Associate Provost Pederson's Response
(3) Membership in ARL
(4) Planning the Future of the Library
Faculty Senate

Library Committee

Minutes

- 2013
- 2012
- 2011
- 2010
- 2009
- 2008
- 2007
- 2006
- 2005
- 2004
- 2003
- 2002
- 2001
- 2000
- 1999
Library Committee

October 31, 2012 Minutes

Voting Members Present: Jack Bellville, Bruce Geller, Sebastian Heiduschke, Stacey Lee, Kari Miller, Yi-Cheng Su
Ex-Officio Member Present: Faye Chadwell
Guests: Cheryl Middleton, Shan Sutton

Welcome and introductions

Updates

- OSU Libraries and Press has two new faculty hires:
  - Hui Zhang, a new digital applications librarian, starts tomorrow. He has a PhD in computer science and will be working on digital projects.
  - Korey Jackson, the next Gray Family Chair, starts in December. He has a digital publishing focus. He will also help investigate some sustainable, affordable, flexible platforms to support OA publishing.

- OSU Libraries Strategic Plan Initiatives
  - One goal is to have a space planning document by the end of the 2014 calendar year. The Library needs to address user needs and to accommodate potential new residents coming to The Valley Library. Also, transformation of the 5th floor space is a fundraising priority.
  - In 2014 the Library will be migrating to a new online catalogue.

Library Budget
The overall budget news is positive, and the Library has been successful with some projects important to the university, including an oral history project that is underway. The data management specialist in the library received a $155,000 federal grant, and OSU will be the lead on the project.

There was a brief discussion of fundraising priorities including enhancing collections, transforming space, creating one more endowed position, and endowing an internship program.

OSU Libraries and Press recently received funds to endow the library undergraduate research award (one of the Library Committee’s active sub-committees), and we are just waiting for the final paperwork to be processed before announcing details.

Libraries Office/Space Changes
Ecampus will [eventually] be vacating offices in The Valley Library, but it’s not clear when that is going to happen. Information Services will eventually move as well although, again, there is no time frame for that move. Student Media Services will remain. There is a movement to bring Disability Access Services to the library, which could be good for students.

The Library is also trying to create more space for students to study by moving print materials. They are also looking to determine how they can better support graduate student research and collaboration space since they do not have a place on campus.

Standing Subcommittees

  a. Study Rooms (Library Committee)
  - The Library tries to have three available each year for long-term use. Typically a faculty member sits on the committee to review the applications. Stacy Lee volunteered to be on the subcommittee.
b. **Library Undergraduate Research Awards**  
One faculty member needs to agree to read the papers submitted and be a member of the committee that selects the winners. Bruce Geller volunteered.

**Other News/Initiatives**

a. New Faculty Outreach  
January 9 is new faculty reception in special collections. Could there be more outreach geared to student affairs faculty?

b. Open Resources  
Data management. A survey will be sent out soon by Library staff to all faculty about data management needs. The Library has memberships to provide discounts to faculty for publishing in certain journals.  
*Action: Shan will report back to this group on the impact, if any, of the Library’s membership.*

c. The Library recently succeeded in getting a library course designator to allow them to start offering credit courses. The first offering will be a two-credit data management course, **GRAD 521**, for graduate students that will be offered winter term and taught by a librarian. The course will be an introduction and skill development class on how to organize, preserve, and share data.  
  - Having the course designator may also allow OSU Libraries and Press to offer internships for credit, which will have strong appeal to students.

d. Internship programs for credit are still being explored by Library staff; updates will be addressed in Winter.

e. Emeritus/Community Access  
Retired faculty who do not have emeritus status do not have access to subscription databases through OSU Libraries and Press. Technically it might be possible to do this, so one question is if there is a widespread interest in this service? The Faculty Economic Welfare and Retirement Committee determines benefits for retired faculty, so they would have to be consulted.  
*Action: After some fact finding is done, this could be pursued at the next meeting.* [FYI- OUS Emeritus Policy]

**Wrap-Up**  
Members of the committee took a mini-tour to become familiarized with Library facilities and those that will be affected by office changes and Library initiatives.
Members Present: Stacey Smith, Hsiou-Lien Chen, Rich Carter, David Myrold, Laura Cray (Graduate Student), Bruce Geller, Marit Bovbjerg
Ex-officio Member Present: University Librarian, Faye Chadwell
Guests: Jennifer Nutefall, Jane Nichols, Andrea Wirth, Steven Sowell
Minutes/Support: JoLynn O’Hearn

Agenda:
- Welcome and brief introductions
- Discussion of Oregon State University Libraries (OSUL) budget proposal
- Discussion of Elsevier boycott and ongoing open access initiatives at OSU

1) Committee members briefly reintroduced themselves

2) Discussion of Oregon State University Libraries (OSUL) Budget Proposal
The main topic of discussion at our meeting was the library budget. Last quarter, University Librarian Faye Chadwell asked for the Faculty Senate Library Committee’s input and support in presenting the OSU Libraries’ budgetary concerns to the Vice-Provost and Provost. In December, FSLC members Rich Carter and Stacey Smith began working with Faye Chadwell, Jane Nichols, Steven Sowell, and Andrea Wirth of OSUL to draft a preliminary budget proposal that Faye can take to the Provost.

The committee discussed the budget proposal and made the following suggestions:
- Add an executive summary.
- Reduce the size of the proposal, minus the graphs, to two pages.
- The first two graphs make the case for increased funding well; the third graph is somewhat confusing and could be cut.
- Include a section at the end of the document that discusses how OSUL will use increased funding to fulfill unmet needs, indicating where, specifically, the money will go.
- In the section on OSUL’s current funding sources:
  - Add the amount of Research and Development (R&D) funding that OSUL receives;
  - Specify how much money OSUL receives in gift funds, and
  - Total out the column.
- The proposal needs to better orient the reader to the current status of the collections and to make the case for a larger collections budget. This could be done by:
  - Indicating that 78% of the collections budget goes to electronic resources and that these resources are just as expensive (if not more expensive) than print resources;
  - Discussing the merits and costs of Interlibrary Loan (ILL) and explaining why OSUL cannot rely primarily on ILL to meet faculty and student research needs; and
  - Discussing why OSUL needs to obtain access to smaller, specialized journals as well as top-tier, high-impact journals. Some departments rely solely on these more specialized journals. In some disciplines, graduate students and junior faculty are more likely to publish in smaller, specialized journals.
- Reconsider whether the theme of a Top Ten Land Grant Library is the most useful way to frame the budget proposal.
- Discuss OSUL’s needs for additional faculty lines and staff positions as well as salary equity.
- The proposal might address subsidizing the cost for OSU faculty to publish in Open Access journals.
Action: The committee will continue to circulate and revise the budget proposal via e-mail. We will hold a committee meeting in early April to discuss the proposal a final time before Faye Chadwell’s meeting with Vice-Provost Warner and Provost Randhawa in late April.

3) Elsevier Boycott and Ongoing Open Access Issues
Elsevier is the largest publisher in the world and it is supporting and sponsoring (via donations to the bill’s sponsors) the Research Works Act currently being considered by Congress. This bill is designed to roll back the NIH Public Access Policy and block the development of similar policies at other federal agencies. It represents another attempt by Elsevier to challenge open access policies. Open access policies make federally funded research available to the public who pay for that research to be conducted.

Faye Chadwell gave the committee an update on the boycott and its progress at OSU. Twenty OSU faculty have presently signed on to the boycott. OSUL is encouraging more OSU faculty to join in this boycott and Michael Boock, the head of the OSUL Center for Digital Scholarship and Services, has drafted the following open letter to the faculty and posted it to OSUL’s main page: http://osulibrary.oregonstate.edu/files/elsevier%20boycott%20letter.pdf.

The committee decided that the best way to promote this open access issue is to publicize it via OSU Today.

Action: Stacey Smith will draft a news item for OSU Today to inform faculty and the broader OSU/Corvallis community about the boycott.
Library Committee

May 14, 2012
Minutes

Voting Members Present: Marit Bovbjerg, Rich Carter, Kira Hughes, Stacey Smith (Chair)
Ex-officio Member Present: Faye Chadwell
Staff: JoLynn O'Hearn (minutes)
Guests: Jane Nichols, Jennifer Nutefall, Steven Sowell

Updates from Stacey Smith

- Year-end housekeeping and reminders
  - New Executive Committee Liaison: Jon Dorbolo, Associate Director of Technology Across the Curriculum
  - Committee membership:
    - Naomi Hirsch and David Myrold will be rotating off the committee this year. We thank them for their service.
    - Rich Carter and Kira Hughes have one more year of service and will rotate off in 2013.
    - Marit Bovbjerg, Bruce Gellar and Hsiou-Lien Chen will rotate off in 2014.
    - Vickie Nunnemaker, Special Assistant to the Faculty Senate President, has put out the call for committee volunteers and we will be getting the names of our new members over the summer
    - Smith will likely continue as committee chair, though this may be contingent on other Faculty Senate decisions

- Year-end duties:
  - Smith will write a year-end report that will circulate via e-mail for the committee’s approval and feedback before she sends it to the Faculty Senate this summer. It will become part of the committee’s permanent record and will appear on the Faculty Senate website.
  - Smith confirmed that the collections budget proposal will be submitted to the Faculty Senate as part of the report.
  - We will have an introductory meeting in October 2012 to assign subcommittee tasks and plan for the year.

- Elsevier boycott and open access
  - Under pressure from the boycott, Elsevier withdrew its support from the Research Works Act (RWA), which made a press release about the boycott unnecessary. In lieu of the press release, Smith worked with the OSU Libraries’ Open Access Work Group on a fact sheet about authorial rights and open access. She suggested that we could launch the fact sheet on the Library’s website during Open Access Week in October 2012.

Report from Jennifer Nutefall, Associate University Librarian

- Jennifer Nutefall, working with committee members Bruce Gellar and David Myrold, selected six OSU faculty to receive Library Research Travel Grants. Information about the winners can be found at the OSU Libraries Travel Grant Award Recipients web page.
- The Undergraduate Student Research Award Committee, which included Nutefall, committee member Naomi Hirsch, and other faculty from around campus, selected three winners of the Undergraduate Student Research Award. They are:
  - Lauren Graebner and Thea Matos, "Intersections of Cross-Cultural Style: Integrating Functional Design into the Socio-Religious Hijab Headscarf"
  - Ingrid Ockert, "The Atomic Awakening of Ava Helen Pauling"

Report from Faye Chadwell, University Librarian
Faye Chadwell will be working with Sherman Bloomer, Dean of the College of Science, to address the OSU Libraries’ critical budget shortfalls.

Changes in personnel: Jennifer Nutefall will be leaving OSU Libraries in June to take a position elsewhere. Shan Sutton will be starting as Associate University Librarian in June. Anne Bahde started as the new History of Science Librarian this month.

Ongoing searches: OSU Libraries is actively conducting searches for the following positions: Data Management Specialist, Circulation Supervisor, and Associate University Librarian for Teaching and Engagement (to fill Nutefall’s vacancy).

Space issues: OSU Libraries’ off-site storage may be moving to a new facility. Plans to renovate the 4th floor of Valley Library are ongoing. OSU Libraries may eliminate some of its print collection (items which have already been digitized) to make room for more study and research space within Valley Library.

Discussion of OSU Libraries Collections Budget Proposal
The proposal met with high praise from the committee and many thanks go out to Steven Sowell, Jane Nichols, and Andrea Wirth for their hard work on the project.

The committee suggested only a few minor changes:
- Rich Carter suggested eliminating the second graph on page two and transferring the data on it to the first graph. He also suggested rounding up the dollar amounts on page four to improve readability.
- Faye Chadwell suggested adding new open access publishing opportunities to the list of new services that the library could provide to faculty if it had a larger budget.
- Stacey Smith and Marit Bovbjerg suggested adding information about the OSU Libraries’ use of Interlibrary Loan to the document. Bovbjerg noted that the document might address the cost savings of converting high-use Interlibrary Loan titles into permanent subscriptions. Smith and Chadwell suggested adding use of Interlibrary Loan under the list of OSU Libraries’ current cost-saving measures on page one.
- Jane Nichols will revise the proposal and send it to Smith for inclusion in the committee’s year-end report. Chadwell will use the revised version in her upcoming discussions with Sherman Bloomer and Vice Provost Rebecca Warner.

Planning for Next Year
- Library Research Travel Grants
  - Smith suggested that the committee might want to revisit the unsuccessful proposal to increase funding for the Library Research Travel Grant next year.
  - Carter suggested that we may need to increase the number of applicants for this award before we can successfully obtain more funding.
    - Chadwell and Nutefall suggested that it will be helpful to connect Larry Rodgers, Dean of the College of Liberal Arts, and Shan Sutton, the incoming Associate Librarian, to discuss marketing the grants and increasing funding for them.
- Publicizing the OSU Libraries’ services
  - Carter suggested a campaign to raise awareness about the variety of crucial services that OSU Libraries already provides for students and faculty and to solicit more feedback about what the campus community needs from the Library. Jennifer Nutefull mentioned that previous and upcoming assessment reports will help OSU Libraries tackle this issue.
- Open Access
  - Chadwell suggested that the committee continue its discussions of a campus-wide open access policy with the end goal of taking a proposal for such a policy to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.
Library Committee

October 24, 2012
Minutes

Voting Members Present: Marit Bovbjerg (Chair), Rich Carter, Stacey Lee, Daniel Dowhower (student representative), Sebastian Heiduschke, Bruce Geller, Oscar Montemayor, Kari Miller, Hsiou-Lien Chen

Guests: Shan Sutton AUL, Cheryl Middleton AUL

Introductions — there are new FSLC members as well as new library staff

- Two student slots remain unfilled. If anyone knows of an undergraduate or graduate student that would make a good addition to the group, please have that person contact Vickie Nunnemaker to start the nomination process.

Open Access Discussion

- Rich, Faye, and Shan went to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee Meeting on open access (9 Oct 2012), to participate in discussion and answer questions. The Executive Committee would like the FSLC to draft a campus-wide Open Access Policy. Members of the FSLC and library staff will attend the Faculty Senate meeting in January to answer questions on open access. The FSLC decided to appoint a sub-committee to work with library staff (Shan and Michael) to draft the Policy. Tasks for this sub-committee will include studying policies at other universities, drafting the Policy, obtaining input from OSU legal counsel, and circulating to the FSLC membership for feedback.
  - Marit and Rich will represent the FSLC on this sub-committee.
- OSU was one of the first universities to pass an open access resolution. The Faculty Senate passed this resolution in 2005, supporting open access to scholarship, but without proposing a formal policy.
- Having a formal policy will allow OSU faculty to negotiate the Copyright Transfer Agreement language with publishers, to allow a copy of the work to be deposited in an open access repository, such as Scholars Archive here at OSU. Precise wording of these policies is crucial from a legal standpoint.

The FSLC has three standing subcommittees, for which we were volunteers:

- faculty travel grants — Bruce Geller and Hsiou-Lien Chen (will work with Shan)
- study/research rooms — Marit and Stacey (will work with Cheryl)
- undergrad research — Kari and Dan (will work with Cheryl)

Faye updated the FSLC on the collections budget report, prepared by the committee last year. Faye presented this report to Sherman Bloomer and Becky Warner over the summer. Faye reports positive feedback (and awareness of the issues) from the provost’s office, but no firm actions yet. The conversation will be continued this year.

Other Library News

- The Library will release their new Strategic Plan in November. This plan has been ‘in the works’ since last spring and there have been opportunities around campus for faculty to provide input.
- New faculty orientation — The Library is working on a proposal for how to introduce new faculty to the library’s services in a more effective manner.
- ORBIS Cascade Alliance — this consortium is made up of 36 libraries from Oregon, Washington and Idaho. ORBIS Cascade is moving to a new card catalog/search system that will save on backend work and make discovery easier for researchers and students.

New business

- Category I proposal funding — this has been resolved in a positive way for the library. The collections budget report may have helped.
- Marit would like for everyone to spread the word to their colleagues that ILL is not free. The Library has
to pay for each requested article, both in terms of staff and copyright/transfer fees.
Library Committee

February 7, 2011
Minutes

Members Present: Rich Carter, Hua–Yu Li, David Myrold, Stacey Smith, Elizabeth Thomas, Tara Williams

Ex-officio Present: University Librarian, Faye Chadwell

Guests: Michael Boock, Jennifer Nutefall

Minutes can be viewed online.

University Librarian Search is progressing nicely. February 25th is the closing date for applications.

Faye: The budget projection for next year is $10 million which includes the OSU Press. We need to prioritize needs year-to-year now. TRF funds give $650,000 a year and gift monies help. Consortium arrangements with other universities help the budget but it locks the library in (trying to get year-by-year deals). The university accreditation coming up may provide negative comments in relation the library but it could also help. Maybe the committee can look at the past 10 years and give an analysis to submit to Becky.

Jennifer reported on the LibQual Survey that is being given at this time. In just the first week, 265 surveys were completed. The survey is on Space, Collections, and Service. This survey could also be a data point for the budget projection on collections.

Jennifer reported on the Scan & Deliver service being offered to students, faculty and staff. 2800 patrons used the service during Fall Term. The average turn-around time was 2.4 days. This service is in addition to the ILL service.

Michael reported on Open Access. As a land grant university, research should be available to our staff and to the world. COAS and Forestry are participating. When an article is published, the rights need to be retained so it can be stored in Scholar’s Archive which helps manage the author’s writings and gives usage data.

Action item: the committee will take a look at Kansas State’s policy 1 & 2 for Open Access and OSU’s Resolution that was passed. Michael suggested that a Recommendation and Guidelines be passed in the new policy.

Links to short pieces from "Life @ OSU" (by former FSLC chair Lee Sherman) that gives great overviews of the key developments and issues in Open Access:

http://oregonstate.edu/dept/ncs/lifeatosu/2009/magic-dome-of-learning/ (The talk by John Willinsky mentioned in this article is also available at http://oregonstate.edu/media/cftzlz.)

The meeting ended with a tour of the new Learning Commons.
Library Committee

May 9, 2011
Minutes

Voting Members Present: Alan Acock, Elizabeth Thomas, Stacey Smith, Rich Carter, Tara Williams, David Myrold
Ex-officio Member Present: University Librarian, Faye Chadwell
Guests: Michael Boock, Jennifer Nutefall, Jane Nichols, Andrea Wirth

Announcements:
- Friday, May 13th, 3:00-4:30 PM in the 2nd Floor rotunda is the Undergraduate Research Awards Ceremony.
- The University Librarian Search is over and we are waiting for the official announcement.

Proposal for the Increased Funding for the Library Research Travel Grant Program
The funding for these grants comes from the Provost’s Office and the Library manages the money. The FSLC suggests asking for full funding using quotes from past applicants. With a few revisions, the proposal was supported by all committee members.

Open Access Resolution
Faye and Michael met with several departments about this. Geosciences has passed this resolution in their department. Others still have misconceptions about it and so Michael is working on a simplified approach for faculty to participate, working college by college.

Action: Could get this on the Senate Meeting agenda for more explanations?
Action: Get a sub-committee formed to pursue further.

Results of the LibQual Survey
Jennifer gave an update on the survey results.

Sent prior to the meeting: Initial LibQual+ 2011 Results_FSLC.pptx

OSU Libraries Budget and how FSLC Might Help to Advocate for an Increase
Jane and Andrea were asked to give an update on the different parts of the budget. With 100 new faculty anticipated for fall term, it would be a good time to track what their research needs are, their packages, what departments they are going to, and see if we can meet their needs. If the library needs the committee’s help, it can be done by email during the summer.

Sent prior to the meeting: Wishlist-Snapshot of need.pdf

Action: The library will come up with several strategies during the summer using information from LibQual.
Library Committee  

October 21, 2011 Minutes

Members Present: Stacey Smith, Rich Carter, David Myrold, Naomi Hirsch, Kira Hughes, Laura Cray (Graduate Student), Bruce Geller and Marit Bovbjerg
Ex-officio Member Present: University Librarian, Faye Chadwell
Guests: Jennifer Nutefall, Jane Nichols, Andrea Wirth, Steven Sowell
Minutes/Support: JoLynn O’Hearn

Agenda:
- Welcome and introductions of members
- Review and discussion of the committee’s standing rules
- Overview of standing FSLC responsibilities, including carrel assignments, library research travel grants & undergraduate research awards
- Suggestions for FSLC agenda items this year from all members
- Update from Stacey Smith on last year’s proposal to increase the Library Research Travel Grant and discussion of future fundraising possibilities
- Updates from University Librarian Faye Chadwell and Associate University Librarian Jennifer Nutefall regarding:
  - the OSU Libraries budget
  - the merger of University Archives and OSU Special Collections
  - resource and collection sharing
  - OSU Libraries’ role in teaching and engagement
- Continuing last year’s discussion about how to improve funding for the libraries' collections budget and the role that this committee (and faculty more broadly) can play in that process. We’ll review the collections budget Power Point presentation that OSU Libraries staff showed us last year.

Everyone introduced themselves and the new members stated the reason why they joined the committee. Stacey Smith went over the committee’s standing rules (Appendix A), noted the lack of student members, and asked members to recruit students who might be interested in participating on the committee. She distributed Associated Students of OSU (ASOSU) application forms for prospective student members. One committee member, Lindy Brown, has left OSU. Stacey Smith will make inquiries about recruiting a new member, preferably from the College of Liberal Arts so that the disciplinary representation on the committee is more balanced. Members are encouraged to bring feedback from the OSU faculty about OSU Libraries and budget.

There will be four sub-committees formed for the following tasks – Stacey Smith will send out an email asking for volunteers to serve.

- Library Research Travel Grants 2010-2011 (2 members)
  - Purpose of the Program: The purpose of the Library Research Travel Grants program is to support faculty travel to libraries and collections outside the state of Oregon in order to promote faculty scholarship and instructional expertise. The scholarly work of some faculty members, especially in the liberal arts and sciences, requires that they visit collections within research libraries, rare book collections, specialized archives, libraries that have received donations of the papers of noted individuals, or research libraries with extensive collections in particular areas of study. In these cases, the use of the OSU Libraries or interlibrary loan is not sufficient; the Provost's Office has established a fund to provide faculty members more intensive access to other research
collections.

- **Amount of the Award**: Up to $2000 per individual will be granted for travel to out-of-state libraries and collections. The award must be used for the exclusive purpose of helping to defray the scholar’s long distance research travel expenses, which includes transportation and per diem expenses only. University standards for computing these expenses must be followed.

- **Library Undergraduate Research Awards (1 member)**
  - The Oregon State University Libraries is pleased to announce the sixth annual Undergraduate Library Research Award. This award recognizes and rewards OSU undergraduate students who, through the comprehensive use of the OSU Libraries, demonstrate outstanding research, scholarship, and originality in writing a paper or completing a project. Typically there are two awards: $1000 scholarship awarded to an upper division undergraduate in the humanities and $1000 scholarship awarded to an upper division student in the social sciences/sciences/engineering from Oregon State University.
  - Students must write their research papers or complete their research projects as part of their coursework at OSU. The intent of this award is to foster outstanding information literacy skills through the extensive and sophisticated use of the library services, resources and collections.

- **Eligibility**: To be eligible for the competition, individuals must:
  - Currently be enrolled as a student (at least part-time; 6 credits or above) at Oregon State University in any discipline (including all branch and e-campus students)
  - Have completed a research project for a credit course at OSU during the Winter, Spring, Summer or Fall terms of 2011 – a project may be in any format or medium
  - Individual or group projects are eligible
  - Awards are given as scholarships, with funds applied directly to the students’ OSU billing account. Therefore the winning students MUST be enrolled at OSU at the time of the award
  - Agree to contribute their papers or projects to the permanent archives of the Oregon State University Libraries

- **Study Room checkout policies (1 member)**
  - Look at the check-out policies for the long-term study rooms and, if necessary, revise them. Some rooms have been checked out for months (even years) by graduate students and faculty and OSU Libraries would like to review policies regarding the rooms.

- **Draft a report to Provost Sabah Randhawa about the OSU Libraries budget, collections, and resource needs.** Rich Carter volunteered for this sub-committee.

Kira Hughes suggested creating a standing meeting time for this committee so that members could schedule around it more efficiently. Since the committee usually meets only once per term, and it is scheduled around OSU librarians’ schedules, it may not make sense to designate a set meeting time.

Stacey Smith asked for any concerns or agenda items to be emailed to her.

**OSU Libraries budget** – Jane Nichols, Andrea Wirth and Steven Sowell presented data in the form of a handout and PowerPoint.

In commenting on the presentation, members suggested that one compelling argument for increasing library resources would be to compare OSU Libraries to libraries at far less prestigious research universities. Many of these institutions have library budgets similar to our own, but have fewer full-time faculty to support. The budget is of special concern because of all the new programs and certificates added to our curriculum and all of the new Provost hires made during the past two years. Most OSU departments chip in less than half of the library budget funds necessary to create their new Category 1 proposals, and this strains the OSU Libraries budget. OSU Libraries is also considering new digital resource acquisition programs, including Get It Now, to enhance collections.

**Bin Items:**

- Continuing last year’s discussion of open access and the role that the committee might play in securing the University’s approval (via the Provost’s signature) for the Berlin Declaration. See the following for details on the Berlin Declaration:
  - Faye Chadwell reported that she has talked to Senior Vice Provost Rebecca Warner and Provost Sabah Randhawa about adding OSU to the Berlin Declaration

- Updates from University Librarian Faye Chadwell and Associate University Librarian Jennifer Nutefall regarding:
  - the OSU Libraries budget
the merger of University Archives and OSU Special Collections
- resource and collection sharing
- OSU Libraries’ role in teaching and engagement
Library Committee

October 11 2010
Minutes

Members Present: Lindy Brown, Faye Chadwell, Kira Hughes, Stacey Smith, Elizabeth Thomas, Tara Williams
Guests: Michael Boock, Jennifer Nutefall
Support Staff: Philip Vue

Member introductions
Each member introduced themselves to the committee and briefly described their interest in the committee.

- Stacey Smith - Department of History. Returning FSLC member.
- Jennifer Nutefall - Associate University Librarian for Innovative User Services
- Faye Chadwell - Interim University Librarian and OSU Press Director
- Tara Williams - Department of English. Chair of FSLC.
- Lindy Brown - Academics for Student Athletes. Just received her Master's in Library and Information Science and is very interested in what is happening in Libraries. New member.
- Kira Hughes - Department of Forestry. New member.
- Elizabeth Thomas - Academic Success Center. Returning member.

Review committee standing rules
The committee discussed the issue with the last sentence in the standing rules regarding retired faculty serving on the committee. Faculty Senate would like FSLC to look at the issues of the last sentence and determine if the provision should be included in the standing rules. Faye will update the committee on the history of the committee rules. Tara will also investigate if this rule covers staff as Elizabeth is staff and not faculty. The committee will hold the decision to add or remove the last sentence after further investigation.

Overview of standing FSLC responsibilities
FSLC is included in long-term research study room assignments. One FSLC member will work with Cheryl Middleton on submitted applications. The library research travel grants now under Jennifer meet twice per year to go over the submitted applications. There is about half a dozen applications for each funding period. The Library Undergraduate Research Award is also administered by Jennifer. One FSLC member will serve on the LURA committee with Jennifer to evaluate the submissions.

Action: Tara will send out an email asking for volunteers.

Suggestions for FSLC agenda items this year from all members

Recap of last year's agenda items:

- In the past, FSLC has dealt with issues around Open Access (OA). There was a subcommittee created to take on the scheduling for talks and making scholarly communication available for use.
- OSU continues collaborative work with the University of Oregon (UO). OSU is currently working on a program with the UO to extend borrowing privileges to allow UO and OSU faculty/staff the same borrowing privileges they would receive from their institutions.
- The committee has also been involved in budgetary struggles.
- The committee will also be involved in advocating for more funds from the University to support the Faculty Research Travel Grants. Each year the university funds $10,000 which is enough to award 5 people a maximum of $2000 per person. The increase in funds would help the humanities scholars and science scholars. OSU Libraries will pull statistics and data together to propose for additional funding.
- The library has data for research grants, what journals are being cited, who is citing, and would like to do something on the issues of publishing for campus in conjunction with OA week.
Action: Members with suggestions can bring them up at the next meeting or contact Tara.

Update on the University Librarian search
This year FSLC may be involved in the University Librarian (UL) search. Tara encouraged members to attend as many of the UL search talks as possible when they are scheduled. Jennifer and Faye have worked together to pull together a position description (PD) for Becky Warner. Faye and Jennifer have also provided Becky with a list of people suggested to serve on the search committee. The committee will consist of people from the library, Library Advisory Council (LAC), people from outside the library and deans. The committee will be chaired by Larry Rogers. The current committee roster is on hold pending approval from the Faculty Senate (FS). The roster should be finalized and approved in the next couple of weeks and put in place at the end of the month. The UL search process will include short interviews, screening, and a decision to bring on campus 3-4 candidates for onsite visits. Site visits are anticipated for the end of the year.

Library update/update on the 24/5 plan

- New space in the Library. The Information Commons on the 2nd floor of the library will be reworked to encourage more collaborative/group study. In March, the Library worked with a design company for a layout of the new space. Furniture has been selected, the PO was submitted, and in the next 8 weeks furniture should be arriving to be installed. Posters are set out to let students know what we have done with their feedback from surveys and focus groups. Posters are color-coded to show where the new furniture will be located within the area. The project was made possible and funded by Friends of the Library. The Barometer also published a short article on the front page on Oct. 6, 2010.

- 24/5 - ASOSU designed posters to advertise the new library hours. Student IDs are required to access the library from 12am-7am. The libraries' highest usage so far has been course reserves and checking out study rooms. The library is only staffing the circulation desk during the night hours with student workers. The library continues to takes statistics every hour. These will be collected to keep Becky and Sabah informed for continued funding support.

- New service - The library now offers a new service called "scan and deliver." Scan and deliver is a service that allows the libraries to scan any print journal on site into a PDF file and deliver the article to an office or by email (faculty and students). The turnaround time for the new service is two or less business days. This includes microfilm and microfiche. The library is benefiting from using the 24/5 staff to help with the scan and deliver service to improve turnaround time.

- Patron driven acquisitions - This services allows the library to more effectively and efficiently make better use of the libraries' monographs budget. There was a soft launch this summer and this should be in place later this fall. The library has created a list of books that have been added to the catalog so, if it is something that a user wants to read, they have access electronically. If a book is checked out/requested more than three times the library will purchase the book.

- New Employees - Two new faculty will be joining the OSU libraries. Evviva Weinraub, the new Director of Emerging Technologies and Services, will start on Monday, October 18 and Natalia Fernandez, the new Oregon Multicultural Librarian, will start November 1.

- The library departments are undergoing a strategic realignment. The Collection and Resource Sharing Department is currently looking for a department head after a retirement. There are also searches for a couple of other positions, including the Access Supervisor for Circulation.

- Oregon Explorer (OE) - The virtual natural resource portal. The portal provides different portals to different natural resource materials around the state. OE recently migrated over to a new interface to allow for searching across all OE portals. Faye and Jennifer will demonstrate the portal at an upcoming FSLC meeting.

- OSU Press - There is a letter going to department heads on campus to encourage faculty to publish with the OSU Press. The Press publishes books in areas of environmental studies, Northwest natural resources, and culture. Mina Carson, faculty from the OSU History Department, was one of the Libraries Resident Scholars who have submitted a proposal to publish a book on the biography of Ava Helen. The Press is also publishing its first OA title in a two-volume series.

- Collaboration with UO - Joint project with UO on an open access journal platform.

- BeaverTracks was launched last spring. It is a website very similar to a GPS that allows people to tour the campus virtually and at the same time get historical information about the campus and buildings. OSU Archives was a key player in this project.

Open Access Week Events
Open Access week is October 18-22. The Library will have a kickoff event on Friday, October 15. The kickoff is in collaboration with a UO featured guest speaker, Kevin Smith, from Duke University who will speak on "Why Open Access Works and Why Copyright Doesn't." The library will have a live feed streaming on the third
floor in the Willamette Industry Seminar Classrooms. There will be a series of tables across campus for people to talk and ask librarians questions about OA and ScholarsArchive. Other events include a presentation on Cascades campus on author rights and short video clips of people on campus talking about OA which will be streamed in the main Library lobby.

**Overview of the Center for Digital Scholarship and Services (CDSS)**

Michael Boock, Head of the Center for Digital Scholarship and Services, presented briefly on the services the new center will provide to the campus. The center came about with the realignment of the cataloging department previously known as Digital Access Services. The center will promote preservation and dissemination of research. The center will work with faculty to insure that they retain the rights to their research, can be reused, repurposed and deposited in ScholarsArchive so that the research is made freely available for use. The center is working with faculty to migrate journals from subscriptions to open access. The center will use a public knowledge platform to publish OA resources such as journals articles, conference proceedings, thesis, technical reports, etc. Thesis and dissertations are now available in ScholarsArchive. The center will continue work on digitization projects as well as data curation services. CDSS is working with the Research Office to come up with a data management plan for all new proposals. The center is working with graduate students to make their research also available. CDSS is working with the OSU Press to digitize all out-of-print books. Michael Boock can be contacted for questions and more specific details.

Meeting adjourned at 4:00 PM
Library Committee

May 12 2010
Minutes

Voting Members Present: Jeffery Breitenfeldt, Hua–Yu Li, David Myrold, David Noakes, Stacy Smith, Tara Williams
Ex-Officio Present: Faye Chadwell
Guests Present: Jennifer Nutefall

Approval of Minutes – The February 16 minutes were approved by the committee.

ASOSU proposal regarding reserves for course readings

Sean Creighton, ASOSU Task Force Director of Campus Affairs, was invited to present on the proposal that ASOSU is developing for course work materials (i.e. reading materials, books). The proposal will address the issues of course materials and how to go about making the materials available for students on the OSU campus. ASOSU has had a lot of support from students and have gathered student signatures which will be included in the proposal to the Provost. ASOSU would like to include the Library Committee on this proposal to look at ways to address and go about making course reserves available. The Provost is currently checking with both the registrar and the library to see what course materials need to be in place. The ASOSU task force goal is to establish an ideal way to make course materials available and to standardize materials. An example would be to determine how many books should be available for every 100 students. Due to the changing nature of materials, what would qualify as course material?

The library was included in the Provost's email regarding the issue on course reserves. The library will help gather data to help the Provost on the issues. Findings will go to the Provost by Friday. The library course reserves currently have 1/3 of the bookstores materials. The issue with course reserves is with textbook publishers bundling deals. One way to look at this issue is to look at the more expensive titles that serve bigger courses. ASOSU can work with the library on an open textbook incentive opportunity as a theme for the next Open Access week. The OSU Bookstore does provide 35 scholarships each year to students to purchase books.

Action: There have been studies on the issues at other institutions. Faye will send links to the studies to any interested committee member.

Report on the 24/5 program

The pilot project has been successful; however, it is still difficult to get the word out regarding the new hours. Not many students are aware that The Valley Library is now open 24/5. The library night staff have been going around the library hourly to gather statistics on activities in the library. Three graphs were generated from the statistics which included the average number of people coming in each week, average number of people coming in per hour and where people are and what they are doing. The library is currently preparing a budget for a full academic year and should have it ready for ASOSU by next week. The budget will be given to ASOSU to take over to the President and Provost to advocate for the service. Students continue to check out study rooms and use reserve materials during these hours and it is worth having staff here to assist them. The library continues to be a place where students can come and gather.

Library Updates

- Library Research Travel Grants – There were nine submissions for the second round. There are a lot of great submissions for the library travel grants each year, however, few will be awarded due to the limited amount of funds the Provost allocates each year. The program has been around since the
1990's. The mission and purpose is to provide support to faculty to do research to visit archives, research collections or institutions and other areas where they might not have access to the collection and tangible items.

Discussion: Will it be worthwhile to approach Sabah to get more money for the program for an allocation of $15,000 a year? This would allow the committee to fund recipients the full amount instead of partial. Action: The Library Committee is in support of this. The travel grant committee will write a letter to the Provost on behalf of Karyle Butcher to expand support to the program. The committee may consider letters of support from previous recipients as further support to demonstrate that there were products that came out of the grant.

- The Linus Pauling Legacy Award and Dinner presentation in Portland on April 20th was a success.
- The Library Undergraduate Research Award ceremony took place in the library rotunda on April 22 to award the two recipients: Douglas Schulte and Robinson Taylor.
- On May 26 the library will have its annual awards for students, faculty and staff.
- Jennifer Nutefall's 4th assessment series session with Joan Lippincott will have a focus on the Learning Commons.
- The library is currently testing out the new furniture, Mediascape, from Steelcase as a possibility for the Learning Commons. Furniture will be in the library until May 28.
- OSU and UofO continue to work on collaboration efforts to provide borrowing privileges.
- OSU and UofO have merged both their digital library collections into one. It is now possible to search through all digital collections from OSU and UofO libraries.
- The library has a grant to look at a platform to push and create a digitization platform and searching tool for a portal collection, creating a platform that will read your IP address without having to show id.
- The newest library development is BeaverTracks – which provides a historical mobile tour of the campus on your mobile phone. Visit http://osulibrary.oregonstate.edu/beavertracks for more information.
- The Library is looking at realignment and is currently in the first phase of iteration.

Adjourned – 3:00 PM

Minutes provided by Philip Vue
Library Committee

May 12 2010
Minutes

Voting Members Present: Jeffery Breitenfeldt, Hua–Yu Li, David Myrold, David Noakes, Stacy Smith, Tara Williams
Ex–Officio Present: Faye Chadwell
Guests Present: Jennifer Nutefall

Approval of Minutes – The February 16 minutes were approved by the committee.

ASOSU proposal regarding reserves for course readings

Sean Creighton, ASOSU Task Force Director of Campus Affairs, was invited to present on the proposal that ASOSU is developing for course work materials (i.e. reading materials, books). The proposal will address the issues of course materials and how to go about making the materials available for students on the OSU campus. ASOSU has had a lot of support from students and have gathered student signatures which will be included in the proposal to the Provost. ASOSU would like to include the Library Committee on this proposal to look at ways to address and go about making course reserves available. The Provost is currently checking with both the registrar and the library to see what course materials need to be in place. The ASOSU task force goal is to establish an ideal way to make course materials available and to standardize materials. An example would be to determine how many books should be available for every 100 students. Due to the changing nature of materials, what would qualify as course material?

The library was included in the Provost’s email regarding the issue on course reserves. The library will help gather data to help the Provost on the issues. Findings will go to the Provost by Friday. The library course reserves currently have 1/3 of the bookstores materials. The issue with course reserves is with textbook publishers bundling deals. One way to look at this issue is to look at the more expensive titles that serve bigger courses. ASOSU can work with the library on an open textbook incentive opportunity as a theme for the next Open Access week. The OSU Bookstore does provide 35 scholarships each year to students to purchase books.

Action: There have been studies on the issues at other institutions. Faye will send links to the studies to any interested committee member.

Report on the 24/5 program

The pilot project has been successful; however, it is still difficult to get the word out regarding the new hours. Not many students are aware that The Valley Library is now open 24/5. The library night staff have been going around the library hourly to gather statistics on activities in the library. Three graphs were generated from the statistics which included the average number of people coming in each week, average number of people coming in per hour and where people are and what they are doing. The library is currently preparing a budget for a full academic year and should have it ready for ASOSU by next week. The budget will be given to ASOSU to take over to the President and Provost to advocate for the service. Students continue to check out study rooms and use reserve materials during these hours and it is worth having staff here to assist them. The library continues to be a place where students can come and gather.

Library Updates

– Library Research Travel Grants – There were nine submissions for the second round. There are a lot of great submissions for the library travel grants each year, however, few will be awarded due to the limited amount of funds the Provost allocates each year. The program has been around since the
1990s. The mission and purpose is to provide support to faculty to do research to visit archives, research collections or institutions and other areas where they might not have access to the collection and tangible items.

Discussion: Will it be worthwhile to approach Sabah to get more money for the program for an allocation of $15,000 a year? This would allow the committee to fund recipients the full amount instead of partial.

Action: The Library Committee is in support of this. The travel grant committee will write a letter to the Provost on behalf of Karyle Butcher to expand support to the program. The committee may consider letters of support from previous recipients as further support to demonstrate that there were products that came out of the grant.

- The Linus Pauling Legacy Award and Dinner presentation in Portland on April 20th was a success.
- The Library Undergraduate Research Award ceremony took place in the library rotunda on April 22 to award the two recipients: Douglas Schulte and Robinson Taylor.
- On May 26 the library will have its annual awards for students, faculty and staff.
- Jennifer Nutefall's 4th assessment series session with Joan Lippincott will have a focus on the Learning Commons.
- The library is currently testing out the new furniture, Mediascape, from Steelcase as a possibility for the Learning Commons. Furniture will be in the library until May 28.
- OSU and UofO continue to work on collaboration efforts to provide borrowing privileges.

Upcoming Event: The next Assessment Workshop will take place on April 26. Speakers will be Raynna Bowlby and Martha Kyrillidou who will present on Survey Service Quality (LibQual+).

Learning Commons space – The group working on this project received IRB approval for the survey to students. The survey went live on January 26, asking what students would like to see in the LC space. Currently there are 660 surveys received. The group will look at the results to figure out the needs for the LC space.

Library to be open 24/5 – The idea would be to have The Valley Library open Sunday–Thursday 24 hours a day. The 24/5 idea came out of a discussion with ASOSU to see if the library could be open 24 hrs. ASOSU has a proposal and will be meeting with Provost Randhawa February 17 to discuss funding. The proposed budget to run the library 24/5 is $38,000-$42,000 which includes security, cleaning, and staffing. This service would only be available to students with an OSU ID beginning at midnight.

Update from Faye Chadwell on scholarly communications work and collaborative opportunities related to managing collections

Scholarly Communications News – The librarian’s serve as resources about OA and our mandate. The library has been working with COAS on a policy to have their research materials deposited into SA. Recently COAS has adopted the first policy of any college in the country and will begin to deposit their materials into SA.

The library met with the News & Communication group on campus to talk about the work the library does to promote research visibility on campus. The first collaboration was on research on “Rice in Africa” which was released to 900 outlets.

There will be collaboration between the University of Oregon (UO) and OSU Libraries to look at collection integration, selection, and acquisition in monographs to reduce duplications and enhance both institutions collections. UO and OSU Libraries will need to sit down and talk about how to pull this off.

Action: FSLC may want to talk about faculty concerns and if the library is adequately covering what the library needs to cover. Michael Boock and Faye will be meeting with OSU faculty in March and April to talk about what they do with data they have in terms of storage/curation on campus. The faculty selected to participate is based on criteria from the subject librarians.

Discussion of proposal to allow UO faculty the same on-site library privileges as OSU faculty (details below)–Karyle Butcher and Cheryl Middleton

There was collaboration with UO last spring to talk about collections. The core of the talk was about how to get the information to faculty and students at each institution. In June both institutions put together recommendations on loan policies and proposed to limit the policy to faculty to implement quickly and then move to a discussion about other patrons. If FSLC approves the proposal, the OSU Libraries will be ahead of
other institutions in a process like this. The library sees this collaboration as ‘one’ library between the two institutions. The proposal will start out with faculty. This is an opportunity to increase the value of the collections for both institutions.

**Action:** FSLC members approved by a majority vote to move forward with the proposal. At some point FSLC would like to revisit the proposal.

**Proposed OSU/UO Collaboration Agreement**

1. We will give each other's faculty checkout access to any items that we give to our own, with the same loan period and fine structure.
   - Faculty from both institutions can borrow from both institutions with the use of their campus ID.
2. We will not be providing Interlibrary Loan privileges
3. We will provide Summit borrowing to each others' faculty so they can pick up their Summit items at either location.
4. While our report addressed site-to-site borrowing via ILL, this isn't specifically included as a service. Let's agree that if any faculty wants something via ILL that the other site wouldn't normally lend via ILL, we'll contact the collection manager to work it out.

**Adjourned** – 5:00 PM
Library Committee

November 11, 2009 Minutes

Attendance: Heather Bennett, Jeffrey Breitenfeldt, Karyle Butcher, David Noakes, Jimmy Rosacker, Lee Sherman, Miranda Smith, Tara Williams

Guests: Faye Chadwell, Jennifer Nutefall

Committee member introductions and discussion of interests/reasons for joining FSLC.

Tara Williams – Chair for FSLC from the English Department
Lee Sherman – News & Communication Services, research writer for Terra, 3rd year hoping to create a subcommittee on Open Access
David Noakes – Department of Fisheries & Wildlife, Senior Scientist at the Science Center, previously served on the same type of committee at a different institution, interested in libraries and in publishing.
Miranda Smith – College of Science and is the Academic advisor for pre-nursing and pre-dental program
Karyle Butcher – University Librarian oversees the University Libraries
Faye Chadwell – Associate University Librarian for Collections and Content Management; oversees the library collections and content.
Jennifer Nutefall – Associate University Librarian for Innovative User Services, takes care of public services

Student Members
Heather Bennett – Undergraduate student working for ASOSU campaign resources
Jeffrey Breitenfeldt – Graduate Student and also TA teaching writing 121; interested in pursuing a MLIS degree with a focus on instruction and research.
Jimmy Rosacker – Undergraduate student majoring in Chemistry and Education; works for ASOSU in campus affairs.

Discussion of standing FSLC responsibilities:

- **Study Carrel Assignments** – Typically there is one person on the committee that works with Cheryl Middleton, Head of Instruction and User Services to allocate study rooms at the beginning of term. Action: Need one FSLC member.

- **Library Research Travel Grants** – This year the library received $10,000 from the Provost. The fund provides funding for faculty to travel and conduct research at other libraries. There are two funding periods each year. The deadline for the first funding period is November 16. Action: Need one FSLC member in November to work with Faye on reviewing applications.

- **Library Undergraduate Research Award (LURA)** – This year will be the 4th year the library will offer the award to students. The award consists of two awards of $1000. One award for an undergraduate and one award for a graduate student. The application deadline this year will be in January for papers written in the 2009 calendar year. The committee that reviews the papers will consist of Jennifer Nutefall, Library Advisory Council members, library faculty, and a FSLC member. In spring a ceremony is typically held to celebrate the awardees and give them an opportunity to read an excerpt from their paper. Action: Need one FSLC member in January 2010.

- **Open Access (OA) Committee** – Lee is seeking a subcommittee to continue to look at and work on the OA efforts. Lee will continue to develop articles for the OSU homepage. Each article will have a focus on one aspect of OA (author rights, peer review, tenure). Lee continues to write articles every other week for the Terra Magazine.
**Action:** Need 3 FSLC members to be a part of the committee. Contact Lee or Faye for more information regarding OA. Members can contact Lee if they are interested in helping Lee write articles on OA in Terra.

**Brief overview of the library (including budget and the strategic plan) – Karyle Butcher**

The purpose of the library is to provide information for students and faculty in the best way that works for them, improve on how the library can make information available, teaching, economic development, staff development and diversity. The library is looking to the FSLC to see where the library can improve and where the bumps are. The library budget is allocated for books and journals, salaries, and a portion to maintain the library. The library also works with the English department to sponsor and bring in authors for the Visiting Writers Series. Currently the library is spending a lot of time balancing what should be digital and what should be paper. Most faculty want digital for access away from campus, while students access the materials online but want to be in the library. There is no longer a food and drink policy but a focus on cleaning up after yourself instead and recycling. The reference books on the second floor were moved out and back into the stacks over the summer. If anyone on the committee is interested in a tour of the Library, Archives or Special Collections please contact Karyle, Faye or Jennifer.

**Issues on which the library would like FSLC assistance this year – Faye Chadwell and Jennifer Nutefall**

**Jennifer**

1. Over the next year the library will be looking at assessment, how the library contributes to student learning and physical space. How do we configure certain areas to make the best use of that space? A focus group will be put together to gather student input on how they work, and to get some different layouts designed.
   - **Possibilities for the reference space:** semi-circular table with a big screen TV where students can project their laptops to the screen, café style seating benches and tables, furniture that is flexible (movable), and presentation practice rooms. A gaming break room is being considered.

2. There are three workshops scheduled this year with speakers presenting on assessment. The ending goal would be to use the LibQual survey to measure service.

3. Two self check-out machines were purchased and installed located next to the circulation desk and are already being used.

4. Looking at instruction and how research practices are incorporated into instruction.

**Faye**

1. Patron driven user center acquisitions: This will be a pilot project.
2. E-books: There will be a small selection of E-books added to the catalog and set with a trigger. If an item is triggered by a user 2-3 times, the library would purchase the item.
3. Transform the library from print to digital: The library will look at what can be digitized in the collection based on copyright to provide easier access to the collection.
4. What does the library do with print materials once we move over to digital? The library is looking at ways to reduce duplications in the OUS institutions.
5. Scholarly Communication and Open Access: There is still a need for faculty input and increased visibility by depositing in our institution repository to “widen access” and discuss authors right. Future outlook would be to having a panel talk about open text book. This is a campus-wide issue and would include graduate students. The panel would discuss issues of publishing and where to publish.
6. The plan is to bring in a speaker in December to talk about OA models and publishing for journals and monographs.
7. Talk about data management and curation with faculty on campus and how to manage.

**Preliminary discussion of ideas for use of the 4th floor space in The Valley Library:**

**Ideas for 4th floor space:**

- Create a space for faculty and students where they can have access to a quiet space
- Faculty research commons with microfiche reader
- Serious work space
Graduate research space
- Faculty learning studio

Other Suggestions:

- Extra computers in the reference area and lab space to provide programs students do not have access to on their own laptops.

Adjourned - 4:00 PM
Library Committee

May 6, 2009
Minutes

Attendance: Karyle Butcher, Hua-Yu Li, Paul Roberts, Lee Sherman, Elizabeth Thomas, Tara Williams

Guest: Jennifer Nutefall

Approve Minutes – Approved

Journal of Current Chinese Affairs: Open Access article
Germany site: www.open.access.net/de_en/homepage/. This site is doing a great job promoting open access. Lee encouraged committee members to take a look at the site. The site provides good background information on OA.

Heather Joseph, SPARC, OSU dialogue: Report
On April 2, 2009, Heather Joseph was invited to do a presentation at the OUS Libraries. Overall the committee members who could attend stated that Heather was informative, educational, interesting and knew about the issue well. Key points that Heather presented were:

- The digital nature of open access scholarship allows scholars to do more than just read—they can make instant connections to related material.
- The differences in open access journals, articles and to make authors aware of their rights that they are not aware of at the time of signing the agreement over to the publisher.
- The Budapest Open Access Initiative drafted a useful and comprehensive definition of open access.
- There is currently a directory of open access journals (4,000) that most faculty are not aware of. These journals have high-impact factors for those journals cited.
- The policy environment is critical. There is a lot of isolated movement, but there needs to be broader policy support where open access can become "the new normal."
- It’s important to emphasize the “public good” when talking about open access, because this is something that resonates with researchers and the public.
- The SPARC Web site is a great resource for open access information.

New Life@OSU Open Access Article Series
This idea came about due to the fact that the Open Access survey was rejected by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. They stated that the survey needed to be designed by a Social Scientist to be more objective. There was too much advocacy in the language and the survey should be more about information gathering. Lee is working with Faye Chadwell and Janet Webster to come up with a list of articles to write. The articles will be short, very focused and about 500 words each featuring one expert. The articles will each focus on one key element of Open Access. The purpose is to not overwhelm people with too much information, but to provide a viewpoint and information about new trends. There will be one article in each issue of Life@OSU for the next couple of years. In the past there was a faculty taskforce that did a series of great articles. These new articles will refer people to those articles (Life@OSU) so that they can go back and re-read the articles if interested.

Articles will consist of these topics:

- Pending journal subscription cuts (Faye Chadwell) – May 14 issue (copy due May 8)
- Author's rights workshops (Andrea Wirth) – May 28 issue (copy due May 22)
- OSU's Scholar's Archive (Digital Production Librarian, Sue Kunda)
- OSU's Library Faculty mandate (Michael Boock)
Faculty Viewpoint - What is OA and why is it important? (Pat Wheeler)
- Editor’s Viewpoint - OA from the publishing side (John Selker)
- Dean’s Viewpoint - OA and P&T (Sherm Bloomer, College of Science dean)
- Business Model/Costs/Author’s Fees (Faye)
- NIH mandate/Pub Med (Pat Hawk on compliance; medical librarian Alison Bobal’s perspective)
- Citation rates for “green” journals/top 100 - ISI data (Collection Development Department, Andrea Wirth, Laurel Kristick, Alison Bobal)
- Logistics of OA (Linda Lamb, COAS, Manager of Publication and Outreach Office) Ron Adams very interested in open access, if our committee is interested in doing a seminar with them, global impact of OA is another option

Other articles ideas/people to interview:
- Research Office
- John Cassady – interview
- Coordinate with other schools on Open Access
- New dean of CLA – What’s the role of humanities?

Announcements
- Update on Library Open Access Plan – Postponed/Faye was not present
- Update on Library Journal Cuts – Postponed/Faye was not present

Library Director’s Report
- Jennifer Nutefall is the new Associate University Librarian for Innovative User Services started on April 20. Jennifer will oversee the Instruction & User Services and Research & Innovative Services departments. Jennifer is from George Washington University (Washington D.C.).
- The library is still waiting to hear about the budget report and how it will affect the library. There is some faculty/staff anxiety.
- There have been several incident reports for the 2nd floor library.
- There is a small team looking at the new Kindle reader. The first Kindle was not as good as it could have been. The purpose of the Kindle project is to provide a popular book collection. The team visited different institutions and studied circulation policies to see how others are going about using the Kindle. There will be a final report in July.
- The library is looking at the concept of cloud computing though Amazon where the library can rent storage space directly from Amazon. The library will test some small projects first and see how it works.
- Ideas for the next University Day, could include Open Access as the main emphasis and have a Kindle on display to show faculty and staff how to use one and what is on it.

Adjourned ~ 4:00 PM
Library Committee

June 11, 2008
Minutes

Attendees: Faye A. Chadwell, Paul Roberts, Lee Sherman, Michael Boock and Rob Armas

1. Approve minutes: Lee Sherman called the meeting to order and the committee approved the May 28 minutes.

2. Begin developing the question for our faculty survey on open access/scholarly communication:

   There should be an online survey prepared for all faculty (Business Solutions). The Executive Committee approves, sends out the survey and then compiles the answers. It would be good if all the questions can be finalized over the summer. The committee should be ready to review the survey (for new members input) before it is sent out fall term.

3. Sketch out a plan of action for next year’s priorities and goals
   a. Filling all vacancies on FSLC: The committee will need full membership next year.
   b. Conducting the faculty survey and analyzing the results: Action: Mike will contact Harvard next week for a copy of their survey. One question to include would be: Do you see open access benefiting you? The committee discussed the need for a point person so that all departments will be reached, the need to educate the faculty prior to the survey being sent out and the need for strategic connections (groups or high level faculty) to deliver some of the messages regarding open access implications. There needs to be a good explanation about author rights. The importance of adding articles to ScholarsArchive should be added to a process already in place when articles are processed at the department level. The committee would like to see a policy that appreciates the issue and provides an opt-out option.

   Brainstorming steps to achieve those outcomes: Getting the university to identify which publishers to choose and provide recommendations. The committee can take this issue back to the Faculty Senate.

   Advertise in OSU Today and OSU This Week to bring more awareness to both faculty and researchers. Rewrite previously released articles and re-publish in The Barometer. Use the Inform lists and follow up with a web page with more information.

   Provide a traveling PowerPoint presentation that someone in each department could show at various meetings.

   Question: How would FS identify who in the department faculty is interested in this topic? The subject librarian would know who is interested. The Faculty Senate could also use a senator to ask the different departments.

   Possibility: Have an Office of Scholarly Communication either on our campus or across the OUS system. The committee will need to pull together a coalition, such as Lee’s office, research office, librarians, the members of the FSLC committee and anyone else that could meet monthly. The university doesn’t have the ability to create a whole office like Harvard. The library web page, research home page and OSU home page could post information in a creative way (a slogan). The message should be limited to only a few key points.

   Identifying a faculty researcher to be the “face” of OSU’s open access campaign: This person will need to be someone who is respected and who knows a lot about open access (maybe Pat Wheeler from COAS could be the scholarly communication person). Action: Lee will approach Pat when
launching the campaign and can do an interview with Pat to discuss the importance of open access.

**Finalizing the desired outcomes of an effective “Access of All” campaign at OSU:** Mike mentioned a quote from Harvard *“The primary mission of university is to conduct research ...”* **Action:** Mike will send Lee the rest of the quote.

**Action:** Lee will draft a campaign plan and run it by the committee. The campaign plan will be for next year. Lee will also contact Pat to see if she is willing to work with us as a public face. The committee will get together one more time over the summer and the survey will go out in the fall to see if faculty around campus know anything about journal cuts, open access issues, and author rights. This will tell the Faculty Senate a lot.

4. **Report from Library Staff**
   - **Faye** – The library has several open positions to fill. It is the time of year where the library is very busy as students are all over the library studying for finals. At one point every seat in the library was taken. Students are increasingly using the space for collaborative learning.
   - **Mike** – The Smithsonian Institute will use our Meta search tool LibraryFind to help them better search their collections. Jeremy Frumkin, Emerging Technologies and Services department head, gave a presentation about the library Meta tool and the tool was well received. Negotiations are still taking place. The University of Houston is already using the tool. The library will be migrating from Summit to a new platform that is run by library services OCLC. This will vastly improve the patron search experience so that a second search is not necessary, and should be in place by fall term.

4:30 meeting adjourned
Library Committee

May 28, 2008
Minutes

Attendees: Rob Armas, Nabil Boudraa, Karyle Butcher, Paul Roberts, and Lee Sherman

3:30-3:35 - Lee Sherman brought the meeting in to order. The minutes from the last meeting were approved.

A) Discuss where we are and where we want to go on the issue of open access, based on the information we have gathered from Stuart Schieber of Harvard, Pat Wheeler of COAS, Michael Boock, Faye Chadwell, OSU Research Office, FSLC Task Force and various supplementary readings. The committee will:

- Establish desired goal(s), both short term and long-term for OSU regarding open access/ scholarly communication.
- Set a timeline for achieving this/these goal(s) over the next two years.
- Determine necessary steps for achieving goal(s).
- Assign specific task(s) toward achievement of goal(s).

Committee makeup: The FSLC will need a complete committee to go forward with these goals for the next academic year. It would be good to have some involvement from research and science faculty. Work will begin in the fall term with subcommittees formed to take on each task. Karyle suggested that it would be good to include some tenure track faculty on the committee. Nabil suggested presenting on the FSLC for 5 minutes at the next junior faculty orientation.

Open Access: The committee previously agreed on open access as a concept. Mike Boock’s previous library task force laid out a lot of groundwork for the committee to pick up from. There is no need for the committee to re-establish the procedures and information already gathered. OSU is already ahead of Harvard in the process of open access. The library does not have the money to fund an open access project like Harvard went through. The committee would like to see all faculty articles posted to the ScholarsArchive next year. Karyle suggested bringing Schieber in from Harvard to present on the topic to help educate the faculty as well as presenting jointly to the University of Oregon. The library could fund this type of event.

Lee mentioned that the Barometer had printed a few articles regarding open access a few years ago and volunteered to look them up and update them to be re-printed as well as submitted to OSU This Week and OSU Today.

Suggestion: Karyle strongly urged the committee to look at the Berkley Model.

Scholarly Communication: The committee discussed the possible need for a position to work on scholarly communication. Karyle added that there could be a future opportunity to utilize one of the library positions to take on some of this work. Faye Chadwell would be a possibility after the second AUL position has been filled. Another option would be to partner with the Research Office.

Action: The committee should create a list of publishers allowing open access for researchers to view, and then present the importance of scholarly communication across campus at the department level. Mike Boock can get a current list to the committee.

Question: How do the librarians approach the departments that will be affected by journal cuts?

Karyle informed the committee that when there are cuts to be made there is a library liaison that presents all
the suggested cuts to each department. There is a new idea to offer a “pay per view” service for journals that need to be used instead of having the full subscription. Faye Chadwell is working on this option. There will be cuts made for the next fiscal year.

At the end of two years the FSLC should have accomplished awareness on campus about open access, moved to an open access policy, and have a scholarly communication plan developed. A survey should be put together over the summer. Karyle suggested naming the committee as scholarly communication so that there is continuity in informing faculty and information is not lost.

Articles to write: FSLC seeking new members. FS re-purpose for scholarly communication.

Open Access Survey: Each committee member will come up with one or two survey questions, as well as asking if Stuart is willing to share his survey for the committee to use. Mike mentioned he has the department survey listing where departments publish and that he would contact Stuart for information on his survey.

Repetition of information will be key in promoting faculty awareness across the campus. The library could put a display together for awareness in the lobby or post information on the library web page.

Lee volunteered to interview Pat Wheeler and write up a short paragraph to be posted on the OSU home page with a link to more information about the open access survey.

B) Study Rooms

Karyle explained the process of how the research study rooms are allocated. The applications are submitted in July/August, and Cheryl Middleton and a FSLC member go over the applications to allocate each room. Nabil volunteered for the next round of applicants.

C) Report from Library Staff

Karyle informed the committee about plans to have an off-site storage facility built for the OUS system. Discussions have been ongoing with Portland State and with the University of Oregon. The library is currently working with U of O on cutting shared journal titles; that is U of O will cut copies of what we hold this year and next year we will cut copies of journals that we hold that they have. This will save money and create a shared resource for borrowing.

An intern, Monica Jacobsen, was hired to work on policies regarding computer logins to tighten up the libraries policies for security and privacy. The work will be completed over the summer months.

Philip Vue, the Building Maintenance Coordinator, has been accepted to the University of Washington iSchool for the MLS program.

Next Meeting: The committee should discuss changing its name to include scholarly communication.

5:00 – Meeting adjourned
Library Committee

May 14, 2008
Minutes

Attendees: Mike Boock, Karyle Butcher, Nabil Boudraa, Paul Roberts, and Rob Armas.

3:35 – 3:37 Nabil brought meeting to order.

Nabil handed out an article “Readers Not Wanted: Student Writers Fight to Keep Their Work Off the Web”

The minutes were approved for the previous meeting.

A. Discuss conversation with Stuart Scheiber from last interview.

Stuart had said that Harvard did not have an institutional repository set in place yet.
Question: Do we know how many people have opted out of signing over their copyright as authors?

B. Report on April 14 conversations with former FSLC member, Pat Wheeler (COAS), about previous FSLC work on scholarly communication/open access.

Nabil and Lee met with Pat Wheeler. Lee took notes on the conversation that Nabil handed out to committee members. Nabil briefly went over some points from Lee’s notes.

- There was a survey of each department about which journals faculty were publishing in (7-10 reports were completed); departments automatically collect this data when they do their graduate reviews.
- Mike Boock was on a library task force that had collected this same data before. Mike explained how department data was gathered. Each department faculty would give Mike a list of books that faculty had published in the last three, five and ten years and then used the data given by the faculty to identify the subscription cost, journal impact factors and the number of times an article was cited in journals. All this work is done by working with a department representative. The data was then presented to the department representative to take back to their department. Citation impact factors did not relate to journal cost (high cost, low impact).
- Advocate that faculty senate should recruit from science faculty. It was noted that Janet Webster would be a good resource on how to go about recruiting from the department level.

Karyle added to Mike’s task force explanation. The library had a very strong task force set and a lot of the work has dissipated. The FSLC should think about Pat’s suggestion to get more science people involved. FS should be briefed on this topic again. Karyle also mentioned that commercial journals just went up in price. E-journals went up 8.6% and paper journals are going up 5%. The library will be looking at a $900,000 increase and would have to make some journal cuts. Nabil also noted that there is a need to educate faculty on campus about journals and publications so that they have a better understanding about the budget and why the library needs to make cuts.

Decision: Next agenda item should focus on what the next step is and how to do it.

Actions:
1. At one of the next FSLC meetings Faye and Mike will come up with a strategic action plan to see who is responsible for what. Those people will then gather all information so nothing is lost. Is it fair for the library to pay for all the journals, can most requested journals be obtained through ILL instead of paying for those that are not used that often?
2. Further discussion of Lee’s notes will take place at the next FSLC meeting May 28.

**C. Report from Library Staff**

Karyle discussed the pending cut on journals that is expected without an increase in budget. The library has submitted TRF funds for $700,000 for electronic journals. The library has always been funded in the past.

Nabil asked Karyle about the library research travel grants submitted to Sabah. The funds have been allocated and the awardees notified.

Nabil also asked about the Library Undergraduate Research Award which the Library Advisory Council provides the funding for outstanding student research papers that were accomplished using library resources. The two winners this year were from the Department of History. Karyle would like to see more students in the sciences department nominated for this award in the future.

**D. Long Term study rooms**

Cheryl Middleton needs a FSLC member to volunteer to assist in assigning the long term research study rooms. Rob suggested having disability services on campus get involved with this as they may have ideas about how to assign the rooms.

**Action:** A volunteer will be announced at the next FSLC meeting to assist Cheryl in the next round of allocations.

4:30 Meeting dismissed
Library Committee

April 4, 2008
Minutes

Attendees: Lee Sherman, Nabil Boudraa, Mike Boock, Faye Chadwell, Paul Roberts, Rob Armas.

NOTE: Lee led the committee meeting; Nabil and Lee will alternate leading the meetings.

1. What is the current status of scholarly communications/open access at OSU and other U.S. universities, such as Harvard, which has taken the lead in mandating that faculty deposit their articles in the institutional archive. How do we take the work forward after the OSU Today series of articles?

   1. Michael Boock reported on his communications with Harvard: see article [http://www.libraryjournal.com/info/CA6532658.html](http://www.libraryjournal.com/info/CA6532658.html)
   Harvard offers the ability to opt out of making the articles open access. Is this for a limited time? Were there any chief objections from faculty? Harvard keeps the final version of the published article. What other units on campus were they involved with (attorney, copyright, research office)? Can the OSU Press help faculty in publishing? Central repositories are available through ScholarsArchive at the library and there are a few other repositories on campus (physics). How do you get faculty involved, surveyed and their buy in?

   **Action Items:**
   - Mike will schedule his Harvard contact to speak to the committee at the next meeting on April 23.
   - The committee should aim to come up with action items and priorities by fall term.
   - Lee and Nabil will schedule time with Pat Wheeler to meet and talk about what she has done in the past.

2. Faye Chadwell reported on her work with the national scholarly communications group on trends/issues/concerns at other universities: see article [http://poynder.blogspot.com/2006/01/changing-paradigm.html](http://poynder.blogspot.com/2006/01/changing-paradigm.html)

   The NIH mandate has impacts on our campus; we need to comply. Faye will give an update on this federally mandated legislature to the Faculty Senate. It will be important to educate faculty to keep their author rights. Open access does not mean free. Someone is paying for it someway. SPARC has been very good at pushing out information about NIH compliance. There are other university systems to look at regarding how they have approached the mandate (Nebraska, University of Minnesota).

   Three years ago the Scholarly Communication Task Force found that the faculty were very open to the idea and ideal, one resolution was passed to encourage posting as open access. There was the issue raised about the pre-tenure faculty not being able to post this way, but it was not surveyed at that time. Many faculty do not understand copyright and their own author rights. Faculty are not always aware of the cost of journal subscriptions.

   Currently the OSU Libraries spends about $3.5 million on journal subscriptions. The inflation rate is 8% each year. There have been some savings made by consortial purchasing and package deals. Which journals are canceled? Sometimes they can be found in another package from another library, or can be switched over from paper to electronic. The subject librarians weed through the lists.

   3. The FSLC will have an opportunity to weigh in on the next steps that should be taken to move this
issue forward at OSU and come up with a workable plan, particularly for the next academic year. See articles: http://ir.library.oregonstate.edu/dspace/handle/1957/1747.

**Action Item:** The committee will work up a survey that the library will implement on Survey Monkey. After the survey, focus groups will be formed to look at the responses.

2. Report from the Library (Faye Chadwell, AUL for Collections and Content Mgmt.)

- **Interactive Course Assignment Pages:** The faculty member works with a librarian on a course and develops a page of resources geared to that course such as links to databases, recommended resources as well as a chat box to a librarian. See: http://osulibrary.oregonstate.edu/instruction/classign/.
- **LibraryFind:** This is a discovery tool that searches across all the libraries databases and digital collections. It was developed as open source and other universities are already using it (Houston and North Carolina).
- **Internet Archive:** In progress, waiting for the demo site to be up and running. **Action Item:** FSLC recommended Jeremy Frumkin write an article on this.
- **ScholarsArchive:** Recent recognition ranked this 29th internationally, and 7th in the US. Searches are in progress to fill the Associate University Librarian for Innovative Services position, a position in Social Sciences that will focus on instructional design as well as a Metadata Librarian position to help with the Institutional Repositories. The Gray Family Chair position is vacant and library management is looking at creative ways to utilize this position to develop tools in the future.
- The librarians are being reorganized to maximize resources and improve focus on instructional outreach.
- The library is doing well toward the OSU Campaign goal of $6.5 million.
- **Library Travel Grants:** Ten applications have been received. Rob Armas will assist Faye in decisions on allocation of the $10,000. The grants allow for research in libraries outside of the state. Each applicant can receive up to $2,000 towards their projects.
- Library Advisory Committee undergraduate research awards; two students won 1k each and used the Urban League documents.

**Question from Faye:**

What would the committee like to know about the library? The committee would like more information about how acquisitions are holding relative to other institutions (journals, books, etc) and how other institutions are dealing with inflation. The problem of shrinking budgets is across the country.
Today’s meeting addressed the difficulty the committee faced in gathering quorum for decision making, whether there was need for a FS Library Committee, meeting times, and topical charges.

The following decisions were made:

1. We would meet face-to-face at least quarterly.
2. We would carry on conversations electronically via email, with the chair being the point of distribution.
3. Conversations would revolve around issues Karyle brings to the table for which the committee can advise.
4. We will meet more often if necessary.
5. We will try to meet over lunch in the spring quarter to facilitate meeting.

Currently the questions raised for discussion by committee members include:

1. How helpful are the library liaisons for departmental faculty?
2. How can liaisons improve the interface between the library and faculty?
3. How can the library staff work with faculty and students effectively?

The other topic that was addressed in today’s meeting, and tabled until spring term, is the impact of the proposed budget cuts on the library effectiveness and usefulness.
Library Committee

January 30, 2006
Minutes

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Molly Engle, Chair
Linda Ashkenas
Gary Beach
Pat Wheeler
Michael Witbeck

EX-OFFICIO MEMBER PRESENT:

Karyle Butcher, University Librarian

GUESTS PRESENT:

John Boock, Member, Scholarly Communication Task Force
John Pollitz, Associate University Librarian

1. **Announcements**

   - Moira Dempsey has been appointed as liaison to the Library Committee from the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.

2. **Minutes**

   - Library Committee Minutes from December 5, 2005
   - **Correction:** John Pollitz, Associate University Librarian, noted that he was representing the Library as Ex-Officio in the absence of Karyle Butcher; not as an Ad Hoc representative.
   - **Edits:** Editorial comments were provided by Gary Beach.

   APPROVED: The minutes will be amended to reflect the correction and the editorial comments.

3. **Standing Rules**

   - **Discussion:** Should the additional responsibility of "Scholarly Communication" be entered into the Library Committee's Standing Rules as part of item 3 or should a new item 4 be created?
   - **Recommendation:** The Library Committee should actively encourage students to consider becoming a Library Committee member.

   ACTION: Since at the time of this discussion, a quorum was not present, the Chair will either send out the proposed wording of the Standing Rules for the Library Committee's approval by email, or this action item will be finalized at the next Library Committee meeting in February.

4. **Task Force on Scholarly Communication: Reports**

   **Discussion:**
- Reports and information from the Library Committee members regarding the Task Force on Scholarly Communication were discussed. Molly Engle led the discussion.

- Horticulture and Public Health - Molly Engle

- Botany and Plant Pathology - Previously submitted

- Curriculum Council/Graduate Council Academic Program Review Procedure Statement - Pat Wheeler. The proposed statement was reviewed and edited by Gary Beach.

**Proposed Statement:**

Faculty Publications:
Provide a list of where your faculty has published articles in scholarly journals during the last five years. Please indicate the journal name, the time span used (e.g. 2001-2006), and the number of articles published in each journal over that time span. This should not be a laundry list of all journals used but should be equal to or less than 50 of the most frequently used journals for each department.

**ACTION:** Gary Beach will submit a request to the Office of Academic Programs and Academic Assessment that the statement be added to OSU's Academic Program Review Procedures. The added statement will apply to future undergraduate and graduate academic program reviews.

5. **Annual Editors/Society Officers Meeting**

**Discussion:** Feasibility and advisability of establishing an annual meeting of OSU faculty who serve as editors and society officers.

**Suggestion:** Karyle Butcher suggested holding a gathering/reception for both editors and society members.

**Recommendation:** Pat Wheeler recommended that we request to have the provost send out a separate request for the names of OSU society members.

**ACTION:** Pat Wheeler will request a list of current OSU editors from the Provost's Office.

**ACTION:** Linda Ashkenas will seek a list of national/international society officer faculty members at OSU. This list will not include the local chapter society members.

**ACTION:** Pat Wheeler will draft a request to Sabah Randhawa, Provost, for a list of faculty members who are society officers. This topic will be placed on the February meeting agenda.

6. **Scholarly Communication Articles**

**Discussion/Comments:**

- Mike Boock has a draft article completed.

- It was noted that no order to the article publication schedule has been determined.

- The Scholarly Communication articles will be published Spring Term 2006 (a series of 6 articles). Each article will be 200-1,000 words that will be published in *OSU This Week*.

- **Proposed order of article publication:**
  1. Cost of Journals
  2. Impact Factors
  3. Open Access (to include not only journals but all types as well)
  4. OSU Institutional Repository
  5. Copyright Issues
  6. Other Venues

- **Conclusion:** The topic of Copyright Issues should be dropped for now. This is too complicated an issue. For example, can authors post their own articles on their own website? The copyright issues will be referenced in the fourth article dealing with Institutional Repository.
DECISION: Publish four articles; i.e., number one through four as listed above.

- Publication Deadline: For the first article, April 28th is the deadline in order for the article to appear in the May 4th issue of OSU This Week. For the May 11, 18, 25 issues, the articles will be due one week prior to the publication date.

DECISION: In addition to the four Scholarly Communication articles, this month-long series will be introduced by an "Introduction to Scholarly Communication" article to be written by John Pollitz. This introductory article will be published in the April 28th issue of OSU This Week.

Note: Articles are to be submitted to Mark Peterson in News and Communication Office.

7. OSU Forum on Publication Practices

Discussion:

- Pat Wheeler had previously attended a Scholarly Communication forum held at PSU in May 2004. An email regarding the effectiveness of this forum was sent to PSU. To date: no response. Question to PSU: Was the forum worth the time and effort?
- Consensus: At this point in time, it is probably not worth putting on such a forum at OSU.
- Suggestion: Linda Ashkenas and Gary Beach suggested the possible development of a decision tree for faculty members regarding considerations that they make in deciding on where to publish; e.g., three things to think about when submitting publications, especially graduate students and assistant professors. The Library Committee can help provide some education to faculty regarding scholarly publication decisions.
- Karyle Butcher noted that SPARC has a brochure regarding this topic. Karyle further suggested that SPARC will be included in John Pollitz's introduction article.

DECISIONS/ACTIONS:
1. At this point in time, it is probably not worth putting on an OSU Forum on Scholarly Communication. The Library Committee will wait to see what the impact of the upcoming articles will have on OSU faculty.
2. Consider putting together an educational brochure for campus distribution on Scholarly Communication issues and the effect publications decisions have on the Library in particular and the cost of publications in general.
3. Need to send a copy of the upcoming Scholarly Communication articles to the Graduate Student Association. Linda Ashkenas will check on this.

8. Library's Strategic Plan

Briefly Mentioned:

- Molly Engle indicated that this topic will be on the agenda for the February meeting.
- A copy of the Library's Strategic Plan is on web. Library Committee members should review the document prior to the February meeting.
- Karyle Butcher noted that the Library is looking at a possible 5% budget cut for the 2006-07 fiscal year. A budget cut of any amount will adversely impact the Library's Strategic Plan.

Meeting adjourned at 11:00 AM

Next Library Committee Meeting

Monday, February 27, 2006
10:00 to 11:00 AM in the Castle Conference Room, 3rd Floor, Valley Library

Minutes provided by Gary Beach
February 27, 2006
Minutes

MEMBERS PRESENT:
Molly Engle, Chair
Gary Beach
Evan Gottlieb
Joe Kerkvliet
Melodie Putnam
Pat Wheeler
Michael Witbeck

EX-OFFICIO MEMBER PRESENT:
John Pollitz, Associate University Librarian for Karyle Butcher, University Librarian

GUESTS PRESENT:
John Boock, Member, Scholarly Communication Task Force

1. Announcements
   - Name Tags:
     Need to have name tags made for the Scholarly Communication Task Force members.
     Action: John Pollitz volunteered to have the name tags created.
   - Scholarly Communication Task Force Invitation:
     The Library Committee extended an Invitation to all of the Scholarly Communication Task Force members to attend all future Library Committee meetings.
     Action: Molly Engle will send an invitation to the Task Force members and request that Vickie Nunnemaker add the Task Force members to the Library Committee’s mailing list.
   - Minutes Transcriber for March Meeting:
     Action: Evan Gottlieb volunteered to take minutes at the March 13th meeting.

OLD BUSINESS

2. Minutes
   - Correction to Item 5 noted.

   APPROVED as amended.
3. **Library Committee Standing Rules**
   
   *Discussion:*
   
   - Minor grammatical changes noted.
   - Joe Kerkvliet asked if the Library has been proactive in attempting to add students. The Standing Rules call for three student members.
   
   **Consensus:** The Library Committee should actively encourage students to consider becoming a Library Committee member.
   
   **Suggestion:** Send a message to the Graduate Student Association requesting a student volunteer.
   
   **Action:** Joe Kerkvliet volunteered to draft a request to the Graduate Student Association for one or two graduate students and to the Associated Students of Oregon State University (ASOSU) for one or two undergraduate students.
   
   APPROVED as amended. The Chair will submit the Library Committee's Standing Rules to the Committee on Committees for review and approval.

4. **Scholarly Communication Task Force Updates**
   
   *Discussion:*
   
   - Melodie Putnam indicated that the scholarly publication information for Botany and Plant Pathology was complete.
   - Joe Kerkvliet stated that scholarly publication information for Economics was in progress.
   - Michael Boock summarized the work of the Scholarly Communication Task Force last year, including a list and costs of journals along with journal impact factors.
   
   **Handout:** COAS Journals
   
   - Pat Wheeler discussed the COAS journal handout. The table listed 42 journals where COAS most frequently publish their research. The table included cost differentials when commercial journals are compared to professional societies; i.e., $0.98 per page for commercial journals versus $0.39 per page for professional society journals.
   
   **Handout:** Revised Appendix 3 - Review of Journals Used for COAS Publications
   
   - Pat Wheeler indicated that Appendix 3, Review of Journals Used for COAS Publications has been revised and will be posted to the Scholarly Communication Task Force report. Bottom line: Professional society journals have cheaper costs and higher impact than do commercial journals.
   
   **Suggestion:** The Library Committee should check on the page charges when commercial journals are compared to professional society journals.
   
   - Evan Gottlieb asked if the Library Committee should publish Appendix 3 as part of OSU This Week articles?
   
   - Pat Wheeler stated that the Library Committee should maintain, i.e., archive, all of the separate analyses that are being prepared. The Library Committee can then refer the readers of the upcoming OSU This Week articles to the Library Committee's web site where the tables will posted; i.e., archived.
   
   - Molly Engle suggested that the Horticulture and Public Health lists of publications be circulated to the Library Committee members.
   
5. **Academic Program Review Procedure Changes to Include Scholarly Publication Information Statistics**
   
   - Gary Beach indicated that the proposed wording changes to the Academic Program Review Procedures has been submitted to the Office of Academic Programs and Academic Assessment...
(APAA) but that these proposed changes have not yet been implemented by the Curriculum Council and Graduate Council.

- Gina Shellhammer, APAA, indicated that these proposed changes probably do not need to go through either the Curriculum Council and Graduate Council but will be handled by APAA (for undergraduate academic program reviews) along with a request to the Graduate School (for graduate academic program reviews).

6. Proposed Annual Editors/Society Officer Meeting

*Handout:* OSU List of 2004 Editors Acknowledged at 2005 Reception

*Action:* Pat Wheeler will request that OSU editors and society officers attend a meeting to discuss the pricing of commercial and professional society journals. Some editors have control while others do not. Pat Wheeler and Alexis Walker will organize the meeting for either Spring Term 2006 or Fall Term 2006.

7. OSU This Week Scholarly Communication Articles

*Handout:* Timelines and Guidance for Preparing Articles for OSU This Week.

*Action:* For those writing articles, outlines (2 to 4 sentences) are due March 6.

- Pat Wheeler volunteered to coordinate the articles and then pass them on to Mark Peterson in News and Communication.

    *Handout:* May 25th OSU This Week Article on OSU Institutional Repository

- Michael Boock distributed a draft of the May 25th article for review and edit.

- Michael Witbeck requested information regarding issues associated with the Open Access article.

**NEW BUSINESS**

8. Faculty Senate Committees

*Handout:* Helpful Hints for 2005-06 Faculty Senate Committee/Council Chairs

*Discussion/Recommendations:*

- **Student Members:** Attempt to add student members, if possible, to the Library Committee.

- **Interinstitutional Faculty Senate:** Share with the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate the work of the Library Committee and the Scholarly Communication Task Force.

- **Scholarly Communication Task Force:** Integrate the Task Force with the Library Committee. Task Force members should be encouraged to volunteer to become Library Committee members for the 2006-07 academic year.

- **Academic Program Reviews:** Actively solicit faculty who are or will be undergoing academic program reviews within the next two years to become members of the Library Committee.

- **Library Committee Membership:** Molly Engle recommended that Michael Boock be added as a member of the Library Committee.

    *Action:* The Chair will submit this membership change to Vickie Nunnemaker in the Faculty Senate Office.

9. Chronicle of Higher Education Article
Handout: Article (Distributed by Molly Engle)


Discussion:

- The article alludes to the future of libraries since Google is proposing to digitize library held books. Plans call for approximately 60% of the books to be digitized. Most of the digitized books will be from 1970 to present.

- John Pollitz stated that the Library will continue to monitor this new development.

10. Library Report

- John Pollitz indicated that the Library is:
  1. looking into ways to mainstream the Library’s repository; and
  2. reviewing new and better ways of conducting searches across data bases.

Meeting adjourned at 11:00 AM

Next Library Committee Meeting

Monday, March 13, 2006
10:00 to 11:00 AM in the Castle Conference Room, 3rd Floor, Valley Library

Minutes provided by Gary Beach
Library Committee

October 12, 2006
Minutes

Attendees: Molly Engle (chair), Michael Boock, Michael Witbeck, Karyle Butcher (ex-officio)

I. Welcome and announcements
   Michael Boock agreed to serve as amanuensis for today’s meeting.

II. Old Business
    Approval of minutes June.
    June minutes will be approved at the next LC meeting.

III. New Business
    A. ScholarsArchive@OSU institutional repository
        Michael Boock reported that Larry Landis, University Archivist, spoke to Faculty Senate Executive Committee. They asked Larry to present at the November Faculty Senate meeting about storing intellectual capital in the university’s institutional repository – ScholarsArchive@OSU.

        Molly Engle suggested that we use Survey Monkey to solicit information about faculty interest in depositing pre-print articles and other research such as gray or fugitive literature in the repository. Agreed that survey should go out after Larry Landis’ presentation.

        Agreed that the Library Committee should identify handful of faculty with an interest to serve on a focus group to discuss the institutional repository. The Library will handle lunch.

        Topics will include range of use for institutional repositories and potential uses of ScholarsArchive for storing and enabling access to research conducted at the institution.

        Agreed that a librarian should present on institutional repositories at a lecture series event such as TRIAD or Dean’s Council under the Library Committee’s auspices.

        FSLC may wish to publish another series of articles in OSU This Week; the library will do publication/impact factor reviews for the departments within Health and Human Services. Molly Engle will send Michael Boock information about the department publications.

    B. Library Advisory Committee is sponsoring a student research award. They would like an LC member to serve on the review committee.

        Michael Witbeck will notify John Pollitz that he is willing to serve on the review committee.

    C. Meeting times

        Agreed to hold one more meeting this term and possibly move to quarterly meetings rather than monthly.

    D. Committee members

        Four LC faculty committee members and 3 students are needed. Committee members should solicit members and have them contact Vickie. Michael Boock will ask a Crop Science professor if he’d be interested in serving.

IV. Report from the librarian
   Karyle Butcher reported that an individual tore paintings from the library walls.
Karyle reported that the Library is engaged in assessment activities and asked that the LC consider how the Library assesses its value.

Karyle also asked that LC consider student use of social networking sites such as Facebook and MySpace.
Library Committee

December 1, 2006
Minutes

Attendees: John Pollitz, Evan Gottlieb, Molly Engle, Alexis Walker, Jerry Yamamuro, Karyle Butcher, Paul Roberts

Welcome and Announcements

Introductions

Old Business

A. Approval of minutes - October

Gathering Impact Statement from departments
Evan and Jerry will get publication data from Dept chairs in English and Civil and Construction Engineering. Molly will get data from Nutrition and Exercise Sciences and Design and Human Environment.

New Business

A. How to get faculty input on open access issues.

Agreed to ask Michael Boock to set up some examples, if possible, including some of the most prominent institute or center on campus. Molly will contact Michael B.

Report from the Librarian

Special Collections has just released a six volume bibliography of the Pauling Collections, funded by private donor. Will be for sale for $120.
Library Committee

December 5, 2005 Minutes

Present: Gary Beach, Joe Kerkvliet, Molly Engle (Chair), Melodie Putnam, John Pollitz (OSU libraries, ad hoc); Rich Carter (Task Force on Scholarly Communications), Mike Boock (TFSC), Pat Wheeler; Deborah Rubel, Michael Witbeck, Linda Ashkenas (notetaker).

Absent: Evan Gottlieb.

Introduction
John Pollitz: Librarian for public service and innovative technology.
Two members of Scholarly Committee Task Force: Rich Carter (Chemistry) and Mike Boock (head of library technical services).

Minutes
Notes of November 7 meeting (after Gary Beach's editing) approved without dissent.

Old Business

Item 2: Review of library's cost of journals and documentation of price differential between commercial and society journals

- Focus needs to continue on compiling journals in which faculty publish, documenting cost and impact factor, and presenting results back to the faculty. Consensus is that this should be performed by individual departments (see below).
- Rich Carter, (TFSC, Chemistry) compiled the top journals for his department, and was surprised at the cost difference between commercial and society journals, and the lack of impact factor difference. Information was well received by his faculty
- Bruce McCune, Botany and Plant Pathology, heard Faculty Senate has presentation of the issue, and would like to compile a similar list. Melodie Putnam (FSLC, also in this department) will take the lead with Bruce.
- Pat Wheeler presented a recent list of journal prices online from UCSB (see http://www.econ.ucsb.edu/~tedb/Journals/jpricing.html) which includes summary tables of pricing by discipline. In general, society journals charge 20-50% less than commercially published organs. Pat also brought up the issue of ownership of journal (society or commercial) and price control. She edits the Journal of Phycology, where society reserves rights to set prices despite being published by Blackwell. However, this requires negotiation by society journal editors (see item 3, below).
- Ten departments per year have program reviews. General consensus that compiling a list of journals in which the departmental faculty publish should become a part of this review. Gary Beach will submit a request to Curriculum Council and Graduate Council to include this task in the packet these departments prepare for review. This should not be a laundry list of all journals; at most, there should be 50 per department, and should include the number of publications per journal. Some departments already do this, but there is no standardization in the metrics used.
- Within FSLC members present, the following departments will submit their journal lists to the library for feedback on pricing and impact factor:
  - Botany & Plant Pathology (Melodie Putnam)
  - Fisheries & Wildlife (Linda Ashkenas)
  - Forest Science (Melodie Putnam will request from them)
  - Economics (Joe Kerkvliet)
  - Public Health (Molly Engle)
Note that Chemistry, all of COAS, and HDFS already had this analysis performed by the TFSC last year.
Library turn-around time has been very fast on cost and impact factor.
So far, no input from some Colleges (Engineering in particular).
Molly Engle suggested publishing these prototype results someplace faculty are likely to see them, provide contacts, and other departments could follow (see item 4).

Item 3: Annual Editors/Society Officers Meeting

- To form network of on-campus editors who can work with journals on pricing, copyright, electronic access, etc. Bonnie Allen to help generate list of invitees; Alexis Walker & Pat Wheeler will take the lead on inviting folks.
- Suggestion is to have 1 or 2 library committee members involved with this effort. Melodie Putnam volunteered to help with this new task. Melodie is rotating off the Library Committee in June 2006, but would stay on in this sub-committee.
- Molly will contact Vickie Nunnemaker to see whether her term can be extended.

Item 4: Articles in OSU This Week

- TFSC proposed a series of consecutive articles, to be published in OSU This Week. Topics to address: Journal cost, open access, OSU institutional repository, impact factors, copyright issues (last suggested by Bonnie Allen). General plan is to work on them during winter term, and then publish consecutively in spring term. Teams of two will write each article, with one member each from the LC and the TFSC.
  - Cost of journals: Joe Kerkvliet & Rich Carter
  - Open access: Michael Witbeck & ?
  - OSU Institutional Repository: Michael Boock & Melodie

  Putnam
  - Impact Factors: Alexis Walker & Molly Engle
  - Copyright issues: ??

- Form of articles: Short: probably 500 to 1000 words. Background information can go on the library web page.
- The entire Library Committee will review the series at end of winter term. Gary Beach will help edit.
- Pat Wheeler will talk to OSU This Week to arrange publication.
- Discussion about relative costs of paper, electronic, both, archives, and what information can be released. Some pricing information is considered confidential. Costs posted on a given Journal website will be the information used in the write-ups. We can use average costs without mentioning specific publishers or journals.
- Linda Ashkenas suggested we should have an announcement prior to the start of the series. John Pollitz will take the lead on writing this; aim is to set up history and basis of the problem. Other outlets (e.g., the Barometer) may pick up the series later.
- Joe Kerkvliet will investigate similar publications at UO and PSU where the series might also be published. Note that UO passed a similar resolution as to that of the OSU faculty senate concerning the costs of scholarly publications.

Item 5: OSU Forum on Publication Practices

- Pat Wheeler presented copies of the workshop held at PSU: an outside speaker, 4-5 local panelists, 50 attendees, videotaped and distributed. It will probably take several years to measure impacts of these types of presentations.
- Pat has given several well-received presentations to libraries from the point of view of an editor. There is a need to make faculty, editors, society members more aware of the issues. Many societies are losing members because faculty can access their journals through their library electronically. The problem varies by discipline, but generally sciences are much worse than humanities.
- An additional issue concerns manuscript reviews for commercial companies. Peer review service is free and is vital to good quality publications, but commercial publishers are taking economic advantage of it.
- It will be a lot of work to pull together a forum; is it the best way to go?
- Joe Kerkvliet brought up the idea of collecting statistics on faculty changes in paper subscriptions, number of faculty who are associate editors, and what journals faculty review for. Tabled for lack of time.
Other items:

- Carlos Jensen and one of his classes in Computer Science performed an ethnographic survey of library use and layout. Students came up with plans and suggestions for the library.
- Students and textbook costs: A recent article in the Barometer suggested the library purchase 2 copies of each text assigned for each class (enormous costs). John Pollitz will meet with Faculty Senate to discuss. Perhaps the library, bookstore, and student government may need to combine forces to examine this issue. Textbook price is a significant problem for many students, and inflation of those costs is similar to that seen in scholarly publications.

Next meeting

- Address standing rules change proposed at last meeting and not discussed today.
- Consider whether we want to do a forum on costs of scholarly publications.
- Gary Beach will be notetaker.
Library Committee

November 7, 2005
Minutes

Present: Bonnie Allen (ad hoc), Linda Ashkenas, Gary Beach, Molly Engle, Evan Gottlieb (minute taker), Pat Wheeler

Not Present: Joe Kerkvliet, Melodie Putnam, Deborah Rubel, Michael Witbeck.

Guests/Staff: Kerrie Cook (minutes)

1. Approval of October Minutes
   - motion to approve October minutes after Beach's editing was unanimously passed

2. Old Business
   a. Task Force on Scholarly Communication - continuation of discussion:
      - Wheeler handed out and explained the Task Force's Work Plan for 2005-2006 (see attachment, to be provided by Engle).
      - Wheeler explained that the Task Force was tasked to look at the increasing price of journals, and then to collect data and see what faculty could do to improve the situation.
      - Faculty Senate approved the idea of keeping the Task Force in place for another year, but to work with the Library Committee.
      - Wheeler explained that tallying costs of journals could be combined with Academic Program and Graduate Program Reviews: by seeing which journals faculty members are publishing in, and then getting the Library to determine the costs of these journals.
      - Wheeler noted that once faculty are made aware of the costs, they can then make informed choices about which journals they might (or might not) choose to publish in and review for (the major distinction being Professional vs. Commercial journals ♦ the latter are typically 2 to 5 times more expensive for institutions).
      - Ashkenas said she can get this information for Fisheries and Wildlife.
      - The committee discussed the "Impact Factor" on 2005 Pricing for Selected Chemistry Titles: noting that there is not necessarily a correlation between cost and impact factor.
      - Wheeler stated that faculty - especially faculty members who are on boards of Societies that partner with publishers - need to become savvier about their negotiations with Publishers.
      - Wheeler discussed publication of scholarly communications articles in OSU This Week.
      - The Committee also discussed organizing an OSU Forum on Publication Practices. Engle proposed that this could be discussed in more detail at a joint December meeting.
      - Allen mentioned that the topic of authors' rights, and retaining those rights, should be another issue.
      - Allen also added SPARC (Scholarly Publication and Resource Council), organized by ARL, has been working on these issues on a national level.
      - Gottlieb volunteered to look at a VHS tape of a prior PSU Library Forum on publication issues, provided by Wheeler: Beach will receive it next, and then Ashkenas (Wheeler will first see about converting the tape to CD for electronic distribution).
      - Engle suggested that the Task Force and Library Committee meet jointly on Dec. 5: Wheeler and Engle to arrange this.
   b. ARL Membership
      - see Report from Librarian in #4
   c. Plan of Work for 2005-06 academic year
      - Strategic Plan: Allen says the Library's strategic plan will need to be discussed at a future meeting.
      - Travel Awards: Ashkenas volunteered to work on travel awards with Allen.
c. Standing Rules
   - Engle will distribute copies of the Library Committee's standing rules with alternative new additions prepared by Gottlieb to incorporate ongoing issue of scholarly communication directly into Library Committee's mandate.

4. Report from Librarian
   a. Allen gave a short update on the status of ARL admission: the Library is not actively pursuing membership, partially because criteria has been in flux for several years, e.g., number of staff, number of additions on a monthly basis to the paper collection, the overall size of collection, and the annual budget) are not in line with some of Library's current priorities.
   b. Meanwhile, the Library is pursuing membership in the Digital Library Federation, and is engaged in other digital projects.

5. Other:
   - Ongoing "old business" item: the Library Committee can work with the Library staff on testing new informational search engines.
   - Linda Ashkenas volunteered to take minutes for the December meeting.
   - Gary Beach volunteered to take minutes for the January meeting.
Present: Gary Beach, Molly Engle (chair), Evan Gottlieb, John Pollitz (for K. Butcher), Melodie Putnam, Deborah Rubel, and Michael Witbeck.
Guests/Staff: Kerrie Cook (minutes)

1. Welcome/Introduction/Expectations
   Engle expects that the committee will accomplish a lot this year and will make sure that the workload is evenly distributed among the members.

2. House keeping
   a. Meetings will be kept to an hour to be most efficient, and winter and spring meeting times need to be discussed soon.
   b. Minutes will now be rotated from committee member to committee member. Volunteers will be selected at the meeting prior to their turn and the library will reserve a laptop to be used.

3. Student Members
   It is sometimes difficult to get students to volunteer to serve on the committee. Please encourage students, when you can, to contact the Associated Students Office to turn in an application specifying their interest in the FSLC. Another option for recruits would be the Honors College.

4. Old Business
   a. Role of the committee and the Scholarly Communications Task Force - The standing rules need revision and more clarification to define the relationship between the Scholarly Communications Task Force and this committee. Gary Beach, Pat Wheeler, Bonnie Allen and Mike Boock were on the committee, and the draft report was presented to the Faculty Senate in June. Since the work is not complete, this committee should discuss how the Task Force should relate to this committee. Some of the items mentioned in the Task Force’s report will have ramifications throughout the campus, not just the OSU Libraries. Pat Wheeler is going to sit on this committee while we discuss what should be done. Due to Wheeler’s absence today, the committee will table further discussion until the next meeting in November.

   In the past, this committee has not formulated policy for the library, except for the new budget transfer policy that was instituted last year.

   Gottlieb will draft a revision of the committee’s standing rules and come up with some new language for the committee’s role.

   The Task Force will present its report to the open session of the faculty senate at the end of the year. Gary Beach and Bonnie Allen will be among those serving on the Task Force. This group has not met yet, but Gary and Bonnie will keep the committee updated.

5. New Business
   a. Long Term Research Study Rooms - Rubel will work with Pollitz on assigning the rooms. Five rooms are to be assigned for doctoral students who are within 90 days of defending. Messages were sent out to the graduate advisor list students but only two renew requests have come through, which is very unusual. October 5th is the deadline for application. Beach worked with Lorraine Borchers last year. Assigning rooms only takes about 1 hour.
b. The work plan for 2005-2006 was tabled to the November meeting. Some suggestions to think about include how will the library plan to take part in the comprehensive campaign, funding transfers (ironing out the details), and strategic planning. Fund transfers will be discussed in detail with an update on procedure in January.

c. Report from the librarian - John Pollitz gave the report. The library is set to raise $6.5 million for the comprehensive campaign. There are still funding issues on campus. The library proposed to use the money for collections, endowed positions and endowed programs. An endowment to build up the program at HMSC, training interns in the sciences, and beefing up the collections and various Digital projects. A portion of all campus endowments raised during the comprehensive campaign is supposed to go to library resources. The percentage will be under 1% but a final amount has yet to be established. Strengthening the weak areas first will be the highest priority. Some donors do not have a clear vision of where to give their donation, so the library is coming up with a short list of ideas to present to potential donors should they pose the question. How can the donation best serve the student? The new giving brochure is being printed this week and a copy will be sent out to each committee member. Donor's names can now be linked online to the electronic items they helped the library obtain. The library is applying for membership to the Digital Library Federation, which is an organization that sets standards for libraries and provides guidance on management of digital collections; it will give the library opportunities to collaborate with other prestigious universities. November 7, 2005 seven staff members will travel to a fall forum out of state. The library has been sponsored by Emory University. With the progression into more and more electronic collections, the question arises of what to do with the original papers, and how to involve archives. The question of ARL came up and the possibility that they were reconsidering their membership criteria. The committee will revisit ARL membership at the next meeting where Butcher can fill in the blanks.

d. Other items - Minutes will be sent out to Engle for approval and then to the rest of the committee. Refreshments are still welcome and may help lure students to the committee. Gottlieb will do the minutes at the November meeting.

Meeting adjourned.

Minutes by Kerrie Cook
Library Committee

October 4, 2004
Minutes

Present: Gary Beach, Molly Engle, Deborah Rubel, Michael Witbeck, Evan Gottlieb, Mo Healy
Student: Avinash Beeram
Other: Bonnie Allen
Not Present: Karyle Butcher (ex-officio), Robert Wheatcroft, Melody Putman

1. The group introduced themselves to each other and talked about why they chose to serve on the Library Committee.

2. Student Members. There is always a need to add more student members to Faculty Senate committees. The Library Committee allows for three student members, including at least one undergraduate and one graduate student. If you know of any students wanting to serve on this committee, please submit their names to Gary.

3. Reviewed Standing Rules
   These were last changed in March, 2002. The group can bring up any changes they think should be made throughout the year. Changes will be discussed, agreed upon, and submitted to the Faculty Senate to be changed.

4. Faculty Senate Task Force on Scholarly Communication (Gary)
   Last year the committee spent a lot of time discussing this issue while Ken Winograd was the committee chair. Many ways were discussed to educate faculty, such as using alternative publishing venues and retaining the copyright to the work they produce. The task force has four charges:
   a. Determine current practices that impede an open and sustainable system of scholarly communication, citing data where necessary to substantiate the findings.
   b. Determine actions that OSU faculty members, who are dependent on scholarly communication for professional advancement, can take to contribute to an open and sustainable system of scholarly communication.
   c. Determine a few of these actions that are likely to have the greatest positive impact towards creation of an open and sustainable system of scholarly communication.
   d. Propose a framework for communicating these findings to the OSU faculty.

   The Task Force will present its report to the open session of the faculty senate at the end of the year. Gary Beach and Bonnie Allen will be among those serving on the Task Force. This group has not met yet, but Gary and Bonnie will keep the committee updated.

5. Long–Term Research Study Rooms for Faculty and Doctoral Students (Gary).
   Gary will meet with Lorraine Borchers, head of Access Services, and go through the applications for reservations of the six study rooms in the Valley Library. These rooms are available to some doctoral candidates and faculty.

   The Business Affairs Office is conducting a cost analysis study of library operations during the 2004-05 fiscal year. Data collected will determine how library facilities, materials, and services are being used.

   The study consists of three major components: (a) cost analysis of the FY 05 library expenses that map to distinct cost centers; (b) a library user survey, conducted for two hours each month at the Valley Library, and eight hours each month at the Guin Library; and (c) a web-based user survey that will pop up when electronic resources are accessed during a two-hour survey period each month.
The data will be used to calculate our share of the overhead return for federal grants.

7. **Library Events** (Gary)
   The library faculty association sponsors a series of seminars generally held once a month on the second Friday of each month. Members of the Library Committee are invited to these seminars. Kevin will send out more information on them, including information on readings in the library and displays.

8. **Library Strategic Plan Handout** (Bonnie)
   Library Strategic Plan Committee members should review in October and have comments and/or observations for the November meeting.

   The strategic plan was developed through a series of meetings with many faculty and student constituencies, they are represented on the last page of the plan. Through these discussions, the committee succinctly drafted three goals, and then developed strategies and outcomes. The library is now working on the implementation plan.

   Although the library is still interested in achieving Association of Research Libraries (ARL) membership, with the five criteria that they now require, we are far from that goal. ARL now looks at volumes, volumes added, serials, total library expenditures, and staff. Until these criteria are updated, we will not be attaining membership. (See table on page 5 of strategic plan).

   **Question**: What are virtual college libraries? These are websites that bring resources, including a search engine, related to that college located in one place.

9. **Library Budget: FY 2005 Handout: Library Budget and Comparison with OSU’s Peer Institutions** (Bonnie)
   Our budget this year is around $9.2 million. This represents some additional funds given to us through the university budget to offset indirect costs from grants and ecampus. This money has all been consumed by increased benefits and maintaining salaries. We’re now developing our Technology Resource Fee (TRF) proposal that should yield about $500k.

   **Question**: Is the added money from ecampus and overhead justified? Probably not. Last year, our budget was actually cut by the Budget Allocation Model (BAM). They made a correction this year and this is where they determined the amount. We have received assurance that a cut will not happen again.

   Some years back this committee submitted a proposal to the Faculty Senate to raise library support to 4% of the E&G budget in line with our peer institutions. This was agreed upon, but lost in the shuffle of recent budget cuts. Karyle is doing some research of the support our peer libraries get from their administration, and she will submit that to this group for discussion.

   **Question**: How is the list of peers formulated? There are two lists; this one (in the Strategic Plan) was formulated by the deans as their aspirational list. They are all land grant, public, and doctoral degree granting. We have another list of peers that we generally use for comparative purposes on the web. The University of Oregon is often used for a comparator because of its vicinity and familiarity, and it puts our budget in a little more context.

10. **Library Funding Transfer Policy Handout: Category I Process: Allocation of Funding to the Valley Library** (Gary and Bonnie)
   The OUS Board of Higher Education requires all new degree-granting programs (Category 1) to be approved through the board after a campus approval process that goes through the college, provost, and Curriculum Council. The process requires that the library sign-off, after a thorough evaluation of the collection, stating whether or not it can support the program. The present process requires the college to offer four years of support, until the library can work it into their budget. This has not been the case in practice. It puts the library in an uncomfortable position, reminding the college that they did pledge support for the program.

   **Suggestion**: Revise the policy. Recommend the establishment of a university level Library Contingency Fund, that can be used to fund the need for monographs, serials, and other library materials for up to four years following the approval of new academic degree programs. This would come from the university’s contingency fund that they are presently building as a response to the last budget crisis. An amount of $50k was discussed, but that could change. Gary will draft a proposal to
review at the November or December meeting. He will distribute the proposal a week or so before the discussion.

Meeting adjourned.

Minutes by Kevin Bokay
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Library Committee

April 8, 2004
Minutes

Present:
Members: Ken Winograd (chair), Mark Edwards, Barbara Gartner, Linda Ashkenas, and Gary Beach; Karyle Butcher (ex-officio), Bonnie Allen (guest), and Kevin Bokay (Admin. Assistant)

1. Strategic Planning. (Allen)
   1. The process has begun, with Tom Dowling (College of Business) as facilitator, on 25 March.
   2. There is a committee of about 10 members. Some day-long sessions are scheduled where the core values, strategic plan and other core strategic documents will be revisited.
   3. Some differently composed focus groups will be involved. One will consist of the deans, some from the FSLC will be asked to serve, and other groups will consist of students - both undergraduate and graduate.
   4. The plan is to wrap-up around 2 June, with an initial draft in early May.
   5. A five-year plan tied to the University's Strategic Plan is being drafted

2. Collaborative Learning Center (Ruth):
   1. In the past, the information commons has hosted space for the Writing Center, the Math Tutoring Center, and the Career Center.
   2. The College of Science (with the University Honors College and the Career Center) has refurbished the area with tutors for physics, chemistry, and math.
   3. The area can be expanded, but their needs in the Library must be considered-the Library will track needs for 3-5 years and re-evaluate.
   4. Tutors, supplies, etc. are supplied from the departments.
   5. The area is in use from 11am - 10pm; outside these hours, it is accessible to anyone.
   6. Ruth has been coordinating with Sherm Bloomer for COS, and has established a task force from concerned departments to coordinate details.
   7. The Open House will be May 4th with a big Open House occurring in the fall.
   8. Students are using the Center and a big turnout is expected in the 3rd week because of chemistry midterms.
   9. An extensive collaboration between concerned departments is being experienced: from chemistry to writing.
   10. The Library will monitor the usage and the departments will keep statistics.

3. 5th Anniversary of the library renovation. (Butcher)
   1. Week of May 3rd
2. Matt Meselsom talk on May 5th

3. Open house for the CLC on May 3rd

4. Draft Proposal to the Faculty Senate regarding scholarly journals. (Winograd)
   1. Cost of journals in unsustainable.

   2. The FSLC is scheduled to present to the Faculty Senate on May 13 and to meet with the Executive Committee in early May.

   3. Changes and approaches to the proposal were discussed.

Notes by: Kevin Bokay
Library Committee

March 2, 2004
Minutes

Present:
Members: Melodie Putnam, Dianne Erickson, Gary Beach, Ken Winograd (chair), Bob Rost and Mark Edwards; Karyle Butcher (ex-officio) and Bonnie Allen (guest)

Agenda:
1. Review and evaluate Category I procedure.
2. Information on how the Library evaluates Category I proposals for program financial responsibility.
3. Information on meeting with Executive Committee (Beach and Winograd), and the next steps.

Notes:
1. Review and evaluate Category I procedure (Beach)
   - Require units to articulate where source of funds would be - has been in place since 1998.
   - Source of funds included with Category 1 proposal.
   - Next step is not in place-transfer of funds to library.
   - Right now, steps 1-5 are in place (see handout); 6-8 still need to be done.
   - Beach talked with Bob Burton of the Curriculum Council (CC): if the Library approves the plan, then it will go to the CC. Once in place, Gil Brown will implement the plan.
   - This is the first time it's been written down.
   - Once academic programs are notified, funds will be transferred.
   - There will be a two-year follow-up review for all new programs.
   - Approval process can take more than a year; therefore payment from department is not always taken when expected.
   - Winograd: Do programs put up money before generating an income?
     - Most new programs have been a consolidation of existing courses into degree programs.
     - Funds transfer will be shortly after program approval, because the Library needs the money up front to get supporting materials.
     - Departments feel they shouldn't have to fund library materials.
     - Lack of money to library, plus lack of administrative reserve that could handle it.
   - Butcher: University should keep courses that the Library can't support.
     - Departments don't look at the whole picture. Money has to come from somewhere, can't have new courses without it.
     - Example: Rubin Landau was dedicated to his new comp. physics and took on more work himself. Now he's retired, and how will his new program be sustained?
   - There is the assumption that after four years the Library will pick up the costs.
   - Brown would build recurring money into library accounts after four years.
     - Winograd: That ought to be written into the document.
   - Edwards: Is there a negotiation process for departments to build slowly?
     - Butcher: Category I proposal is bad - because there's no money, it doesn't solve collections problem and creates petty fights with departments.
     - Not a sustainable model.
   - Once provost signs off, money comes from administration, not academic units.
   - Bonnie: Raises awareness about cost to have new program.
   - Noone has money. If colleges did, then they wouldn't care.
   - Melodie: Departments need to know you can't do something with nothing.
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- Karyle: Someone has to pay the money, and if we do it, then someone else loses money.
- Ken: What is the process of determining financial responsibility?
- Mark: Process isn't long-term, but might nudge people in the right direction.
- Karyle: Might add money for library into mindsets of departments.
- Dianne: The university adds programs, but never takes any away.
  - Gary: There's a 10:1 ratio of new programs to those eliminated.
  - The university averages 5-6 new programs a year.
  - April 27-8 will be the accreditation visit.
- Mark: Need admin. to say get rid of programs to help getting new ones.
- The plan goes to academic programs then to CC then to Financial Planning then to EC.
  - (Bill said there will be no grandfathering, but it will start with this fiscal year.)
- Allen: Should there be a step 9 if the department budget falls through?
  - Butcher: No, then there is a fall back plan.
  - Butcher: Should be some type of agreement that the Library will get the money from somewhere?
    - Erickson: Departments make a deal with the provost, etc. Why is library involved?
    - It'll take a couple of years to make departments understand paying is a reality.
- Winograd: Is it too harsh to put a 7a in the process that says without library money the program isn't implemented?
  - Butcher: Provost can overrule everyone.
- Vote on process: unanimously accepted.

2. Information on how library evaluates Category I proposals for program financial responsibility (Allen).
   - Allen distributed a handout outlining the evaluation process.
   - Conspectus protocols used for collection assessment.
     - Use qualitative and quantitative data.
     - Look at external biblios and compare collections.
     - Compare library collections with others.
     - Look at the average age of the collection.
   - Gap
     - Distance community adds costs - shipping, etc.
     - Use cost assessment from ARL.
     - Ways to deliver and acquire materials.
   - ILIAD tracks ILL work - have records for past 15 months. Use this data to create averages over one year.
   - ILL use goes up 25-30% every year.
   - Butcher: Library has always done these assessments.
     - Started putting costs with assessments with Mel George.
     - Required by State Board of Higher Education.
     - Librarians work well with faculty and have awareness of where the holes in the collection are.
   - Winograd: We'll talk more next meeting on how to handle politics of having these conversations with departments.

3. Information on meeting with Executive Committee (EC) (Beach and Winograd), and the next steps.
   - A study was done 6-7 years ago; need to look at the 4% figure again now.
   - Library funding question should be brought to the Faculty Senate.
   - Assuming EC reaffirms evaluation and supports increase of revenue to library (go from 2.5% to 4%).
   - What will come of this money? New librarians, new services, new collections?
   - The EC wants more info on how this money will be spent.
   - Between now and the next meeting, Beach will have a new list of how we compare (budget).
   - Give figures for Tier 1?
   - Butcher: 4% may not still be right. The current funding model does not work for libraries, and most people on campus agree.
   - We ran figures for the accreditation.
     - If talking about faculty and student productivity, the facility should be user-friendly. But...
     - Students and faculty just want to get the stuff, they don't want to wait for books and other
We need to be very careful about what we produce to the Faculty Senate. Whoever generates funds through increases in student enrollment wants the money spent on them, but that's not how the Library does it.

Butcher: How do we advocate library budget so students and faculty see how they will benefit?
Erickson: Determine comparators to where we are (peers) to where we want to be (2007 plan).
Allen: What does it cost to provide the services needed—not just percent, but actual numbers?
Butcher: It's a good figure to have, but we don't want to be tied to it.
Edwards: For universities with more or less of the pie going to the library, what is the difference? Where is that difference going?
Beach could have new figures before next meeting, looking at total budget and E&G budget.
Winograd: Need to wait to go to Faculty Senate until there is a clear message.

Notes by: Kevin Bokay
Library Committee

December 2, 2003
Minutes

Present:
Members: Ken Winograd (chair), Mark Edwards, Bob Rost, Barbara Gartner, Adam Taylor, Mo Healey, Linda Ashkenas, Melody Putman, and Gary Beach; Karyle Butcher (ex-officio); Bonnie Allen (guest); Kevin Bokay (Admin. Assistant)

1. Discussed issues facing scholastic publishing - the Big Deal:
   1. This is a package deal that publishers of journals propose to promote their lesser-used journals by packaging them with other widely popular journals.
   2. Many times the "deal" is weighted heavily in favor of the publisher, with a three-year or more buy-in, with penalties for early cancellations.
   3. Although the biggest offender nowadays is Elsevier, others are quickly using the same model.
   4. OSU Libraries does not have a packaged deal with any publisher at this time, although they'd like to have a package (searchable journals) that can be used - and there are some 400 individual subscriptions the Library would like to get a better deal on.
   5. These publications are based on research that the taxpayer has (usually) paid for. The author gives up their rights to it, and academic libraries have to buy the same research again at high prices.
   6. Elsevier is just the leader in the field. It is turning a good profit for its shareholders, so there's little complaint from anyone, including faculty.
   7. What can be done? Open access to tax-payer funded data/research; address tenure/publishing issues; e.g., professional society journals, Bio-one, Public Library of Science, SPARC, institutional repositories, and other alternative models of scholarly publishing.
   8. Bill Lunch has submitted a proposal to the full senate for consideration that deals with this issue.

2. Discussed previous FSLC resolution
   1. The previous resolution was submitted to administration by the Faculty Senate four years ago by FSLC when it was chaired by Gary Beach, requesting an increase in G&E support to the libraries in line with our peer institutions.
   2. Support for the libraries was also mentioned in the accreditation report. The administration has not responded to this recommendation.
   3. Beach will draft a memo/resolution for the full Faculty Senate.

Notes by: Kevin Bokay
Library Committee

October 31, 2003
Minutes

Present:
Members: Ken Winograd (chair), Mark Edwards, Bob Rost, Barbara Gartner, Adam Taylor, Mo Healey, Linda Ashkenas, Melody Putman, and Gary Beach; Karyle Butcher (ex-officio), Richard Brumley (guest), and Kevin Bokay (Admin. Assistant)

1. How are materials added to the collection?
   1. Brumley: The materials budget is usually about $4.1 million, 80% of that goes to serials given the nature of our current collection, i.e., heavy in the sciences. So, 20% of that is left for monographs - split evenly from approval plan and firm orders. The approval plans are through Blackwells. A profile is established based on subject, publisher, level, format, language, etc., and as new books are published, Blackwells sends books based on the approval plan profile established. Firm orders are those orders outside the approval plan, usually requested by department faculty. Typically these orders fall outside parameters of the approval plan, i.e., small presses, out of print, foreign, proceedings, society pubs, etc. About $75,000-80,000 is spent on binding, and a smaller amount on videos. A responsibility of librarians is to contact faculty and tell them how much money is left in their account or that the account is out of money. Although librarians are supposed to keep in contact with faculty, some do a better job of it than others. After a request is made, one way to determine if it's there is to periodically check the catalog, and the librarian should also keep list.

2. Do librarians typically under or overspend? More cannot be spent than is available, but many faculty don't spend much at all. Then sometimes there are those who want to spend it all on their stuff.

3. Does ORBIS affect whether the collection is added to? That is, the book may be available in the Summit catalog, so the selectors won't order another copy?
   No, it will be ordered if there's a demand regardless of whether it is available in the Summit catalog. Although all librarians are not monitored; some follow up-some don't. They may make decisions based on the Summit catalog and not explain this to the faculty - but it's not written into any policy document that this be done. Faculty are welcome to call Brumley or Butcher to follow up on these issues.

4. How often is the profile for the approval plan updated? Every six months or so, based on returns, new programs, etc.

5. Is there a way that information on spending down an account is communicated back to departments? Each department should have a liaison that communicates this information. A liaison is the person who's supposed to communicate anything to do with the library, such as hour changes, not just collections. Being a liaison is a big job and a strategic role.

6. Should FSLC send a letter to departments emphasizing the importance of the library liaison? Butcher will investigate the liaison program to see what needs to be fixed or tweaked. Brumley will email answers to future questions regarding collections.

2. Library Research Travel Grants-
   1. Bonnie wants a volunteer for all campus to assist her with the approval process. Mo Healy will help this term and Mark Edwards next.

3. Capital Campaign--
1. Butcher: The University is beginning a capital campaign. All the colleges will develop a plan to submit to the University Development Council. A consultant has been hired to help decide which projects will be funded. It was relatively easy for the Library to identify projects ten or so years ago because a building was being discussed. At that time, $27 million was raised from private donors with $10 million from the Valley’s. Now the Library needs to present funding ideas about collections and staffing. Ultimately what is needed is more money on a regular basis, i.e., endowments - but how are donors convinced to support this? Everyone wants more monographs, and digital collections, but how should this be framed to donors? The draft plan is due to the UDC in the spring. Butcher will give LAC something soon. A brief, concise way to characterize points is being sought-donors want to move the institution forward.

2. The group discussed connecting the five themes to funding ideas, or departments with endowed library chairs i.e., natural resources, education, archives, special collections, marine science, or a librarian for Extension.

4. Budget--
   1. Should FLSC make a recommendation to the administration asking for a different budget allocation model (BAM)?
   2. TRF funding is a set amount, or at least a percentage, preferable?
   3. Indirect cost recovery-it's built into the budget, but the Library doesn't see the amount supposedly provided.
   4. Moving toward 20/30 split academic to administration-the Library is on the academic side, but is not getting dollars from Extended Campus while others are.
   5. Beach will generate a letter for the Committee to edit.
October 1, 2003 Minutes

Attending Members:
Ken Winograd (chair), Mark Edwards, Bob Rost, Barbara Gartner, Adam Taylor, Mo Healey, Linda Ashkenas, Melody Putman, Dianne Erickson
Karyle Butcher (ex-officio)
Bonnie Allen (guest)
Kevin Bokay (Admin Assistant)

1. Welcome and Introductions

2. Dates/times for future meetings:
   1. 30 Oct 03, 3:30-5pm
   2. 2 Dec 03, 3:30-5pm
   3. 6 Jan 04, 3:30-5pm
   4. 3 Feb 04, 3:30-5pm
   5. 2 Mar 04, 3:30-5pm
   6. 8 Apr 04, 3:30-5pm
   7. 4 May 04, 3:30-5p

3. Review and discussion of the committee's purpose.
   1. The committee reviewed the standing rules.
   2. No changes were suggested.

4. Consideration of committee's agenda for the year
   1. Expanding access to literary materials and services-broaden constituencies
   2. Broaden definition of what collections are, eg. plant pathology.
   3. Discern where collections are deep/shallow. That is, what are our weak collections and what can the committee do to help.
   4. Where are we deficient in core collections?
   5. Look at webpage development, possibly a briefing from Mary Caughey of the web group.
   6. How does the library serve the statewides?
   7. How does library administration work? What issues is the library facing now?
   8. Tutorial from someone in CCD selection.
   9. Library as portal for all digital information found being developed on campus.
10. Discuss the university's strategic plan.

5. Other issues. Bonnie Allen would like someone to assist in library research travel grants.

Notes by Kevin Bokay
Library Committee

May 29, 2003
Minutes

Members: Mark Edwards, Larry Landis, Barbara Gartner, Dianne Erickson, Bob Rost, Heidi Brayman Hackel
Student member: Katie Cunnion

Ex-Officio: Karyle Butcher

Guests: Bonnie Allen, Richard Brumley

Karyle: Discussed what pursuing outside funding for ARL might involve. We want to look like a top research library, i.e., an ARL library. We'll probably not meet all criteria for ARL like 90K volume count, but we have other strengths, (i.e., Pauling, History of Science collections), that make us unique. The criteria should change soon to reflect new avenue trends in research. All in all, our focus will continue to be supporting the institution, if this brings us to ARL so be it. But supporting the institution is the way we'll build volume count, staffing, and other the other related ARL criteria.

Bonnie/Richard: Shared collections with UofO and other nearby libraries. We’re starting with selected journals with the idea to eventually share the whole journal collection. We’ll begin with the hard copy journals and work out the details for electronic journals later when licenses issued are worked out. The transport will be accomplished by a dedicated shuttle between the libraries. Bound journals issues: we circulate, they don’t, they’re changing so that both libraries have the same rules on journals use. The goal of the project is to save money and provide a more diverse collection. Right now, we have four libraries ninety miles apart that duplicate $1million in journals.

Some ideas for next year’s committee

1. The committee should monitor these upcoming campus changes in plan 2007 - and the budget.
2. We should invite the new president to talk, but during the screening process ask the candidates what they’ve done for libraries at their universities. (Mark will collect ideas for questions to ask candidates.)
3. We may want to arrange a meeting with our counterparts at UofO to discuss the shared collections and other issues.
4. We should find ways to ensure students are involved in the library.
5. We can ask students what/how to use the library.
6. Use internal, targeted, surveys from the faculty and students to gauge library use/needs, and to help identify the important needs

Note: ASOSU wants to get someone on committee.

Notes by Kevin Bokay
February 27, 2003 Minutes, Library Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

Library Committee

February 27, 2003 Minutes

Present: Mark Edwards, Chair, Bob Rost, Larry Landis, Lorraine Borchers, Diane Erickson, Ken Winograd, Mo Healy, Katie Cunnion

1. Julia Blixrud (of ARL) and Karyle Butcher: Why should OSU Libraries be a part of ARL?
   1. It's not just about the library, but the whole institution.

2. ARL sees itself as an association for collective action, advocating for the research community: 124 research libraries in the U.S. and Canada

3. Some examples of ARL's collective action: intellectual property and copyright issues; scholarly communication; establishing library performance measures to justify funding and measure effectiveness; preservation of primary sources and materials.

4. 2000 new membership committee discussed new criteria including digital collections/sources and an emphasis on uniqueness of collections, support of parent institution, and distinctive contribution to the research community.

5. One measure of demonstrating institutional support is through the organizational reporting relationship.

6. All ARL libraries, as most other research libraries, report to the academic side.

7. There do exist some old structures where the librarian also serves as the computing/info services person, but this is mostly due to the personnel situation at a particular university.

8. ARL looks for the library's contribution to the institution's learning and research and how the administration values these things.

9. Computer centers and libraries are completely different cultures; therefore, OSU's current structure runs counter to the ARL model.

10. ARL also evaluates whether the library is situated in the organization in a way that it can get resources it needs, therefore, budgets have to be separate; funds are vulnerable when dollars are mixed with computing needs.

11. ARL tries to look at the library from a student's point of view, i.e., is the library well supported well enough?
12. Some examples of collaboration that ARL membership would bring include:
   1. Grant from the Mellon Fund that funds research that addressed how to alleviate high cost of journals.
   2. Scholars Portal - both purchased and free - ARL headed development of project; once established, other libraries can join.
   3. Scholarly publishing-the SPARC initiative.

2. Recently Mark met with Bruce Sorte.
   1. He is enthusiastic about ARL, but wants material to tighten the case for membership and to move the libraries to the academic side of the reporting structure.
   2. He would like specific data and an answer to how it would effect the campus.
   3. He also wants information on how we compare to other like institutions.
   4. Other information would pertain to:
      2. Anecdotes and data, i.e., ILL stats for borrowing.

3. Mark will draft and staff a statement to Sabah listing the committee’s concerns and recommendations. This statement will include the
   1. Library’s lack of visibility in the 2007 plan.
   2. Library’s budget.
   3. P&T and teaching issues.
   4. ARL goals and how it fits with making OSU a top tier university.

Notes by Kevin Bokay
Present: Mark Edwards, chair; Bonnie Allen, Karyle Butcher, Dianne Erickson, Heidi Brayman-Hackel, Mo Healey, Larry Landis, Bob Rost, Ken Winograd

Agenda:

1. Welcome and introductions
2. Discussion of highlights in orientation packets:
3. Report on the state of the Library and areas of support from the Committee
   a. Preview of major topics for this academic year
   b. Suggestions for other new business to address this year
4. Confirming proposed meeting times for fall term meetings
   a. November 21, 2002 and December 12, 2002

1. Mark welcomed new Committee members and made introductions.

   a. Evaluating demand for short-term library study rooms.
   b. Library advocates in the OSU redesign discussion.
   c. Satellite teams involved in achieving ARL status for the library.
   d. Continued efforts to pursue ARL status.
   e. Monitor Category I Proposals procedures and indirect costs distribution.

3. Mark passed out potential issues for the Committee to address this year.
   a. Shared collections with the University of Oregon.
   b. Collaboration with the University of Washington Libraries.
   c. Continue to seek ARL status.
   d. Continued advocacy for the library via satellite team in OSU 2007 process.
   e. Suggestions from the University Librarian:
      1. Identifying key services to ensure continued funding.
      2. Proposal to move to electronic publications where feasible and useful.
      3. Explore ways to obtain better feedback from faculty and graduate students on services they need.
      4. Working with other institutional repositories to find shared server space and software to allow faculty to make their research information available to others within the wider academic community.
      5. Joint University of Oregon and Oregon State University Faculty Senate Library Committee.
Additional items:

- Mark suggested using the December meeting to get feedback from the Library's redesigned web page. He asked the Committee to make notes about the web page (areas that are confusing, hard to find, etc.) and send back to the Committee for review.
- Mo Healey asked for an organizational (or flow) chart for the next meeting.

Notes by Kevin Bokay
March 13, 2002 Minutes, Library Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

Present: Mark Edwards, Larry Landis, Heidi Brayman-Hackel, Bob Rost, Christine Armer, David Horne, Cynthia Twohy, Graeme Mitchell, Karyle Butcher

Agenda:

1. Review of minutes of February meeting.
2. Reports from committee members who have attended Faculty Senate forums with President Risser
3. Discuss OSU 2007 Strategic Vision with Becky Johnson, Chair of the Steering Committee

1. Review of minutes of February Meeting.

   a. February minutes were reviewed and
   b. approved with minor changes.

2. Reports from committee members who have attended Faculty Senate forums with President Risser.

   a. Larry Landis attended a meeting on 28 Feb 02 w/President Risser.

   b. The participants brought up many topics including:

      i. Crumbling facilities;
      ii. Hiring freeze;
      iii. Junior faculty grievances;
      iv. Lack of research funds.

   c. The president spoke of:

      i. Change happening from the "bottom up;"
      ii. Facilitating better communication;
      iii. Interpersonal relationships;
      iv. Middle managers managing for accountability.

   d. Some library issues were brought up; the president assured all that he was aware of the library concerns.

3. Discuss OSU 2007 Strategic Vision with Becky Johnson, Chair of the Steering Committee.

   a. Becky Johnson handed out a new website that described "OSU 2007"

   b. To sustain current level of growth, OSU will need 20-30 million dollars more in the operating budget of 2007.

   c. Some 65 people are working in groups and committees on the OSU 2007 project.

   d. The library could be part of a satellite group to enter in the planning process.

      i. The library recently went through a re-working of its vision statement.
ii. This satellite group could be formed out of the same group that worked on the library's 2005 Vision Statement.

iii. The satellite groups will represent different interests on campus, not necessarily units.

e. The OSU 2007 related to the formerly called redesign project. The group wanted to change the process somewhat to take the fear out of it.

f. Although the satellite groups will represent different interests, the OSU 2007 committee will be expected to consider the university as a whole.

g. The procedures for how exactly the groups will work, i.e., what will be the feedback mechanism and other reporting processes, are still being worked out.

h. Karyle: it would be better to have FSLC members and other library staff serving on many separate groups than one library group. One group that library staff would certainly have an active interest in is the Curriculum Committee.

i. Most of the groups have not been formed yet.

j. Protocol and procedures should be posted on the web in the next few days.

k. Long term, big studies would be developed in the committees and submitted to Tim White and Paul Risser for approval. Deans will be actively involved in the process, too.

Notes by Kevin Bokay
Library Committee

February 21, 2002
Minutes

Present: Mark Edwards, Larry Landis, Heidi Brayman-Hackel, Bob Rost, Christine Armer, Karyle Butcher

Agenda:
1. Review of minutes from January meeting.
2. Reports from committee members who have attended Faculty Senate forums with President Risser
3. Plan meeting with vice provost for research on indirect costs
4. Discuss recommendation for large-scale university funding for library
5. Discussion of ORBIS policy for faculty

1. Review of minutes from January meeting.
   a. Minutes were reviewed and
   b. Approved

2. Reports from committee members who have attended Faculty Senate forums with President Risser
   a. Mark Edwards and Heidi Brayman-Hackel both attended a similar meeting with President Risser
   b. Although the focus was on CLA, some of the discussion would apply to the library and other departments.
   c. The administration believes that state funding is going to amount to less and less.
   d. Units will have to rely on private partnership, e.g., engineering and industry; COAS and private donors.
   e. Other departments have to try to find private money and/or grants to augment their budgets.
   f. Lobbying the legislature is not a big part of OSU's strategy.
   g. When ARL membership was mentioned, President Risser applauded the idea, but countered that the library must find a way to achieve it.
   h. The administration does not favor one department's mission. They also leave the accomplishment of the department's goal incumbent on that department/college.
   i. There seems to be some momentum toward re-organization into an Arts and Sciences center.
   j. Karyle suggested that Becky Johnson be asked to speak with the FSLC in the future.

3. Plan meeting with vice provost for research on indirect costs (Karyle)
   a. Perhaps Larry, David, and Ajoy can continue with this action
   b. Now that Rich is in the job we may want to revisit the issue
4. Discuss recommendation for large-scale university funding for library
   a. Although the administration may have better figures, it doesn't really change the library's situation.
   b. The library is looking to cut about $600k from this year's budget.
   c. Archives and development will be cut 6.5% because the administration sees those sections as administrative and the rest of the library will take a 3.25% cut.
   d. The library may have to cut collections and supplies and services, but won't really know till the budget arrives from the state.
   e. The library will make up some of the money with gift funds and will also try to get more TRF. The FSLC doesn't need to get into the details of these issues, but support through the Faculty Senate is needed.

5. Discussion of ORBIS policy for faculty
   a. Orbis policy would be very hard to change, 16 libraries are involved and all would be affected
   b. The library would have to get an agreement with all participant libraries
   c. Orbis is a good service now, but some aspects could be improved upon
   d. Better to suggest changes to Karyle who can then gauge feasibility
   e. The FSLC can also invite John Helmer, the head of the organization, to speak
   f. The library can supply the call numbers of Orbis requests to see if there are gaps in the collection

Notes by Kevin Bokay
Members present:
Mark Edwards, Bob Rost, Heidi Brayman Hackel, Karyle Butcher, Larry Landis, Dianne Erickson

Agenda:

1. Update on our letter to Redesign Committee 12-10-01 (Heidi)
2. Update on budget cuts (Karyle)
3. Discussion of collaboration with University of Oregon Libraries
4. News/New business

1. **Update on our letter to Redesign Committee**
   a) No formal response yet.
   b) Should members of this committee attend meeting with President Risser to discuss redesign and rally for library to be on the academic side? Several slots are available at each of the remaining meetings, though not enough for the entire committee to go at once.
      i) Need lots of voices at many meetings.
      ii) Attend as individuals, not as a committee (Risser needs to hear support for the library from many sources, not only from one group which represents the library).
      iii) Should we develop a set of useful questions to ask at these meetings? No, more beneficial to discuss possible questions and let individuals take it from there.
   c) Send copy of letter to Bruce Sorte.
   d) Big redesign issues are overwhelming and leaves people in limbo; this committee might tackle some local issues (e.g. noise, food and drink, library policies, etc) for the time being.

2. **Update on budget cuts**
   a) No actual info on next year's budget.
   b) Rather than cut collections, we will use gift money to buy subscriptions.
   c) Archives treated as "administration" (6.5%); Library Admin will be cut 6.5% as well; Mark McCambridge is not changing reduction figures this year, but will next year.
   d) Approach '03 as though this year's budget is what we have to get under next year.
   e) Waiting for results is OUS audit -> May?

3. **Discussion of collaboration with University of Oregon Libraries**
   a) Had a meeting with UO.
      i) Developed principles/objectives.
      ii) UO has task force already, has had conversations about process.
      iii) We still need to have the conversations.
   b) Big picture: leverage collections money between the two libraries to get the best collections possible.
   c) Review of 4 objectives (see letter).
   d) Questions/Comments.
      i) Will campus support this concept? Answer will have to come from input from this committee.
      ii) Will bound volumes be available to students and faculty? The University Librarians are leaning towards yes, but need further input (idea: 3-day loan to students).
      iii) Will items go through ORBIS or ILL? ILL processing can be very slow-orders not put in in a timely fashion, then wrong item ordered.
      iv) JSTOR is a couple years behind, but if neither library owns the items, then patrons will
have to wait a couple years for access to the materials -> perhaps buy titles and keep unbound in stacks for a couple years, but then never bind them.

v) Problem with only bound journals being available (hard for faculty to stay current) -> let unbound issues circulate too, maybe only available in libraries.

(1) What about getting scans of TOC's, articles, etc.
(2) Having journals on shelf is much more conducive to faculty staying current in their field than having to go through ORBIS/ILL. Access vs. Ownership.

e) Conclusion: Yes, take agreement to UO that we will start a task force to:
   i) Begin working out process.
   ii) Task force meets with Faculty Senate Library Committee.
   iii) Joint UO/OSU Faculty Senate Library Committee meeting?

4. News/New Business
   
a) Natural Resources digital library.
      i) Working with College of Forestry (Hal Salwasser).
      ii) Applying for grants to develop digital collections in natural resources - new electronic info as well as digitizing older info.

b) Gray Family Endowment -> Meetings to discuss best access for finding the information you need.

c) Archives grant -> consortium of NW archives/special collections, looking to create a new standard of archival description.

d) ORBIS concerns: 5-day period too short; have email announcement day before item is to be returned? Karyle will look into it.

e) Noise and food complaints.
      i) Quiet floors are available: 4th and 5th floor Rotundas, entire 6th
      ii) Food remains an issue, though it's better than in past years.

(Notes by Karen Russ)
Library Committee

November 28, 2001
Minutes

Attending:
Larry Landis, Heidi Brayman Hackel, David Horne, Cynthia Twohy, Dianne Erickson, Bob Rost, Darlene Judd,
Mark Edwards, Ajoy Velayudhan
Library Staff: Bonnie Allen, Kevin Bokay

Agenda:
1. Review of minutes from October meeting
2. Review of standing rules
3. Approval of letter to Executive Committee on recall policy
4. Update on library's status and concerns in redesign and budget crisis
5. Schedule a location for meetings
6. Announcements

1. Review of minutes from October meeting:
   a. Minutes were reviewed and
   b. Approved.

2. Review of standing rules:
   a. Committee reviewed and discussed standing rules.
   b. Discussed inclusion of library personnel, i.e., the AUL and the executive assistant in the standing rules. It was noted that, in the past, the university librarian was the only ex-officio, and the AUL was normally the guest at the meetings. The executive assistant provides support.
   c. Discussed a statement acknowledging the desired broad range of membership in the committee, reflecting the whole campus. Heidi will draft a statement regarding this.
   d. Committee decided to discuss the standing rules at a future meeting with the statement described above in 2.c.

3. Approval of letter to Executive Committee on recall policy
   a. Letter drafted by Heidi regarding faculty senate member's request to change recall policy for the library.
   b. Letter states that no change is recommended, however library staff is asked to widely disseminate current policy.
   c. Letter was discussed and approved.

4. Update on library's status and concerns in redesign and budget crisis
   a. Bonnie: Upcoming meetings this week should have more concerning redesign.
b. The library seems to be on the academic side of the redesign for right now. We don't know if it will stay there. Ideally, the library should stand alone, under a dean of libraries.

c. While we don't know what the outcome of the redesign will be, we intend to keep collections strong and library staffing at present levels. We may have to use more of our gift funds for any new initiatives.

d. Our donor base remains strong. It is our gift funding that has allowed us many things presently that we wouldn't have enjoyed relying on state funds.

e. Our best guess right now is we stand to lose $300k in collections. We hope to make some of that up with gifts.

f. Cascades Campus is still up in the air. Right now we're negotiating catalog issues and ready to make an offer to a librarian - but we still don't know if we're going ahead with the branch campus.

g. ARL decided not to add any new members this fall. Although our numbers look weak, they are revising the membership criteria to include electronic resources and other services. Again, it is our funding levels and the fact that we're not considered an academic entity that hurts us.

h. What can the committee do to advocate the library in these times?

1. State the case to make the library a separate entity under a dean and
2. Strive to keep the budget at least at present levels.
3. Meet with Karyle to strategize. Possibly a letter to the Faculty Senate with recommendations.

5. Schedule a location for meetings

   a. The following schedule was proposed for future meetings

   1. Tuesday, December 4, 3:30-4:30
   2. Thursday, January 17, 3:00-4:30
   3. Thursday, February 21, 3:00-4:30
   4. Wednesday, March 13, 3:30-5:00
   5. Wednesday, April 17, 3:30-5:00
   6. Wednesday, May 15, 3:30-5:00
   7. Tuesday, June 4, 3:00-4:30

   b. Committee was instructed to check their calendars and call Heidi if all the dates were inconvenient.

6. Announcements

   a. David/Larry: Report on indirect cost recovery. Nothing has happened yet. We're still waiting on a permanent Director of Research. Someone from the FSLC needs to be present at the open forums when they interview the candidates for this position in order to state the library's position and find out where the candidate stands.

   b. Heidi: We'll meet on December 4th if we decide that Karyle can meet with us and give us some guidance on possible approaches to the redesign process.

Meeting adjourned.
Minutes by Kevin Bokay
Library Committee

October 18, 2001
Minutes

Attending:
Bob Rost, Larry Landis, Ajoy Velayudhan, Heidi Brayman Hackel, Darlene Judd, Mark Edwards
Library Staff: Bonnie Allen, Kevin Bokay, and Karyle Butcher
Meeting started with a welcome and introductions.

The group reviewed committee's work of last year.

1. Research study room policy revision. Last year's committee proposed a change to the study room policy. Based on survey results, committee recommended 10 of 70 study rooms be set aside for long-term use, only 3 were granted in the fall term round, but we had additional applications in the winter, spring, and summer rounds. This policy may be revisited with input from Access staff.

2. Library support for category I proposals. The curriculum committee has taken this task. Probably will require a change in the faculty handbook and an administrative mechanism for transferring funds. Task to our committee is to monitor changes that curriculum committee proposes.

3. Indirect costs. Discussed subcommittee's visit with Rich Holdren of Research Office. Library's share of indirect should be 3% of research funds. The library does not receive the full 3% for reasons unknown. This committee will re-visit this issue when there is a permanent director of the Research Office.

4. Discussed other issues including:
   a. Faculty Senate passed a resolution in 1999 to increase the library's budget to 4% of general and education budget. Currently it's about 2.4%. This issue was discussed with Steve Hiller from the accreditation team.

   b. Committee's support of the implementation of pay-as-you-go printing in the information commons.

   c. Accreditation team visit. Library's role in OSU's attainment of top-tier engineering school goal was not addressed by the university administration. University needs a better definition of "top-tier."

5. Update from the university librarian, Karyle Butcher.
   a. Budget: we don't know how this will play out, but we need to keep our eye on the goal, i.e., where we want to be in the future - regardless of budgetary conditions.

   b. We need to move into a more electronic environment. In the sciences, there's lots of stuff available, but we need to strike a balance with the social sciences and humanities. We are in the process of creating digital libraries - Natural Resources and Tsunami Research. Some libraries are digitizing volumes from the shelves, we'll not be doing that.

   c. ARL membership is something we've wanted for some time now. We've recently applied, our numbers are looking more like what their criteria asks for. They've added a new, less tangible criterion for services provided. At the same time, they're changing their criteria. This is an important step for us, and will help us to secure more funding through grants.

   d. Our strengths are the sciences, and special collections - especially the Pauling collection.
e. Our volume count is being added to all the time as we are in the process of adding the VetMed collection to our count. Not control, but to our count. Also, the Herbavarium has a collection that we can add.

f. How are decisions made in the library? This committee is a good example. One purpose of the committee is to advise the library administration on matters that are important to the university committee at large. We get lots of advice from various sources before important decisions are made.

6. Update from the associate university librarian, Bonnie Allen.
   a. There's been progress in collections, mostly due to gifts.
   b. Last year we licensed Web of Science with another NW school.
   c. We also licensed JSTOR. This is a full-text journal database that accesses some journals from 1819.
   d. Everything we've done this year that's out of the ordinary has been due to gift funds. We have several endowments that provide funds for specific subjects and some that provide funds for books at our discretion. We are able to enhance our collection of both journals and monographs with gift funds.
   e. Only two years ago we had to cut several serials due to the skyrocketing costs of these scholarly publications.
   f. Our strategy is to stabilize the collections and periodicals budget in the next two years.
   g. Technical Resource Funds (TRF). Every year the library, and other campus electronic resource providers, submit proposals to get a portion of these funds. This year the library asked for a multi-year allotment so we could forego the proposal process next year. They did not allow that to take place, but we did get almost $400k.
   h. We also completed the ALA LibQual survey last year with 40 other universities. We found out that our customers want to see more electronic databases and journals, and at the same time, more in print.
   i. Bend OSU Cascades-Campus. We are in the process of building a collection there to support the branch campus. We are hiring a full-time, tenure-track librarian and a .5 FTE Library Technician to manage our operations there. We have a separate budget for Bend.

7. Tasks for this year's committee.
   a. Heidi Brayman Hackel (committee chair) will continue the funding for category I proposal tracking in the curriculum committee.
   b. Larry Landis, Ajoy Velayudhan, and David Horne will continue with the indirect cost issues through the Research Office.
   c. Work towards a recommendation for large-scale university funding for the Library, considering the 1999 Senate resolution in our discussions.

8. Discussion of recall policy and privacy issues. The committee returned to the proposal made last June by a Faculty Senator and confirmed its earlier sense that a change in the policy was neither practical nor desirable, especially since the Library has an informal policy of offering to contact the holders of recalled books to speed their return. The committee will encourage Circulation to make this offer more widely known and practiced. Recall period will remain at 14 days for reasons of fairness and practicality.

9. Next meeting will be on a recurring basis, coordinated through email. Members are encouraged to read the minutes and rules posted on the Faculty Senate Library Committee web page. We'll review the standing rules at the November meeting.

10. Meeting adjourned.
Attending: Larry Landis, Dianne Erickson, Christine Armer, Heidi Brayman Hackel, Mina Ossiander
Library Staff: Bonnie Allen, Kevin Bokay, Karyle Butcher

Agenda

1. Follow-up to accreditation

2. Library happenings
   a. COCC/OSU partnership for the OSU-Cascades Campus
   b. Library budget
   c. Library fall in-service day
   d. Collections report
   e. Initiative for the upcoming year (digital collections, stacks maintenance and space issues, building supervisory capacity)

3. Faculty Senate proposal concerning library procedures Budgetary issues updates (the latest on Category I proposals, indirect costs, etc.)

4. Announcement of the committee chair for 2001/02

5. Other announcements

Follow-up to accreditation
The whole document has not been released at this time. The emphasis of the whole process was whether the university was meeting the goals it had set for itself. Recommendations by the committee will be reviewed in five years to see if progress is being made. It was a good process, tactfully done. The report doesn't point fingers or assign blame, just address resources to fix the problems it uncovered.

Archives issues were discussed with the team. Some of the issues were: location - out of the way, prone to flood, next to a meeting room, inadequate circulation, environmental conditions not ideal; lack of visibility. These would have been library issues regardless of archives' move to the library.

Indirect cost issues. Grants do not allow money to go directly to support facilities, only through the indirect can these costs be recovered. OSU is renegotiating federal indirect costs through HHS. We think facilities on campus have deteriorated to a point that renegotiation will send the rate downward, lower than 43%.

Library happenings
COCC/OSU partnership for the OSU-Cascades Campus - We're looking for a librarian and a .5FTE library technician. We're starting to order some monographs and discussing a catalog merge and sharing databases.

Library Budget
From a recent meeting with Rob Specter - Budget will probably remain status quo. This would likely mean a serials cut, but not drastic since inflation is holding steady. We may have to cut some databases, especially those that receive limited use. We're going to request TRF for 2 year intervals to stabilize income.

Digital Collections
The library is looking for a funding opportunity for the Natural Resources Digital Library project.
Collections Report
LigQual survey result will be at American Library Association soon. The Faculty Senate Library Committee will get them next fall.

The library is still looking for more space. The 1st floor was full, but the storage project has made some room. We'll have space problems taken care of in two more years. The project has currently taken over 40,000 volumes to storage. These were serials and monographs that had no circulation in the last year to 1959.

Periodicals: we're starting to use gray boards for preservation of displayed journals.

Energy conservation is still an issue. We're trying to cut back while maintaining current levels of service and security. We're looking into sensors on lighting tracks, timers, and doing most maintenance activities during the daytime.

Library Fall In-Service Day
The library is beginning planning for a fall in-service day to train staff and build morale. Library will be closed for one day. We're looking closely at the calendar for a good day to do this.

Faculty Senate proposal concerning library procedures
Gary Beach's Category I proposals and the Library budget were discussed.

Announcement of the committee chair for 2001/02
Heidi Brayman Hackel is committee chair for 2001/02. Larry thanked committee members and said he would submit an annual report.

Meeting adjourned.
The first part of the meeting was with Steve Hiller, University of Washington, the accreditation team member assigned to Standard 5, Libraries. Some of the concerns and topics of discussion were:

More money for journals. When serials are cut, there is a campus outcry. The problem is that academic publications costs are rising much faster than library budgets. Initiatives such as SPARC are slowing catching on, must wait and see. Also digital journals are helping to lower costs.

Role clarification. What is the role of the Faculty Senate Library Committee in the accreditation process? Role is to give as clear a view as possible of problems in the library in order for the team to address them. Accreditation process is based on whether the University is living up to the goals it sets for itself, not between institutions. Peer comparisons are inherently unfair, except for possibly PhD programs. Accreditation team can point out that the libraries do not adequately support certain programs, but not recommend dollar amounts. The team can recommend that the library play a more active role in the establishment of category I programs.

What does it mean to be "Top Tier?" We need a better definition than the News and World Report's survey. Here on campus there's lots of enlargement of programs, but not enough enhancement of existing programs. The university needs to define a strategy to reach top tier. Right now we're supporting programs at the expense of faculty research. Eighteen of the top 50 university's libraries are in ARL. That is one goal that is clear to us.

The academic departments have great disparity between themselves. Even the treatment by the central administration is disparate. More money goes to Athletics than many other departments.

Does the university have a process that involves student/staff in decisions made by central administration? On paper, yes, but not in practice. Nor do administrators even have the tools (information) to become a part of the decision-making process.

Regular meeting agenda: Library Notes
JSTOR update 169 journal titles dating back to 1850. This database is getting lots of use, and use satisfaction is high.

LibQual Survey-ARL has initiative for measuring user satisfaction for library services. OSU is participating. The goal is to find a standard research instrument to set library standards for service. Our services are good, the comments on the staff were positive, and the collection could be better. Overall, the survey got a positive response because the library has good support.

Big 12 Plus has a new name: the Greater Western Library Alliance.

SPARC continues to meet with faculty about changing publishing paradigm.

Web of Science license is stuck in Department of Justice Contracts Office.

Updates:
Category I proposals: Gary Beach hopes that after accreditation he can work on putting a better process in place. The Curriculum Council has it presently.

Indirect costs: we pointed out to Rich Holdren that we're not getting our 3%. He passed the word to Mark McCambridge.

No news on TRF.

Look for Bend funding to come from OUS money. It has not yet been allocated by the legislature. We anticipate that the legislature will give $7.2 mil to Bend operation.
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Library Committee

February 26, 2001
Minutes

Attending: Larry Landis, Ajoy Velayudhan, Diane Erickson, David Horne, Christine Armer, Cynthia Towey, Darlene Judd, Heidi Brayman Hackel
Library Staff: Bonnie Allen, Kevin Bokay, Karyle Butcher

Agenda:
1. Review/approval of January minutes
2. Library happenings/items from library staff
3. Ongoing discussion items:
   a. Indirect cost redistribution - discussion of subcommittee's Feb 22 meeting with Rich Holdren, interim VP for Research
   b. TRF Funds
   c. Category I Proposals
   d. Ramp up to 4% of G&E budget
4. University of Maryland Health Sciences and Human Services Library exhibit on library costs
5. March meeting date
6. Adjourn

Approve minutes of January meeting
Minutes were reviewed, approved.

Library happenings/items from library staff. Karyle spoke of the Digital Library Initiative on Natural Resources (Janine Salwasser, project officer), and Tsunami research that the university and library are involved in. She also talked about the organization of the modern electronic library portion of this research, i.e., researchers' materials - primary sources; lay persons - secondary sources; and children and others - more general information - all based on reference interviews. She talked about Cheri Pancake's Tsunami research and the possible link to the library could be accomplished through the Gray Family Endowment.

Bonnie: Jstor has been licensed, should be up in the spring. She brought a new SPARC pamphlet and passed it around the group. On Bend: we'll not build a new library, but will employ a full-time librarian. $100k will start the collection. At Big 12 Plus' meeting in Tempe with Karyle and Tim: journal's high prices are not due to libraries action, but faculty's reluctance to rock the boat.

Indirect cost redistribution - discussion of subcommittee's Feb 22 meeting with Rich Holdren Larry and Ajoy met with Rich Holdren. Library's share of indirect is 3% of $17mil. Currently receiving $427k - we don't know why there's a discrepancy. Larry passed out a hand-out that listed peer institutions and their library expenditures. Discussion included questions to be drafted for Toby's replacement when candidates meet with different campus groups.

TRF Funds: Bonnie: We need to decide to what degree students use the library technology resources, taking a sampling of use, also of proxy server. Difficulties in vendors identifying status of users, some do, some don't, others use different counts. Bonnie will submit a proposal in the amount of about $500k. The problem to be addressed is reliable, predictable funding for technology resources for the library.

Category I Proposals: Larry - no change. We still need a mechanism to transfer funds.
Replacement for Shiao-ling: position is still vacant.
January 22, 2001 Minutes
Library Committee

Attending: Larry Landis, David Horne, Christine Armer, Cynthia Twohy, Darlene Judd, Mark Larson,
Library Staff: Bonnie Allen, Kevin Bokay, Karyle Butcher

Agenda:
1. Review/approval of November minutes
2. Committee vacancy (replacement for Shiao-ling Yu for remainder of academic year)
3. Library happenings/items form library staff
   a. Storage
   b. Budget
   c. Jstor & Web of Science
   d. Addition of netLibrary
4. Ongoing discussion items
   a. Category I proposals
   b. Indirect costs redistribution
   c. Status of ramp up to 4% of E&G budget.
5. Technology Resource Fee (TRF) funds
6. February meeting dates
7. Adjourn

Approve minutes of November meeting
Minutes were approved after minor corrections.

Committee vacancy (replacement for Shiao-ling for remainder of academic year). Larry said that he would prefer someone who was not only interested in finishing out Shiao-ling's term (till next fall) but wanted to continue with the three-year term she will leave vacant beginning in the fall of 02. He asked committee members to recruit for this position.

Library Happenings/items from library staff. Bonnie passed out copies of the collection budget projections for FY00/01. Scenarios included paying for Jstor out of one budget cycle or spreading payment over three years.

Announcements from Library Staff
The storage project is on-going. We began by moving ceased periodicals and monographs from 1950 with little or no circulation/use. We're looking for other low-use materials. So far, the response is good with only one retrieval request.

Budget: OSU has to cut $40 million for a myriad of reasons. President Risser has not identified areas to be cut yet. Library has also recently received $2million for an endowed chair "Innovative Technologies." Right now the library is focusing on Natural Resources and web development.

JSTOR/Web of Science: JSTOR stands for Journal Storage and is a project to digitize core scholarly journals to and make the articles available in full image format. JSTOR provides access to full runs of humanities and science journals back as far as the mid 1800s.

The researcher sees on the screen the image of the original page of the publication but with the convenience of it being delivered on the desktop. This project not only provided access to sometimes fragile bound journals and preserves the journals for wider use, but will save miles of shelf space in libraries.
STATISTICS:
Number of members: 700 in US, 915 world wide (7 current members in Oregon)
Number of journals: 147, 1.2 million articles, 8 million pages
Dates: as old at mid 1800s for the Royal Society of London titles
Subjects: Economics, Mathematics, Ecology, Botany, Anthropology, Literature and History
OSU connection: Jane Lubchenko was on an early Board of Directors and was instrumental in getting Science journal digitized by JSTOR. It is available from 1880 - 1995 on JSTOR

Web of Science: created by the Institute of Scientific Information. The Institute of Scientific Information creates three major databases for science, social science and arts publications. The Web of Science indexes publication since 1970 and are adding older issues all the time. It is a web based search tool of journals from the most prestigious publishers in the field.

For Science alone. A searcher would have access to the current citations of 5,800 science journals. The database adds over 18,700 articles per week, or 14 million per year. The full text of the article can be ordered by the searcher and faxed to the office or the desktop. In addition to the article searches, the searcher can trace the research done by a colleague by tracking the author's publications. An author can determine the impact of his/her publication by finding how often other researchers in their publication cite his/her work. We can scope the search to OSU only and get a listing of where, how often and who cites OSU researchers work by other researchers in the world.

David Horne motioned to go ahead with the purchase of Web of Science. Mark Larson seconded the motion. A vote was taken and the decision to go ahead with the purchase of Web of Science was unanimous.

Category I proposals: The curriculum committee is aware of the funding issues and are addressing them. Some departments are still upset when they realize that a library component has to be funded. The committee is revising the curriculum handbook which will incorporate library funding in the proposal process. The revised handbook will be out next year.

Indirect costs redistribution: As Toby is leaving and we're probably going to be dealing with an interim director who might be reluctant to make any real changes, we're going to survey our peer institutions and find out how they distribution indirect costs.

Status of ramp up to 4% of E&G budget: Larry is compiling data from peer institutions.

A discussion of TRF will be on next meeting's agenda.

Meeting was adjourned at 5pm.
November 29, 2000 Minutes

Members Present: Larry Landis, Heidi Brayman Hackel, David Horne, Christine Armer, Cynthia Twohy
Library Staff: Bonnie Allen, Kevin Bokay
Guests: Leonard Friedman, Gary Beach

Agenda:

1. Welcome
2. Review/approval of October minutes
3. Discussion of/update on other ongoing agenda items
   a. Serials cost increases and cancellations/SPARC
   b. Indirect costs redistribution (volunteers still needed for a subcommittee to address this issue).
   c. Status of ramp up to 4% of E&G budget.
4. Announcements from Library staff
5. Discussion of Category I curriculum proposals with Leonard Friedman and Gary Beach.
6. Adjourn

Approve minutes of October meeting
A quorum was not present to approve the minutes.

Announcements from Library Staff
Bonnie explained the PR campaign that will take place at the beginning of next term to reinforce the food and drink policy in the library. The current policy allows for drinks in reusable, spill-proof containers in the library except for Special Collections, map areas, and the Serial Set area in Government Documents. No food or tobacco products of any kind are allowed in the library. The PR campaign will include increased signage and enforcement by the staff. We need the Student Association to buy into the program, too. She also said that she would like to talk about the use of storage and space issues in our library for the next meeting. She asked that these items be placed on the agenda.

Larry stated that the research study rooms had three applications for ten rooms. Those three were granted long-term research study room reservations.

Serial Costs/SPARC (Scholarly Publishing & Academic Resource Coalition)
Larry distributed an article from the New York Times entitled "As Publishers Perish, Libraries Feel the Pain" that dealt with the current rise in the costs of serials. A discussion ensued in which the following points were considered:

- Elsevier costs less to the author and publishes quicker.
- What are the advantages for faculty to publish in society journals?
- Perceptions of support for alternative routes to publishing instead of Elsevier.
- Petitions with well-known people in their fields and circulating letters of support of alternative methods is a good tactic to send a message to publishers who arbitrarily raise prices annually.
- Disadvantage of publishing with Elsevier is you sign away your copyright.

Indirect cost redistribution
David Horne and Ajoy Velayudhan will serve as a subcommittee and meet with Toby Hayes and the Research Council regarding indirect cost redistribution.
**Status of ramp-up to 4%**
Larry will contract Henry Sayre and find out what our next step should be.

**Category I curriculum proposals**
Leonard Friedman and Gary Beach presented some information on Category I proposals and the library's portion of the proposal. The following items were discussed:

- Ignore the earlier proposal drafted by Gary.
- This is a procedural issue; it should not go to Faculty Senate.
- Where the library falls in the staffing process is important, should be at the point when other aspects of the proposal are finalized, but before funding sources are determined.
- The Curriculum Council will develop a step-by-step proposal.
- Proposal form or format will include signatures from department dean, head, chair and budget office.
- Procedure needs to address common situation when departments believe they can support a new program with little or no new resources.
- There needs to be an awareness that the library needs continual support for programs, i.e., an annual budget allocation to keep current materials for specific programs.
- Proposal procedures must specify where funds are coming from, with agreement of all concerned principals.

Meeting was adjourned at 4:45pm.
Approve minutes of September 21 meeting
Minutes were approved.

Announcements from Library Staff
Karyle talked about the printing procedures and why the library has to charge for this service. This is a new process and the users will have to get used to the method. We have tried to make it as simple as possible, but there will still always be glitches when you’re dealing with machines. The Diebold now accepts the new currency and we have staff from ID center adding funds to ID cards in the Information Commons. There have been ideas proposed about different ways to pay for printing, e.g. the TRF funds, grants, and a return to free printing. None of these approaches may be considered realistically, but we will continue to do the best we can. Please send all suggestions and complaints to Karyle, Bonnie, or Catherine so that we can monitor the situation. Karyle said she was very interested in comments about the library, especially where we were not connecting like we should with our customers. She said the input is needed to identify area where we need to improve our services.

Research study room policy update
Friday is the deadline to apply for a research study room. Lorraine and Larry are reviewing the applications and will notify the successful candidates after 10 Nov, when they plan to have finished reviewing all packets.

Category I curriculum proposals
Discussion ensued to explore methods for making proposals contingent on adequate library resource funding. First step is a review of existing library resources, if not adequate, a dollar amount is arrived at with a recurring requisite annual funding. So far, money to fund proposals has not been forthcoming from departments. The FSLC would like to put in place a mechanism for departmental or central funding to cover the costs of new proposals. Gary Beach wanted the FSLC to form a resolution asking/reeffirming this mechanism be put into place. Larry has been asked to continue to pursue this resolution. Gary has suggested he could work on this from his end also. Karyle suggested that the FSLC try to find another method of funding besides just departmental or central. Dave said the FSLC should try to profit from the president's proposal to make OSU a top-tier engineering university and get out of the "adequate" mode. Ajoy said that the university couldn't just keep adding programs without proper library support. He suggested that the curriculum committee must separate teaching and research materials and prioritize accordingly. The teaching/research comment was discussed and the need for highly specific materials for some PhD candidates. Larry suggested and it was agreed upon to invite Leonard Friedman from the curriculum committee and Gary Beach to the next meeting at the end of November or early December.

Serial Costs/SPARC (Scholarly Publishing & Academic Resource Coalition)
Larry said that Henry Sayre suggested that the FSLC find out who the faculty members on campus that have been or are currently periodical or publishing editorial board members and meet with them to start an education process. Karyle and Bonnie talked at the Faculty Senate meeting to members and told the story of serials cancellations and the greater than 10% average annual increase that we are experiencing. Many of these journals are key and many of our faculty would like to use them i.e., Elsevier publications. We want to faculty to change the paradigm of publishing, in ways such as SPARC is doing. (SPARC is a worldwide alliance of research institutions, libraries and organizations that encourages competition in the scholarly communications market.) Karyle suggested that the goal of the FSLC should be to get behind journal editors on campus and get the education process started. Next meeting Bonnie will bring a list of current journal
editors to the meeting. A discussion regarding electronic journals ensued, pros and cons, with the general consensus favoring full-text, real journals instead of electronic ones. Serendipitous learning is still a factor that electronic journal do not facilitate as of yet.

**Indirect cost redistribution**
Karyle noted that the library's share of the university's indirect has been $400k to $424k for many years now. Grants continue to increase, but not the library's portion of the indirect. Larry asked committee members to look into this matter with the Research Council and see if there's a way to increase the library's portion of the indirect. Ajoy Velayudhan volunteered.

**Status of ramp-up to 4%**
Last year Henry Sayre authored a resolution from the FLSC to increase the university's support of the library to 4% of the General and Education budget. Larry and Karyle will look into the disposition of the resolution.

**Meeting was adjourned at 4:30pm.**
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Library Committee

September 21, 2000
Minutes

Attending: Larry Landis, Heidi Brayman Hackel, Shiao-ling Yu, Cynthia Twohy, Darlene Judd, Ajoy Velayudhan
Student members: Cynthia Ross
Library Staff: Bonnie Allen, Kevin Bokay

Agenda:

1. Welcome and Introductions
2. Announcements from Library Staff
3. Review of committee's work during 1999/2000 academic year
4. Issues to be addressed during 2000/2001 academic year
5. Announcements from Library Committee members
6. Meeting times
7. Adjourn

Welcome and Introductions

Members introduced themselves individually.

Announcements from Library Staff

Bonnie - thanked all members from Karyle and rest of library staff.

Some events that are taking place Archives has joined the Library; they and Special Collections are in the process of digitizing their holdings.

The Library has joined Big 12 Plus, a consortium of 30+ ARL-level libraries (Association of Research Libraries); this increases the collection, leverages the library for bigger projects.

Charges for printing have recently been implemented. Printing is paid for by adding valued to your OSU ID, other patrons may buy cards in lobby. Copying charges were increased slightly, also. This change should save the library $70k in paper/printing costs.

Review of committee's work during 1999/2000 academic year

Gary Beach worked on a Category One Curriculum proposal, but did not submit it. Larry will continue with proposal and attempt to submit it this fall.

Revision of Library Research Room Policy - The new policy is being implemented this term. There are 10 rooms that may be reserved long term for 2 terms or more. Students must submit their proposals for approval. Lorraine in Access will monitor compliance (rooms must be used at least eight times per month).
Last year's committee discussed and supported the Library's decision to charge for printing, serial cuts, and ARL membership application.

The conspectus developed last year on the library's holdings was also discussed and approved by last year's committee. Bonnie said she would arrange to have a copy of the conspectus on reserve for FSLC members (it is about 300 pages). The committee discussed the conspectus, but it was not an action item for approval.

**Issues to be addressed during 2000/2001 academic year**

**Category One proposal** - this is a mechanism to move funds from departments to the library so that new programs are not put in place without adequate library support.

**Cancellation of Serials** - the committee will continue to discuss this issue. Bonnie handed out a pamphlet that explains the current situation with high-cost, low-use serials, and serials being priced out of libraries by publishers. The library now participates in SPARC (Scholarly Publishing & Academic Resource Coalition) an ARL consortium that seeks to increase affordable accessibility to scholarly journals.

ARL membership is another goal that the library will pursue this year. President Risser has sent a letter to ARL supporting our membership in early September. We expect to know something by the end of October.

**Fundraising** - the committee will work on ways to be an advocate for the library in the Salem legislature. We should think of ways to lessen the impact of any of the anti-tax/government measures that are on the ballot in November which are approved by the voters.

The committee will have a role in the accreditation of the library. The packet has been submitted for edit and the accreditation team will be here in April.

The committee will discuss the increase in the library's budget. The library has recently received a $612k boost in its budget. Also, to bring the library in line with its peer institutions and to pursue ARL membership, a 2% increased in the overall university budget is expected (from 2% to 4% of Educational and General budget).

**Announcements from Library Committee members**

There were no announcements.

**Meeting times**

Before the meeting was adjourned, Larry asked for schedules/preferred meeting times for the next meeting. We will meet in the latter part of October, November, and early December for the rest of the term.

Meeting was adjourned at 2:45 p.m.
May 25, 2000 Minutes, Library Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

Attending: Larry Landis, Heidi Brayman-Hackel, Christine Armer, Shiao-Ling Yu, Darlene Judd, Gary Beach.
Library Staff: Bonnie Allen, Karyle Butcher

Landis: Minutes were approved.

Beach: Continues to work on Category One proposals. Suggests that a mechanism be in place that will prevent Cat. 1 proposals from going through without appropriate library funding. Funding would be moved from departmental budget to the library for three years, than library absorbs. Beach distributed a note outlining proposed language - he seeks responses by June 1.

Beach: Hopes to have work on cumulative financial effect of Cat. 1 proposals available by end of June - maybe for July meeting.

Brayman-Hackel reported on the distribution of study carrels. Suggest that faculty assigned a set number for long term uses; remain assigned first come first served to faculty and graduate students. Further proposed that except for long term use, study carrels should be issued on a shared basis. Finally, will send survey to current/past users asking why they need a study carrel, how often they use it, ideal time needed, would they consider sharing and final comments. Survey results available for June meeting.

Butcher: Library will be charging for printing cents/page. Currently, library spends about $70,000 on printing. Brayman-Hackel thought 7 cents was too great an increase especially for CLA faculty. Committee discussed further and voted for the 7 cent charge.

Some discussion of Summer meetings - agreed to meet in June with possible e-mail discussions.

Karyle Butcher
University Librarian
Deputy Vice Provost for Information Services
April 27, 2000 Minutes

Library Committee

April 27, 2000
Minutes

Attending: Landis, Horne, Judd, Twohy, Brayman Hackel, Beach, Yu, Butcher, Allen
Absent: Armer, Larson, Rubert

Review of Minutes - one change noted to minutes of March 30, otherwise, the Minutes were approved as written.

Discussion of Faculty Use of Library Study Carrels - Heidi Brayman Hackel

Heidi Brayman Hackel presented the issue of limiting faculty usage of library study carrels to 90 days, or one term. In her own research, she finds it difficult to complete a project in this short amount of time, and feels she is not the only faculty member to run into this problem. She presented some suggestions on policies for carrel use and assignment.

- Set aside some carrels exclusively for faculty use.
- Provide a range of choices to faculty for length of time.
- Assign carrels to faculty for up to one year at a time.

The library currently has 42 study carrels available. Ph.D. candidates use 85% of these, which leaves 15 carrels available for faculty use. On the waiting list, it's 75% PhD candidates and 25% faculty.

A lengthy discussion followed on the pros and cons of this issue. One suggestion made was to have graduate students share a carrel - this would allow twice as many students to have a space.

The decision was made to form a subcommittee, including a person from Library circulation and a representative from the Graduate Student Association to look into this issue. Butcher stated she thought the concept of sharing carrels was valid, but wants graduate student input before a decision is made. Hackel will report back on this issue at the next meeting.

Category I Proposals and the Library Budget - Gary Beach

Gary Beach presented a resolution to the committee involving background on his study of this issue, how category I proposals are evaluated, and the perspective of budgetary needs of the library in conjunction with these new proposals. Beach has conducted a study of this issue going back 20 years and has concluded that no funds have EVER been transferred to the library to support ANY new academic degree programs - either from the academic units or from the central administration.

Beach presented his draft resolution to the Committee for consideration to present to the Faculty Senate on how to ameliorate this lack of funding. He asked for committee member input on this draft.

The next meeting of this Committee will be held on May 25, 3:30 P.M. in the Drinkward Conference Room, Valley 4960.
March 30, 2000 Minutes, Library Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University
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Library Committee

March 30, 2000
Minutes

Attending: Landis, Armer, Larson, Judd, Brayman Hackel, Rubert, Allen, Yu
Presenters: Anne Christie, Laurel Kristick, David Johnson, and Bonnie Allen
Absent: Butcher, Horne, Beach, Twohy

Minutes approved as written.

This meeting was dedicated to a collection assessment presentation from the Valley Library Collection Development Department. Bonnie Allen, Associate University Librarian for Collections and Technical Services, gave the introduction. She described some of the background of OSU library collection assessment and factors considered in selecting The WLN Conspectus method of collection assessment.

Laurel Kristick, Physical Sciences Collection Coordinator, explained the methodology of the assessment process. She distributed five handouts that illustrated worksheets and reports used by librarians and staff to conduct the assessment. Quantitative data gathered from reports run in the Oasis electronic catalog, journal reviews, and bibliographic searches and were the basis for evaluating monographic and serial collections.

David Johnson, Social Sciences & Humanities Collection Coordinator, provided an overview of assessment results from the College of Business and the College of Liberal Arts. He distributed specific report summaries to respective departments that were present. Johnson emphasized the importance of conducting shelf walks with faculty to gain qualitative information for the reports.

Anne Christie, Life Sciences Collection Coordinator, reviewed assessment results in Life Sciences. She divided the departments into two major areas, biological and agricultural sciences, discussing strengths and weaknesses within each area as well as overall concerns and problem areas.

Laurel Kristick listed the departments in the physical sciences and discussed the overall trends found in the results of the assessment reports for these areas.

Bonnie Allen concluded the presentation with information about current inflationary trends in serial subscription costs and plans on how to utilize results from the assessment, specifically in Category One proposals, accreditation reports, and future fund raising efforts. She summarized input from subject librarians who critiqued the assessment process once it was completed. They found the study defined vulnerable collections and areas, helping them prioritize purchasing. New program proposals in these areas must include library funds for collection development. Allen also outlined efforts to supplement OSU collections with consortia memberships, document delivery services and interlibrary loan agreements.

The Collection Development Department will disseminate assessment results by offering to meet with individual departments to discuss the reports and other library collection issues. Results will also be available on the Internet in the future.
Library Committee

February 24, 2000 Minutes

Members Present: Beach, Armer, Horne, Rubert, Landis, Allen
Absent: Yu, Butcher, Hackel, Judd, Twohy

Review of Minutes - one change was noted to the Minutes of January 27, otherwise, the Minutes were approved as written.

Library Support for New Academic Programs - Review of Category I curriculum proposals.

Bonnie Allen gave an overview of what was currently being reviewed by the Library, as well as some history of past responses from the Library that she had gleaned from the files. Currently, she said the M.S./Ph.D. in Bioengineering is in review process in the Library today.

The reason this was on the agenda was to ask what the Library has been saying in the past for Category I's when we have noted our collection doesn't support it, and we have asked for additional funds. We have already talked about the fact that there is no mechanism for funding to be transferred to the library. In the case of the Masters in Applied Ethics, we have a collection that supports a bachelor's degree, and we have replied that we would need additional funding to move our collection from a bachelor's level to a master's level.

In looking at our replies over the last few years since 1997, it's a little spotty. I have noted that the library typically responds - "well, we are missing this and that, we only have this, but we can rely on interlibrary loan."

All we have is a service that will fill the gap - but we do not specify the dollar amount for additional funding.

Then we've had another period of time where we routinely asked for more money. During 1996-97, the head of collections said, unless you have funding that can come to the library, we will not review your Category I proposals. We have that in our history as well. So, the way the Library has responded to Category I's has been on and off over the years.

Allen also stated that there was no indication that any funds ever changed hands for these Category I's. Allen indicated we reviewed the BS degree for biological engineering in 1995, to give you an example of how we would have responded. Because we have undergraduate level courses in other related areas of the sciences, specifically biotechnology, and we have over 200 titles and 12 periodicals and holdings under biochemical engineering, genetics and biochemistry - they thought that would be sufficient to support a BS in biological engineering. It also goes on to say that we will use interlibrary loan and rely on OHSU and no additional funds were requested.

We now are in the process of reviewing the MS and PhD in bioengineering, and based on what I'm reading from the College of Engineering, they again are looking at Good Samaritan Hospital for space and resources, and there really is no mention of library resources in their proposal. That's where it is at this moment.

Allen added that for accreditation, interlibrary loan is not a substitute for holding materials or having access like electronic resources -- wherever the instruction takes place. Basically, we don't have adequate resources to support a master's program.
Gary Beach indicated another proposal would be coming shortly for a PhD in Materials Science.

Landis stated he thought this committee's focus this year would be primarily on this Category I issue. However, next month's meeting is devoted to the collection assessment. But again in April, he wanted to return to Category I proposals. That should give Beach plenty of time to finish his review and write a draft proposal for the committee to review.

The question was asked of Bonnie Allen as to how a review of holdings was done for these Category I proposals. She replied that it's much the way the library does a collection assessment. We look at our card catalogue, we compare our holdings against bibliographies, and we look at other resources of electronic access we have that provide full text access. A certain amount of quantity that compares to what is being published in that field. If we have just a very small percent of publications, then it would look like we didn't have a wide range of materials. We can look at how the subject is broken down in our classification schemes and see how much material we have in each classification.

ISI does publish an impact study that has a listing of journals and how often they are cited and what is cited- we can use these impact studies to see how much a particular periodical is actively used within a discipline. We have studies of those sorts that give us some idea. Looking at other schools and their holdings that have established programs in the same area helps somewhat. Each discipline has its own core reference material that has a periodical listing and we can compare our holdings against what is commonly referred to, etc.

Allen stated that it's harder to determine in interdisciplinary programs, which is often the case in looking at this list, because you would have some material or a portion of it. The problem would be whether it's in a Masters level or BS or Ph.D. level. We end up looking in all of the disciplines to see what extent of holdings address the curriculum and come up with some conclusions based on that. It's usually a pretty complex process and time consuming.

Rubert stated he thought it might be pertinent for the committee to prepare a directive to the Faculty Senate to help the library establish a policy and have something behind it. Larry Landis replied that he knew that Henry Sayre is looking for something to come out of this committee to do that. Especially because what we do is going to have an effect on the accreditation process as well.

**Serials Cancellation Process Update** - Allen

There was to be a letter sent out to the Deans, but since our E-mail went down on Tuesday, it hasn't gone out. This will be going out across campus announcing our $300,000 cut in periodicals for the 2000-2001 fiscal year. Allen indicated she visited the U of Oregon who is also doing a cut this year of the same amount and same time schedule. We are talking about a collaborative approach to our serials cancellations, where each school agrees to hold onto a title and then the other school cancels. That looks promising as a way of sharing resources and reducing duplication. For Elsevier titles, which are primarily sciences, between the two schools alone we spend $500,000 on the same titles. That is a target for us, so we would be choosing titles from that list as a way of sharing. Also, another part of this collaboration would be providing services that support it which would mean loaning bound journals and current issues so that faculty and students at each school would have the same kind of access. We are also looking at electronic journals that are full text to take the place of these cuts.

We're negotiating with Elsevier now for another database that would give a comprehensive access to all of the titles. What remains to be seen is the cost. It looks promising and looks like a way of reducing the impact of the cuts and working more closely with a school that is nearby. What will be important is that as we proceed with this, because of the accreditation issues, that we do have a formal agreement for the lending and sharing of these materials. As long as we have that, accreditation matters for interlibrary loan or use of ORBIS and the courier service will be okay.

Portland State also has a significant portion of Elsevier titles and some titles are held in common by all three schools, but at the moment we're just talking with the U of O. PSU is not planning a cut this year.

Landis asked if there was any further progress on the consortial agreement with Big12+. Allen replied they are planning to visit us later this spring.

The list of targeted titles to be cut should go out about the end of March with at least a four-week response and review time from the campus community. Allen indicated the Library needed to finalize the list by the end of spring term and the cancellations would take effect in January of 2001.
Study Room Data Ports - Landis

The issue here is whether the Library should charge for activating study room data ports, and how much. Landis distributed some e-mail material regarding this issue, as well as a policy established about a year ago for study rooms. He asked for input from members who were in academic departments, and a lengthy discussion followed on the pros and cons of this issue.

A suggestion was made that we could write a TRF proposal to pay for these activation fees, as requested by students when they sign up for a study carrel. It was decided that Bonnie Allen would gather some more data on this, in preparation for writing a TRF proposal.

New member orientation packets were distributed to members, to see if they feel the material would be useful for new members. New committee members will be given these packets next fall.

The next meeting will be held on Thursday, March 30 at 3:30 PM in the Library's Drinkward Conference Room. This entire meeting will be devoted to the collection assessment for science and humanities.

Minutes recorded by Marcia Griffin
Members Present: Landis, Beach, Rubert, Butcher, Horne, Larson, Judd, Armer
Absent: Yu, Twohy, Havermale

Chairman Landis announced that another new member has been appointed to the committee. She is Heidi Hackel of the English Department and will join us next month.

Review of the Minutes. The meeting minutes for December 7 were approved as read.

Library Collection Assessment Update - Bonnie Allen

Allen, the Associate University Librarian for Access, Collections & Technical Services, gave an update on the collection assessment to date. She indicated that the social sciences and humanities reports have been completed, and they are in the last stages of completing the science reports. These should be finished by mid-February. Allen indicated that March might be a good time for an in-depth review of the assessment. She wants to present to the committee how the assessment was done - the methodology used, what was looked at, what they are basing some of their conclusions on and the overall picture of where the Library is with their collections across the disciplines. Recommendations for making some corrective moves and the end results would also be discussed.

The Committee decided that the regular March meeting would be devoted to this topic. Allen indicated she would bring the collection coordinators who have been involved to the meeting so they can answer questions as well. This meeting will take place on March 30th.

Future meeting dates were determined for the Committee. These will all be held from 3:30 to 5:00 p.m. in the Drinkward Conference Room of the Library.

24 February
30 March
27 April
25 May
15 June

Budget Update - Allen/Beach

Beach gave a history of budgeting woes for OSU for the past few years, summarizing by saying that there weren't enough dollars to fund all the new initiatives.

Bonnie Allen then reported on Library collection development funding. She indicated the collection budget in the Library right now is in deficit, but they have a couple of goals for next year. One is to bring the collection funding in line with the budget and not rely on TRF* funding as they have in the past. This year we received $200,000 in TRF funding - that went completely to the licensing costs for our electronic databases.

TRF = technology resource fee/part of student tuition each term. Use of these fees has to be connected with student services.
Allen stated that every year is a poker game as to whether we get funds and how much, so librarians are trying to wean themselves away from that dependency.

The Library is looking at another journal cut for the next fiscal year. The amount is still in question - will be around $300,000. Allen stated that the challenge is to move our collection forward at the same time that our funding stays the same. The Library is looking into consortial purchases - some of this is detailed in last month’s minutes. How to leverage our purchasing power with the use of development funds, gift funds, etc. The process is not worked out yet. Two years ago we sent out a survey to faculty asking them what journals they used. We had 600 responses, and we will use that data to determine what we will need to cut. We will also look at other databases that we might acquire and then cancel the print. So, we are juggling funds and the way we manage our funds in every direction we can imagine.

Allen also mentioned the e-mail from Karyle regarding a website from the University of Oregon. If anyone is interested in what is happening to libraries and serials and budgets across the country, this is a very good collection of the economics of publishing and library budgets. Although OSU’s budget has been in trouble for some time, serial cuts are something that all academic libraries face. It's a national phenomenon. For instance, the University of Washington and the UofO are making significant cuts this year.

The question was asked: how will equity be distributed among departments? Will one department suffer more cuts than another because of their response to the survey?

Answer: We are trying to soften any cuts by looking at what other universities in the state have, and leveraging our purchasing. Elsevier titles, for example, would be something the scientists would be very much interested in. We pay $800,000 to Elsevier alone, as do U of O and Portland State. That's a lot of duplication. We are working with Elsevier and the other schools to see how we can maintain our access and share in a greater way.

Karyle Butcher indicated that there is a budget allocation formula for departments - so, they would look at the different departments to see if they could mix it up a little differently. In sciences there might be some interplay between the monographic budget and the journal budget. In CLA, because the journals are so cheap, you can't get a lot of money out of them because they don't have a lot of money to start out with. Another issue is if colleges do have their own departmental libraries and they own the paper copy, ought we to cut our paper copy and have it electronically? The intent is to spread the grief proportionately so no one has undue burdens.

Butcher also encouraged members to take a look at the U of O website. She indicated they really talk about the economics of publishing and why they have to do what they do.

Fundraising Subcommittee - Rubert

Rubert reported that this group met to talk about possible fundraising ideas. One was sending out a letter from the football coach or from all the Athletics coaches - if we could have this letter sent out by the Alumni Association then we might well get responses from people who don’t give to Athletics. They also talked about approaching the associated student body, ASOSU - looking at $1 per student per term out of their fees would be $45,000 to $60,000. This could conceivably help fund more student workers, or more staffing at the Library.

Another idea was approaching the American Chemical Society specifically to fund a recurring research position for a graduate student to help manage the Pauling collection.

Library Support for New Academic Programs - Beach

Gary Beach indicated that he was at year 1991 in compiling statistics on library support for new academic programs. He asked the group if they thought 10 years' worth of data would be enough to show there had not been any funding from central administration for category I proposals? After an affirmative answer, he indicated he could compile this report fairly quickly. He will then send a draft to committee members to look over, before it is passed on to the Faculty Senate. Landers said that we, as a committee, should make a strong statement about this situation.

A lengthy discussion took place on this topic. Butcher stated she believed there actually was no mechanism in place for the actual transfer of funds, once the Curriculum Council approves the proposal.

Beach stated that there needed to be a commitment - once approved, there should be a year’s time for this
approval. When it first comes out of the college to the Curriculum Council, there needs to be a commitment on the part of a Dean or the President to transfer the funds needed to the library to support this new program.

Beach also said he would send copies of category I proposals to committee members for their perusal.

**Library ARL Status - Butcher**

Butcher met with ARL at a recent meeting and they indicated that the OSU Libraries looked a lot better than they had first thought. They are continuing to look at changing their criteria. She has asked the librarians to identify the strengths of our collection, and Paul Risser said if she wrote a letter, he would sign it, supporting our nomination.

Butcher also indicated that another initiative the Library is looking at is affiliating with the new western Big 12 plus libraries - mostly to get some consortial advantages. Butcher has sent them a letter of interest.

One additional note: Printing costs are skyrocketing in the Library. Last quarter - 700,000 pages were printed, which means the Library will be spending $65-75,000 a year for printing costs. Butcher indicated the Library would soon be charging for printing, using a vending card. This will be initiated after July 1st.
Library Committee

December 7, 1999
Minutes

Members Present:  Leahy, Landis, Beach, Horne, Judd, Armer, Rubert, Twohy, Butcher, Larson
Absent:  Yu

The meeting began with round-the-table introductions.  New to the Committee is Mark Larson of the Crop and Soil Science Department.  Also joining this meeting as guests were the two new Associate University Librarians, Bonnie Allen and Catherine Murray-Rust.

Rita Leahy announced that Larry Landis of Archives would be stepping in as Chair of this Committee when Rita departs at the end of the year.

Review of the Minutes.

Leahy asked for any changes or revisions to the Minutes of the last meeting.  A question was asked about the statement concerning $2 million for Athletics on page 4.  Clarification and discussion followed about the university budget.

Bonnie Allen, Associate University Librarian for Access, Collections and Technical Services spoke to the group, outlining her area of oversight at the Library.  Her responsibilities cover every aspect of the Library's collections -- access to it, collection development, and technical services, or the business end of the library.

One issue she is currently working on is trying to determine if the Library can afford to buy the "Web of Science".  She indicated this is an extremely expensive electronic database that covers social sciences, science, and arts and humanities, produced by ISI.  The cost at a consortium level for three databases of science, social science, arts and humanities is in the range of $150,000.  That is the initial buy-in, the sustaining cost after the first year will be around $60,000 to $70,000.  The Library is now part of a consortium formed to try to get a better price for the batch files and the current indexes.

Catherine Murray-Rust, Associate University Librarian for Public Services and Innovative Technologies, then introduced herself to the group.  She explained that she is responsible for public services at the Library that is defined as reference and instruction, which includes the Information Commons, and government information and maps.  It does not include circulation, reserves, and interlibrary loans.  Murray-Rust is also responsible for special collections and library technology.

One of the issues Murray-Rust said she is working on is furnishing the Information Commons, which is not completely finished.  She stated there is an urgent need for many more computers.  One solution she is investigating is using thin-client technology.  She explained this amounts to a big server that runs 30-50 dumb clients.  No computing is done at the client end; the server does it all.  Murray-Rust indicated that the Library would take part in a test project next term.  Tangent computers have made an offer of a 3-month pilot project.

Other issues Murray-Rust is working on are looking at the configuration of the service desks and finding remedies for the absence of adequate signage in the building.  She will also begin to work on digital libraries.  Of particular interest are the Pauling papers in Special Collections that are in digital form.  Catherine also mentioned another possibility is a collection of Oregon watershed data that could be digitized.

Library ARL status.

Karyle Butcher indicated no progress has been made yet.  She is still waiting to see if ARL will change the membership criteria.  ARL is trying to develop standards that will include electronic access, major collections, major services, etc.  They should be doing a final report to come out in January, and Butcher stated she would go from there.  There was some discussion on this topic including criteria for status, member institutions, and adding quasi collections to the count, such as Vet Medicine, etc.

Collection Assessment.
Bonnie Allen told the group that collection assessment is a process of evaluating every aspect of the libraries' print collection. This method consists of looking at the collection in depth -- getting a physical description and median age of our collection, comparing it to stated bibliographies within each discipline and evaluating that against where our curriculum is going. Evaluators look at the level of instruction we have at doctoral, masters, and undergraduate level, and the kind of research done at the university and come up with a coded level that ranges from minimal to comprehensive at a 1 to 5 scale.

This process began in February last year, and the intent is to complete the social science and humanities assessment by the end of December. Allen stated they are in the process of writing summary reports on each discipline that will be arranged according to the academic departments. Where disciplines cross more than one area, they have been evaluated by more than one person. The subject specialist who works in that area has been asked to come up with an overall view of that discipline.

The other aspect of this project is the acquisitions level where they look at how much the Library is spending in each discipline - how much is published - and coming up with the same kind of scale level. The final aspect is looking at the data in terms of where the Library's collection fits relative to what's published and what is needed. Allen will be spending quite a bit of time over the break getting reports completed for the social science and humanities, and expects to complete the sciences by the end of winter term.

Karyle Butcher stated she was very proud of everyone who worked on the collection assessment. She added that this is a very time-consuming process and is a great deal of work. She also added that the goal of Allen, Murray-Rust and herself is to get out on campus to hear what people say about where they think the Library should be headed. Also, they will be looking at the catalogue to see where the university thinks we're going.

**Budget Update.**

Gary Beach distributed some handouts. One was a summary document that Rob Specter presented to the Faculty Senate last month. Beach explained that the Library enhancement of $306,300 shows an increase over last year's budget. Last year the Faculty Senate approved a recommended increase in the Library's budget of 2% and 4% of the total OSU budget, which within three biennium's, would effectively double the Library's budget. In six years, the Library is supposed to be at around $14 million dollars, as compared to where it is now, just under $8 million. In order to get the Library there in six years, that would be over a million dollars a year and this year we only have $300,000. Beach went on to say that given the status of the current budget, the Library did very well this year. There is still a 2% holdback on all academic units and it doesn't look like there will be sufficient revenue coming in for the rest of this fiscal year to cover that 2%. Departments will be taking some reduction in their total budget.

Beach also stated that he was somewhat optimistic that the amount of money set forth for the Library will increase in future years.

Karyle added that the Library's general fund money is status quo, but the overall budget is less because they don't have carry-over funds or independent funding. She indicated that journals have gone up another 10%, and they do have this additional $306,000 in new money, but if we wash this into journals we wouldn't get anywhere. The struggle we are having is, do we just keep going with increases? Every piece of money we get will go into journals and we still won't be able to afford them. Butcher stated that she didn't think it was smart to take that $300,000 and just buy back-fill. That's why Library administrators keep flirting with the Web of Science because it would be a benefit -- but as Bonnie told you, it's a big ticket item.

The other thing the Library is struggling with is what to do with expensive titles. One university got a list of the high-rolling titles, and they said "anything that has gone up x amount, we are cutting." So, you lose high rollers, but you are enabled to keep up with inflation. This strategy is an important one, but we need to talk it through - what will people bear? You can cut journals, you can fund them and not do anything else, you can cut books, you can cut staff - but even if we fired a lot of librarians, we still wouldn't make up the 10% increase. It's about $350,000 just to stay even.

Butcher went on to explain that the Elsevier science titles go up 10% every year. There is no justification for this, but they can do it because they hold us hostage for this information - primarily science titles. Some researchers rely on these science journals, so we can't cut them.

Karyle also stated that the Library was trying to go to more electronic information. "We could say we won't subscribe to anything in paper - we did that already with History, but they got upset because there was some information that got dropped from the electronic version, so we had to reinstate it."

Butcher indicated she didn't believe the library's budget would increase to $14 million in six years - "so how do we want to handle these increases? The traditional way is to cut serials, but if we take any new money and put it into serials, we will not have moved forward one inch. No new journals, no new nothing - no assessment will make any difference. We need to come up with some strategy or decisions."

Butcher remarked, "We could test them on you, the Committee, and you could take this to your departments - and maybe we could take our money and really move the library forward. We would need the Library
Committee closely behind us, and then go to the Faculty Senate." Butcher also said, "We need help from you, the Committee members, in helping people understand the seriousness of this situation."

Additional ideas put forth during this discussion were:

- Can we collaborate with other institutions? You buy this, we'll buy that and we'll share.
- Drop the paper, we'll have it on electronic.

After some discussion on various fundraising ideas for the library, it was decided the group would form a subcommittee to look into this issue. Steve Rubert, Karyle Butcher and David Horne will plan to meet in the future to talk about fundraising ideas.

The next meeting date for this Committee will be determined in January.

Minutes recorded by Marcia Griffin
Faculty Senate
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Supporting a Top 10 Land Grant University Library

Oregon State University Libraries (OSUL)

Achieving student academic success and teaching and research excellence requires significant and targeted investments in the University’s infrastructure including increased support for the OSU Libraries’ collections. With aspirations to rank among the top ten land grant institutions, OSUL’s budget is not currently adequate to meet campus needs or to provide flexibility, especially with the demands a growing student body and for additional content supporting new faculty and programs.

Currently collections funding is built on state funding along with several variable sources (FY11-FY12).

\[
(E&G) + (TRF) + (Library Fines) + (Gift Funds) = Yearly Budget \\
(3,200,000) + (550,000 to 750,000) + (100,000) + (48,000 to 200,000) = 3,898,000 to 4,250,000
\]

This budget structure, together with annual inflation, creates significant challenges:

1) Due to increases ranging from 5-7%, OSUL cuts subscriptions to stay within budget. This prevents OSUL from adding new subscriptions. OSUL’s inability to add new subscriptions hampers student and faculty access to content. Faculty and researchers hired to work in disciplines newly supported by the University are adversely affected.

2) Variable funding impedes OSUL’s ability to swiftly accommodate changes in student and faculty research needs. One-fourth of OSUL’s budget rests on changeable funding sources. Technology Resource Fees provide 17 - 23% of the OSUL collections budget and an additional 3% of the budget is contributed from library fines and replacement costs.

OSUL controls costs by using several strategies. These include rightsizing the print collection, aligning purchases with demand, reducing scholarly publishing costs, outsourcing lower-value work and relying on interlibrary loan services in lieu of paying for subscription(s). However, even the deployment of these strategies does not provide adequate flexibility to address new and emerging curricular and research needs.

OSU students and faculty use the content provided by OSUL. In 2010 OSUL reported 2,744,571 uses across all books, journals and databases. That year’s budget of $3,700,000 resulted in a $1.35 cost per use. The University of Oregon’s cost per use of $2.24 in 2012 offers a rough comparison as the two institutions may have different use calculations.

While OSUL has met these funding challenges, the existing funding model is inadequate to provide needed resources to ensure student and faculty success. To remedy this, the OSUL Faculty Senate Library Committee (FSLC) recommends increasing support over the next three years to a level at which OSUL is at least as well-funded as OSU’s peers. The FSLC recommends raising the collections budget to $6,500,000 by 2015 to match the median library collection expenditures per student FTE of our peers.

Target: Increase support of OSU Libraries Collections Budget to $6,500,000 by 2015.

---

Peer Comparators

Compared to OUS designated peers, OSUL collections receive the least amount of support and have the lowest expenditures per FTE student.

Library Collection Expenditures & Collection Expenditures per Student FTE 2010*
for OUS-Designated Peers + PSU +UO

*Data from National Center for Education Statistics.

The Impact of Campus Growth on OSU Libraries Collections Budget

With the OSU student FTE growing at over 7 percent since 2009, OSUL faces additional challenges in sustaining current collections and negotiating reasonable prices on new resources.

Nearly half of OSUL’s expenditures on the most expensive databases are tied to the size of OSU. Information product vendors frequently determine pricing based on student FTE, number of students or faculty in a department, overall demand on or use of the resource, and even research output. This means that OSUL’s prices increase as the student body continues to grow and more faculty are hired to support them.

New degree programs also drive OSUL’s costs. From 2009-2011 the library would have needed approximately $65,000 in new money to adequately support the proposed new programs in their first year; $40,000 of this total would become ongoing costs.

Impact of a Significantly Improved Budget
The library maintains a wish list of student and faculty requests, which are primarily online resources (journals, books, primary sources). The approximate annual cost associated with the ~100 items on the list is over $700,000. A significantly improved budget will allow the library to provide students and faculty with resources they have told us they need to excel, but which we cannot afford to add to the collection. Access to international research covering OSU’s signature areas increases faculty productivity and supports student learning. Examples of resources currently requested by students and faculty include:

- Online primary sources, and reference materials which support the humanities and undergraduate education: Proquest Historical Newspapers, Proquest Early English Books Online, the complete U.S. Congressional Serials Set, PAIS, and online encyclopedias.
- Giving the campus an opportunity to try innovative new tools such as Faculty of 1000 (bioscience research reviews) and SimplyMap (demographics, marketing), and business research datasets.
- Support Open Access (OA) initiatives by paying author fees to publish in OA journals and provide immediate access to OSU research publications.

**AN APPROACH TO INCREASE SUPPORT**

Tie the collections budget to student FTE as a measure of campus growth and apply targeted increases over three years.

**Year 1 2013**
Adjust the current base budget to rely on stable funding by permanently adding to E&G the average of TRF funds received recently: $3,200,000 + $600,000 = $3,800,000. Next, determine the increase needed to bring OSU to the median of our peer’s library collection expenditures per student FTE as of 2010 and add this.

\[
\text{Adjusted base: } $3,800,000 + \text{Increase } $1,491,512 = $5,291,512
\]

Add to set the 2013 budget.

**Year 2 (2014)**
Account for OSU’s increase in student population since 2010 and add that library collection expenditures per student FTE. The difference in OSU’s student FTE between 2011 and 2010 is: 22,978 – 21,934 = 1,044. Library collection expenditures per student FTE is 1,044 x $260/FTE = $271,440. Add to set the 2014 budget.

\[
\text{Adjusted base: } $3,800,000 + \text{Increase } $1,491,512 = $5,291,512
\]

\[
\text{Year 3 (2015)}
\]
In 2015 and going forward, annually adjust the new base according to student growth and materials inflation which typically range 1.8%-2% and 6-8% respectively along with the library collection expenditures per student FTE of $260. Find OSU’s total student FTE and multiply by the library collection expenditures per student FTE of $260 (adjust $260 as it changes). Then add 6-8% for serials inflation based on the previous year’s inflation.

For example:
- Student growth of 2% of OSU's 2011 student FTE 22,978 is 459. Total student FTE would be 23,437. Multiplied by $260 = $6,093,776.

- Serial inflation of 8% of the base $5,562,952 is $445,036. Add this to set that year's budget: $6,538,812.

(Student Growth) + (Materials Inflation) + (Previous Year's Base) = Yearly Budget
Oregon State University seeks to rank among the top ten land grant institutions in the United States. Achieving this goal requires improving infrastructure through targeted investments. In particular, increased funding for OSU Libraries Collections will be necessary to support faculty and student success, enhance research and teaching, and improve the Return on Investment (ROI) for OSU Libraries (OSUL).

Currently, OSUL's budget relies on state funding and other sources, including:

- E&G $3.2M Collections
- TRF range $550,000-$750,000 FY09-12
- Library fines, $118,000 fy11 (3.6%)
- Gift funds

The current budget structure, together with annual inflation, has created a number of challenges for OSUL.

1) OSUL can only support the existing collections, which increase in price 7 – 9% annually due to inflation, by cutting subscriptions and holding positions open.2

2) The grant awarded Technology Resource Fees provides 17 - 23% of the OSUL collections budget. This means that a high percentage of OSUL’s budget rests on an unstable, variable funding source.

3) Library fines contribute 3.6% to OSUL budgets, but this amount decreases every year and many libraries nationwide are ceasing to collect fines.

4) OSUL employs many strategies to contain costs, including several recommended by the 2011 report Redefining the Academic Library. These include rightsizing the print collection, aligning purchases with demand, reducing scholarly publishing costs, and externalizing lower-value activity.3

While OSUL has met these funding challenges with a variety of innovative, cost-saving measures, it is clear that the existing funding model is inadequate to raise OSUL to match libraries at top ten land grant institutions. The OSUL Faculty Senate Library Committee recommends increasing support to $9.43M by 2016 to match the median of OSU peers, to maintain existing collections, and to provide access to new content.

**Target: Increase support of OSU Libraries Collections Budget to $9,426,000 by 2016.**

---


OSU Faculty Senate Library Committee, February 2012
PEER COMPARATORS

Compared to OUS designated peers, OSUL collections receive the least amount of support.

OSUL also has the lowest expenditures per FTE student.
Library expenditures per R&D dollar fall in the middle of OUS's peers.
With OSU growing at the rapid pace of eight percent over each of the last two academic years, OSUL faces additional challenges in sustaining current collections and negotiating reasonable prices on new resources.

Nearly half of OSUL’s expenditures on the most expensive databases are contingent upon the size of the OSU student body and related university growth. Information product vendors frequently determine their pricing based on campus characteristics such as student FTE, number of faculty or students in a department, overall demand on or use of the resource, and even research output. This means that OSUL’s prices increase as the student body continues to grow and more faculty are hired to support them.

New degree programs also drive OSUL’s costs. From 2009-2011 the library would have needed approximately $65,000 in new money to adequately support the proposed new programs in their first year; $40,000 of this total would become ongoing costs. This support ranged from adding critical journals (e.g. *Nature Climate Change*), to new databases (*PAIS* - a public affairs database), to new print or online book collections.

**TO ATTAIN SUPPORT AT THE LEVEL OF OUS PEERS**

**Scenario 1 (Note: OSUL will not reach our peers’ medians using this scenario)**

Step 1:
Over the next four years add 4% per year for a total 16% increase.

\[
3,200,000 + 128,000 = 3,328,000 \text{ (yr1)} \\
3,328,000 + 133,120 = 3,461,120 \text{ (yr2)} \\
3,461,120 + 138,444 = 3,599,564 \text{ (yr3)} \\
3,599,564 + 143,982 = 3,743,546 \text{ (yr4)} \\
3,743,546 \text{ Total Budget 2016}
\]

Step 2:
After year four tie the collections budget to student growth. OSU experiences growth of 1.8% -2% per year.

\[
1.8\% 3,743,546 + 67383 = 3,810,929 \\
2\% 3,743,546 + 74870 = 3,818,416
\]

**Scenario 2**

To reach the median of OUS peers, OSU Libraries collection budget would be increased by 66% or $6,226,000. Distributed across 4 years looks like this

\[
3,200,000 + 1,556,500 = 4,756,500 \text{ (yr1)} \\
4,756,500 + 1,556,500 = 6,313,000 \text{ (yr2)} \\
6,313,000 + 1,556,500 = 7,869,500 \text{ (yr3)} \\
7,869,500 + 1,556,500 = 9,426,000 \text{ (yr4)} \\
9,426,000 \text{ Total Budget 2016}
\]
SUPPORTING A TOP 10 LAND GRANT UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

Oregon State University Libraries (OSUL)

Achieving student academic success and teaching and research excellence requires significant and targeted investments in the University’s infrastructure including increased support for the OSU Libraries’ collections. With aspirations to rank among the top ten land grant institutions, OSUL’s budget is not currently adequate to meet campus needs or to provide flexibility, especially with a growing student body and the demand for additional content to support the research and teaching of new faculty and new programs.

Currently collections funding is built on state funding along with several variable sources:

- E&G $3,200,000
- TRF $550,000-$750,000
- Library fines $115,000-$118,000
- Gift funds $48,000-$200,000
- Total: $3,913,000-$4,268,000 FY10-FY12

This budget structure, together with annual inflation, creates significant challenges:

1) Due to annual cost increases of 7 – 9 %, OSUL can only support the existing collections by cutting subscriptions.1 This prevents OSUL from adding new subscriptions. OSUL’s inability to add new subscriptions hampers faculty and student access to content and faculty and researchers hired to work in disciplines newly supported by the University are especially negatively affected.

2) One-fourth of OSUL’s budget rests on changeable funding sources. The grant awarded Technology Resource Fees provides 17 - 23% of the OSUL collections budget and an additional 3.5-3.7% of the budget is contributed from library fines. Variable funding impedes OSUL from swiftly accommodating changes in student and faculty research needs—such changes are often met only after targeted cuts which may take multiple fiscal years.

OSUL controls costs using a variety of strategies including rightsizing the print collection, aligning purchases with demand, reducing scholarly publishing costs, and outsourcing lower-value work.

OSU faculty and students use the content provided by OSUL. In 2010 OSUL reported 2,744,571 uses across all books, journals and databases. That year’s budget of $3,709711.79 resulted in a $1.35 cost per use. To get a sense of how that compares, the University of Oregon’s cost per use in 2012 was $2.24. This is a rough comparison because the two institutions may have differing use calculations.

While OSUL has met these funding challenges, the existing funding model is inadequate to provide needed resources to ensure student and faculty success. To remedy this, the OSUL Faculty Senate Library Committee (FSLC) recommends increasing support over the next three years to a level at which OSUL is at least as well-funded as OSU’s peers. The OSUL FSLC recommends raising the collections budget to $5,562,952 by 2015 to match the median library collection expenditures per student FTE of our peers.

---

Target: Increase support of OSU Libraries Collections Budget to $5,562,952 by 2015.

**PEER COMPARATORS**

Compared to OUS designated peers, OSUL collections receive the least amount of support. We fall between UO and PSU.*

OSUL also has the lowest expenditures per FTE student. Again, we receive less than UO and slightly more than PSU.

---

*Data from National Center for Education Statistics

**Library Collection Expenditures, 2010**
OUS-Designated Peers + PSU +UO

Expenditures: Current Journal Subscriptions
Expenditures: Books, Journal Backfiles, Other Materials
THE IMPACT OF CAMPUS GROWTH ON OSU LIBRARIES COLLECTIONS BUDGET

With the OSU student FTE growing at over 7 percent on average since 2009, OSUL faces additional challenges in sustaining current collections and negotiating reasonable prices on new resources.

Nearly half of OSUL’s expenditures on the most expensive databases are tied to the size of the OSU student body and related university growth. Information product vendors frequently determine their pricing based on student FTE, number of faculty or students in a department, overall demand on or use of the resource, and even research output. This means that OSUL’s prices increase as the student body continues to grow and more faculty are hired to support them.

New degree programs also drive OSUL’s costs. From 2009-2011 the library would have needed approximately $65,000 in new money to adequately support the proposed new programs in their first year; $40,000 of this total would become ongoing costs. This support ranged from adding critical journals (e.g. Nature Climate Change), to new databases (PAIS - a public affairs database), to new print or online book collections.

IMPACT OF A SIGNIFICANTLY IMPROVED BUDGET

The library maintains a wish list of faculty and student requests, which are primarily online resources (journals, books, primary sources). The approximate annual cost associated with the ~100 items on the list is over $700,000. A significantly improved budget will allow the library to provide faculty and students with resources they have told us they need to excel, but which we cannot afford to add to the collection. Access to international research covering OSU’s signature areas increases faculty productivity and supports student learning. Examples of resources currently requested by faculty and students include:

- Subscriptions to **new science journals and online archives**: Nature Archives, Nature Nanotechnology, Nature Photonics, Nature Physics
- **Online newspaper archives, primary sources, and reference materials** which support the humanities and undergraduate education: Proquest Historical Newspapers, Proquest Early English Books Online, the complete U.S. Congressional Serials Set, and online encyclopedias.
o Giving the campus *an opportunity to try innovative new tools* such as *Faculty of 1000* (bioscience research reviews) and *SimplyMap* (demographics, marketing).
An Approach to Increase Support

Tie the collections budget to student FTE as a measure of campus growth and apply targeted increases over three years.

Year 1 2013
Adjust the current base budget to rely on stable funding by permanently adding to E&G the average of TRF funds received the past few years: $3,200,000 + $600,000 = $3,800,000

Determine the increase needed to bring OSU to the median of our peers library collection expenditures per student FTE as of 2010 and add this to the base. In 2010, OSU’s expenditure per FTE was $192; the median of our peers was $260; and, OSU’s FTE was 21,934.

\[
\begin{align*}
192 \times 21,934 &= 4,211,328 \\
260 \times 21,934 &= 5,702,840 \\
2010 - 2011 \text{ increase} &= 1,491,512
\end{align*}
\]

Add the adjusted base and the increase to set the 2013 budget.

Adjusted base: $3,800,000 + Increase $1,491,512 = $5,291,512

Year 2 2014
Account for OSU’s increase in student population since 2010 and add that library collection expenditures per student FTE. The difference in OSU’s student FTE between 2011 and 2010 is: 22,978 – 21,934 = 1,044.

Library collection expenditures per student FTE is 1,044 x $260/FTE = $271,440. Add this amount to set the 2014 budget.

\[
271,440 + 5,291,512 = 5,562,952
\]

Year 3 2015:
In 2015 and going forward, annually adjust the new base according to student growth and serial inflation which typically range 1.8% -2% and 6-8% respectively along with the library collection expenditures per student FTE of $260. Find OSU’s total student FTE and multiply by the library collection expenditures per student FTE of $260 (adjust $260 as it changes). Then add 6-8% for serials inflation based on the previous year’s inflation.

For example:
- Student growth of 2% of OSU’s 2011 student FTE 22,978 is 459. Total student FTE would be 23,437 Multiplied by $260= $6,093,776
- Serial inflation of 8% of the base $5,562,952 is $445,036. Add this to set that year’s budget: $6,538,812.

\[
\text{(Student Growth) + (Serial Inflation) + (Previous Year’s Base) = Yearly Budget}
\]
Proposal for Increased Funding for the Library Research Travel Grant Program

Request:
The Faculty Senate Library Committee and OSU Libraries are requesting a $10,000 increase in funding for the Library Research Travel Grant program. This program is the only significant source of institutional support for OSU faculty who need to travel to libraries, archives, or collections to conduct research. Based on statistics collected over the last five years, this increase would allow all meritorious proposals to be fully funded and would allow the LRTG program to expand, increasing the ability of faculty across the university to do original, high-impact, and high-visibility scholarship.

While most science and engineering researchers come to OSU with substantial support for labs, equipment, etc., similar support is not readily available for scholars in the social sciences (including business) and humanities. The LRTG program is an important source of research support because no university library is capable of meeting all the needs of its faculty, especially when they have to travel to specialized collections. As part of her LRTG-funded research, for example, Professor Anita Helle traveled to gain access to “sound tapes of Sylvia Plath and Ted Hughes at the British Sound Library and small press publications…non-circulating, non-digitized, yet essential items.” As she notes, “the variability of copyright internationally (free use in the European Union and in the US deriving from two different legal traditions) means that many kinds of materials of interest to scholars will not likely be available in digitized forms anytime soon.”

Background:
The LRTG program was founded in the 1990s and is funded entirely through the Provost’s Office. There are two application cycles, one in the fall and one in the spring; a committee that includes representatives from OSU Libraries and the Faculty Senate Library Committee reviews the applications and makes award decisions. At the current funding level of $10,000 per year, the committee is able to award a total of five applicants a maximum of $2,000 each. If funding were increased as requested, we would be able to double that.

Access:
Since 2005, the LRTG program has received applications from faculty in 16 different areas across the university: anthropology, art, economics, English, ethnic studies, extension, foreign languages, history, horticulture, music, political science, philosophy, sociology, speech and communication, women studies, and zoology. These applications requested access to resources all over the world.

In that time period, the LRTG program has awarded $59,609. However, the unmet demand remains substantial. The committee must often award partial rather than full support (amounts have ranged from $400 to $2000, with 62.5% of funded applicants receiving less than the maximum amount) and was unable to offer any funding at all to 14 applicants. Please see Appendix A for more details.
Impact:

Because the LRTG program funds research on materials only available in specialized collections and archives that would otherwise be inaccessible, it enables faculty to do original research that they would not be able to do without this support. While we were not able to contact every previous grantee, we were able to compile partial figures on outcomes from 19 recent recipients. Those outcomes include 26 presentations and talks, 29 journal articles, 4 book chapters, 15 monographs and edited collections, and 3 grants, among others (see Appendix B).

If the funding were increased by $10,000, OSU Libraries would commit to improving the marketing for the LRTG program to maintain the competitive nature of the application process (including creating a more compelling web presence); to encouraging applicants to demonstrate how their proposed research would impact students and/or the OSU community; and to reporting regularly and in detail to the Provost on the specific outcomes enabled by the awarded grant funds.
## Appendix A

Library Research Travel Grant Program 2005-2010: Applicants & Awards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding period</th>
<th>Applicant Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Destination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005 round 1</td>
<td>Peters</td>
<td>Ethnic Studies</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>National Regional Area Archives, Seattle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005 round 1</td>
<td>Shaw</td>
<td>Women Studies</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>various locations in US South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005 round 2</td>
<td>Penhallegon</td>
<td>Horticulture</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Kyrgyzstan &amp; Washington, DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005 round 2</td>
<td>Coolen</td>
<td>Music</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005 round 2</td>
<td>Inderbitzin</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005 round 2</td>
<td>Gross</td>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>NY &amp; Philadelphia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005 round 2</td>
<td>Husband</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>Univ of IL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005 round 2</td>
<td>Trembley</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>St. Louis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005 round 2</td>
<td>Xing</td>
<td>Ethnic Studies</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005 round 2</td>
<td>Rubert</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005 round 2</td>
<td>Khanna</td>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>New Delhi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005 round 2</td>
<td>Kopperman</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>NLM, Bethesda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005 round 2</td>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>Women Studies</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fall 2005</td>
<td>Coolen</td>
<td>Music</td>
<td>1876</td>
<td>New York theaters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fall 2005</td>
<td>Chappell</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>Reagan papers, Simi Valley, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spring 2006</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Foreign Lang</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>British Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spring 2006</td>
<td>Von Germeten</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spring 2006</td>
<td>Helle</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Bodleian Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spring 2006</td>
<td>Li</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>Boston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spring 2006</td>
<td>Blumenthal</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Uwiscinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spring 2006</td>
<td>Katz</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spring 2006</td>
<td>Hackel</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Huntington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spring 2006</td>
<td>Poppino</td>
<td>Music</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fall 2006</td>
<td>Boudraa</td>
<td>Foreign Lang</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spring 2007</td>
<td>Zhang</td>
<td>Zoology</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spring 2007</td>
<td>Gottlieb</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>Bodleian Library at Oxford University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spring 2007</td>
<td>Barbour</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>British Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spring 2007</td>
<td>Porrovecchio</td>
<td>Speech &amp; Communication</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Huntington Library; USC Specialized Libraries and Archival Collections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fall 2007</td>
<td>Gallagher</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>Syria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fall 2007</td>
<td>Carson</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>Boston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fall 2007</td>
<td>Kingston</td>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Alaska Native archives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fall 2007</td>
<td>Oriard</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>various locations in US South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fall 2007</td>
<td>Peltomaki</td>
<td>Art</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semester</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Major/Field</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2008</td>
<td>Barbour</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>London</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2008</td>
<td>Li</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>China</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2008</td>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>Women Studies</td>
<td>London</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2008</td>
<td>Blumenthal</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>Uwiscconsin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>Solari</td>
<td>Art</td>
<td>Tulane collections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>Coolen</td>
<td>Music</td>
<td>New York theaters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>Hosty</td>
<td>Extension</td>
<td>South America</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2009</td>
<td>Barbour</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Huntington Library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2009</td>
<td>Inderbitzin</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>John Jay College, NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2009</td>
<td>Sklansky</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2009</td>
<td>Heiduschke</td>
<td>Foreign Lang</td>
<td>Umass Amherst</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2009</td>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>Women Studies</td>
<td>London</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2009</td>
<td>Boudraa</td>
<td>Foreign Lang</td>
<td>France</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>Chappell</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>Khanna</td>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>New Delhi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>Art</td>
<td>Berlin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>Shaw</td>
<td>Women Studies</td>
<td>Berkeley, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2010</td>
<td>Olson</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>British Library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2010</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>MLA Archives, NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2010</td>
<td>Shaw</td>
<td>Women Studies</td>
<td>Vanderbilt U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B
Library Research Travel Grant Program 2005-2010: Research Outcomes

Conference presentations and invited lectures:


Nabil Boudraa, talk on Kateb Yacine’s Nedjma as a founding text in Maghrebian Literature in "Relire les classiques africains" panel, North Eastern Modern Language Association (NeMLA) annual conference, New Brunswick, April 7-10, 2011.


Sebastian Heiduschke, OSU Center for the Humanities talk.

Janet Lee, ‘Beyond courage and economic enlightenment’: Australian Feminist Miles Franklin’s unpublished marriage protest stories," National Women’s Studies Association (NWSA) annual meetings, Denver, CO (November 2010).

Janet Lee, “‘Writing Red’: Miles Franklin's unpublished plays (Chicago, 1906-1915) NWSA annual meetings, Atlanta, GA (November, 2009).
Janet Lee, “Experts at the geography of hell: Domestic sites and sororal subversions among the First Aid Nursing Yeomanry in World War I.” NWSA annual meetings, Cincinnati, OH (June 2008).

Janet Lee, “Miles Franklin on American manhood and white slavery: The case of ‘Red Cross Nurse,’” Hawaii International Conference on the Arts and Humanities, Honolulu, Hawaii (January 2007).

Janet Lee, “‘Miles Franklin in Chicago, 1906-1915.’” NWSA annual meetings, St. Charles, Ill (June 2007).


Janet Lee, “‘This was life!’: Accidental modernism and inadvertent feminism in women’s stories of the Great War,” annual meetings of the Pacific Sociological Association, Pasadena (April 2003).

Janet Lee, “‘Our shining, beckoning danger’: Memoirs of World War I First Aid Nursing Yeomanry,” NWSA annual meetings, Minneapolis, MN (June 2001).


Janet Lee, “Biography at the Limits of Representation” annual meetings of the Pacific Sociological Association, Portland, OR (April 1999).


Journal articles:


Susan Shaw, “I Am Woman: Southern Baptists and Feminism,” *Baptist History & Heritage* (Spring 2010).


**Book chapters:**


**Monographs and edited collections:**


Paul Kopperman, “Regimental Practice” by John Buchanan, M.D.: An Eighteenth-Century Medical Diary and Manual (forthcoming from Ashgate)


**Grants:**

Dahong Zhang, 2009-2011 (Principal Investigator), National Science Foundation, Dissecting Recruitment of Actin into the Contractile Ring, $220,000

Sebastian Heiduschke, L.L. Stewart Grant

Rebecca Olson, Renaissance Society of America Research Travel Grant (one of nine selected in a highly competitive, international contest)

**Other outcomes:**

Sebastian Heiduschke: brought an East German director and his film to Corvallis for two screenings at the Darkside Cinema.

Shelley Jordon: *Anita’s Journey*, a hand-painted animation based on her mother-in-law Anita Greenstein’s experience in hiding in Berlin during WWII.
At the February FSLC meeting I was asked to send examples of existing university and college open access policies. Below are links to open access policies at MIT, Kansas and Harvard. Other policies can be found at a Simmons College wiki: [http://oad.simmons.edu/oadwiki/Unanimous_faculty_votes](http://oad.simmons.edu/oadwiki/Unanimous_faculty_votes). Open access policies that have passed in the U.S. over the last three years all contain similar elements and language. Stuart Shieber, Professor of Computer Science in the School of Engineering and Applied Sciences at Harvard and the Harvard Office for Scholarly Communication’s faculty director, has written a model open access policy that includes language that is shared by most of the university and college-level open access policies that have passed. The model policy includes annotations about why each element is included: [http://osc.hul.harvard.edu/sites/default/files/model-policy-annotated_0.pdf](http://osc.hul.harvard.edu/sites/default/files/model-policy-annotated_0.pdf).

For example, each of the university and college policies I looked at include a license granting certain copyrights to the institution for the purpose of making the scholarly research freely available online.

- **MIT statement:** Each Faculty member grants to the Massachusetts Institute of Technology nonexclusive permission to make available his or her scholarly articles and to exercise the copyright in those articles for the purpose of open dissemination. In legal terms, each Faculty member grants to MIT a nonexclusive, irrevocable, paid-up, worldwide license to exercise any and all rights under copyright relating to each of his or her scholarly articles, in any medium, provided that the articles are not sold for a profit, and to authorize others to do the same.

- **Kansas statement:** Each faculty member grants to KU permission to make scholarly peer-reviewed journal articles to which he or she made substantial intellectual contributions publicly available in the KU open access institutional repository, and to exercise the copyright in those articles. In legal terms, the permission granted by each faculty member is a nonexclusive, irrevocable, paid-up, worldwide license to exercise any and all rights under copyright relating to each of his or her scholarly articles, in any medium, and to authorize others to do the same, provided that he articles are not sold for a profit.
Most policies ask faculty to deposit the “final version of the article; that is, the author’s manuscript with any changes made as a result of the peer-review process, but prior to publisher’s copy-editing or formatting” to an open access repository operated by the library.

**MIT**’s policy passed unanimously in March 2009. In the two years since the policy was passed, approximately 2800 faculty articles have been deposited in MIT’s open access repository.

**Policy:** [http://info-libraries.mit.edu/scholarly/mit-open-access/open-access-at-mit/mit-open-access-policy/](http://info-libraries.mit.edu/scholarly/mit-open-access/open-access-at-mit/mit-open-access-policy/)

**FAQ:** [http://info-libraries.mit.edu/scholarly/mit-open-access/open-access-at-mit/mit-open-access-policy/mit-faculty-open-access-policy-faq/](http://info-libraries.mit.edu/scholarly/mit-open-access/open-access-at-mit/mit-open-access-policy/mit-faculty-open-access-policy-faq/)

**Implementation details:** Authors asked to self-deposit articles or email copy to library.

**University of Kansas** also passed its policy in 2009 and became the first public institution to do so. The policy has since been revised to include implementation responsibilities and details.

**Policy:** [https://documents.ku.edu/policies/governance/OpenAccess.htm](https://documents.ku.edu/policies/governance/OpenAccess.htm)

**Implementation details:** Policy calls for faculty to “provide bibliographic information and an electronic copy of each article within 30 days of publication to the [Library].” Library offers "full-service" and "self-service" options to make articles available in [KU ScholarWorks](http://ku.edu/scholarworks) (KU's open archive of scholarly work created by its faculty).

**Harvard College of Arts and Sciences** passed the first college-wide open access policy in the country in Spring 2008. Other Harvard schools and colleges have since passed similar policies.

**Policy:** [http://osc.hul.harvard.edu/sites/default/files/model-policy-annotated_0.pdf](http://osc.hul.harvard.edu/sites/default/files/model-policy-annotated_0.pdf)

**FAQ:** [http://osc.hul.harvard.edu/policies](http://osc.hul.harvard.edu/policies)

**Implementation details:** Office for Scholarly Communication established in Harvard University Libraries in order to implement Harvard University policies.
Press Release

January 27th, 2009: Sharing research information via a more open access publishing model would bring millions of pounds worth of savings to the higher education sector as well as benefiting UK plc. This is one of the key findings from a new research project commissioned by JISC.

Professor John Houghton from the Centre of Strategic Economic Studies at Melbourne’s Victoria University and Professor Charles Oppenheim at Loughborough University were asked to lead research that would throw light on the economic and social implications of new models for scholarly publishing.

The research centred on three models which include:

• Subscription or toll access publishing which involves reader charges and use restrictions;
• Open access publishing where access is free and publication is funded from the authors’ side; and
• Open access self-archiving where academic authors post their work in online repositories, making it freely available to all Internet users.

In their report, Houghton et al. looked beyond the actual costs and savings of different models and examined the additional cost-benefits that might arise from enhanced access to research findings.

The research and findings reveal that core scholarly publishing system activities cost the UK higher education sector around £5 billion in 2007. Using the different models, the report shows, what the estimated cost would have been:

• £230 million to publish using the subscription model,
• £150 million to publish under the open access model and
• £110 million to publish with the self-archiving with peer review services plus some £20 million in operating costs if using the different models.

When considering costs per journal article, Houghton et al. believe that the UK higher education sector could have saved around £80 million a year by shifting from toll access to open access publishing. They also claim that £115 million could be saved by moving from toll access to open access self-archiving.

In addition to that, the financial return to UK plc from greater accessibility to research might result in an additional £172 million per annum worth of benefits from government and higher education sector research alone.
JISC’s Chair Professor Sir Tim O’Shea said, “The argument for moving from more traditional subscription or toll-based publishing to a model that allows for greater accessibility and makes full use of the advances in technology cannot be ignored. This report shows there are significant savings to be made and benefits to be had.

“JISC will work with publishers, authors and the science community to identify and help to remove the barriers to moving to these more cost-effective models,” he added.

Sir Mark Walport, Director of the Wellcome Trust, commended the report and added that, "as a research funder that provides additional funds to its grantees to meet the cost of open access publishing, I am delighted that this report vindicates this approach and shows that the benefits of enhanced accessibility outweigh the costs of supplementing research funds with 'author-pays' open access publishing fees".

Professor Ian Diamond, speaking on behalf of Research Councils UK said,"RCUK welcomes this substantial and interesting report. It will be of great use to the Research Councils as we develop our future policies in relation to publishing and in particular open access."

The full report is available online at http://www.jisc.ac.uk/publications/publications/economicpublishingmodelsfinalreport.asp

Heather Joseph
Executive Director, SPARC
21 Dupont Circle, Suite 800
Washington, DC 20036
USA
+01 202 296 2296
heather@arl.org
Catherine Candee is director of publishing and strategic initiatives in the Office of Scholarly Communication at the University of California (UC). Here she talks to Richard Poynder about UC’s eScholarship Repository, and outlines her vision of the future of scholarly publishing — a world in which universities would retain ownership of their scholarly output, and make it freely available on the Web via a network of institutional repositories like the eScholarship Repository.

RP: The Office of Scholarly Communication is based in UC’s California Digital Library (CDL). Are you a librarian by background?

CC: I am.

RP: What does your job entail?

CC: My mission is to marry available technologies with ongoing experiments aimed at finding new publishing models for improving the scholarly publishing system.

RP: Your job grew out of the so-called scholarly publishing crisis did it?

CC: Very much so. We faced a situation in which spiralling serials costs were literally killing the University of California. Today we spend about $27 million a year on licensed content.

However, while my job certainly grew out of the scholarly publishing crisis it was also a response to the development of new technologies.

RP: You mean in the sense that the Web has allowed the University to respond to the scholarly publishing crisis in ways that would not otherwise have been possible?

CC: Exactly. In 2000, for example, we launched the eScholarship program, which was created to exploit technologies that can help us reduce the cost of scholarly materials, especially journals.

At the same time we wanted to get much closer to the classroom, and to the lab, and to find out if there were ways that the library could better support faculty — both in their teaching and in their research. As a result, we learned an awful lot about what faculty were doing with new technology, what ongoing experiments were underway (or planned), and where faculty needed help.

eScholarship Repository

RP: I guess the most visible outcome of that program has been the eScholarship Repository, which was launched in 2002?

CC: Right. And the eScholarship Repository grew organically out of our efforts to find out what faculty were doing.

RP: Talk me through the process you went through?

CC: We discovered that since the structure of the literature varies considerably from discipline to
discipline, faculty were taking advantage of new technology in vastly different ways.

We found ourselves, for instance, trying to support people in humanities who were using GIS systems with a temporal aspect in order to publish their data in new ways; we found ourselves helping the social scientists put working papers online; and we found ourselves helping people in performance arts who wanted to capture performances and store them.

Before long we were involved in twelve different projects, and as we started trying to develop the infrastructure to support all these projects we found ourselves being pulled in so many different directions that we realised that none of them would be sustainable if we tried to support them all. We also knew we would need to support further projects as they arose.

So we realised that if we were going to meet all these needs adequately we would have to find some sort of generic solution. And since the predominance of the materials that we were supporting were textual we began — in a very pragmatic way — looking around and testing repository software.

RP: So while the roots of the eScholarship program lay in UC's attempt to address the problem of journal price inflation, the eScholarship Repository grew out of your growing knowledge of the specific needs of faculty?

CC: Exactly. The journal pricing issue drove us in the library to seek new solutions; but it wasn’t journal pricing that drove faculty to try new things. In the end, therefore, the eScholarship Repository grew out of the opportunistic use of new technology by faculty, and the decision by UC library to establish new ways of helping faculty.

RP: What was the appeal to faculty of your offer of help?

CC: The attraction for most faculty units was that they had a lot of materials that were at risk: they were putting seminar papers up on web sites that were disappearing, and they were frustrated at trying to manage huge inboxes — because in the preprint environment there were manuscripts flying around in a generally unmanaged way, and they were not being properly preserved.

RP: Initially you built the eScholarship Repository with the EPrints software, which was developed at Southampton University in the UK?

CC: Right. We started with Eprints, and the aim was to create what people now call an institutional repository — a repository where faculty could put materials (text and images) that they wanted to disseminate, or actually publish.

A different model

RP: You later switched to the bepress software. Why?

CC: We found it so, so, so difficult to get faculty even to test the EPrints software that we abandoned the idea of providing a platform for faculty to individually publish their own works. Around the same time we serendipitously encountered the bepress software, and right away we could see that it would to allow us to do something much more important.

RP: How do you mean?
CC: We could see that if we used the bepress software the repository could also support peer-reviewed publications. Consequently, by the time we launched we had switched to a different model, and we had adopted the bepress software.

RP: How was the model different?

CC: The bepress software allowed different units within the University of California to become the gatekeepers, with all the editorial and administrative ability resting with an academic department, an institute, or a research unit, rather than with individual faculty, or with the library.

RP: So where EPrints software assumed that researchers would do the inputting of papers themselves, bepress software was more suited to third-parties depositing them?

CC: That is one difference — although, because the software is difficult to use, Eprints submissions are often managed centrally. Additionally, the bepress software lent itself to the size of UC; and it allowed the University to decide exactly what it wanted to put in, and to brand everything in the way it wished.

RP: You were also able to outsource the hosting of the eScholarship Repository to bepress?

CC: Yes. It is hosted by bepress, but preserved here at CDL.

Harvesting citations

RP: You said the original aim was to create an institutional repository. There is some debate today over the terminology used when talking about repositories. Would you say that the eScholarship Repository, as it has developed, is still an institutional repository?

CC: I would. It is hosted by this institution, and it is managed by this institution.

RP: Certainly most agree that an important role of an institutional repository is to allow a university to make its peer-reviewed papers freely available on the Web, and thus "open access". As it happens, UC is being very proactive in this regard. It has, for instance, introduced a metadata harvesting program designed to track down papers published by faculty, and it then asks the authors to deposit postprints of those papers in the eScholarship repository. How does the program work?

CC: What we are doing is harvesting citations. We then send them to faculty members saying that the listed works may be eligible for inclusion in the eScholarship repository. It is a way to alert them to the repository, and to the fact that they have content that could be placed in it.

RP: How do they then deposit the postprint?

CC: The message sent to faculty is clickable, and when they click on the link it brings them directly into the repository, where the citation data for the paper automatically fills out the repository metadata fields for them. This, by the way, is the one case where we allow authors to put their content in directly themselves.

However, we also allow them to use a proxy — so they can legally assign someone else to put their papers in for them. The aim is to make the process as easy as possible, because time is the biggest constraint when it comes to getting faculty to participate.
Rights clearance

RP: And you have contracted bepress to do rights clearance on the papers?

CC: Right. After the papers are submitted we pay bepress to check the rights on them. That was a concession to the fact that bepress’ business would be threatened if they got sued for allowing something illegal to be put into the repository. This part of the process is both onerous and expensive, and we hope we will not need to do it at some point in the future.

RP: I'm told you have acquired about 1,000 papers in this way. Does that figure represent the total number of postprints in the eScholarship repository?

CC: Yes, that is the total number of postprints in the eScholarship repository, and around one tenth of the papers currently available. [At the time of the interview there were 10,373 papers in the repository].

RP: How do the other papers get into the repository?

CC: It depends what kind of paper they are. The working papers, the technical reports, the state reports, and other professional materials that have not been peer reviewed are all deposited into the repository by the units, who act on behalf of the member of faculty.

RP: So the units allocate a member of staff to do the inputting?

CC: Exactly. And with the seminar papers we allow faculty to create the metadata for papers that are going to be given, and to add a sort of place holder in the calendar. Then, later, someone goes in and adds the paper. That is still the responsibility of the unit however.

Mandating researchers

RP: 1,000 postprints is a small drop in the ocean I guess. How many researchers are there within the UC system?

CC: UC is the largest public research university I know of. It has ten campuses and around 16,000 faculty and researchers.

RP: When you ask faculty for a postprint is it a request or a demand?

CC: It is not a demand. Clearly, incentive is the single biggest issue for getting content in. Awareness is another issue, so we are just starting some market research to discover what percentage of UC faculty even know about the repository. I suspect it is less than half.

RP: So you still have work to do in publicising the repository?

CC: We do. While we are very excited that we have more than 200 departments participating in the repository we have no idea what percentage of the faculty know about it; and we have no idea what percentage would participate if they did know — because there is no overriding incentive for them to do so today. We need to understand the situation.

RP: As your experience shows, creating a repository is only half the task. You then have to fill it.
For that reason there are growing calls for funders to mandate researchers to self-archive their papers. Do you think that that is the best way of filling institutional repositories?

CC: Well, I wouldn’t say that our purpose is simply to fill institutional repositories. We built an institutional repository as one way of providing an alternative to the current publishing system, and to give faculty something to do with that copyrighted material that we keep saying shouldn’t be given away to publishers.

It may turn out that institutional repositories aren’t the way to go however. For that reason we are also interested in encouraging faculty to manage their copyrights differently, and to consider who they give their manuscripts to, and where they commit their editing and reviewing time. So our main focus is in accomplishing that, rather than filling repositories.

**Managing rights**

RP: Do you nevertheless anticipate that funders will eventually introduce mandates?

CC: Actually we expect that universities will make some sort of a mandate before funding agencies do. In this regard there are a number of white papers floating around the University of California right now. We are waiting to see what happens to those.

RP: Yes I saw that. Given what you say about rights, I’d be interested to hear more about the Scholarly Work Copyright Rights Policy white paper. This proposes that UC faculty "routinely grant to The Regents of the University of California a limited, irrevocable, perpetual, worldwide, non-exclusive licence to place the faculty member's scholarly work in a non-commercial open-access online repository." Would this apply only to journal articles or all the works of faculty, including books?

CC: Ultimately it is intended to apply to all works, but starting with journal articles.

RP: The aim is to take the citation harvesting program one step further is it?

CC: Actually the white papers are an initiative of faculty, not us. Indeed, the most exciting aspect of it is that these papers were put before the Academic Council by the Scholarly Communication Sub-Committee of the Senate. This is significant because, as everybody knows, faculty are far more likely to listen to faculty. But if implemented the white papers would clearly allow the University of California to significantly extend the work we have been doing with the eScholarship Repository.

RP: Who will decide whether the white papers are accepted?

CC: I haven’t followed a white paper process like this before so I don’t know exactly. But the papers were immediately approved for circulation by the Academic Council, and they’re being circulated and talked about as we speak. I imagine each of the academic senates on the campuses will take them up, discuss them, and they will then be brought back to the system-wide senate.

We can’t know what the outcome will be but, at a minimum, there will be an awful lot of consciousness raising. And who knows, perhaps UC faculty will indeed choose to act in concert to change the way that they manage their rights.

RP: What is the likely timing for a decision?
CC: As I understand it, the aim is to get things passed and through the system before next fall.

RP: If it does go ahead would you envisage a postprint mandate following behind it?

CC: Yes.

RP: And you would welcome that?

CC: I would. While I don’t find the postprint issue as interesting or exciting as trying to encourage new forms of communication, it is strategically important — because it would allow us to put in place a production-level service capable of managing UC copyrighted material, which would better prepare us for the future.

**Stepping stone**

RP: So while your long-term ambitions are greater, you are keen to see UC researchers deposit their postprints in the eScholarship Repository as a matter of course?

CC: That’s right. We now view the postprints project as a kind of stepping stone, or a means to an end, to changing the paradigm, and of educating faculty. Part of that process means getting hold of a lot of content so that people can see there is real value in having this managed by the University, that there is a value in making it open access, that there is value in being able to speed up communication, and that there is value in having more direct control over it. So we are keen to see any initiative that will drive content into repositories and help change the way people do things.

RP: You expect to see universities taking a much greater role in publishing in the future?

CC: I do. And as the number of repositories being developed around the world has taken off so more and more people are beginning to see them as publication and communication tools.

RP: Indeed, UC has already started publishing electronic open access journals in the eScholarship Repository hasn’t it?

CC: Yes. We have used the platform for all levels of peer review. I should add, however, that we weren’t aiming specifically to get faculty to launch new academic journals. There are too many journals already!

But we recognised that there were some niche journals that could use the repository software well. There were, for example, some in-house UC magazines that have been around for a long time that really just needed hosting. In fact, although we don’t think that it is going to be the primary use of the repository, there is now a queue of things moving into the journal part of our publishing section.

**Alternative publishing models**

RP: Can you say more about the alternative publishing models you envisage?

CC: Sure. One of the things that is so interesting about the repository is that about half the materials are never published in the traditional sense: they have a life all of their own. So, for
instance, many conference papers and seminar papers that would never be published are now able to live as part of the Web, and of the scholarly record.

**RP:** This is like the concept of the *Long Tail*?

**CC:** That’s right. There is one other really interesting initiative that I should mention. You maybe know that we have something called eScholarship Editions?

**RP:** No. Tell me about the initiative?

**CC:** Actually we don’t use the repository for this: it runs in-house on a home-grown open source system we call XTF — or eXtensible text framework.

Anyway, eScholarship Editions are scholarly monographs encoded in XML. And we have marked up the backlist for University of California Press titles and are now trying to redefine a workflow that would allow us to publish in XML going forward in a cheaper way.

**RP:** eBooks?

**CC:** Yes, eBooks. And in the meantime — because they are so expensive to produce — we have also started using the eScholarship repository to do monographic publishing. We have four monographic series underway so far.

**RP:** What is the rationale here?

**CC:** As you know, the corollary to the serials crisis is that libraries have less money to buy monographs, and so fewer monographs are being published. The fact is, however, that an awful lot of monographs could be published if the UC Press had more editorial bandwidth.

So we have been experimenting with empowering UC Press editorial boards, or faculty editorial boards, to become, essentially, publishers. In this way we can extend the work of UC Press.

**RP:** The eScholarship Repository has also effectively become a publishing platform for the University of California Press then?

**CC:** Exactly. It won’t be used for most of the monographs: there will be a tiered arrangement. So there will be some fabulous critical editions and glorious books that won’t ever go through the repository, but there is an awful lot of really good material out there that is worthy of publishing, and that faculty very much want to publish. We are happy to share the load in order to get it published.

**RP:** Will these monographs be published in print or electronic format?

**CC:** They will be printed if there is sufficient demand for them. The wonderful thing about publishing the first copy digitally is that print publication can be taken up by UC Press as a separate, business decision. Ultimately, we hope to offer the monographs as Print-on-Demand.

**Something narrower**

**RP:** It’s clear you have a very broad view of the role of an institutional repository. Advocates of self-archiving, by contrast, insist than an institutional repository should only ever be viewed as a
**postprint archive. What's your response to that view?**

**CC:** I think it is unfortunate that the term institutional repository has come to mean something narrower. As I say, the postprint component is the least interesting and ultimately the least important part of this. So while right now it is tactically extremely important to deposit postprints, ultimately I envision a very different arrangement between universities and publishers than we have now.

**RP:** You believe universities should be in control of the publishing process, rather than managing papers that have been published by someone else?

**CC:** That's right. Eventually I hope all the content will be hosted and managed by universities themselves, and the publishing services would be in the form of added value. So, for instance, a published article would refer back to the raw article in the repository.

**RP:** What sort of added value services do you envisage?

**CC:** In addition to peer-review, I can see scope for various kinds of indexing services, and for aggregation services. People love to go to processed stuff that offers them a limited view of the content. So there could be discovery mechanisms to allow people to do research in their discipline regardless of the location of all the materials — this could be a service, for instance, that harvested content from a bunch of institutional repositories and then sorted and metadata enhanced that content along a discipline line. That is certainly a model we are looking at.

**RP:** On the other hand, there is a school of thought that argues that rather than posting papers in institutional repositories, researchers should post them directly in disciplinary repositories — using, for instance, subject-based services like arXiv or PubMed Central.

**CC:** Until I realised how differently the disciplines were using technologies I also thought that discipline-based archives were the way to go. I don't any more. Moreover, now that there is a fairly well developed layer of institutional repositories becoming available it makes more sense for a service layer to develop on top of those repositories for researchers who want to distinguish material on a discipline basis.

But to go back to your earlier question, I believe it would be just too bad to limit our vision of the institutional repository to postprints alone, and to not exploit their potential for enabling faculty to put all kinds of creative output in them.

**Deterrent**

**RP:** What worries self-archiving advocates about this is that if universities try to make institutional repositories too broad in functionality they could delay the transition to an open access environment; that we need to stay focused on the narrower view until OA is achieved. You are arguing that we need to plan for the longer-term future from day one are you?

**CC:** I think so. Moreover, I don’t see why a broader view would slow OA down. It is a matter of getting the right platform and getting things moving so that faculty can see that there are other things that can be done.

**RP:** One obvious speed bump, perhaps, is the cost of building a repository. While it only costs a few hundred dollars to set up an Eprints server, the kind of repository you are building is
inevitably far more expensive. Indeed, in a recent issue of the INASP newsletter, Ann Okerson, a librarian at Yale, estimated three-year start-up costs for hardware and software alone for such a repository at over $300,000. While that might be fine for a UC, a Yale, or a Harvard, it will surely act as a powerful deterrent to any smaller institution considering setting up an institutional repository?

CC: Sure. In fact I doubt every single school will have its own institutional repository. More likely their content will be hosted by the larger schools like ours. We are in conversations right now, for instance, with California State Universities — trying to figure out how to partner to make it easier for CSUs to start out.

RP: So some of the costs could be shared between institutions?

CC: Possibly. Certainly we are open to partnerships, and to maybe extending services to other universities. I should stress, however, that we are not open for business yet. We are only exploring possibilities.

Natural caretakers?

RP: Are librarians the natural caretakers of institutional repositories?

CC: Well, there is a strong argument for saying so. Libraries have a good history of looking after things. At the same time, however, they have not historically been identified as publishers. So to the extent that this is a publishing service I can see that it could work against a repository to be over identified with the library. The best and the healthiest approach would be an alliance between faculty and libraries.

RP: I wonder if we might see increasing tension between researchers and librarians over the issue of institutional repositories? I ask because the primary aim of researchers is to achieve maximum impact for their research; librarians, by contrast, are looking to create large digital libraries or even, as in the case of UC, complete publishing systems. Could this threaten the historic relationship between librarians and researchers?

CC: I can see such a tension theoretically: where resources were limited, for instance, the aim of building a digital library could seem to stand in the way of getting publishing out quickly. But ultimately I think you are presenting a false dichotomy.

RP: If someone from another university was looking to create an institutional repository and asked you for advice how would you reply?

CC: I would tell them to consider all of the new forms of communication that are taking place and to work very, very closely with faculty to determine what they need.

RP: Looking to the future, how important do you think institutional repositories will prove to be in the scholarly publishing process and will they be seen as an alternative to the traditional system or as an adjunct?

CC: In the short term I think they will be quite important. I don’t see them as a replacement but, as I mentioned, I really think we are heading towards a layering of services, where an awful lot of raw content will be managed more responsibly by universities, and publishers and aggregators will develop all kinds of services to add value to that content.
RP: So the basic content would always be free and openly available in an institutional repository, but those who wanted to could go to a publisher and pay to use enhanced search and aggregation services?

CC: I think that's right.

RP: OK. Thank you for your time.
Congressional Hearing Over Public Access Filled With High Drama

By JENNIFER HOWARD

A life-and-death battle is going on over public access to federally financed research—life for taxpayers and many scientists, and death for publishers. Or so each side claims. That battle, whose outcome will affect many university researchers, kicked into high gear on Capitol Hill yesterday, as the combatants debated the merits of a bill that would curtail the National Institutes of Health's public-access policy.

The hearing, held by a House of Representatives subcommittee, did not lack for drama. It featured pleas by Nobel Prize winners, a story of how open access helped soothe an anguished mother, and warnings that intrusions by the "hairy snout" of federal regulation could destroy the economic basis of publishing.

The NIH policy that triggered this latest skirmish only went into effect in April. It requires that all researchers whose work is financed by the NIH submit electronic copies of their final, peer-reviewed manuscripts to PubMed Central, a free online archive of biomedical and life-sciences journal articles, and that the material be made publicly available within 12 months of publication. Publishers tried to derail the policy last spring and succeeded in getting Congress to specify that it be consistent with copyright law.

That point is the focus of the new bill, HR 6845, the Fair Copyright in Research Works Act, which seeks to amend the legislation governing the NIH policy. It was introduced this week by John Conyers Jr., Democrat of Michigan. Mr. Conyers is the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee. Yesterday's hearing took place before the panel's Subcommittee on Courts, the Internet, and Intellectual Property.

'Vital' for Science

Elias A. Zerhouni, director of the NIH, led off with a passionate case for PubMed as "a vital component of 21st-century science." He presented a timeline of breakthroughs related to the Human Genome Project to demonstrate what he called "a true explosion in scientific discovery," one accelerated by researchers' access to unprecedented amounts of data.
The NIH’s public-access policy, Dr. Zerhouni argued, helps speed up the pace of discovery by making knowledge widely available. “We fully believe it is consistent with copyright law,” he said. He also pointed out that the NIH policy allows for an embargo twice as long as the standard period in Canada, Australia, and parts of Europe.

Heather D. Joseph, executive director of the Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition, or Sparc, expressed "serious reservations" about the legislation. Ms. Joseph’s group speaks for many research libraries, which have been stalwart supporters of public access. Undoing the NIH policy, she said, would limit taxpayers' access to "crucial, health-related information that can make a life-or-death difference in the lives of the American public."

Voice cracking, Ms. Joseph drove the point home in an anecdote about her 5-year-old son, recently diagnosed with Type 1 diabetes. "I got online and looked for every piece of current information I could get my hands on," she said. "I did this from home, at 3 in the morning the night we got home from the hospital, desperate for information that could reassure me that there was something else I could do besides wake my child up twice a night to check his blood sugar for signs of hypoglycemia."

She found what she was looking for in a 2008 study of continuous glucose monitors—reported in a manuscript posted only a month earlier under the NIH’s public-access policy. "It was worth the world to me," she said.

A Threat to Publishers

Yet Ralph Oman, a copyright lawyer who lectures in intellectual-property law at George Washington University Law School, made the case to the committee that "a mandatory federal policy requiring these works to be made available for worldwide distribution is in inherent conflict with copyright" and would threaten publishers' continued existence.

"My basic concern about the NIH proposal is that it will, sooner rather than later, destroy the commercial market for these scientific, technical, and medical journals," Mr. Oman said. Later, during a question-and-answer session, the lawyer got a laugh by asking whether we really wanted "the hairy snout of government" poking around in science publishing.

Both the Association of American Publishers and the Association of American University Presses issued strong statements of support for the bill.

So did Martin Frank, executive director of the American Physiological Society, which publishes scientific journals. He repeated the publishers’ mantra that they make "a significant value-added contribution" to the research they publish, even if the NIH pays for it. "Articles should not be taken from those of us responsible for their creation," he told the subcommittee.

One group was not well represented in yesterday's wrangling: the scientists who actually do the research being fought over, as a subcommittee member, Zoe Lofgren, Democrat of California, noted. Most of these researchers sign their copyrights over to their publishers as a condition of
being published. One glimmer of how some of them feel came in an open letter to Congress submitted by 33 Nobel Prize winners in chemistry, physiology, and medicine.

"The current move by the publishers is wrong," the laureates wrote. "The NIH came through with an enlightened policy that serves the best interest of science, the scientists who practice it, the students who read about it, and the taxpayers who pay for it."

The subcommittee did not say when it will take further action on the legislation. But today's testimony was a bracing reminder that the war over public access is far from over, no matter how Mr. Conyers's proposed bill fares this fall.
Faculty Senate Library Committee

Open Access Campaign (2008 -2010)

Year 1 (2008 - 2009)

The first year of the campaign will focus on awareness and information with two main goals: (1) creating faculty support for the concept of Open Access; and (2) encouraging faculty to deposit papers in OSU’s Scholar’s Archive as a first step.

The committee will:

• **Conduct a Faculty Survey:** A brief survey of five or six questions will be conducted online through the Faculty Senate office’s Business Solutions Group software during fall term. Results will help inform the development of home page stories and a PowerPoint on Open Access.

• **Run Homepage Stories:** A series of three stories will run on the OSU Homepage. One will feature an interview with COAS researcher Pat Wheeler, a strong advocate for Open Access. One will feature an interview with Stuart Schieber of Harvard and coincide with a panel discussion of Schieber and several other noted scholars sponsored by the committee (see bullet point below). The third will coincide with the campus-wide roll-out of the PowerPoint across departments.

• **Sponsor a Panel Discussion:** Invite Stuart Schieber of Harvard, along with several other scholars, to speak to the Faculty Senate and answer questions about Open Access.

• **Create a PowerPoint:** The committee will put together a brief, to-the-point PowerPoint (10 slides) capturing the key issues in the Open Access debate.

• **Identify Departmental Spokespersons/Liaisons:** The committee, with input from the Library and the Research Office, will identify a liaison in each academic department who is willing to make a presentation at a faculty meeting and hold a discussion. The liaisons will report back to the committee on faculty attitudes.

Year 2 (2009 - 2010)

The second year of the campaign will focus on two goals: (1) formalizing a campus-wide “opt-out” policy requiring faculty to deposit their papers in the Scholars Archive; (2) laying the groundwork for a centralized “office for scholarly communication” as a go-to place for faculty to receive information and assistance on all questions of Open Access.
The below notes were attached to the April 23, 2008 Library Committee agenda.

Notes from telephone call with Stuart Scheiber, Harvard Computer Science professor, 4/11/08


Stuart is able to speak to the FSLC on April 23 at 4pm PST (7pm EST). I am arranging to use ICHAT and a projector so we’ll have video as well as audio. If that doesn’t work, we’ll simply have Dr. Scheiber call the phone in the Drinkward room of the library.

Stuart began working on the Harvard Open Access resolution about 3 years ago. It was a faculty led initiative with many groups involved. He initiated it with the University Librarian and Provost. The Provost formed a scholarly communications committee similar to the task force that was created by Faculty Senate here. That group did the work and presented the proposal to their Faculty Council (probably the equivalent of our Faculty Senate). Didn’t work with Research Office on this. RO is working on NIH mandate and his group is just beginning to work with RO on that. Strong support of Provost and library – very important. Worked with legal council and attorney at Villanova [Should ask more about this. Who was involved and at what point?]

They had conversations with many faculty over the course of those three years. [It would be good to ask him how this communication happened. Was it formal? Did the committee conduct surveys? Did they talk to individual academic units? Did they talk to department heads?]

They held two open forums, one for faculty and one for librarians before the resolution came up for a vote in February. Provide opportunity for faculty to vent.

What made it possible?:
  • Faculty led effort
  • Don’t make it appear to be library led because faculty will then think it is just economic – the library complaining about not having enough money to purchase subscriptions.
  • Be prepared with responses to the questions that will come up, including: Is this the end of peer review? Will this put price pressures on publishers? How will this affect scholarly societies’ ability to stay afloat? [Ask Stuart about how this will affect peer review and publishing long-term. If more and more universities do something like this, how will it affect publishers? Will they increase, rather than decrease prices?]
  • Emphasize broadening access to the research rather than economics.
Things to be prepared for:

- Knee-jerk negative reactions, natural unease, faculty who claimed it was a violation of their academic freedom, that faculty must have the right to publish in whatever journal they want to, even if that journal won’t accept the Harvard license. Allowing faculty to waive the license assuages this.
- Faculty are generally in favor of open access, but are concerned about unintended consequences.
- Be prepared with responses to the questions that will come up, including: Is this the end of peer review? Will this put price pressures on publishers? How will this affect scholarly societies’ ability to stay afloat?

The waiver:

- Anyone who requests a waiver, gets it. It is on an article-by-article basis. Opt-out rather than opt-in. Opt-in has been unsuccessful everywhere.
- He doesn’t use the term “mandate”, doesn’t like it. Says you can’t force faculty to do anything nor does he want to. Faculty won’t react well to any “mandate”. Gain the high ground by offering them the waiver. If they don’t want to do it they don’t have to. The end result is that most faculty will not elect to opt out and more research will be accessible.

[Ask him to explain how all of this works in practice. Does each faculty member ask the publisher to agree to Harvard license upon manuscript submission? If not, at what point? Does the publisher have to sign the license? Who is responsible for depositing the final version in an OA repository? Does everything go to the Harvard repository? Can we see that repository?]
Oregon State University Libraries
Strategic Plan 2004
8 November 2004

From the University Librarian

The OSU Libraries’ strategic plan calls for bold and decisive action including an accelerated migration from print to digital collections, providing for the resources needed to support being among the Top 10 land grant institutions, and active support of economic development activities. These strategic changes are based on extensive discussions with internal and external stakeholders and best practices research. This vision for the future will require a redefinition of the libraries’ relationship with OSU colleges and programs. OSU Libraries will create a partnership with each college based on its unique teaching and research agenda.

In conversations with our key stakeholders, we have received a clear and unambiguous message about the expectations for OSU Libraries. In the future, the libraries will:

- be competitive with our peer institution libraries;
- be as easy to use as Google and other search engines;
- deliver information wherever and whenever it is needed; and
- take the lead in archiving and preserving digital information.

This plan focuses the strengths and assets of OSU Libraries in its teaching role and in its support of the five thematic areas described in the OSU Strategic Plan. By targeting resources and aggressively moving to a full-text electronic environment, OSU Libraries will be a leading provider of information on campus and a leader in digital initiatives nationally and internationally. To meet the goals of the plan will require additional resources as well as a greater targeting of these resources.

I invite the campus community to review our strategic plan and to work with us in implementing its bold strategic agenda.

Karyle Butcher
Donald and Delpha Campbell University Librarian
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This strategic plan is a bold and imaginative call for the libraries to reposition itself with the OSU community. Key stakeholder groups including faculty, students, and the Library Advisory Council expect the libraries to be a prominent player as Oregon State University moves to implement the campus strategic plan. Each stakeholder group agreed that a Tier One university must have a Tier One research library. This means aggressively acquiring new resources and targeting available resources in a manner required to meet the increasing requirements of faculty and students.

OSU faculty and students have very clear expectations of the libraries. They want information delivered to them wherever they are located quickly and efficiently. In other words, they want the advantage of a Google search combined with high quality content. They want full text information and they want a means to easily share this information with other students and researchers. Finally, they expect OSU Libraries to take responsibility for ensuring that information in digital format will be archived and preserved with a set of standards that guarantee future access.

To meet these needs, OSU Libraries must focus on supporting the themes identified in the OSU strategic plan where it has the ability to make the greatest impact. Currently, this means focused attention to natural resources, oceanic and atmospheric sciences, and engineering and technology. We will do this by developing strong partnerships with faculty and students who teach and research in these fields. These partnerships will lead to discovering new funding opportunities, creating targeted digital collections to support students and faculty research, and redeploying library faculty to spend more time in the colleges.

OSU Libraries recognizes that the academic success of OSU students will require that the libraries play a greater role in the areas of student recruitment and retention. We will do this through increased participation in such programs as OSU CONNECT as well as collaborating with teaching faculty to increase student awareness of library resources.

The libraries are committed to designing virtual college libraries that will target individual student learning needs. To do this successfully, the libraries will work to develop tools to assess learning outcomes as well as best practices for teaching students with varying learning styles. Finally, OSU Libraries will work with others to ensure that students have barrier-free access to all library services.

In recognition of the growing need to provide information to support colleges and programs involved in economic development activities, OSU Libraries will expand its role as an information broker in the state. We will be a critical partner in fostering economic development by increasing our partnership with OSU Extension Services; by greater involvement with the Institute for Natural Resources; and by developing tools and resources that make remote access to library information seamless.
OSU Libraries embarks upon its strategic plan with enthusiasm and confidence. Through our current partnerships with the College of Forestry and the Institute for Natural Resources, we have proven that we can bring critical information to students, faculty, and state policy makers in an organized and efficient manner. By filling our Gray Family Chair for Innovative Library Services, we are positioned to be a national and international player in the world of digital information.

Our plan is ambitious. The table below demonstrates that for OSU Libraries to be competitive with our peers and to accomplish our vision for the future we will need new resources from state funding as well as from the private sector. Future investments in OSU Libraries will need to be substantial if we are to compete effectively with our peer academic libraries. Yet, investing in OSU Libraries is investing in the future success of OSU students and faculty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Institution Name</th>
<th>Total Library Expenditures</th>
<th>ARL Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>$25,656,448</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>California, Davis</td>
<td>$17,828,690</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>$39,759,708</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Illinois, Urbana</td>
<td>$32,996,914</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Michigan State</td>
<td>$20,616,822</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Ohio State</td>
<td>$27,045,276</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Pennsylvania State</td>
<td>$41,819,383</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Purdue</td>
<td>$17,442,905</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Texas A&amp;M</td>
<td>$24,468,359</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>$39,281,520</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
<td>$14,274,677</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Oregon State University</td>
<td>$8,912,390</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MISSION STATEMENT

The mission of the Oregon State University Libraries is to engage with the OSU community and the people of Oregon in their pursuit of knowledge, thereby advancing the role of OSU as a nationally recognized land grant university. We do this by:

• contributing to the development, management, and preservation of knowledge;
• providing excellent services, tools, and resources for learning and research;
• teaching our user community how to locate and evaluate information; and
• supporting life-long learning.
VISION
OSU Libraries are integral to the success of OSU, its colleges and programs, and its students and faculty. We will be the preferred source of quality information for the OSU community. We will be recognized as an innovative leader in defining the research library of the 21st century and for excellence in education on finding and evaluating information. We will develop new partnerships and collaborations to expand our services and to enhance our revenue base.
CORE VALUES
The OSU Libraries strive to live by the core values of the university: accountability, diversity, integrity, respect, and social responsibility. In support of our specific mission and role as a academic research library, we also value:

• learning and scholarship, which we enhance through innovation and collaboration within and outside the university;
• making information freely available to our community;
• intellectual freedom and patrons’ rights to privacy;
• preservation of information for future generations of scholars and students; and
• furthering democracy by having collections that reflect the widest possible range of viewpoints.
ENVIRONMENTAL CONTEXT
OSU Libraries deliver distinctive and outstanding service to the OSU community and the state of Oregon through our support of OSU’s research, instructional, and outreach missions. A dedicated commitment to proven and emerging technologies has enabled us to successfully develop unique collections and services. Our strengths include:

The Valley Library
The renovated and expanded Valley Library is a center for learning, study, and collaboration. Designed to make maximum use of technology, this spacious, technologically advanced building is heavily used by undergraduate students for both individual and group study. Conceived as a center for student learning and work, the library incorporates tutoring, research, and the necessary technology support for the effective completion of student papers and projects. The Valley Library has developed a variety of technologies for finding and using information productively and efficiently. In addition to its collections, the Valley Library also houses the Northwest Art Collection, a collection of more than 100 paintings, sculptures, photographs, and mixed media artworks.

The Guin Library
Located within OSU’s Hatfield Marine Science Center (HMSC), the Guin Library is recognized nationally for its strong collection with particular depth in marine fisheries. Guin Library staff tailors services and resources to address the information needs of OSU faculty and students, state and federal agency researchers located at HMSC, marine resource managers, public policy makers, and private industry.

OSU Cascades Library Services
OSU Libraries supports the information and research needs of the OSU Cascades campus through innovative collaborative partnerships. Working cooperatively in a unique inter-institutional setting, Cascades Library staff provide services and collections that serve the growing presence of OSU in Central Oregon.

Noteworthy collections – paper and digital
Excellent collections in natural resources, marine science, forestry, and agricultural science are an important part of the libraries offerings. The papers of Ava Helen and Linus Pauling are a cornerstone in our Special Collections’ focus on the history of 20th century science. In recent years, a significant portion of this collection has been digitized to produce an invaluable resource for researchers across the globe. Other digital collections including the Pacific Northwest Stream Survey, Virtual Oregon: A Natural Resources Digital Library and the Braceros in Oregon photograph collection have received considerable recognition for both their regional historical relevance and distinctive quality.

Partnerships and research collaboration
The OSU Libraries are recognized for their contributions to statewide, regional, and national library organizations. Membership in the Orbis Cascades Alliance consortium has provided OSU faculty and students access to over 27 libraries, 22 million books, and other critical reference and research materials. Recently, the libraries have joined with OSU departments to explore collecting, maintaining and making available digital research by OSU faculty and students through institutional repositories. In a time of significantly reduced funding, we have partnered with the University of Oregon Libraries to construct a mutually beneficial program of collection management.
Technology, innovation, and digital initiatives

In addition to on-campus relationship-building, OSU Libraries enjoy a loyal base of support from alumni and private donors. These gifts allow for the pursuit of new initiatives, particularly those that involve innovative uses of technology. The Valley Library is known for its Information Commons, a sizeable array of state-of-the-art public-use computer workstations, software, and printers that are busy with students day and night. A growing number of users take advantage of the wireless networking technology within the Valley Library for laptop computers. We are committed to the development of targeted digital libraries to serve specific clientele. In the last year, we have deployed a storage area network (SAN) to accommodate the tremendous storage requirements associated with the creation of such collections. The libraries have also invested significant resources in redesigning and updating our computing infrastructure.

Commitment to outreach

OSU Libraries have taken a leadership role among Oregon academic libraries in reaching out to Oregonians across the state. These efforts are unique among OUS libraries. We extend our expertise and service mission beyond the boundaries of the OSU community, demonstrating a commitment to improving the quality of life for all Oregonians. We have partnered with the OSU Institute for Natural Resources to support delivery of information and services related to the protection and management of Oregon's vitally important natural resources.

The OSU Libraries have a variety of valuable resources at our disposal, including:

Innovative faculty and staff

OSU Libraries faculty and staff are typically described by patrons as helpful, friendly, and professional. As stewards of information literacy and access to information, our faculty, staff, and administration are actively involved in instructional support and consultation, as well as classroom teaching. Many OSU Library faculty and staff collaborate with peers and colleagues on recognized programs of research locally, regionally, nationally, and internationally. Such exceptional performance is even more significant given that our budget has been historically lean when compared to other academic libraries at similarly-sized institutions.

Resource sharing

OSU Libraries actively participate in library consortia to provide increased access to information resources. Students and faculty can request books from libraries in the Orbis Cascades Alliance consortium. Our membership in the Greater Western Libraries Alliance (GWLA) provides access to collections in other libraries as well. OSU Libraries fully covers all costs involved in obtaining materials from other sources—no fees or charges are passed on to faculty or students.

Technology

OSU Libraries’ investment in technology enables efficient management of the campus library collections as well as participation in regional library consortia. The OSU community uses the state-of-the-art technology in the Information Commons and library-loaned laptops via the wireless network to access electronic information and applications software. Electronic classrooms are available for instructing students, staff, and faculty in effectively using the libraries’ catalog and database collections.
Discretionary funds
OSU Libraries are fortunate to have two substantial endowments: the Donald and Delpha Campbell Endowed Chair and the Gray Family Chair for Innovative Library Services. These endowments support distinguished library faculty as well as provide funds for innovative projects and the purchase of significant library materials that are beyond the reach of state funds. Generous donations from library supporters are dedicated to the purchase of books and journals that enhance both the general collection and targeted subject areas. Donated and grant funds provide the flexibility to take advantage of opportunities to leverage other revenue and form internal and external partnerships.

In addition to our strengths and resources, the OSU Libraries have many competitive advantages that help distinguish us from our peers:

Continuing donor support
OSU Libraries continue to gain and retain support for our collections and technology initiatives through private funding, including two endowed chairs, other endowments, and recurring gifts.

The Valley Library
The special design of the building accommodates independent and collaborative work, and encourages the social interaction of students and faculty on campus. Because of its beauty and functionality, the Valley Library is a recruitment tool for students and a vibrant part of campus life.

The Guin Library
The unique location of the library within the HMSC research complex positions OSU to take advantage of renewed interest in the ocean and its resources. Its capacity and quality enhance OSU’s reputation in the marine science community.

Agility
The libraries’ organization proactively shifts to meet the challenge of changing technology and increasing faculty and student requirements. The organizational culture values innovation and risk taking as evidenced by early adoption of computer technology, investment in campus-wide collaborations such as the Institute for Natural Resources, and the leveraging of private funds to secure grant funding.

A record of success
OSU Libraries are successful in completing projects we undertake, developing financial resources through grants and private funding, and assembling necessary expertise. In 1999, the Valley Library was the first academic library to be named Library of the Year by the Library Journal. OSU Libraries is the only academic library in Oregon to have two librarians named Oregon librarian of the year.

Unique collections
The Ava Helen and Linus Pauling Papers are internationally recognized, now with much of the collection available in digital format. The opening of the website was noted in Science and the New York Times, and was the subject of a homepage feature of National Geographic magazine. In the first three months that the website was available to the public, it received more than 1.6 million hits. The OSU Libraries are also host to the History of Atomic Energy Collection and the Bernard Malamud Papers, among many other collections of note.

Leadership, regionally and nationally
OSU Librarians play a leadership role in state, regional and national library associations. Library faculty have been recognized for their unique contributions to the profession by the Library of Congress, the Oregon Library Association, and the Library Journal.
STRATEGIC GOALS AND STRATEGIES

Goal 1: OSU Libraries will change the information landscape at OSU by providing faculty and students with the information they require - whenever and wherever they require it.

Outcome Measures

By 2010, through the steps called for in this strategic plan:

• Availability of digital content in the OSU Libraries will triple.
• Usage of electronic content will increase by a factor of six.
• User satisfaction, for both print and electronic collections, will increase relative to the targeted investment strategy.
• Users will have access to library systems that are be easy to learn, use, and customize.
• Information will be easily manipulated by users after retrieval.
• Users will be able to retrieve targeted information more effectively.
• Faculty and students will be able to exchange information more easily.
• Born-digital content produced at OSU will be collected and preserved.

Strategies

A. Pioneer information management tools to enable targeted and rapid information retrieval.

Actions

a. Provide easy-to-use tools that enable students and faculty to obtain authoritative, quality information at their point of need.
b. Work with software developers and content providers to improve and create tools for managing and organizing information.
c. Strive for ADA compliance in the delivery of information regardless of format.

B. Capture and preserve faculty and student intellectual capital to enable researchers to dynamically and easily work together.

Actions

a. Develop standards and criteria for institutional repositories.
b. Invest in staff and equipment needed to implement institutional repositories.
c. Identify early adopters and partners for institutional repositories with OSU colleges and departments.
d. Develop, in conjunction with the OSU Graduate School, procedures for electronic submission, access and archival storage of theses and dissertations.
e. Integrate institutional repositories with other digital initiatives.
C. Create nationally and internationally recognized digital collections that enable OSU’s faculty and researchers to have immediate access to critical information and enhance OSU Libraries’ reputation as a leader in providing quality digitized and born-digital content.

**Actions**
- a. Develop a sustainable framework for creating and preserving digital collections.
- b. In collaboration with OSU and other statewide agencies, identify opportunities for building key digital collections.
- c. Digitize OSU owned materials in support of state, national and international digital collections.

D. Strategically acquire and expand collections to align with the OSU five thematic areas.

**Actions**
- a. Assess specific user community needs to identify core collections.
- b. Enhance collection of electronic journals, databases and books.
- c. Enhance collection of print materials in targeted disciplines.
- d. Enhance collection of video and other non-print materials in targeted disciplines.
- e. Increase the rate of collections migration from paper to digital based on user community input and in conjunction with the development of a regional depository for print archives.
- f. Strategically build shared collections with other universities.
- g. Commit to long-term preservation of selected subject and collection areas.
- h. Digitize OSU-owned materials in support of the five thematic areas.

E. Contribute to changing the international economic model of scholarly publishing and communication to ensure access to critical information.

**Actions**
- a. Support alternative publishing models.
- b. Educate faculty and administrators on issues of scholarly communication.
- c. Negotiate favorable license agreements.
- d. Influence policies, license agreements and access rights through purchasing decisions, consortia memberships and discourse with publishers and authors.
Goal 2: OSU Libraries will be a critical partner with OSU colleges and programs by contributing to the academic success and life-long learning of OSU students.

Outcome measures
By 2010, through the steps called for in this strategic plan:
• OSU colleges and programs will recognize the critical role OSU Libraries play in teaching and learning by an increase in their support for library programs.
• Library instruction will be incorporated across the curriculum.

Strategies
A. Deliver tailored services to the teaching and learning needs of OSU faculty and students and alumni.

Actions
a. Co-develop with faculty ‘virtual college libraries’ to make targeted information easily available to students.
b. Assess student and faculty requirements for tailored library services that contribute to academic excellence.
c. Align OSU Libraries’ resources to support college strategic initiatives, research programs, and teaching.
d. Develop innovative delivery methods for instruction in library research.
e. Canvas OSU alumni to determine what tailored library services they require.

B. Take a leadership role in promoting information literacy as an academic goal of OSU.

Actions
a. In partnership with OSU faculty, design an information literacy program to reach students at critical points in their academic career.
b. Participate in curriculum planning at the university level to promote information literacy.
c. Establish relationships with community college partners to prepare students for transfer to OSU.
d. Develop, in collaboration with OSU faculty, assessment tools for measuring student success in using and understanding library resources.

Goal 3: OSU Libraries will be a critical partner in fostering economic development in Oregon communities.
Outcome Measures

By 2010, through the steps called for in this strategic plan:

• OSU Libraries’ will have established partnerships with OSU colleges and statewide partners required to promote economic development.
• OSU Libraries’ will be a primary source of reliable economic development information used by Oregonians, statewide, and regional partners.
• Oregon communities and individuals will have increased capacity to successfully build new economic activity as a result of the information resources provided by OSU Libraries and their partners.

Strategies

A. Partner with OSU colleges, departments and programs to identify, select, organize, deliver, and preserve information required to support economic development activities.

Actions

a. Provide tools and expertise that enable OSU colleges, departments, and programs to access and preserve information.
b. Secure funding to support the creation of an OSU Libraries economic development web portal.

B. Expand OSU Libraries’ outreach programs to support state and local agencies’ economic development.

Actions

a. Create virtual tools and provide professional development training for public library staff to support their economic development activities.
b. Expand OSU Libraries’ outreach programs to support statewide economic development efforts.

C. Leverage OSU Libraries’ technological capacity to support economic development activities in Oregon communities.

Actions

a. Make available search and tutorial tools to Oregonians and statewide public library partners.
b. Identify opportunities for revenue generation with OSU colleges and statewide partners through the delivery of professional services including digitizing, organizing, delivering, and preserving information.
c. Develop licensing agreements with content providers to provide Oregonians, statewide, economic development information resources currently restricted to the OSU community.
OSU Libraries Strategic Planning Committee Members 2004
Karyle Butcher, University Librarian
Bonnie Allen, Associate University Librarian

Richard Brumley, Head of Collection Development
Anne Christie, Reference Librarian
Rick Crelia, Library Technology
Linda Kathman, Technical Services
Margaret Mellinger, Reference Librarian
Jane Nichols, Reference Librarian
Elizabeth Nielsen, OSU Archives
Ruth Vondracek, Head of Reference

Tom Dowling, College of Business,
Facilitator Kevin Bokay, Executive Assistant to the University Librarian
Karen Russ, Administrative Assistant
Jordan Gushwa, Graphic Designer
OSU Libraries Strategic Planning Stakeholder involvement

The OSU Libraries strategic planning effort was informed by several small group discussions with external advisory groups, constituent groups of the OSU community and individual meetings between college deans and the university librarian. These focused discussions were held early in the planning stages and facilitated by the planning consultant and representatives of the library planning committee.

Group Discussions

- Library Advisory Committee: membership external to OSU representing interests in technology, industry, law and business.
- Research representing OSU Departments of Horticulture, Botany and Plant Pathology, History, Biochemistry and Biophysics, the College of Oceanic and Atmospheric Sciences, and the Center for Gene Research and Biotechnology.
- Instruction representing OSU Departments of Human Development and Family Science, Forest Engineering, Botany and Plant Pathology, Sociology, and Wood Science.
- Outreach representing the OSU Graduate School; Dean of Students; Extension; Difference, Power and Discrimination; Students with Disabilities; and the Honors College.
- Associate deans representing the OSU School of Education, College of Oceanic and Atmospheric Sciences, College of Science, College of Liberal Arts, Health and Human Sciences, College of Business, Pharmacy, and the College of Engineering.
- Undergraduate students.
- Graduate students.
Faculty Senate Library Committee Standing Rules

The Library Committee advises the University Librarian in 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 and policies of the library to the University; and 4) identifying and addressing issues regarding scholarly communication. The committee consists of nine Faculty members, ideally providing a broad representation of academic disciplines, and three Student members, including at least one undergraduate and one graduate student, the University Librarian designee as an ex-officio, non-voting member. One faculty member may be retired.
Faculty Senate Library Committee and Scholarly Communications Task Force

Timelines and guidance for preparing articles for OSU This Week

Topics and Authors

Introduction (Pollitz)
1. Cost of journals (Kerkvliet, Carter)
2. Impact Factors (Engle, Walker)
3. Open access (Witbeck)
4. OSU Institutional Repository (Michael Boock & Melodie Putnam)

Per discussion with Mark Peterson 21 February 2006:

All articles should be ready at the same time.

Because of space limitations articles should be 300-400 words maximum. (articles can refer to library web page for additional information.)

Outlines (2-4 sentences) due 6 March. This is so that Mark Peterson has a better idea of what will be covered.

Proposed timeline for writing articles:

Drafts submitted to Library Committee and Task Force 20 March.
Comments due to authors 27 March.
Revisions due to Committee and Task Force 3 April.
Drafts due to Mark Peterson 13 April.
Mark Peterson will review and comment by 20 April.
Final revisions due 28 April. (Introduction due on 21 April).

Publication Dates

27 April Introduction (Pollitz)
4 May Cost of journals (Kerkvliet, Carter)
11 May Impact Factors (Engle, Walker)
18 May Open access (Witbeck)
25 May OSU Institutional Repository (Michael Boock & Melodie Putnam)
Appendix 3. Review of journals used for COAS publications.

The Task Force analyzed subscription costs for journals most often used by faculty from three OSU units (Chemistry, COAS, and Human Development and Family Sciences). For the period from 1994-2003 COAS faculty published most frequently in 42 journals. These included 20 commercial publishers, 20 professional journals, and Science and Nature that were put in a separate category. The resulting data base was used for a cost comparison for print subscriptions and evaluation of differences in impact factor. Costs for electronic subscriptions are even more convoluted (time period covered by electronic versions, permanent archiving, bundling of less important journals, etc.). Neither electronic subscriptions nor author costs (page charges and reprint costs) are covered here.

The collective cost to the library for these journals in 2004 was $73,812. Commercial journals cost on average $0.98 per page. Professional journals cost on average $0.39 per page. Publication costs are similar for these journals so the difference in price per page reflects the larger net profit that commercial publishers are collecting for their products. Science and Nature cost only $0.15 per page, but these two journals bring in a substantial amount of their revenue from advertisement.

Science and Nature are popular publishing venues due to their extremely high impact factors (mean = 30.38). Science is published by AAAS (a professional society) and Nature is published by the Nature Publishing Group (a commercial publisher). COAS authors published 33 papers in these two journals between 1994-2003. This represents 4% of the articles included in the data base.

The average impact factor for the other commercial journals was 1.796. The average impact factor for the professional society journals was 2.580. This indicates that the professional journals not only cost less per page (for library subscriptions) but also represent a significantly higher quality of scientific publication. COAS authors published 484 articles in professional society journals between 1994-2003. This represents 62% of the articles included in the data base.

The Task Force encourages faculty to publish in professional rather than commercial journals when they have a choice. We also encourage faculty to review for professional and to decline to review papers for commercial journals. Continued support of the professional society journals will help promote the sustainable pricing of scholarly publications for academic institutions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COAS Journal name</th>
<th>Library Cost</th>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>2003 IF</th>
<th>2004 Pages Per Year</th>
<th>(94-03) Times Published</th>
<th>Cost Per Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commercial Journals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appl. Geochem.</td>
<td>$1,140</td>
<td>Elsevier</td>
<td>1.804</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atmosph. Environ.</td>
<td>$5,707</td>
<td>Elsevier</td>
<td>7121</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chem. Geol.</td>
<td>$3,817</td>
<td>Elsevier</td>
<td>4059</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cont. Shelf Res.</td>
<td>$2,130</td>
<td>Elsevier</td>
<td>2.330</td>
<td>2551</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep Sea Res. II</td>
<td>$4,950</td>
<td>Elsevier</td>
<td>3101</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earth Planet. Sci. Lett.</td>
<td>$3,774</td>
<td>Elsevier</td>
<td>6859</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel</td>
<td>$2,910</td>
<td>Elsevier</td>
<td>1.167</td>
<td>2443</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta</td>
<td>$2,673</td>
<td>Elsevier</td>
<td>5204</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Mar. Systems</td>
<td>$2,319</td>
<td>Elsevier</td>
<td>2343</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar. Chem.</td>
<td>$2,143</td>
<td>Elsevier</td>
<td>2.555</td>
<td>2044</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Geology</td>
<td></td>
<td>Elsevier</td>
<td>3689</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org. Geochem.</td>
<td>$3,028</td>
<td>Elsevier</td>
<td>1.712</td>
<td>1634</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>$1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress in Oceanography</td>
<td>$2,518</td>
<td>Elsevier</td>
<td>1166</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Fluid Mech.</td>
<td>$2,303</td>
<td>Cambridge Univ.</td>
<td>1.811</td>
<td>9284</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.</td>
<td>$4,691</td>
<td>InterResearch</td>
<td>5809</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary-Layer Meteorology</td>
<td>$2,222</td>
<td>Kluwer</td>
<td>2218</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Origins life Evolution Biosphere</td>
<td>$598</td>
<td>Kluwer</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Petrology</td>
<td>$1,159</td>
<td>Oxford Univ.</td>
<td>2612</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Plank. Res.</td>
<td>$452</td>
<td>Oxford Univ.</td>
<td>1566</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROFESSIONAL SOCIETIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geochem. Geophys. Geosystems</td>
<td>$585</td>
<td>AGU</td>
<td>2885</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geophys. Res. Lett.</td>
<td>$1,593</td>
<td>AGU</td>
<td>2.422</td>
<td>6520</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>$0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Biogeochem. Cycles</td>
<td>$596</td>
<td>AGU</td>
<td>2.338</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Geophys. Res.</td>
<td>$6,782</td>
<td>AGU</td>
<td>2.992</td>
<td>31688</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>$0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paleocceanography</td>
<td>$426</td>
<td>AGU</td>
<td>3.043</td>
<td>1440</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>$0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Atmos. Ocean. Tech.</td>
<td>$349</td>
<td>AMS</td>
<td>1.637</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>$0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Atmos. Sci.</td>
<td>$730</td>
<td>AMS</td>
<td>2.641</td>
<td>3133</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Climate.</td>
<td>$622</td>
<td>AMS</td>
<td>3.617</td>
<td>4909</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Phys. Oceanogr.</td>
<td>$545</td>
<td>AMS</td>
<td>2.209</td>
<td>2856</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>$0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon. Wea. Rev.</td>
<td>$680</td>
<td>AMS</td>
<td>3077</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shore &amp; Beach</td>
<td>$51</td>
<td>ASBPA</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.31 estimated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limnol. Oceanogr.</td>
<td>$416</td>
<td>ASLO</td>
<td>3.329</td>
<td>2316</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>$0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Coastal Res.</td>
<td>$190</td>
<td>CERF</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>1252</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEEE Geosci.Remote Sensing</td>
<td>$590</td>
<td>GRS5</td>
<td>2892</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology</td>
<td>$539</td>
<td>GSA</td>
<td>3.065</td>
<td>1072</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microb. Ecol.</td>
<td>$1,015</td>
<td>ISME</td>
<td>1051</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Optics</td>
<td>$2,754</td>
<td>OSA</td>
<td>6687</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar. Mam. Sci.</td>
<td>$123</td>
<td>SMM</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanography</td>
<td>$810</td>
<td>TOS</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$20,903</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.580</td>
<td>484</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.39 Cost/Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature</td>
<td>$1,292</td>
<td>Nature</td>
<td>30.979</td>
<td>5908</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>$635</td>
<td>AAAS</td>
<td>29.781</td>
<td>8428</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$1,927</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30.380</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.15 Cost/Page</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Oregon State University

Category I Process
Allocation of Funding to the Valley Library

Procedures

(1) **Library Evaluation**: The Category I proposal (full or abbreviated) will be evaluated by the Valley Library staff prior to submission to the Office of Academic Programs.

(2) **Category I Final Draft**: The Library Evaluation will be attached to the Category I proposal and the four-year re-occurring or one-time non-reoccurring funds necessary to support the proposal will be identified in the budget pages of the proposal. The academic unit(s) responsible for transferring funds to the Valley Library will be identified in the Category I proposal.

(3) **OSU Review of the Category I Proposal**: The Category I will be reviewed, edited, and modified following review by the Curriculum Council, Graduate Council, Budget and Fiscal Planning Committee, Office of Academic Programs, Faculty Senate Executive Committee, Faculty Senate, and the Provost/Executive Vice President.

(4) **OUS Review of the Category I Proposal**: Following approval by OSU, the Category I proposal will be submitted to the OUS Office of Academic Affairs. The OUS Academic Council (council of OUS Provosts) will review the proposal prior to submission to the Oregon State Board of Higher Education for final approval.

(5) **OSU Campus Notification**: Following Board approval, the Office of Academic Programs will notify the campus community and specifically the academic unit(s) sponsoring the Category I proposal.

(6) **Budget and Fiscal Planning Office Notification**: The Office of Academic Programs will notify the Office of Budget and Fiscal Planning of the amount specified in the Category I proposal (one-time non-reoccurring or four-year annual transfer) for transfer to the Valley Library. The Office of Academic Programs will authorize the Budget and Fiscal Planning Office to initiate a voucher transfer from the academic unit(s) to the Valley Library.

(7) **Budget and Fiscal Planning Office Action**: The Office of Budget and Fiscal Planning will notify the academic unit(s) of the amount that is to be transferred (transfer voucher) to the Valley Library. If it is a reoccurring amount, the Budget and Fiscal Planning Office will set up an annual transfer of the specified amount not to exceed four years of fund transfer.

(8) **Two-Year Follow-up Review**: Included within the two-year follow-up review of the new program will be an assessment of the funds that were expended by the Valley Library in support of the new program.

Note: Even though a new program may be approved several months prior to implementation; e.g., Board approval occurs in December with actual implementation scheduled for the following Fall Term (September), the fund transfer will occur shortly after Board approval to facilitate the Valley Library acquiring the monographs and serials required of the new program.
Library Committee

Draft

OSU Libraries Vision Statement: 2002-2005
March 2002

DEFINITION

The OSU Libraries are critical to the university's instructional, research and public service programs. Library staff will continue to manage, develop and preserve large collections of printed materials. Digital resources will proliferate through purchase, gift, and reformatting. There will be a special emphasis on unique, primary source materials. Many resources and services will be available electronically via the network, but people will choose to use the library as a place to work, both for private study and for group project work. The libraries will continue to give users help with information and advice on the availability and use of learning materials and information technologies.

UNIVERSITY CONTEXT

The driving forces are economics, changing state demographics, and the availability of affordable technology. Controlling costs, increasing revenue, and demonstrating accountability are prominent concerns. There is an effort to plan comprehensively and strategically, particularly in light of the changing demographics of students, and evolving expectations of traditional and new constituencies. New emphasis on the use of information, revisions to university curriculum, and changing scholarly practices suggest the need for coordination among the entire university community. Increasing numbers of faculty enthusiastic about the potential of technology join the student body in urging better infrastructure and more resources dedicated to technology. Increasing specialization in the research arena combined with more collaboration across disciplines help shape how the university is organized. This new organization emphasizes and facilitates scholars working together. Private and federal support is vital.

SERVICE EMPHASIS

Oregon State University is a land, sea, and space grant university and is the predominant research university in the state. Recognizing this and the fact that different user groups require different services and resources and that the university's strategic direction is to build on its strengths in research and graduate education, the libraries will increasingly target specific services to these user communities. The OSU Libraries will continue to serve all of the OSU community of students, faculty, and staff as its primary users, but will emphasize services intended to aid faculty and graduate research, particularly in the fields of science and technology.

COLLECTIONS EMPHASIS

The OSU Libraries will continue to collect and provide access to research and curriculum materials needed by the OSU community of scholars and students. Increasing emphasis will be placed on providing digital materials to the library's primary clientele. This will necessitate decreasing funding and support for paper-based collections. In addition, to support this effort, the OSU Libraries will actively develop an organization structure and initiatives to digitize select materials and provide effective access to "born digital" as well as reformatted information.

STRATEGIC GOALS

- Provide effective, sustainable services that are tailored to defined user communities.
- Identify, acquire, preserve, and organize collections in all formats.
- Advocate strengthening the university's technological infrastructure and support services.
• Collaborate with private and public institutions to enhance resources and services.
• Promote a culture of employee excellence and effectiveness.
• Augment state budget support for programs and services by actively seeking grant funds and private support.
• Contribute to the academic community and library profession through research and scholarship.
• Increase the use of appropriate technology to enable the library to move further towards the use of digital resources and to offer other innovative services.
• Facilitate access to information resources through reference and research assistance, instruction, and cataloging and classification.

IMMEDIATE STRATEGIES AND GOALS

Organization

The OSU Libraries will assess internal operations and organizational structure to determine how to enhance, eliminate, or maintain services, pursue new initiatives, increase revenue, and operate in a fiscally responsible manner. OSU Libraries will continually assess and define services. As the libraries move towards desired strategic directions, work assignments will change.

• Develop a plan for services that focuses our efforts on OSU research and graduate student education.
• Assess current instruction efforts.
• Evaluate potential instructional and work models.
• Evaluate options that will increase the effectiveness of current public service points.
• Consolidate efforts in different departments when appropriate.
• Change or eliminate existing procedures and services.
• Review processing activities in all departments to determine crucial tasks, maximize efficiency, and eliminate the non-essential.
• Continuously review current and developing technologies in order to consider their possible application to library services.

Collections

• Develop a plan that directs the continued migration from a print to a more digital.
• Monitor use of resources as they move from paper to digital.
• Integrate into library operations the management and maintenance of born digital collections and digital libraries of reformatted information.
• Continue to strengthen the Digital Library Steering Committee’s efforts to formulate standards, policies, and procedures for the development and management of the libraries’ digital collections.
• Special Collections and the University Archives will continue to acquire new collections that fit within their existing collection policies. A new emphasis will be placed upon creating collections and materials that are “born digital” and that contribute to OSU’s digital library projects.
• Continue to raise TRF funds for collections and seek a permanent allocation.

Preservation/Conservation

• Review the management and maintenance of paper collections in terms of service goals and costs.
• Increase commitment to basic conservation practices including binding, handling, and repair.
• Collaborate with partners to preserve information in digital form.
• Plan the move of the Archives from the Kerr Administration Building.
• Participate actively in the Orbis Regional Library Services Center project to ensure high-quality space for infrequently used materials in the future.

Strategic Partnerships

• Continue to contribute to the activities and programs of various partner organizations.
• Seek other partnerships that have a demonstrated capacity to increase services and resources available to the OSU community.
• Review service agreements and memberships to determine if the value of the relationship is worth the expense.
• Continue to pursue ARL membership.
Funding

- Increase indirect cost allocation.
- Continue to work with the OSU Foundation to seek private gift support.
- Strengthen support for grant seeking efforts within the library.
- Ensure sustainability for grant-funded projects.
- Advocate for library fundraising within the university.
- Increase library collaboration in university grant seeking activity.
- Increase revenue with defensible, necessary charges for services.
- Work toward removing all subsidies.
- Ensure Category I proposals are funded.

Assessment

The OSU Libraries will create a culture of measurement, assessment, and evaluation through follow-up with the LibQual survey and other applicable assessment tools, and review of external organizations' practices.

- Collect and disseminate trend data and other information within library departments and programs.
- Produce a formal annual report to ensure that the staff and users understand the library's role, responsibilities, and service trends.

Employee Excellence

The OSU Libraries will provide developmental opportunities to develop skills and expertise, to increase management/leadership capacity, to further excellence in customer service, and to encourage scholarship.

- Continually evaluate and maintain reasonable and balanced staff workloads when reassigning, eliminating, or choosing not to fill positions.
- Recruit and hire talented, well-prepared staff.
- Establish performance standards and expectations.
- Provide opportunities to develop skills and expertise.
- Reward and recognize performance appropriately.
- Increase management and leadership capacity.
- Continue to support faculty research and scholarship.
- Mentor staff.

STRATEGIC CONCERNS

- Infrastructure, especially the campus technological infrastructure.
- Sufficient revenue (e.g. declining state base budget).
- Availability of qualified staff.
- Justifying/explaining tiered levels of service to the university.
- Gaining user acceptance for moving from paper to electronic resources.
- Internal effort and energy required to make these changes happen.

Tasks

(From Organization)
- Renegotiate agreements with service organizations located in the Valley Library including the Memorial Union and the OSU Federal Credit Union to increase revenue.
- Review all activities that involve possible loss from theft or vandalism to decrease risk and expenditures on maintenance and replacement.

(From Services)
- Re-evaluate ILL services.

(From Funding)
- Train professional staff in grant and gift seeking skills.
(From Collections)
- Analyze the materials budget allocations and assess the proportion of expenditures within the three broad discipline groups (Soc/Hum, Life Sciences, Physical Sciences) for print serials, electronic serials, standing orders, firm orders, and approvals.
- Formulate standards, policies and procedures for the development and management of OSUs digital collections.
- Address issues of planning and oversight for projects to create digital collections of reformatted information.
- Establish systems of maintenance of digital collections in the areas of metadata creation, technological support and user access.

(From Assessment)
- Participate in the 2003 Lib-Qual survey and compare to 2001 results.
- Plan for a formal assessment of the services within the Information Commons Create an effective suggestions system.

(From Employee Excellence)
- Continue support for training and travel.

DRAFT
Attachment for January 17, 2002 Agenda:

TO:        OSU Library Staff & Faculty
UO Library Staff & Faculty

FROM:  Karyle Butcher
Deborah Carver

RE:         Building a Shared Collection

Our respective libraries have a history of working collaboratively--as the two largest research libraries in the state and as members of Orbis. Given our similar responsibilities and challenges, we believe it is wise, if not imperative, to take full advantage of our proximity and to build on this foundation of cooperation.

In a recent meeting of administrators from both libraries, the concept of "building a shared collection" was discussed with enthusiasm and commitment. Both libraries are ready to pursue a new model for developing and maintaining our collections, particularly in light of the current fiscal difficulties facing higher education in Oregon. This new model is based on the goals of increased collection diversity, reduced redundancy, and efficient resource sharing.

The vision of a shared collection includes the following objectives:

- **Creating a single print archive.** As we both develop our e-journal collections and reference databases, we must move towards a single print archive whenever possible. First steps should focus on *Project Muse, J-Store,* and *BioOne titles.* Backfiles of printed indexes should also be examined, and only one copy should be retained in most cases.

- **Reducing duplication.** Duplicate copies of expensive journals should be closely scrutinized. In some cases, one copy between the two campuses can satisfy the collective demand. First steps should focus on the commercial equivalents of SPARC titles and 5-10 of the most expensive, highly specialized journals.

- **Resource sharing.** Both libraries are committed to providing the most efficient methods of sharing journal articles and bound volumes. First steps should focus on joint participation in appropriate services, e.g., RAPID, and revising circulation policies to enable cost-effective document delivery.

- **Creating Diversity.** Adding titles that are not available in either library will enhance research on both campuses. First steps should focus on identifying mutual interests which can be served with a single subscription.

In January, a joint task force will be appointed to begin the process and establish additional goals and timelines. Implementation of these objectives will improve rather than diminish access to information. Success will depend upon good communication, faculty confidence, and a willingness to push beyond technical and procedural barriers.

We look forward to this new level of collaboration and further discussions with all of you.
Oregon State University seeks to rank among the top ten land grant institutions in the United States. Achieving this goal requires improving infrastructure though targeted investments. In particular, increased funding for OSU Libraries Collections will be necessary to support faculty and student success, enhance research and teaching, and improve the Return on Investment (ROI) for OSU Libraries (OSUL).

Currently, OSUL’s budget relies on state funding and other sources, including:

- E&G $3.2M Collections
- TRF range $550,000-$750,000 FY09-12
- Library fines, $118,000 fy11 (3.6%)
- Gift funds

The current budget structure, together with annual inflation, has created a number of challenges for OSUL.

1) OSUL can only support the existing collections, which increase in price 7 – 9 % annually due to inflation, by cutting subscriptions and holding positions open.

2) The grant awarded Technology Resource Fees provides 17 - 23% of the OSUL collections budget. This means that a high percentage of OSUL’s budget rests on an unstable, variable funding source.

3) Library fines contribute 3.6% to OSUL budgets, but this amount decreases every year and many libraries nationwide are ceasing to collect fines.

4) OSUL employs many strategies to contain costs, including several recommended by the 2011 report Redefining the Academic Library. These include rightsizing the print collection, aligning purchases with demand, reducing scholarly publishing costs, and externalizing lower-value activity.

While OSUL has met these funding challenges with a variety of innovative, cost-saving measures, it is clear that the existing funding model is inadequate to raise OSUL to match libraries at top ten land grant institutions. The OSUL Faculty Senate Library Committee recommends increasing support to $9.43M by 2016 to match the median of OSU peers, to maintain existing collections, and to provide access to new content.

**Target: Increase support of OSU Libraries Collections Budget to $9,426,000 by 2016.**

---


**Peer Comparators**

Compared to OUS designated peers, OSUL collections receive the least amount of support.

![OUS-Designated Peer Institutions Library Collection Expenditures, 2010](chart1)

OSUL also has the lowest expenditures per FTE student.

![Total Library Expenditures per FTE Student, 2010](chart2)
Library expenditures per R&D dollar fall in the middle of OUS’s peers.

**The Impact of Campus Growth on OSU Libraries Collections Budget**

With OSU growing at the rapid pace of eight percent over each of the last two academic years, OSUL faces additional challenges in sustaining current collections and negotiating reasonable prices on new resources.

Nearly half of OSUL’s expenditures on the most expensive databases are contingent upon the size of the OSU student body and related university growth. Information product vendors frequently determine their pricing based on campus characteristics such as student FTE, number of faculty or students in a department, overall demand on or use of the resource, and even research output. This means that OSUL’S prices increase as the student body continues to grow and more faculty are hired to support them.

New degree programs also drive OSUL’s costs. From 2009-2011 the library would have needed approximately $65,000 in new money to adequately support the proposed new programs in their first year; $40,000 of this total would become ongoing costs. This support ranged from adding critical journals (e.g. *Nature Climate Change*), to new databases (*PAIS* - a public affairs database), to new print or online book collections.
TO ATTAIN SUPPORT AT THE LEVEL OF OUS PEERS

Scenario 1 (Note: OSUL will not reach our peers’ medians using this scenario)

Step 1:
Over the next four years add 4% per year for a total 16% increase.
3,200,000 + 128,000 = 3,328,000 (yr1)
3,328,000 + 133,120 = 3,461,120 (yr2)
3,461,120 + 138,444 = 3,599,564 (yr3)
3,599,564 + 143,982 = 3,743,546 (yr4)
3,743,546 Total Budget 2016

Step 2:
After year four tie the collections budget to student growth. OSU experiences growth of 1.8% - 2% per year.
1.8% 3,743,546 + 67383 = 3,810,929
2% 3,743,546 + 74870 = 3,818,416

Scenario 2
To reach the median of OUS peers, OSU Libraries collection budget would be increased by 66% or $6,226,000. Distributed across 4 years looks like this
3,200,000 + 1,556,500 = 4,756,500 (yr1)
4,756,500 + 1,556,500 = 6,313,000 (yr2)
6,313,000 + 1,556,500 = 7,869,500 (yr3)
7,869,500 + 1,556,500 = 9,426,000 (yr4)
9,426,000 Total Budget 2016
Faculty Senate Library Committee  
May 9, 2011

Data from a variety of sources can be compiled and analyzed to identify gaps.

PLEASE NOTE: ALL DATA ARE EXAMPLES AND GIVE A SNAPSHOT OF OSU LIBRARIES FULL BUDGET.

Wishlist-Snapshot of Need

- Subject librarians capture faculty requests and resource needs in a database. Items are reviewed and prioritized as funds become available. Wishlist currently has over $1,000,000 worth of requests on it (~70% annual costs).
  - Mix of one-time purchases and subscriptions
  - Mix of full text content and discovery tools
  - Mix of books, journals, and primary source collections
  - Mix of librarian-identified and faculty/student-identified resources

- Examples of requested items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Req date</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Annual price</th>
<th>1Time Fee</th>
<th>Librarian</th>
<th>Requestor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4/28/11</td>
<td>Early English Books Online ProQuest</td>
<td>9,442</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nichols</td>
<td>English, History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/15/11</td>
<td>America's Historical Newspapers-Select-Oregonian;1850-1987</td>
<td>45,738</td>
<td>1,372</td>
<td>Nichols</td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/30/11</td>
<td>Springer Earth Science Ebooks 2011</td>
<td>8,301</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wirth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/22/11</td>
<td>Conservation Letters</td>
<td>470</td>
<td></td>
<td>Avery</td>
<td>Ken Vance-Borland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/18/11</td>
<td>Journal of the Association for Research on Mothering back issues</td>
<td>262</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nichols</td>
<td>Kryn Burton-Freelimg; Women Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/24/11</td>
<td>Ecohydrology</td>
<td>1,560</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wirth</td>
<td>Allison Danner/Water Res Grad Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/3/11</td>
<td>Violence Against Women journal</td>
<td>1,027</td>
<td>1,027</td>
<td>Nichols</td>
<td>Women Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/4/11</td>
<td>Dissertations and Theses (formerly Dissertation Abstracts)</td>
<td>12,755</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wirth</td>
<td>Collection Development Dept</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The hiring of 100 new faculty will present an opportunity for the acquisition of new collections if faculty request materials as part of their hiring package. Subject librarians may field requests for unfunded resources that may end up on the wishlist.
Interlibrary Loan Services

- **Scan & Deliver**
  - OSU Libraries scans print items requested by patrons. The most requested items can be identified for conversion from print to electronic. The cost for moving to electronic can be higher and often includes ongoing fees not associated with print.
  - Example: the following titles were requested 40 and 35 times respectively showing demand for immediate access.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal Name</th>
<th>Number of Requests/Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Journal of counseling psychology.</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of personality and social psychology.</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Interlibrary loan items requested from other libraries**
  - Below are titles most requested by OSU faculty and students from last fiscal year. The same analysis as above can be applied to these titles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Number of Requests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The International Journal of Quality &amp; Reliability Management</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Psychology</td>
<td>Health and Human Sciences</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thermochimica Acta</td>
<td>Health and Human Sciences</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hortsience</td>
<td>Agricultural Sciences</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbohydrate Polymers</td>
<td>Agricultural Sciences</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Nanotechnology</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinics in Perinatology</td>
<td>Health and Human Sciences</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Journal for Specialists in Group Work</td>
<td>Teacher and Counselor Education</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infection Control and Hospital Epidemiology</td>
<td>Veterinary Medicine</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of physical activity &amp; health</td>
<td>Health and Human Sciences</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Psychology</td>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural Education &amp; Technology Journal</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Local Journal Utilization Report (LJUR)

Shows journal titles where our faculty publish, which titles they cite and titles where they were cited for the years 1981-2008.

- Example shows titles OSU faculty cited:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3206</td>
<td>OECOLOGIA</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2190</td>
<td>MAR BIOL</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1782</td>
<td>THEOR APPL GENET</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1551</td>
<td>BOUND-LAY METEOROL</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1166</td>
<td>PLANT SOIL</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Projecting Rising Costs

OSU’s rising FTE affects OSUL’s electronic resources costs because some vendors determine their costs based on an institution’s FTE. We anticipate our costs going up because of OSU’s goal to increase student FTE.

- Example 1: LexisNexis Academic is an essential resource for undergraduate research. It provides news, industry, and legal sources appropriate for undergraduate research at all levels. It is used heavily, for example, in the WR 121 courses. The price for LexisNexis Academic is $1.89 per student FTE. Because of our increase in student FTE, OSU’s price went up by nearly $1700 between 2010 and 2011.

- Example 2: in Fall of 2010 OSU’s FTE was 19,877. Many faculty and students will use PsycArticles a critical resource providing full text access to the major psychology journals. Once OSU’s FTE hits 20,000 our price will increase by $6500 per year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Full-Time Equivalents</th>
<th>APA Data Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>15,000-19,999</td>
<td>$20,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>20,000-24,999</td>
<td>$27,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>25,000-59,999</td>
<td>$28,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>60,000+</td>
<td>Contact APA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cost Avoidance

OSUL frequently participates in consortial purchasing to acquire content. We belong to formal and informal consortia. Participation results in significant cost savings.

- In FY2010, OSUL paid $82,926 for $286,768 worth of content as part of the Orbis-Cascade Alliance. Over $200,000 was saved. And, this provides access to quality content: Taylor and Francis journal titles, Duke e-journals, Ebsco databases—most used by our students and others.
- From the Greater Western Library Alliance we have even more significant savings. Through our participation we avoided $686,785 in 2009. Titles purchased were IEEE, Wiley-Blackwell and BioOne. Despite this great savings, our subsequent budget required difficult cuts—which affected our participation in the Wiley deal.

Annual supplements to the base budget

- Example 1: Technology Resource Fee: Annually OSU Libraries requests funding to maintain and expand the electronic book, journal and database collections. TRF funding has become an essential subsidy for the continuation of electronic content for all students. With increased enrollment, it is imperative that the Libraries be able to maintain and build a collection that meets the needs of students.
- Example 2: Library gift funds are intended to enhance the collections, acquire and provide access to content to round out holdings. In some years, OSU Libraries relies on gifts for standard purchases.

LibQual Data and Comments

- “The library's biggest flaw is the lack of ebooks. Everyone has smartphones, ereaders, & tablets & we want ebooks for loan!"
- “The most valuable service that the library offers me is access to online databases of journals and technical articles. I am very satisfied with the library website search capabilities, I just wish we had more articles. I am successful at finding a lot, but there are also a lot that I can't access because we don't have subscriptions to them.”
- “The library service is improving...it was very frustrating to do a research project remotely with a paper due in a week and not be able to access information soon enough.”
- “I wish the library had access to more online journals. Interlibrary loan is wonderful but having instant access to more journals would facilitate learning.”
Category 1 Reviews

From 2009 to early 2011, 19 category I proposals were sent to the library. These new program proposals are required to have a library collection assessment completed. Of these 19, 9 made recommendations for funding for library collections. Some were simply to bring book collections in new undergraduate programs up to par. Other requests indicated a need to purchase essential databases and journals to effectively support graduate programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Cost (initial)</th>
<th>Cost (Ongoing)</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Earth Sciences BS</td>
<td>Online Encyclopedias and Nature Climate Change</td>
<td>$12,600</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Admin (MS)</td>
<td>Ebook funding (PDA)</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Policy PhD</td>
<td>PAIS database</td>
<td>$10,400</td>
<td>$10,400</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Masters</td>
<td>Books and Journals</td>
<td>$5,433</td>
<td>$5,433</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Engineering BS</td>
<td>Books and Journals</td>
<td>$5,400</td>
<td>$5,400</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Humanities Certificate</td>
<td>Books and 1 journal recommended by faculty</td>
<td>$1,695</td>
<td>$655</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F/W administration (MS)</td>
<td>databases and ebook</td>
<td>$5,350</td>
<td>$5,350</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability dual degree BA/BS</td>
<td>AASHE membership</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources (MS)</td>
<td>journals, databases, books</td>
<td>$21,500</td>
<td>$9,500</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$65,878</td>
<td>$43,738</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Peer comparisons

We can determine where OSUL falls in comparison to similar institutions for overall budget and expenditures.

![Chart showing library expenditures, professional salaries & wages, and total materials expenditures for various institutions]
Appendix A:

Faculty Senate Library Committee

Standing Rules

The Library Committee advises the University Librarian in (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 communication (e.g. print and electronic journals and books). The Committee consists of nine Faculty members, ideally providing a broad representation of academic disciplines, and three Student members, including at least one undergraduate and one graduate student, and the University Librarian, or designee, as an ex-officio, non-voting member. One faculty member may be retired.

Membership -- 2011-2012

| Stacey Smith, Chair '12                       | History                               |
| Naomi Hirsch (v. Williams) '12               | Environ Health Sciences Center        |
| David Myrold '12                             | Crop & Soil Science                  |
| Lindy Brown '13                              | Academics for Student Athletes       |
| Rich Carter '13                              | Chemistry                             |
| Kira Hughes '13                              | Forestry                              |
| Marit Bovbjerg '14                           | Public Health                         |
| Hsiou-Lien Chen '14                          | Design & Human Environment            |
| Bruce Geller '14                             | Microbiology                          |

Student Members -
- Laura Cray, History of Science
- Vacant
- Vacant

Ex-officio: University Librarian (Faye Chadwell)

Executive Committee Liaison – Starr McMullen
Faculty Senate Library Committee  
October 21, 2011

Data from a variety of sources can be compiled and analyzed to identify gaps in OSU Libraries’ Collection.

PLEASE NOTE: THESE ARE EXAMPLES AND ONLY GIVE A SNAPSHOT OF DATA AVAILABLE.

USE-BASED

INTERLIBRARY LOAN SERVICES

- Scan & Deliver
  - OSU Libraries scans print items requested by patrons. The most requested items can be identified for conversion from print to electronic. The cost for moving to electronic can be higher and often includes ongoing fees not associated with print.
  - Example: the following titles were requested 40 and 35 times respectively showing demand for immediate access.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal Name</th>
<th>Number of Requests /Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Journal of counseling psychology.</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of personality and social psychology.</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Interlibrary loan items requested from other libraries
  - Below are titles most requested by OSU faculty and students from last fiscal year. The same analysis as above can be applied to these titles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Number of Requests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The International Journal of Quality &amp; Reliability Management</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Psychology</td>
<td>Health and Human Sciences</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thermochimica Acta</td>
<td>Health and Human Sciences</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hortscience</td>
<td>Agricultural Sciences</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbohydrate Polymers</td>
<td>Agricultural Sciences</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Nanotechnology</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinics in Perinatology</td>
<td>Health and Human Sciences</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Journal for Specialists in Group Work</td>
<td>Teacher and Counselor Education</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infection Control and Hospital Epidemiology</td>
<td>Veterinary Medicine</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of physical activity &amp; health</td>
<td>Health and Human Sciences</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Psychology</td>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural Education &amp; Technology Journal</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compiled by Jane Nichols & Andrea Wirth for FSLC
LOCAL JOURNAL UTILIZATION REPORT (LJUR)

Shows journal titles where our faculty publish, which titles they cite and titles where they were cited for the years 1981-2008.

- Example shows titles OSU faculty cited:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cites</th>
<th>Work</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3206</td>
<td>OECOLOGIA</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2190</td>
<td>MAR.BIOL</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1782</td>
<td>THEOR.APPL.GENET</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1551</td>
<td>BOUND.LAY</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1166</td>
<td>PLANT SOIL</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COLLECTION GAPS

WISHLIST

Subject librarians capture faculty requests and resource needs in a database. Items are reviewed and prioritized as funds become available. The wishlist currently has over $1,000,000 worth of requests on it (~70% are annual costs).

- Mix of full text content and discovery tools
- Mix of books, journals, and primary source collections
- Mix of librarian-identified and faculty/student-identified resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Req date</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Annual price</th>
<th>1Time Fee</th>
<th>Librarian</th>
<th>Requestor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4/28/11</td>
<td>Early English Books Online ProQuest</td>
<td>9,442</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nichols</td>
<td>English, History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/15/11</td>
<td>America's Historical Newspapers-Select-Oregonian,1850-1987</td>
<td>1,372</td>
<td>45,738</td>
<td>Nichols</td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/30/11</td>
<td>Springer Earth Science Ebooks 2014</td>
<td>8,301</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wirth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/22/11</td>
<td>Conservation Letters</td>
<td>470</td>
<td></td>
<td>Avery</td>
<td>Ken Vance-Borland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/18/11</td>
<td>Journal of the Association for Research on Mothering back issues</td>
<td>262</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nichols</td>
<td>Kryn Burton-Freehling; Women Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/24/11</td>
<td>Ecohydrology</td>
<td>1,560</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wirth</td>
<td>Water Res</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/3/11</td>
<td>Violence Against Women journal</td>
<td>1,027</td>
<td>1,027</td>
<td>Nichols</td>
<td>Women Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/4/11</td>
<td>Dissertations and Theses (formerly Dissertation Abstracts)</td>
<td>12,755</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wirth</td>
<td>Collection Developmen t Dept</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compiled by Jane Nichols & Andrea Wirth for FSLC
The hiring of 100 new faculty presents an opportunity for the acquisition of new collections if faculty request materials as part of their hiring package. Subject librarians may field requests for unfunded resources that may end up on the wishlist.

**CATEGORY 1 REVIEWS**

From 2009 to early 2011, 19 Category I proposals were sent to the library. These new program proposals are required to have a library collection assessment completed. Of these 19, 9 included recommendations for funding for library collections. Some were simply to bring book collections in new undergraduate programs up to par. Other requests indicated a need to subscribe to essential databases and journals in order to effectively support graduate programs.

In some cases new resources are funded by the departments for a temporary period of time. After that the library integrates the new resource into its regular collection management cycle.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Cost (initial)</th>
<th>Cost (Ongoing)</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Earth Sciences BS</td>
<td>Online Encyclopedias and Nature Climate Change</td>
<td>$12,600</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Admin (MS)</td>
<td>Ebook funding (PDA)</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Policy PhD</td>
<td>PAIS database</td>
<td>$10,400</td>
<td>$10,400</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Masters</td>
<td>Books and Journals</td>
<td>$5,433</td>
<td>$5,433</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Engineering BS</td>
<td>Books and Journals</td>
<td>$5,400</td>
<td>$5,400</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Humanities Certificate</td>
<td>Books and Journals</td>
<td>$1,695</td>
<td>$655</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F/W administration (MS)</td>
<td>Databases and ebooks</td>
<td>$5,350</td>
<td>$5,350</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability dual degree BA/BS</td>
<td>AASHE membership</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources (MS)</td>
<td>Journals, databases, books</td>
<td>$21,500</td>
<td>$9,500</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$65,878</td>
<td>$43,738</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**LIBQUAL+ DATA AND COMMENTS**

OSU Libraries uses the LibQual+ survey to measure the quality of library services based on OSU student and faculty perceptions. In Spring 2011, OSU Libraries administered the survey and received numerous comments about our collections such as these:

- "The library's biggest flaw is the lack of ebooks. Everyone has smartphones, e-readers, & tablets & we want ebooks for loan!"
- "The most valuable service that the library offers me is access to online databases of journals and technical articles. I am very satisfied with the library website search capabilities; I just wish we had more articles. I am successful at finding a lot, but there are also a lot that I can't access because we don't have subscriptions to them."
- "The library service is improving...it was very frustrating to do a research project remotely with a paper due in a week and not be able to access information soon enough."


**BUDGET**

**PROJECTING RISING COSTS**

OSU's rising FTE affects OSUL's electronic resources costs because some vendors determine their costs based on an institution's FTE. We anticipate our costs going up because of OSU's goal to increase student FTE.

- Example 1: LexisNexis Academic is an essential resource for undergraduate research. It provides news, industry, and legal sources appropriate for undergraduate research at all levels. It is used heavily, for example, in the WR 121 courses. The price for LexisNexis Academic is $1.89 per student FTE. Because of our increase in student FTE, OSU's price went up by nearly $1700 between 2010 and 2011.

- Example 2: in Fall of 2010 OSU's FTE was 19,877. Many faculty and students will use PsycArticles a critical resource providing full text access to the major psychology journals. Once OSU's FTE hits 20,000 our price will increase by $6500 per year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Full-Time Equivalents</th>
<th>APA Data Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>15,000-19,999</td>
<td>$20,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>20,000-24,999</td>
<td>$27,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>25,000-59,999</td>
<td>$28,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>60,000+</td>
<td>Contact APA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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PEER COMPARISONS

We can determine where OSUL falls in comparison to similar institutions for overall budget and expenditures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Total Library Expenditures</th>
<th>Professional Salaries &amp; Wages</th>
<th>Total Materials Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A &amp; M</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn State</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California, Davis</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX: STEWARDSHIP/WHAT WE'RE DOING NOW

Good stewardship of the collection budget is integrated into our processes and something we are always working to improve. Here are a few examples.

COST AVOIDANCE

OSUL frequently participates in consortial purchasing to acquire content. We belong to formal and informal consortia. Participation results in significant cost savings.

- In FY2010, OSUL paid $82,926 for $286,768 worth of content as part of the Orbis-Cascade Alliance. Over $200,000 was saved. And, this provides access to quality content: Taylor and Francis journal titles, Duke e-journals, Ebsco databases—most used by our students and others.
- Through opportunities with the Greater Western Library Alliance (GWLA) we avoided $686,785 in 2009 and approximately $20,000 in 2010. Savings ranged from 2% to 58% of list price for a variety of products. Resources included in our current GWLA deals are ASTM, IEEE, and BioOne. Through 2009 we participated in the GWLA Wiley deal. Despite this great savings, our subsequent budget required difficult cuts in 2009 - which affected our participation in the Wiley deal.

ANNUAL SUPPLEMENTS TO THE BASE BUDGET

- Example 1: Technology Resource Fee: Annually OSU Libraries requests funding to maintain and expand the electronic book, journal and database collections. TRF funding has become an essential subsidy for the continuation of electronic content for all students. With increased enrollment, it is imperative that the Libraries be able to maintain and build a collection that meets the needs of students.
- Example 2: Library gift funds are intended to enhance the collections, acquire and provide access to content to round out holdings. In some years, OSU Libraries relies on gifts for standard purchases.

TRACKING ACTUAL USE

- We regularly look at our e-resources use. For journals and other full-text materials we look at downloads on a regular basis and other data as practical (OSU author publications, citations, and editorships for example).
- For our print book collection we have incorporated circulation into our allocation formula.
Faculty Senate Library Committee
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Data from a variety of sources can be compiled and analyzed to identify gaps in OSU Libraries’ Collection.

PLEASE NOTE: THESE ARE EXAMPLES AND ONLY GIVE A SNAPSHOT OF DATA AVAILABLE.

USE-BASED

INTERLIBRARY LOAN SERVICES

- Scan & Deliver
  - OSU Libraries scans print items requested by patrons. The most requested items can be identified for conversion from print to electronic. The cost for moving to electronic can be higher and often includes ongoing fees not associated with print.
  - Example: the following titles were requested 40 and 35 times respectively showing demand for immediate access.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal Name</th>
<th>Number of Requests/Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Journal of counseling psychology.</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of personality and social psychology.</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Interlibrary loan items requested from other libraries
  - Below are titles most requested by OSU faculty and students from last fiscal year.
  - The same analysis as above can be applied to these titles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Number of Requests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The International Journal of Quality &amp; Reliability Management</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Psychology</td>
<td>Health and Human Sciences</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thermochimica Acta</td>
<td>Health and Human Sciences</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hortsience</td>
<td>Agricultural Sciences</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbohydrate Polymers</td>
<td>Agricultural Sciences</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Nanotechnology</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinics in Perinatology</td>
<td>Health and Human Sciences</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Journal for Specialists in Group Work</td>
<td>Teacher and Counselor Education</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infection Control and Hospital Epidemiology</td>
<td>Veterinary Medicine</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of physical activity &amp; health</td>
<td>Health and Human Sciences</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Psychology</td>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural Education &amp; Technology Journal</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compiled by Jane Nichols & Andrea Wirth for FSLC
**LOCAL JOURNAL UTILIZATION REPORT (LJUR)**

Shows journal titles where our faculty publish, which titles they cite and titles where they were cited for the years 1981-2008.

- Example shows titles OSU faculty cited:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3206</td>
<td>OECOLOGIA</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2190</td>
<td>MAR BIOL</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1782</td>
<td>THEOR APPL GENET</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1551</td>
<td>BOUND-LAY METEOROL</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1166</td>
<td>PLANT SOIL</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COLLECTION GAPS**

**WISHLIST**

Subject librarians capture faculty requests and resource needs in a database. Items are reviewed and prioritized as funds become available. The wishlist currently has over $1,000,000 worth of requests on it (~70% are annual costs).

- Mix of full text content and discovery tools
- Mix of books, journals, and primary source collections
- Mix of librarian-identified and faculty/student-identified resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Req date</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Annual price</th>
<th>1Time Fee</th>
<th>Librarian</th>
<th>Requestor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4/28/11</td>
<td>Early English Books Online ProQuest</td>
<td>9,442</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nichols</td>
<td>English, History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/15/11</td>
<td>America’s Historical Newspapers Select Oregonian;1850-1987</td>
<td>1,372</td>
<td>45,738</td>
<td>Nichols</td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/30/11</td>
<td>Springer Earth Science Ebooks 2011</td>
<td>9,304</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wirth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/22/11</td>
<td>Conservation Letters</td>
<td>470</td>
<td></td>
<td>Avery</td>
<td>Ken Vance-Borland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/18/11</td>
<td>Journal of the Association for Research on Mothering back issues</td>
<td>262</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nichols</td>
<td>Kryn Burton-Freehling; Women Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/24/11</td>
<td>Ecohydrology</td>
<td>1,560</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wirth</td>
<td>Water Res</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/3/11</td>
<td>Violence Against Women journal</td>
<td>1,027</td>
<td>1,027</td>
<td>Nichols</td>
<td>Women Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/4/11</td>
<td>Dissertations and Theses (formerly Dissertation Abstracts)</td>
<td>12,755</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wirth</td>
<td>Collection Developmen t Dept</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strikethrough indicates item purchased.
- The hiring of 100 new faculty presents an opportunity for the acquisition of new collections if faculty request materials as part of their hiring package. Subject librarians may field requests for unfunded resources that may end up on the wishlist.

**Category 1 Reviews**

From 2009 to early 2011, 19 Category I proposals were sent to the library. These new program proposals are required to have a library collection assessment completed. Of these 19, 9 included recommendations for funding for library collections. Some were simply to bring book collections in new undergraduate programs up to par. Other requests indicated a need to subscribe to essential databases and journals in order to effectively support graduate programs.

In some cases new resources are funded by the departments for a temporary period of time. After that the library integrates the new resource into its regular collection management cycle.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Cost (initial)</th>
<th>Cost (Ongoing)</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Earth Sciences BS</td>
<td>Online Encyclopedias and Nature Climate Change</td>
<td>$12,600</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Admin (MS)</td>
<td>Ebook funding (PDA)</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Policy PhD</td>
<td>PAIS database</td>
<td>$10,400</td>
<td>$10,400</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Masters</td>
<td>Books and Journals</td>
<td>$5,433</td>
<td>$5,433</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Engineering BS</td>
<td>Books and Journals</td>
<td>$5,400</td>
<td>$5,400</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Humanities Certificate</td>
<td>Books and journals</td>
<td>$1,695</td>
<td>$655.</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F/W administration (MS)</td>
<td>Databases and ebooks</td>
<td>$5,350</td>
<td>$5,350</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability dual degree BA/BS</td>
<td>AASHE membership</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources (MS)</td>
<td>Journals, databases, books</td>
<td>$21,500</td>
<td>$9,500</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$65,878</strong></td>
<td><strong>$43,738</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LIBQUAL+ DATA AND COMMENTS

OSU Libraries uses the LibQual+ survey to measure the quality of library services based on OSU student and faculty perceptions. In Spring 2011, OSU Libraries administered the survey and received numerous comments about our collections such as these:

- “The library’s biggest flaw is the lack of ebooks. Everyone has smartphones, e-readers, & tablets & we want ebooks for loan!”
- “The most valuable service that the library offers me is access to online databases of journals and technical articles. I am very satisfied with the library website search capabilities; I just wish we had more articles. I am successful at finding a lot, but there are also a lot that I can’t access because we don’t have subscriptions to them.”
- “The library service is improving...it was very frustrating to do a research project remotely with a paper due in a week and not be able to access information soon enough.”


BUDGET

PROJECTING RISING COSTS

OSU’s rising FTE affects OSUL’s electronic resources costs because some vendors determine their costs based on an institutions FTE. We anticipate our costs going up because of OSU’s goal to increase student FTE.

- Example 1: LexisNexis Academic is an essential resource for undergraduate research. It provides news, industry, and legal sources appropriate for undergraduate research at all levels. It is used heavily, for example, in the WR 121 courses. The price for LexisNexis Academic is $1.89 per student FTE. Because of our increase in student FTE, OSU’s price went up by nearly $1700 between 2010 and 2011.
- Example 2: in Fall of 2010 OSU’s FTE was 19,877. Many faculty and students will use PsycArticles a critical resource providing full text access to the major psychology journals. Once OSU’s FTE hits 20,000 our price will increase by $6500 per year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Full-Time Equivalents</th>
<th>APA Data Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>15,000-19,999</td>
<td>$20,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>20,000-24,999</td>
<td>$27,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>25,000-59,999</td>
<td>$28,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>60,000+</td>
<td>Contact APA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PEER COMPARISONS

We can determine where OSUL falls in comparison to similar institutions for overall budget and expenditures.
APPENDIX: STEWARDSHIP/WHAT WE’RE DOING NOW

Good stewardship of the collection budget is integrated into our processes and something we are always working to improve. Here are a few examples.

COST AVOIDANCE

OSUL frequently participates in consortial purchasing to acquire content. We belong to formal and informal consortia. Participation results in significant cost savings.

- In FY2010, OSUL paid $82,926 for $286,768 worth of content as part of the Orbis-Cascade Alliance. Over $200,000 was saved. And, this provides access to quality content: Taylor and Francis journal titles, Duke e-journals, Ebsco databases—most used by our students and others.
- Through opportunities with the Greater Western Library Alliance (GWLA) we avoided $686,785 in 2009 and approximately $20,000 in 2010. Savings ranged from 2% to 58% of list price for a variety of products. Resources included in our current GWLA deals are ASTM, IEEE, and BioOne. Through 2009 we participated in the GWLA Wiley deal. Despite this great savings, our subsequent budget required difficult cuts in 2009 - which affected our participation in the Wiley deal

ANNUAL SUPPLEMENTS TO THE BASE BUDGET

- Example 1: Technology Resource Fee: Annually OSU Libraries requests funding to maintain and expand the electronic book, journal and database collections. TRF funding has become an essential subsidy for the continuation of electronic content for all students. With increased enrollment, it is imperative that the Libraries be able to maintain and build a collection that meets the needs of students.
- Example 2: Library gift funds are intended to enhance the collections, acquire and provide access to content to round out holdings. In some years, OSU Libraries relies on gifts for standard purchases.

TRACKING ACTUAL USE

- We regularly look at our e-resources use. For journals and other full-text materials we look at downloads on a regular basis and other data as practical (OSU author publications, citations, and editorships for example).
- For our print book collection we have incorporated circulation into our allocation formula.