LIBRARY COMMITTEE
ANNUAL REPORT FOR 2009-2010

I. Committee Charge

The Library Committee (LC) reviews, consults and advises on, plans for, and receives reports and recommendations on the performance of library services, automation, budget, administrative structure, and allocation of resources. Responsibility for keeping the faculty informed of major issues and for creating opportunities for the faculty to discuss priorities also falls to the committee. (See *Faculty Policies and Procedures* 6.46.B.)

II. Summary of Recommendations and Actions

Primary issues focused on by the LC during 2009-2010 included:

A. Budget
    Budget discussions centered on the outcomes of the Library Management Group process redesign, the base reduction issues that the campus and the libraries responded to including the reductions in FTEs, LTEs, and project appointments, and analysis of library operations.

B. Collection Development
    Further reductions in print subscriptions were made. There was an increase in open access publications. A large multi-year license was signed with Wiley/Blackwell that provides access to a greater number of journal titles for lower cost.

C. Library Collaborations and Partnerships
    Increasing collaborations and partnerships is a strategic priority of the libraries. Two important partnerships included the Go Big Read common book program and the Google Books/HathiTrust partnership.

D. Campus Library Spaces
    Discussions were ongoing regarding the importance of an off-site preservation shelving facility and the need to repurpose campus library spaces. LC is represented on the Campus Planning Committee and has over the years indicated their support to the planning committee and to the Faculty Senate for the off-site facility and the repurposing of campus library spaces.

E. Library Usage
    More than 4.2 million visitors come to campus libraries each year. The libraries continue to be successful in providing the resources and services that support the needs of students, faculty, and staff. LC has been an important resource in providing input regarding the needs important to campus faculty.

F. Miscellaneous
    Presentations were made throughout the year by campus librarians and other campus experts on issues of interest to the committee.

III. Detail of Current/Past Year's Activities and Issues

    A. Budget

        1. Budget and staff reductions
The General Library System (GLS) staff provided ongoing reports to the LC regarding the budget and staff reductions that were being made. As of July 1, 2010 the GLS completed a 7.3 FTE reduction out of a total 9.3 FTE reduction that must be made by July 1, 2011. The GLS also reduced its budget by $528,835, which is part of a larger reduction of $746,135 that must also be made by July 1, 2011. The series of reductions represents a total cut in the base budget of $1,087,135. These reductions have come from reducing collection budgets, supplies and equipment budgets, hours of operations, professional development and travel, and the personnel line.

The GLS is complying with an overall message from campus administration to downsize staff, consolidate services and programs, reassign staff based on priorities, use data to inform decisions, and align decisions with the goals and initiatives of the chancellor.

        2. "Moving Forward"
The library management updated the LC on the redesign efforts that took place throughout the year in response to budget reductions. The "Moving Forward" principles include centralizing functional services, reducing service points, eliminating duplicative collections and formats, and circulating fewer collections. The libraries will continue to provide innovative services in areas including research collaborations, designing new learning facilities, managing non-bibliographic data/information, infrastructure for arts and humanities, transforming textbooks and course materials. See Appendix 1 for a summary of the redesign efforts and "Moving Forward" principles.

In 2010-2011 the libraries will make some reductions in library hours and student budgets and will want to help staff develop different skill sets to build strength in strategic areas; the value of the libraries is in the staff and the information resources that they manage.

        3. Development and fund raising
The Library Committee has indicated that they would like to participate in future discussions on development and fund raising, and they support the libraries' progress on an annual giving campaign.

    B. Collection Development

There are ongoing reductions to print journal subscriptions, and the libraries have elected to purchase electronic-only journal subscriptions with five major publishers representing more than 700 titles. Retaining the print copies of these journals adds 5-10 percent to the cost; these subscription conversions represent approximately $50,000 in savings. Other publishers will be considered in 2010-2011. The libraries also joined the CIC-negotiated Wiley-Blackwell license, which has a 4% annual price cap and a 2.5% cancellation margin. It is a 3-year license (2010-2012).

C. Library Collaborations and Partnerships

1. Go Big Read Common Book Program
    Sarah McDaniel reported that the first year of the Go Big Read program in 2009 was a success with the author event drawing more than 8,000 people. The book was used in 131 classes, and more than 8,600 books were distributed to faculty, students, and staff. The second year of Go Big Read is underway with the chancellor's selection of *The Immortal Life of Henrietta Lacks* by Roberta Skloot. The author will make a presentation at the Kohl Center on October 25, 2010. Plans are underway by faculty to incorporate the book into their 2010 classes. The book will be distributed free to freshman students at convocation and at the Center for the First Year Experience office.

2. The Madison Initiative for Undergraduates (MIU)
    The libraries reported on their desire to increase partnerships for projects developed for MIU funding. The Digital Studies Initiative will address services to undergraduates across disciplines and schools with four key areas of interest: media, visual, information, and technology literacy. This project offers an opportunity for collaboration with the libraries and undergraduate curriculums and supports new areas of study on campus. Some opportunities include: providing support for community involvement of digital studies; working with faculty and DoIT to create websites that integrate libraries with teaching and learning; providing spaces to support digital studies such as the media studio in College Library.

3. E-Textbooks and online study tools
    Blair Bundy and John Thompson from DoIT provided information to the LC about an ongoing partnership with the libraries that is looking into the areas of e-textbooks and study tools and services, to help students and faculty. The libraries have talked with LC faculty members about possible partnerships in the development of an e-textbook.

4. Humanities
    As part of the Year of the Humanities, Ken Frazier proposed the creation of a Digital Humanities Initiative that might result in a Digital Humanities Center that would be part of the libraries. It would be a space to support the community doing such work and would emphasize collaborative work environments. Such efforts are supported by the LC as well as faculty including Jon McKenzie and Michael Witmore, who is leading the Working Group for Digital Inquiry housed in Memorial Library.

D. Library Spaces

1. Preservation facility
    There were ongoing discussions about the off-site shelving facility, and the libraries were finally successful in obtaining approximately $2 million in funding from the campus for the development of such a facility. The facility is necessary as the libraries continue to add two linear miles of book per year to the collections. The libraries are appreciative to the LC for their constant support and representation of the libraries to the Faculty Senate.

_____

2. Repurposing library spaces
   There are continuing efforts by the libraries to repurpose spaces throughout campus libraries in order to address growing and changing resource and space needs of faculty, staff, and students. There is an emphasis on thinking about what the future libraries should look like and what types of services will be needed in a 21st-century library. The LC will provide important feedback on these issues in discussions about the changing instructional and research needs of faculty and students.

E. Library Usage

The campus libraries report that usage continues to be strong. The libraries had more than 4.2 million visitors during the last year; the majority of those visitors were students. The libraries will work with LC and University Communications to sharpen constituents' understanding of how students use library spaces. Donors, external constituents, and others need to know the myriad activities that take place at campus libraries. Library administration is creating a multimedia presentation that will be used in presentations and communications to these constituencies. LC provided input into the areas that might be highlighted including: stop-action video in College Library during exam periods; students engaged in collaborative research in Special Collections or the art libraries; highlighting study rooms and special-purpose spaces and places being heavily used by students; using focus groups to get students to discuss their use of libraries; highlighting special resources and technologies that are available for students to use.

F. Miscellaneous

The LC was pleased to host presentations to learn more about library services and resources. David Null, director of University Archives and Records Management, presented an overview of services offered by the libraries through this unit. It is responsible for the records management of the university and houses the official university records. Staff of the unit are also responsible for documenting and preserving the history of the university. They provide outreach to campus groups, departments, and programs as well as to organizations and individuals across the state. New technologies and ways of sharing information have led to changes in how records are maintained, and new methods are being developed to provide access to the materials. Archives is developing large online collections of university documents including the Badger Yearbook, class albums, and oral histories, and some oral history clips are now available through iTunesU.

IV. Future Priorities for 2010-2011

A. Building the off-site preservation facility
B. Budget reduction discussions
C. Collaborations with campus partners for library spaces and digital initiatives
D. Scholarly communication and open-access needs on campus

V. Summary/Recommendations

The support and involvement of the LC in ongoing library activities continues to be very important. LC has been instrumental in conveying to the Faculty Senate and colleagues the importance of such issues as: the diminishing collections budget, the need for a preservation facility, and scholarly communication and open-access publishing. LC support is also important in creating additional opportunities for collaboration on a variety of activities from publishing to development.

(continued)

VI. Committee Membership (2009-2010)

Elected Faculty (voting members)
Timothy Allen (Botany)
Ivy Corfis (Spanish and Portuguese)
Cynthia Jasper (Human Ecology)
Joseph Kemnitz (Physiology), chair
Ernesto Livorni (French and Italian)
Katherine (Trina) McMahon (Civil and
    Environmental Engineering)
John Pfotenhauer (Mechanical Engineering)
David Weimer (LaFollette School of Public Affairs)

Academic Staff (voting members)
Allison Kaplan (Library and Information Studies)
Pamela Wilson (UW Press)

Students (voting members)
No students were appointed

Ex officio (nonvoting members)
Phillip Braithwaite (Budget Planning and Analysis)
Jocelyn Milner (Academic Planning and Analysis)

Librarians (nonvoting members)
Steven Barkan (Law Library; LCC liaison)
Kenneth Frazier (Director, General Library System)
Sarah McDaniel (Memorial Library)
Lisa Saywell (Memorial Library)
Edward Van Gemert (Deputy Director, General
    Library System)

Appendix 1
Library Management Group: Process Redesign Discussions, February-August 2009
Summary Report

Overview:
In the budget climate of this past year, the GLS Library Management Group (LMG) initiated a series of discussions, facilitated by Nancy Thayer-Hart of the Office of Quality Improvement. During these meetings, we reviewed GLS work processes in order to better align our resources with our priorities.

LMG reviewed current practices in five areas: technical services, administration, public services, information technology, and information resources (physical and electronic).

After each area was afforded an in-depth discussion of current practices, we identified the most important issues and divided them into areas that need attention now and areas that would soon need additional attention. We are now creating a process to examine current practices; when necessary, redefine best practices in those areas; and develop plans to achieve those best practices.

During the process, "anticipated budget reductions" became "real budget reductions," creating a greater urgency to find ways to maintain excellent service with fewer resources.

Process:
The group began by defining the activities of each area. Because there is overlap among these activities, the planning areas were described and populated simply to help us focus our discussions on broad functional areas.

We also undertook a project to identify current use of staff resources in each area, providing an overall picture of FTE, by activity, in the various GLS libraries. This overview gave all LMG members better shared knowledge of the different approaches to managing our services and the work that goes on in each area at the broadest level.

For each area of discussion, we reviewed the strategic plan and the "moving forward" principles to help identify priorities within that area. We then looked for opportunities to do new things, form new partnerships, or possibilities to do existing things in new ways. We also considered activities that could be consolidated, handed off, or ended. Finally, we considered what metrics are available or appropriate for assessing activities.

As each area was discussed, issues that raised concerns about current practice or activities that were seen as growing in importance were identified for further evaluation.

Following the discussion of all five functional areas, each LMG member submitted no more than three priorities from each of the five areas for additional discussion. A wrap-up meeting allowed us to identify and agree upon some areas to begin pursuing as projects. In subsequent analysis, we also identified the status of various priorities, many of which involve work already being pursued by groups or committees.

(continued)

_____

Outcomes:
The following areas were determined to need priority attention for process improvements:
- Public services space planning and assessment
    - Public services: consolidation of physical service points
- Information resources strategy
    - Reduction in print duplication across campus
    - E-journal/digital format for journals
    - Preservation policy
    - Shelving/space for collections – short- and long-term
    - Collection funding issues
    - Digital selection
- Overall space planning vision
- Staffing models into the future
- Web services and related support
- Resource discovery
- Donor/development efforts
- Technical services: review additional consolidation possibilities
- Reserves processing and collections: review consolidation possibilities
- Marketing and communication
    - Plan for strategic communications
- Human resources: retirements/succession planning
- Continued library roles for future:
    - Publishing
    - Repository strategy

Additional attention is also needed for:
- Google Initiative: move from project to fully integrated workflow (staff reallocation)
- Retrospective conversion (ensure continuation of efforts through staff reallocation)
- Selection framework across budget lines
    - Role of gift funds
- Acquisitions
    - E-licensing
    - Patron-driven acquisitions
- Information technology
    - R&D
    - Consolidation opportunities (infolab/library IT)
    - Cost/benefit assessment of IT projects
- Academic services and service points
    - Liaison
    - Scholarly communication
    - Faculty partnerships
- Overall UWDCC role
    - CTS/preservation/UWDCC relationship
    - Metadata
    - Selection
- Media, equipment, non-standard reformatting
- End-processing/local processing of materials
- CTS centralization/staff realignment
- ILL/DD funding models
- Administrative assessment needs
- Budget accountability

_____

Next steps:
A broad communication plan is necessary for sharing information about the process so far and plans to take the issues to the next step. LMG will report on the current state of activities already in place for each of the areas identified.

A general vision for the future includes:
- Focus on campus libraries as a whole
- Collectively serve the needs of the university community
- Need to meet differing needs of various patron groups/communities (no "one size fits all")
- Library with and without space; with and without physical collections
- Redefined service model: focus on services provided
- Everything is changing: disruptive innovation

(continued)

_____
UW-Madison Fac Doc 2214 - 4 October 2010

Appendix 2

To: Library Committee
From: Richard Reeb
Subj: Shift to e-access in 2010 for major publishers' journals

Reasons for relying on e-journals and cancelling print subscriptions
• Users' preference for online access
• Shelving/space required for storing volumes
• Reduced binding costs
• Staff time required to manage and maintain print can be reallocated
• Reduced subscription costs

Publishers targeted for print cancellations in 2010
• Elsevier
• SAGE
• Springer
• Taylor and Francis
• Wiley-Blackwell

Why these publishers?
• Account for nearly $3M of campus library expenditures
• Over 500 print subscriptions realizing a subscription savings of ca. $50K
• Licenses with these publishers secure us ownership rights to online format
• Participants in either Portico or LOCKSS, means for UW Libraries to retain access to purchased content if their businesses fail

Impact of cancelling print by broad discipline
• Area Studies: 15%
• Humanities: 11%
• Sciences: 7%
• Social Sciences: 67%

_____