

**COMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY & SCHOLARLY COMMUNICATION  
MINUTES  
November 10, 2016**

**Present:** Eileen Zurbriggen (*chair*), Dimitris Achlioptas, Michael Cowan, T.J. Demos, Graeme Smith, Elizabeth Cowell (ex-officio), Susan Perry (LAUC Chair), Alix Norton (LAUC Vice Chair), Wendy Lin (UGSR)

**Absent:** Chelsea Blackmore, Gabriela Ramieraz-Chavez (GSR)

**Announcements**

Members approved September 29 minutes.

Chair informed members she would like to extend the duration of the meeting to two hours in the winter quarter and will send out the faculty letter after minor updates. She disclosed that in attending the department meetings, faculty has conveyed a strong desire to consult with the Library.

Librarian Cowell shared with members that donors are funding Bright Spot, an experience design consultancy to re-imagine the S&E library spaces with a focus on undergraduate STEM students. The contract began this month and they expect to have a case statement by the end of the year. Bright Spot has met with forty students, student support services, Student Success Steering Committee, Director of the Center for Innovative Teaching and Learning, etc. Bright Spot Consulting has previously worked with the UCSD, Davis, and UCLA libraries.

**Consultation with University Librarian Cowell & Collections Development Librarian Kerry Scott**

Librarians Cowell and Scott previously reported to the committee on the Science & Engineering Library consolidation project in May and were invited to provide an update on the project and discuss the specific question raised from faculty, along with COLASC's questions. Librarian Cowell expressed that they are focused on the student experience. Half of the overall collections budget is dedicated to STEM fields. She also pointed out that the Library is not funded to be a research library, the campus would need to invest three times the amount of continued investment according to the Association of Research Libraries .

A member recalled that in the past, there were lists circulated for proposed removal of materials and noted there was no such list for the S&E Library consolidation project. Librarian Scott conveyed that a list was circulated in the past because it was for journal subscriptions and if they were canceled, faculty would have lost access whereas the recycled books are still available through inter-library loan. Librarian Scott noted the low usage of the collection in the S&E Library compared to the reserved collection (and laptops) which has a usage rate of 70%. The titles removed are available online, 80% of the titles were duplicated elsewhere. A member asked what "title" meant and Librarian Scott explained that it referred to the series of work and not an individual volume (one book of related series). Put plainly, 60% of the books or monographs were recycled and the rest were journals; members had assumed journals would be recycled first rather than books. A member stated that as an undergraduate he browsed the stacks and still does, as do many faculty, the removal of the physical books removes the serendipitous nature of learning from physical books. Another member wanted to ascertain the square footage gained in the consolidation project but the Librarians were unsure and will follow up with the committee.

The committee wanted to understand the process that led to the decision to remove the books. Librarian Cowell responded that the decision was made in May 2016 due to the lack of study space; it was an iterative process although there were earlier discussions when Librarian Cowell was the interim Librarian. The Library arrived at the removal criteria of five years based on the literature for the science discipline, although in the humanities, it has a longer timeframe of ten to fifteen years. A list (on google drive) was generated to differentiate between the books that would be kept and removed. Members inquired about the list but the Librarians communicated that it no longer exists. The committee strongly urged Librarians Cowell and Scott to retrieve the list so that faculty can review the books that were removed. The Librarians were uncertain what this would accomplish and members articulated providing a list demonstrates accountability conversely as it stands, the process is opaque. Importantly in the spirit of transparency and collegiality, faculty could then evaluate if the titles removed are indeed useful or if they have become obsolete.

The committee would like to learn more about the vision and plans for the S&E Library renovation and recommend broader Senate consultation, engagement, and participation (e.g., Committee on Research, Committee on Planning & Budget). The

initial consultation in the spring used vague language (de-duplication, consolidation) which masked the enormity of the project. A member differentiated between the technical (increasing the square footage of study space by removing books) and political aspect (the Administration requesting the space), regardless, the committee should have been adequately consulted. The committee is deeply concerned about the Senate's lack of involvement in the large-scale change of the Library. If there is a cultural shift in changing the Library to study spaces, members believed this should have been discussed. It's crucial faculty are informed in a timely manner with substantial information and the process needs to be transparent.

**Discussion of Possible Forum on Alternate Textbook Models**

Due to lack of time, the committee did not discuss this topic.