MINUTES OF APRIL FACULTY MEETING (4/1/2010)

Present: Janet Swan Hill, Peggy Jobe, Sue Williams, Marcy D'AVIS, Laurie Sampsel, Steve Mantz, Michael Dulock, Charlene Kellsey, Gabrielle Wiersma, Jennifer Knievel, Alison Graber, Suzanne Larsen, Kathryn Lage, Holley Long, Xiang Li, Anna Ferris, Alison Hicks, Stephanie Alexander, Thea Lindquist, Jennie Gerke, Salem Martin, Natalia Tingle, Kevin McDowell, Eric Harbeson, Matt Brower, Rice Majors, John Culshaw, Skip Hamilton, Mark Mabbett, Jina Wakimoto, Jim Williams.

Meeting called to order at 9:05 am.

I. Approval of Minutes and Agenda
   • One correction to March minutes
     IV.4 - "tenure cases went to VCAC." should be "tenure and comprehensive review cases went to VCAC."
   • The Libraries Faculty would like to thank Anna Ferris for updating the Faculty minutes database.
   • Dean Williams inquired as to the total number of Fellows going to library school.
     Addendum: Mark Mabbett checked into this and found that of the 26 fellows, 9 applied to library school, 7 attended, and 3 have finished.

II. Unfinished Business--none

III. New Business--none

IV. Committee Reports
   1. Faculty Personnel: Scores were sent out about a week and a half ago. The career merit scores will be forthcoming.
   2. Awards, Elections, Faculty Support: Peggy Jobe has been reelected to the BFA for three years.
   4. Tenure: Tenure cases are at the VCAC. Post tenures are with the Dean. A Full Professor case is at the VCAC. Janet Swan Hill is the new chair of the Tenure Committee. Jennie Gerke has passed the tenure comprehensive review through the Chancellor level.
   5. Committee of Chairs: no report.
   6. Appeals Committee: no report.
   7. Other Library Committees
      a. Faculty/Staff Development: Eric Harbeson will be presenting a talk on the AMRC next week.
      b. Web Advisory Committee: no report.
      c. Library Advisory Board: The All Libraries meeting will be in May.
      d. Recruitment to the Profession: Stephanie thanked those who took time to send her information about interns who have worked in the Libraries, and encouraged those who hadn't yet responded to take a moment and write a brief summary so that she could share the information with future potential interns.
e. Digital Projects Advisory Group: The CWA Audio Archive and the Historical Hats and Headdresses Collection are now on the Libraries Digital Library website.

f. Boulder Faculty Assembly: A motion will be put forth regarding the Policy on Class Conflicts and Club Sports at today’s BFA meeting. Also, there will be a vote on whether or not to endorse the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Status of Instructors.

V. Announcements

1. University Committees: EPUS worked on recommendations for a set of "Guiding Principles" which Principles will become part of current Regental Policy 1.B.. These Principles establish a set of goals or ideals which will direct the Regents in their work. The "Guiding Principles" will not have a direct affect on the Libraries' work.

2. Other: None

VI. Administrative Reports

1. Recruitment Update: 60 applications have been received for the Romance Languages position. 106 applications have been received Government Publications Instruction and Outreach Librarian. There are five applications for the Interim Associate Director for Public Services. The search committee will meet to narrow the pool to two or three and half day interviews will be held in May.

2. Dean's Report: Congratulations to Jennie Gerke for passing her comps. Congratulations to Laurie Sampsel for her MLA Book of the Year award.

Jim discussed his concerns regarding the Libraries not being part of the process regarding new PHD program approval. After discussions with the Chancellor and the Dean of the Graduate School, the Libraries will now have Yem Fong representing the Libraries on the Graduate Advisory Council.

The Dean discussed the fair market value of library resources and services. When put in this context, our Libraries fair market value is $48 million. Please see the following documents for further information.

a. An email discussing the Cornell Study on Fair Market Value

>From: Research and Assessment
>][mailto:researchandassessment@cornell.edu]
>Sent: Thursday, December 17, 2009 10:43 AM
>To: CU-Lib@cornell.edu
>Subject: Did you know? (the value of the library)
>
>Dear Colleagues,
>
>We all know that maintaining a research library requires a large investment. The annual expenditure figures of a library quantify the investment, but do not tell the whole story.

>How do we quantify the other side of the story, the contributions the library makes in return to the university? Research libraries are not used to assigning a monetary value to the use of their collections, services and expertise, although public
libraries have been moving into this direction in the past few years. Borrowing some of the methods public libraries use, RAU has calculated dollar values for some core library transactions. This is only an illustration and is by no means an exhaustive list of the ways the library contributes to the university. As calculating financial value is a new approach in our environment, we'd be interested in hearing your reactions and suggestions for improvement.

The bottom line: even a partial list of how CUL is used every day shows that we generate more value than how much money is expended on supporting our operations. And we didn't even try to include what the popular MasterCard ad would use as its punch line:

Intellectual stimulation: priceless.

Here are the figures:

It cost $56,678,222 to maintain Cornell's 20 libraries in 2008/2009.
Includes Weill Cornell in New York City but not in Doha, Qatar. Includes all sources of funds: appropriated, endowment income, sponsored funds.

If CUL did not exist, the university would have had to pay the following amounts last year to secure services that are comparable to the use that the Cornell community makes of the library:

For the use of physical volumes: $15,135,782 The assumption is that access to a volume through borrowing it from the library is worth a user 50% of what it would cost to purchase a book. This calculation uses 50% of the average Amazon.com unit order cost for library-like content (price + shipping): $26.12 (although obviously a lot of volumes we provide access to are not available at Amazon and are a lot more valuable than Amazon's average title.) In 2008/09 Cornell-owned titles were used 553,938 times (general and reserve charges excluding renewals, laptop and equipment charges.) Books not owned by Cornell were borrowed for Cornell users 25,533 times a year (BorrowDirect and Interlibrary Loan)

For articles accessed online and through interlibrary services:
$61,265,783 The assumption is that a commercial pay-per-view charge fairly describes the value of accessing a scholarly article.
Number of full text article downloads from licensed core online sources in calendar year 2008: 3,877,755 (not all downloads can be tracked, so the actual number is higher than this.) Non-returnable interlibrary borrowing transactions in 2008/2009: 12,136.
Pay-per-view charge for Science Direct in the absence of a license: $31.50. This calculation uses 50% of Science Direct charge to attempt to average out price differences among a wide range of disciplines.

For answering questions to build research skills and contribute to Cornell research results: $1,176,615 Number of reference questions answered in 08/09: 78,441. The Massachusetts Library Association, in its widely used and adapted library value calculator, uses $15 to represent the value of a reference question.

For in-depth consultations that contribute to Cornell research results: $126,900 The assumption is that $75/hr is a fair representation of the value of a research consultation. This figure is based on the fee-based reference rate charged at the ILR library for requests coming from non-Cornellians.
In 2008/09 376 consultations were conducted at the three unit libraries where these counts are available (Olin, Mann, JGSM.) We are estimating that three times this number took place at CUL as a whole, and that the average length of a consultation was 90 minutes.
>For Cornell’s use of preprints from arXiv.org: $740,250 The assumption is that half of a commercial pay-per-view charge fairly describes the value of accessing a scientific preprint (since preprints have not gone through peer review and the editing process, although they are a lot more current than published articles.) Number of arXiv preprint downloads from cornell.edu unique IP (multiple downloads of same item from same IP in the same month are excluded): 47,000 Pay-per-view charge for Science Direct in the absence of a license: $31.50 Calculation uses 50% of Science Direct charge in recognition of the fact that these items are preprints.

>For distributing Cornell-created content to the world through eCommons: $12,001,290 The assumption is that half of a commercial pay-per-view charge fairly describes the value of accessing a Cornell-authored preprint/document (since these items have not gone through peer review and the editing process.) Number of downloads from eCommons excluding robots for 1/1/09 – 11/30/09: 733,412. Extrapolated for full 12 months: 800,086.

>For laptops borrowed: $202,165 In 2008/2009 124,793 laptop charges and renewals took place. We are calculating that each loan and renewal lasted for 3 hours, so the total is 374,379 hours. The Cornell Store rents laptops at $90/week, and we assume that this is a fair market value. This translates to the $0.54/hr rate used in this calculation.

>TOTAL OF PARTIAL LIST ABOVE: $90,648,785

>What’s missing from these value calculations:
>Use figures are not available for some parts of our electronic collections (e.g. use of our approximately 518,000 e-books, some of our licensed e-journals and electronic databases, some locally produced and maintained digital collections.) Use figures are not available for our public computers, carrels, and study spaces.
>It is difficult to assign a dollar value to library instruction and what it contributes to students’ educational outcomes.
>It is difficult to quantify the value of unique and rare materials (e.g. archival material and rare books.) We are not including library discovery services in these calculations since it can be argued that the value is included in the delivery of the items discovered.

>Please share your reactions and ideas for other value calculations by sending us e-mail at researchandassessment@cornell.edu

http://research.library.cornell.edu

b. The Fair Market Value Data for the CU-B Libraries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Time range</th>
<th>Amount (hours or uses)</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Value from where</th>
<th>Am x Value</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PS Annual Report</td>
<td>Material checked out - circ across Norlin system</td>
<td>FY 08/09</td>
<td>558966</td>
<td>$26.12</td>
<td>Cornell figured access at 1/2 price of purchase, so 26.12 per use of single title</td>
<td>$14,600,191.92</td>
<td>Per Bert, for 2009 we have 4,348,639 titles, of which at least 522,350 are ebooks. This is guaranteed access, unlike...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brice</td>
<td>Laptop Checkout</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>35,084</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>Local rental for a day, non-Apple, was 80, so 3 hours would be 10.</td>
<td>$350,840.00</td>
<td>Took the day rate, which was higher than the weekly rate Cornell used, to account for the extra value of local convenience for checkout and return.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brice</td>
<td>Prospector and ILL &quot;returnables&quot; checkout</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>27060</td>
<td>$26.12</td>
<td>Cornell figured access at 1/2 price of purchase, so 26.12 per use of single title</td>
<td>$706,807.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brice</td>
<td>Scanned article delivery to patrons, including PASCAL</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>11503</td>
<td>$15.75</td>
<td>Cornell - half of the SciDirect pay per view</td>
<td>$181,172.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yem</td>
<td>Fulltext downloads from our 23 top sources</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1,565,225</td>
<td>$15.75</td>
<td>Cornell - half of the SciDirect pay per view</td>
<td>$24,652,293.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS Annual Report</td>
<td>Reference questions answered</td>
<td>FY 08/09</td>
<td>63,783</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>Cornell, per the MA library association library value calc.</td>
<td>$956,745.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brice</td>
<td>Video/DVD rentals</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>15,757</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>Movie rentals are all over the board, so this seemed reasonable</td>
<td>$31,514.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Knievel</td>
<td>Reference consultations - hour as average</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1,111</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
<td>Cornell - fee-based reference consultation in their ILR library</td>
<td>$83,325.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norlin Security</td>
<td>Safe, controlled environment, consistent offerings, escapism - person count = hour</td>
<td>8/30 to 12/16/10</td>
<td>27,314</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>Based on costs for urban writing space including tables, wireless, coffee bar, etc.</td>
<td>$1,365,700.00</td>
<td>11pm to 7am Commons hourly counts, totalled, as those are the hours where safety and lack of options are most valuable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS Annual Report</td>
<td>Group Instruction Contact Hours</td>
<td>FY 08/09</td>
<td>16,521</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>From Cont Ed, it cost the student from $13- $16 + per hour of class time (for</td>
<td>$247,815.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
humanities and A&S - Business and computer skills much higher), so we have used the $15 as a low estimate.

| Preprints from arXiv.org | Listed in Cornell report; we have no equivalent | $0.00 |
| Local unique content distributed through eCommons | Listed in Cornell report; we have no equivalent | $0.00 |
| **Admin Svs** | **Library space for materials, support and student use** | **203,158** | **$20.00** | If University needed to rent central Boulder space for students as library space - comparables range from $16 - $25 sq ft | **$4,063,160.00** |
| **Admin Svs** | **Library space used by others** | **16,025** | **$20.00** | If we could charge rent for our space | **$320,500.00** |

$47,239,564.12

c. The Data for CU-B Libraries related to Return on Investment re Consortial Licensing

**2010 CU SYSTEMS SHARED RESOURCES - 3 CAMPUSES, 5 LIBRARIES**

**Total CU System Expenditure for Library E-Journals & Databases: $7,307,597**

81 databases and journal packages licensed
Includes more than 12,000 online journal titles
400,000 + electronic government publications and e-books

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CU Library</th>
<th>Library Contribution</th>
<th>% per Library</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boulder</td>
<td>$4,677,374.65</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSL</td>
<td>$1,260,032.52</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auraria</td>
<td>$858,198.98</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCCS</td>
<td>$464,301.48</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CU Library</td>
<td># Contributed out of 81 total</td>
<td>Consortia Cost for Accessed Content (C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulder</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>$7,270,064.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSL</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>$6,844,693.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auraria</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>$6,947,244.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCCS</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>$6,923,735.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>$765,091.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ROI calculated based on the number of resources and $$\text{\$}$$ contributed by each library (C/D)
Each library contributes to a subset of the total 81 per campus needs and interests

YF & DP
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d. The narrative re: the Benefits of Consortial Licensing

TO: Jim Williams

FROM: Yem Fong

DATE: March 22, 1010

RE: Benefits of Licensing E-resources Across the CU Systems

The Libraries on the Boulder campus provides leadership and significant funding to promote the licensing of journals and databases jointly across the CU System’s 3 campuses and 5 libraries. As a result we are able to offer broad access to major journal packages such as Wiley/Blackwell, Springer, Taylor and Francis, Sage and Elsevier. By retaining our local subscriptions we are able to acquire access to the full range of publisher’s content at substantial cost savings, due to in large part to our membership in GWLA, other consortia and Boulder’s large number of subscription holdings. Our colleagues at the other CU campuses have likewise negotiated for cross system licensing at every opportunity. Most notably the Health Sciences Library has been able to procure System access to biomedical resources for which they underwrite the full cost.
The total CU System expenditure for library e-journals and databases is $7,307,596. Of that amount, the Libraries provides $4,677,375 towards 81 resources. This includes more than 12,000 online journal titles and 400,000 government publications and e-books. A separate spreadsheet of shared resources and a spreadsheet of ROI cost data are also provided.

Below are a few anecdotal highlights of the benefits the System gains through cross campus negotiations and licensing.

**Boulder:** Many biomedical resources formerly limited to the Health Sciences campuses are now available to Boulder through shared licenses—includes AMA journals, American Assoc for Cancer Research Journals, Nature journals and BioMed titles that Health Sciences underwrites for the full cost but access is provided to all campuses. This is especially important for our biotechnology research and joint biomedical research on the 2 campuses.

**UC Denver Auraria Library:** The following packages are used heavily by UCD Public affairs and political science students & faculty at both MSCD & UCD:
1) Sage – UCD public affairs and MSCD & UCD political science
2) LexisNexis Congressional Hearings Part B – primarily UCD public affairs, but also MSCD political science, we also know of one faculty member using for her own research.

Cochrane Library is used in all of our campus health areas and in some psychology areas too. Students love the full text reviews of treatment evidence.

ScienceDirect is also heavily used in a wide variety of subject areas from Biology to Sports. It is one of my most heavily used subject specific databases because it covers so many areas, has full text and in proof articles.

ScienceDirect is also used heavily by SOCIAL science researchers because it has a lot of psychology, social science, and econ content.

Quotes from Elaine Jurries, UCD Librarian:
“The CU System deals have greatly benefited the faculty and students of the various science, engineering and health curricula on the Auraria campus. In the years prior to our many science/technology/medicine CLERT journal package deals, we would get numerous requests from faculty to order this journal or that journal, along with the comment “what a lousy journal collection Auraria has”, or words to that effect. In the past 4-5 years, we rarely get requests for individual journals. The silence from the faculty in regard to journals, tell us that by and large, their journal needs are being met by the wealth of journal access we now have by virtue of the CU System deals. Among the packages that particular stand out as benefitting our faculty and students are: The American Chemical Society Journals, ACM Digital Library, IEEE Xplore, SpringerLink, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, Knovel Library, The Cochrane Library, Nature journals, Wiley-Blackwell journals and the American Institute of Physics journals. These packages represent literally thousands of journals with full text access. On our own, I would venture to say that we would have access to a couple hundred of these journals.”

“I remember a specific instance in which two UCD faculty members (engineering & mathematics) requested that we subscribe to Physical Review B: condensed matter and...”
materials physics. Upon looking up the subscription price, I was not surprised, but disappointed to see that the annual cost was between $7000-$8000 (2007). I asked our head of Collection Development if she thought there would be a possibility of sharing the subscription with CU-Boulder. The outcome of this was a CU Systems deal for all the American Physical Society Journals, including Physical Reviews A-E. We now have access to 19 APS journals for approximately the price we would have paid for this one journal alone.”

“A few days ago, I helped a UCD engineering PhD student over the phone. He was desperately looking for a specific article in the Annual Review of Energy and the Environment. I was able to quickly steer him to the online version of this annual review and to the full text of the article for which he was searching. He was ecstatic. Happily, due to a CU-Boulder GWLA deal, a few years ago we were able to join the consortial deal for online access to around 40 annual reviews covering many disciplines, including this one. We would not have been able to afford all this content on our own, and our PhD programs would not be as richly served.”

UC Colorado Springs notes the example of the shared licensing to IEEE IEL database. Without the GWLA/CU pricing Colorado Springs cost for this resource would be 2-3 times as much.

Health Sciences is able to provide access to the American Chemical Society’s web version of SciFinder Scholar for a fraction of the cost of an entire single institution subscription. Health Sciences also contributes a small percentage to the ISI Web of Science resource, again at a fraction of the cost of a single institution subscription.

The Business School wanted to take half of the Business Library space to make an undergraduate student center. This will not work for the Libraries so this idea is no longer on their agenda.

A Libraries wide meeting will be held next week for updates on the campus and Libraries budgets.

3. Other: Peggy Jobe recently sent out a document on Parliamentary Procedure. Please send any questions or additions regarding it to Janet Swan Hill.

VII. Adjourn
Meeting was adjourned at 9:52 am.

Recorder: Sue Williams