

Report of the Administrative Board of the Library
to Faculty Council
Friday, March 28, 2014

Membership of the Administrative Board of the Library:

Last Name	First Name	Dept	Constituency/Electoral Division	Term Expires
Bridges	Arlene	Pathology	Health Affairs	2014
Brundage	Fitz	History	Social Sciences	2014
Dalton	Robert	Univ Lib	AA Libraries	2016
Goodman	Sue	Mathematic	Natural Sciences	2014
Gura	Philip	ENGL & CL	Humanities	2015
Krome-Lukens	Anna	History	Graduate Student	2014
Langbauer	Laurie	ENGL & CL	Humanities	2014
McMillan	Timothy	Af&Afro Am	Social Sciences	2015
Michalak	Sarah	Libr Sci	University Librarian	EO
Moran	Barbara	Libr Sci	Chr Appt. AA Prof Schools	2015
O'Neill	Hugh	Business	Chr Appt. At-Large	2015
Schultz	Lars	Poli Sci	Chr Appt. At-Large	2015
Vision	Todd	Biology	Natural Sciences	2015
Windsor	Robert		Undergraduate Student	2014

Seven meetings, more or less monthly, during the academic year

Report prepared by Laurie Langbauer (chair)

Circulated to members March 20, 2014

Discussed by Board March 26, 2014

Overview:

We “are poised for great change” the Library’s strategic plan announces (“A Plan for the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill Libraries 2013-2018,” 1). This year, the Administrative Board of the Library focused primarily on the strategies through which our Library, to keep UNC-CH at the forefront in the creation and management of knowledge, is meeting, and plans to meet, the changing nature of information. To give these far-reaching transformations a local habitation and a name, the Library commissioned a 2013 Ithaka Survey of UNC-CH faculty about the impact of technology on research and teaching. The Ithaka Survey data provided part of the means by which the Board considered the Library’s vision of best practices to shape and contribute to scholarly discovery at UNC-CH. Discussions with the heads of various libraries and of cross-library initiatives also afforded insight into key issues and future plans, including matters such as Open Access and proposals such as the Research Hub.

While these discussions revealed our Library as a leader in advance of change (historically having produced original high-quality electronic content in our digital collections), they also highlighted our ongoing needs in facilities and budget. Substantial funds approved this year for improvements to Davis Library begin to address the needs of our bricks and mortar facilities. The yearly one-time allocation of the more than decade’s old multi-million dollar gap in funding

between the cost of the Library's base program and the amount of the budget approved for the Library, coming earlier this year than in general, helped to facilitate the complicated task of managing expenditures when necessary funds remain uncommitted in advance. Such support, along with the celebration of the seven-millionth volume to be added to the University Library's collection, reflect the commitment of the UNC community that has maintained our Library's excellence. Given continued austerity and sweeping changes, that support remains more vital than it has ever been.

Activities:

The Board met with Jim Curtis (interim director, Health Sciences Library), Heather Gendron (Art Library; scheduled March 2014), Gary Marchionini (Dean of the School of Library and Information Science) Dianne Mizzy (Head of Kenan Science Information Services), as well as with Tom Carsey (Director, Odum Institute), Nicholas Graham (Director, NC Digital Heritage Center), and Jill Sexton (Head of Digital Repository Services and chair of the Library's Research Commons Task Force). Throughout the year, we scheduled presentations by Library staff Catherine Gerdes (Budget), Carol Hunter (Ithaka survey), and Peggy Myers and Emily Silverman (Fundraising; scheduled March 2014), and by Board faculty member Todd Vision (Open Access), as well as our annual meeting with the provost (scheduled April 2014).

"The best way to predict the future is to invent it," Dianne Mizzy began her presentation, quoting computer scientist Alan Kay. Our conversations this year all looked to the kind of future the Library was actively creating. Dean Marchionini discussed the ways SILS is preparing students for the library of the future—for how it will provide new access to information, improving that information's organization and use, and how it will evolve new methods of sharing expensive resources. Mr. Curtis shared how the Health Science Library has pioneered connections with off-campus locations, moving research from benchtop to bedside, while dealing daily with some of the most rapidly changing technological innovations. Its re-imagined space as a flexible research commons provides another roadmap for the library of the future. Dr. Carsey explained how the Odum Institute maintains one of the largest social science data archives in the country while also being at the cutting edge of developing digital archives technology. Nick Graham presented the ways the Digital Heritage Center builds on UNC-CH's historical excellence in digital collection. Beginning with *Documenting the American South*, UNC-CH has been a leader in disseminating new digital resources and providing access to online faculty projects that set the standards for research.

Access:

As early as 1997, while the chair's report already noted UNC's national recognition for *Documenting the American South*, it also recorded the sky-rocketing costs and use restrictions involved in electronic materials. We still face those challenges in 2014. As response to such challenges, Open Access became a matter of Board discussion and campus policy by 2002-03, when the chair's report noted that "new methods for disseminating peer-reviewed scholarly information must eventually be designed to break the hold on scholarly publishing now held by several highly profitable international corporations." The 2004-05 report considered an Open Access initiative, and, in that year, Faculty Council passed an Open Access resolution which stated "Be it resolved that UNC-CH faculty are owners of their research and should retain ownership and use open access publication venues whenever possible."

In Fall 2013, following a visit by Heather Joseph (Executive Director, SPARC: Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition)—invited by UNC-CH Libraries’ Scholarly Communication Committee—the Board discussed re-visiting UNC-CH’s Open Access policy. Recognizing the need for campus-wide discussion (given the differences of scholarly communication in the humanities and sciences, for one example), it passed a resolution proposing that the Faculty Council Executive Committee “appoint a cross-campus faculty committee to consider an institutional rights-retention-with-opt-out policy.” The University Committee on Copyright passed a similar resolution, and both committees made recommendations to the Chair of the Faculty for the slate of members. That Open Access task force was duly constituted and will be fulfilling its charge during the coming year.

Ithaka Survey:

Ithaka, a think tank for libraries, provided a local version of a national faculty survey on the use of technology (The Library is working with Ithaka to develop a student survey). The UNC-CH survey had a 17% completion rate, higher than other institutions administering local surveys. The survey considered how faculty discover scholarly content for research given new technological resources, surveyed their digital research activities and methodologies, their data preservation and management practices, questioned how they disseminate their research, and queried the role of the Library in supporting their needs. 93% of respondents indicated that the Library’s role as buyer of materials remained very important. 76% valued the Library as a starting point for locating research information. 75% valued the Library’s role as a repository or archive of data. 62% indicated that the Library’s role in helping undergraduate develop research and analysis skills remains critically important. In analyzing the data, the Library looked for different research needs in the humanities or sciences. These findings will help the libraries more accurately plan responses to future research needs.

Research Hub:

The Ithaka Survey provided data to build a profile of emerging twenty-first century research practices. At the turn of this century, “enhanced Library support for teaching and learning through new information literacy programs” (Report, 1998-99) meant in large part the purchase of hardware, such as laptops and wireless cards, for loan to patrons. Fifteen years later, our vision of technology’s relation to teaching and research has everything to do with new networks of knowledge more than with the devices to connect to them. The Research Hub, the most ambitious long-range plan presented to the Board, is a vision of such a network—both virtual and physical—on our campus. This kind of hub ties together the other central issues the Board discussed this year—issues of access, the relations of new media to existing collections, reconfiguring physical space, and determining spending priorities.

As presented to the Board, the Research Hub would use central common areas (in Davis and elsewhere) to provide spaces for campus collaboration. As the Odum Institute’s move to Davis already exemplifies, that physical presence would be the outward and visible sign of virtual filiations that have already spread across campus and that connect UNC-CH with the world. Consolidating different networks in a research commons would recognize their centrality in the research and learning of faculty and students. Bringing them together physically would not only recognize, but facilitate, their shared concerns. It would realize the current move to

interdisciplinary studies within universities that has reconstituted fields of knowledge. At the same time, it would assert that the Library has always been at the center of what the Board report for 2003-04 calls “genuinely pan-University concerns.” Combining the expertise of the Library staff and partner organizations such as Odum in a central location, the Research Hub could facilitate shared events while providing the up-to-date technology necessary to modern collaboration. It could provide a front porch to the Library, and promote and describe the impact of faculty research for audiences beyond the academy.

To imagine this configuration, the Library must plan for a future it needs to invent; hence, it understands the need to feel its way in phases, envisioning a hub easily transformable as research evolves. Guided by this need for flexibility, its plan involves first developing a menu of likely services and communicating that vision, in part through an developing online identity. At the same time, it similarly involves renovating areas of Davis Library (as well as the Health Sciences and Kenan Science libraries) to meet developing needs, maintain staffing, and provide technology, while preserving traditional collections and services.

Physical Plant:

In 2005, the Facilities Planning Board undertook an engineering study of Davis Library. At that time, renovations to aging building systems were estimated to be around fifty million dollars, with a place holder of thirty-five million given in UNC-CH’s list of capital projects. It is almost ten years later, and Davis is now thirty years old.

In February 2014, the Chancellor’s budget committee approved seven million dollars for code improvements for Davis Library, adding sprinklers, enclosing elevator lobbies, and addressing safety issues. Such infrastructure, essential in itself, is also required for the kind of changes in Davis that would configure Library space for the twenty-first century needs of students and faculty in a Research Hub, allowing Davis similar bold re-organization of common and research areas necessary today, as are visible at NC State’s Hunt Library.

Budget:

The issue of non-recurring allocation of resources in the materials budget began to be troubling as far back as 1998-99 when appropriations eliminated inflation funding for Library materials even while the inflation rates of online serials’ costs exploded. With no allotment of funds for inflation, the gap between the annual approved budget and the Library’s real costs has widened every year, to be met yearly by non-permanent one-time provisions. These one-time gap allocations now account for 31.5% of the University Library’s base materials budget. In past years, the Library has covered part of the shortfall by diverting other funds to materials, and by cancelling journals or putting off purchase of new ones.

For the last fifteen years, Board reports to Faculty Council have all advocated that reinstatement of inflation funding and closure of the gap must remain a top administrative priority. While the administration has always to date provided for this gap—a support the Board finds “extremely valuable and deeply appreciated,” as the 2004-05 report puts it—the “annual and increasing deficit ...leaves the library vulnerable to catastrophic cutbacks and cancellations if the University Administration suddenly finds it impossible to continue to provide one-time funds.” As the last (2012-13) report maintains “the impact of losing gap funding is nearly unimaginable and would

hamper every area of scholarly and instructional endeavor at the University.” None of that has changed this year, although the Chancellor’s Budget Committee’s allocation in February—rather than at fiscal year’s end—of the \$3.7 million in non-recurring funding for the Library’s current budget testifies to the administration’s good will toward the Library during the continued straitening of the University’s finances.

Last year, Catherine Gerdes, Assistant University Librarian for Financial Planning and Administrative Services, explained to the Board how cuts eroded the Library’s standing in national rankings. Our Library’s ability to reenter the ranks of the top twenty research institutions depends on increased commitment of resources (in the Investment Index by the Association of Research Libraries for FY12, UNC-CH ranked 22nd, down from a high of 15th in 2004-05). At the same time, however, even as retrenchment and uncertainty of funds persist as challenges, the Library continues to anticipate the local needs of its research community, devising much appreciated unfunded improvements in services (the faculty’s gratitude for the Carolina BLU Delivery Service is just one attestation to the Library’s creative ingenuity).

Seven-Millionth Volume:

In March 2014, UNC-CH’s Library became one of twenty-one libraries nationally to have more than seven million volumes. Its seven-millionth volume, Juan Latino’s 1573 book of poetry in Latin (the first publication of poems in a Western language by someone of sub-Saharan African descent), unites past and future in shared concerns and global experiences. Its acquisition was funded by the John Wesley and Anna Hodgkin Hanes Foundation of Winston-Salem.

The Hanes family has funded each of the Library’s millionth volumes. When they donated the millionth volume in 1960, the second millionth came almost fifteen years later in 1974. This latest celebration demonstrates how the rate of collection has accelerated: this seven-millionth volume comes just five years after the six millionth in 2008. Generous donors such as Hanes family, along with support from the Friends of the Library, continue to advance the Library’s excellence and reputation.

Conclusion:

Amidst the difficulties and opportunities occasioned by wide-scale technological changes, the sense of the Library as the heart of the university and its support within the UNC-CH community have never been stronger. The parting words of the Board report for 1998-98 remain apt today: rather than saving money, the proliferation of electronic resources has resulted in increased costs, while the “prominence of networked resources [has not] in any way mitigated the ... the Library as a central place in the academic and intellectual life of the campus community.” The 2002-03 report cautions against regarding Library funding “as though it were a maintenance item, to be deferred, like many such items on our campus, until rosier days.” Given the funds received this year for Davis upkeep and the continued and early provision of one-time funding, we can nevertheless conclude now, as it did then, that “it is greatly to the credit of the present Administration at Chapel Hill that this has not happened.”