

LIBRARY COMMITTEE OF SENATE

Minutes

Tuesday, April 3, 2001

2:00 p.m.

Room 360k, Library

Present: Deborah Gorham (Chair), Martin Foss (University Librarian), Carter Elwood (History, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences), David Elliott (Law, Faculty of Public Affairs and Management), Edward Lai (Chemistry, Science), Sylvia Gruda (Library), Tracy Low (Undergraduate Student Member) and Ann Newton (Library, Secretary of the Committee)

Guest Speaker: Leslie Firth (Assistant Librarian, Systems)

Regrets: Robert Johnson (Graduate Student member), Bozena Clarke (Library), and Barry Syrett (Electronics, Engineering)

Observers:

Library staff: Marsha Poole, Kristof Avramsson, Janice Scammell, Elizabeth Knight, Pamela Armstrong, Trish O'Flaherty, Wendy Sinclair, Laurie Campbell, Susan Jackson, Melody Mastad, Callista Kelly, Monica Ferguson, Leslie Firth, Gilles Monast, Dorothy Rogers

Norman Paterson School of International Affairs: Vivian Cummins

College of Natural Sciences: Alexis Bawagan (Chemistry), Cam Wyndham (Biology)

The Chair, D. Gorham, opened the meeting by expressing appreciation to outgoing members, D. Elliott, B. Syrett, S. Gruda, T. Low, and R. Johnson for

their contributions to the Library Committee of Senate (SLC).

1. Adoption of the Agenda

Motion to accept agenda as circulated: moved by S. Gruda, seconded by D. Elliott.

Carried.

2. Approval of the Minutes of the November 28, 2000 Meeting

Motion to accept Minutes as circulated: moved by S. Gruda, seconded by C. Elwood.

Carried.

3. Business Arising

3.1 Relationship Between Library and Departmental Library Representatives – (E. Knight)

(# 3.1, November 28, 2000)

E. Knight, Head, Reference Services, advised the Committee that a specific sentence in the *Guidelines for Departmental Representatives* was highlighted to ensure that Subject Specialists would keep their Library Representatives informed of library policies and developments. See Appendix A.

3.2 Budget 2001-2002 (M. Foss)

(#4.1.2, November 28, 2000)

3.2.1 Budget 2001-2002 (M. Foss)

M. Foss reported that at the Senate meeting of March 30, 2001 the President revealed that the government would not announce details on transfer payments to the universities until May. It is anticipated that this announcement, which will cover a three-year period, would include an increase to fund the double cohort. M. Foss stated that the May announcement would place Carleton University and other institutions in the position of entering a new fiscal year without having a clear picture of their budgets. As it stands, Carleton University will close its books at the end of April, and the budgets for the month of May will duplicate those that were approved for 2000/2001. The Library has requested a 10%

increase in its Materials Budget for 2001/2002. Whether that request will be granted is not yet known.

3.2.2 D. Elliott's question on p.4, #4.1.2

At the November 28, 2000 meeting of the Senate Library Committee, D. Elliott questioned whether the Library kept statistics on articles that were requested more than once. If so, D. Elliott thought that the Library should consider placing a copy of these more popular items on Reserve. D. Elliott viewed this measure as a means of reducing some costs associated with Document Delivery. At the November 28, 2000 meeting, M. Foss agreed to consult with C. Kelly to determine whether the Interlibrary Loans Department maintained records on the number of times that a specific article was requested. At the April 3 meeting M. Foss invited C. Kelly to speak to this issue. Following a brief discussion, D. Elliott stated that it was apparent that the costs associated with tracking individual articles would be much greater than the expenses generated by placing more than one request for the same article.

4. Report from the University Librarian (M. Foss)

4.1 Library Budgets: 2000-2001 and 2001-2002

Library Budget 2000-2001

M. Foss stated that a financial snapshot of the Materials Budget for this year was taken during the last week in March. The Library is expected to overspend its budget by approximately \$70,000. In the context of a budget of \$3,500,000, an overexpenditure of \$70,000 is not unusual. The University Librarian reported that a more precise assessment of the Library's financial situation would be conducted later this month.

M. Foss announced that the Library would receive \$115,850 from the Undergraduate Student Levy Fund. Results of the Referendum, which have been consistent over the past two years, revealed that approximately 35% of the undergraduate student population voted for the Library to receive monies from this fund. A gift of this amount, if received on an annual basis, would translate into an additional \$100,000 in base money for the Library. M. Foss advised the Committee that Duncan Watt, the Vice-President (Finance and Administration) must be informed by April 10 about how the Library plans to use these funds. M. Foss will request that the monies be allocated as follows:

1. \$25,000 for student terminals for the new library system
2. \$10,850 to the Carleton Library Endowment Fund
3. \$80,000 for collections, both print and electronic.

(The Collections Librarian and the Collections Committee are currently in the process of defining a priority list.)

M. Foss stated that his request for funds to be disbursed in a specific manner was subject to approval by Duncan Watt's Committee. **M. Foss and D. Gorham agreed to meet and discuss initiatives that could be undertaken to encourage undergraduate students to provide ongoing support to the Library through their Student Levy Fund.**

Library Budgets 2001-2002

See item 3.2.1.

4.2 CISTI Agreement

M. Foss briefed SLC on the agreement that Carleton University signed with the Canada Institute for Scientific and Technical Information (CISTI) three years ago. This document allowed for, among other things, access by Carleton University faculty and graduate and fourth-year students to the journal stacks at CISTI. Our Library also agreed to fully subsidize photocopying during these visits. Under the terms of the Agreement, which will expire at the end of April, Carleton agreed to pay CISTI \$55,000 for the first year, \$65,000 for the second, and \$75,000 for the third year. When the documents were initially signed, it was understood that the value of the service would be evaluated towards the end of the third year. Our Library and CISTI would then enter into a new series of negotiations to either extend or modify the existing agreement. M. Foss reported that the Library and CISTI have already met twice for preliminary discussions on this matter. In 1998/1999 there were 288 visits to CISTI by our faculty and students (graduate and 4th year Honours). This number was increased to 647 in 1999/2000, and reduced to 440 in 2000/2001. The University Librarian informed Members that he believed that the decrease in 2000/2001 could be attributed to the fact that more electronic resources are now available to our users. M. Foss also stated that these resources, coupled with our membership in CNSLP, would probably result in even fewer visits in the future. In response to a question from the floor, M. Foss said that membership in CNSLP would provide Library users with access to 650 electronic journals. An analysis of the number of visits indicates that the Library is paying CISTI over \$150.00 per visit. M. Foss questioned whether we are receiving value for our money. During preliminary discussions, a request for access to CISTI's "virtual library" (which includes the

1200 Elsevier journals and a host of others) was put forward by Carleton. This request was rejected on the grounds of licensing agreements. Our Library then suggested that CISTI find a more creative way to offer us better value. M. Foss stated that at this time there were no "real" proposals on the table from CISTI to Carleton or vice versa, but it seems that CISTI is not prepared to modify the existing agreement in any significant way. The University Librarian reiterated his concern about the cost of the visits. In lieu of a trip to CISTI, a number of our users already avail themselves of CISTI Source and Document Delivery. M. Foss stated that without the Agreement, our clients could still visit CISTI, request an article on site, and have it delivered to them for use on the premises.

In response to an invitation from the Chair, Members and observers engaged in a discussion on this issue. S. Gruda questioned whether the 440 visits represented 440 different users. C. Kelly (Head, Interlibrary Loans) stated that she could not provide an accurate response to this question. There are, however, indications that some individuals visit CISTI often. S. Gruda then questioned whether these individuals were allowed to request more than one journal per visit. C. Kelly responded in the affirmative. A. Bawagan (Chemistry) spoke briefly about the effects on students and faculty of the switch from ownership to access (print to electronic). He viewed this trend as contributing to the destruction of the age-old tradition of browsing. With the depletion of print resources, and fewer opportunities for serendipitously leafing through various journals, Professor Bawagan was concerned that students would not develop this skill - a skill that Professor Bawagan believes is an essential tool of the researcher. D. Elliott questioned whether CISTI had entered into similar arrangements with other universities. M. Foss stated that Carleton University was the only institution that had access to the journal stacks at CISTI. C. Wyndham (Biology) commented on subscription cancellations and stated that the Library had saved over \$500,000 on cuts that were made primarily in the area of the Biological Sciences.

M. Foss informed Members that the Library now spends significantly more money on its electronic resources. Some of the monies previously spent on maintaining print journal subscriptions have been allocated for non-print materials, the costs attached to the CISTI Agreement, and our participation in the Canadian National Site Licensing Project (CNSLP). The latter will cost the Library approximately \$200,000 annually over the next three years. M. Foss commented on how difficult it was to decide on an appropriate price for maintaining access to CISTI's journal stacks. Users of the service would probably agree that we should pay the price, whatever the cost. During negotiations with CISTI, the Library is attempting to get the best value for its dollar. That being said, the University Librarian recognized how important it was for some individuals to conduct their research in this way. M. Foss stated that he would try to preserve this option for these users.

Following M. Foss' remarks, Members commented on materials that are only available at CISTI and the delays that occur when items are requested through

traditional Interlibrary Loan service. C. Kelly noted that turnaround time for delivery of items from CISTI was rarely more than three days.

P. Armstrong questioned what would happen while negotiations were underway. M. Foss stated that it would be "business as usual". M. Foss invited Members to suggest other options that could be brought to the table. He noted that a "pay per visit" option has been considered. Our Library would agree on a fee and CISTI would bill us for the number of visits. CISTI is not enthusiastic about this option, as it would result in a significant loss of revenue for them. CISTI supports an agreement that would specify a flat rate per year. M. Foss stated that participation by libraries in CNSLP will have a profound effect on CISTI's revenue picture. CISTI currently sends out approximately 5000 articles a day via document delivery through its CISTI Source. With 64 libraries acquiring electronic access to 650 journals through their membership in CNSLP, the revenue that CISTI previously received from requests for articles in these journals will disappear. M. Foss believes that CISTI realizes that document delivery service is a transitional technology for access to scholarly information. The question was raised as to whether CISTI was requesting an increase in the annual amount that our Library pays for access to the journal stacks. M. Foss replied in the negative. M. Foss said that the choice was to decide whether or not to apply the \$75,000 that was presently paid to CISTI, to the purchase of new or cancelled print and electronic journals. D. Gorham remarked that no one was suggesting that the choices were easy. Her sense, from comments that were expressed during the meeting, was that those present were in favour of the Library maintaining access to the journal stacks at CISTI. M. Foss agreed with D. Gorham's remarks. The Chair then invited others who wished to make a stronger case for keeping the Agreement, to share their thoughts with the Committee. E. Lai questioned whether the Library had considered negotiating a lower rate by placing a cap on the number of visits. M. Foss stated that the Library had not yet put a formal proposal on the table, but that he personally favored the pay per visit option. A. Bawagan reminded members that there were other benefits, in addition to access to the journal stacks, which were provided to Carleton University through its agreement with CISTI. L. Firth stated that it was part of the Library's role to make sure that it received the best value for its dollar, and if possible, to negotiate a better deal. D. Gorham stated that she was sure that no one was opposed to negotiating a better deal. D. Elliott questioned whether there were non-academic users of CISTI facilities. M. Foss stated that use was restricted to NRC scientists and researchers. M. Ferguson asked the University Librarian if he thought that CISTI was being underused. M. Foss stated that precious few people were using the service. D. Gorham was of the opinion that 647 and 440 were significant numbers. A. Bawagan informed members that most supervisors encourage their students to verify their citations during the last two or three months that they are working on their theses. This particular task requires intensive use of the service for a relatively short time. C. Wyndham stated that the numbers might have dropped this year as two major users of the Science journals (Earth Sciences and Biology) were involved in moves from one building to another. T. Low questioned

whether the Library would feel that it was getting better value for its money if more students visited CISTI. Ms. Low suggested that students, fourth-year Honours, in particular, might not be aware that this service was available. M. Foss stated that with an agreement in place, numbers were not an issue. M. Foss concluded his remarks by stating that the message from Members and observers was very clear. The Library should continue its arrangement with CISTI.

4.3 Canadian National Site Licensing Project (CNSLP)

M. Foss informed the Committee that the final report of the Canadian National Site Licensing Project (CNSLP) has just been released. This collaborative initiative involved 64 Canadian universities joining together as a consortium to obtain licenses for electronic resources. Funding for the three-year pilot project totaled \$50M, with \$20M awarded by the Canada Foundation for Innovation (CFI) and \$30M contributed by the 64 universities and provincial revenue partners. M. Foss advised Members that agreements were signed with the following:

Academic Press (approximately 175 journals);

American Chemical Society - ACS Web Editions (30-35 journals);

American Mathematical Society - MathSciNet

Institute for Scientific Information (ISI) - Web of Science

Institute of Physics Publishing - IOP Journals

Royal Society of Chemistry - RSC Electronic Journals

Springer-Verlag - LINK service (about 410 journals)

M. Foss commented on the cost. He stated that publishers only sell their products on a "mass" basis. In other words, libraries cannot pick their 200 favourite Springer-Verlag journals. They must purchase all 410 titles or none at all. Of the 650 journals that have been acquired through the CNSLP initiative, there may be many titles that have little or no interest to faculty and students at Carleton. M. Foss reminded the Committee that libraries are no longer selecting and paying for individual journals. They are, instead, selecting and paying for the "Big Deal". This is how things work at the moment, and until publishers develop a new business model, libraries will have to adapt to this approach. M. Foss stated that there was an expectation that more federal funds would be provided to extend the CNSLP, and to license additional databases. M. Foss informed Members that he would be attending a debriefing session on the CNSLP in Toronto on April 4. M. Foss noted that Chemistry seems to have fared better than most disciplines in terms of the number of journals that are now available through the CNSLP. S.

Gruda queried the cost for participation in this initiative. M. Foss replied that our costs would be \$200,000 annually over the next three years. T. Low questioned whether the Library had determined how many of the Library's cancelled subscriptions were accessible through CNSLP. M. Foss stated that this kind of analysis had not yet been done. P. Armstrong questioned why Elsevier had not participated in this venture. M. Foss said that the rumour was that if Elsevier had come on board, they would have consumed the entire 50M. C. Wyndham asked what the Library intended to do about high profile journals that were not included in the CNSLP. M. Foss said that the Library would have to find more revenue to buy these journals or to stop buying something else in order to invest in these titles. He informed the Committee that the Library does not receive additional funding for new programmes. The result is that you have to "carve something out of one place and put it in another place" to provide the necessary resources. Often there is an overlap, and to date it has not become a major problem. M. Foss stated that the Library was committed to the CNSLP for the next three years. K. Avramsson suggested that the \$75,000 fee for the CISTI Agreement might be better spent on titles not included in CNSLP. A. Bawagan viewed this suggestion as the "slippery slope" approach. M. Foss then said that the Library was trying to find ways to compensate for the fact that its budget had been wiped out by the inflation in journal prices. A. Bawagan said that someone could suggest that a review of the entire Library budget might be in order. A. Bawagan encouraged the University Librarian to renew the CISTI agreement. As students and faculty become more aware of what is available, use of the service will increase. T. Low questioned whether there was a way to assess the use of CNSLP. M. Foss said that that statistics on usage could be easily obtained. Most of the publishers already have the facility to provide reports of this nature. The Ontario Information Infrastructure Group hopes to develop a scholar's portal. It will feature authentication, which will allow users to go through a single window and obtain access to all the shared electronic resources. Management information would also be provided. If libraries determine that some of the contracted resources are underutilized across the country, they may ask to have these items taken off the table. In response to C. Wyndham's question, M. Foss stated that access to CNSLP titles was already available. M. Foss also informed Members that CISTI would block all CNSLP titles to prevent our users from ordering articles from CISTI that are accessible through the CNSLP.

5. Library System (L. Firth)

Leslie Firth, Assistant Librarian (Systems), discussed plans for the implementation of the new library system. She reported that Millennium, the Java-based leading-edge library system product by Innovative, would be installed and implemented over the coming nine months, with a planned rollout of Jan. 2002. She tabled a one-page summary (see Appendix B - in paper copy only) that briefly described the product and the implementation schedule. She also reported that a Communications/Public

Relations Committee had been created and that it would be working closely with Reference Services to create an education and information dissemination plan to ease the transition to the new system for Library clients. Ms. Firth noted that the University of Ottawa had also selected Millennium and that we would, as part of the SmartLibrary Project, be working with them and other libraries on standard search profiles and indexes. Through the SmartLibrary Project, an initiative of Industry Canada and the Ottawa Centre for Research and Innovation, the Library will receive \$130,000, which will be applied to the purchase of the library system.

D. Gorham expressed appreciation to L. Firth for her comprehensive presentation on Millennium.

6. Library Space Study (L. Rossman)

M. Foss announced that L. Rossman had planned to discuss this issue, but was unexpectedly called away. A more detailed report will be presented at the next SLC meeting. M. Foss informed the Committee that last year the University had hired a consultant to conduct a study of Library space. A number of recommendations were put forward. No action has been taken yet. Subsequent to that, the University hired an architect to assist the Library with plans for the main floor. The architect recommended changes to the entrance, the main floor (lighting and floor coverings) and the area just outside the entrance. In addition to these recommendations, there were discussions about installing a coffee shop in the reading area on the main floor. Food services would be responsible for building and staffing the facility. E. Lai queried the ultimate objective of the space study. M. Foss stated that stacks are overflowing and most reading areas have been eliminated. Reducing the staff areas in Technical Services would create more space. The Library is not utilizing the seventh shelf in some parts of the Library. There are a number of minor ways to create additional space, but these measures would only buy us a few more years. Basically, time is running out. The options are to expand the space here, i.e. build the final two floors on the Library extension, find off-site storage, or ramp up the weeding process to the extent that one book is removed for every book that is added. M. Foss informed SLC that off-site storage might be the answer for little-used materials. In response to a query from E. Lai, M. Foss stated that the proposed coffee shop would take up very little space on the main floor. D. Elliott questioned whether the Library had received any monies from the SuperBuild fund. M. Foss

replied in the negative.

6. Other Business

There was no other business.

7. Adjournment

At 3:25 p.m. S. Gruda moved that the meeting be adjourned.

APPENDIX A

GUIDELINES FOR DEPARTMENTAL LIBRARY REPRESENTATIVES

REFERENCE SERVICES

CARLETON UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

Library Representatives are appointed by academic departments for the purpose of liaising with the Library. Faculty appointed to this role work closely with the appropriate Subject Specialist in Reference Services and may on occasion consult with the Head of Reference Services, the Collections Librarian, the Gifts Librarian, or the Head of the Maps, Data, and Government Information Centre.

Responsibilities:

Collection development: In co-operation with the Subject Specialist, the Library Representative participates in the building of the collection:

- by transmitting requests from departmental colleagues to the Subject Specialist;
- by recommending new subscriptions, retrospective material or expensive items for purchase;
- by checking publishers' catalogues and query slips received from our approval plan dealers, marking items for purchase;
- by participating in serials cancellations projects.

Collection policies: The Library Representative will assist the Subject Specialist with revisions to the approval plans managed by the Library's Acquisitions Department. The Library Representative should be familiar with these plans in



order to inform departmental colleagues.

Departmental/Library Co-operation: The Library Representative should notify the Library of new courses or programs being proposed by the department. **The Subject Specialist will keep the Library Representative informed of library policies and developments so that this information can be shared with other faculty.** Library staff may be invited to departmental meetings to report on library initiatives and to discuss areas of mutual concern.

April 2001