

COUNCIL ON LIBRARIES AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ANNUAL REPORT/MINUTES FOR THE 2009-10 ACADEMIC YEAR

Council on Libraries and Information Technology November 2, 2009

Present: Zac Beals, Anne Fields, Rai Goerler, Richard Hart, Ashok Krishnamurthy, Tim Rhodus, Sherwin Singer, Kathleen Starkoff, Les Tannenbaum, Kathleen Wallace, Julia Young

Absent: Nongnuch Inpanbutr

Vacant: InterProfessional Council Representative

Guests: Larry Allen, Jim Bracken, Joanne Dehoney, Nancy O'Hanlon, Diane Sliemers

1. Introductions

2. Libraries acquisitions budget 2009-10 and OAA long term perspective (guest: Diane Sliemers, Libraries Fiscal Officer).

The Libraries requests funds for acquisitions each year from OAA. The amount received is not sufficient to cover the 7-10% annual inflation rate of databases, e-books, and journals. This year the Libraries received an additional \$220,000 to split with Health Sciences and Law Libraries (our final share was \$170,000). We also received \$800,000 to cover some POM expenses (space usage fees) and are using this to build up our operating budget reserve. OAA will create a task force when our new Director arrives to determine a strategy for funding of acquisitions to get us out of crisis mode. Kathy Starkoff asked about peer institutions. Jim Bracken responded that only one peer (NYU) has regular increases for inflation. We have a regular process for reviewing all purchases that have increased in price and may cancel some of these. We will be paying an increased bill to OhioLINK to help maintain that content, but we will get some rebate from the state for this payment.

3. Case of the missing manuscripts (Rai Goerler).

85 medieval manuscripts were misplaced during the move into Thompson Library this summer and later found in the Book Depository. Although it was not likely that they were stolen, library protocol requires public reporting of potential theft of rare materials. Members suggested that the Libraries needed only to inform the COLIT committee chair, not the entire membership, of any future events like this.

4. Space for print collections (Rai Goerler)

After a brief tour of the crowded journal stacks in Thompson Library, members discussed:

a. The ongoing deduplication of Thompson:

Les asked about demand. Jim Bracken noted that electronic journals are in highest demand. 40,000 volumes in storage at Ackerman need to be moved and also have electronic counterparts. We are spending funds to store print journals that could be used for other purposes. Tim suggested that we keep only a fixed number of volumes on the shelf in Thompson (e.g. last 5 years) and put older volumes in storage. Les suggested that subject librarians should poll constituents about individual titles to be retained in electronic format only. Ashok stated that choices have to be made and that the library should make these decisions and explain their rationale. Sherwin asked what can replace the browsing experience offered by print materials? Rai stated that although we have offered to provide long runs of periodicals for browsing in the Archives Reading Room, faculty seldom use this service. Rai indicated that a criteria statement related to maintaining print would be shared with COLIT for comment. Members suggested that information about access to physical materials in storage should be more easily found on the library website.

b. Evolving plans for coordinating depositories in Ohio to eliminate excessive duplication: OhioLINK has begun a project to create more space in the five Depositories (which are owned by OhioLINK) by deduping journal holdings across the Depository system. Sherwin asked how this will affect delivery time. Rai indicated that the library directors will set service standards.

5. Acquisitions statement (Rai Goerler).

Rai asked for guidance on what is a satisfactory statement of principles that guide the Libraries selection / deselection processes and how news should be communicated to constituents. Jim Bracken noted that the library cannot spend more than it receives. Les asked what procedures we use when deciding what to keep and noted that cross disciplinary needs are more difficult to deal with. Data is available on usage of our collection. Members should send questions to Jim Bracken to be covered in a Frequently Asked Questions document.

6. Overview of the OSU Libraries assessment being conducted this fall, involving surveys and observations of library locations (Nancy O'Hanlon).

See the attachment (Appendix A).

7. Report on proposed open forum on evaluation of teaching and research that involves electronic media (Anne Fields).

The forum is being planned for spring 2010 and will focus on how to evaluate faculty performance in use of digital media for teaching and research, with one important audience being promotion and tenure decision makers. Anne mentioned some possible speakers for the panel: Vice Provost Susan Williams (P&T context), a faculty member like Susan Fisher, Susan Delagrange, someone with a social science focus, Doug Danforth, Lewis Ullman. Planning continues and will be reported on at future meetings.

8. Setting up COLIT Projects and Activities for 2009-10

Proposed activities/projects:

- Consider a rumor page on the OSU Libraries website to combat misinformation.
- Monitor results of reduced hours of service. Be prepared to be flexible if faculty and students find any hours of service reduction difficult (e.g. special security arrangements in Music and Dance library as a pilot).
- Discuss the advantages and context of our desire to collaborate with the Columbus Metropolitan Library.

Les asked Kathy Starkoff what the committee role should be with regard to the CIO Office, since there are other advisory groups with whom she consults regularly. Kathy indicated that she sees the cross section of university faculty, staff and students represented on COLIT as valuable and identified projects that COLIT can help with. CIO priorities for fiscal 2011 include:

- Consolidating 135+ campus e-mail systems (over a 4 year period).
- Review and implementation of the eLearning report.
- Investment in Carmen.
- The OSU website.
- Identity management issues.
- Storage needs (24% increase each year).

Ashok asked about the proper process for taking CIO proposals, such as the recent one related to the e-mail system consolidation, to the Senate. Should they come to COLIT, as the responsible Senate committee, first? Kathy suggested that COLIT should get involved going forward, helping to establish principles for selection. Ashok asked whether COLIT will also consider research computing issues. Discussion on this topic will continue at the next meeting.

APPENDIX A: Library Locations Assessment Plan and Timeline, Autumn 2009

OSU Libraries Assessment Committee

Updated: October 28, 2009

PROJECT GOAL: Gather information from a variety of sources for managerial decision making and to provide feedback from clientele to library location managers.

LOCATIONS INCLUDED: Architecture; Biological Sciences/Pharmacy; Food, Agriculture & Environmental Sciences; Fine Arts; Geology; Music/Dance; Science & Engineering; Thompson; Veterinary Medicine.

PLAN:

Interview with librarian/library manager (August 2009)

Research and plan observational study (August/September 2009)

Pilot and revise surveys; hire and train student observers (September 2009)

Distribute surveys to location clientele (October/November 2009)

- In-Library Survey (one week, Monday through Friday, during weeks 5-6)
- Online Survey (stratified random sample of user groups, beginning in week 7)

Conduct observational study (October/November 2009; MWThSu evenings, low/intermediate/high use periods beginning week 2)

Compile and analyze survey data (December/January 2009-10)

Other Autumn Quarter data collected (December/January 2009-10)

- Gate counts (total and after 5 pm)
- Circulation (local by hour)
- Reserves usage
- Reference questions (from ASK database)
- In-house use (from Millennium)
- Public PC logins; Wireless usage (if available from OIT)
- ILL requests for journal scanning (from Brian Miller)
- "Open by appointment" data from locations
- Local data as appropriate

Review findings (January 2010)

Report findings (February-March 2010)

Council on Libraries and Information Technology Minutes, February 1, 2010

Present: Zac Beals, Carol Diedrichs, Anne Fields, Nongnuch Inpanbutr, Ashok Krishnamurthy, Tim Rhodus, Sherwin Singer, Kathleen Starkoff, Les Tannenbaum, Kathleen Wallace, Julia Young.

Absent: Richard Hart, Dillon Muth.

Guests: Larry Allen, Jim Bracken, Joanne Dehoney, Rai Goerler, Nancy O'Hanlon, Dickie Selfe.

NOTE: Documents discussed at this meeting are also available to members on the Carmen wiki:

Agenda 1. Discussion of Draft of Policy for Maintaining Print Items for the OSU Libraries

Carol asked for background, since the current document seems restrictive. Though faculty input is important, librarians manage collections on a daily basis and need more flexibility. Rai Goerler stated that this document is a follow up to controversy on campus over withdrawal of duplicates from the collection. Carol noted that this document pertains particularly to journals, and seems originally written for that purpose, but has now been revised to refer to all materials. Sherwin stated that the process for journals seems piecemeal. Carol agreed, She wants a larger conversation about these issues. Carol asked to withdraw the current document from consideration. She will bring a revised version that describes categories of materials and the Libraries review process back for discussion later.

Sherwin Singer made a motion to table the document and bring it back to a future meeting. The motion was seconded by Kathy Starkoff and approved by the group.

Les reminded members that documents should be distributed a week before meetings and made available on the wiki.

Agenda 2. Discussion of Proposed Revisions of Faculty Senate document on COLIT duties.

Ashok Krishnamurthy motioned to table consideration of this document until the next COLIT meeting. The motion was seconded by Anne Fields and approved by the group.

Agenda 3. The new OSUL homepage.

Larry Allen described the revision process for the Libraries website as well as the move of pages to a content management system and the potential benefits from this approach. A process employing wireframes is currently underway to get constituents to help design the home page. Larry answered questions and asked members to visit the site and offer comments or send them to him directly. He will also forward text that members can share with their colleagues in order to get more feedback.

Agenda 4. Discussion of current OhioLINK situation and call for a Proposal.

Carol summarized actions pertaining to recent changes at OhioLINK, particularly dissolution of the current Advisory Board, and noted that faculty around the state are putting forward resolutions on this matter. She has updated the Senate Steering Committee to give them background and to indicate that there is library support for these resolutions. Steering provided a draft resolution, which was revised by COLIT members. Sherwin proposed the following text:

“Be it resolved that the Ohio State University Senate strongly urges Chancellor Fingerhut, in consultation with the Ohio Faculty Council, to recreate the OhioLINK Advisory Board and charge the Board to consult with academic, library, technology and State leaders to assure alignment with the academic and economic development missions of Ohio higher education, and the continued, effective integration of institutional and statewide information delivery programs.”

Nong Inpanbutr motioned to accept this revision. The motion was seconded by Ashok and approved by the group. Les will forward this motion to Chris Zacher.

Agenda 5. Outcome of the OhioLINK Electronic Journals Center content review process for this year.

Carol provided this document for information and to highlight the loss of local buying power because of reduced funding to OhioLINK to license/purchase materials for the entire consortium.

Agenda 6. Guidelines for risk-aware use of non-contracted internet applications.

Joanne Dehoney reviewed this document, which articulates the risks associated with cloud computing, and is intended to raise awareness. Guidelines are not policy, but the current document pulls out important points of other campus policies. For example: if we sign “click through agreements,” individuals take on personal liability for any problems that might arise. The committee responsible for this document recommends that the university enter into enterprise level agreements with social media providers, so that faculty are covered. Nong asked who would field questions. Joanne can take them. Nong would like contact information added to the document.

Agenda 7. Share DRAFT recommendations from the eLearning Strategic Implementation Committee.

Kathy Starkoff provided background on the first eLearning report. Joanne noted that recommendations from the Implementation Committee pertain to leadership issues and financial investments. One recommendation, creation of an Advisory Committee, probably won't be difficult to move forward. Tim Rhodus asked whether COLIT already has some of these responsibilities. Carol Diedrichs suggested that since this would be more of an administrative committee, COLIT's role would be providing a faculty viewpoint and input. Ashok asked about a permanent seat for a COLIT member and Kathy will take this recommendation back to

committee. Ashok also asked about departmental assistance for moving courses online. Unless financial assistance opportunities are spelled out, faculty will not step up or view this as a priority.

Submitted by:
Nancy O'Hanlon
February 22, 2010

Council on Libraries and Information Technology Minutes, April 5, 2010

Members present: Zach Beals, Carol Diedrichs, Anne Fields, Richard Hart, Nong Inpanbutr, Tim Rhodus, Sherwin Singer, Kathy Starkoff, Les Tannenbaum, Julia Young.

Guests: Larry Allen, Jim Bracken, Joanne Dehoney, Pam McClung, Nancy O'Hanlon, Dickie Selfe.

Old Business

1. COLIT Forum:

Anne Fields and Nongnuch Inpanbutr reported on the upcoming COLIT sponsored forum, "Evaluating the Teaching and Research Performance of Faculty Who Use Digital Media." The forum will be held on Tuesday, April 27, 4-5:30 in 165 Thompson Library. Panelists are: Doug Danforth, Susan Delagrange, Susan Fisher, and Ann Pendleton-Julian. Lewis Ulman will moderate and Vice Provost Susan Williams will provide an introduction to the issues. The audience is faculty thinking about promotion as well as departmental faculty and administrators rewriting the Pattern of Administration. It was publicized on the Libraries web site, and through the Digital Union and other CIO and university venues. Anne will also ask subject librarians to disseminate information to the departments they serve.

2. OSU Libraries Policy for Print Retention and Withdrawal (Carol Diedrichs)

Carol gave a PowerPoint presentation and shared a document, "Print Retention and Withdrawal Guiding Principles." The presentation described the Libraries current concern about storage space for printed materials, the various consortial approaches to storage that are available, and described a set of guidelines for withdrawal of printed materials that inform this work. The Libraries goals include provision of 24x7 access to electronic information and delivery of high use print materials. Reasonable access to lesser used print materials would be provided on a more extended timetable. Librarians with subject expertise manage collections over their entire life cycle, consult appropriately with faculty and other users, and utilize professionally recognized best practices in their decision making. OhioLINK owns its content, which meets preservation standards for digital materials. JSTOR also maintains print copies of digital journals, so it may not be necessary for OSU to retain print copies of resources in these collections.

Sherwin Singer commented that the phrase “seldom used” is not defined in the document. He also noted some confusion about the meaning of the bulleted items in guideline #4. This will be rewritten to clarify meaning. Concern about OhioLINK Depositories project was also expressed. Carol indicated that policies will be defined first, before we agree to participate in this project. Tim Rhodus asked about digital preservation, and Carol referred to the Trusted Digital Repository standard.

3. Revised description of COLIT duties (Les Tannenbaum)

Kathy Starkoff raised a question about why this revision is needed. She proposed that we should retain the original description and steer committee work toward larger issues facing both units. She recommended that the Council do some advance planning of committee agendas for the upcoming year, since some of these issues/concerns, such as budget requests, occur on a predictable cycle.

Tim asked whether there are expectations for COLIT to make recommendations or approve policies. Carol stated that use of the word “approve” is not appropriate, since it conflicts with CIO and Director of University Libraries administrative responsibilities. Les stated that the Council’s function is strictly advisory. The University Senate would take action if there were concerns about CIO or Libraries policies. Richard Hart moved that we embrace our current duties and responsibilities, and interpret them rather than rewrite them now. Nong added that Council duties should be reviewed later, in light of other new university committees forming and taking on new responsibilities. Kathy seconded the motion and it was approved.

New Business

1. USG request to increase hours of Thompson Library (Jim Bracken)

Old hours from Thompson Library were established when it re-opened. USG asked what it would take to extend hours from midnight to 2 am. Jim presented a summary of data, including gate/head counts during late hours, survey responses on this issue, and costs for adding staff to extend hours. A broader question involves the need to re-examine Science & Engineering Library hours, since current data indicates very low usage after 2 am. Carol stated that we may need to go through autumn quarter, to determine any impact of the Ohio Union on Thompson use, before making a decision about this. Jim will meet with USG later in April to discuss this issue.

2. Research Computing Committee

Some concern has been expressed by humanities faculty about their lack of representation on this new committee, which was created by Carol Whitacre and is chaired by John Heimaster. Kathy indicated that the committee was formed because some individuals felt that the CIO was not spending enough time on interests of the research community. It’s important for COLIT to understand the committee’s goals. Carol suggested that we express concern about lack of representation by arts and humanities on the committee. Sherwin moved that Les should send an email about this issue to John Heimaster and copy Carol Whitacre. Julia Young seconded the motion and the committee approved it.

3. Proposal for a forum/conference next year on transforming scholarship, and its implications for faculty, OSU Libraries, and OSU IT staff (Carol Diedrichs)

Discussion was deferred to a future meeting.

Council on Libraries and Information Technology Minutes, May 3, 2010

Members present: Zach Beals, Carol Diedrichs, Anne Fields, Nong Inpanbutr, Tim Rhodus, Sherwin Singer, Kathy Starkoff, Les Tannenbaum.

Guests: Joanne Dehoney, Nancy O'Hanlon, David Pike, Dickie Selfe.

Old Business

1. Forum on Evaluating the Teaching and Research Performance of Faculty Who Use Digital Media, April 27, 2010 (Anne Fields, Nong Inpanbutr).

Anne Fields reported that 25 people attended the session, which was not videotaped. One speaker could not attend. As Vice Provost Susan Williams noted in her presentation, policies are already in place that support review of digital media for the promotion/tenure process. But there is still a need for "reverse mentoring" so that senior faculty are helped to understand how to evaluate digital scholarship. Kathy Starkoff noted that the university strategic planning process will help to integrate technology planning and faculty development into units over time. The forum was a good start to the university conversation on this issue. Some have asked Anne what is next on this topic. This could be the first agenda item for the new COLIT committee in autumn: review forum notes to determine any related projects for next year or to generate action items for another committee. Anne will try to add a report on the forum to the Knowledge Bank <<http://kb.osu.edu>>. Members thanked Anne and Nong for all their work on the forum.

1. Update on the issue of representation of Arts and Humanities on the Research Computing Committee (Les Tannenbaum).

The description of the Research Computing Committee and its charge is available at:

<http://research.osu.edu/documents/ResearchComputingCommittee2010Final.pdf>

Les contacted the Chair of the Faculty Senate Research Committee, and wants to discuss possible next steps offline with some COLIT members. Les noted that there should be some collaborative link from the Research Committee to the Libraries and the Office of the CIO. Dickie Selfe suggested pulling together some people who have large scale computing projects or concerns in Arts and Humanities to meet with John Heimaster.

New Business

1. Setting election date for choosing Chair and Vice Chair.

Kathy Starkoff made a motion, seconded by Sherwin Singer and approved by the committee, to collect nominations and manage the vote by email. Nancy O'Hanlon will follow up before the June 7 meeting. The Vice Chair will be elected at the first meeting of autumn quarter.

2. Update on OSU computer security policies and practices (Kathy Starkoff, David Pike).

The following BuckeyeSecure web pages are relevant for this discussion:

University Computer Security Standards
<http://buckeyesecure.osu.edu/Policy/UCSS>

Local Administrative Privilege Standards (LAPS)
<http://buckeyesecure.osu.edu/Policy/LAPS>

Minimum Computer Security Standards
<http://buckeyesecure.osu.edu/Policy/MCSS>

David Pike, Office of the CIO, discussed the need for a pro-active security framework to get ahead of issues. Today he will focus on password practices. The university is moving toward a more mature password security environment, with greater consistency, in order to meet requirements for research grants and other federated activities. The vision is to integrate other college or local systems, so that individuals have fewer passwords to deal with. More protection would be helpful for the Libraries too, where stolen passwords are being used to get database resources. There will be a self-service site for resetting passwords. Kathy stated that they would like more faculty feedback on this to be sure issues are understood. She will try to get it on the agenda for the next Senate meeting. Tim Rhodus asked about the MCSS and LAPS policies – is input still needed? Kathy noted that MCSS is not finished and will be brought to COLIT for discussion. These policies are minimum requirements, but colleges have the opportunity to exceed them.

The Committee agreed to meet on June 7 to continue discussion of the LAPS and MCSS standards.

3. Carol Diedrichs – proposal for a forum/conference next year on transforming scholarship, and its implications for faculty, OSU Libraries, and OSU IT staff.

Discussion deferred until a future meeting.

Council on Libraries and Information Technology Minutes, June 7, 2010

Members present: Carol Diedrichs, Anne Fields, Richard Hart, Ashok Krishnamurthy, Tim Rhodus, Sherwin Singer, Kathy Starkoff, Les Tannenbaum.

Guests: Larry Allen, Joanne Dehoney, Nancy O'Hanlon, David Pike, Dickie Selfe.

Selection of Chair and Vice Chair:

Richard nominated Les Tannenbaum for COLIT chair, 2010-11. Sherwin seconded the motion and all those present affirmed this choice. The selection of a Vice Chair will be deferred to the first meeting of autumn quarter.

Update on Research Computing Committee:

John Heimaster, chair of the Research Computing Committee (RCC), met with Les and also with other humanities faculty to get an overview of issues important to them. He is more interested in methodologies than content when considering research computing issues, but is quite open to collaboration with arts and humanities faculty. Les will arrange a joint meeting in autumn to discuss ways to collaborate. Ashok noted that it is important to document the diverse needs of research computing across campus and that this is the focus of the RCC.

Continuation of MCSS and LAPS Policy Discussion: (David Pike, oCIO)

Several large-impact, costly incidents in 2007 gave rise to the Minimum Computer Security Standard (MCSS) and the security framework. Departments report compliance on a regular basis. The policy pertains only to university owned equipment and focuses on the desktop, not mobile devices. Ver. 2 (CCSS) fixes some gaps in the previous policy. Proposed revision at: <http://buckeyesecure.osu.edu/Policy/MCSS2>. There is a process for departmental exceptions.

Tim noted that actual cases that have prompted this policy really require better employee education, not university-wide auditing of software. David replied that a number of measures are needed to strengthen our security environment, and minimum standards are still needed. Kathy agreed that we need balance in these measures and better communication with the IT community on these issues. Sherwin added that faculty should be encouraged to keep as much information as possible off their laptops. David mentioned a pilot online training program for faculty. Tim noted the general need for a more robust instructional technology toolset for faculty. Carol suggested that the colleges and departments need to put pressure on OAA to make this happen. Sherwin suggested the use of pop-ups and other real time feedback in systems like Carmen to remind faculty users of their obligation to protect data.

Local Administrative Privilege Standards (LAPS): <http://buckeyesecure.osu.edu/Policy/LAPS>

These privileges are inconsistently administered across departments. The LAPS document suggests best practices. Departments may decide how or whether to implement LAPS. The oCIO role is advisory; they will provide feedback and comments. Tim noted that there is confusion, since some departments are being very restrictive. Kathy suggested working with the CIO Advisory Community to engage IT staff in colleges. Dickie noted that some Deans give IT

staff time at meetings to discuss these issues. IT staff need to be educated to work with faculty on these issues.