

FS Library Advisory Committee

Meeting Minutes

Friday, February 24, 2023, 11:30 AM – 12:30 PM, Dean's Conference Room

Present: Dr. Gundela Hachmann, Stanley Wilder, Lois Kuyper-Rushing, Leslie Tuttle, Dr. Yimin Xhu, Dr. Yi-Jun Xu, Dr. Kayanush J. Aryana
Next meeting: March, Early April, Friday from 11:30 AM-12:30 PM

I. Call to Order

Meeting begins at 11:33 AM

Dr. Hachmann mentions the statute of printing the meeting agenda and the public comment sign-in sheet. We are instructed to go through the motions.

II. Determine minute taker

Kelsey Gresham volunteers as a minute taker for the Spring meeting

III. Roll Call

Introductions:

Dr. Hachmann is chair of the LAC and has been for the past 3 years. She teaches in the department of world languages and is affiliated with comparative literature, screen arts and international studies. Associate professor.

Dr. Kayanush Aryana is a professor at the school of nutrition and food sciences – research and teaching responsibilities + extension work.

Lois Kuyper-Rushing is the assistant dean of public and collection services at the Library.

Dr. Yi-Jun Xu is a hydrology professor, teaching and research, and previously served on the committee of international studies.

Leslie Tuttle is an associate professor of history and affiliate faculty member in women, gender, and sexuality studies – research in early, modern France.

Dr. Yimin Zu is a professor in construction management for the college of engineering and does research in computing and civil engineering.

Stanley Wilder is the Dean of the LSU Libraries and has been since 2014.

Kelsey Gresham is the executive assistant for the Dean and for the Dean's executive office.

IV. Public Comments on Agenda Items*

*It is intended that public comments may be made (1) when they relate to a matter on the agenda and (2) when individuals desiring to make public comments have registered with the committee chair in the 15 minutes prior to the scheduled meeting time. When registering, individuals should identify themselves; the group they are representing, if appropriate; and the agenda item on which they would like to comment. In order to ensure that the meeting is conducted in an efficient manner, the chair reserves the right to limit public comment, if necessary. The LSU Faculty Committees may enter into executive session in accordance with the provisions LA. R.S. 42:17

No public comments

V. News from the BrightSpot project planning and analysis for new library building

Dr. Hachmann: Brightspot is a consulting company LSU hired to make a needs analysis for the new Library and Learning Commons. The Master Plan determines there will be a new building related to research and scholarship in a parking lot southwest of here. Picture the airplane near the ROTC building and the football stadium. The parking lot across has been designated as the new location for the new library building. To make this a reality, we need to state what we want, need, and costs. The new project is not yet funded which presents a major challenge. A new library building typically costs between \$100-150 million. LSU hired Brightspot to formulate a "first design" along with a general estimate of what the costs would be + what would the new building do for the University. Series of interviews were conducted with constituents around campus about their wants.

Aside: There are some people on this campus who doubt the need for a building due to the influx of "online materials"

Brightspot came up with a needs analysis to substantiate the space and need for the building.

Stanley: This planning project began Labor Day and will end in a couple of weeks in time for the next legislative session. The point is to give LSU the documentation and data to advocate for a significant state contribution. The state agreed in principle at the last session to come up with \$50 million but this is only a 1/3 of what is needed. The process has encompassed so much of our time with a multitude of inputs for the process. The process isn't funded by us or aimed at us; the process is aimed at enabling President Tate to decide about the scope and function of the new library building in a way to enable him to martial the fundraising and state fundraising support for the new building.

An important benchmark was had this morning during the leadership meeting. Preliminary results were presented to a group + President Tate wherein the object is to provide him with options at various price points, keeping in mind that the cost of construction has increased significantly in the past 9 months. \$150 million then is easily \$200 million now. Essentially there are 2 options being presented to the President and he has given no indication of which direction he was leaning except to state the need to be realistic and to convey overall skepticism towards what LSU can possibly aspire to martial in support of the new building.

Stanley: LSU has a new capital campaign they're preparing to launch – we hope for the Library to be the University's priority. For that to happen, they must complete the interdisciplinary building Dr. Aryana mentioned. The chances are high that we will be a priority. If so, we'll have all the directors of development and the LSU Foundation turning their attention to raising money for the new building. That would be encouraging, but it is a harder sell to raise money for a library building vs. a science building or Patrick Taylor which has heavy corporate Foundation interests.

Dr. Hachmann: The functionality of the current library building is limited. There's a time limit on how much longer the building can serve a purpose. There needs to be a solution, a new place. The building was built in 1959 and at a low building standard, so the building has just about reached its end of life. They've patched up the foundation to prevent more flooding in the basement. Most recently, there has been a temporary fix for the roof leaks. A new roof would be a fortune and unrealistic. The temporary fix will last only 10 years, and we're one year down. Having a library building leaking water into a building with important research documents, books, equipment will not allow the survival of any items exposed. We desperately need something new.

Dr. Aryana: Applying the food science idea (grants in food safety) to the library situation could present the need for a new library as a safety issue. Mold exposure. Bringing a safety angle to it would raise more concern. We stress that people's health is at risk.

Stanley: We have been taking that approach. The most recent basement fix was digging trenches and putting in pumps which is an acknowledgment that we cannot stop the water from coming in. All the people have had to be removed. Environmentally, we cannot have people in areas with stagnant water. For safety, we think of the extensive collection in Special Collections. Safety in terms of safety for the collections which could become molded and usable. The 4th floor has Visqueen draped over so many stacks.

Dr. Hachmann: Everyone understands this building is no longer functioning. We have convincing to do about what we need. Will the report be made public? Who will it be shared with?

Stanley: There is some sensitivity to the report in terms of the cost figures. We simply do not know.

Stanley: The University has decided to build an ASRS – it would be faster and more convenient to get collections. The alternative is offsite storage. Between offsite and ASRS, I prefer ASRS because it will allow for an increased amount of storage. Why is it that LSU has decided to do an ASRS? Hunt Library at NC State has one, so the President said he wanted one.

Leslie: Is there a possibility of having a state collaborative project where collections are shared between state institutions that way there is equity between sharing in the buildings like in the California model. The state has the money for the book - not every institution has the book, but you can get access in a day.

Dr. Hachmann: It would change the nature of our Library. We already have a State Library which is effectively almost unusable and inaccessible. State services + University services would make products more available but at the cost of additional restrictions imposed by the State.

Stanley: The idea of cooperation among LA higher-end institutions presents so many hidden barriers to doing this. The LSU community alone would at least have faculty considering the availability of collections for our primary constituency. On the other hand, we have the Inter Library Loan program.

Dr. Aryana: People are talking about Artificial Intelligence. Can that be presented as one of the library's dynamics? Could that be a spin added to the bullet list of justifications for a new Library?

Stanley: My colleagues and I are there, and interested in how AI can improve, but we're in the early days.

Lois: It's beyond what the legislature can consider.

VI. New zero-based budget model and the library budget (short presentation by Dean Wilder)

Stanley: The Zero-Based Budget approach can't help but to help the Library out. We've done our presentation and aren't aware of the results, yet. *Powerpoint Presentation begins to show the possible scope of change:*

Our core problem lies with our journal collections (\$6 million/half our budget) and the increase of inflation. We are in the situation we're in because LSU never funds inflation on its most expensive cost center which is journals. The ZBB approach to our situation means an addition of \$700,000 to our budget in serials alone. For books, if we expect \$800,000, that means an increase of almost \$500,000. Without touching any other aspect of the operation, that's already \$1.2 million in new money that must be allocated to fund where we are now. The median expenditure for books in research institutions is \$1.5 million. And that is the lower tier. Staffing – GA stipends are increasing, we had 11 or 12 GAs at any time and since they are classified by LSU as "service GAs", the funding for them is going away altogether. They are doing basic operational things, so that means we need full-time employees to replace them. We have a library school that produces people in a professional program. Our GAs were getting professional experience and exposure in a fully functioning research library. It kills us we are not able to provide this kind of mentoring service to LSU students, etc.

Collections – Brightspot analysis of collections – ~573,000 volumes to potentially be disposed of out of the total collection of 2.2 million in print. To make up for this, we have journal runs superseded by better electronic options in such a way that these print collections will never be used. We have a lot of journal materials and duplicates in clinically oriented collections where being out of date is a problem. Whatever we do as a process has to be perfectly transparent and provide lots of loops for excluding material from being discarded. We requested money for student-facing furniture – We have no budget at all to replace furniture. We've got 6000 square feet of space with absolutely no money to replace broken items.

I am optimistic they will meet our needs. In the absence of a program like ZBB, we're in a layoff situation. The only other option for more money to us is laying people off and redirecting their salaries to basic operations.

Dr. Aryana: Another source of money – if the Library could somehow be tied into local enterprises – maybe a small stream of money could be produced. Some way of getting information to the citizens of LA other than the university population. Food Sciences got \$1.2 million from the bottling line.

Conversation about the presentations and when decisions will be made about budgets. How are the decisions being made by the Provost? We don't know when, and we don't know the criteria so we're just waiting.

Dr. Aryana: What are the courses we are not offering? What could we be offering? It could be another justification bullet.

Stanley: A huge problem we've had in the planning project is persuading the group of what a 21st century library ought to be doing vs. what we're doing.

Dr. Hachmann: Brightspot is coming up with a price point + a vision + report.

Yi-Jun Xu: What can we do to help you as an FSLAC member? There was a university-wide email sent out months ago about suggestions to help the Library. The argument was about who goes to the Library? The question is how will the new Library be beneficial for students and faculty in the future considering a lot of faculty and students do not go to the Library. Information can be found online. Library Vs. Digital Library. Several faculty wished for it to be packaged more attractively, with restaurants, etc.

Lois: We have seen initial presentations from Brightspot and they have incorporated a lot of what Dr. Xu is describing in this new building...study space, classroom space, restaurant areas, virtual/digital media

Stanley: The reason you're able to do your academic and research work in digital format is that we've obtained it and made it available to you. Even in our reduced state, this building is the highest-used academic building in LSU. Students are telling you by voting with their feet that there is a need for this space.

Maker's spaces, Data services, teacher training, face-to-face experiences – It's important that the Library exists to house those experiences and make them a possibility.

Dr. Hachmann: We must be very careful about this argument. Yes, there are some who only rely on digital research. The conclusion is ergo we don't need a Library building.
Do we really want LSU to be a university without a Library?

Dr. Hachmann: We passed a resolution last year about the collection funding and an increase for funding to the Faculty Senate. But nothing happened. We have been regularly showing up at the Senate bringing up these issues. I write an annual report to the executive committee of the Faculty Senate. It's very hard to get through to the administrators at LSU. I wrote a detailed report on the problems with our extremely limited budget on databases, collections, and subscriptions – what happens when we can't search for what we need or cannot access what we need. NOTHING has happened. We've tried very hard to no avail.

Dr. Hachmann: The Library is not an add-on, it's the substance of what we're doing here. As long as the library budget is so low, we cannot increase the number of references.

Dr. Aryana: The sum of everything is persistence. We make a simple bullet list: Support of Faculty Senate for a 21st century Library, Library is the Highest Used Academic Building, Increased digitization services (E-textbooks)

Stanley: If there's more I can be doing as an advocate, I don't know what it is. I think LSU walked into a trap as far as the Library is concerned in the sense that the ZBB budget model will completely fund the

proposed Library budget. If the money comes to us, it must come from somewhere else. There is no new money.

VII. Update on initiative to get faculty involved in disposing of no longer needed collection items

VIII. Update on efforts to increase use of Orcid-ID among LSU researchers

IX. Brief survey among committee members for next meeting date:

Friday at 11:30 – another meeting in late March, early April

Stanley: Bring any issues or concerns to proposed agendas.

*Decision made to invite David Dunaway, head of the online (E-Text) initiatives, to the next meeting.

Meeting adjourns at 12:54 PM