Present: David Garman (Chair); Matt Panzer; Sandra Stark; Marie-Claire Beaulieu; Brenna Gormally, GSC Representative; Eva Kahan, TCU Senate Representative Ex Officio Member: Dorothy Meaney

Guest: Kevin Dunn, Vice Provost, Tufts University; Dan Santamaria, Director, Digital Collections and Archives, University Archivist, and TLC Co-Chair; Debra Berlanstein, Associate Librarian, Hirsh Health Sciences Library (HHSLS) and TLC member; Martha Kelehan, Assistant Director for Research and Learning, Tisch Library; and Alicia Morris, Assistant Director, Tisch Library

Absent: Genevieve Walsh; David Ekbladh; Ichiro Takayoshi; Ioannis Evrigenis; Sarah Lessin, TCU Senate Representative

1. Chair’s Welcome and Member Introductions: David Garman, Chair
   David welcomed the members of the Library Committee and the Tufts Libraries Council (TLC) and asked everyone to introduce themselves.

2. DJA Consulting’s report (2015), Libraries Organizational Review: Final Report and Recommendations, and David Garman’s Scenario 3.5 Discussion: Dan Santamaria, TLC Co-Chair, Director of Digital Collections and Archives, and University Archivist; David Garman, Library Committee Chair
   I. Goals for discussion:
      a. obtain feedback
      b. determine steps forward

   II. TLC’s discussion:
      a. TLC has reviewed the strengths and weaknesses section within the document to see what TLC can address themselves. Specific structures have not yet been discussed. Today’s Library Committee discussion will be incorporated into the ongoing one that TLC has been having. David Garman and other Library Committee members have offered to come to TLC for a larger conversation.
      b. Questions from TLC:
         What is the AS&E faculty motivation was for revisiting a centralized structure?
         The Library Committee appreciates
         i. how complicated the decision-making, budgetary issues, and actions across libraries (e.g. – contract negotiations and initiatives) have been
         ii. that a centralized structure was needed to ensure the libraries were included at the table for critical university discussions and decisions
         iii. faculty understand that the libraries operate with very lean staffing as well as budgets received from their respective schools. Having centralized funding along with a University Librarian to advocate for a collective vision as well as more stable funding, and who will fundraise for resources (including staffing) would be of great benefit
         iv. the timing for a proposed change is advantageous with the hiring of a new Provost

   III. Concerns about a centralized structure expressed by TLC and Library Committee members:
      i. protecting the differences in models and roles at the different libraries
      ii. the funding source for a University Librarian and its impact on the libraries’ services, resources, and staffing
      iii. integration issues and the impact upon quality, consistency, and continuity of resources and services
      iv. resource acquisitions and access
      v. administrative bloat
      vi. if a centralized organization is adopted, the University Librarian should not also be a library director so as to avoid conflict of interest
David assured the group that one of the values of a useful University Librarian structure is to preserve local management and decision-making. Several examples were given to the Library Committee of cases in which resources and services are successfully shared between libraries with each having their own discrete domains:

i. an MOU for a shared ERM Librarian between Tisch and HHSL

ii. an MOU with TTS for a developer in Tisch to manage development of the repository

iii. Ginn’s payment to Tisch for all of their (Ginn’s) technical services work

IV. Suggestions for steps forward:

i. invite University Librarians, including those from institutions that have recently implemented a centralized system, to talk about best practices as well as their own experiences. TLC members suggested SMU, UNC, and Cornell.

ii. perhaps invite DJA to return to do additional work

iii. include other stakeholders in this discussion. When a more comprehensive plan is ready for proposal, the Faulty Senate and the deans of the schools will be approached for their feedback.

V. Scenario 3.5:

David directed the group to Scenario 3.5, the option he had written as a middle ground to the options offered in the DJA report. He asked if this option would:

i. improve the current situation and how

ii. what makes the current situation better/worse

Questions from Library Committee and TLC members:

i. what will the scale efficiencies look like and what would streamlining of staff, services, and resources yield?
   David suggested starting assessment with the largest library, Tisch, and how it’s administered – i.e. – is the percentage of the work greater for Tisch or for the university?

ii. what is the University Librarian’s role and how does it justify the position and salary?
   a. the position is more strongly externally facing with the day-to-day operations left to the library directors and senior leadership team
   b. management of the libraries’ senior leadership team
   c. member of a broad range of university committees
   d. fundraising
   e. evaluates new initiatives to determine the value of either undertaking or being a partner in them

Debra noted that the EADs of the dental and medical schools would need to be convinced that taking monetary control of the library away from them would work out well. Dorothy suggested using TTS’ consolidation as an example of financial mechanics.

DCA and Library Technology Services would not fall under the new structure outlined in Option 3.5 because they are units within central administration already. A formal mechanism for communication with those units would need to be developed if the libraries become centralized, too.

VI. Next steps forward:

i. TLC will discuss Option 3.5 and decide whether to endorse or revise it before it is sent to the Faculty Senate, the Executive Committee, and the deans of the schools.

ii. David and Kevin will communicate with these groups about this process once TLC is ready. When the time comes, those groups will receive the DJA final report for context along with the option that TLC proposes. David and Kevin also will discuss with them how they would like to be involved.

iii. Library staff will be included in a discussion once TLC has an option to propose, too, in order to clarify the changes, consolidations, efficiencies, and allay fears and concerns regarding job changes and loss.

David Garman, David Ekbladh, and Yannis will form a Library Committee sub-committee dedicated to continued work on evaluation of moving to an appropriate centralized library system structure.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:05 PM. The spring semester Library Committee meetings will be determined via Doodle poll to be sent out shortly.