



THE UNIVERSITY of TENNESSEE

KNOXVILLE, CHATTANOOGA, MARTIN, TULLAHOOMA, MEMPHIS

FACULTY COUNCIL

MEETING 41 - Minutes

November 20, 2013, Videoconference, 4:00 p.m. (EST)

UT Faculty Council Voting Members (Quorum, 5 voting members)

UTHSC George Cook (Faculty Senate President) - present
Phyllis Richey (Campus Representative) - present
UTK David Golden (Faculty Senate President) - present
David Patterson (Campus Representative) – present
UTM Jeff Rogers (Faculty Senate President) - present
Jenna Wright (Campus Representative) – present
UTC Deborah McAllister (Faculty Senate President) - present
Kay Cowan (Campus Representative) - present

Trustees (Ex-Officio voting)

Vickie Steinberg (Board of Trustees Faculty member - voting) -present
Thad Wilson (Board of Trustees Faculty member – non-voting) - absent

UT Faculty Council Ex-Officio Non-voting Members

UT Dr. Joe DiPietro (System President) – absent
UT Dr. Katie High (System Office of Academic Affairs and Student Success) – absent

Faculty Council Guests

UT Dr. India Lane (System Office of Academic Affairs and Student Success) – present
UTHSC Maggie DeBon – present
Sandy Oelschlegel, Chair, University of Tennessee Library Council - present

Call to Order

Roll Call – as above

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Approval of the October 16-17, 2013 minutes.

Old Business

1. Documents for Web site.

Recommendations approved by UFC, in previous years, were discussed for inclusion on the UFC Web site. Several items were approved for inclusion [and now appear on the Web site: <http://tennessee.edu/systemfacultyouncil/recommendations.html>]. See below.

2. Course and lab fees.

Jeff stated that department operating budgets have been trimmed, and there has been an attempt to increase course fees. This may not be justifiable. A complaint may get to the Board of Trustees, THEC, or the state legislature. This may cap our ability to charge fees. We are seeing some parallel with tuition increases. As a System, we should set these fees. Kay noted that the Provost is interested in the same issues. David P. is concerned about a centralized response, or the requirement of a System procedure, as it may interfere with campus practice.

India stated that this is a campus issue, and the System does not want to take away campus autonomy. There should be a policy, with checks and balances. The System would be asked to provide a reasonable policy, for each campus. This would be sent.

New Business

1. Presentation from UT Library Council.

Sandy Oelschlegel, Chair, University of Tennessee Library Council, presented the report, "Background: University of Tennessee Libraries Shared Purchases of E-Resources" (attached).

The intent is to provide access to resources across campuses. Discussion has been ongoing, since 2000. In 2003, campus-to-campus sharing was the most common approach to resource sharing. The timeline of activities is presented in the report. Now, statewide purchase is an option. There are 76 master agreements in place. This is not an ideal situation. They would rather have a policy for all campuses, in place, and would like a System purchase of a core set of databases, as well as funding to get all campus contracts on the same timeline.

Questions and comments followed.

Kay noted that, basically, medical resources are in the shared core, and wanted to know how to get a core collection. Sandy said we would need to ask: What is it? How do we get funding (would need to be recurring)?

David P. wanted to know about economy of scale. Is there a benefit to pooling FTE. Sandy said that there may be some benefit, but it wouldn't be significant. FTE in a particular category could be considered. If two vendors are in competition, there may be some negotiation. They are working on two core lists: medical and general. India mentioned undergraduate enrollment, faculty, and staff. She said that funding is new, recurring dollars that get charged back to campuses. They prefer smaller amounts to make contracts happen.

David G. mentioned library funding. Sandy said it had been voted on, at all campuses. She wants Faculty Council to know that they are working on resource sharing. Phyllis suggested that we could bring this to the attention of Dr. DiPietro, the Board of Trustees, or Anthony Haynes, as a lobbying issue. India responded that, with the climate, this wouldn't go far. Information from the Governor's office indicates a high cost for health care. She would remind Dr. DiPietro that this is on the list of important items, for the Faculty Council. Sandy said that, with regard to lobbying, and the suggestion of learning on vendors, that they are not state companies. Sandy stated that the Faculty Council can support the Library Council by being vocal, regarding the access to information, as it is important for teaching, learning, and research. Kay emphasized the critical nature of this access, with regard to critical thinking. We need the resources to do what we say we're going to do.

2. Family medical leave.

George stated that some faculty had been told that they had to go on leave. The Family Medical Leave Act protects jobs, and the employer is required to offer it to those absent for 5 days or more. It must be offered, but doesn't have to be accepted. Faculty have sick leave, but are told they have to go on FML. It is limited, and they can be fired. If FML is not accepted, faculty can go on it, later, if needed.

Vicki noted that, under federal law, they don't have to pay us (9-month faculty). We deal for a shorter term of absence, on this campus. There is a negotiation strategy. We need to make sure everyone is informed of the policy. George agreed that faculty members must be informed. We should invite someone to discuss thos, and add this issue to the recommendations list.

3. Salary gaps for faculty and staff across the System.

Vicki wanted to make sure that we have the Sibson data. We want to bring faculty to a certain level. As new faculty are beginning, there is the compression issue for others. Dr. DiPietro will meet with the UTHSC faculty, possibly, on December 4. With whom he will meet is unclear, as his schedule is tight.

Other Business

David G. had a question, regarding the meeting to be held in Martin. A pervious chancellor had not allowed the travel to Martin. He should be reimbursed for the upcoming travel.

Next meeting – January 15, 2014 videoconference (not held), UT-Martin, February 25-26, 2014.

Adjournment

Recommendations - UFC

Meeting 28 – April 11, 2012

24. Faculty more involved in BOT. It was recommended that the faculty and students who are members of the BOT to make a report at the Fall BOT meeting. There was discussion about the seating arrangements of the BOT members and it was believed that it was by seniority, but Catherine Mizell will be asked about this. Additionally, when available, faculty senate presidents should be invited to attend lunch and sit with the BOT members.

Meeting 26 – February 27, 2012

Action Items:

UTFC recommends that the office of Academic Affairs and Student Success communicate with the UTFC members the agenda items of the AASS committee meeting prior to the Board of Trustees scheduled meetings. Motion by Miles, second by Wright. Carried

UTFC recommends that all AASS committee members be reimbursed, through regular Board of Trustee channels, for their travel to all AASS committee meetings associated with the Board of Trustees meetings. Motion by Miles, second by Brown. Carried

Meeting 26 – February 27, 2012

Old Business

Old Recommendations – Cook pointed out that there seem to be two previous recommendations that are still pending. The first was a recommendation that the President support the appointment of an ombudsperson on each campus. Since that time, UTK has successfully added an ombudsperson, and UTHSC is working on this. It was decided at a previous videoconference that this issue should be handled by each campus. The second recommendation “All full-time UT faculty and staff should receive at least 3% cost of living raises, before considerations of merit.” was discussed and agreed that cost of living should precede any merit pay awarded. This was deferred to the next videoconference and then for an agenda item when UTFC meets with the President face-to-face in April.

Meeting 27 – March 21, 2012

Only reference - Ombudsman: pursue this with the new President and what he feels about having one on each campus. Each campus should continue to push to have one.)

Meeting 28 – April 11, 2012

11. Ombudsman. Previously, UTFC met and recommended to the President that each campus have an Ombudsman. UTK has a program and UTC and UTM have faculty relations type groups. The Ombudsman would be vital for hearing disputes before they escalate to an appeals process and become entrenched in the system. It was recommended that each FS recommend an Ombudsman program at the first Senate meeting in the fall. There is no reason this program should be opposed on any campus.

Meeting 25 – January 18, 2012

Review of Recommendations.

George reported that since 2007, UTFC has made several recommendations that have been put forward to the various UT Presidents. (<http://web.utk.edu/~utfc/Recommendations.html>) On some occasions the recommendations have been acted upon and on others the recommendations have lost momentum or been lost altogether. George will go through the recommendations and try to identify those that need to be brought forward to Dr. DiPietro at the meeting in February.

Meeting 24 – November 16, 2011
Department Head training revisited.

It was brought up that the conversation regarding department head training was never completed. Patterson moved that: UTFC recommend to the President that the Office of Academic Affairs and Student Success work with the Vice Chancellors of Academic Affairs on each campus to facilitate department head/chair training.

Second by Boulet. (final version following friendly amendment)

Meeting 22 – September 8, 2011
Future Meeting Schedule.

To facilitate the face-to-face meeting schedule with the President, it was decided that the UFC would regularly meet with the President, in Nashville, in coordination with the May and September Building Commission Meetings. Additionally, the UFC would meet face-to-face with the President at the Winter (February) and June Board of Trustees (BOT) meetings. The UFC members would come in the night before the first committee meeting of the BOT.

Recommendation was made that this schedule be added to the Bylaws. (The Bylaws may be revised at any meeting of the UFC provided notice of the proposed revisions have been given to all UFC members at least one month prior to the meeting. Revisions to the bylaws require a two-thirds majority of all voting members of the UFC to be implemented.)

Motion by McCullough to allow videoconference attendance at this meeting, second by Boulet. Motion carried. (4-yes, 1-no, 1-abstain)

Background: University of Tennessee Libraries Shared Purchases of E-Resources

Prepared for the University of Tennessee Library Council Summit Meeting

July 26-27, 2012

Updated for the University Faculty Council

November 20, 2013

Libraries play a major role in the success of university faculty and students. At the University of Tennessee, the libraries located on each campus reflect the needs of the specific academic programs by selecting resource to meet information needs. Not all UT libraries can purchase all the available resources, and not all resources are needed by every library. But when the information needs of the faculty and students on multiple campuses overlap, it is the goal of the UT Libraries to meet those needs through cooperative efforts. The libraries of the University of Tennessee have a long history of collaborating to meet the collection needs of the faculty and students through interlibrary loan, cooperative lending and shared purchases of E-Resources.

Some highlights of University of Tennessee Library activities, which have culminated in today's meeting are listed below

2000: Meeting minutes reflect discussion on the topic- An extensive discussion about shared electronic databases culminated in the decision to develop a short briefing paper on issues, topics related to securing and sharing databases.

2003: The libraries met and discussed the need for collaboration among the libraries and support from UT System, a document was drafted to be sent to the UT Chief Academic Officers with the following prelude:

Collaboration among University of Tennessee system libraries can leverage the more than \$2 million we spend on electronic resources. With UT chief financial officers, library directors of UT System libraries wish to coordinate license review and purchase processes.

Collaborative purchasing will also require development of procedures for central funding or pooling appropriate contributions from participating libraries.

The following library initiatives were stated in this document:

- UT system libraries are forming a collaborative group. Procedures will be developed through a governance structure that includes representatives of each library who have the authority to commit funds for database purchases, and librarians who are familiar with selection, evaluation, acquisitions, and license negotiation for electronic resources.
- Libraries with an interest in the same database will designate a leader to negotiate on behalf of the group. Terms of participation will be developed in advance, including financial commitment.
- With the authorization of UT system financial officers, libraries could designate a single-point-of-contact for database license negotiations. While the industry does not yet have a standardized license agreement, most licenses for electronic resources now conform to key points such as state requirements for local law, no indemnity, no binding arbitration, and vendors are familiar with terms acceptable to state institutions. License review must be swift to take advantage of good deals and to avoid backlogs.

- The group will invite a representative from another statewide library consortium to advise on policies and processes that promote team-based, expeditious, and cost-effective purchase of subscriptions for electronic resources.
- Although no funding mechanism presently exists for the libraries to negotiate centrally, we are working on a formal process to pool funds as they become available for purchase of electronic resources of interest to two or more UT libraries.

The following request was made in this document:

UT System library directors wish to discuss the following issues with financial officers:

1. What process will enable coordinated license review and database access?
2. What funding sources can support central funding or pooling appropriate contributions from participating libraries?

2004: The E-Resource Librarians developed a list of all E-Resources purchased by UT Libraries with the goal of finding commonalities. Meetings were held to discuss ways in which resources could be purchased jointly. Some collaborative purchases were accomplished between UT Libraries with site licenses for electronic access to New England Journal of Medicine, JAMA, nine of the Archives journals and Journal of Clinical Oncology.

2006: The E-Resources group took further action

- Met in **January and February** and identified and ranked resources that the librarians knew were of interest to their students and faculty.
- In **March**, a “Request for Quotation” was drafted and distributed to the vendors who sell the targeted electronic resources.
- Based on the vendor responses, Barbara Dewey, Dean of Libraries, representing the UT Library Directors sent a letter to Chancellor Crabtree to inform him of the results of our work. The letter stated that “\$ 1,011,972.00 in recurring funds was required to add these resources for additional campuses.” The letter is dated **May 30, 2006**.
- The UT Library Directors meeting was held in **September**, the electronic resource committee also attended. At that time the group was informed that there had been no response from the UT administration regarding additional funding that would accommodate wider access to the desired resources.
- During the September meeting, the group came to a consensus that :
 - There would need to be additional funding to make the selected resources available.
 - There should be a person at the system-level at UT to work with the libraries to streamline the acquisition of e-resources of common interest to more than one campus. (TBR has a person who handles licenses for the whole system.)

2007: The UT System Faculty Council began discussing lack of access to library resources as a problem that limited academic endeavors. Dean Barbara Dewey was contacted by Interim Vice President for Academic Affairs and Student Success, Dr. Katie High to discuss the topic.

2008: UT Library Deans and Directors were invited to speak to the Chief Academic Officers meeting in April. We presented a vision for shared resources of commonly needed resources.

2009: Vice President for Strategic Planning and Operations, Sylvia Davis and Vice President for Academic Affairs and Student Success, Bonnie Yegidis both expressed an interest in the success of access to shared library resources for faculty and students. Results from their interest included central licensing/purchasing for Web of Science, additional collaboration on the Science Direct purchase, which added UT Health Sciences Center Library to the contract. Streamlined borrowing of library materials by UT Borrowers also resulted from an agreement that the ID card issued by the library user's home institution is sufficient to borrow library materials at any campus in the UT System.

2011: Katherine N. High, Ed.D. Interim Vice President of Academic Affairs and Student Success facilitated a videoconference meeting with the University Faculty Council and library Deans & Director directors from all campuses. She invited the libraries to submit a proposal for shared resources. Present at that meeting was also Mark Paganelli from the Treasurer's Office and India Lane from the Office of Academic Affairs and Student Success

Jan 18thThe following was requested as a part of this proposal:

- 1) Continue funding for Web of Science
- 2) Create a UT System library position, funded and reporting to UT System.
- 3) Provide start-up funds to create a UT System library presence, accessible by all UT students, faculty, and staff.

April 8th UT Library Deans and Directors held a conference call with Katherine N. High, Ed.D, Interim Vice President of Academic Affairs and Student Success.

June 28: Conference call was arranged with Mark Paganelli and Katherine N. High. The stated purpose was "to develop a dialog regarding system-wide electronic databases and subscriptions for library resources that all campuses could use. This is an initial meeting to discuss the feasibility of leveraging some economies of scale to provide the same resources at each campus in an attempt to both save money and come to some sort of consensus on products that might serve all campuses."

August 5: UT Library Deans and Directors met with representatives Katie High, India Lane, Mark Paganelli from UT System at the Renaissance Center in Dickson. An announcement was made of the assistance with processing our shared library resource purchases through the development of the "E-Resources Licensing Specialist".

The libraries began working with Mark Paganelli and Samantha Johnson from the System Budget office tackle the issue of electronic library subscriptions. Blake Reagan, J.D. Director of Contract Administration assisted with the process and discussions.

December 2011 UT System assists with negotiating one single license for a deal with Nature/NERL which is structured to mutually benefit all campuses.

December 2011 a state-wide meeting in Nashville regarding electronic library resources was organized by Samantha Drenner-Johnson Director of Purchasing

2012: The libraries formed the University of Tennessee Library Council in **January 2012** with the stated purpose “to advance the operations of University of Tennessee libraries for the benefits of faculty, students, staff, administrators and practitioners. The UTLC is a coordinating body that acts through consensus around issues of common interest to all UT campus libraries.”

April, 2012: University of Tennessee Library Council met for the spring meeting and also met with Mark Paganelli, Treasurer, Samantha Johnson and Abbie Shellist. The list of potential shared purchases was prioritized.

In a second meeting; the UTLC members discussed the concept of a retreat for all the E-Resources and UTLC members.

July, 2012: UTLC Retreat was held at the Embassy Suites, Nashville with 18 participants including Library Deans/Directors, UT Librarians central to the library Eresources process and UT System Purchasing/Contracts personnel

2013: Since the formation of University of Tennessee Library Council and the July 2012 meeting, the activity has focused on streamlining the purchasing process for library resources The UTLC E-Resources group has meet twice to establish methods of resource sharing, some accomplishments are listed below

Master Agreements: The University of Tennessee’s Treasurer’s Office, has been negotiating master agreements with various vendors in order to assist libraries by making the contract process more efficient. Blake Reagan, Director of Contracts in the Treasurer’s office and Corey Halaychik, UT Hodges Library have worked together and established Master Agreements. There are currently 76 Master Agreements available for libraries to join with information products vendors. This is important because the presence of a Master Agreement in the system allows other UT library to complete the purchase process faster, and under the same terms as the library that initiated the Master Agreement. While not strictly a shared purchase, the results are faster, more efficient purchase of the same product with the same terms. The master agreements are listed on a central website
<<http://treasurer.tennessee.edu/contracts/masteragreements/libmasteragree.html>>

Joint Purchases: There have also been a number of joint purchases, some library resources that are jointly contracted and purchased by two or more campuses are listed in Table 1.

Table 1: Shared Purchase of Resources by Two or More Campuses
Access Medicine
Cochrane Database
Embase: International Pharmaceutical Abstracts
JAMA
Journal of Clinical Oncology
Journals@OVID Full text
LWW Total Access
OVID Medline
Nature Journals
New England Journal of Medicine
PsycARTICLES
PsycInfo
RIA Checkpoint
Science Direct
Web of Science

Preservation: Steven Escar Smith, Dean of Libraries at UT Knoxville campus worked closely with the State Librarian, Chuck Sherrill in developing a proposal for a centrally stored collection of scientific and scholarly literature from University of Tennessee Libraries to preserve the journal collections as a "resource in common for the state of Tennessee." While not strictly a UTLC initiative, the UTLC members voted at the April meeting to support the project in concept and principle. The project is called "Preserving the Academic Record of Scientific and Scholarly Literature" for the State of Tennessee (PARSS L).

Future Plans: The barriers that exist to purchasing library resources jointly so that access is available across campuses to faculty and students fall into two broad categories, financial and practical. Financial issues include the lack of central funds to assist in prorating subscriptions to get each campus on the same payment/contract cycle and lack central funds to purchase commonly desired resources. From a practical perspective, not all campuses need access to all resources because of nature of UT System's mix of academic and health sciences campus focus.

However, goals set for the University of Tennessee Library Council for Academic Year 13-14 are focused on expanding access to resources for UT Faculty and students.

The Stated Goals are

- Facilitate the process of setting up Master Agreements with Library vendors.
- Facilitate meeting of the E-resources Group.
- Ensure that all library related contracts in UT facilitate purchase for all libraries including TBR Libraries.
- Support Print Repository for Legacy Academic Journals Collections in concept and principle.
- Explore the collective purchase E Books.

The University of Tennessee Library Council welcomes comments from the UT Faculty Council