University Libraries Management Team
Meeting – December 18, 2012
Attending: Culshaw, Austin, Larsen, Majors, Wakimoto, Williams, Knievel, Maness, Fong, Montgomery
SCWG – Dulock, Lage, Bresnahan, Johnson

In these minutes
- Scholarly Communications Working Group future directions
- Review Working Groups white paper
- Course release discussion
- Outlook calendaring
- LibQual update & timing

Meet with Scholarly Communications WG regarding Future Directions for IR report
Members of the working group attended to review and discuss the report (see attached). At the last MT meeting, the team agreed with most of the proposal. Andrew Johnson went over the document. He defined “Green Open Access Repository” as encompassing both platform and services for preserving and providing public access to the scholarship of an institution. He reviewed several approaches to OA, and the SPWG thinks we can use elements of all three approaches, cherry-picked for the local needs. Johnson had a nice graphic of the flow of the scholarly resource ecosystem on campus that he got from Faculty Affairs. SCWG also made a list of the desired features; easy to use, trustworthy, profiles (individual’s stuff in one place), use info stats, & discoverability.

Jim Williams noted that we need to have our system work with VIVO, and would like to have this decision made for our own best interests, like the detailed RFI we did with Coll Dev that led to the decision to work with Ingrams. We need to the review situation with Luna as well as Digitool in this process. ArtSTOR’s Shared Shelf is a better product now and rates a second look. D2L and learning object repository also need to be part of this review and look-over. We likely need a vendor supported platform, as we do not have the internal people to support an open source solution in-house. An open source platform supported by a vendor would probably be acceptable.

The WG will need to further clarify their mission internally. There are some other issues about what we as a library want to do. Shelley and Yem may need to be involved along the way to have procurement represented in the decision; just to be sure recommendations would be possible within state/campus rules. Other people can be pulled in as needed, after discussion with the full working group. WG should contact MT if more resources are needed. Discussions at Midwinter with vendors might be of use, too. In three months, a skeleton/draft schedule/proposal for this could be brought back to MT to review.

The BFALC (Boulder Faculty Assembly Libraries Committee) is kept apprised of these issues, and maybe someone on that group would be interested in occasional discussion of this. A presentation should be done to the BFALC in the early stages, definitely.

The WG thinks they have what they need at this point.

Review Working Groups white paper
The draft was reviewed, and some suggestions were made. Jennifer will send out a revised draft, and the document will be sent to Norlist when approved.
**Course Release Discussion**

When other faculty wants to include faculty time in their grants, the usual compensation is a course release. This is money to use to hire some teaching substitute for the faculty working with the grant. This doesn’t apply to librarians as it would to most other faculty, which limits our participation. Any creative way to work this for us? Jennifer will develop a document with some possible best practices that might be applied Libraries-wide and the MT will discuss again at a future date.

**Outlook calendaring**

Administration schedulers (Amy, Mary Jane, and Cheryl) asked MT to confirm that the official and primary means for scheduling in the Libraries be Exchange, specifically Outlook calendars. This includes keeping all appointments and planned absences on an individual’s calendar and keeping that calendar up to date. This is the most efficient way to schedule meetings, we have the technology that facilitates this, and this would help the admin people (as well as others!). This is about our organization’s needs. There general consensus that this is a reasonable thing to do.

Everyone has at least one default calendaring function on their Exchange. If there are questions, send to Web Help Desk. All people need to adopt this technology and keep it up. People who do not go to a lot of meetings are not on this, and this might not be an issue. Viewing of calendar can be restricted to busy/not busy, and individual appointments can be marked private as needed, as well.

**LibQual Update and Timing**

We have a LibQual task force working on running LibQual in spring 2013, and they have decided to go with LibQual Lite, which is a shorter version of the full LibQual. This proposal went to the Usability committee, who, while not enthused, found it acceptable and said to go ahead.

**Upcoming meetings**

- January 1 (cancelled, New Year’s)
- January 15 (Confirmed agenda item: Kelly Fox, Senior Vice Chancellor & CFO, will visit with MT regarding campus budget; tentative agenda items: Debbie Hollis to discuss ARPAC report on Arts & Humanities, evaluation rating scale)

Management team minutes are available online: [http://ucblibraries.colorado.edu/adminservices/management/index.htm](http://ucblibraries.colorado.edu/adminservices/management/index.htm)