

UNIVERSITY *of* MISSOURI

The Faculty Council Ad Hoc Committee on the Library Mold Issue

March 1, 2015

Professor Craig Roberts
Chair, MU Faculty Council on University Policy

Dear Professor Roberts and Faculty Council,

The Committee has now had time to consider carefully Director Cogswell's letter of February 6, 2015. We stand firmly by our previous conclusion that promises made to the Ad Hoc Committee during our March 2014 meeting with Director Cogswell, promises to faculty guaranteeing the delivery of lists of books to be destroyed and giving faculty an active role in decisions regarding the removal or destruction of mold-infested books, were not honored. See accompanying supplement and documentation.

It is important to ensure that lines of communication between the Faculty and the Library Director are clear and transparent, and that all faculty, through the mechanism of the standing Library Committee, have timely access to information that affects the integrity of the Library collection as well as effective input into such decisions. The good health of our library system is crucial to our teaching and research missions. For this reason, it is imperative that the Library Committee play an active role in all future policy decisions regarding the collection and that the Director of the Libraries honor this principle.

Finally, the mold infestation event makes imperative the construction of a long term library storage facility.

Sincerely,
The Faculty Council Ad Hoc Committee on the Library Mold Issue

Mark Ashbaugh
Stamatis Dostoglou
Noah Heringman
Jeanne Mihail
Dennis Trout
John Zemke

SUPPLEMENT AND DOCUMENTATION

As of February 2015, MU Libraries are slowly recovering from a massive mold outbreak at the University of Missouri Library Depository 2 (UMLD 2) Subterra cavern, affecting 629,000 items. Starting in September 2014, some 441,000 books are slowly becoming available at the rate of 20,000 per month (reported in the meeting of the standing Library Committee on 2/13/2015).

In the cover message of his February 6, 2015 letter to the Faculty Council Ad Hoc Committee on the Mold Issue (henceforth the Ad Hoc Committee), Director Cogswell refers to the role faculty did not play in the recovery from the mold infestations as a “regrettable incident.” This is true, we agree, but we contend that what has happened represents a sequence of events whereby the Library Administration has excluded faculty from matters of paramount importance to our teaching and research.

Below we detail commitments Director Cogswell made that were unfulfilled.

1. Director Cogswell writes in his February 6, 2015 letter to the Ad Hoc Committee: “I did pledge to have faculty assist in selecting materials to be salvaged, and I offered to have lists of books requiring salvage decisions ready by early fall” (second paragraph, line 2). The Director's “pledge” came at the Ad Hoc Committee’s insistence that faculty **determine** which materials would be salvaged, not “assist in selecting such materials.”

2. In the same letter Director Cogswell writes “it is also important to note that this commitment was given in the context of an earlier discussion, in the same meeting, concerning the ‘Selection Process’ ” (paragraph 3, line 1). This is correct, as it is also correct that this earlier discussion resulted, according to the minutes (see Item 1 in the Appendix), in deciding that:

Lists [will be] available for faculty review by early Fall.

Faculty can veto “to be removed” books.

3. Director Cogswell writes in the same letter: “In March, we had no way of knowing if we would have sufficient funds on hand to salvage any of these non-duplicated items” (paragraph 3, line 8).

We recall that in the 14 March 2014 meeting, Director Cogswell mentioned with optimism that the Mellon Foundation had approached him with the prospect of grant funding to remediate mold-damaged items. Director Cogswell requested that we not publicize the offer, and the Ad Hoc Committee respected his wishes. (The minutes indicate that the “grant application has been made with some confidence of success.”)

It is disingenuous to portray the lack of certainty about funding in March 2014 as the only reason for “a great deal of consultation with faculty” (paragraph 3, line 10 of Director Cogswell’s letter of February 6, 2015). In fact, the discussions in Spring 2014 in the Ad Hoc Committee were predicated on the forthcoming Mellon grant and the libraries' ability to remediate upwards of 400,000 books. (See letter of D. Hooley from April 2014 regarding appeals to the Chancellor and President to increase funding levels so that, **given the Mellon fund** money, the library insurance fund is not depleted; see item 2 in Appendix. See also article from the “Missourian” of April 4 & 5, 2014; item 3 in Appendix.)

4. Director Cogswell's response to the Ad Hoc Committee on February 6, 2015 places promises in quotation marks when referring to his promises made in the 14 March 2014 meeting (paragraph 4, line 2). He claims no recollection of a specific mention of a faculty veto of materials selected for destruction (paragraph 5, line 2).

The eight members of the Ad Hoc Committee who were in attendance at the 14 March 2014 meeting

stand by the minutes of the committee that were distributed by its then-Chair Dan Hooley, Professor of Classics. The minutes clearly show the promises made, including the faculty veto. We take exception to any implication to the contrary.

5. The classification of mold-damaged materials according to Categories 1, 2, and 3, was announced by the Library Administration on April 3, 2014 via press release, see <http://library.missouri.edu/announcements/2014/12/29/faq-regarding-mold-at-offsite-storage-2/> and message from Ken Dean to Craig Roberts on January 29, 2015. This happened without any faculty consultation.

Furthermore, the Categories are nebulous (books could fall into more than one category, “unique characteristics” in Category 1 is ill-defined). We understood that faculty involvement would be essential to determining exactly how the selection process would develop.

Per our March 14, 2014 meeting, we were led to believe that only after faculty were asked about books in Category 2 (items that “may be withdrawn permanently”) would they in fact be withdrawn. Instead, the Library Administration destroyed thousands of unvetted volumes.

As of February 13, 2015 books in Category 3 (138,000 items) were still in Boone County and unremediated (as reported in the meeting of the standing Library Committee of that day).

6. According to Director Cogswell's chronology of events (see message from Ken Dean to Craig Roberts on January 29, 2015, or the website in point 5 above) some faculty members of the Ad Hoc Committee indicated in the 14 March 2014 meeting that “they do not consider electronic copies acceptable substitutes for print.” Nevertheless, the Director made decisions to destroy print copies that were only otherwise available in electronic duplications.

7. It is dismaying that faculty were not apprised of the destruction of library materials from the 14 March 2014 meeting (when faculty were promised a veto) until at least October 30, 2014. We note that another part of the 14 March 2014 agreement was that lists of all provisionally “to be destroyed” items, prepared by the MU Libraries and to be revised by faculty, would be provided to faculty by September 1, 2014. This did not happen, and requests for these lists by the standing Library Committee during early Fall 2014 were met with Director Cogswell's statement that he “hoped that the lists may not be necessary” (see minutes of the October 3, 2014 standing Library Committee, item 4 in the Appendix). The Library Administration's own terminology when communicating with faculty about the “provisional lists” of to-be-destroyed materials always used conditional and hypothetical language, suggesting that no destruction had actually yet occurred. See item 4, item 5, and item 6 in the appendix (the last copied both to Chancellor Loftin and Director Cogswell).

8. A good part of the destruction of materials didn't have to happen at all. At the time of the mold outbreak the Libraries' “self-insurance fund” through the Provost's office stood at “a little over \$800,000” (see item 4 of the Appendix) with another \$100,000 due in 2014, in time to be used for the recovery effort. On June 6, 2014 the Library Administration received \$400,000 from the Mellon Foundation. Thus \$1,200,000 and more could be counted on by the middle of June 2014 for the recovery effort. According to Associate Director A. Riley's presentation during a joint meeting of the standing Library Committee and the Ad Hoc Committee on October 30, 2014, it was known to the Library Administration in March, 2014 that the direct remediation cost per book would be less than \$1.50 (plus costs for shipping, relocating, and reorganizing the collection). Therefore, \$1,200,000 would have sufficed to save nearly the entire collection of UMLD2 holdings (600,000+ items). It was learned even more recently (standing Library Committee meeting of 2/13/2015), in a second bid process, that the direct cost (from yet another company) would be under \$1/book. With the self-insurance fund at approximately \$300,000 still on hand as of October 3, 2014 (see item 5 in the Appendix), the Ad Hoc Committee is at a loss to understand the destruction of books beyond June, in direct defiance of faculty wishes and against all principles of good stewardship of the assets of the university and state.

9. Furthermore:

a. Faculty requested lists of items that were provisionally to be destroyed to be organized according to the Library of Congress call numbers (see letter of M. Ashbaugh to Faculty Council Executive Committee, item 6 in the Appendix). The library made available a list of monographs that had already been destroyed, by call number, along with a list of journals. The latter does not include call numbers. (See <http://libraryguides.missouri.edu/staff/umld2>.)

b. In the October 30, 2014 joint meeting of the standing Library Committee and the Ad Hoc Committee, in response to questions regarding quality assurance from the remediation company, the Library Administration claimed that books could be returned to the company to be cleaned repeatedly. Faculty requested the opportunity to review the contract. Instead, we later received documents that did not provide answers to the questions asked. (This is documented in the minutes of the 10/30/2014 and the 12/12/2014 standing Library Committee.)

c. As soon as the mold outbreak was announced, Director Cogswell asked the standing MU Library Committee during their January 2014 meeting that individual departments deal with saving potentially to be destroyed books via their library liaisons. At least one MU Department (Mathematics) did just that and received from Associate Director of MU Libraries J. Pierce an ironclad promise (see Item 7 of the Appendix) of: "a note in the catalog records that will prevent actions to remove Math volumes until [Library Administration] have communicated with [Math] about what actions will be taken." Nevertheless, Math books and journals were among the thousands of volumes destroyed without warning.

10. At the standing Library Committee meeting of 20 October 2011, the committee voted unanimously to endorse a resolution entitled "MU Library Committee Policy on Faculty Communication and Consultation" (see item 8 in the Appendix for full text). The committee unanimously approved this document and presented it to Director Cogswell, as recorded in the minutes of that meeting. This policy has a long history: it was first drafted and approved in 2006, revised in 2011, and reviewed one final time at the meeting of 20 September 2012. This document unequivocally states the importance of real faculty participation in major decisions involving the library collections. The mold outbreak prompted many such decisions, and therefore falls under the purview of this policy.

Conclusion:

The Library Administration, despite promises to involve faculty in key decision-making roles and despite public claims of the necessity and value of faculty involvement, conducted remediation of the mold situation without giving faculty timely and detailed information necessary for them to have a determinative role in deciding which books or other materials would be destroyed. Library Administration proceeded with the disposal of books acting as the sole arbiters of what would be kept and what would be destroyed.

According to the official website (<http://library.missouri.edu/about/mission/>), the mission of MU Libraries is: "In support of the teaching, research, service and economic development programs of this internationally distinguished university, the MU Libraries acquire, preserve and make accessible scholarly resources; enhance teaching and learning; facilitate discovery; and provide innovative services, to achieve a single overarching purpose: **to anticipate and to serve the needs of our users.**" (Emphasis in the original)

The fact that since September 2013, and probably for at least one more year into the future, we have had no access to a substantial part of the collection, in which the State of Missouri has been investing for over 175 years, cannot be seen as "support[ing] the teaching, research, service," or "enhanc[ing] teaching and learning," or "facilitat[ing] discovery."

APPENDIX: Documentation

Eight documents referred to above are appended here:

1. March 14, 2014 minutes - Ad Hoc Committee, page 5
2. D. Hooley's message of April 24, 2014, page 8
3. Missourian article of 4/4/2014, page 10
4. Minutes of the 10/3/2014 Library Committee Meeting, page 11
5. Correspondence included in message to M. Ashbaugh from the Library Administration, page 14
6. Letter from M. Ashbaugh to Faculty Council Executive Committee, page 15
7. Memo from Jeannette Pierce, page 17
8. MU Library Committee Policy on Faculty Communication and Consultation, page 18

Item 1. March 14, 2014 minutes - Ad Hoc Committee

Notes from Mold Committee meeting with Jim Cogswell and Ann Riley: March 14

Present: Mark Ashbaugh, John Zemke, Dennis Trout, Jeanne Mihail, Stamatis Dostoglou, Kerby Miller, Noah Heringman, Dan Hooley

Review of current information: estimated remediation cost may be \$2 per volume; projected number of books to be saved, 400k, grant application has been made with some confidence of success.

Discussed progress of bidding for mold remediation vendors: decision probably March 19

Vendor would arrive with truck facilities; work done on site

- 1) Books are swabbed with a solution which appears to be intended to remove surface fungal structures (hyphae and spores). Ann Riley mentioned ethanol (ethyl alcohol) as one possibility, which is a very standard surface disinfecting agent. Typically it is used as a 70% aqueous solution.
- 2) The second step is exposure of individual books to a penetrating sterilant treatment. Two were mentioned:
 - a. Ethylene oxide which is applied as a liquid and quickly vaporizes. The gas can then insinuate itself through the books. (Propylene oxide is also used for a similar purpose.) I don't know how deeply these gases penetrate. If the fungal hyphae (the thread-like body of the mold) have penetrated through a thick page, I don't know how deeply the gas will penetrate.
 - b. Gamma irradiation. Gamma rays will certainly travel through anything solid and should render it sterile. (this courtesy of Jeanne Mihail)

Process would go on until at least June of 2015

Selection process:

Goal to achieve no net loss of information

Destroy damaged duplicates, saving last copies in Merlin, last 10 in OCLC etc.

Rely on electronic copies where available

HOTI trust — e-copies printable via Espresso Book machine

Replace essential items too damaged to keep

Books/serials with illustrations, maps, high res. images etc. to be kept.

Certain historical records replaced by other system libraries

Space soon to be identified for intermediate and longer term storage

Will construct "asbestos wall" space with moveable barrier between clean and dirty books

Some concern expressed by Jeanne about the reliability of that; budget will not allow a better arrangement.... (unresolved)

Projected calendar coming out--will receive from AR, along with bid matrices, pie chart of division holdings etc.

Vendor will probably arrive and begin in the second week of April

Alternative space identified by May 1

Out of U2 by June 30

Lists available for faculty review by early Fall

Bibl. record and call numbers

Faculty can veto "to be removed" books

Issues:

Some books are being destroyed now. AR and JC mentioned that this is not terribly out of the ordinary; books fitting certain criteria are destroyed on an ongoing basis. Those too damaged to remediate, extra copies in certain areas: Law, Historical records... Would recommend faculty begin now to identify things they would like to see kept.

"The issue is the utilization of space in a new facility. If there are 2 adjacent rooms ('clean' and 'not clean') with a very small door between them, then I can believe that once materials are treated they will be in good shape on the clean side. However, the notion of a moving wall is really troubling." (Jeanne Mihail)

JC reviewed the history of the developing situation:

1997 remote storage at Lamone (U1) provided for expansion when necessary

2002 system proposed remote storage at EdCo (underground), Springfield; not helpful for MU

2006 Steve Graham and UM general officers decided against funding addition and told Libr. to find local space : U2.

Recent: Ken Dean has spoken again of putting expansion of U1 on priority list for funding.

Kerby Miller: Why no help coming in the face of crisis from the system or campus administration (or even Jeff. City)? You would think they would be embarrassed by the fiasco for which they are largely responsible. No answer to that. The administration, it was noted, has been conspicuously silent on the

situation.

Secondly, why no mass appeal for financial help? JC partially explained...

Stamatis Dostoglou: Library administration does share responsibility for what has happened.

Follow up meetings proposed to check progress. JC also promised to keep this committee in the loop

Item 2. D. Hooley's message of April 24

Thu, 24 Apr 2014 08:56:16 -0500

Content-Type: application/ms-tnef; name="winmail.dat"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: binary

From: "Hooley, Daniel M." <HooleyD@missouri.edu>

To: "Heringman, Noah" <HeringmanN@missouri.edu>, "Miller, Kerby A."

<MillerK@missouri.edu>, "Ashbaugh, Mark S." <ashbaughm@missouri.edu>,

"Mihail, Jeanne D." <MihailJ@missouri.edu>, "Zemke, John M."

<ZemkeJ@missouri.edu>, "Trout, Dennis E." <TroutD@missouri.edu>, "Dostoglou,

Stamatis" <dostoglous@missouri.edu>

Subject: library mold committee

Sorry to be out of touch for a couple of weeks. After making a pretty full report to FC, I'd put all this aside in order to catch up on work and tend to other matters—it's been busy! As it has for all of us, I know. At any rate, I thought I'd update everyone on the current state of things.

The library admin has contracted a company to remediate the books, Belfor—you will recall seeing the name on some of the material the library gave us. They are beginning immediately. There has been a change of plan with respect to procedure: books will be removed and transported to Belfor's hq in Texas for treatment rather than treat them here onsite. A storage facility here has been contracted as well: it's above ground, you'll be happy to hear, and located just east of exit 121 on I-70. They, moreover, will NOT be using the "moving wall" they'd proposed earlier. Rather, a constructed wall will separate clean from dirty (2/3 clean), and the remediated books will not be moved into the clean area until they've been removed to Belfor's facility, cleaned, and returned. The wall will not move nor will there be traffic between the spaces. When the process is completed, the dirty area will be cleaned to make room for further storage.

On the funding front, I've written a letter now being distributed to chairs suggesting appeals to the Chancellor and President for upgraded funding levels. The "model" letter I included was based on the excellent letters of English and History.

I'd initially got a commitment from Mike O'Brien for some challenge funding and mentioned that to Mat

Gaunt when I met with him. Mike subsequently mentioned this to Matt and he, Matt, said he'd follow up with Mike. He hasn't done that yet, so I am meeting with Mike myself next week and we will make this happen. The result will only be a challenge contribution from A&S, but I want to talk to Mike about using the A&S website and other A&S publicity mechanisms to make this appeal more widely known. The library can pay for this remediation out of its insurance fund, pending approval of the Mellon (shhh) grant, but doing so would bleed that fund down to dangerous levels, hence the appeal. And of course the more money available for remediation, the fewer hard calls they have to make.

I'll report again to FC today, but we should probably meet sometime in the next couple of weeks to review what we've done (?) and set some goals as we monitor the process of fixing this, a process that will go on all next year. I'll be gone, put out to pasture, so we'll have to see too who might be interested in taking over as chair/organizer/whatever.

Thanks, and I'll be in touch about when we might meet next. Meantime, good luck with the last two weeks or so of teaching!

Dan

Dan Hooley

Department of Classics

405 Strickland Hall

University of Missouri

Columbia, MO 65203

573-268-0922

573-882-0679

<http://classics.missouri.edu/>

Item 3. Missourian article of 4/4/2014

http://www.columbiamissourian.com/a/172400/mu-libraries-irreparable-moldy-books-will-be-available-online/?in_app=in_app

MU Libraries' irreparable moldy books will be available online

Thursday, April 3, 2014 | 8:28 p.m. CDT; updated 12:17 a.m. CDT, Friday, April 4, 2014

BY [Thomas Dixon](#)

COLUMBIA — MU Libraries confirmed Thursday that about 400,000 of the 600,000 books exposed to mold last fall will be saved, and the remainder will be available online.

The estimate, delivered at Thursday's MU Faculty Council meeting, tacks closely to the prediction MU Libraries Director Jim Cogswell made in February.

MoreStory

A list of the books to be destroyed will be available Sept. 1 for faculty review, said Dan Hooley, who heads the Faculty Council committee working with MU Libraries on the remediation process.

A contractor to repair the books has been selected and will be announced later, he said. The process is expected to go on until June 2015.

Also discussed at the Faculty Council meeting were midyear raises, the search for a new provost, and facility construction plans and space management requests.

Item 4. Minutes of the 10/3/2014 Library Committee Meeting

Library Committee

10/3/14

159 Ellis Library

Attending: Winfred Phillips, Rabia Gregory, Mark Ashbaugh, Matthew Miller, Justin Legarsky, Alla Barabtarlo, Jim Cogswell, Carley Deddo (student support), Mark Ellis (support).

- • Introductions: Chair Mark Ashbaugh
- • Library Committee members were asked to introduce themselves.
- • New members present:
- • Winfred Phillips – Health Management & Informatics.
- • Rabia Gregory – Religious Studies

- • Directors update – Library Director Jim Cogswell
- • Mold situation update – UMLD 2
- • Recap: MU Libraries experienced a mold bloom in its secondary off-site storage facility, in the caverns north of I-70 in Columbia.
- • The second offsite depository is a rented storage facility.
- • All the books in the facility where the mold was discovered are considered exposed to mold spores and the Library of Congress advised that they be treated or destroyed to contain the outbreak.
- • 600,000 books were stored there.
- • At the time of the last meeting of the Library Committee, MU Libraries only had enough money in a self-funded “insurance” account to treat approximately one-half the books.
- • Update since Library Committee last met:
- • A new storage area has been rented, located in the former Rust and Martin furniture warehouse near the midway exit of I-70 in Columbia.
- • As of May 30 the last of the Library books and material were moved out of the former storage area.
- • A Mellon Grant was officially received for \$400k to address the mold situation.
- • This will allow MU Libraries to treat the great majority of affected material.
- • The grant also enabled MU to partner with Missouri State University and Washington University in St Louis.
- • These libraries will be giving us their copies of Government Documents that were lost to

the mold outbreak.

- • MU Libraries contracted with Belfor, a global property restoration company.
- • Ultimately, over 400,000 books will be treated and retained.
- • After taking into account duplicates and the books we will be receiving from partners, we believe only approximately 100K will need to be permanently withdrawn.
- • All of them are considered material easy to obtain because we have other copies in the library, or we can get other copies electronically or interlibrary loan. (SEE discussion below for update.)
- • MU Libraries is looking for a permanent solution for ongoing book storage.
- • Ultimately, we would like to build on the planned addition to the original depository which was built in anticipation of additions to be made to expand capacity.
- • This will enable precise temperature and humidity controls.
- • At the request of MU Libraries, the MU Risk Management office is working to assess traditional insurance vs. self-insurance.

[Editor's Note: MU Libraries had been allocating \$100K per year to a "sinking fund" (self-insurance fund) that was reserved for emergencies such as this. The fund had a little over \$800K at the time of the mold outbreak. *Noted by Jim Cogswell, Director of Libraries, 10/16/14.*]

- • There is approximately \$300K in the self-insurance fund at this time.
- • Questions/Discussion:
- • Discussion about cleaning method and possible impact on Special Collections took place. Alla Barabtarlo, who works in MU Libraries Special Collections, was concerned that the treatment technique was not thorough enough for the material that may be store in the Special Collections stacks.
- • Jim Cogswell said he would be willing to discuss possible further treatment to any material that would pose a threat to the other Special Collections material.
- • The treatment Method is the hand application of sporicides and the physical brushing of all outer surfaces of each book.
- • This was the treatment recommended by preservation experts at the Library of Congress.
- • Belfor is a trusted vendor in the Library restoration and mold treatment field.
- • Mark Ashbaugh mentioned that an ad hoc committee assigned by Faculty Council to address concerns over the mold situation was told last spring that a list of any books being destroyed would be provided for review. The time frame given was during the Fall Semester. He wondered where the Library was on that...
- • Jim Cogswell said the Libraries were still seeing what needs to be destroyed.
- • Also he feels that the lists were more important when the Library was only sure of funding to save about 300K of material.

[Editor's Note: It should be noted that the grant from the Mellon Foundation was not assured until June, 2014, although much of the discussion in Spring 2014 prior to June had been conducted under the assumption that the grant would be approved, and that we would be able to save approximately 400K items from the collection of roughly 600K items that had been held at UMLD 2. See, for example, the minutes of the Library Committee meeting of 5/15/14. *Noted by Chair Mark Ashbaugh, 10/14/14*]

- • Now that the situation has changed (grant funding and MSU/Wash U partnerships) and more books can be saved, he hoped that the lists may not be necessary.
- • The lists will be expensive and the process time-consuming.
- • Mark Ashbaugh and Rabia Gregory felt that the ad hoc committee and faculty were still expecting lists.
- • Communication about any change in the situation needs to be made to the ad hoc committee and faculty in general.
- • After discussion the committee resolved to invite the members of the ad hoc committee on mold to the next Library Committee meeting.
- • Meanwhile Jim C will inquire about the lists and a process for review.

UPDATE: According to Ann Riley, Associate Director of Libraries for Access, Collections and Technical

Services, the only books identified for destruction are monographs currently duplicated in University of Missouri library collections in Columbia. A list of these books, numbering slightly more than 100,000 items, should be available to faculty before the end of October. *Update by Mark Ellis. Statement confirmed by Jim Cogswell and Ann Riley, 10/14/14.*

0.
 - Library Student Fee Proposal.
 - Chancellor Loftin invited the Library to submit a student fee proposal to his office.
 - He is in favor of a library funding model that includes a student fee.
 - If the proposal is strong and something he can support, he is willing to promote to the students and take it before the board of curators.
 - The preliminary amount suggested by the campus budget office is \$5 per credit hour. This would generate \$2.6M – 4.3M. (This is only a working number, the actual amount of the fee may change by the time a proposal goes forward.)
 - This fee would provide additional space and services for student including:
 - A 24 hours study area.
 - Updated furniture and new study spaces.
 - Increase on line collections.
 - Other student-focuses services. (based on feedback and research)
 - Discussion:
 - Several peer libraries have fees like this:
 - Both in the Big 12 and SEC.
 - Missouri Senate Bill 389 – puts a cap on the amount that Universities can raise tuition and fees. They cannot increase a larger percentage than previous years CPI (Consumer Price Index) without a student referendum.
 - The library has created a working group to prepare material and make presentations about the idea to various student groups.
 - Will also be planning a couple town hall meetings for students to discuss (hopefully with the chancellor in attendance).
 - The Library has looked into a fee before but chose not to submit a formal fee proposal.
 - The invitation by the new Chancellor to submit a proposal is the reason the Library is pursuing the idea again.

~ Submitted by Mark Ellis. Edited and reviewed by Mark Ashbaugh and Jim Cogswell.

Item 5. Correspondence included in message to M. Ashbaugh from the Library Administration

From: Cogswell, James A.

Sent: Monday, October 13, 2014 10:43 AM

To: Ellis, Mark W.

Cc: Riley, Ann C.

Subject: RE: Draft of the Library Committee minutes for your review...

Thanks for preparing these notes, Mark. I am attaching a revised draft and sharing it with Ann Riley for her review. I hope we can share a final revision with Mark Ashbaugh before Ann leaves for her ACRL work later this week.

Obviously, we need to clarify what materials will be destroyed and confirm that no items will be permanently lost as a result of our actions. I trust that we can produce for faculty a list of duplicates scheduled for destruction, and categorically state that clean copies (either replacements or treated volumes) will be retained for our collections.

Jim C.

Item 6. Letter from M. Ashbaugh to Faculty Council Executive Committee

Professor Craig Roberts

Department of Plant Sciences

210 Waters Hall

University of Missouri - Columbia

Dear Craig,

Thank you for inviting me to discuss the ongoing developments stemming from the mold issue at the secondary library depository (UMLD 2) with you and the Faculty Council Executive Committee last Thursday.

I certainly understand and share the committee's concerns regarding faculty involvement in any decisions to discard books or other library materials. Here is where things stand at present regarding permanent withdrawal of (i.e., discarding) books from the libraries's collection (you'll note that some items on this list were prompted by questions brought up during our discussions Thursday):

1. According to an update to the campus Library Committee's minutes to its Oct. 3, 2014, meeting, ``According to Ann Riley, Associate Director of Libraries for Access, Collections and Technical Services, the only books identified for destruction are monographs currently duplicated in University of Missouri library collections in Columbia. A list of these books, numbering slightly more than 100,000 items, should be available to faculty before the end of October."'

Thus we hope that faculty can begin looking over lists of books in their areas at that time. These lists will almost certainly be large computer files, which will likely require the assistance of library staff to get them sorted appropriately. (For example, library staff surely know how to sort by Call Number leaving the Library of Congress's, or other system's, sequencing intact, as opposed to what a simple alpha-numeric sort produces.) It is expected that these lists will contain information as to the fashion in which the monograph is duplicated (whether by a second hard copy of the book, electronically, or by other means). Faculty should expect to have a reasonable length of time to go over these lists, especially if additional help in sorting the lists turns out to be needed. For now, at least, the original timeframe of trying to be finished with the process of going over the book lists and reaching decisions by June of 2015 still seems reasonable.

2. Concerns about the process by which the contaminated books are being remediated should be addressed in more detail. Is the procedure of wiping down all six sides of a book really sufficient? Are some books being treated more thoroughly because it's clear that their interiors have received mold exposure? What about the spines of the books -- mold that has infiltrated the spine would seem to be difficult to get rid of by wiping the book's outer surfaces. What is the Library of Congress's recommended protocol(s) for dealing with mold exposure? Are we prepared to use radiation or extremely low temperature treatments (or other recommended means) for at least some of our collection (e.g., rare books)? What precisely are the chemicals used in Belfor's treatment of our books? We have experts here on campus who could make informed judgments as to the efficacy of the treatment process if they knew the chemicals that were being used.

3. According to the statement quoted in item 1, the only books identified for destruction are monographs. Can we infer from that that no journals or series will be destroyed, even if they are duplicated on campus,

in the UM system, and/or on JSTOR or via similar electronic access?

4. Members of Faculty Council's Ad Hoc Committee to address the mold issues will be invited to the next meeting of the campus Library Committee, as well as Ann Riley, since they all participated in the discussions last spring that led to the agreement that MU Libraries would produce draft lists of "to be destroyed" books for faculty to go over this fall. It is expected that their input and recommendations will be taken seriously. In addition, it is to be noted that with the large number of people invited to this meeting there will be a number who cannot attend due to scheduling conflicts. Such people, and members of the Ad Hoc Committee especially, will be encouraged to submit their views in advance of the meeting, to be read at the meeting if they request it.

5. Near the end of October it appears there will be a need for an informational message to be sent to all faculty concerning the availability of the book lists, their access to them, and what will be expected of them. It may well be that we will need the assistance of Faculty Council in distributing such a message and seeing that it gets to all relevant parties.

I will try to keep you and Faculty Council informed as to developments, or changes or impediments to the plans outlined above, as needed. Thank you and the committee for giving me the opportunity of discussing these matters with you.

Sincerely yours,

Mark Ashbaugh

Chair of the Campus Library Committee

cc: Dr. R. Bowen Loftin, Chancellor, James A. Cogswell, Director of Libraries

Item 7. Memo from Jeannette Pierce

From: "Pierce, Jeannette E." <piercej@missouri.edu>

To: "Ashbaugh, Mark S.", "Weston, Dana T.", "Gesztesy, Friedrich", "Dostoglou, Stamatis", "Tsoi, Allanus"

CC: "Maseles, Judy S.", "Meyer, John L."

Subject: Meeting about UMLD2 on Friday

Dear Math Library Faculty Committee,

I appreciated the opportunity to join your meeting last Friday, though I do wish we had met under different circumstances. I understand that your primary concern is to have an opportunity for input on our decisions about materials which cannot be retained. We will do our best to support your request by:

1. Providing you with new lists of Math volumes that may not be retained using more general strategies such as "last copy in MERLIN" as soon as possible.
2. Providing you with the Library of Congress subject classification schedule for the QAs.
3. Placing a note in the catalog records that will prevent actions to remove Math volumes until we have communicated with you about what actions will be taken.
4. Exploring digital collections that may serve as a suitable or preferable replacement of our print copies such as Lecture Notes in Mathematics.

Thank you for again for working with Judy and me during this difficult time for all of us. We appreciate your active and ongoing interest in the collection and will do our best to address your concerns during and after the current disaster.

Jeannette

Jeannette E. Pierce

Associate Director for Research & Information ServicesMU Libraries

152 Ellis Library

Columbia, MO 65201-5149Phone: 573-882-6450Fax: 573-882-6034

E-mail: piercej@missouri.edu

Web: <http://library.missouri.edu>

Item 8. MU Library Committee Policy on Faculty Communication and Consultation

Updated October 2011

1) The MU Library Committee shall be informed as early as possible of any proposed changes to journal subscriptions recommended by the Collections Steering Committee or any similar internal Library Staff Committee . We are especially interested in having a voice in decisions concerning the conversion of print to digital formats as well as cancellations, which, we understand, may again become necessary in Fiscal Year 2013. A member of the Library Committee, designated by the Committee chair, shall be permitted to attend relevant meetings of the CSC.

2) If any specific changes are recommended with regard to a given subscription involving i) a shift from print to e-format, ii) a shift from e-format to print, or iii) a shift from subscription to document delivery, the relevant liaison librarian should consult the relevant departmental Library representative(s) in as timely a manner as possible to allow consideration of department preferences based on research and teaching priorities.

3) The Library Committee should expand its website, currently under committees.missouri.edu, to include more recent documents and other material relevant to faculty. There should be a link to the committee's page from the main Libraries website.

4) The Library Committee should take an active role in the Library's Open Access efforts as a path toward greater independence from inflated serials costs.

5) The Library Committee should be as active as possible in monitoring library budget and policy developments that may impact research and teaching.

Once approved, this document will be entered in the minutes as a confirmed agreement along with a record of relevant discussion, changes (if any), and the date approved.