

Minutes of the Senate Library Committee
Meeting of October 19, 2021
3:00 PM to 4:00 PM

In Attendance: Mark Lynn Anderson, Jeff Aziz, Renae Barger, Lauren Collister, Charlotte Johnson, Donovan Harrell,* Kristen Kanthak, Marty Levine, Jonah McAllister-Erickson, Susanna Leers, Matt Moore, Diana Khoi Nguyen, Jessica Rolke, and Lucy Russell, Ken Saltzer, Bianca Shieu, Kornelia Tancheva, Laura Winters†

**University Times* reporter.

† for Nancy Russell.

Excused: Gary Kohanbash, Lucy Russell, and Elizabeth Reich

1. Draft minutes of the SLC meeting of September 20, 2021 were approved by the Committee after a correction.
2. Aziz (with Tancheva) announced to the Committee a planned interactive installation on the history of medical texts at the Text & conText Lab of the Center for Creativity. Barger mentioned that Gosia Fort is the medical text librarian at HSLs, and Aziz responded that she has already been involved in the project.
3. Anderson shared a short paragraph with the committee that was an initial draft of the rationale for the Committee's proposal to request a funding stream to support the open scholarship of Pitt faculty hired under the Race and Social Determinations of Equity and Well Being cluster hire. The paragraph was part of a document to be shared with Committee members online and includes indications of other elements of the proposal that still need to be decided upon and drafted, and Anderson invited all members to share their ideas, concerns, suggestions, and/or proposed language on the online document. Winters asked if it made sense to include faculty hired under the smaller Latin X cluster hire in the proposal too.

Barger stressed the importance of including open data and open science initiative's in what counts as funded research, and she expressed concern that certain disciplines might take a disproportionate share of funding if there's not some consideration of equity and if funds were distributed on a first-come-first-served basis. McAllister-Erickson concurred with Barger on both points, mentioning his and Dominic Bordelon's open workshop on open data, and he noted that the fair distribution of funds is important. He and Collister noted that their office had already gone through about two-thirds of their annual allocation to offset APCs for faculty authors.

Tancheva pointed out that grant funded research doesn't always anticipate open-work, and researchers are then hit with large fees. She said that we can't make APC funding the central focus of the proposal. Anderson and Collister agreed and proposed a bifurcated stream with a smaller portion being set aside for APCs and the larger portion dedicated to other sorts of support for open scholarship and creation. Anderson said he would distribute the link for the online document and encouraged members to contribute in any way they could, that no thought or idea was too small or insignificant at this stage of drafting. Anderson mentioned that Robin Kear had suggested at the previous meeting of the SLC that our taking the proposal through the Faculty

Assembly wasn't necessary if we worked closely with the Office of the Provost before submitting.

4. Anderson also mentioned that Kear, again at the expanded executive meeting of the Faculty Assembly, had encouraged standing committee chairs to have their committee's review and rewrite the mission statements. Anderson confessed that he hadn't looked at the Library Committee's mission state during the five years he has served on the committee, but was happy to see that faculty advocacy was a prominent value. Kanthak noted that there is nothing in the statement about the importance of libraries, and Anderson added that the vital work of librarians is also not acknowledge, and that these have become important concerns of the SLC and should perhaps be articulated in the mission statement.

Anderson also noted that at the expanded executive meeting he had been queried by both the chair of the Benefits and Welfare Committee and chair the Budget Policies Committee whether we would consider looking into the situation of faculty librarian salaries, and Anderson asked the committee if this was something they wanted to pursue going forward, at least as a new project of information gathering. There was expressed interest by many members. Barger related how she felt demoralized when someone on a librarian discussion list had refused to pursue employment at the University of Pittsburgh because of its substandard pay. Tancheva responded that, generally, faculty pay was on par with peer institutions, but said the real scandal of compensation exists at the staff level. Barger concurred and noted that staff reclassification was a problem, and Leers noted how it was next to impossible to hire well-trained staff given the current restrictions on staff classifications and compensation. Anderson suggested that the committee could look into *both* faculty and staff compensation during the coming year.

The meeting adjourned at 4:01 PM.

Draft minutes compiled and submitted by Mark Lynn Anderson
Minutes approved by Committee on November 15, 2021