

3-5-2009

## LACUNY Reserves Roundtable Meeting Minutes, March 2009

LACUNY

Follow this and additional works at: [http://academicworks.cuny.edu/lacuny\\_meeting\\_minutes](http://academicworks.cuny.edu/lacuny_meeting_minutes)



Part of the [Library and Information Science Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

LACUNY, "LACUNY Reserves Roundtable Meeting Minutes, March 2009" (2009). *CUNY Academic Works*.  
[http://academicworks.cuny.edu/lacuny\\_meeting\\_minutes/251](http://academicworks.cuny.edu/lacuny_meeting_minutes/251)

This Meeting Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Library Association of the City University of New York at CUNY Academic Works. It has been accepted for inclusion in Meeting Minutes by an authorized administrator of CUNY Academic Works. For more information, please contact [AcademicWorks@cuny.edu](mailto:AcademicWorks@cuny.edu).

**MINUTES OF THE MARCH 2009 MEETING  
LACUNY RESERVES ROUNDTABLE**

March 5, 2009, 3:00 pm

Library Conference Room, John Jay College

**Members in attendance:**

Ida Bazan, Medgar Evers

Angelina Brea, Lehman

Addy Soto, Lehman

Dean Bryan, CUNY OLS

Kathleen Collins, John Jay

Rhonda Johnson, Hostos

Curtis Matthew, Grad Ctr

Michael Miller, Queens

Simone Yearwood, Queens

Jeanne Yan, Hunter

Ester Ramos, Baruch

Meeting began with the reminder about who uses DocuTek system for reserves – all but Lehman who expect to start at end of March.

RJ explained the pressure she feels to promote the use of E-reserves. Faculty don't seem interested because they are using BlackBoard which serves them well enough. This raised the issue of how new providers (i.e. Lehman) might publicize the service.

MM and SY described their attempt at eliminating E-reserve services within the library, an endeavor which will not come to pass. RJ has considered suggesting similar attempt at Hostos for reasons mentioned above.

RJ spoke of problems of linking to E-res within BlackBoard, especially if not using latest version of DocuTek. She also attended E-res webinar recently and was disappointed that her question (what is the difference between BB and E-res? Aren't they duplicative?) was bypassed by moderator. Others present agreed these services are duplicative.

Queens maintains a matrix of copyright costs based on class size and other factors so help decision-making when requesting/paying for permission. MM noted that with the Copyright Clearance Center and DocuTek partnership, permission costs have increased.

With regard to Copyright Clearance Center and the annual license option, RJ heard from others that there was no way for subscriber to be identified when submitting requests through DocuTek so the question of double-payments is a possibility.

Many agreed that a culture of reserves and patterns of service are extremely hard to undo.

Both Baruch and Queens spoke of bookstores no longer selling to their libraries (for billing and logistical reasons).

The remainder of the meeting was framed by a survey sent out by the CUNY Copyright Task Force for each LACUNY committee to respond to.

Each question caused further discussion, often touching on previously addressed issues as well as different questions from the survey.

The first (substantive) question, “Please list particular copyright issues that confront your committee,” was answered with: cost, standards (rules, guidelines), training, education, licensing (RJ mentioned task of understanding negotiations with and language of agreements with database vendors), fear, orphan works, out-of-print works, faculty interactions.

DB asked if there had ever been a CUNY-wide copyright workshop. No one knew of one.

AS asked about the practice of teaching faculty being responsible for requesting copyright permissions themselves so that the onus (of labor or legal responsibility) is not on library.

RJ requested more specificity in new guidelines (to be drafted by CUNY Copyright Task Force) including clarity with regard to structure, who the go-to people are on each campus for questions and problems, legal support, training related to copyright. MM understood her to be looking for “recommended assurance.” MM emphasized that copyright is a grey legal area and it would difficult to delineate a specific structure. He raised the point that it is possible for all CUNY libraries to minimize responsibility for copyright.

RJ commented that many people seem to unaware that a CUNY Copyright guideline document even exists and emphasized that it is not just a library issue but something relevant to many on campus. For instance, BlackBoard administrators, bookstores, academic departments should all be aware, and currently there is little discussion of such issues outside (or even inside) the library. MM spoke of his efforts to create partnerships with IT and center for teaching and learning depts.

General eye-rolling and sighing about the inefficiency of the Aleph Reserve Module. DB said there’s hope, but we have to get to version 20 (we’re at 18 now).

The next survey question, “Which aspects of copyright would you like to see addressed in revised policy?” was met with these responses: universal structure, where to go for what (resources)

KC brought up the length of time issue (i.e. reserve items staying on for more than one semester requiring permission). SY, ER, MM explained their reading is that a new group of students is first-time use and therefore permission does not need to be sought. But course pages do need to be de-activated and re-activated at the end and start of semesters.

General discussion of the need for reserve items to be legally-owned and –obtained items.

RJ brought up the issue of archives and their place in the copyright guidelines. Some CUNY libraries house college archives and should be held to same guidelines, but there may be a lack of awareness on this issue. She recommended that this be included in revised policy.

The next survey question, “Where do you go for copyright information or advice?” was met with: copyright experts (e.g. Kenneth Crews, Kerri Russell), ALA publications, various list serves.

MM emphasized a hopeful plan for revised policy to embrace simplicity vs. complexity.

The next survey question, “About which areas of copyright and intellectual property do faculty need to be educated?” was answered first by RJ who said that copyright should be taught in the context of a faculty member’s teaching, for example how their syllabus, their own web pages, their curricula are subject to copyright. She mentioned the importance of making faculty aware of strategies to help avoid copyright problems such as using persistent links to database documents. And with regard to their own research how they may be renouncing their rights to ownership of a published work without being aware of it – they have the right to try to negotiate with publishers on such issues. MM summarized RJ’s comments with the idea of “bringing IP issues home” to the faculty. He also pointed out that the idea of these issues being “not just about the library” would be useful for marketing copyright information on campus.

The next question on the survey, “What kinds of questions about copyright do you receive from faculty?” to which KC added, “do faculty come to you and ask how to do things and/or how to do things properly?” Answers were generally, no, they come and ask us to do things, but not how to do things. Most said they send the information reserve links to faculty.

The final question on the survey, “What formats would you suggest we use to present information about copyright to librarians and faculty/students (e.g. websites, text documents, tools, etc?)” was met with the following comments: information sessions are not well attended, faculty don’t read messages and notifications. Others suggested rather than recreating the wheel, why not link to other information on copyright that already exists (KC and MM assured them the Task Force is focusing on this). RJ said faculty only pay attention to what dept. chairs and provosts tell them. Others suggested at least targeting new faculty to get important information across to the new wave. Others suggested instituting a required copyright workshop before reserves services would be provided.

MM mentioned an ACRP intellectual property workshop that he hopes the chiefs would approve to bring to campus, possibly for all CUNY to attend. This could be used as a model for an all-CUNY copyright workshop. KC suggested coordinating the release of

the revised copyright guidelines (TBA 2010) with such a workshop. JY suggested podcasting as another possible format for information.

Meeting adjourned at 5:00 pm

*Submitted by Kathleen Collins, John Jay College*