Minutes of the Library and Learning Resources Committee (LLRC) Meeting
April 11, 2012 – 2:30-3:30 PM / Room 204, Curtis Laws Wilson Library

I. Welcome and Minutes Approval
II. Library Director Search
III. Library Survey
   a. Preliminary Results
   b. Follow-up Focus Group Sessions
IV. Faculty Communication
   a. Survey Results and follow-up
   b. Informing about new resources and service
   c. Upcoming weeding project
V. Background Library information presented to Chancellor Schrader
   a. One-page handout
   b. Total Library Expenditures per Student FTE
VI. FY12 LLRC Annual Report to Faculty Senate
   a. Identify important content for summary
VII. Items from the Floor
VIII. Adjourn

1. **Introductions and Welcome**
   The meeting was called to order by Gearoid MacSithigh, Committee Chair. Gearoid asked for a motion to approve the minutes from the last meeting. Tom Shuman made the motion, seconded by Jun Fan, motion passed.
   Attendees: Michael Bruening, Jun Fan, Wei Jiang, Gearoid MacSithigh, Tom Schuman, Hari Hara Kumar Chaluvadi, Maggie Trish and Andy Stewart

2. **Library Director Search**
   Andy explained there could be some delay in beginning the search due to the shuffling between the Provost and Vice Provost of Academic Affairs positions as the Chancellor search was going on. With Bob Schwartz's move to Columbia and Dr. Wray's move back to the Provost position, the search is on hold for the time being. Andy anticipates that it could stretch into the next academic year before a search begins. He commented that Maggie Trish filled his role while he was assigned overseas and did an excellent job. He felt he would be leaving the library in very competent hands.

3. **Library Survey**
   Maggie explained the library had recently conducted a campus-wide survey. Results were gathered from undergraduates, graduates, faculty and staff. The response was very good and the statistical data is still being analyzed. Not surprisingly in the results was the fact that the graduate response to online resources was much higher than the undergraduates. And the undergraduate response to print resources was higher than graduates. Some of the main points that came from across the student population was the request for more study space, textbooks, more online journals, fiction, computers, and more connectivity, specifically wireless printing.

The library just this afternoon completed the last of the focus group discussions that were born out of the initial responses from the survey. There were two undergraduate and two graduate sessions held. The library was seeking to find out what is done well, what needs improving, and what space and services issues the students would like addressed. Transcribing all the data from those sessions will take a few days and that work has begun.

An outside facilitator was used to help avoid any library bias. Some of the preliminary findings have shown some areas that can immediately change to meet the student needs. Other items will need to be packaged and sent to IT to address such as the technology issues. Other items will need to be addressed with the Provost to explore resolutions. The students participating were very upbeat and positive. When and if any of the data is published, none of the student information will be included and their anonymity will be secured. Gearoid asked about faculty which led to the next item agenda.

4. Faculty Communication

Maggie said there was a good response from the faculty, about 23%, to the survey. We are considering holding open forums with the faculty to say "this is what was heard from the survey" and ask faculty to expand on those comments. There seem to be some lack of understanding about the pruning process and requests were made for journals the library already purchases. This raised the question of whether the missing journals were for older issues. Maggie expressed the need to have more of a dialog with the faculty and having an outside facilitator would not work the best in that situation.

Gearoid suggested having two sessions, one for faculty that focus on research and one for faculty whose focus is on the teaching effort. He felt the library would receive very different responses from the two groups. Jun also felt this would be the best approach. Tom said it is difficult to get in to faculty schedules. He suggested using CERTI as a resource for lunch meetings. This would be a good way to get to the teaching faculty and might also pick up a few of the faculty that has both research and teaching.

Gearoid also suggested that any type of announcement come out of Dr. Krishnamurthy's office because faculty members always read those communications. Hari suggested a Facebook page. Maggie asked about the best time of year. Tom commented that with the research faculty there is really no good time. He did suggest having the forums on different days and at different times to try and attract more of the faculty. Wei suggested the library wait until after a couple of weeks into the new semester as the first few weeks are hectic for the teaching faculty. He also asked about the use of Blackboard.

Maggie asked what the best way was to communicate with faculty. There is a perception that they are not receiving the information the library is trying to get out to them. Tom said he disseminates the information out to the faculty in his department and also reports at department meetings. Hari suggested that the library disperse the information in multiple formats.

Maggie also mentioned that the library was going to begin a weeding process on the print resources currently in the library. Journals and serials are used very differently than monographs. Many of the print journals are available through JSTOR.

JSTOR is a widely used resource for research, teaching, and learning. With more than a thousand academic journals and over one million images, letters, and other primary sources, JSTOR is one of the world's most trusted sources for academic content. The library will make a list available to the faculty of what is duplicated in JSTOR and recommend the print volumes be sent to the depository. The print copy can always be retrieved from the depository if needed similar to, but faster than, Inter Library loan. The weed list will consist of those print journals that receive little or no usage.

Gearoid suggested the library start by putting a list on the home page or a link to the list and then send out to each department their own material. Any department wanting to look at another department's material could then link back through the library home page. Michael commented that he would not want to wade through the entire list. Maggie said she could design the list to be tabbed by department so each faculty member could look at their own department or others at their discretion and not send the entire list out to everyone. Andy interjected that if there is a valid reason to keep the print journal, that request would be honored.

Maggie said the library staff would spend the summer compiling the lists and have it ready to go in the fall. She also mentioned that the weeding of monographs would be started as well. There are some books that are simply out of date, others that are not core to what we are doing, and others that have better editions. We want to evaluate these section by section to see what needs to be weeded and where we are weak in the collection.

Michael asked about the process and looking at those monographs that were published five years or more ago. Maggie explained that the library would be running a comparison against Gist Gift & De-Selection Manager to see what the library has compared to what is needed. The list we provide to faculty on suggested weeding can be as detailed as the information contained in a bibliographic record. Tom asked about classic historical original books or primary works.

Maggie advised that the procedures for the vault are currently being re-written and would include rare or special works. Maggie also advised that if a title keeps circulating back to the library from the depository, then that title would be returned to the collection. The library will set up a room so the titles to be removed from the collection could be browsed by faculty as well, giving them another opportunity to review.

5.   Background Library Information to Chancellor Schrader
Andy provided a copy of the handout prepared for incoming Chancellor Schrader. This document is a good overview of the library staff, resources, services, budget and future expectations. A copy of the document is attached to the minutes. Andy also provided a graph comparison of total library expenditures per student FTE comparing Missouri S&T to other peers and as well as other UM libraries. A copy of that graph is also attached to the minutes.

6. Annual Report to Faculty Senate
Tom stated the information shared in this meeting that went to the Chancellor along with any other trends should be shared with the Faculty Senate. Maggie indicated the library could pull statistics on the usage of online databases and the way

trends are shifting from Inter Library loan to online resources. When Maggie began working on this campus, almost 12 years ago, there were less than 200 online journals. The library now has access to 50,000 journals and we purchase 28,000 to 30,000 journals. Also the way the space in the library is used has shifted as well. Tom indicated those are the statistics and information that need to go to the Faculty Senate.

7. Items from the Floor

Gearoid said that since this would be Andy's last LLRC meeting, he would like to thank him for his years of service and let him know how much the work he has done is appreciated. Gearoid wished Andy well on his retirement.

Meeting adjourned at 3:25 p.m.