

## **Minutes of the Library and Learning Resources Committee (LLRC) Meeting**

November 7, 2008 / Room 204, Curtis Laws Wilson Library

### **Agenda**

- I. Call to Order, Roll, and Approval of Minutes
- II. Strategic & Tactical Plans for the Library
  - a. Continual Assessment of Campus Needs
  - b. Library Decision Making: Transparency & Faculty Input
  - c. Ensuring Sufficiency of Library Budget to meet Campus Needs
  - d. Keeping the Library Relevant in the 21st Century
- III. Items from the Floor
- IV. Review Action Items
- V. Adjourn

### **I. Call to Order, Roll, and Approval of Minutes**

The meeting was called to order by Daniel Tauritz at 4:11 pm.

Present: Julia Medvedeva, Ed Malone, Waleed Al-Assadi, Krishna Kolan (Council of Graduate Students), Daniel Tauritz, Chair; Maggie Trish, Assistant Director for Technical Services, and Andy Stewart, Library Director.

Absent: Jacqueline Bichsel, Charles Chusuei, Xuerong Wen, Daniel Forciniti, Ashley Hampton (Student Council)

There was one change to the Draft Minutes of the October meeting. Under Item 3(f), Ed Malone asked about the existence of a departmental allocation formula for books (not about books vs. journals). Minutes were approved with this change.

### **II. Strategic & Tactical Plans for the Library.**

A. Continual Assessment of Campus Needs. Daniel has reviewed the campus strategic and tactical plans. The Library is mentioned once in each plan. In the current Tactical plan, a progress report includes the statement that the Library budget has been increased by \$25,000. (*While the Library budget was increased by four percent for FY09, Andy will investigate to discover the nature of the transfer of this amount*). In the Strategic Plan, a provision is made for increasing the Library budget by five percent per year in addition to the inflation rate. Andy has a projection of these total amounts over the five-year span of the Plan. He will send it to the LLRC Chair. The committee expressed dismay that the Library is not mentioned under "Education" or in any other part of the Strategic Plan.

#### **1. Continual Assessment of Campus Needs -- Internal**

Daniel asked about preparing possible response to the questions: "What do you need money for?", or, "Why \*does\* the Library need more money?." What data can the Library provide? The inquiry was also made about determining the usage of the Library's resources for "education" purposes vs. "research" purposes.

The Library uses a SCAT (short for "statistical category") table to find and display the number of books checked out by Library of Congress classification. Before going much further, a more detailed table should be identified and used. Qualitative studies of library users would be harder,

but shouldn't be avoided just because of that. Andy is aware of a university library which hired an anthropologist to perform actual "field studies" of how students find and use information. An in-house, paper survey may not be as informative as something more rigorous, as it will probably reflect "self-selection" error.

Maggie reported that it is possible to count check-outs by patron type (Department, or Freshman, Sophomore, Junior, Senior—for example). A lot of data is potentially available. Maggie also told the committee that it is possible to view temporal trends of electronic resource usage over time. Ed noted the importance of not cancelling low-use resources which are related to important programs.

## 2. Continual Assessment of Campus Needs – External

The committee inquired with Krishna about any input he might have from his undergraduate years. Daniel asked that the names of Departmental Liaisons be added to the appropriate Library web page (along with the listing of liaison librarians). Allowing a search of newly-received books and other materials is problematic, because the received date field is not "indexed." It is possible we can add this capability, as a UM committee is looking at adding new indexes now. Maggie will look into this.

Maggie suggested that there may be alternate ways to think about how monograph money is allocated; she has some ideas. In thinking about InterLibrary Loan (ILL), the Library doesn't really have "income" from this source. All of the money that is received is repayment for materials which we've ordered on behalf of individual patrons. Also, the Library has an obligation to "lend" as well as "borrow"—if the Library stopped lending, then fewer libraries would permit us to borrow from them. Daniel also asked about making the specific costs of an individual request explicit at the time the request is placed. The ways of calculating ILL costs are variable—we have not figured out a way to do this yet. Library staff anticipates that the need for journal borrowing will decline as we get more complete full-text databases; this effect may be offset by the offering of more and more in-depth bibliographic databases. During the discussion, it became apparent that some faculty did not know of the UM System's purchase of the ScienceDirect "Freedom Collection." This single product includes around 1,500 high-demand Elsevier titles.

## B. Library Decision Making: Transparency and Faculty Input

### 1. Publicizing Library decision-making processes.

The committee believes this is pretty well underway; LLRC agendas and minutes will be posted on the Faculty Senate – LLRC page.

### 2. Publicizing Library feedback loops

Adding the names of the departmental liaisons will make these connections more explicitly known.

### 3. Keeping departmental liaisons informed

This is "easy" from the Library side; each Librarian is assigned 4-5 departments. However, each academic department has different individuals, methodologies, and responses to the Library.

### 4. Ensuring faculty input in time-critical decision processes.

Daniel suggested and committee members present agreed that in the event a decision had to be made very suddenly, Library personnel should ask at least the Chair of the LLRC. Consulting or notifying the full committee would be ideal.

### C. Ensuring Sufficiency of Library Budget to meet Campus Needs

#### 1. Reducing spending on underutilized resources (e.g., thesis binding)

The Library thinks on a very long (hundreds of years) planning horizon. To date, the campus (Graduate Faculty?) has not made the deposit of theses and dissertations into the Scholars' mine mandatory. Also, S&T IT has not guaranteed a permanent plan for back-up of the 'Mine' data. Until both these provisions change, the Library will continue to bind theses and use microfilm as the permanent archival copy of this work. Microfilm remains the library's best option for preservation on a permanent basis. The Library anticipates spending about one-half of the previous year's budget on binding—as the number of print journals will decrease. Space for bound journal volumes (or theses/dissertations) is not expected to be a problem in the near future.

It is important to note that the Scholars' Mine is seen and used as a campus project—NOT a Library project, as it was funded centrally. Library staff worked exceptionally closely with S&T IT staff to accomplish this implementation; Library staff continue to oversee the project and invite faculty to participate therein.

#### 2. Increasing efficiency

[Discussed under Item II A. See above.]

#### 3. Obtaining increased budget from current funding sources.

[Discussed under Item II A. See above.]

#### 4. Developing new funding mechanisms

The committee members present agreed that this is an important issue and various ideas were discussed such as (1) working with the development office to put together a short wish list that would be attractive for donors to fund, (2) working with the office of sponsored programs to ensure that funds requested for the library in grants actually is transferred to the library, and (3) proactively pursuing grants to directly fund library projects.

### D. Keeping the Library Relevant in the 21st Century

#### 1. Inform campus community of accomplishments

#### 2. Make Library website a preferred starting place for information gathering

#### 3. Keep up with technology changes (e.g., replacing VHS tapes with DVDs)

Maggie has looked at a sample of the VHS videotape collection. Using availability through Amazon as an indicator, about ten percent of the educational tapes (“non-entertainment”) are available in DVD format (whereas about 90% of entertainment videos are available). For another example, certain productions of a (Shakespeare) production may not be available in DVD format. Another option for the Library would be to upgrade videos after they had been used (instead of converting the entire collection at one time)—or items used as Course Reserves materials--basing the replacements on actual material usage.

The committee, in a general discussion, noted that it is always difficult to balance the criteria of “fairness” and “needs analysis” in considering the needs of all Library constituents.

### **III. Items from the Floor / General discussion**

A. Julia asked if it would be possible to buy *Web of Science* for the local campus. Library staff can check the pricing, but can't promise anything. (Similar requests were made when the change to Scopus was first announced.)

B. The Library Liaisons will obtain "big thing" lists from each department—perhaps looking at a five-year planning horizon. A list like this could easily be publicized, presented to donors by Advancement, and perhaps an endowment could be created. The LLRC is already aware of these titles (in addition to *Web of Science*): *ASME Proceedings*, and *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*.

C. Maggie will send the departments' existing "wish list" (containing items of which the Library is already aware) to Daniel. [Completed]

D. Krishna Kolan (CGS) raised the question of the Library purchasing multiple copies of textbooks for Library Course Reserves. Waleed pointed out that, traditionally, it is the responsibility of each student to purchase (or share) textbooks for his or her classes.

The Library has never made a practice of buying one copy of every class textbook in the past for Course Reserves (although the concept has been considered, if not investigated). It would require a substantial sum of money—both to start up and on an ongoing basis--which would lessen the Library's ability to purchase other materials.

The CGS will ask graduate students who are done with a textbook to donate it for Course Reserves. Library staff will investigate potential space demands.

The LLRC also asked Krishna to see if the CGS would support a \$1 or \$2 fee per semester--which could be used for this specific purpose.

E. Krishna also reported an incident where one of his fellow students had a problem getting the patron record cleared after paying a fine. The person who was in charge of that function was not available. Andy will emphasize the aspects of "good customer service" to the Circulation staff.

### **IV. Review Action Items**

Daniel asked all LLRC members to be thinking about what questions they want to have answered about how well the Library meets the needs of the campus. The Library already has a number of specific data-related questions; Library staff will begin accumulating answers to these.

Ed asked committee members to determine where the "gaps" are; what does the campus need from the Library that it doesn't get?

### **V. Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned at 6:40 p. m.

Respectfully submitted,

Daniel Tauritz, LLRC Chair

Andy Stewart, Library Director and Recorder