

**University Library Committee Minutes**  
**February 10, 2016, 3:30 pm**

Present: Thomas Burr, Magdalena Casper-Shipp, S.J. Chang, Chris Hamaker, Cindy Kerber, Marie Labonville, Dallas Long, Carlyn Morenus, Kelly Murphy, Jay Percell, Molly Quinn, Dane Ward, Clint Warren

Absent: Isaac Dallas, Chad Kahl

Meeting was called to order at 3:17pm.

The minutes from the previous meeting were reviewed. The minutes were approved, with a single editorial change provided by Morenus.

Burr asked the committee what the committee's focus should be next year. Burr suggested the actions should be in response to Ward's presentation to the committee last month.

Warren suggested whether members should identify the most useful sources in the library for each member's college. He asked how he could identify the best sources for CAST, and which of those might be under-utilized. How could he be an effective liaison for his college as a whole?

Hamaker asked whether the library will or should go beyond the withdrawal of under-used titles stored on Floor 1 to withdrawing underused titles from the other floors. Hamaker suggested a comprehensive review of the collections will provide the librarians with a better idea of how much space might really be optimized for other purposes.

Morenus asked whether "weeding" (withdrawal) guidelines are something available for the librarians to use. Long answered the librarians are following best practices for collections in their subject areas. Ward said the library could really identify the core collections that are critically important for each discipline and ensure we have the best, most useful titles in our collections. To answer Warren's questions, Ward said the library has a working group that includes Mark Walbert from Academic Technologies and Claire Lamonica from the Center for Teaching, Learning, and Technologies to identify the most critical technologies, among other things, that students need most. Ward shared an example of a student request from a previous year for the library to have graphing tables available for student use. This is an example of an unexpected student need that the library had not anticipated.

Chang offered his apologies for missing the previous meeting. He shared a list of possible contributions Milner could make to the university, based on some reading he did about trends in academic libraries. He asked whether Milner is considered a research library. Ward explained that Milner supports a different scale of research activity than do libraries at major research institutions, such as the University of Illinois.

The highlights of Chang's hand-out were:

- "The university is becoming the library.
- Library is descending from an isolated perch and "Taking it to the streets"
- Library should/will be diffused throughout the university – departments, labs, course management systems, residence halls, student unions...

- Integrate library services and functions in academic curriculum through partners with schools and departments. Embed library services and functions in ReggieNet (through CTLT)
- Serve as the electronic publisher of faculty projects involving multiple media
- Serve as institutional repositories, open educational resources, where faculty can store their scholarly work under the stewardship of the library
- Create a one-stop learning environment by providing writing support, tutoring, group study support,. Offer more technology-enhanced collaborative learning space.
- Librarians without a physical library work with faculty/staff and help them find, certify, and evaluate the information they need. Work in virtual space, co-create scholarly content, use collection funds to purchase and license digital content, and provide other customized service.”

Burr asked how significantly Milner should serve the public at large since the University is a state-supported institution. Is Milner sort of a public library because of the character of the university? Discussion followed regarding the types of services available to community members and to alumni. Ward said the University’s faculty and students are the library’s primary audiences, and services and collections are designed principally to support those audiences.

Murphy suggested more academic services could be integrated with the library.

Hamaker said he has noted the increase in group study space, and he is comfortable with assigning more group work now that the library has practice rooms and spaces to accommodate group work. Hamaker said it is important for students to research businesses as they are applying for jobs. Ward noted career services staff would be coming to Milner later in the spring semester to provide resume critiques for the students.

Morenus noted the growing importance of instructional activities in public and school libraries. She wondered whether Milner should have these “hanging out” spaces. Casper-Shipp said she had student responses to questions she posed on the whiteboards indicating support for gaming and wellness activities in the library. Morenus suggested the library could support creative activities, in conjunction with makerspaces. Perhaps the library could provide the raw materials students could use to create new works.

Percell introduced the “20%” concept, in which businesses – and now K-12 schools – allow employees time to be creative. Maybe we should foster innovation in the library, such as sponsoring “Demo Days.” We could really plug some creative multimedia projects.

Burr said the library is virtually an undergraduate student space as a physical entity. Faculty interact with it only as a virtual space. Discussion followed about whether we really know how many faculty versus students use the library and the ways they use the library. Long interjected that that we do not need to recreate the wheel; the librarians have this information, and we understand how these constituents use or don’t use the physical and virtual library. Hamaker said the physical space is less useful for faculty because of the collaborative work that takes place there.

Casper-Shipp pointed out that Chang had identified new areas that support faculty research specifically. Ward explained that we are providing services in some of the areas Chang identified. The institutional repository, ISU ReD, is one of those services. Percell said he had had difficulty accessing ISU ReD and needs help in uploading articles but he thought the Author Dashboard statistics to be interesting.

Discussion turned to ISU ReD. Ward highlighted it as an example where the library has had difficulty finding the right ways to inform the faculty about ISU ReD and what it could offer faculty. Hamaker said some faculty are skeptical of such self-archiving services because they don't want to migrate all of their information when platforms must be transferred. They've had a bad experience with BlackBoard.

Casper-Shipp passed out copies of the ISU ReD brochure, designed several years ago when the institutional repository first launched. Several members indicated it was not a helpful brochure because it lists no primary contact name and no information regarding copyright. Many faculty members say to themselves "I signed away the copyright when I published this, so I can't do anything with it" and that stops all the conversation. Long said the librarians can help with that, but we need to make that better known.

Burr reiterated what the committee should accomplish in the next year. Long suggested whether the committee could function as a focus group for the big questions the library is wrestling with. There seemed to be consensus that this seemed like a good idea. The group decided to examine ISU ReD on their own time and to be prepared to come back to the committee with their experiences, questions, and insights.

Meeting adjourned at 5pm.

Next meeting will be Wednesday, March 16<sup>th</sup> from 3:15 to 4:45 pm in Milner 311G.