<div align="center">

University Library Committee Minutes
February 8th, 2016, 3:15 pm

</div>

<u>Present:</u> Thomas Burr, S.J. Chang, Oguzhan Dincer, Chad Kahl, Marie Labonville, Alan Lessoff, Jay Percell, Ed Reitz, Dane Ward, Kathy Webster

<u>Absent:</u> Alex Goldstein, Dallas Long, Melissa Johnson

<u>Guest:</u> Susan Kalter

Meeting was called to order at 3:15pm.

Revisions and Approval of minutes

Labonville requested clarification for a sentence in the December 7 minutes. She will send corrections to Long.

Collection Development Policy

Burr distributed "Collection Development Policy, faculty responses" handout.

Burr noted the agenda item is really about collection management, not the deaccession policy.

Burr noted he had asked Ward prior to the meeting that perhaps the library should revise all three documents—Collection Development Policy, Collection Philosophy, Withdrawal Policy--and bring them back to the ULC.

Chang asked for clarification on which three policies. Burr clarified which three and noted they should all sync.

Lessoff noted that would be a considerable amount of work. In previous meetings, he proposed an ad hoc group to split up the work. He noted there was not universal agreement with his proposal, noting the concern that it would affect the ability of library faculty to perform their professional responsibilities. He also noted that a number of the documents were out of date.

Webster asked how often the policies are reviewed. Kahl responded that there has not been a set schedule for review and updating. Ward commented the process for review needs to change. Reitz noted the changes brought on by the changing landscape of library resource acquisition contributes to the need to review all three. Webster reviewed the purpose of the three. Burr reiterated that they do not seem to sync.

Ward commented the committee should be focusing on the big picture, not operational issues. Reitz expressed his concern about the appropriate level of feedback. Chang agreed with Ward's perspective.

Ward agreed with Burrs' point that they are not in sync.

Burr felt the line was blurred between providing the documents for feedback and being too directive.

Percell noted his objecting to the ad hoc group proposal previously because of his concerns on encroaching on the library's agency. He agreed that the three documents need to be in sync.

Lessoff clarified that his intention for the ad hoc group was to offer input and it was never his intention to overstep the bounds. The proposal was misunderstood. He withdrew the proposal, stating he had received an adequate response from Milner's Administration.

Percell does not dispute the need to have greater clarity of these documents.

Dincer remarked that the Committee is putting forth these ideas and the library has the ability to agree or disagree. He now better understands how the library works and is better able to talk to his colleagues about the library. He is expecting to learn more about the workings of the library.

Does the library have a program review? Ward noted that Kahl has discussed tying the program review cycle to a consistent review of collection development policies and collections. Ward noted that Milner's Administration team appreciated the questions for the Collection Development Philosophy and put a lot of work into the response.

Burr did not completely agree with Dincer because of the broad nature of the library and how it impacts the rest of campus. He mentioned the importance of the charge. Is "advice" a strong enough verb? Dincer suggested Milner be very clear about the boundaries of his feedback.

Kahl noted that there is a Collection Development departmental goal to do a broad review of the collection development management and documents. It will reflect on the ULC feedback received. Ward noted that Milner has fifteen goals for the year and two were developed in part due to response to ULC feedback.

Burr shifted focus to faculty responses to Collection Development Policy – committee members took time to review the twelve responses.

Webster asked about electronic formatted items. Are e-books available to just one or to many? Ward and Kahl noted it depends on the e-book vendor. Burr noted the problem with the EBL vendor. Kahl explained what causes the problem.

Concern was expressed that the document gives preference to electronic formats for books with the part: "If a monograph is available electronically, consideration should be given to purchasing it as an e-book unless print is specifically required." Kahl disagreed that it gives preference but agreed it could be clarified.

Lessoff noted his discussion with Vanette Schwartz about e-reference titles. In this instance, the e-book titles were cheaper, but also cautioned that Milner is paying for access and not permanent access to content. Kahl noted that it differs by discipline and publisher. In some instances, it is much more expensive, especially if the online version is continually updated.

Percell asked about e-book availability in I-Share versus Interlibrary Loan. Kahl responded.

Dincer asked about electronic resources resource sharing, particularly across the state. Ward noted that academic libraries do some through CARLI but there are restrictions due to vendor licensing. CARLI leverages the consortium when it is able, but noted that it consists of many smaller libraries that may not have the same resource needs. Kahl noted the University of California system tried to negotiate more aggressively, as Dincer suggested and they were unsuccessful for the most part. Kalter noted her frustration with Interlibrary Loan where a request is made where for an item that Milner canceled

because it is available as an e-book but she needs it in print. Webster noted the Notes field, but Kalter noted that the format of the title is not always clear.

Lessoff remarked on the faculty response that stated there was no justification given for prioritizing purchasing newer publications over retrospective purchases. Burr added that "new" materials may actually be re-released or newly developed scholarship on older issues that then is published. Lessoff stated it may be difficult for development of a response to this concern since the subject librarians meet with their disciplinary areas separately.

There were faculty suggestions to include acquisition data. There was disagreement and discussion over the need to do so.

Ward stated the fundamental question should be "are your needs being met?" He noted the division of the book budget is based on legacy decisions that have been fine-tuned since the initial distribution but not fundamentally examined. It is challenging to know if that distribution is still accurate. Evaluating the use of electronic resources is particularly challenging.

Dincer shared his experience about responding to a cancellation of an electronic resource when he worked in New Zealand.

Ward noted he's struggled with Milner's approach to electronic resource purchasing.

Dincer remarked we have a common pool challenge. He proposed that Milner send aggressive emails to departments about taking away things that aren't really needed. Lessoff noted that many of these resources cut across disciplines and this can prove particularly challenging if the classroom faculty and subject librarians are isolated in their discussions and decision-making. Kahl noted that the IRMA review was an attempt to share these decisions to the entire campus. He admitted that the scope was overwhelming, given the large number of titles to review. He gave an example of how cross-disciplinary concerns were addressed in a review of the law collection.

Kalter suggested an opt-in process where faculty could declare their areas.

Kahl described criteria that are included in the book budget formula. Dincer asked if it is a disciplinary standard. Ward or Kahl were not sure. Burr suggested we note criteria that go into the formula. Webster suggested providing examples.

Dincer asked if the databases are included in the policy. Ward noted that many have been around a long time, although the vendors may change.

Ward provided basics on library budget, roughly half is personnel and half is acquisitions. The acquisitions budget is roughly $4,500,000. The book portion is roughly $600,000 [post meeting note – the distinction between electronic resources and books is blurry because e-books may be purchased with the electronic resources portion of the acquisitions budget]

Kalter asked about the instance where one million dollars was added to Milner's budget due to lobbying in the Academic Senate. She asked if it was adjusted for inflation. Ward and Kahl responded no.

Ward commented that we are still not asking the fundamental question on whether needs are being met. Labonville suggested committee members ask their departments. Ward stated Milner rarely hears from faculty that the library does not have enough resources for their research. Reitz noted that

Mennonite successfully lobbied for the addition of the Cochrane database. Ward noted that was successful because we had a wider library discussion about its addition. Ward remarked that everything should be under scrutiny. Kahl noted the electronic resources collection development is an area that Milner most needs to develop because it is currently done so idiosyncratically. Burr asked how long the review would take. Kahl responded it would take months.

Burr suggested the Committee set aside an entire meeting for discussion on the departmental faculty questions.

Lessoff suggested that we should go over responses from Milner Administration on the collection development philosophy. Ward stated that Milner really wants feedback on the responses provided to the Committee. A number of committee members commented that they like the responses. Lessoff suggested that committee members provide responses to the Milner Administrative response.

Questions for Departmental Faculty

Percell asked if the questions were for the committee members or for his colleagues.

Burr said survey, focus groups, and going to faculty meetings are all methods to get feedback. Do we need to change questions based on methodology?

Kalter asked for clarification on whether they should be sent now or if they are draft. Burr said they are not ready to be distributed.

Ward stated this is a document that establishes the things we should talk about in a continuous process, not a one-time effort. Burr noted classroom faculty have not been asked these questions previously.

Ward suggested we think about the questions strategically and clarify how the discussions could occur, noting it would likely vary from department to department.

A March 3rd deadline was established for committee member responses on the questions for departmental faculty and to Milner Administration's responses to collection philosophy questions. Ward suggested a discussion rather than having everyone respond, to value everyone's time. Webster suggested that Milner identify the ones that they would most like feedback. Percell suggested both approaches. Ward reiterated Milner's desire for feedback. Committee will provide two sets of responses.

Meeting adjourned at 4:45pm.

Next meeting is scheduled for March 8, 3:15-4:45pm, in Milner 311g.