

## University Library Committee 1995-1996

### Minutes for January 17, 1996

#### **Summary**

The Library Committee dealt with issues concerning the serials cancellation project and the use of faculty studies.

#### **Detailed Minutes**

**Present:** Bart Alexander, Frances Cogan, Peter Gilkey, George Shipman, Ray Weldon.

**Absent:** John Gage, Lucy Lynch, Bill Orr, Theodore Palmer.

**Guests:** Deborah Carver, Assistant University Librarian for Public Services and Collections; Nancy Slight-Gibney, Head, Acquisitions Department.

---

The meeting was brought to order by Peter Gilkey, chair, at 4:05 pm. The November 29, 1996 ULC meeting minutes were approved with no corrections or additions.

Gilkey reported that he, Carver, and Shipman met recently with the Faculty Advisory Council to brief them on the serials cancellation project. The FAC had some questions concerning the procedure of deciding the titles to be eliminated that were answered by Shipman. The FAC also had some questions regarding the total budget allocation for serials given to various areas. Gilkey reported that he and Shipman would meet with the department heads of CAS on 5 February 1996 for a similar discussion. of CAS on 5 February 1996 for a similar discussion.

Gilkey brought to the floor the concern by Lucy Lynch conveyed in her Nov. 30 email to him, which is to assure that the savings generated by the serials cancellation will be used to support monographs, which she believes was the original intent of the committee. Gilkey asked if there will be a net transfer, e.g. from natural sciences to humanities, in term of monographs? Shipman responded yes, to some extent. He added that we will have more information on the cancellations effect on the budget this summer which will allow for more in-depth discussion by the 1996/7 Library Committee fall 97. The bottom line answer is that money not spent to cover increases of journal costs \*will enable us to maintain our monograph expenditures.\* [Note further clarification: By not spending more and more money on journals, we will be able to maintain our current ability to purchase books which are heavily used by the humanities and social sciences. 1/23/96]

Weldon asked that if inflation is in fact lower next year than what has been predicted, what will the library do with that money savings? Shipman stated that if the inflation rate is lower, we may be able to delay further cuts for a period of time. However, sooner or later, the entire \$500,000 cut will have to be made.

Gilkey stated that another question that has been asked by several faculty members, including some members of the Faculty Advisory Council, is whether new subscriptions can be purchased. Shipman stated that the library has allocated \$20,000 for new serial purchases. A

department can choose to use their portion of new serials money this year to retain current subscriptions.

Gilkey said that several faculty have expressed concern on the responsibility of selecting core titles being given to library subject specialists. Cogan responded that librarians are hired because of their expertise within certain disciplines. They should be qualified to make these kinds of decisions. Shipman suggested that if faculty members have concerns over the core titles identified by librarians, they should ask their departmental library representative to convey their concerns to the library subject specialists. Carver added that the librarians work with the collection every day and are familiar with titles that are used on a regular basis. The core titles may represent only 10-15% of the titles within each discipline. The intent behind this procedure is to expedite procedures and create a collaborative process. We need to provide access to the core titles and if the library cuts a core journal, that would be very costly to the interlibrary loan service. The average cost of processing an Inter Library Loan request is \$30.00. Weldon asked if the list of core titles could be distributed to departments in order to assist faculty when selecting titles to eliminate. Carver responded yes.

Shipman distributed a draft of a letter from him to tenure track assistant professors informing them of the faculty studies use policy. He explained that Knight Library has a number of studies available since the completion of the building project. The faculty studies are not to be used as offices. They are intended to provide a quiet space for faculty who are conducting extensive research in the library. The rooms are available to any full time, permanent faculty member, not just to tenure track assistant professors. Cogan made a motion to approve the draft of the letter and to send it out; the motion passed with all in favor.

The discussion then turned to the GTF's presently assigned space in the faculty studies. Some members felt that GTF usage of these studies was inappropriate and that they were being used as offices rather than as studies. It was suggested that GTF's no longer be assigned space in faculty studies and that the GTFs currently assigned to faculty studies not be removed until their space is needed for a faculty member. Bart Alexander raised reservations about eliminating student access to faculty studies and hoped there would be a possibility of GTF usage of studies not required by faculty. No formal action was taken by the ULC.

Gilkey suggested that the committee not convene again until spring term. Everyone agreed. The agenda item for the next meeting will be copyright issues. Gilkey added that he will notify the members if something comes up which requires action by the committee during the remainder of winter 1996 quarter.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:05 pm. Submitted by Sheila Gray January 23, 1996