FACULTY SENATE LIBRARY COMMITTEE
MINUTES
20 OCTOBER 2004

PRESENT: Nathan Buckner, Larry Hardesty, Joan Lewis, Jose’ Mena-Werth, Rick Miller, David Palmer, Brinton Strohmeyer, Janet Wilke

ABSENT: Deb Schroeder

Dr. Miller convened the meeting at 4:04 p.m.

Miller then read the charge and composition of this Committee to the members:

Article VII.J. Library Committee
“Recommends the procedures by which funds are allocated to the colleges and advises the University administration on the formulation and implementation of Library policy. COMPOSITION: One faculty member from and elected by each undergraduate college, the Dean of Libraries, the Assistant Vice-Chancellor of Information Technology, one member selected by the Graduate Council, and one student selected by the Student Senate. Total: 8 members.”

The next order of business was to elect a Chair of the Committee. Mena-Werth nominated David Palmer (Buckner), who accepted the nomination. Mena-Werth moved (Buckner) that nominations cease and a unanimous ballot be cast. The motion carried.

Miller then stated that in the past this Committee has often elected a secretary, however, since the scribe takes the minutes, a secretary is not really needed. The scribe will send drafts of all minutes to the Chair for review and/or correction prior to sending them on to the Secretary of Faculty Senate.

Chair Palmer then took over the task of leading the remainder of the meeting. The next item of business was approval of the minutes from the 28 January 2004 meeting. Due to several factors last spring, these minutes were not released for submission to Faculty Senate, but they need to be properly approved so they can be archived with other committee minutes of the 2003-2004 academic year. Palmer moved (Wilke) that the minutes from 28 January 2004, be accepted as written. The motion carried.

Dean Hardesty then gave a review of the library’s budget for FY 2004-05. He noted that a new thing the library is doing is providing some additional money to new tenure-track faculty that is over and above the departmental allocations. This year the new faculty each received $500 to spend on materials.
Hardesty announced that last year the library used $143,950 from Student Library Enhancement Fee money to purchase electronic resources. He commented that this is a great asset to the students.

Hardesty then mentioned what the library has done so far this year regarding databases:

- expanded from Academic Search Elite to Academic Search Premiere
- expanded Art Retrospective from a one-user license to an unlimited user site license
- expanded the Humanities and Social Sciences Retrospective
- added Arts & Humanities IV and Arts & Humanities Compliment to JSTOR
- added Hospitality and Tourism Index

Hardesty reported that the library will be implementing Docutek electronic reserves. UNK will share the license with UNO and UNMC. This will allow journal articles to be scanned in and stored electronically.

Hardesty then announced the library is purchasing four laptop computers that can be checked out for use in the library only. We’re starting with four to see how it goes.

The librarians will be looking at Education Retrospective Index, which will be available in January, 2005. They may also consider a Federated Searching program from Innovative Interfaces.

Hardesty stated he is looking at some ways to prepare some group study areas in the library. Following the recent NLA/NEMA Convention, an architect, who had made a presentation at that convention, toured our library and provided some suggestions. Hardesty said he and Colleen Lewis also recently completed a walk-through of the building, both inside and outside, and noted areas needing repair, replacement, etc.

In answer to a question about the cost of Social Science Citation Index, Hardesty said it’s a nice resource for students, but it’s expensive.

In answer to a question about purchasing a database for our campus only vs. sharing one with other campuses, Hardesty said our cost is determined by the number of students we have. Wilke said that with shared databases we could end up paying more because the number of students is broken up into quantities such as 1-5,000 students, 5,001-10,000 students, etc. The more students there are in the group, the more we’d have to pay. In addition, we could only share databases that everyone could use, and the vendor would have to allow it.

In answer to a question about cutting journals, Hardesty stated that we won’t be cutting journals again for awhile unless there are some severe budget shortfalls. The inflation rate for journals is about 10% per year, so our budget will handle the inflation, but won’t allow us to acquire new journals.
Academic Program Review template – Wilke reported that the librarians have been discussing developing a template for providing library data to departments that come up for program review. Wilke has looked into the Academic Program Review Guidelines and Procedures as they pertain to library information. She has also asked the librarians to send information to her regarding the kinds of data requests they have received by their liaison departments. She stated that what we’d like to do is determine what kinds of information could be provided in general to all departments, and then see if there are specific types of data that individual departments would need in addition to the general information. We want to be sure every program review includes information from the library.

She asked if there are specific questions that the library should be asking departments in order to develop this template. It was thought that Dr. Nikels might have some ideas on the kinds of information reviewers might be looking for. Miller stated that resources need to relate to the courses that are taught. He suggested looking at faculty research areas and determining what library resources support those areas. Lewis suggested including information related to distance education courses. She stated that electronic support is also important. Many journals and other materials are cross-disciplinary. Miller invited Wilke to attend a Council of Chairs meeting to get feedback from the chairs as to what they might need. It was also suggested that perhaps a focus group could be formed to work on this.

Disaster Plan update – Wilke mentioned that last year the library had a huge roof leak and lost about 1500 government documents. Since then we’ve been working on preparing a disaster plan. Inventories were taken of all units; the collections are recorded, but we needed to know the numbers of desks, chairs, file cabinets, computers, etc., throughout the building. Hardesty said that when he came here in July, he brought a disaster plan with him. It included a list of materials for a disaster preparedness kit. He has consulted with Sheryl Heidenreich regarding the list and we will soon be purchasing some of the more critical items on the list. He also said we need to identify someone who does cold storage because of the necessity of flash freezing damaged books. We hope to put a disaster kit together in the next couple of weeks.

Library grants – Hardesty distributed a draft letter and draft application form for review. The deadline was discussed relative to the dates by which materials must be ordered and received for this fiscal year. The grants could be used to purchase special sets or collections that we might not otherwise be able to acquire. In answer to a question, he indicated that it is reasonable to request backfiles of journals to which we currently subscribe. For many disciplines, if there is a way to access older issues of certain journals, they might get used. Miller observed that a lot of materials that are on microfilm or microfiche are of poor quality. Lewis asked about digital access to materials on microfiche.

The maximum amount that can be requested per grant is $2500. Departments can submit more than one request but, if they do, they must prioritize the requests. The deadline for receipt of grant requests is Wednesday, 1 December 2004.
Priority Program funds – Hardesty reported that the library submitted a request for Priority Program funds, but will not receive any of this money this year. He said that Sr. VCAA Murray is supporting the cost of the Docutek electronic reserve system license.

The next Library Committee meeting will be at 4:00 p.m. on Wednesday, 8 December, in the Library Conference Room. At that meeting the Committee will review all the grant proposals that have been received, and will make recommendations for funding the requests.

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting adjourned at 5:12 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Colleen M. Lewis
Scribe