

**University Committee on Libraries (UCL)  
October 13, 2005  
Hesburgh Library - Room 222**

**Present:** Chair, John Weber. Committee members, Roger Jacobs (ex officio), Parker Ladwig, Semion Lyandres, John Robinson, David Smith, Andrew Sommese, Laurence Taylor, Jennifer Younger (ex officio), Carol Hendrickson (student), and Brian Pitts (graduate student).

**Absent but excused:** Susan Blum, Agnes Ostafin, Charles Rosenberg, Gordon Wishon (ex officio)

**Observers / Guests:** Nigel Butterwick, Kitty Hoye (recorder)

**Call to order**

The meeting was called to order at 3:30 pm by UCL chair, John Weber.

**Welcome and agenda review**

Weber welcomed committee members and guests in attendance. The meeting, he explained, will focus primarily on identifying issues and discussion topics for future UCL meetings. While some topics have already been identified and will be included in discussions today, Weber urged the committee to propose new topics for the UCL to consider during this academic year.

**Minutes**

Weber announced that the minutes from the September 15, 2005 meeting will be forthcoming in the next few days. Once they have been reviewed, he will entertain a motion for their approval via e-mail.

**UCL Chair's Report**

UCL Annual Report for 2004-5

Before moving on to a discussion of future potential agenda items, Weber asked former UCL chair, David Smith, for an update on the status of the **2004-2005 UCL Annual Report**. Smith indicated that the 2004-2005 UCL Annual Report has been approved by the UCL and sent on to the Academic Council for their consideration and review. A copy of the report is available online at <http://www.library.nd.edu/ucl/annual-reports/documents/UCL-Annual-Report-2004-5.pdf>. The next step, explained Smith, is to make ourselves available to the Academic Council for a prospective spot on their agenda for discussing the report (perhaps along with discussion of results of the Library Task Force Report, when that report is issued – probably in early 2006). John Robinson, a member of the Executive Committee of the Academic Council, volunteered to help in the effort to gain a spot on the Academic Council's agenda.

A discussion followed regarding the desirability of and procedures for also approaching the Faculty Senate to try to get discussion of the **2004-2005 UCL Annual Report** on their agenda (perhaps along with discussion of the Library Task Force Report, when that report is issued – probably in early 2006). John Robinson, a member of the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate, volunteered to also help in the effort to get on the Faculty Senate agenda. He explained that a three-tiered process would be required. We would first approach the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate, with a goal of having them refer us to the Academic Affairs Committee of

the Faculty Senate. The Academic Affairs Committee in turn could recommend a spot on the Faculty Senate agenda.

In anticipation of these prospective spots on the agenda of the Academic Council and the Faculty Senate, the group discussed the desirability of developing a UCL position statement on library issues for the possible meetings with the Academic Council and the Faculty Senate. With that in mind, Smith has collected a number of position statements from other schools regarding e-journal packages and other important library issues and offered to share those with UCL members. (Smith subsequently sent a list of relevant web-site addresses to the UCL chair for distribution to UCL members.) Weber indicated that this topic will be brought up again for continuing discussion at the November UCL meeting and again when the Library Task Force Report is issued.

#### Possible Agenda Items for This Academic Year

Next, Weber reiterated that the primary goal of today's meeting was to identify and briefly overview potential UCL agenda items for the upcoming year. In introducing the discussion, Weber asked members to consider the possibility of forming standing **UCL subcommittees** to address particularly complex and important issues that make the planned UCL agenda. He noted that "standing subcommittees" are used effectively by other groups on campus as a way to more consistently and thoroughly gather information and analyze complex issues of continuing significance and importance. In addition to current UCL members, he suggested that, where deemed appropriate, a given subcommittee might include UCL members, key members of the library staff, plus a small number of other faculty and students. The potential creation of specific possible UCL subcommittees will be discussed further at the November and December UCL meetings, following the identification and initial overview of UCL agenda items selected for this academic year.

#### **Director's Report -- Jennifer Younger**

For her "Director's Report", Library Director, Jennifer Younger, mentioned a number of issues she would like to see included as agenda items or discussion points during this academic year. She began by describing the "**e-journal packages**" issue as being "timely" and "extremely important." Referring to the email recently (10/05) sent to all faculty members, Younger updated the committee on the recent decision to terminate the Springer SBM (previously known as Springer/Kluwer) e-journal packaging contract. Looking for ways to streamline the process, she described two vendors, CISTI (Canada Institute of Scientific and Technical Information) and INGENTA, currently providing document delivery services. Younger is "looking to the UCL for suggestions and guidance" as she and her staff assess the situation and move forward with alternative document delivery packages.

Younger also addressed the need to assess and update a number of library policies and procedures, including the current "**recall policy**." Noting that many new faculty members are "shocked" when they learn the recall process does not always result in prompt returns, Younger stressed the importance of addressing the recall policy issue as soon as possible. With this in mind, she has asked Nigel Butterwick to prepare a report with information and statistical data on faculty compliance regarding requested recalls. Younger indicated that she is looking to the UCL for advice and counsel on the recall policy and would, therefore, like to see it included as an agenda item to be examined in greater depth at an upcoming UCL meeting.

#### **2005-06 Agenda Items Discussion, cont.**

Following these introductory from Jennifer Younger above, the discussion then continued with the identification and brief overview of additional potential items for the UCL agenda this year.

#### Information Literacy

Weber called upon Librarian Nigel Butterwick for an overview of “**information literacy**” and related issues. Butterwick described “information literacy” as an area of “enormous interest and importance” not only within the library, but throughout the many academic departments on campus. Many faculty members consider current students to be “ill prepared” and otherwise lacking in the skills necessary to conduct meaningful research. Describing this as being a “significant issue” throughout higher education in general, Butterwick referred the committee to an article (American Library Association (2000) “Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education,” 18 p.) detailing a set of guidelines on “information literacy standards” to be considered when evaluating academic programs. The article identifies five “key competencies” and related performance indicators. In response to concerns expressed by Weber on technological advances with the internet since the article was originally written in 2000, Butterwick noted that a couple of the performance indicators would likely be rewritten and be richer given today’s internet technology, but that the other indicators remain as relevant today as when the paper originally appeared. [Butterwick also referred the UCL to a second publication on information literacy -- Barbour, W., et al (2004), “Integrating Information Literacy into the Academic Curriculum,” Research Bulletin Vol. 2004, Issue 18, Aug. 31, 2004, 10 p. Both articles were subsequently distributed to the entire UCL committee.]

The key question for Notre Dame regarding information literacy, argued Butterwick, lies in determining “where” Notre Dame wants to be regarding information literacy and “what” the library can do to assist in meeting that need. He added that the role of the UCL regarding the information literacy issue should also be determined.

When asked if the issue stems from a “proliferation of information” or an “increased ability to access information,” Butterwick responded that both factors are relevant. Regarding the second factor (accessing information), he noted that students are tending to rely more and more on popular search engines such as “Google” for much of their research and, therefore, the library resources are “not being fully utilized”.

A discussion on the traditional role of libraries followed. Roger Jacobs contrasted the role of those who “use” or seek information with those who “teach” or guide users regarding what information is relevant or important. Recognizing that his experiences in legal education may differ from those in other academic areas, Jacobs briefly explained the role of law librarians as “teachers” within the three year legal education process. Referring to it as being “highly integrated,” Jacobs went on to describe the unique relationship between law faculty and law students. He added that the “success of this system depends upon or stems from everyone – faculty, student, and law librarian – being on board”.

Younger described both the Law School and Music Department as “model programs” for developing successful relationships between their department and the library. When it comes to research, she added, many college students are left to “do it alone”. Younger indicated she would like to see more of a focus on establishing a partnership” between the library and faculty as opposed to an “either or” proposition – that is, something similar to the “law school model” described by Jacobs. Noting that it is not just a student issue, Parker Ladwig added that “more can also be done to educate faculty on new and better ways of doing research”.

Given the significance and complexity of this issue, “information literacy” at Notre Dame, Weber suggested that the UCL consider forming a UCL subcommittee to address this issue. Noting that a number of committee members were unable to attend today’s meeting, Weber agreed to revisit the issue at the November meeting. He encouraged members to reflect upon the issues and report back to the UCL at the next meeting to express interest in serving on the potential subcommittee. Should the UCL be in favor of establishing such a subcommittee, a reasonable goal, he suggested, would be to have an ‘Information Literacy Subcommittee’ named and charged by the conclusion of the December 2005 meeting.

### Faculty Outreach

Weber deferred to Director Younger for a brief overview and discussion of issues relating to the “**faculty outreach**” issue. Explaining that the faculty outreach issue routinely comes up during meetings with library staff and administration, Younger emphasized that “faculty outreach” includes “much more than collection development.” She sees an “expanding role” of the library in faculty outreach, a role that might include using library “liaisons” to explain new resources and to work more proactively with faculty on specific issues relating to the library.

In response to a request for clarification on the differences between “information” and “outreach,” Parker Ladwig described ‘outreach’ as more than explaining what ‘materials’ are available -- also including information and training on how to more productively use what ‘services’ are available. He referred to the “recall policy” as a good example of a “service” area that could be explained in an “enhanced faculty outreach” program. He suggested that as the trend moves towards “on demand” access to materials, the Library finds itself in a “constant battle” to develop new programs and initiatives that will continue to provide “equitable access” to its users. He also indicated that the library staff is currently exploring “marketing initiatives” in addition to the more traditional method of “faculty outreach”.

A lengthy discussion on the differences between “marketing” and “information literacy” as applied to both faculty and students followed. Ladwig expressed the underlying desire for faculty to keep the library resources in the “forefront of their students’ mind.” The real issue, he argued, is that the faculty doesn’t seem to have a clear sense of “who their librarian is and what their library can do” for them and their students. Dave Smith reminded that another dimension complicating the discussion of faculty outreach is a desire from faculty to meet their “very narrow” and “extremely specific” resource needs.

Ladwig suggested that another potential dimension for faculty outreach was to “pro-actively monitor” reactions to significant changes in library policies, so as to address faculty concerns in a more effective and timely manner. As an example, Ladwig described the recent complaints heard from faculty after learning the Library decided to cancel its contract with Springer/Kluwer. The Library might have “mitigated” much of the concern, argued Ladwig, had it “proactively” addressed these concerns via “faculty outreach” programs.

Recognizing that “faculty outreach” is a complex issue, Younger suggested that the committee not focus so much on “solving the problem” but instead on “ensuring that the relevant issues are appropriately addressed” by the proper parties and/or committees. With that suggestion, Weber asked that the topic be included for further discussion on the November agenda, with the possibility of creating a UCL ‘Faculty Outreach’ subcommittee.

### **Old / New Business**

The Chair suggested the committee institute a general meeting policy stating an intention to adhere to a 1 ½ hour time limit on regularly scheduled monthly meetings. Weber suggested that the November agenda might include, among potential additional items, the following:

- Update (from Dave Smith and John Robinson) on prospective consideration of the 2004-5 UCL Annual Report on the Academic Council agenda for this year (including a UCL discussion of possible goals, strategies and development of a UCL position statement for that prospective meeting);
- Update on Library Task Force Report from Associate Provost Chris Maziar’s office;
- Continued discussions of e-journal packages, recall policy, information literacy (including potential establishment of UCL subcommittee), and faculty outreach (including potential establishment of UCL subcommittee).

- A prospective organizational overview of the library for UCL members would be moved to December or January agenda.

UCL members were again encouraged to bring other issues of concern to the Chair's attention as soon as possible so that they can be included as discussion items on upcoming agenda.

**Adjourn –**

Meeting adjourned at 5:10 pm.

The next meeting is scheduled for November 10, 2005, 7:30 am (Grace Hall – Café DeGrasta).

Respectfully submitted,

Kitty Cooney Hoye  
Recorder