

**University Committee on Libraries
Minutes of the Meeting – December 8, 2005
3:30 – 5:00 pm Foster Room**

UCL Members

Present: Chair, John Weber, Director Jennifer Younger (ex officio), Susan Blum, Roger Jacobs (ex officio), Parker Ladwig, Semion Lyandres, John Robinson, Charles Rosenberg, David Smith, Andrew Sommese, Laurence Taylor, Gordon Wishon (ex officio), Brian Pitts (graduate student).
Absent and excused: Carol Hendrickson (student). **Absent:** Agnes Ostafin. **Observers / Guests:** Nigel Butterwick, Kitty Hoye (Recorder)

Call to order

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

1) Welcome and Agenda Review

The Chair welcomed all committee members and guests to the meeting and briefly reviewed the December agenda. Weber made particular note of two items – Library Recall Policy and Information Literacy – which are carryover topics from the November meeting. In addition, agenda items #2 (Chair’s Report) and #3 (Director’s Report) will be combined into one discussion.

2) Approval of Minutes from November 10, 2005 UCL meeting.

Minutes of the 11/10/05 UCL meeting, distributed with the current agenda, were briefly discussed and unanimously approved, subject to minor changes. (**Motion** / Rosenberg – **Second** / Parker)

3) Chair’s Report and 4) Director’s Report Combined

Weber turned the floor over to Library Director Jennifer Younger for a status report on the Pilot Document Delivery Project as well as an update on the Library Task Force Report.

Update - Pilot Document Delivery Project

The Pilot Document Delivery Project involves an experiment in alternative document delivery services, in response to the library’s recent cancellation of the Springer-Kluwer (SK) contract. Two vendors, INGENTA and CISTI (Canada Institute of Scientific & Technical Information), were selected to participate in the project. The project involves thirty faculty and graduate students. Sherri Jones, life science librarian and head, Resource Delivery Department, is directing the pilot program. Update. From her initial observations and recent discussions with Jones, Director Younger reports that she is pleased with the overall progress of the project thus far. She added, however, that some faculty members have expressed a desire for more “mediated” services (staff assisted) instead of the “unmediated” (faculty direct to vendor) services. The project will continue for several more months and Younger will update the UCL as more data and feedback become available.

UCL member and pilot project participant Andrew Sommese provided the committee with his personal impressions of the project. While he is not as impressed with CISTI, he is quite impressed with the ease and efficiency of INGENTA. Sommese currently also uses and remains pleased with the Inter Library Loan (ILL) system in place. In his opinion, the best case scenario would include a “spruced up ILL with the ability to use INGENTA for immediate needs.”

Update - Task Force Report

Turning to the Task Force Report, Director Younger informed the committee that she expects to meet with the new Provost, Tom Burish, in early 2006 regarding the initial draft of the report and hopes the final report will be issued by February of 2006.

On a potentially related issue, Younger referred the committee to the recent ND press release which identified the library as one of “three academic priorities” to receive a share of the \$14.5 million Fiesta Bowl revenues. (The statement, released in early December, 2005, listed financial aid, Jordan Hall of Science and “library acquisitions” as key areas to receive a share of the Fiesta Bowl revenues.) Younger indicated she is very pleased with the announcement, but cannot provide the committee with specific details until an official, more detailed announcement is released by the Provost.

5) Library Recall Policy

Some faculty and student have complained about excessive delays in returning items, once recalled. In response to these concerns, Weber called upon the library’s Associate Director for User Services, Nigel Butterwick, to give the committee a brief overview of the current recall policy and procedures. Butterwick explained that three penalty phases are included in the recall policy. If a book is returned within 14 days of receiving a recall notice, no overdue charges are imposed. If the book is returned within 15 – 43 days of recall notice, a \$10 recall charge can be assessed to the patron. Butterwick added, however, that this is not currently collected and the time is considered a “grace period” for the patron. After 43 days, the patron is billed \$95 which includes \$55 for average replacement costs, a \$15 processing fee and a \$25 non-refundable overdue recall charge. For students, these charges are sent to Student Accounts. If the book is returned, the student will receive a credit for all but the \$25 overdue recall charge. In applying the current policy to date, no charges have been levied against faculty with overdue, recalled items.

The complaints, explained Butterwick, seem to have arisen because of excessive delays in faculty returning items, once recalled. Butterwick has been studying the recall phenomenon and shared some initial data comparing recall activity in 2002 with that in 2005. He described the data as merely a “snapshot” taken over the course of a few days in each year studied (2002 and 2005). After hearing Butterwick’s summary analysis of the initial data and asking several questions, the committee concluded that it was premature to draw conclusions at this point. Butterwick offered to collect additional data and prepare a supplemental report for the February 2006 UCL meeting. Additional information should help to identify whether the problem (of excessive delays in faculty returning items, once recalled) is localized, consisting primarily of repeat offenders, or is more global, including a broad spectrum of patrons.

The discussion prompted a consideration on alternative potential sanctions for faculty who fail to comply with repeated recall requests from the library. A number of suggestions were discussed, including warnings, a graduated fine structure to faculty, and temporary revocation of library rights and privileges. While none of the potential sanctions discussed received unanimous support, the committee did agree the recall policy should be rethought in the context of today’s faster, more time sensitive environment. For example, waiting upwards of 2 weeks for a response was considered “too lenient” by some UCL members since that policy was formulated before instantaneous on line recall notification was feasible.

Weber summarized the recall policy discussion, indicating that the issue appears to include dimensions such as: updating the timeline for triggering sanctions; identifying alternative strategies for stimulating more timely compliance by faculty; rethinking specific sanctions and their application; and developing mechanisms to effectively communicate any potential policy

changes to faculty and students. Weber asked UCL committee members to think about these and other potential dimensions of the issue in preparation for more detailed consideration of the recall policy issue, once more detailed data and analysis are provided by Nigel Butterwick at the February 2006 UCL meeting.

6) Information Literacy Discussion

Before opening up the floor for a discussion of the ‘information literacy’ challenge, the Chair asked Nigel Butterwick for a brief summary of the background and motivation for bringing the information literacy issue before the UCL. Referring to the introduction of this topic at an earlier UCL meeting (refer to 10/13/05 UCL Minutes), Butterwick described information literacy as an area of significant interest and importance not only within the Notre Dame community, but throughout higher education in general. Many faculty members consider current students to be ill prepared and otherwise lacking in the skills necessary to conduct meaningful research.

Butterwick indicated that the issue stems from both the proliferation of information and the increased ability to access information (largely via the Internet). One important concern of the library is that students are tending to rely more and more on popular search engines such as Google for much of their research and, therefore, library resources are not being fully utilized.

Butterwick referred the committee to an article detailing a set of guidelines on “information literacy standards” to be considered when evaluating academic programs [American Library Association (2000) “Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education,” 18 p.]. The article identifies five “key competencies” and related information literacy performance indicators. Butterwick also referred the UCL to a second publication on information literacy for additional insights on the issue [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 previously distributed to the UCL committee.

Butterwick said that, among the key question for the Notre Dame Library regarding information literacy, are 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 discussion might also consider and attempt to define what role, if any, the UCL could play in helping to sort out and address the information literacy challenge.

Director Younger added further insights on the information literacy issue and its potential relevance for the UCL. She suggested a “partnership” among different constituencies of the University (for example, representation from the library, OIT, First Year of Studies, faculty, students, and others) would be the required to effectively address the many different dimensions of the information literacy issue. The list of information literacy challenges to be sorted out might include: identifying the basic information literacy skill set appropriate for different subsets of students; assessing of the existing level of these skills among these same subsets of students; designing specific strategies to enhance information literacy skill sets; and designing mechanisms for outreach to faculty and students alike to communicate and implement any yet to be determined potential information literacy strategies.

Weber turned to the committee at large for their thoughts on the matter. Virtually all UCL members recognized the potential significance, breadth and complexity of the issue. Some members expressed concern that taking the lead in sorting out and addressing the complex, multifaceted information literacy issue would not be appropriate for the UCL, given the breadth of the overall issue and its critical relevance for so many different constituencies in the University. The diversity and complexity of the issue was highlighted further in additional observations from UCL members. For example, Roger Jacobs expressed his concern that the ‘ideal’ basic information literacy skill set might well vary significantly for students and faculty

from varying disciplines – for example, science versus business. Gordon Wishon suggested that addressing the information literacy challenge is likely to call for complex strategies because students arrive on campus with varying levels of information literacy. Noting that plagiarism is a related issue, John Robinson suggested that input from General Counsel’s office should also be involved in any discussion of how to address the information literacy challenge.

Library Director Younger and Director of the Notre Dame OIT, Gordon Wishon, acknowledged that the University already recognizes the importance and breadth of the issue by pointing out that, reflecting the growing concern over information literacy and related technology issues here at Notre Dame, a committee has already been established to address these challenges. This is the University Council for Academic Technologies (UCAT), with Wishon as Chair. Sub-committees of the UCAT have also been formed, including the University Academic Technology and Training Committee (UATTC). The mission statement of the UATTC indicates the following mission: “To provide advice and recommendations to the UATTC towards identifying and meeting the information utilization and information technology needs of faculty and students at the University of Notre Dame.” The goals of that advisory committee related to information literacy (also specified in the mission statement) include the following: *“Expanding Familiarity with and Utilization of Information Resources at Notre Dame”* (by way of):

- Survey academic departments to learn the kinds of information needed to support teaching and research in the discipline;
- Work with academic departments to gauge the effectiveness and efficiency with which students and faculty acquire, critically evaluate, organize, and cite scholarly materials;
- Explore ways to better support how students and faculty learn to access and utilize information in their intellectual pursuits.

Shiree Moreland, OIT and Joni Warner, University Libraries were appointed to co-chair the UATTC (Warner has since left the University). A Faculty / Student Advisory Committee was also organized to advise the UATTC, but has since disbanded, for lack of receiving a mandate to move forward. The loss of the co-chair and the disbanding of the Faculty / Student Advisory Committee have slowed the progress in regard to information literacy.

The prior establishment of UCAT, UATTC and its stated mission reinforces the notion that, while the information literacy issue itself and addressing the issue are relevant concerns of the UCL, taking the lead in sorting out and addressing the complex, multifaceted information literacy issue may not be appropriate for the UCL, given the breadth of the overall issue, its critical relevance for so many different constituencies in the University, and the fact that a broader based university committee has already been established for considering information literacy issues.

For the present, UCL members agreed on the following. Given the nature of the underlying information literacy issue, the library and the UCL could presumably play important contributing roles in helping to design, implement and communicate relevant information literacy plans and strategies. However, given the points highlighted above, especially the fact that a broad-based university committee has already been established to address issues in this area, taking the lead in sorting out and addressing this complex, multifaceted information literacy issue with specific plans and strategies may not be appropriate for the UCL. The UCL agreed to continue consideration of this issue, without yet committing to formation of a UCL subcommittee on information literacy.

As a way to stimulate that continuing discussion at the next UCL meeting and beyond, Weber asked if Butterwick and Younger could draft a potential charge for any potential UCL subcommittee on information literacy. As input for drafting that charge, Wishon agreed to provide a copy of the original charge originally given to the Faculty / Student Advisory

Committee to the University Academic Technology and Training Committee (UATTC) Working Committee.

In preparation for continued discussion of information literacy at the next UCL meeting in February 2006, Weber encouraged all UCL members to revisit the two articles on information literacy previously distributed to the committee -- with special emphasis being given to a careful review of the information literacy competency standards set out in the year 2000 ALA article.

7) Discussion on UCL goals, strategies and position statement

At the 11/10/05 UCL Meeting, the UCL discussed the desirability of developing a UCL position statement on library issues in anticipation of potential spots for the UCL on the agenda of the Academic Council and the Faculty Senate. In order to help start the discussion at the current UCL meeting, Chair Weber had asked Parker Ladwig, Nigel Butterwick and Dave Smith if they could generate an initial bullet list of items that the UCL might want to include in a potential position statement.

The discussion began by recognizing several important relevant background phenomena. These include: the impending completion of the University level Library Task Force Report; the recent changes in the library policy regarding e-journal packages (for example, the library's recent cancellation of the Springer-Kluwer contract); the proximity of the next University campaign and related requests to the library for fundable projects and related potential endowments; and the recent announcement identifying the library as one of three major areas slated to share the Fiesta Bowl revenues.

After some discussion, UCL committee members agreed that any potential position statement should focus upon highlighting opportunities and challenges that the library has in trying to help the University to maintain its prominence in teaching while simultaneously enhancing its research output and related reputation as a premier research institution. To accomplish this, UCL committee members feel there is a need to turn away from emphasizing "one-time-funding" opportunities toward emphasizing more "regularized" funding required to adequately support specialized research areas targeted by the University. Rosenberg described the problem as being "critical" and "systemic" and in need of serious attention. Aspiring to become a top university requires the continued and sustained support of a top research library. Reflecting this proposed transition, as commitments to existing research programs are renewed and as new research initiatives and programs are funded, the related monetary commitments need to include adequate monies to establish and maintain appropriate research and library materials.

Related to the above emphasis, UCL members pointed explicitly to the anticipated influx from Fiesta Bowl revenues. The committee noted that this and other potential one time infusions are certainly needed, very helpful, and very much appreciated. However, one time funding of this sort will not fix the long term systemic problem of under-funded ongoing library support for University prioritized research programs.

Ladwig, Butterwick and Smith agreed to meet prior to the next UCL meeting to continue discussion of input for a potential position statement. The intention is to again provide a starting point for continued discussion of this issue at the next and/or subsequent UCL meetings.

Motion to adjourn (Motion / Jacobs – Second / Blum)

The meeting adjourned at 5:05 pm. The next UCL meeting is scheduled for February 16, 2006 at 7:30 am (Grace Hall – Café DeGrasta).

Respectfully submitted,

Kitty Cooney Hoye
Recorder