University Library Committee
Minutes – November 16, 2007
(approved 1/18/08)

Present: Kristi Austin, Colden Baxter, Kay Flowers (ex-officio), Jennifer Groom, Beverly Hewett, Vitit Kantabutra, Melania Chikobvu, Stephanie Christelow, Tera Letzring, Tracy Payne, Daniel Selvage, Linda Smith (?), Michael Spall, Curtis Whitaker (?), and Sue Roth.

Guests: Janet Higgins, Marcia Francis

 Approval of Minutes: There was no quorum at the meeting on October 19, 2007, so the Committee approved the minutes of September, 18, 2007.

BUSINESS:

1. Web of Science: Kay Flowers announced that the Vice President for Academic Affairs approved $105,000 for the purchase of Web of Science back files, and suggested that we take a one year subscription, $45,000, from the Library's current account. Larry Ford will work with us on the redistribution of the overhead money so that Web of Science can be paid for out of those funds on a regular basis starting next July. The Library is to make arrangements for this purchase with all deliberate speed. Flowers is waiting for Sandra Shropshire to return and will then put everything in place. The subscription starts January 1, but Flowers will try to get it a month ahead of time. The 2% overhead allotment is producing about forty to fifty thousand dollars per year; with one more percentage rate it could produce approximately $90,000. The Library can put about half of it toward this subscription and still have money left over for other departments.

Concerns were voiced about the need for this product when journal subscriptions have been cut and teaching positions are unfilled.

Flowers explained that ISU is only one of five doctoral institutions that does not have Web of Science and it does provide many capabilities. It's hard to consider being a research university without it, but she does not believe the money should be just for sciences.

ACTION: In response to concerns, Flowers agreed to talk to Adkison and the vendor again about phasing it in and making the backfile smaller.

2. Overhead Money: Flowers explained the process by which the Library receives 2% of grant overhead monies and referred to a memo from the Research Coordinating Council which gives recommendations as to the use of these funds. There are three priorities and the University Library Committee is the group that decides how this percentage is spent. The Library has used money from this account for prepayment on databases and for anything that will enhance research. Flowers explained further that,

now that Web of Science is dealt with, the next step is to decide how to award the overhead money. The RCC will decide on their distribution, but she is hoping for at least 3%. If that is the case, the amount would be about $90,000 each year to be spent toward enhancing research or saving serials again. Some of it would be spent to maintain Web of Science.

Request for Special Research Purchase Form: Kay discussed the draft of policies and procedures designed for a competitive award of the overhead money designated for departments. The Research Coordinating Council does internal competition for their funds and Kay thought it would be good to do the same for the Library Overhead Funds. She presented the form, Request for Special Research Purchase, and asked the Committee for recommendations for changes in the form. Kay proposes that the requests could come in anytime and be reviewed by the ULC two times a year: January and April. The most common requests for special research purchases would be journal subscriptions, but this money is one-time only money. Kay is willing to use half of the overhead money for ongoing commitments, because, if there are research needs for grants, the Library will need to have the funds to accommodate those requests.

Response to the form: The odds of a faculty member taking the time to fill out one of these forms are quite low. A certain amount of discretion should go to the Library to spend on "wish lists". However, areas in the social sciences may need some very specific works. The form does not make it clear that there is no guarantee for future funding.

Research Coordinating Council: Recommendations for use of Indirect Costs going to the Library:

Policies for Spending Library Account 826-021-20:

Section #4 is open for misunderstanding and needs to be clearer by expanding on what the RCC suggests on the first page. One suggestion is to have a rubric for rating, so researchers know what the ULC is looking for. Until the ULC starts seeing the proposals, we won't know how to deal with this.

Baxter agreed that part of this budget should go to the competitive process, but, of the researchers generating this overhead, many are not going to get around to making a proposal. Perhaps researchers could trust the judgment of the librarians, and if they have questions, the librarians could call the liaison and have them make the decision.

There should be a report on the status of the fund: how much is spent and how much should be put out for competitive spending. A certain amount of the funds should remain in the realm of librarians with input from the ULC.

Procedures for Spending Library Account 826-021-20:

Section 2—the rubric for evaluating proposals should be shared at that time, and a including a statement that in September of each year, the ULC will decide on the amount to be awarded through this procedure.

Section 5—ULC expects to use up to half of the funds available at the January meeting.

Section 6—Change wording to "material will be purchased".

ACTION: Flowers will make changes in the policy and procedures and send it out for approval at the next meeting. The ULC will run a short call in the spring of 2008 with $20,000, stressing the research nature of the funds.

3. Library Budget: Flowers reviewed the current budget. Her goal is to make the State Account reflect what we absolutely have to have.

Capital budget:
- **Electronic resources**—online access is not solving anything with the budget; it is expensive. The Library is doing everything to get remote access in Idaho Falls and Boise, but is not always successful. Some publishers see these sites as separate campuses and want us to pay for more licensing. She explained how off campus access is granted. Janet Higgins, Head of Systems, has already identified nine databases for which access will be a problem if the modem goes away. Licensing is very restrictive and there is no way of knowing whether a patron trying to access online is on or off campus. As part of the ERP process, they are revisiting campus security to make a new authentication process.

  ACTION: Janet will look into what access we have with all the databases.

  In the Humanities Department, upgrading some of our electronic resources would be a priority rather than buying new ones.

  ACTION: Flowers will double check on Humanities resources to make sure everything possible is deliverable.

- **Subject area books:** the part divided between departments is $300,000.

  Question about ordering books: Member asked if it is possible to request books the way ILL orders are requested. Flowers responded that there is a form online and exists outside of the catalog. Part of the problem is that all book requests go through the department liaison for approval before we buy them.

  ACTION: Flowers will check and report back.

- **University Librarian's Reserve:** Keeps $25,000 to cover special expenses. The balance is $105,000 this year and designated for one time funding only.

Flowers explained the rest of the budget, drawing few comments.

4. Approval of Library Fees: Fees are reviewed each year.

> **ACTION:** Hold for January's agenda.

5. Library Naming Opportunities: Flowers would like feedback on this list of donor opportunities. She is working on the end of year mailing, and Friends group, but the Library has never had gigantic donations. The Development Office is willing to work with the Library with people who want to donate money to the Library.

- Collections now include E-books.
- When a donor endows a chair, there ought to be money that endows a collection fund for the chair.
- Focus first on doctoral programs; graduate students are not satisfied with the collection we have.
- Suggestion that donations be to a subject area rather than a degree.
- Suggestion there ought to be some money allowed for new faculty for start up funds.
- Suggestion that Flowers change the format to make needs clearer.
- Some research centers in the University have their own library.
  ACTION: Flowers would like to address this at a future meeting.

More ideas to consider include:
- using the space under the building eaves
- importance of bringing students into the library to help them connect to the social fabric of the rest of the university—music listening room, bridge to the Rendezvous Building to hook up with the third floor, microwave in the student lounge.

Flowers asked for any feedback to be sent to her.

Flowers will send more information via email regarding Web of Science when she finds out more.

6. Minutes for October—do in January.

Adjourned: 6:44 PM

Submitted by: Sue Roth