

University Library Committee

February 8, 2015

Present: T. Burr, C. Hamaker, D. Heylin, E. Hurd, C. Kahl, D. Long, C. Morenus, K. Murphy, and M. Porter

Absent: M. Labonville, J. Solberg

Meeting convened at 3:35pm.

New student members Dan Heylin, Kevin Murphy, and Matt Porter were introduced and welcomed. Carlyn Morenus attended as Marie Labonville's proxy. Morenus expressed in joining the committee as a member at-large. Her interest was supported by other committee members.

Hurd motioned to approve the minutes from the 1/13/15 meeting. Kahl seconded. The minutes were approved by voice vote.

Burr provided a brief summary of the research methods project discussed at the previous two meetings. Burr questioned what the ultimate product our outcome is intended to be and asked where would such a product "live" once completed? Burr proposed the research methods project is arguably beyond the scope of what the committee, or the librarians, could accomplish in the remaining months of the spring semester.

Hamaker suggested some departments do not have a comprehensive understanding of the resources the library offers. Perhaps the librarians could create webpages on the library's website that are written specifically for certain departments that identify resources of most to those departments. Burr asked which resources; Hamaker answered databases, journals, books. The goal is to help departments locate the most valuable resources for their specific disciplines.

Hamaker suggested many faculty do not know how to locate information effectively in the catalog. The student members believed most students know to locate the information they need using the single search box on the library's website; they have received instruction on how to do so from the librarians. Hamaker clarified that students are arguably more familiar with current search strategies than faculty, so are there opportunities for training faculty?

A suggestion was made to use the program review process to guide this work. The following questions were asked: What are the research requirements in certain disciplines? Are there gaps in regards to the library's resources? Are there overlaps? Could we pick a program as a pilot and answer these questions?

Morenus volunteered to conduct a pilot program using the School of Music, as Music will be undertaking a program review in the near future. Could Anne Shelley (Music Librarian) assist with this? Kahl noted the role of the librarian in program reviews has typically stopped after the department chair has the information they need for the review, and the librarian doesn't see the end result or aren't included in discussions until the next program review cycle.

Ward suggested we look at research skills more broadly such as what skills do students need to enter the workforce in their chosen discipline? Is there a skills matrix that could be developed?

There seemed to be agreement that a pilot project should be endorsed that identify the research methods taught by the School of Music, with Morenus, Anne Shelley, and Kahl leading this project.

Burr turned discussion to clarifying the purpose of the committee. Ward suggested the committee should talk deeply about issues – does this solution or response really get to what the faculty and students need the library to be doing? How can we best understand what the students and faculty need/want?

There was concern that the committee would create additional work for the librarians and staff. Porter responded that that creating work is an unintended but necessary consequence of collecting feedback about what the patrons need/want.

Hamaker suggested we change the print chemistry journals on the upper floors with the ones located in storage, as those on the 4th and 5th floors have electronic access but the older journals runs do not.

Murphy said we should be action-oriented. We should collect input in order to know what issues we want to resolve.

Hurd noted the language in the charge is action-oriented. We should be both a discussion and an action committee. The library is for community as well as for information resources. We must balance student and faculty culture. How do we get faculty and students to want to come here and to work together?\

Heylin said SGA members are looking to connect with their constituencies and volunteered to staff a booth at Milner Library in order to collect feedback directly from students in the form of short surveys. Long suggested Sundays, Mondays, and Tuesdays in the late afternoon and early evening would be the days and times when the greatest number of students are at Milner.

Burr requested that Ward present some new “happenings” in academic libraries at the next meeting in order for the committee to consider its future work. There was agreement that the next meeting should be largely dedicated to brainstorming and to review the feedback collected by SGA members.

It was agreed that SGA’s help collecting student feedback would be a good initiative.

Meeting adjourned at 4:45pm.

Next meeting is March 17th at 3:30-5pm in Room 311G at Milner Library.

Action items:

SGA members will coordinate a booth at Milner Library to collect student feedback.

Respectfully submitted,

Dallas Long