University of Arkansas Libraries, Fayetteville, Arkansas
Faculty Monthly Meeting with the Dean
October 28, 2014

Present: Amy Allen, Carolyn Allen, Jeff Banks, Molly Boyd, Cheryl Conway, Donna Daniels, Jason Dean, Marco de Prosperis, Angela Fritz, Tess Gibson, Mary Gilbertson, Norma Johnson, Phil Jones, Beth Juhl, Deb Kulczak, Kathleen Lehman, Lora Lennertz, Elizabeth McKee, Luti Salisbury, Joshua Youngblood, and Tim Zou.

Following the discussions at the library retreat, two task forces have been created to accomplish the goals addressed by each of the three groups in the area of discovery. The charges for these two task forces (both ending in December) and a long-term committee were sent to the group via email previous to the meeting, and Lora Lennertz asked the group for any feedback and opened up the topic for discussion.

**Question:** Does “survey” mean “clientele”?
**Answer:** No, it means looking at what we are currently doing; identifying or listing current discovery methods and tools.

**Comment:** The deadlines are too tight, as it is only five weeks, four if you take out the week of Thanksgiving.
**Response:** The latest date for the completion of the tasks will be February 28.

**Question:** Are we anticipating software demos during this short time span for the task force on discovery systems?

**Comment:** The white paper prepared for the Amigos Library Services by the Texas State Library and Archives Commission leaves out large swaths of information, such as Encore and Blacklight. Also, the Texas Archives and State Library did not look at specialty searches, such as would be required in a music library.

**Comment:** We must have a broad discussion to get feedback on various pieces of the discovery process; broad, open meetings might be useful.

**Question:** What is the next step beyond the DLCR?
**Answer:** To identify gaps and then identify products or services to address the gaps.

**Question:** How will we build a consensus on whether to adopt a discovery system?
**Answer:** We will assess whether it will add value to what we are trying to accomplish at the University. We will pursue it if the answer is yes and get it for our users. We are obligated to get them what they need. The whole idea is to get more use of our resources. The key question to be answered is how beneficial would any product be for our users?

**Comment:** If the groups thinks the formation of these task forces and committee are the wrong approach to the issue, now is the time to voice that before people start working on strategic objectives.
Comment: Combine the two task forces into a single group, because the work of one informs the other, and that would eliminate duplication or working to cross purposes.

Comment: Two groups may be preferred due to the tight deadlines.
Question: Will the User Experience Team be a permanent library committee?
Answer: The User Experience Team will be a standing body; some positions may rotate.

Comment: It should be called a “committee” rather than a “team,” which denotes a work group.

Question: Will the User Experience team work concurrently with the other two task forces?
Answer: Yes.

Question: Will the User Experience committee get information from those who are already conducting surveys?
Answer: The User Experience committee will have representation from constituents that are already conducting studies, like the Web Group.

Comment: A survey is a good idea; through it we could determine what users need, what software is needed to meet the needs. What we may identify as missing may or may not be what users identify as needed. The task force needs to both create a list and a concrete concept of how the list might be used.

Comment: The User Experience team work would greatly inform the purchase of software products. Could be a voice for patrons who have been frustrated with the discovery process.

Question: How much do we want to put in stone before the User Experience librarian is hired?
Answer: The longer we put off the work, the further we get behind. We must start somewhere, make some progress, and retool if necessary. We need to balance the workload and complete the goals. We will not be so far off the mark that we can’t modify or change what conclusions we have drawn when the User Experience librarian arrives. The failure would be to remain stagnant.

Comment: The same is true for statistics and assessments. We already know what we need to count, and what we don’t. We are looking for leadership in that position.

Comment: We need user feedback on what they are finding and what they are not finding.

Comment: Another discovery tool conversation that needs to be discussed is whether to include the items in the CRL collection in our catalog, where students can order them through Interlibrary Loan.

Faculty Senate Presentation Preview
Dean Allen previewed the slide show she prepared for the Faculty Senate on the state of the Libraries and asked for feedback and suggestions.

Human Resources Update
Jeff Banks reported that Richard Ray will be presenting in the library on the upcoming election period and increases in health premiums (2-5%) and in dental (3%). These increases are not yet shown in future pay on WebBasis.

**Academic and Research Services Update**
Lora Lennertz reported that vendors will be demonstrating microformat readers, beginning with one on Tuesday at 9 a.m. in 472B. She invited everyone to attend and then give recommendations to purchase.

**Facilities Update**
Marco de Prosperis reported that work will begin on November 5-7 to get to the source of the water leak in Special Collections, which will require jackhammering between two walls. Facilities Management has hired an outside specialist contractor to perform this work.

**Institutional Repository**
Provost Gaber charged the faculty task force and letters of appointment have gone out to members. Libraries’ personnel will be involved in group discussions as needed. The committee is comprised of faculty from major academic groups on campus and those who are actively involved in research.