University of Arkansas Libraries  
Library Council, Wednesday, February 1, 2012

Present:  Dean Carolyn Allen, Jeff Banks, Molly Boyd, Elaine Dong, Judy Ganson, Necia Parker Gibson, Jennifer Rae Hartman, Norma Johnson, Phil Jones, Kathleen Lehman, Tim Nutt, Robin Roggio, Luti Salisbury, Tony Stankus, Julie Thacker, Randy Thompson, Juana Young.

Minutes
The minutes from the November 30, 2011 meeting of the Library Council were approved without changes.

Initiatives and Goals Review and Discussion
The Library Council reviewed the Initiatives and Goals. Comments are summarized below:

The goals are not set in stone, and the names are merely suggestions at this point, based on who volunteered and who was appropriate for the goal based on their duties or functions. We should not focus on who is doing what or who might do what, but on the goals themselves and make modifications where necessary. Also, identify big gaps. What are we missing? These goals focus on particular items that can be accomplished rather than a broader picture of the total area, which is too big to accomplish. We have not talked to managers yet to approve assignments.

In response to a question regarding the Honors Thesis project, this is not the only digitization project of theses we will undertake; it is, however, a pilot project that includes processing a backlog of Engineering theses that have been collected for a while, and establishing a submission process that includes an approval stage managed by personnel at the college and department level. We also have a backlog of theses that are on microfilm from the Fulbright College. The parent initiative for this goal indicates future goals will be added; but we will see how this goes before developing additional projects or expanding this one to include other theses.

1.1 and 1.6 may include further consolidation if it makes sense to do that; however, we may leave that to the persons to whom those goals are assigned to decide on keeping two distinct and separate goals or combining into one multi-part goal.

Some of the major goals that have multiple sub-goals will be assigned to one body or committee, who will provide oversight to those related goals to give consistency to the similar projects and eliminate redundancy or working at cross purposes. Oversight is given by a committee, not yet formed, who will determine the guidelines and protocols for accomplishing goals.

We will list similar goals or connected goals sequentially in the list.

Goal 2.1 is a small piece of Initiative 2, which we need to develop further. 2.1 will require a lot of data gathering and is a good place to start because of that.

Would like to see a goal regarding assessing library services at the reference desk (under 1.1?). We don’t want our goals too narrowly focused on instruction; we need to address general public service across the board.
A critical goal will be one that addresses the Libraries’ relationship to teaching faculty and what we do in their classrooms. The administration is not getting good reports on what is presented in these instruction sessions. For the university’s overall mission, we need to improve instruction. This falls in line with the Teaching and Support Center’s focus on increasing the faculty’s tools with which to instruct students. The instruction and instructional aspects of service and faculty contract are interconnected. We need assessment to determine if our support of faculty is sufficient.

Goal 9.3 needs rewording. Identify librarians who are working with faculty in diversity classes. The efforts to support this goal may involve collaboration with the Multicultural Center, Human Resources, or other programs, so wouldn’t necessarily be assigned only to Subject Selectors.

Goal 8.3. We need to be involved at a national level in many areas, but this is one specific, achievable task that is identified, and does not therefore prohibit other involvement in organizations or conferences on a national level.

Organizational Structure Review and Discussion
The Library Council reviewed the latest draft of the Organizational Structure chart. Comments are summarized below:

We are not alone in reviewing our organizational structure for efficiency; University of Colorado, Kansas State, and Arizona have all reworked their organizational structures. At one point in the discussion last fall, Bonnie McCuen from Auburn provided outside consultation to the Admin Group regarding her experiences at Auburn. The overall consensus last fall from the committees and the discussion groups was to retain the basic hierarchical structures we have in place with modifications. The current model represents and amalgam of the structures presented by the two committees, with modifications suggested by the discussion groups. The reports from both of those committees outline the primary points suggested by this current model. The Communications Clearing House is retained from the recommendation of Group 1. Services or functions represented in the description of the CCH may change over time, and rather than being a definitive point, should be regarded as a place to begin.

The division of library instruction into two primary levels of focus, fundamentals and advanced, comes from the recommendation of Group 2, as does the consideration of Special Collections and Performing Arts & Media as branch libraries based on their similarity of functions.

The reports of both Group 1 and Group 2 expressed the same idea as is stated in the last paragraph of description, which cannot be stressed enough. We must cultivate the ability to confront programmatic evaluation of the work we do. There is no intent to make individuals fear losing their jobs, but rather to allow employment security by altering job duties to fit current workloads and areas of emphasis.

The amalgam version presented to the Library Council is a redrawing of the molecular model of Group 1. Both Kansas State and the University of Tennessee have separated their services into two areas of emphasis, fundamentals and advanced, or undergraduate and graduate, loosely speaking, a structure which allows for the focus on the faculty components of instruction and research assistance.

The Human Resources office is moved to the Dean’s support group areas for efficiency, because the dean must oversee Human Resources issues, and to increase the focus on diversity initiatives, making this a more central element.
This move allows the Assessment and Management Analysis person or unit to be located under Administrative Services (from which Human Resources would move). Although assessment and management analysis is an organization-wide effort, the location under Administrative Services will remove the function from being centered on Public Services, and will emphasize that unit’s mandate to assist everyone throughout the organization.

Library Council members recommend using the term “foundational” and “general service” rather than “undergraduate,” as the line should be made between “generalist” and “specialist” or fundamental literacy skills versus subject expertise, such as in music, art, and chemistry.

Likewise, the term “upper division” rather than graduate suggests focused instruction or research assistance in a specialty area rather than by class. Statistics show that we currently offer only a few graduate-level instruction classes.

The problem with splitting the two areas is that there is so much overlap that such a distinction seems artificial. We are trying to improve problems with instruction. A systematic review may make this harder. The latest ALA report shows that more colleges are shifting their focus this way on two separate levels. Perhaps the term “first year experience” or “non-major” instruction would clarify the issue, and the term “research services” instead of “graduate.”

Students are encouraged to do research in their first year. Librarians work with faculty, collections, in depth graduate student research, and become recognized as experts in their respective fields. We have not been letting the faculty know what support we offer, like data management plans, of which librarians can assist faculty or department in the formation. If librarians do not move toward embedding themselves within the departments, we will be left behind. Library faculty must be viewed as a source for researching faculty.

Although the separation of instruction and research assistance into two levels of emphasis may seem false, what we are trying to do is to free up more time for library faculty to allow active interactions with departments and faculty.

We should try to think beyond limitations and whom we have on deck. We may have to shift current duties or hire new people to create the subgroup of generalists, or the current faculty may do both, and attend meetings for both. We don’t know at this point, but we do understand there will be overlap between both groups. The overall goal is flexibility and the ability to be more responsive to the goals we need to accomplish in the library profession.

The current functions diagram only represents big ticket items, and nothing is listed in priority order. What we are now calling departments are described in the new chart as functions, but not all major tasks are represented in detail. In order to group like functions and streamline processes, we are going to have to make shifts. Interlibrary Loan is a big function comprised of many elements. We should take the functions out of the traditional hierarchy and put more in a relationship aspect. Trying to separate functions will not work because they are inherently combined. The model shows how we do the work. The planning group looked at functions across the board, but the work of one subject librarian spans from top to bottom.
Library Council members suggested the term “research services” be used instead of “collection development,” as the current delineation “hides” the research element, and stating it in the title would be useful for promotional purposes. The same could be said for teaching and research.

Everyone that performs has to deal with undergraduate and graduate services effectively. From a human perspective, the workload is way too much for a single library director to oversee. The problem the Admin Group grappled with was how to break up the services to make the workload manageable. One idea is to send the “fundamentals” librarians out to present to large classes, not just Communications and English fundamentals classes. We can catch a larger population at the lower division classes and then develop that research expertise continuously into the upper division of classes and graduate school.

The bottom line is that we cannot continue with the same paradigm. How much instruction are we giving to the lower divisions? We have to consider how we can structure ourselves to be more effective and do more instruction. Don’t get caught up in the idea of continuum; we must have a program focused solely on undergraduate students and others focused on graduate students and faculty.

We are not creating structure, but functional areas, which can include individuals from all areas and are not assigned to one department.

A possible functional chart may include three areas: first year experience (which introduces the student to the campus and Libraries), subject specific research (which teaches students subject specific research based on data in their field), and research / data management support (which is increasingly becoming the focus of library faculty endeavors).

Other units, not just instruction, will support grant applications and faculty endeavors, such as Archives and Special Collections, and Tech Services, with imaging and data management skills. We need to provide assistance with research grant applications, assisting students and graduate students.

This functional diagram represents no preconceived notions as to reporting structures, but attempts to view functions in relation to library programs.

We need to penetrate with faculty, get in the forefront, sell ourselves, and sell the Libraries to faculty.

Splitting out collection development function must not overlook the needs of undergraduate students, whose needs must still be met with the collection. It is the responsibility of subject selectors to review the needs of users across the university, the majority of which are undergraduate students. Their needs must be served. Often course requirements drive collection development of a particular field.

Is the textbook policy posted on the Web? It can be found on the StaffWeb at http://libinfo.uark.edu/collectionmanagement/textbookpolicy.asp. Our policy follows the university’s policy of not providing textbooks to students, but leaving that to all students to negotiate.

The Communication Clearing House can be thought of as a working and planning group, which will not supplant the Library Council, which is an advisory and policy making group. The Communication Clearing House is not amorphous, and will include representation from all of the functions indicated on the model.
Brief reports

We have received a $500,000 bequest and $250,000 from the campus budget to augment our book purchasing this year. The upcoming capital campaign is being structured, and very soon will require input from librarians regarding “sell points” and areas of focus from individual subjects.