Tony said that the provost had emphasized the following three university goals, meant to increase rankings in US News and World Report: 1) increase graduation rate, 2) retention rate, and 3) scholarly productivity of the faculty. He asked if our strategic initiatives were composed looking that those goals or something else. The Committee used the goals stated on the University’s Web site for the goals, which includes the first two, but has no mention of the third. He agreed to table the discussion of these points and look at the initiatives as they stood and see if his points could be subsumed or should replace those of the committee.

Janet suggested that we organize our initiatives and present to faculty/students for input. Janet Parsch felt that we should find a way to get feedback from faculty, staff, and students regarding our initiatives.

1) Adopt assessments that are based on outcomes aligned to the University’s overarching goals and regularly modify—or discontinue—programs that do not support the University and demonstrate that support.
   • Patricia had concerns about the wording of the first initiative, and whether we were supporting the University or the University goals. The concerns centered around “programs.” Perhaps we can shorten the ending of this initiative. Patricia suggested: “Adopt assessments that are based on outcomes aligned to the University’s overarching goals and regularly modify—or discontinue—programs that do not demonstrate support the University.”
   • Jimmy suggested that workstudy jobs assist in student retention; can we measure this? He indicated we should assess workstudy jobs as a measure of direct assistance to students.
   • Patricia suggested measuring how often the library is written into the curriculum and what types of programs it supports this way.
   • The hardest part of assessment is figuring out what can be assessed and how to use that data. Our assessment may go beyond the university’s stated goals, and is not limited to the university’s stated goals.
   • Sarah talked about gathering data that are fresh, with enough turnaround time to still be useful and usable, and that can be used for a sufficiently long time after gathered. Need timely data—faster turn-around time on surveys, in order to make use of the data.
   • Janet questioned whether there were other tools than LibQual for assessing library activities. Is the ARL developing a new assessment? [find out what this is?]
   • Allon mentioned the use of the collection by nontraditional students. Can the library determine how non-traditional students use the collection? Can we assess that use from their home?

2) Extend the Libraries’ role in scholarly communication and the curation of data.
   • Already begun with Amy Allen and the University Archives, and the beginnings of the University Repository, provide a site for data.
Jimmy discussed the value of developing a repository of data that could serve the campus (e.g., how did the winter weather affect each unit on campus), such as that maintained by Institutional Research.

Tony indicated that this would include the publishing aspect and indicated that measurables are needed by faculty (journal evaluation, etc).

Someone suggested playing a role in increasing open access publication by faculty.

Gail asked if digitization projects would fall under this initiative.

Patricia feels that we can play a more significant role in intellectual property rights, such as looking into terms of patents.

3) Implement practices and programs that make the Libraries more fiscally and environmentally sustainable.

Jimmy asked if we can “in source” operations to be more sustainable, and if we could sell things to generate revenue, such as items from Special Collections.

Lisa raised the importance of marketing and using the library’s brand more effectively, such as on marking Web resources with Libraries’ brand.

4) Develop and sustain key collaborations that enable the Libraries to fulfill their goals and objectives and raise the profile of the Libraries.

Tony agreed that collaborations were very important as the dean says this is the biggest immediate goal in Public Services meetings.

There was discussion about identifying appropriate partners/collaborators. The terms should be broad enough to include on campus and off-campus collaborators.

Collaboration with instructors to increase the knowledge of what the libraries can do for students.

Allon suggested a collaboration tree?

We should collaborate with student organizations to pursue a library fee, by getting students’ to champion the project and vote it into being (like HPER fee).

We should get input and feedback from faculty on the best prospects for collaborations.

5) Enhance the learning of students, both in residence and distant AND 6) Enhance the teaching and research of the faculty of the University.

Lisa suggested information literacy instruction and strengthening the Web presence, teach students how to use library resources. Make the students’ work load easier by teaching time saving techniques; for instance, searching

Discussion regarding whether this were sufficient for graduation rates and speeds. It is a political statement whether we use the terms “graduation rate” or “retention.”
• Gail indicated that students do not know what the library as professor do not talk about library resources in class. Need increased efforts at orientations. Students want to know how it is useful to them.
• Elizabeth disagreed with the verb used and indicated we should “expand the libraries’ role,” “contribute to the learning,” and “support the teaching and research.” A small discussion ensued that we are looking beyond the supportive role. Elizabeth suggested that we get language from Anne Marie Candido. Elizabeth also indicated that we are not able to enhance the work of other faculty. Elizabeth felt that our wording was presumptuous. Several countered that we need to have a more significant role. Convey increase rather than maintain status quo. Take a leadership role on campus rather than support.
• UNLV programs with faculty partners are a good example.

6) Promote the excellence and diversity of the Libraries’ personnel.
• Dawn hopes to work “team building” in to our initiative to promote the excellence and diversity of our personnel, to promote unity in the library as a whole, and to build trust.
• There was some discussion about identifying our organizational culture, then addressing what issues are identified. Donna said it could be defined as areas, such as communication levels and levels of decision making.
• There was not a consensus on the state of our organizational culture, although Tess identified several characteristics. MK suggested that determining the culture is not the goal in itself.
• Employee satisfaction surveys could be used to assess the organization culture.

7) Apportion the resources of the Libraries in a manner that balances the current needs of all constituents and anticipates future demands.
• There seemed to be a consensus that space, human capital, services, collections, and equipment are part of the “resources” stated in the last initiative. Need to first determine what are current resources are, what current allocations of resources are, and where we need to move to reach goals.
• Someone said that we should be transparent to our stakeholders in our use of resources
• There was discussion about the importance of ongoing feedback from our clientele on the use of our resources. Our constituents need to know what we have done with our resources and to have input on them? Lisa and Patricia indicated resources allocation should be assessment driven and transparent. User input is needed.
• A final point is the importance of balancing the needs of all our constituencies, which can be in conflict.