Senate Library Advisory Committee
Tuesday, February 5, 2002, 2:00 pm
Library South, 7th Floor, LAO Conference Room

Present:  Cynthia Hollaway-Owens, Charlene Hurt, Philo Hutcheson (chair), Zhongshan Li, Ramona Matthews, Michael Vaughn, Akilah Nosakhere (guest), Roger Presley (guest).

Approval of Minutes
October 23, 2001 minutes were approved.

Serials Review Project
C. Hurt distributed three documents that pertained to the Serials Review Project that the Library was undertaking: Project description, project timeline and a chart depicting the change in cost of periodicals. The importance of the chart is that it shows while Library budgets nation-wide have been decreasing, the cost of periodicals has increased. This holds true for Pullen Library as well. Pullen is taking a more comprehensive approach to reviewing its periodical holdings; something that should be done on a regular basis. C. Hurt indicated that the Library has looked at its subscriptions and A. Nosakhere (Pullen’s Collection Development Department Head) reported that over 200 items have been canceled; however, she didn’t have what the cancellations equated to in cost savings. C. Hurt added that the savings didn’t amount to as much as she had hoped.

C. Hurt reported that she has been meeting with deans and associate deans to discuss the process and it’s evident that the University’s emphasis has changed. All parties have to work together and provide information for the best outcome of the project: The deans know what programs are being emphasized and de-emphasized, faculty know research needs, librarians know how students use materials and have information of interlibrary loan activities and consortia agreements. During the meetings, the deans were given a list by LC call numbers with ranges assigned to subject areas for their respective areas.

P. Hutcheson asked for clarification on the numbering on document describing the Serials Review Project. Under II3, there’s a listing of priorities and it’s not clear what the “or” in priority 2 means and some departments don’t have accreditation. It was recommended to leave the “or” in priority 2 and change “and” in priority 3 to “or” for consistency. All agreed.

C. Hurt indicated that there is an anticipated 5% cut next year. The Library will have to cut journals by ½ million dollars. If it turns out to be less than 5%, then by going through this process, we will develop a priority list. She will be consulting with deans and associate deans several times throughout the process. Another factor to consider is that the Library’s Acquisitions Department has deadlines for renewal submissions. Currently, we are projecting a total cut of 17% to the Serials budget.

M. Vaughn says there’s a rumor among faculty that they will be asked to cut a straight dollar amount. C. Hurt says that’s incorrect; too arbitrary. More importantly, Georgia State University (GSU) has changed and we should structure to reflect the strategic goals of GSU. M. Vaughn agreed that a comprehensive review is important; so the focus is on what’s important. The last review was conducted in 1988 and it was not comprehensive.

C. Hurt indicated that the documents distributed will be placed on the Library’s website. This process may result in documentation for FacP to consider when allocating future base budgets for the Library. R. Presley (Library Associate University Librarian, Resources Management) reported that the Library’s acquisition base
budget is less than the book acquisition. The Library does receive $900,000 of contingency funds.

C. Hurt stressed the importance of this project to the Library and how it’s handled is critical because of the impact it could have on the Library’s reputation. She’s grateful to SLAC for its support and assistance.

P. Hutcheson reminded members to raise the issue in faculty meetings to remind faculty in multiple ways that these activities are occurring; trying to avoid a repeat of what occurred in 95/96 from the space storage project. He also asked whether or not the allocation procedures and chart would be placed on the website. C. Hurt said, yes. P. Hutcheson wanted additional clarification on II6 of the Project Description; the focus seems to be narrow. After some discussion the committee agreed to delete the sample criteria provided under II6.

M. Vaughn wanted more information on the appeal process for this project. R. Presley indicated that the Library’s Collection Development Department would receive appeals. A. Nosakhere indicated that there would be discussions with other colleagues. P. Hutcheson recommended that appeals be submitted with a copy to the appropriate dean. C. Hurt is already asking deans to assist and thought that deans could assist with appeals. Another possibility is to have the appeal go through the dean’s office; either way, a structured process should be in place. P. Hutcheson added, the appeal should directly address priority, 1, 2, and 3. R. Presley and A. Nosakhere took note of the recommendations and will develop a structured appeal process.

C. Hurt indicated that the minute the Library knows anything about budget cuts, everyone will be informed. This is another reason why it’s not good to do a straight across the board percentage cut. It’s easier to adjust the cuts when a priority list had been developed. The notice/letter will be sent to the book chairs (faculty liaisons) by Friday, February 8th informing them that the same letter will be distributed to all faculty next week.

C. Hurt reported that OCLC bought the second series of NetLibrary which should help us. Additionally, the Library has been cutting the monograph (book) budget to increase the serials budget. C. Hurt stated that books are still important because undergraduates use books and need the overview and they are still important in scholarly research. P. Hutcheson recommended that since some faculty think that the book budget should be cut as well that she should report that it has already been cut.

Library Security
C. Hurt reported that turnstiles will be installed at both entrances; Library North ad Library South. Patrons will have to use their Panthercard for swipe entry. Patrons without a Panthercard will have to surrender some form of government issued picture ID to security for entry. We want to get the word out that this will be implemented to increase the safety of our patrons and the collection. The Library did not fund this project. The issue was raised that some patrons may not have a government issued ID; particularly international students from non-affiliated institutions. P. Hutcheson volunteered to meet with Police representatives if necessary. C. Hurt indicated that she would raise the issue with the appropriate individuals.

Meeting adjourned at 3:39 p.m. The next meeting scheduled for March 21st, 11:30am in the LAO Conference Room, Library South 7th floor.

Carmen Newton
Library Human Resources Officer
Recorder