

University Library Board
San Jose State University
Minutes of October 15, 2001 Meeting

Present: Barnsley, Branz , Breivik, Gorman, Heisch, Martinez, Nellen, Reekie, Stroh, Whitlatch, Wu.

Guests: Belanger, Gorney-Moreno.

1. Introduction and Announcements:

Heisch announced that the next SJSU/City of San Jose Joint Library Advisory meeting will take place on October 22, 2001 at the Guadalupe Room in the SJSU Student Union from 6-8 p.m. Dinner will be provided. All members of the University Library Board are invited to attend. A formal invitation will be sent out shortly. Although the whole planning process for the joint library proceeds according to the terms spelled out in the *MOU* between the University and the City, it is to be expected that issues and problems which require trust and cooperation to resolve will arise. This dinner gives us a great opportunity to get to know and communicate with our counterparts from the SJ Library Commission. In the next issue of *Books & Bytes*, there will be articles on areas that are common in both university and city library, and special characteristics that are unique to the university library.

Breivik announced that one time lottery allocation from CSU for the library acquisition has been granted from the originally requested \$150,000 to \$210,000.

Breivik suggested adding, "Updating on the Weeding Project" as agenda item no.7.

2. Minutes of ULB meeting of 9/17/2001

Minutes were approved with minor corrections.

3. Report on Meeting of SJSU/City of SJ Joint Committee

Postponed to next meeting.

4. Continuing Discussion of Journal Management Policy

Whitlatch distributed a copy of the summary she collected from the members, and encouraged members to read it thoroughly, especially the first three pages. Reekie suggested adding "immediacy" to the list under "prefer ownership." Branz cautioned us to keep in mind the accreditation requirements set out by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges; he also pointed out that the cost to librarian and staff associated with journal management should also be considered.

Whitlatch will bring this issue to the next Library Liaison meeting on Oct. 23 for more discussion before getting final approval by this Board. A final policy recommendation will be generated according to the recommended criteria. She

will request liaisons from both library and teaching department to review the final list in Spring 2002.

5. Information Competency, Continued (S. Belanger)

As a prelude to this discussion, Breivik shared an article “The Recent College Graduate,” *Change*, May/June 2001. The survey shows that although 63% of the respondents indicated that they are confident in organizing information and communicating with others, only 48% feel confident to find information, which is crucial to research a topic.

She commented that in a recent national information literacy forum she attended representatives from UNESCO and World Bank are working to form a task force for lifelong learning. One of its goals is to equip people with adequate skills so that people can move from one job to another confidently. The ultimate goal is to bridge up the digital divide.

Belanger, Head of Academic Services at the University Library, distributed a discussion list and a progress report (draft), which outlines the work accomplished by her Information Competency Task Force. She reported on the progress and asked for feedback and support from this Board. One of its goals is to “establish information competency as a curricular priority on campus and within academic departments.” ULB members engaged in a lively discussion. Suggestions and comments are summarized as follow:

- IC is essential to ensure our students’ employability upon graduation;
- IC is a complex and serious issue in CSU system, especially for some minority groups, according to a study done by the Chancellor’s office;
- In terms of the awareness and planning to include IC as an academic priority, CSU is in the leading position among colleges and universities across the nation;
- All ULB members are encouraged to bring this report to their Departments’ and College’s attention to encourage dissemination and discussion;
- English1B and 100W classes are two courses required for graduation: how can IC concepts and modules be embedded in these courses? How can we obtain annual data to benchmark students’ progress in IC? How can it be assured that courses other than 100W also cover IC;
- Heisch will talk to Dean Noble regarding campus-wide 100W committee meetings;
- Add proof of IC competency to placement tests, which are required for all new and transfer students;
- It will take years to develop campus-wide IC standards. An interim solution should be developed and implemented at SJSU.
- Can IC competency be built into MUSE seminars? Should IC workshops be added as a separate component;
- Both web-based and conventional versions should be provided to accommodate different learning styles;

- Should the ULB try to develop an informal group of interested librarians and teaching faculty to share their experiences and ideas?

Belanger encouraged members to explore the TILT modules at <http://tilt.lib.utsystem.edu/>. This is an online tutorial developed by the University of Texas at Austin. There are two versions: TILT-full and TILT-lite (which doesn't require plug-in). Each version consists of 3 modules, and takes about 30 minutes each to finish, and can be complete in any order. This is an open-source tutorial that is available for all to use.

6. IRC/Library Interface Policy (Mary Jo Gorney-Moreno)

Gorney-Moreno, Interim Associate Vice President for Academic Technology, responded to the ULB's recent discovery that several hundreds of 16 mm films were weeded from the Library's collection housed in the IRC without notice or consent of the Library, and were offered to various individuals (presumably faculty interested in the subject matter of the films). This has been stopped and the IRC will generate a list of titles so that determinations regarding these films can be made according to Senate Policy F98-5, which is very specific in laying out procedures to be followed for materials which may become candidates for weeding. It was noted by Jo Bell Whitlatch, however, that some of these films are valuable, and may not be available anywhere else. In fact, some have special historical value and may be added to Special Collections. We will have a follow-up report on this subject at our next meeting.

In response to a question about frequency of use, Gorney-Moreno reported that A-V materials are used heavily to support or enhance classroom instruction and curriculum. By October 12 of the present semester, 292 titles had been checked out from IRC.

About one thousand items need to be generated from the library OPAC. Gorney-Moreno will seek a lottery grant to support the cost of recovery. Issues to be considered are: 1) if preservation is needed, what format (video or DVD) should we consider? 2) investigate if in-house duplication is allowed according to copyright agreement; 3) if an item has been re-mastered in a newer format, who distributes it at what cost?

7. Update on Weeding

As of October 12, there were 45 lists had been returned and 15 were still pending. Whitlatch recommended two minor revisions in the process that was developed by this Board:

- 1) If the teaching department liaisons have not responded and have not indicated the desire to move the responsibility to the librarian, the librarian liaison will ascertain the status and pick up the review at the point that has been left out.
- 2) Because of the delay, there is no time to send the primary returned list to the faculty or librarian liaison who wish to do secondary review. Whitlatch

recommended that we incorporate the secondary review through the final lists of all discards according to Academic Senate Policy F98-5, section 7.2.3. (See Whitlatch's memo dated October 5, 2001 for details)

- 3) The ULB agrees that the Academic Senate must be fully apprised of this change. Annette Nellen will communicate this directly to the AS Executive Committee.

Breivik agreed with Branz that all faculty members who wish to review the lists are given the opportunity. Nellen will report to the Academic Senate on the progress in its next meeting, and make sure the senate is fully informed.

Meeting adjourned at 4:03 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Yuhfen Diana Wu