

UNIVERSITY LIBRARY BOARD  
Minutes of November 5, 2001 Meeting

Present: Heisch, Breivik, Reekie, Nellen, Loomba, Stroh, Nelson Branz, McNeil, Freeman, Whitlatch (guest)

1. The 10/22 meeting with the City Library groups was a useful “getting acquainted” session, with some notes taken (to be distributed) about future work for the joint group. Mutual understanding (and even trust) will be useful if and when contentious issues arise.
2. Librarians need to be encouraged to apply for the sole remaining slot on the ULB. The Senate Executive Committee approves appointments.
3. Heisch reports on last week’s senate meeting, where there was a questions about weeding and some discussion of the somewhat dispersed collection of 16mm films. Ultimately there will be decision about what films are to be retrieved and preserved, and perhaps translated into a more modern format.
4. The Minutes of the 10/5/01 meeting of the ULB were approved as corrected. Thank you, Diana Wu!
5. We went over the 11/5/01 draft of “Principles of Journal Management.” Liaison librarians will work with departments to implement the final principles (within budgetary constraints). The “journal management” policy will be reported to the senate.
6. Our next meeting will be in Clark 511 for some “hands-on” information competence work (November 12).
7. McNeil noted that inadequate library support is mentioned in a Senate report to the CSU Trustees to be presented 11/14/01. (The full report may be downloaded at <http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/csu 21stcentury.pdf>)
8. The weeding project deadlines must be revised. Whitlatch reported that some large lists are still in the departments, or were turned over too late to the library liaisons. Secondary lists will not be ready for use in November, which is a setback. The ULB received lists of a couple of dozen LC categories yet to be turned in. Monographs are a particular problem.
9. The IRC videos are divided into closed circuit (non-circulating) and “check-out” items. When the extensive City Library video collection arrives on campus, will our materials be placed with that collection? Will “their” videos be available for classroom use? Will faculty be able to reserve them for times certain? How will site licenses and copyright be involved? We need to study how many faculty use how many IRC videos and how happy they are with present level of service. There is potential for using videotapes for purposes beyond those declared when site licenses were obtained. We need to ask some questions of Mary Jo Gorney-Moreno. Are the greater prices for

videos-cum-site license (for closed circuit broadcast) a good use of our resources? How will distance/distributed education impact all this? This will be a problem over the long term, and we must begin working on it now.

10. We received a preliminary list of faculty working with librarians as “information competency advocates” who are open to an effort to improve student research and information skills across the campus.

11. We began discussion of a statement about “Academic values to be preserved in the New Library,” revised 11/5/01. The fifteen items listed are suggested as important elements of SJSU’s academic character and commitment to educational values, and each one is linked to Senate policy or the Operating Agreement. The document needs editing and additions; it is meant to be an important checklist for future use.

Adjourned at 3:55 PST

Respectfully submitted by David McNeil, Recording Secretary