

1996

November 6, 1996

Library Advisory Board

Follow this and additional works at: <http://thekeep.eiu.edu/lab>

Recommended Citation

Library Advisory Board, "November 6, 1996" (1996). *Minutes*. 103.
<http://thekeep.eiu.edu/lab/103>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Library Advisory Board at The Keep. It has been accepted for inclusion in Minutes by an authorized administrator of The Keep. For more information, please contact tabruns@eiu.edu.

MINUTES OF THE LIBRARY ADVISORY BOARD
November 6, 1996

The meeting was convened by Dr. Lankford Walker, Chair, at 4:04 p.m. in the Dean's Conference Room of Booth Library.

Present: Randall Beebe, Mark Christhif, Scott Crawford, Larry Helsel, Lynda Kayser, Michael Stokes, and Ted Weidner.

Absent: Tracy Bentson, Rosemary Buck, Leo Comerford, Richard Keiter, Karen Ketler, Matthew Monippallil, and Austin Rhodes.

Visitors: Virginia Baldwin, Kari Grisso, Bob Hillman, Johnson Kuma, Marlene Slough, Pam Waldrep, John Whisler, and Karen Whisler, of the library faculty.

I. Approval of minutes

There were no corrections to the minutes of the October 23 meeting; minutes were approved.

II. Communications

Letter to Dean Lanham from Morgan Olsen, notifying him and the Board of the appointment of Ted Weidner as representative from Business Affairs, replacing Suzanne Ashmore. Also Dr. Lanham's letter to Ms. Ashmore, thanking her for her years of service to the board, and his letter of welcome to Mr. Weidner. Dr. Walker expressed his appreciation for Ms. Ashmore's years of service, and noted that her contribution to the board will be missed.

III. Old business

A. Response time for interlibrary loan requests

No discussion.

B. Proposal for recommending an increase in the budget for books and periodicals

The members of the subcommittee to draft the recommendation to the president were absent. Dr. Christhif noted that the board needs to take action on this, before the end of the semester. Dr. Walker will contact the subcommittee to see if a draft will be ready for the next meeting.

Dr. Helsel expressed his concern over the level of increase being requested. Fifteen percent is far above any increase received by any other department across campus. Dr. Lanham said we are not asking for this increase in all lines of the library budget, just in the book and materials budget, which would amount to around \$141,000. He did not feel such a request was out of line. Dr. Crawford said he was surprised we were not recommending a larger increase. Since the library is the heart of the institution, it is critical that it get a reasonable level of funding. Dr. Christhif said he thought it was appropriate to be idealistic in our request. Dr. Walker said he thought 15 percent was not an outrageous amount; we must try for as much as possible. John Whisler said that we must keep in mind that every unit on campus is competing for funds, and we need to be as vigorous as our competition, realizing we will not get everything we ask for.

C. Faculty evaluations

Dr. Kayser asked if the board was just discussing this issue or if a recommendation was going to be made. Dr. Walker said the focus right now is on discussion. Dr. Crawford asked Dean Lanham for a review of the current evaluation procedure for library faculty. Dr. Lanham explained the procedure, noting that it is similar to the evaluation procedure for academic faculty. A set of guidelines is used. There is a self-evaluation and a peer evaluation based on the person's portfolio; it then goes through the DPC, the Dean, and the Vice President. Peers evaluate primary duties only; the DPC and the Dean evaluate research and service also. Dr. Beebe asked if such a process actually could be implemented--aren't evaluations prescribed by contract and the DAC?

There was discussion as to why positive or negative comments regarding library faculty could not be forwarded to the dean. Such letters could be put in their portfolios. Dr. Lanham said he has always welcomed such comments. He said the issue is to make this a requirement of departmental coordinators. Dr. Walker said he would rather see departmental faculty other than the library coordinators do such evaluations. Dr. Lanham said he is not in favor of a formal process for library coordinators to evaluate subject librarians.

The issue itself then was questioned, and since Dr. Comerford, who initially raised the issue, was not in attendance, it was decided to discontinue the discussion.

IV. New business

A. Dean's report

- Dr. Lanham said the Library Services Council made its final review of the FY98 Articulated Plan, and he gave members a copy of the final plan as submitted to the Vice President. He pointed out that the vision statement on page 4 is the newer one, which is more specific and will require more work to achieve. He reviewed the goals and objectives, noting that the intent of all of them is the same as the draft copy members received, only some wording may have been changed.

- The information included in the Panther Pack publication, given to first-year students by the Office of Orientation, is being redesigned. It is being geared more toward its audience, and made to look more like an "advertisement" for Booth Library.

- The library technology HECA grant papers are ready to submit. The \$27,800 will be used to purchase 12 computers to aid us in the implementation of the DRA online catalog system.

- The technology training facility should be completed in January. It will be used for students, faculty and library staff training for such things as the new online catalog, multimedia equipment, and workshops on the integration of technology in the classroom.

- A new publication is being designed, a basic library information brochure. It is intended to answer basic questions about Booth Library to aid both patrons and the student assistants in the library.

B. Dr. Walker asked about the formula data that members received. How should the numbers be interpreted? Dr. Lanham explained that they are the numbers being used at this time. We now have fall '96 information that we can use for next year's allocations. He said again that there is no intention of using this draft to change the current allocation of the book and materials budget. The formula was not applied to the FY97 budget. Dr. Christhif said he was surprised to learn that the formula is not being applied; he thought it had been. Dr. Lanham said the formula was used only to identify those disciplines that were severely underfunded. It is being used as one indicator of need when making assessments for collection development, but not as the sole basis for allocating funds. It was used for the \$85,000 in new monies last year, but is not being used this year because there are no new monies.

The meeting adjourned at 5:10 p.m.