

Minutes of the LMIS Committee for March 20, 2018

Present: Jane Carlin, Kate Cohn, Jeremy Cucco, Ann Gleason, Wade Hands, Sue Hannaford, Bill Kupinse, David Latimer

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 am.

The minutes from the March 6 meeting were approved after minor corrections.

Carlin opens discussion on two pressing library issues: (1) the cost associated with excessive use of the Interlibrary Loan system (ILL) and (2) reevaluating the library's procedure for dealing with individual challenges of the appropriateness of specific library materials.

To frame the ILL issue, Carlin mentions that the library has had a \$30k reduction in its budget; additionally, the library is short-staffed with one open position. In navigating these constraints, she wants to chart a course that will minimally impact operations. In thinking about the future of library, Carlin sees a move from print to digital. She is committed to our continued collaboration with the Orbis Cascade Alliance because our participation strengthens the offerings available for an institution of UPS's size. She is also working to make more study and collaborative spaces for students by renovating spaces and leveraging resources.

With this in mind, Carlin has taken a close look at ILL usage over last 5 years. The library has begun to provide access to more databases, making materials easier to find; as a result, ILL use has increased. Often, students don't evaluate request info; they just click. Of 2937 requests, 833 were from materials already have in the library collection! Carlin sought suggestions on how we might encourage students to be more thoughtful. The ILLiad service is costly, and staff must take time to cancel duplicate requests. Additionally, the library pays for the postage of materials lent to us, increasing cost. For legitimate requests, 70% are made by students, and 16% of these requests are never picked up. Carlin indicated that the library does not collect data about why ILL's are not picked up but a variety of factors may be in play such as timing of the request, information needs being fulfilled in alternative manners, and the student simply not paying attention or forgetting.

Hannaford wondered if the library might charge a fee for ILL. Carlin said that a fee might be awkward because she wants the library to support student learning. Carlin suggested it may be possible to leverage a fine for ILLs not picked up.

Kupinse asks for a clarification regarding the discussion: are we talking exclusively about about ILLiad or is Summit part of the conversation? Carlin says that the cost for Summit versus ILL materials is different. Students can be used to fulfill Summit requests, and the courier fee is around \$6k per year. Summit is not as labor intensive for the library staff as ILLiad requests. Currently, the library policy allows 15 active ILL at any one time. Carlin wonders if this could cut down? Regardless, there needs to be stronger messaging regarding the pick up of ILL materials. Perhaps, fees could be assessed for items which are never collected.

Kupinse remarks that in his experience it is rare that a student legitimately needs an ILL. Summit is pretty good for the most part. He suggests that there might be greater restrictions

on ILL allowances for first- and second-year students. Perhaps, ILL materials are too easy for students to request; maybe some additional obstacles should be put in place.

Carlin comments that some first-year students do unique projects, requiring an occasional ILL. As Puget Sound students are engaged in more unique research topics, it is inevitable that ILL will increase.

In terms of obstacles, Hannaford suggests that students be required to visit the ILL desk in the library to request a loan, but, on the other hand, this could disadvantage some students. Perhaps a look at the materials the students are requesting might be of some use. First- and second-year students do need to learn to use primary literature, but often *any* primary literature will be sufficient for learning (because it's more about the process of accessing primary literature – it need not be the *best* source).

In response, Carlin says that ILL requests run the gamut. She asks should we impose fines? Create some warnings? Make an effort to educate the students on the issue via Moodle or syllabi?

Returning to the discussion of obstacles, Kupinse thinks that ILL requests could be cut down if the method of request were less of a default setting. Also, he suggests that first- and second-year students be limited to 5 requests, and then step this up for the upper-level students. Or with more serious students, faculty can support a student's request for more ILLs. Or perhaps it's reasonable to charge an upfront fee after 3 ILL request.

Carlin says that the library can easily implement limits in ILL.

Hands suggests taking the airline approach: don't make any big changes, just tweak features here and there. Also, it might help to make the messaging clear on ILLiad that you can request just chapter of a book (to be photocopied and scanned), so that an entire collection is not needlessly requested.

Carlin adds that the library could lower the threshold for blocking students' ILL use if books are not collected or the system is abused.

Carlin now shifts the discussion to the second topic. Recently a student requested that a book containing racially insensitive images be removed from the library. This is the first time in 9 years that the library has dealt with this type of request, and Carlin found that the existing library policy for dealing with such issues was outdated, so she and her staff have updated it. Briefly, the policy now entails that staff first meet with the student to try to resolve the issue. If the student still wishes to request a removal of the material, then she can fill out a reconsideration form. This form signals a formal review process which means the library brings the case to the LMIS group (or some other group) for mediation. Is the LMIS committee the appropriate body to handle these situations? Carlin notes that the policy is relatively standard across libraries, including the feature that unresolved challenges are mediated by a body outside the library.

Cohn questioned the wording of the policy: what constitutes persistent criticisms? More than one complaint about an item?

Hannaford asks if LMIS *is* the right committee? Cohn believes that LMIS is the proper body to hear this, but depending on the specifics of the situation, the committee might benefit from working with outside resources like Michael Benitez, Dave Wright, etc.

Kupinse remarks that he imagines that the student feels strongly about these sorts of offensive materials, but he believes these situations can be good teaching moments: the library holds these offensive materials much like a lab holds a deadly virus – so that one can study it and learn from it. The library is a good repository for such materials.

Carlin rehashes the library's response to this student's request. Carlin met with a group of library staff to craft a response to the student, contextualizing the book, and then invited the student to blog about it. Unfortunately, the student did not respond to the library's invitation for further discussion. Cohn said that even though the student didn't reply, the library staff's efforts were well placed. But, perhaps the library staff could follow up with this again?

The meeting was adjourned at 9:50 am.

Respectfully submitted,
David Latimer

Appendix

Below is Jane Carlin's summary of her report to the LMIS committee for the March 20 meeting.

LMIS Report:

In broad terms, just want to remind everyone that it has been the libraries' policy to move from print to digital when appropriate, to collaborate with the Alliance on projects that provide access to reduced costs for full text resources, to participate in the ebook access program. From student feedback we know the importance of having a space to study and research and we continue to improve our spaces; for example, outside Misner Room used to be floor to ceiling government documents but now it is an open and popular study space. Where A&SC is now located it used to be used to be floor to ceiling books. We now have room for classes, seminar and research. This has been accomplished while still supporting the academic programs by providing access to full text electronic materials and building collections for the A&SC which are unique to Puget Sound.

Note: Ebooks are not always the best resource for humanities.

ILL Concerns:

1. Interlibrary Loan services support academic study and research at the University of Puget Sound. As we acquire more and more research databases, expand the discovery of articles through our integrated search features of PRIMO, and more of our students/faculty are engaged in research projects, ILL remains an important service.
2. Yet, ILL is a costly service to run. We have to pay for the system ILLiad which helps manage ILL, we often have to pay the lending institution, and in general every ILL transaction is at least 1 hour of staff time. We also pay for the courier service to deliver books. For those items not supplied by an Alliance Library we must cover the cost of US mail.
3. There are a significant number of materials that are not picked up ? either in print materials delivered by the courier, print journal articles or electronic articles.
4. In addition, there are a significant amount of items requested that we already own and are then cancelled, resulting in staff time.
5. In terms of general breakdown, undergraduate students represent 76% of the no pickups with faculty representing 16%.
6. Our current policy is that we try to go to free lenders first and if not, we pay up to \$12 of a request for an individual. Students are required to pay upon pickup. Faculty sometimes pay or sometimes the department pays.
7. We currently allow 15 active ILLs for students
8. Recommendations: Stronger wording on the ILL forms, consider reduction of the number of open ILL.

Challenged Books

In the 9 years I have been here never had a request for a removal of a book Recently a student asked to have a book removed due to racially insensitive images. This prompted a review of our current policy and procedures associated with challenged materials.

LMIS was listed as a resource for challenged books. Just want to reaffirm LMIS can serve in this role. Below in red is the old policy that Jane will update.

Collins Memorial Library advocates full intellectual freedom as fundamental to the educational process. Where there is controversy or disagreement concerning the truth of particular ideas, issues, or beliefs, Collins Memorial Library will attempt to provide a diverse selection of sources encompassing the major views. To this end, materials will be collected that offer a wide spectrum of ideas, opinions, and information, regardless of the popularity of the viewpoints expressed in these materials. The library supports the American Library Association Library Bill of Rights (see Appendix A) and Freedom To Read Statement (see Appendix B).

Challenged Materials (Jane will update language)

Challenged materials which meet the criteria for selection in the selection policy of the library should not be removed under any legal extralegal pressure. The Library Bill of Rights (see Appendix A) states in Article 1 that “Materials should not be excluded because of the origin, background, or views of those contributing to their creation,” and in Article 2, that “Materials should not be proscribed or removed because of partisan or doctrinal disapproval.” The Collection Development Coordinator, with the advice of the Library Director, is responsible for responding to all questions concerning the propriety of specific materials in the library collection. Persistent criticisms from persons or groups may be referred to the Library, Media, and Computing Committee.

This is new information that Jane will Include on library web page:

Reconsideration/Challenge

Step 1: A Library user that has concerns about content and materials is asked to contact the Director of the Collins Library to discuss the concerns. If after discussion, the concerned individual is not satisfied with the outcomes and wants the item removed, a formal reconsideration process will be followed.

Step 2: This includes the individual completing a reconsideration form. The submission of the completed form will initiate the formal reconsideration process and the document will become part of the public record. The form will be submitted to the Library, Media and Information Services Committee for consideration.