Minutes of the LMIS Committee for October 23, 2018

Committee Members Present: Adam Smith, Andrew Gomez, Kate Cohn, Jane Carlin, Ann Gleason, Sue Hannaford, Lori Ricigliano, Janet Marcavage, Lisa Wood, Quentin Hubbard

LMIS Committee chair, Sue Hannaford, called the meeting to order at 4:00 pm in TS 054.

ASUPS representative Quentin Hubbard was welcomed to the meeting. Introductions were made.

The minutes from 10-9-17 were discussed. Cohn made a suggestion in regards to the Moodle discussion about specificity. Hannaford asked that additional changes to be sent to Smith.

Hannaford shared that the draft of confidentiality guidelines was sent to chairs of the IRB, PSC and ASC. There isn't a particular contact for the FAC, so the document was sent to Alison Tracy Hale of the Senate to be forwarded to Associate Dean Sunil Kureja. The guidelines are on the agenda to be discussed at the PSC's Nov. 11th meeting.

Cohn asked if non-standing committees were pushed out of this charge:

> **5. Circulate the draft of "Best Practices for Managing Sensitive Documents" to the Professional Standards Committee; the Institutional Review Board; Counseling, Health, and Wellness Services; the Center for Writing, Learning, and Teaching; Data Standards; Student Accessibility and Accommodation; Registrar's Office; Student Conduct; Title IX; and Human Resources for feedback in the expectation that in AY 2019-2020 the committee will finalize the document for approval and campus use.**

Hannaford replied that Hale took our request to the Faculty Senate and then the charge was limited to only faculty committees at this stage. Perhaps later other committees will be included.

Wood asked, what if non-standing committees created their own document?

Cohn asked, wasn't our charge to have them look at our document?

Hannaford stated that perhaps committees have area-specific suggestions, such as for medical documents with CHWS.

Wood asked, are we inviting them to think about it?

Cohn stated that we are asking committees to put their own lens on our document. Documents in areas such as CHWS may be helpful to inform ours.

Hannaford clarified the background of our discussion. The guidelines are for how to handle sensitive/confidential documents and how long to hold onto them for.

Hubbard asked if there currently are procedures.

Hannaford answered that yes, FERPA (the law) covers certain things. We are working on best practices.

Hubbard stated that counsel was recently hired.

Carlin replied that they will likely review this document.

Ricigliano asked if there are exisiting guidelines.

Sue replied that we are establishing these.

Wood stated that in therapy, files are removed after five years.

Cohn asked, in moving from the quiet phase to other areas, how best do we support this work from the staff perspective?

We can start to talk to other areas. If we hold off in speaking to some groups, we could delay the process.

Wood replied that two phases may allow us to implement some practices after getting initial suggestions. Maybe we can identify a few problems to address rather than getting all of the problems from every area.

Cohn stated that she feels that the charge is about getting information.

Hannaford doesn't see a problem with doing both. We can consider this an ongoing process. She stated that we don't want to worry about throwing away things like grades that we were supposed to keep.

Gomez stated that he shares this worry that if he gets rid of something, he may need it later.

Cohn was surprised about the charge having so many areas to contact. Initially it was just TS and the Registrar's office. Her interpretation of the charge is that we are asking for feedback, not dictating.

Hannaford stated that if we can do this in a way that doesn't seem too dictatorial, then we can go ahead with the quiet phase.

Cohn stated that perhaps we can start with the Academic Leadership team, which Cohn, Carlin, and Rigliano sit on.

Hannaford shifted the discussion to charge #6:

6. **Clarify and publicize to faculty and academic staff the general policies and processes related to making changes in library and information systems as applies to the academic program.**

She asked, how best to proceed in regards to systems, problems, and procedures?

She stated that TS is driven by space, operating systems, etc. Should we look at case studies? What is the most productive way to go about it?
Hannaford also asked if everyone had a chance to look at the Library Communication and Policy Document (attached as an appendix to the minutes).

Carlin shared that the summer procedures were unusual. The library was given a problem to solve in a very short time; this is unusual in general operations. The library provided updates as the process went forward. She stated that she is interested to know if there are gaps in the process described in the document.

Hannaford asked for clarification about standard practices.

Carlin responded that the library works with individual departments and deans and directors. In regards to the budget, they look to maintain consistency in acquisitions. When there are cuts, they work with departments that are most affected. They would not cancel a journal without consulting the affected departments. At times, there is a choice about making changes.

Carlin offered to give a budget presentation to the LMIS committee. The endowed funds have helped with some budget cuts. Recently budgets have not increased and it is a juggling game.

Wood stated that there is a gap in what is happening, what is being talked about, and hierarchies. The timing of when things are delivered is when we are flooded in our work. There is almost never a good time for communication. It seems that a lot of budget decisions happen over the summer and we find out when the semester begins and we are busy.

Carlin stated the summer project in the library was intrusive and difficult; most institutions are given years for such projects. But they will not dwell on it. Again, this was an unusual situation.

Wood shared that we are given new models for classrooms that are difficult. In regards to digital platforms (Moodle to Canvas) there is little time to respond.

Cohn stated that summer tends to be used as a time for deep administrative projects. Budget discussions primarily come out of the BTF.

Wood stated that we can have more time to digest and implement new technology and classroom changes.

Carlin shared that if we are ever in a situation where a budget cut needs to be made, they know in advance.

Hannaford asked if the library has advantages that TS doesn't, such as established relationships with liaisons. Faculty are stretched for time.

Marcavage stated that there are differences in departments. The Department of Art and Art History works often with TS. Faculty are also engaged with the budget and its rhythms due to the management of studios, equipment, and materials.

Smith stated that in Computer Science, faculty end up doing a lot of their own tech work.

Wood shared that different departments have different cultures.

Gomez shared that in the History Department, faculty has contact with Peggy Burge in the library. The relationship with TS is different.

Gleason shared that ET has three Education Techs for the whole campus.

Gomez shared that there is stress built into the interaction with TS, as they are contacted when there is a problem.

Wood shared that tech changes can be disruptive. The technology was not picked by faulty. Due to a lack of budget, there is some jerry-rigging. There are practical obstacles with technology, whereas in the library, the issues may be symbolic: books can be obtained from other sources.

Hannaford stated that students prefer sources that are online. She is wondering about communication.

Gleason shared that TS doesn't have liaisons like the library does to make sure that the word is out.

Carlin shared that faculty coms has limitations in communicating. Liaisons were the best source for communication for the summer project. It is difficult to get feedback. The library puts our reports but doesn't know if they are read. At a certain point, they have to move on.

Hannaford stated that faculty response may be a problem.

Wood shared that now faculty are getting laptops and there is a learning curve. Adaptors weren't provided.

Gleason stated that adaptors are now being provided.

Wood shared that we are all pressed for time. There are not enough thank yous for what staff in the library and TS are going through. In the past, faculty had more interaction with TS staff.

Hannaford asked everyone to let her know if they can think of things that will facilitate this conversation.

Gomez suggested case studies.
Hannaford asked Cohn if she could come up with some.

Carlin shared that there will be a discussion regarding the journal discard project on the 30th in the Makerspace.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00PM.

Respectfully submitted, Janet Marcavage

Appendix:

<div align="center">

Library Communication and Policy Discussions
Submitted to LMIS Committee
Jane Carlin, Library Director
Fall 2018

</div>

Introduction:

A review of the minutes of the LMIS Committee, as well as the Annual Reports from 2014 to the present time document that LMIS Committee consulted on policies and practices associated with the Library. In addition, a substantial number of reports and updates about library issues and operations were provided to the LMIS Committee.

It is important to remember that the last few years have been a time of substantial change associated with the implementation of PeopleSoft and many of the meetings focused on the processes and policies

associated with this new technology. The LMIS Committee has to balance both library and technology issues and that can sometimes be a challenge due to the impact and complexity of operations.

LMIS provided substantial feedback on many issues such as:

- Review and recommendation of circulation policies associated with the new Shared Integrated Library System
- Review and endorsement of the library's recommendation to curtail the Government Depository program
- Endorsement of the effort to develop an Archives & Special Collections research and teaching space

In addition, presentations and documentation were provided to LMIS by library staff on a range of topics, including:

- Explanation of the library budget, as well as concerns and trends in budget management
- LIBQUAL Survey Results
- Collection use and collection development
- The continued shift from print to digital journals
- Update on the Learning Commons and library spaces

Library Shift and Discard Project, 2018:

In terms of the situation that transpired last spring associated with the renovation of the lower level library space and the library collections, the library actively shared information.

- The library communicated via faculty coms and with departments about the project numerous times. There were many moving pieces associated with the project and we did the best we could to share updates and be transparent.
- Liaison librarians also met or talked individually with concerned faculty who wished to review books slated for deselection. In the case of some of the bound journal runs, the library staff packed the journals for delivery to faculty departments.

- An update on the project was shared with LMIS prior to the end of the semester.

- The sheer volume (no pun intended) of the collection shift was immense and required a multitude of internal temporary shifts to accommodate the change of locations of materials, as well as the identification and subsequent discard of materials. Again, at every point we did our best to communicate with faculty throughout the summer.

- Our work is further impacted due to the aging compact shelving that has to be removed. This complicates the space issue. The failing compact shelving combined with the shift project exacerbated the collection review process.

- We created a guide that shares information on the project and requests feedback by October 19, 2018 concerning journal review. This guide was shared with Deans, Directors, and

Department Chairs as well as distributed to faculty through faculty coms in fall of 2018: http://research.pugetsound.edu/Summer2018. The guide also provides information about our existing collection development policy and criteria used to review collections.

Feedback about the process from the perspective of the Library:

- Ideally, this project would have been announced far in advance to provide the library with time to plan, consult and follow our established practices of consultation.

- Ideally, this information would have been shared with LMIS well in advance to seek input about how to plan for a thoughtful and reflective review process.

- While it was the Space Study conducted by the University combined with the Welcome Center project that drove the changes, it would have been beneficial to have had the information well in advance so that we could do a better job on soliciting feedback and planning.

- Timing of the project was awkward as it was at the end of the academic year and continued throughout the summer. Not only did this hamper direct communication with faculty, but impacted library work schedules, as well as necessitated a reorganization of work priorities. Staff spent close to 2.5 months of work effort on this project. We are still working on details of this project and have yet to make decisions about final journal locations and discards. The level of commitment and effort was extraordinary and library staff should be commended for their flexibility and willingness to undertake such a large project.

Next Steps:

- Collection culling is an ongoing process and a normal part of the operations of a liberal arts library. Faculty have always been involved in review of collections. Liaisons work with departments to review existing print collections and ask for feedback. Depending on the discipline, approaches vary. We conduct journal reviews and solicit feedback from faculty. In cases of individual journal title increases, we usually check with the department prior to cancellation. In recent years we have actively promoted the shift from print to digital for journals because of demonstrated user preference and space requirements.   While the library has shared collection development and budget information through *Collins Library Links*, in formal reports to LMIS, Faculty Senate, and the Administration as well as with academic departments, this project brought to light the need to review, clarify and discuss with stakeholders the current state of our budget, purchases, trends in scholarly publishing, and the future of library collections.   We anticipate working closely with LMIS to help foster discussions and to reassess collecting practices with the goal to formulate a shared understanding of the collections and resources of a 21st century liberal arts library.

- The renovation transformed the lower level of the library. The Library's input as to space renovation was largely as an advocate for the retention and enhancement of public study spaces for students. Prior to the renovation, library space studies and observations confirmed that the lower level rooms were prime study areas for students and always in use so it was important to provide enhanced student space in the lower level.

  We are delighted that new and engaging study areas are now available for students.

  During the renovation project, there were many conversations with facilities about additional projects associated with the lower level.   Some of the issues that we still need to work on include:

  - Review faculty input after the October 19 deadline associated with the remaining bound journal collections and determine space needs
  - Work with facilities to establish a timeline to:
    - Remove compact shelving in the large journal room
    - Install free standing shelving saved from the former A-C books and re-install in the large journal room
    - Remove wall shelving in the A-C print book room, paint and install counter height computer bar
    - Discuss the possibility of updating the former Archives Processing Room into an expanded Maker area or collaborative work environment