LMAC Minutes for Meeting of Tuesday, April 19, 2005

Present: Bill Barry (ex-officio), Randy Bentson, Sigrun Bodine, Karen Fischer (ex-officio), John Hanson, Rob Hutchinson, Lotus Perry, Geoff Proehl, Matt Warning (chair), Paula Wilson

Call to Order: Matt Warning called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

Approval of Minutes: Minutes of last meeting, April 5, 2005, was approved with one correction of Hanson's name.

Announcements:
1. There will be one more meeting scheduled this semester to meet with the TPG.
2. John Hanson, who was charged by the committee to redraft the policy on computer privacy, said that he discovered that revisions to the computer privacy policy which had been approved by the Faculty Senate in Spring 2003 had never been implemented. He is in the process of trying to obtain the Senate's revised version of the policy in order to use it as a starting point for further deliberation.

Discussion of Security Policy:
Randy Bentson gave the committee a five-minute overview on computer security issues, explaining the three methods of computer exploits, "sniffing," "trojan horse," and "mal-formed messages," listed in a document he sent out to all committee members prior to the meeting. (See security document from Bentson attached.) Bentson offered suggestions for the university to avoid or prevent these possible attacks and proposed that LMAC send a recommendation to OIS with regards to these concerns. Bill Barry suggested that the committee should contact OIS and get their feedback first. Warning agreed that LMAC should raise the concerns but would prefer not to get into the technical details. Discussion followed, focused on how the committee should present these concerns to OIS. After some deliberation, the committee agreed to pursue the matter via a more informal process first and asked Bentson to present the security issues he raised to OIS via Norman Imamshah and report back to the committee.

Discussion of Library Materials Budget Allocation Formula:
Karen Fischer presented two documents to LMAC (see attached). The first one stated the Library's materials budget planning goals for 2004-2005, and its plan and timeline for drafting an allocation process proposal. The library staff, since last fall, has gathered input from the departments about their needs and concerns and the liaison librarians have met internally to come up with an allocation formula for the Library's materials budget, as detailed in the second document. Fischer explained the need for such a proposal as the problem of inflation, even with the increases in library budget, has decreased the Library's purchasing power in recent years. The formula takes many issues and factors into consideration; however, Fischer noted that any formula would be imperfect, as not all factors work equally well for all departments, and to modify the results, the formula should be balanced with the knowledge of the liaison librarians working closely with the

faculty. Fischer invited LMAC to comment on the factors that should be included in the proposed formula when deciding how much to allocate to the departments.

Discussion followed with questions and comments on issues regarding one-time orders vs. permanent subscription, online/electronic resources vs. printed materials, and periodicals vs. other materials. Specific concerns were raised with regards to the factors used in the proposed formula for one-time orders, such as the circulation patterns. Paula Wilson voiced concerns shared by other members that a formula using numbers might not be the best way to assign allocations. Fischer assured the committee that the proposed formula would apply only to about 25% of the current library budget and would be gradually implemented and tested over a few years.

Discussion of Location of Data Projectors:
Barry announced the three locations (Music 110, South Hall D106 and Jones 202) on campus where new data projectors will be installed for fall 2005. This would be the second installation of the 10 new data projectors that have been in the planning. There would be four more to go in the coming years. Brad Tomhave, Michael Nanfito and Gordon Gilbert were all consulted in the decision process as to which building and classroom has more priority and need.

Adjournment: Meeting was adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

Attachments:
1. Security.txt from Randy Bentson
2. Library Materials Budget Planning.doc from Karen Fischer
3. Allocation Formula for Collins Library Materials Budget.doc from Karen Fischer

Computer exploits (violations of normal operation) are often categoriezed
in terms of the techniques used to break into a system. Here are two
methods which concern LMAC, and a third which we should understand.

The first exploit is "sniffing", one of many methods used by the bad guys
to determine account names, passwords, and other identification which
can later be used by the bad guys to masquerade as one of the victims.
This technique came to light as more computers were connected to Local
Area Networks (LANs) which convey packets of information from one computer
to another. Often LANs are implemented as busses or hubs which permit
a bad guy to watch the packets passing between two other computers.
Consider what happens when an ordinary user wishes to read e-mail. Such a
user typically opens a web browser to webmail.ups.edu and fills out a
form to login. These fields are bundled up and sent AS ORDINARY TEXT to
the server. This permits the bad guy to see the user name and password.

This attack can be thwarted at least two ways: (1) do not configure the
network to permit systems to see each other's packets, or (2) encrypt all
data between the client and server. The former is often achieved by the
use of a "switch" as opposed to a "hub". Each computer is connected to
a switch by individual cables and the switch sends packets only where
they are intended to go. The cheaper hubs also connect computers with
individual cables, but a hub broadcasts all packets to all the computers
so that it doesn't have to keep track of what computer is on which cable.
[ADDED IN DISCUSSION: The current interface to webmail.ups.edu provides an
encrypted connection, but only if the user selects that option instead
of logging in directly.]

The second exploit is using "trojan horse" software to corrupt systems.
The classical reference points out that the user is tricked into running
some malicious program (offered by the bad guy). One common path for
this software is e-mail or a web site which invites the user to open
an executable file, i.e., a file which contains program code, not text,
images, etc. Many current mail clents or web browsers happily load such
a file into memory and run it. In the case at hand, AuditWizard could
have been replaced by a trojan horse and it would have been executed as
part of the network login sequence.

This attack can be thwarted by configuring the system to execute only
carefully vetted software. (Executing ANY software which is obtained
over the network is dangerous unless the individual user can first verify
its provinence. I am very worried by the concept of 'automatic updates'
of a system without a STRONG warranty by the provider.)

The third exploit is using mal-formed messages to cause client programs
to fail in ways which expose their execution to bad guys. The most
common reason for security upgrades is to replace sofware which can be
made to fail in this way. The best protection is to use software which
has been designed from the beginning to avoid these attacks. The second
best is to use software which monitors the contents of our computers,
keeping an eye out for corruption.

Library Materials Budget Planning

In addition to carrying out the annual add/drop process for periodicals subscription renewals, the Library's materials budget planning goals for 2004-2005 include:

1. To cap our overall spending on print journal subscriptions at its current level for two years while we examine the changing nature of scholarly publishing.
2. To find a fair and balanced way to allocate spending for the collection to support the needs of all departments.
3. To bring a plan for allocating the budget to LMAC for discussion by the end of spring term.
4. To begin an in-depth analysis of each subject area on a rotating basis over a period of 5 to 7 years leading to a plan for collection development for each department.

We will accomplish this by:
- Creating useful background statistical information about our current collections at the department level.
- Having discussions with departments about their perceptions and needs.
- Inviting faculty feedback before developing an overall plan.
- Inviting faculty/department feedback on a draft plan
- Bringing final draft plan before LMAC for feedback and endorsement

Timeline:
- November-December 2004: Library Director and Liaison Librarian have meeting with Department Head/Faculty Liaison to initiate process.
- November- mid February: Departments provide feedback to Library Liaison on needs/concerns to be considered in any allocation process.
- Mid February-mid March 2005: Library Director and Librarians draft an allocation process proposal.
- Mid March – mid April 2005: Draft proposal circulated to departments for feedback.
- Mid April – May 2005: Final draft brought to LMAC for comment and possible endorsement.
- July2005: Allocations for FY06 budget year based on new allocation process.
- September-December 2006 review with faculty how plan is working.

Karen Fischer
October 2004

Building on the document from 1990, certain issues need to be addressed. These include:

The new core curriculum needs to be supported by the library collection.
New programs, program changes, and interdisciplinary programs need to be supported
Graduate programs need special attention.
The number of tenure track faculty and the number of students majoring in a discipline over time need to be taken into account.
The number of credit hours generated by each department need to be taken into account.
The average cost of materials in a field needs to be taken into account.
Discipline accreditation standards need to be taken into account
Patterns of interlibrary loan usage need to be taken into account.
Patterns of use of paper, microform and electronic journals need to be taken into account.
Circulation patterns need to be taken into account.
Standing orders need to be taken into account.
Workflow issues need to be taken into account.
Effect of library deadlines on faculty need to be taken into account.

Proposed formula elements

The above issues can be incorporated into an allocation process **for one time orders (books, scores, CD's, DVD's, etc.)** that includes the following factors:

The number of tenure track faculty in a depart.
The number of majors in a department averaged over time..
The number of credit hours generated by a department averaged over time.
The average price of a book in a subject.
Circulation patterns averaged over time.

Any formula created from such factors will be imperfect since not all factors work equally well for all disciplines. Therefore the knowledge of the liaisons needs to be applied in modifying the resulting figures.

A minimum amount of each department's allocation (70%) should be spent by the end of fall term. Whatever part of the minimum allocation is not spent by faculty fall term will be spent by the liaison librarians using their best judgment and consultation with the faculty. The maximum allocation needs to be spent by March 31st.

The balance in the library's material budget among one time purchases, paper journal titles, electronic resources and microforms needs to change over the next few years to reflect the greater need for journal literature. **The faculty, liaison librarians, and LMAC are invited to participate in this discussion next year.**