SENATE LIBRARY SUBCOMMITTEE  
MAY 15, 1997  
MINUTES

Present:  A. Sandstrom (Chair), J. Brian, L. Hite, D. Oberstar, J. Vollmer, J. Violette (ex-officio)

Absent:  S. Faseyitan, C. Kracher, C. Scott

Guest:  R. Manalis

Chair A. Sandstrom called the meeting to order at 3:05 in room CM 208.

The minutes of the May 11th meeting were approved as amended for punctuation errors.

**Collection Development Policy**

The Library Subcommittee considered first the recommendations brought by the librarians to the May 11th meeting. Then the Subcommittee considered the editing changes suggested by Steve Hollander.

**Section III: page 1 - Library Mission Statement**

The Subcommittee determined to keep “and faculty” in the second sentence. The second sentence of the mission statement as amended now reads:

The library is primarily committed to providing easy access to information and an atmosphere conducive to study and research; a collection development program that includes print, electronic, and other nonprint materials that directly support the needs of undergraduate students, graduate students, and faculty of IPFW; access services for the timely retrieval of bibliographic data and materials from other information sources to support the research needs of the undergraduate students, graduate students, and faculty; and expert professional information services that facilitate thorough and accurate use of the library’s resources.

Rationale:

Subcommittee members stated that faculty need library collections for both their teaching and their research responsibilities. Their intention in the collection policy is to leave the emphasis on supporting student needs but to open the door to bigger, more in-depth collections in some areas in the future.

J. Violette noted that the librarians are the people on campus whose education and job responsibilities cover collection development. While they should be working closely with teaching faculty to determine collection needs and to solicit recommendations, the final decisions regarding purchases of all materials, including monographs and serials, rest with the librarians.

**Section VII: page 1 - Library Materials Fund Allocation**

The Subcommittee amended paragraph two to read as follows:

The Library Director, under guidance from the Senate Library Subcommittee, is responsible for allocating budget within the three areas. Access services receives an amount based on projected
usage. The serials budget is projected based on pricing information from publishers and vendors. After a projected amount is subtracted to cover serials and access services, the Library Director allocates the remaining funds in accordance with a formula recommended to the Library Director by the Library Subcommittee.

Rationale:
The Senate Subcommittee reaffirmed the 70%:30% serials to monographs ratio of the library materials budget (after projected costs for access services have been removed) passed by the Library Committee in April 1992 and also reaffirmed the current allocation formula for monographic funds approved by the Library Committee April 9, 1993.

The Subcommittee will continue to oversee these recommendations.

Section VIII: page 3 - Selection Policies: Criteria h. appropriateness of the medium

The Subcommittee substituted the words “Suitability of content to form” for “appropriateness of the medium.”

Rationale:
The Subcommittee agreed with the librarians that the suggested wording is clearer.

Section VIII: page 6 - Selection Policies: C. Format Guidelines

The Subcommittee agreed to strike the first sentence.

Rationale:
The sentence is redundant.

Section VIII: page 7 - Selection Policies: F. Levels of Collection Development by Subject Classification

The Subcommittee amended this section to read as follows:

Librarians are responsible for assessing the collection strengths. Guidelines for determining levels of collection density and collecting intensity designations exist. Such guidelines are used to identify the existing strength of the collection; the actual current level of collection activity; and the desirable level of collecting to meet program needs. Helmke Library uses these standard guidelines to define its intended level of collecting.

Rationale:
Since the policy was drafted the librarians have been investigating assessment models. The revised wording does not limit the assessment possibilities. The Subcommittee agreed.

Section IX: page 2 - B. Business Annual Reports

The Subcommittee amended this section to read as follows:

The Library maintains a partial file of current printed annual reports of all public companies listed in the Fortune 500, as well as public companies in the Fort Wayne area. The purpose of
the collection is to provide representative samples of annual reports and it is not meant to be a comprehensive collection of Securities and Exchange Commission filings.

Rationale:
The Subcommittee agreed that the statement of purpose is important to clarify the nature of the collection.

Section IX: page 12 - G. 1. Serials Selection

The Subcommittee left the first paragraph unchanged.

Rationale:
The Subcommittee members were reluctant to prioritize the factors considered in selection/deselection decision. These are numbered in the following paragraphs, however.

Section IX: page 13 - G. 2. Serials evaluation

The Subcommittee eliminated the word “media” in the last line.

Rationale:
The word “media” was used in error.

Section X: page 1 - Collection Maintenance, B. Deselection

The Subcommittee deferred to the suggestion of editor Hollander. The definition is now inserted in the first line as follows:

B. Deselection

Deselection of library materials (removal of items from the collection) is essential . . .

Rationale:
The Subcommittee agreed that the term might be jargonistic to some readers.


The Subcommittee accepted the substitute wording supplied by the librarians:

e. Material that has not been used, based on circulation and browsing statistics, may be deleted after five to ten years of inactivity. However, some library materials, such as items considered classic works in their field, have long-term value and should be kept in the collection despite lack of use.

Section X: page 2 - 3. Other considerations

The Subcommittee amended the section by changing the verb “is” to “may be” in all three sentences.

Rationale:
The Subcommittee interprets these as considerations, not mandates.
Section X: page 2 - 3. Other considerations

The Subcommittee agreed to keep only three considerations and not to add a fourth as requested by the librarians.

Rationale: Committee members concluded that the fourth consideration is too obvious to merit repeating.

Section X: page 3 - 1. C. Book repair

The Subcommittee added the word “materials” to the end of 1. C. It now reads:

C. Book repair is provided for damaged materials.

Rationale:
The word was omitted in error.

Section X: page 3 - 2. C. New Books

The Subcommittee eliminated the word “routinely” and changed “NOT” to lower case. The selection now reads “Newly acquired paperbound books are not rebound. Exceptions may be made when heavy use is anticipated.”

Section X: page 5

The Subcommittee made no changes to this area.

The Subcommittee accepted all changes suggested by S. Hollander.

J. Violette will compile the revisions and send copies of the final policy to committee members. A. Sandstrom will forward the policy with a cover letter of intent to the University Resources Policy Committee.

Chair Sandstrom will send a letter of appreciation to Professor Hollander for his special efforts in editing the document.

Chair Sandstrom will draft a letter to the chancellor on behalf of the Subcommittee regarding the need for improved library facilities, staffing, and collections.

J. Violette will send to committee members a copy of the 70:30 ratio adopted in 1992 as well as a copy of the Allocation Formula approved by the 1992/1993 Library Committee. (This formula was included in the background materials originally distributed to Subcommittee members in August, 1996).

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 pm.