



**COLLEGE OF
LIBERAL ARTS & SCIENCES**

Department of Anthropology

114 Macbride Hall
Iowa City, Iowa 52242-1322
319-335-0522 Fax 319-335-0653

October 20, 2006

Sheldon F. Kurtz
Faculty Senate President
Percy Bordwell Professor of Law
604 Jefferson Building

Dear Professor Kurtz:

In response to your letter of June 22, 2006, the Universities Library Committee met on September 8 and October 6 to discuss the charge to the committee as requested. The results of our deliberations follow.

We suggest that the first charge to the committee be modified as indicated.

a. Advise on policy regarding the ~~size, scope, nature, and growth of the collections housed by the University Libraries~~ **resources and services the University Libraries provide.**

Rationale: Increasingly "collections" are electronic in nature rather than print and thus access to resources and services are emphasized.

The second charge to the committee could remain unchanged.

b. Advise on policies regarding the assignment of facilities within the libraries and the availability of services which render the libraries more useful to members of the University community and the public.

We suggest that the third charge to the committee be amended as indicated.

c. Advise on the coordination of the ~~decentralized branch~~ **libraries and their collections services and resources with those of the Main Library and the Hardin Library for the Health Sciences.** ~~its collection.~~

Rationale: As noted above the present emphasis is shifting from print to electronic services. At the same time the branch libraries are increasingly part of the Main Library through electronic communication. To speak of collections, print media, does not cover the total range of resources and services provided by the Library System.

We suggest that the fourth charge be amended as indicated.

d. Advise on the **use and development** ~~expansion or substantial modification~~ of library facilities **including the Main Library, the Branch Libraries, and off-site storage.**

Rationale: The committee views the Branch Libraries as integral parts of the Main Library and suggests that such development of facilities include them and increasingly common long term “dead” storage facilities.

The Committee had three opinions on the fifth charge.

e. Hold joint meetings at least once a year with representatives of various departmental and divisional library committees in order to understand their needs for library services.

This seems to be a charge which was added when the branch libraries’ direct representation on the University Libraries committee was eliminated.

One change suggested was a modification so that any meetings with Branch Librarians or Administrative Heads of such libraries be carried out over a two year period and not within a single academic year.

Hold joint meetings with representatives of various branch libraries as necessary (approximately every two years) in order to understand any special needs required by their library constituencies.

Rationale: As noted in the 2005-06 Annual Report of the University Libraries Committee it was not possible to arrange meetings of all such libraries within a series of 6 committee meetings To keep the committee involved in the branch libraries a 2 year series of such meetings would be better.

A second change suggested was to classify the branch libraries in terms of their operational independence of the Main Library.

Rationale: Such a classification the committee thought would reduce the number of branch libraries to be invited to committee meetings during the year by leaving those which operate quite independently out of the loop.

The third change proposed in our meeting of October 6 and agreed to by consensus was the elimination of the fifth charge in its entirety.

Rationale: The committee felt that given the increasingly integrative relationships between the branch libraries and the Main Library as noted above that such meetings were unnecessary.

The committee also addressed five specific questions included in the letter of June 22, 2006.

1. Whether you believe your committee is properly structured, and if not, how its structure might be revised? This might relate to the composition of faculty, staff, and students.

The committee felt, that with one possible exception, that committee structure adequately represents various interest groups on the campus. The one exception was a suggestion that a faculty representative from the Arts might be added to the faculty groups represented.

2. Whether there are any particular issues relating to continuity from year to year?

The committee believes that the staggered terms of members, the presence of the University Librarian, and the new web site where minutes, agenda, and reports are stored, adequately ensures that there is an institutional memory. Over the long haul, however, it might be a good idea to store those materials, from the distant as well as close past, with the new Shared Governance Council (SGC).

3. Whether your charge should be reduced or expanded?

The prior discussion addresses those changes suggested.

4. Whether you are liaised with the appropriate administrative office on campus?

The committee answers this in the affirmative.

5. Any other matters the committee thinks appropriate.

There are none.

The committee thanks the Faculty Senate for their interest. If any of the above materials are incomplete or unclear please contact me for clarification or addenda.

Sincerely,

Thomas H. Charlton,
Professor
Chair of the University Libraries Committee, 2006-2007

cc. Committee Files