

CARLETON UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

Minutes

LIBRARY COMMITTEE OF SENATE

Date: Tuesday, April 26, 2005
Time: 10:30 a.m. – 11:05 a.m.
Location: Room 360k, Library

Present: Leslie Pal (Chair), Martin Foss (University Librarian), Aleksandra Bennett (Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences), Anita Hui (Library), M. H. Ogilvie (Faculty of Public Affairs and Management), Pamela Armstrong (Library), Xin Wang (Faculty of Engineering and Design), Michael Weiss (Faculty of Science), Susan Weston (Graduate Student member), Committee Secretary (Ann Newton, Library)

Regrets: Carl Neumann (Undergraduate Student member)

Observers: Charelle Evelyn (Charlatan), Ross Mutton (Instructional Media Services), Vivian Cummins (Norman Paterson School of International Affairs) and **Library Staff:** Isla Jordan, Gwyn Price, Leslie Firth, Janice Scammell, Wendy Sinclair, Trish O'Flaherty, Elizabeth Knight, Susan Tudin, Michelle Atkin, Ingrid Draayer, Laura Newton Miller, Jöel Rivard, Wendy Watkins, Susan Jackson, Colleen Neely, John Warren

1. Adoption of the Agenda

Motion to accept the agenda as circulated: moved by Bennett, seconded by Armstrong.

Carried.

2. Approval of the Minutes of the Meeting of November 25, 2004

Motion to accept the Minutes as circulated: moved by Bennett, seconded by Weiss.

Carried.

3. Business Arising from the Meeting of November 25, 2004

3.1 Motion on Proposals for Revisions to the Library's Fines and Replacement Policies – Update (Agenda Item 5 – I. Draayer)

[At the November 25, 2005 meeting of the Senate Library Committee the Chair called for a motion on this issue.

It was MOVED (Aleksandra Bennett, Pamela Armstrong) subject to approval by Senate, that the “Proposals for Revisions to the Library’s Fines and Replacement Policies” be passed, effective immediately, but pending review by the Senate and approval by the Board of Governors.

Carried

[Subsequent to the SLC meeting of April 26, 2005, A. Newton was informed that the motion was not forwarded to the Board of Governors, but was approved by the Financial Advisory Committee.]

Ingrid Draayer informed Members that the plan was to phase in the changes outlined in the “Proposals for Revisions to the Library’s Fines and Replacement Policies” in June 2005. Media campaigns to publicise these revisions would be conducted in June and September.

4. Approval of the Minutes of the Special Meeting of March 10, 2005

Motion to accept the Minutes as circulated: moved by Armstrong, seconded by Foss.

Carried.

5. Business Arising from the Special Meeting of March 10, 2005

5.1 Motions on Learning Commons - Update

The Chair reminded members that motions passed at the March 10, 2005 Special Meeting of the Senate Library Committee were forwarded to Senate for debate and discussion at its April 1, 2005 meeting. The Chair then invited M. Foss to provide a snapshot of what had occurred at that session.

The University Librarian reported that following a lengthy discussion the three motions were passed by Senate. Foss read into the record

a portion of the “draft” minutes of the April 1, 2005 meeting of Senate, i.e.

“It was MOVED (Neumann, Laird)

that Senate recommends that the University explore the physical expansion of the MacOdrum Library.

Carried.

It was MOVED (Neumann, Laird)

that Senate recommends that the Learning Commons not be implemented beyond its first phase (September 2005) until an appropriate Committee of Senate fully explores and compares the Library Master Plan currently being undertaken and an alternative Library Master Plan that would incorporate physical expansion of the MacOdrum Library.

Carried.

It was MOVED (Ogilvie, Jeffreys)

that Senate recommend to the Board of Governors that it make the expansion of the MacOdrum Library a high priority for the future development of the University.

Carried.”

M. H. Ogilvie stated that the first and third motions were carried unanimously and that the vote for the second motion was 23/21.

Anita Hui questioned whether the minutes of the Senate meeting of April 1, 2005 would be posted. Newton informed Hui that Senate minutes, when approved, are available on the Senate Web site.

Bennett remarked that the Senate Library Committee meeting of March 10, 2005 (extraordinary in terms of attendance and participation) revealed that there was considerable support for the Library within the University community. Although the University Administration appeared to have priorities unrelated to the physical expansion of the Library, motions 1 and 3 were carried unanimously at the April 1, 2005 meeting of Senate. The President, Vice-Presidents, senior members of the Administration, and faculty, staff and student representatives voted in favour of these 2 motions. Given the funding (\$17,000,000) that was allocated for renovations to the University Centre and the \$15,500,000 that was spent on two NHL rinks, Bennett was of the belief that there was money available to be used for the physical expansion of the Library.

Bennett recommended that

- organizations like the Circle of Friends be approached to spread the message and to conduct a campaign to raise funds for this expansion;
- the Senate Library Committee become involved in the process; and
- the physical expansion of the Library be moved up on the University's list of capital projects.

Foss informed Bennett that in May the Library would receive the annual request to submit proposals for capital projects.

In response to a statement by Foss, M. H. Ogilvie said that the Board of Governors had not discussed the Senate motion. It was possible that the motion would be addressed at the next meeting, but the agenda and accompanying documents had not yet been distributed to Board members. As a member of the Board of Governors and the Board's Building Program Committee, Ogilvie agreed to promote the physical expansion of the MacOdrum Library.

In reply to the Chair's query, Ogilvie said that in theory monthly meetings were scheduled during the academic year, but in practice the Board of Governors met approximately 7 or 8 times annually. Ogilvie agreed to contact the Chair of the Board of Governors if motion 3 was not on the agenda for its next meeting.

The Chair proposed that a report, review or follow-up of these events, and in particular the Board's activities, be scheduled on the agenda for the fall meeting of the Senate Library Committee. Ogilvie agreed to provide an update.

Bennett questioned whether the University Administration had clarified budgetary issues, as there had been no commitment for the proposed changes as of the last meeting of the SLC. M. Foss stated that the Library had not received the operating budget for 2005/2006. The Library was instructed to exclude a Learning Commons component in its budget proposal. Funding for the re-configuration of this building or expansion would come from a separate account for capital projects. The only way that a commitment could be made to expand the building would be to know the cost, and to know whether there was the wherewithal to gather the funds to pay for the expansion. The other option would be to consider what it would cost to implement the changes, within the existing space, that were recommended by the architect.

Bennett asked if it was true that the University of Ottawa would not be sharing the Library's Storage Facility. Foss informed Bennett that the University of Ottawa had decided that Carleton's facility was insufficient for its needs. M. Foss advised Members that this decision would represent lost revenue for the Library. Foss reassured members that the costs associated with the implementation of the Learning Commons for September would not be significant – approximately \$200,000 at most.

Foss stated that Carleton, like all Ontario universities, was waiting for the provincial government to table its budget. What was the impact of the Rae Report on the government? Would the impact of that report translate into a better funding envelope for universities? Foss informed Members that he was optimistic about the results.

The Chair, who also sits on the Council of Ontario Universities, advised SLC that the best intelligence to date would seem to suggest that the provincial government's budget would reflect very closely the funding recommendations outlined in the Rae Report. There were a few glitches. Rae has recommended that the funding be provided in a three-year period. It appears now the provincial government would, instead, spread that same sum of money over a five-year period. The other wild card was Rae's recommendation about lumping the funding for universities and colleges together. The Council of Ontario Universities believes that universities should receive the lion's share or a larger share of the funds. Distribution is up in the air. The Chair stated that there were wrinkles, but concurred with Foss' earlier statement about being optimistic.

M. H. Ogilvie then suggested that if we, as members of the Senate Library Committee or the Library generally, wish to reflect what the university community seems to want – the Library expansion - we should keep in mind that when the current budget is finished, the University planners will, in late summer or in the autumn, start planning the budget for next year. It is important for us to get the process rolling and to ensure that our recommendations and or/ ideas are represented during the budget planning process for the 2006/2007 academic year and beyond. The preliminary budget for 2006/2007 will probably be available in late autumn. Whatever the impact of the Rae Report on the provincial government and whatever decision the government makes with respect to increased funding for the university, it seems to be very clear that if we want a substantial expansion of the Library, we will have to engage in a significant amount of private fund raising. That takes us back to the importance of trying to persuade the Board of Governors to make that decision, because once that decision is made, then all the planning can take place – not just in terms of an external campaign,

but in terms of internal budgeting as well. It was agreed that M. H. Ogilvie should “press this issue” as hard as she could at meetings of the Board of Governors.

6. Other Business

6.1 Minutes of SLC meetings and the Chair’s Annual Report

L. Pal advised Members, on behalf of L. Rossman, who was not present, that she had contacted Chong Chan, Clerk of Senate with a request to have the minutes of the SLC meetings and the Chair’s annual reports posted on the Library Web site. Chong Chan agreed that the minutes could be posted on the Web site. In an email to L. Pal, L. Rossman also suggested that, as a corollary, the agendas also be accessible on the Library Web site. With respect to annual reports, Chong Chan had stated that the Annual Reports were reports to Senate, and as such, they “belonged to Senate”. If SLC members agreed to this proposal, the annual reports could also be posted on the Library Web site.

L. Pal then called for a motion on this issue.

It was MOVED (M.H. Ogilvie, M. Weiss) that the Senate Library Committee Minutes since 1993 be placed on the Library Web site and that subsequent “approved” Minutes, agendas, and “approved” Annual Reports of the Chair also be posted on that site.

Carried.

6.2 Report of the Library Committee of Senate – April 2005

L. Pal informed members that he had submitted the 2005 Report of the Library Committee of Senate to the Clerk of Senate. [Copies were distributed to members prior to the meeting.]

6.3 Announcements and Expressions of appreciation

L. Pal announced, with regret, that

- Anita Hui (Library) would be relieved of her responsibilities on the Committee, as her three-year term of service would end in April 30, 2005.
- Michael Weiss would be on sabbatical from January 2006, and, although he could technically stay on the Committee until that date, he had advised Chong Chan that it might be better if another member of Science was selected for 2005-2006.
- Susan Weston's term as Graduate Student member would end in April 2005
- our esteemed and distinguished University Librarian, Martin Foss, would remain on the Committee until his Administrative Leave began in January 2006.

On behalf of the Committee, he expressed thanks for the service these members have rendered both to the Committee itself and to the wider university community.

He noted that he, too, would have to be relieved of his obligations as Chair of the Committee due to an impending sabbatical.

L. Pal stated that he had enjoyed his role immensely. When the Chair first came into the job, he assumed that the Library Committee, much like his stereotype of a Library, would be a serene, tranquil and untroubled spot, only to discover that this committee, along with the Library, seemed to be on the tectonic fault lines of University administration, budgeting, and everything else that goes along with it. L. Pal expressed appreciation to Committee members, and, in particular, the staff of the Library, for their support. The Chair then conveyed his best wishes to everyone in attendance.

6.4 Vote of Thanks

Alek Bennett, on behalf of the Committee, offered a vote of thanks to Les Pal for the way in which he had chaired the meetings. Bennett stated that L. Pal was a model chair, and that the Committee appreciated and was very grateful for the work that he had done in that capacity. Bennett's comments were heartily endorsed by members and observers.

7. Adjournment

At 11:05 a.m. Armstrong, seconded by Ogilvie, moved that the meeting be adjourned.