

LIBRARY COMMITTEE OF SENATE MINUTES

Wednesday, December 5, 2001 10:30 a.m.

Room 360k, Library

Present: Leslie Pal (Chair), Martin Foss (University Librarian), Carter Elwood (Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences), Bozena Clarke (Library), Andrea Chandler (Faculty of Public Affairs and Management), Pamela Armstrong (Library), Edward Lai (Science), Andrea Rounce (Graduate Student member), John McAndrew (Undergraduate Student member), Ann Newton (Secretary of the Committee)

Guests: Leslie Firth (Library, Assistant Librarian, Systems) Linda Rossman (Library, Associate Librarian)

Regrets: Shikharesh Majumdar (Faculty of Engineering and Design)

Observers:

Library staff: Elizabeth Knight, Callista Kelly, Kristof Avramsson, Ingrid Draayer, Isla Jordan, Gilles Monast

Norman Paterson School of International Affairs: Vivian Cummins

Faculty of Engineering and Design: Vic Aitken (for Shikharesh Majumdar)

The new Chair, L. Pal, opened the meeting by acknowledging the services and contributions of Deborah Gorham, past Chair of the Library Committee of Senate. L. Pal also welcomed new Members and encouraged observers, guests, and Members to introduce themselves by name and affiliation.

1. Adoption of the Agenda

Motion to accept agenda as circulated: moved by B. Clarke, seconded by

P. Armstrong.

Carried.

2. Approval of the Minutes of the April 3, 2001 Meeting

Motion to accept the Minutes as circulated: moved by E. Lai, seconded by C. Elwood.

Carried.

3. Business Arising

3.1 Library Budgets: 2000-2001 and 2001-2002 (M. Foss)

(Agenda Item 4.1, April 3, 2001 meeting) Student Levy Fund

M. Foss reported that

- the Library's proposed 10% increase in the Materials Budget for 2001/2002 was rejected;
- all budgets passed were identical in dollar value to those of the previous year;
- discussions relating to the Library budget for 2002-2003 were in progress;
- the agreement with CISTI was renewed for an additional two years - at an annual cost of \$44,000;
- D. Gorham and M. Foss were not able to meet for discussions on initiatives that could be undertaken to encourage undergraduate students to provide ongoing support to the Library through their Student Levy Fund;
- the Library has come to rely on and appreciates this tangible form of support from the undergraduate student population;

and

- money from the Student Levy Fund is generally used to purchase new equipment and print and electronic resources.

In response to a question from A. Rounce, M. Foss stated that a committee, chaired by Duncan Watt, Vice-President (Finance and Administration)

determines which services the Levy Fund supports each year.

3.2 Library Space Study (L. Rossman)

(Agenda Item 6, April 3, 2001 meeting)

L. Rossman briefed Members on a number of issues relating to Library space.

During the last few years Library management and staff have become increasingly more concerned about space shortages in the Library. Some books are permanently located on trucks that are marked "overflow books", as there is no room left in the stacks to shelve this material.

Lobbying efforts by Mr. Foss and others convinced the Vice-President that a Library Space study was needed. Two such studies were conducted - one called the Space Utilization Study was done in February 2000 by a consultant from Education Consulting Services Corp. This study concentrated on overcrowding in the stacks. A second study, conducted in November 2000 by Diane Phillips of Taylor Phillips Architects, focussed on the aesthetics of the building: lighting, furnishings, acoustics, co-ordination of finishes and materials, paintings, and concealment of electrical closets. Ms. Philips was also mandated to provide recommendations on the proposed Library coffee shop.

During the summer, Anne Babcock, who was recently hired by the University as Manager of Space Administration, informed Linda Rossman that she would be happy to assist the Library with its master plan. L. Rossman, Ms. Babcock, and staff from the Physical Plant will meet in January 2002 to discuss this matter. In the meantime, Michael Bell, Carleton University Art Gallery, has designated artwork from that collection for display in the Library. L. Rossman discussed ongoing efforts to ensure that the building is properly maintained and that repairs are handled in a timely manner. In closing, L. Rossman commented on a conference that she recently attended on *Re-inventing Library Space*. Three trends emerged at that conference: wireless buildings, the purchase of lap tops which allows for rearrangement of rooms at any time, and coffee shops. A fourth trend was for the establishment of an Information Commons. The University of Toronto is a leader in this area. Huge banks of high technology terminals are located in a central area in the Library - an all-in-one information portal to the world. The Learning Commons is another variation on this - again high tech terminals are situated on the main floor. Adjacent to this area is a service desk staffed by librarians, computer technicians, and learning specialists who assist patrons with, among other things, their writing skills. L. Rossman stated that the implementation of the new system and a review of space would allow us to consider which, if any, of these trends would be most viable for our Library. The Chair thanked Ms. Rossman for her report and invited Members to comment.

C. Elwood questioned the "optics" of the proposed coffee shop. "How can we

justify allocating space and funding for a coffee shop when we need more shelving and a public elevator?" L. Rossman stated that the plan was to locate the coffee shop in the newspaper reading room/lounge on the main floor. This space has traditionally been reserved for users. As the area required for a coffee shop is relatively small, the reading room space would not be significantly compromised. Food Services would pay the full cost of renovations and furnishings for that area if/when the coffee shop is installed. Essentially, no money would be required from the University's operating budget.

C. Elwood then said that Ms. Rossman's comments were facts, not optics. It was the perception that concerned him. In conversations with colleagues, reactions to the coffee shop proposal were primarily negative: users would take coffee into the stacks, coffee shops were not the first function of a library, etc.

L. Rossman responded by stating that studies indicate that students typically spend upwards of four hours a day in the Library and that they are reluctant, with good reason, to leave the building for coffee/dinner breaks. The installation of the coffee shop would be a positive way to create a more comfortable, inviting environment for users. One of the Library's functions is to provide a place for people to study and to congregate. Ms. Rossman also addressed the issue of garbage. Waterloo University conducted an audit. Results revealed that there was no difference in garbage accumulation pre and post their coffee shop. L. Rossman advised SLC that members of our staff have expressed concern about implications for the Library's existing food and drink policy. Changes to current regulations would be required if/when the coffee shop becomes a fait accompli.

A. Rounce said that, given the current climate, students' associations tend to become very nervous when they hear discussions about adding more coffee outlets on campus. Ms. Rounce informed SLC that she thought that she could speak on behalf of the Carleton University Students' Association (CUSA) and the Graduate Students' Association (GSA) about general concerns. She questioned how the coffee shop would be managed, who would run it, what would happen with the revenues generated, and how this Library initiative would impact financially on existing student-run coffee services. Ms. Rounce reminded Members that the Library's proximity to the University Centre could conceivably create a reduction in the revenues generated from student run coffee services in that building. Ms. Rounce also stated that GSA and CUSA support initiatives that encourage students to use student services, including the Library. A. Rounce questioned whether statistics were available that would demonstrate a link between the presence of a coffee shop and increased usage of the Library.

L. Firth advised SSC that it was reported at the Access Services Conference in Winnipeg that turnstile statistics increase significantly when coffee shops are installed. Ms. Firth admitted, however, that a direct link could not be established. M. Foss informed SLC that circulation and reference statistics have increased at the University of Western Ontario. This increase, though, could also be attributed

to the installation of a huge bank of computers. There is no question that the trend today, and at most universities, is for a decline in statistics for circulation/reference/and turnstile transactions. Statistics for the University of Western Ontario are unique. This may change with the double cohort. L. Rossman noted that at the *Re-inventing Library Space* conference, the librarian from the University of Western Ontario stated that exit counts at that institution were on the increase: 88,000 in September 1999, 104,000 in 2000 and 109,000 in 2001.

E. Lai proposed that the Library negotiate some profit sharing with respect to the coffee shop. E. Lai then questioned whether plans to install a coffee shop would have any effect on future staffing requirements? L. Rossman stated that these requirements could be folded into plans for the double cohort. E. Lai also questioned whether noise would be a problem. He noted that students would be inclined to chat more in a coffee shop environment. L. Rossman stated that staff had raised this concern, but the main floor is not known to be a "quiet" floor. Students tend to study in other areas. L. Pal summarized the questions and concerns that were raised and stated that Ms. Rossman would have more concrete information to present at the next SLC meeting.

4. Report from the University Librarian (M. Foss)

4.1 Carleton University Library Biennial Report for 1999/2000 - 2000/2001

The University Librarian encouraged Members to comment on the Carleton University Library Biennial Report for 1999/2000 - 2000-2001 Report. C. Elwood complimented M. Foss on the document, stating that it was "informative and readable".

4.2 Library Budgets for 2001-2002 and 2002-2003

M. Foss reported on various budgetary issues:

- the Library is constructing its 2002-2003 budget;
- information must be submitted to the Budget Planning Committee by the end of January 2002;
- an increase in funding for the Materials Budget is essential;
- receipt of the main consolidated invoice for journal renewals will reveal the effects of inflation and the dollar value on our budget for this fiscal year;
- projections of the industry would seem to indicate an inflation of 9 or 11

percent over last year's journal prices;

- dollar effects will be close to about \$100,000;
- last year's invoices were paid with a dollar that was worth 67 cents U.S.;
- with a 63 cent dollar this year, the Library's spending power will be effectively reduced by approximately \$20,000 per each penny;
- the combined effect of the value of the dollar and inflation is approximately \$175,000;
- that information will help inform the construction of next year's budget for materials;
- the University Librarian has signaled to the Vice-President (Academic) and Provost, who is also the Chair of the Resource Planning Committee, that the Materials Budget should probably be increased by \$500,000;
- it is clear that other Libraries, for example Windsor and Guelph, receive more support for materials;
- typically there is an inflation factor built into their budgets so that whatever else happens their Materials Budget is increased by 5%; because our Materials Budget is embedded within the Total Library Budget, and further embedded in the other budget of the Resources Planning Committee, it tends to become lost;
- requests to have our Materials Budget "plucked out and highlighted" have been denied;
- the Library will probably receive an increase this year, but it will likely be given in the form of one-time funding as opposed to base funding;
- base dollars to cope with inflation and to invest in new products are what is most needed.

L. Pal asked whether the Library would be making a case again to extract the materials budget? M. Foss said no, and that response to an earlier request to make the Materials Budget a University Budget was not positive.

E. Lai questioned whether the Library could afford to purchase SciFinder Scholar. In response, M. Foss informed E. Lai that SciFinder Scholar costs \$55,000. In the proposal for next year's budget, Mr. Foss will cite specific examples of products that have been bypassed due to budgetary constraints.

4.3 Canadian National Site Licensing Project (CNSLP)

M. Foss informed Members that

- the CNSLP is in place;
- a number of electronic journals are available - over 700;
- to distinguish between electronic journals available through CNSLP and others that are received through the OCUL consortium or purchased individually by our Library is not difficult;
- continuing centralized funding beyond the three-year pilot stage for CNSLP is not a given;
- there may be additional funding, an assumption based on increases in staffing. Two individuals were recently hired - one with technical expertise and the other with a background in communications;
- with no government subsidy, costs for products could increase by 50%;
- current costs are \$200,000 a year for the first three years;
- this amount will increase to \$300,000 in the fourth year;
- typically prices for products do not change during the first three years. Vendors have agreed on a price cap of 8 or 9 per cent for the fourth or fifth year.

E. Lai asked if the Library expected to acquire the Elsevier journals. M. Foss stated that there are several OCUL libraries that are, through a special arrangement made with University of Toronto and Elsevier itself, accessing the University of Toronto suite, i.e. Brock, Trent, Waterloo, etc. Carleton Library will be asking Elsevier for a quotation.

J. McAndrew questioned whether the University of Ottawa and Carleton University Library have coordinated efforts in the acquisition of print and electronic journals. M. Foss stated that in the past the two institutions had consulted with one another on print subscriptions for Science and Engineering journals. That no longer happens, as our Library has basically cancelled most of its print journals in this area. We rely on what is available electronically through the different consortial arrangements and on our agreement with CISTI for document delivery.

E. Lai's comment that the University of Ottawa subscribes to SciFinder Scholar led to a discussion on borrowing between the two institutions. B. Clarke stated

that Carleton students borrowed 25,600 items from the University of Ottawa, while their students borrowed 13,000 from our Library.

C. Elwood questioned whether the journals that we receive electronically are listed in our catalogue? The answer to that question was yes. Students will be directed to the appropriate URL when they perform a title search for the journal.

5. New Library System (L. Firth)

L. Firth reported that

- the Library is on track for the implementation of the new Library system;
- the Launch celebration is planned for January 17, 2002;
- all staff should be commended for their work and efforts to ensure that the January deadlines are met;
- Bozena Clarke and team (Access Services) and the Systems staff deserve a special pat on the back for their contributions;
- The Implementation Steering Committee is overseeing the whole project;
- a representative from CUPE 2424 is on that Committee;
- the Public Relations Committee, headed by Linda Rossman, has done an excellent job in providing status reports to staff and the Carleton community about the new system;
- The Teaching and Learning Resource Centre assisted the Library with an information session that was given on November 30, 2001;
- Isla Jordan offered a similar session to faculty, staff and students;
- Some of the funding for the system has come from the SmartLibrary Project, which is part of the Smart Capital project that is funded by Industry Canada;
- The goal of the SmartLibrary Project, with a membership that includes Carleton University, the University of Ottawa, CISTI, the Ottawa Public Library and the National Library, is to create a National Capital Region portal for our Library systems by February 2003;
- Carleton University, CISTI and the University of Ottawa have purchased the same system. This should simplify things with respect to the aforementioned portal.

5.1 Motions 1 and 2 (B. Clarke)

B. Clarke provided commentary on two motions that she wished to propose that would tie in with the new system. (See Appendix A)

Proposed Motion # 1

I, Bozena Clarke, move that the Library Committee of Senate approve a request to introduce a fee of \$5.00 to be charged to patrons for issuing replacement library cards.

B. Clarke stated that outside borrowers pay a set fee for the privilege of borrowing materials from our library. There is no charge for the card itself. When cards are lost, another card is re-issued at no cost to the patron. Cards are re-issued in great numbers, which translates into an increase in workload for staff at Circulation. A nominal fee of \$5.00 per replacement card would probably discourage patrons from requesting another card, when they have not lost, but simply neglected, to bring their cards with them.

L. Pal suggested that the word "patrons" be replaced with "outside borrowers".

It was moved (Clarke, Armstrong)

That the Library Committee of Senate approve a request to introduce a fee of \$5.00 to be charged to outside borrowers for issuing replacement library cards.

Carried.

Proposed Motion # 2

I, Bozena Clarke, move that the Library Committee of Senate approve a request to allow the Library to impose sanctions for Carleton University students who owe the Library \$100.00 or more. Such sanctions would prevent students from borrowing or renewing library books until the outstanding fines are paid.

Before considering this motion, B. Clarke elaborated on the contents of an email dated November 30, 2001 that Maria Brocklehurst, Supervisor, Media Circulation, IMS sent to Bozena Clarke, with copies to Ross Mutton (Director, Instructional Media Services) and Dianne Gavin (Systems Department, Library). See Appendix B for text only. Paper copies of the email were distributed to Members at the meeting.

B. Clarke stated that

- IMS and the Library would be using the same database for circulation and fines;
- ITV fines are \$1.00 per hour; Library fines are 50 cents a day;
- ITV fines accumulate very quickly;
- IMS hours of service differ from Library hours of service;
- IMS does not wish the Library to accept ITV fines;
- IMS does not agree with blocking borrower privileges once fines reach \$5.00, as ITV fines increase more rapidly than Library fines. Students who borrow tapes would be placed in sanctions if they were 5 hours late in returning one tape;
- B. Clarke's proposed motion #2 would address M. Brocklehurst's concerns;
- M. Foss reminded Members that fines collected by the Library are directed to the general University revenue, but fine dollars collected by IMS are retained by that department and deposited into their revenue stream. It is for this reason that funds should be segregated;
- A. Rounce questioned the impact of this motion on students;
- B. Clarke stated that there would be no impact. Students, regardless of whether they owe money or not, can borrow books. They cannot, however, graduate if they owe above a certain amount of money. "At present our sanctions are linked to overdue material. The new system will no longer allow for sanctions linked to overdue material. It will, however, allow sanctions for unpaid fines";
- The Chair questioned whether the motion should read "materials" rather than library books;
- The Chair also questioned whether this motion would affect faculty. B. Clarke stated that faculty would not be affected by this motion;
- L. Firth asked if there was an absolute need for sanctions in monetary terms;
- L. Pal stated that he viewed sanctions as intended to re-capture materials to make them available to other patrons;
- B. Clarke stated that lower levels for sanctions would remind people a

little earlier. The problem was that sanctions wouldn't kick in until books were returned;

- L. Rossman thought that \$100.00 was a very high amount;
- Ms. Rossman also expressed concern that the Library was being driven to come up with a policy in response to what was essentially a technical problem;
- B. Clarke said that, in theory, the Library could accept ITV fines if IMS would agree. Ms. Clarke commented on potential problems, i.e. fines intended for IMS could end up in the wrong budget account;
- L. Firth questioned whether reports could be generated on ITV fines received in the Library;
- G. Monast stated that the cash register at circulation could be re-programmed to allow for a new category. A record of transactions relating to ITV fines would be available on the cash register tape. Funds to be deposited in the IMS account could then be identified in the report that the Library Office sends to the Business Office;
- In response to a question from the Chair, B. Clarke stated that M. Brocklehurst's suggestion to block at \$21.00 would not address situations in which students had more than one overdue tape;
- L. Firth questioned whether circulation could override a sanction. B. Clarke stated that student assistants can't override sanctions, and that there are occasions when they are working by themselves at the Circulation desk, i.e. on weekends and in the evening;
- G. Monast stated that he thought that the number of students who would be inconvenienced by this motion was not significant. He also stated that \$100.00 seemed fair. To lower this amount would primarily inconvenience students who borrow tapes from IMS.

Following this exchange, it was agreed that further consultation and discussion (internally and with staff from IMS) was required before this motion should be put to a vote.

6. Other Business

There was no other business.

7. Adjournment

At 12:20 p.m. M. Foss moved, seconded by Andrea Rounce, that the meeting be

adjourned.

APPENDIX A

Motion # 1

I, Bozena Clarke, move that the Library Committee of Senate approve a request to introduce a fee of \$5.00 to be charged to patrons for issuing replacement library cards.

Motion # 2

I, Bozena Clarke, move that the Library Committee of Senate approve a request to allow the Library to impose sanctions for Carleton University students who owe the Library \$100.00 or more. Such sanctions would prevent students from borrowing or renewing library books until the outstanding fines are paid.

- Reasons for the change in policy:

In order to ensure prompt return of material most libraries rely on various systems of sanctions. These sanctions may be linked to overdue material or to outstanding fines.

- At present, our sanctions are linked to overdue material
- The new system will no longer allow for sanctions linked to overdue material. It will, however, allow sanctions for unpaid fines.

To be decided:

Should we restrict the students' ability to study for owing money?

If so, what should be the amount owing that would trigger sanctions?

Present Carleton University practice with respect to money owing:

- Any student owing the university \$100 or more will not be allowed to graduate and will not receive a transcript
- Members of the faculty are not allowed to borrow or renew books if they owe \$10 or more
- Outside Borrowers are not allowed to borrow or renew books if they owe any amount of money.

December 5, 2001

APPENDIX B

[Text only of an email sent on November 30, 2001 from Maria Brocklehurst, Supervisor, Media Circulation, Instructional Media Services (IMS), to Bozena Clarke, Head, Access Services, Library. This email was copied to Ross Mutton, Director, IMS and Dianne Gavin, Systems Department, Library.]

"Subject: fine concerns

I have a couple of major concerns regarding fines to bring to your attention.

The first is the concern that ITV fines NOT be taken at the Library. The only identifier that will differentiate our fines in the patron's record is the location code, so the staff members must know not to accept money on that type of fine. I understand this is even more of a problem when a patron decides to put a certain amount down on all the fines owed. If there is an ITV fine, the system has to be told specifically not to put money against that fine.

Our fines make up a substantial portion of our income, so it is important that the money be directed to the proper account by being accepted only at IMS.

Also, I see in Linda's most recent Friday message that you are considering blocking borrower privileges once fines reach \$5.

Unless there is a way of separating ITV fines, as there was in the old system, a block due to Library fines will affect our patrons. Conversely, ITV fines will activate a block. Our fines are \$1 per hour and get to \$5 quickly! It also occurs to me that if a patron is borrowing books, or checking out ITV tapes, and find their privileges are blocked due to a fine, they will wish to pay the fine immediately in order to de-activate the block. However, they will not be able to pay the fine from the other location. This will result in a great deal of frustration for the student, especially if the other location is closed.

I would suggest setting the fine level much higher than \$5 before a block is activated - perhaps \$21 to at least allow one maximum fine."