Library Committee Meeting Minutes  
November 13, 2013 - Noon – 1:15 PM  
Austin Conference Room, Tisch Library

Present: Daniel Abramson (Chair); Michael Reed; Malik Mufti; Matt Panzer; Ichiro Takayoshi; Richard Weiss; Rachael Bonoan (GSC Student Representative); Christie Maciejewski and Bryson Wong (TCU Senate Student Representatives); Ex Officio Members: Laura C. Wood and Laura Walters

Absent: Patrick Forber; Sam Thomas; Ning Ma; Isabelle Naginski

1. Member Introductions and Announcements: Laura Wood, Director, Tisch Library
Laura announced two events next week, both occurring on November 20th: 1) she will be doing a 5 minute presentation with slides about the Tisch Library renovation planning at the A&S faculty meeting, leading a small group discussion afterward; and 2) later that afternoon, Tisch Library will be hosting our Faculty Inspirations event (formerly, Honored Faculty, Honored Books) to honour and celebrate faculty who have been promoted and/or tenured in the last two years. Provost Harris will be greeting honorees and guests as well as making the champagne toast.

2. Collections Management Strategies: Danny Abramson, Chair, and Laura Wood
Danny introduced this discussion as an opportunity to dig into issues, look at library data, and start to look at some options for shifting part of the collection to off-site storage.

Statistics regarding collection circulation rates: This data can be broken down into multiple categories and ways. It is challenging to determine which ways are most useful for the information needed. The first 5 ranges on this chart, P – D, comprise 70% of zero circulation [Zero circulation refers to the items that have not circulated, in this case, since 2004.]; zero circulation includes very recent purchases as well as much older ones. Also of note is the percentage of items that circulated: 63%. This rate is high for a research library. [Members wondered what the top 10 circulating books are.]

Models for selecting material for off-site storage and retrieval: The chart delineates advantages and disadvantages of each model. Bullets were left empty in each category for all of the models in order for committee members to offer their own.

Use Level: Several members stressed that it would be important to retain as much primary source material and monographs as possible on-site. Tisch Library bibliographer, Chris Barbour, also has expressed this need, stating that it would be easier to access secondary source and interpretive materials through the index and to request them from off-site storage.

Digital Delivery: The biggest drawbacks to this model currently are the lack of capacity at off-site storage facilities to scan material and the inability to browse material in the original packaging. Members asked if Tisch was able to keep scanned material to send to multiple requestors or if each request had to be delivered separately. This is a tricky legal and copyright issue. We don't keep pdfs of scanned material, and we can only send a chapter per scan, not an entire book. Laura assured members that Tisch regularly buys backfiles of journals once they become available as long as they are affordable and there is a demand for them. Currently, Tisch holds approximately 150,000 – 160,000 journals on-site. These could all be moved off-site, but that still would not solve the problem of having enough space for the print collection. Ichiro raised a concern about students not being able to afford to print large amounts of digital materials. Laura said that we do the best we can to offer free scanning and low-cost printing.
**New Materials:** This alternative caused great concern for some of the group. Although it’s possible to find a large amount of metadata about new books online, particularly via Amazon, Danny felt that there could be a high degree of illusion in terms of knowing what the book is about since there are only snapshots of the full material. Matt and others felt that buying new books and immediately sending them off-site sends mixed messages to the users, i.e. -- the books were requested as additions to the collection and then shuttled off-site. Laura cited advantages as reported by other institutions who are using this model, including user preference in coming in to pick up the material at the Circ desk rather than hunting for it in the stacks. Users stated they were more likely to request a book that is off-site. The model also eliminates stack shifting, which generates significant costs and workflow demands.

**Conservation Consideration:** This tends to be a bigger issue for larger institutions, although Tisch does have some Special Collections materials that have conservation requirements. Overall, this is not a high-ranking option for most of our collection.

**Publication Date and Subject Based models:** Material chosen via these models would need to be vetted with each department.

**Shared Retention:** This may be a good option for low-circulating material, but the limitations of this option are two-fold: 1) it is highly political; 2) the politics of institutions working together for the long-term is quite challenging. Laura urged that even if we do not weed from our collection, we should become a partner in shared retention as good stewards. Laura asked members to consider how many copies of low-circulating materials should be kept.

A mixed strategy model is a possibility to some degree. Matt asked how much material needed to be moved now as well as in the future. Laura responded that we need to move a significant set of materials off-site now, but it also needs to be determined how much growth room will be left. This growth room will determine how soon sending more materials off-site will need to occur.

3. **Presentation of Information to the Tufts Community:**

   Laura and Danny asked members for suggestions for sharing information about the impending on-site storage problem. Discussion during A&S and AS&E faculty meetings during the winter is an option, although Danny felt the audience would not be wide enough. Michael suggested creating a webpage, including an overview, circ data with greater detail if people wanted to dig deeper via a link to more detailed data, the models for selecting off-site storage and retrieval, any other relevant information, and a field for faculty feedback and/or questions. A meeting with all of the department chairs would facilitate their adding the topic to their department meetings. Utilizing departmental library liaisons in this process also was recommended. Other suggestions included an article and an editorial in *The Daily* and a town hall meeting.

   Members felt that the more people are informed and given the opportunity to give feedback, the greater the buy-in will be.

4. **Director’s Report**

   The meeting was adjourned at 1:15 PM. The next Library Committee meeting will be on January 22, 2014 from noon – 1:15 PM in the Austin Conference Room.