University of Maine System and URSUS

**Library Directors’ Council**

Held at University of Maine at Machias

**Thursday and Friday, August 17 and 18, 2006**

**Attending:** Tom Abbott, Joyce Rumery, Sharon Johnson, Greg Curtis, Frank Roberts, Bert Phipps, Marianne Thibodeau, David Nutty, Chris Knott, Gary Nichols, Barbara McDade, Susan Lowe, and Karl Beiser

Congratulations to Jonathan Williams and his wife on the birth of their son and best wishes to Marilyn Lutz.

Hearty thanks to Marianne and Bert for arranging and hosting the annual meeting of the directors.

The order of the agenda was revised by Tom based on priority – and flowed as follows:

**1.**    **CLEANING UP OLD FINES**

Concern raised by a number of directors about the massive number of very old fines remaining in the database – replacement costs not part of the discussion. Biggest problem seems to occur when fine statements are printed – all the old “junk” has to be printed as well as the current fines. Several libraries do not print statements and others will consider whether they can avoid that process as well.  Suggestion made to pick a date – perhaps 3 years, after which old fines would be deleted and no long pursued.  Each library is able to make their own decisions about fines on their materials but when other library fines are on their students’ files, a decision can only be made with the agreement of the lending library.

The Circ Heads have discussed this a number of times and based on their interpretation of the directors’ unwillingness to make any changes are passing it back to the directors.

After some discussion which reminded all of us that the fine process is handled differently at different locations: UM passes the fines to the business office and they are placed on student accounts but the library continues to manage the library accounts for the delinquent students. At UMFK, after a certain period (3 years I think) the unpaid fines are sent to the business office and handled from there as delinquent accounts, even being sent to collections at some point.  UMA and UMFK have agreed to collaborate to clean up back fines between their two libraries and encouraged others to consider that process.

**ACTION:**

1)     It was recommended that we ask Karl, (Marilyn and Jonathan) to investigate whether they can recommend action to clean up the fine files based on their understanding of how the new PS system will work – determining especially if it will be possible to have real-time debits and credits, as well as identifying tags to tell the student and library what he/she is being charged for on his/her student account.

2)    Further, they are asked to recommend a revised “as common as possible” policy that is compatible with PS and workable for the future – aimed at reducing staff work load in this area.

**2.**    **HOLDS AND RECALLS**

BPL is interested in allowing patrons to place holds on items that are checked out which is currently not turned on. We learned from Karl that the hold can be adjusted to operate at the title (specific bib record) level but would have to be system-wide.  Adding local priority to a title level hold would allow this to happen.  **ACTION:** There are possible consequences that need to be reviewed and Karl will refer this to Jonathan and ask him to study the potential impact and prepare a list of pros and cons for our next meeting.

**3.**    **LIBQUAL FOR DIRECTORS**

David provided a slide presentation (notes attached) outlining the steps and requirements for each of the 13 libraries’ participation in the LibQual national assessment process.  The bottom line is that the survey’s authors feel that “only customers judge quality, and all other judgments are irrelevant.”  This full market (all constituents) survey has been validated using 800,000 library users and is based on the widely accepted ServQual industry model of quality assessment.

LibQual compares participants’ perceptions versus their expectations using phrases (not questions) and three agreement scales for each:

1)     What you are willing to accept

2)    What you would like to see

3)    What is happening today

IRB (Institutional Research Board – Human Subjects Protection) approval will be required at each campus in the UMS and perhaps at other locations as well.  **ACTION:**Tom will work with David to prepare a common IRB application template and coordinate with others to facilitate review and approval.

There are 22 questions and we are allowed 5 local option questions (also attached) suggestion is that we select from previously used local option questions so we have comparative data once we get our results – next meeting

David will head the LibQual Task Force and each library will need to appoint a representative.  Please let David know immediately who will represent your library.  **Finally, PLEASE REVIEW DAVID’S PRESENTATION NOTES AND ADD THIS IMPORTANT PROCESS TO YOU CALENDARS**

**4.**    **ONE CARD AND LINKING TO THE PATRON DATABASE**

Susan reported that there was no easy way to provide campus ID cards with pre-linked library barcodes for distance students.  Several ideas were tried at UMA but all failed.  That puts us back at the same process we used in the past, especially just before the semester starts or within the first weeks:

1)     Either giving the student a temporary library card with a linked barcode and then replacing it when he/she receives a campus ID card – you will override the temp card when linking the campus ID or

2)    Sending the student to get their campus ID before they come to the library (the hassle we were trying to avoid) and then coming back to have the campus ID linked as the library code.

3)    Distance students will continue to contact  Off-Campus library services for their library cards.

**5.**    **URSUS BUDGET**

Joyce and Karl reported that on behalf of the URSUS directors, Karl is now has control of the operation part of the URSUS budget, and Joyce retains oversight for the databases. At this point, no new funds have been added to the budget as requested, thus there appears to be no requirement that campuses contribute additional funds to support operational costs for the URSUS budget.  That does not however preclude campus libraries from sharing costs of common databases as they see fit and are able. The Capital budget is still being considered – immediate need is a new server for the LINUX version of III management software.

**6.**    **URSUS REPORT**

Report was provided by Jonathan prior to the meeting.  Thank you.  With the exception of Karl who is at UMS System Offices in Bangor, URSUS staff are now in Belfast Hall on the Bangor Campus of UMA. One clarification: a graphics artist has not been hired at this time due to budget limitations.  It may be possible to adjust the budget to accommodate this need later in the year.  Karl’s old position is close to being filled. The new “agency” model software is running and has improved functionality in the area of user data.

**7.**    **MAINE INFO NET BOARD**

Maine Info Net has met and begun the process of creating a functional Maine Info Net.  David Nutty was elected Chair – CONGRATULATIONS DAVID.  They will soon be holding a retreat to work on strategic planning. The Maine Info Net membership list is attached.

8.     **REPORTS**

·        Tutorial Committee: It appears that no URSUS libraries are using the Mariner tutorials, opting instead for local versions. It was noted that they do provide “self-help” support for those accessing the library pages on their own. **ACTION:**Tim is asked to check on page “hits” for us.   Question raised about keeping the Mariner versions up to date verses supporting local development.  All seemed to agree that local option is acceptable if library has resources, but others would like to have the Mariner tutorials up dated – and will create and promote links on local library pages.  **ACTION:**  Committee will be asked to up date or replace them.  It was also agreed that all locally developed tutorials will be made available at a “swap shop” site on URSUS “Admin” for others to use.  Karl volunteered Tim to update the tutorials.  Susan will gather the recommendations of the tutorial committee and take the changes to Tim.

·        Docutek “Ask a Librarian”: A number of libraries are moving toward “generic” instant messaging to replace the formal “ask a librarian” Docutek software.  **ACTION**: In an attempt to save money by cancelling unneeded seats, please let Tim know if you plan to continue using Docutek and/or when you would no longer need it.

·        E-Reserves: -- Joyce and staff are looking into open source software that offers the same features available in our e-reserve system – again in an effort to save money – thanks Joyce

·        Information Literacy librarians’ meeting:  About 30 interested staff attended the meeting including staff from the CC’s privates and the UMS.  It was helpful for all involved to learn that they share similar problems and issues – suggestions were shared and best practices were discussed. All agreed as did the directors that the event should happen annually.

·        Greg was asked to present his idea about formalizing a link in BlackBoard or Web CT that links to library resources.  All agreed it would be helpful.  **ACTION:** Tom and Greg will draft an “index page” and speak with Glenn LeBlanc about adding such a library link to the Blackboard and/or webCT template given to faculty when they begin the process of creating their online course.    One of the links on the index page will allow users to go to their own campus library.

·        North Carolina State University library pages: Joyce shared a new search system: Endeca, currently in use at NCSU. Please see:  <http://www.lib.ncsu.edu/endeca/>.   There is also new web browser that is like Endeca in presentation: http://clusty.com/

·        Joyce also provided information on a machine that easily digitizes bound volumes which Fogler and the Maine State Library bought buying to digitize locally owned and/or non-copyrighted materials such as yearbooks and older Agriculture Reports. Information on the technology can be found at [http://www.kirtas-tech.com](http://www.kirtas-tech.com/).   Joyce said she hopes to be able to provide this service for other campuses – for a fee that will help offset the cost of the maintenance of the equipment.

9.     **ITEMS DISCUSSED BRIEFLY BUT NEEDING WORK OFF-LINE:**

·        Cooperative collection development

·        CUPA librarian position descriptions: Tom, Joyce and David will be working with CUPA (College and University Professional Association for Human Resources and ACRL leadership to create an ACRL Task Force and charge to review and recommend changes in the current (out of date) librarians’ position descriptions – bringing them in line with the IT, instruction and campus leadership realities of modern librarianship.  This results from research following the UMS professional position review process where we found the work duty responsibilities from CUPA woefully out of date.

·        Career ladder for MLS librarians – needed for UMS

·        Library Assistant III & IV for library support staff – needed for UMS

·        Federal Research Public Access Act – ALA asked for support

·        Repositioning libraries for the Google generation

10.   **LIBRARY DIRECTORS’ FOR THE YEAR –**this is the beginning of the year’s agenda – feel free to edit as needed

·        Fine policy for future

·        LibQual – ongoing

·        Action on Holds and Reserves Policy

·        Decision on continuing Docutek

·        Career ladder system for MLS librarians – system-wide

·        Library Assistants III & IV for support staff – system-wide

·        Cooperative collection development consistent with goals of UMS Strategic Plan

·        Last copy center if possible and if not – planned sharing via cooperative collection development

·        Digitizing bound publications where we control copyright

11.    **THIS YEAR’S MEETING SCHEDULE:**

All meetings will take place at Bangor Public Library – scheduled as follows:

            September 15

            October 20

            November 17

            December 15