

## **University of Florida Future of the Library (FOL) Committee**

### Meeting Minutes

*September 21, 2006*

*Present:* Will Harrison, Chair; John Cech; David Denslow; Dan Driscoll; Mary Ann Eaverly; Stephanie Haas; Tess Kulstad Gonzalez; Carol Murphy; Robin Poynor; Betty Smocovitis; Michele Tennant; Eric Triplett; Robert Zieger; and Amy Mashburn via telephone.

*Next meeting:* October 12, 2006 at 8:30 a.m. in 239 Tigert Hall

---

#### **I. Minutes**

Dr. Harrison asked that the committee review the minutes from the September 7<sup>th</sup> meeting and email any corrections to him or Cheryl Gater.

#### **II. Announcements**

Dr. Harrison mentioned that he and Dr. Joe Glover, Chair of the Dean/Director Search Committee had been invited to attend the Libraries' Town Meeting on Thursday, September 28, 2006. Stephanie Haas extended the invitation to the entire committee.

Dr. Harrison also commented that he was meeting with the Senate Infrastructure Committee on September 28<sup>th</sup> also.

Dr. Bob Zieger as liaison to the Dean/Director Search Committee gave the FOL committee an update that the search committee is going to advertise the position at the Dean level. The search committee plans to coordinate with the FOL committee and use its recommendations. The search committee plans to have candidates on campus early in the Spring semester.

#### **II. Consultants Visits**

Ken Frazier from Wisconsin will be meeting with the committee on October 19<sup>th</sup>. Exact details of his trip are to follow.

Discussions with Wendy Lougee of Minnesota are progressing and at the very least, the committee will have a video-conference with Ms. Lougee.

#### **III. Discussion of Library "Future" Issues**

Dr. Harrison developed 5 areas of concentration for the FOL issues:

1. Comparative Analysis
2. Collection Balance (Electronic and Print)
3. Capital Campaign
4. Mission
5. Integration of Libraries

The committee discussed a few ideas of the main focus areas for each concentration.

1. Comparative Analysis
  - a. Peer selection important – Use existing peer group and expand? Develop own peer group? Should peer group be actual or group UF is aspiring to be?

- b. The following FOL committee members were assigned to the Comparative Analysis subcommittee: David Denslow, Stephanie Haas, and Eric Triplett
- 2. Collection Balance – issues and concerns discussed
  - a. Two issues – Space/acquisitions and how to make the collection available to everyone
  - b. Card catalog and Dewey decimal system
  - c. The following FOL committee members were assigned to the Collection Balance subcommittee: Tess Kulstad Gonzalez, Robin Poynor, and Bob Zieger
  - d. This subcommittee is working on the premise that the balance we have been discussing has more to do with digital/electronic as opposed to hardcopy/archival/print materials. Of course, this ultimately has to do with availability.
- 3. Capital Campaign – issues and concerns discussed
  - a. Should this encompass the whole aspect of how funding is done for the library infrastructure?
  - b. More focused on endowments?
  - c. The following FOL committee members were assigned to the Capital Campaign subcommittee: John Cech, Mary Ann Eaverly, Stephanie Haas, and Will Harrison
- 4. Mission – issues and concerns discussed
  - a. What is UF's mission compared to others? Current mission is just definition, not clear
  - b. Be sure not to miss the service aspect – librarian role dependent on university needs
  - c. The following FOL committee members were assigned to the Mission subcommittee: Carol Murphy, Michele Tennant, and Betty Smocovitis
- 5. Integration of Libraries – issues and concerns discussed
  - a. The committee discussed if this was a worthwhile or feasible area for the committee to address and it was decided to pursue this focus area also.
  - b. The following FOL committee members were assigned to the Integration of Libraries subcommittee: Dan Driscoll, Amy Mashburn, and Michele Tennant

#### **IV. Conclusions**

- 1. Subcommittees should find times to meet and keep the full committee generally informed.
- 2. Two weeks will be too soon for follow-up meeting, so the FOL committee will meet again on October 12 at 8:30 a.m. with verbal reports from subcommittees

Ms. Haas asked for the committee to more clearly define the peer group and while not all the committee agreed on the listing, the general consensus was to include the following institutions in the peer group: Wisconsin, Minnesota, Penn State, Ohio State, Illinois, Georgia and Michigan.

The meeting adjourned at 9:30 a.m.