



Robert Shrock
<shrock@max2.physics.sunys
b.edu>

02/12/2008 04:07 PM

To cfilstrup@notes.cc.sunysb.edu,
ltheobalt@notes.cc.sunysb.edu, hahn@ams.stonybrook.edu,
bbutt@notes.cc.sunysb.edu, fcash@notes.cc.sunysb.edu,
cc robert.shrock@stonybrook.edu

bcc

Subject University Library Services Committee Meeting, Feb. 14

Dear Members of the University Library Services Committee:

This is a reminder that we will have a meeting of the University Library Services Committee this Thursday, Feb. 14, at 10 AM in Room W-1502 of the Melville Library.

Chris Filstrup has suggested that we discuss the agenda items below. If any of you have other things to discuss, please contact me and we can add them.

1. Status of revised charge
2. Budget status for present year and request for next year
3. Review of off-site policy
4. Discussion of policy for discarding library materials that have been superseded by digital resources?
5. Integrated library system (Alelph)
6. Health Sciences Library update

Since a number of you were away for our January meeting, let me recall for you that in early January I sent a second communication (the first having been sent during the fall semester) on behalf of our committee, to Provost Eric Kaler, emphasizing our support for Chris Filstrup's request for an increase in library funding to deal with the inflationary increases in costs for journals. The Provost's response in January was similar to his response to my first communication in the fall expressing our support for increased funding. For your reference, I include the text of my second communication with Provost Kaler:

For Provost and Professor Eric Kaler

Dear Provost Kaler,

I am contacting you as Chair of the University Library Services Committee. I would like to thank you for your response to my communication to you, on November 16, 2008, on behalf of our committee, expressing our hope that the funding could be increased for the library. (Copies of our email and your response are appended below.) In your response you said that because of the budget deficit, such an increase was not yet possible, but mentioned that you agreed that this is an area of critical need and that as soon as the budget situation improves significantly, such an allocation might be feasible. We certainly understand the very difficult budget problems that the university faces.

At our December meeting, the Dean and Director of the Libraries, Chris Filstrup, reported to us on his discussion with you concerning this issue. Although the library has maintained well its electronic subscriptions to

professional journals, purchases of books have suffered because of lack of funding. For example, Prof. Judith Lochhead, a member of the committee from the Music Department, told us that that the Music Library has not been able to purchase new books or other materials.

To prepare for my report to our January meeting of the committee this coming Thursday, I would like to ask you if there has been any improvement in the budget situation that might make possible an increased allocation of funds to the library.

Thank you in advance for this information.

with best regards,

Bob Shrock

Chair, University Library Services Committee

Professor, C. N. Yang Institute for Theoretical Physics and
Physics/Astronomy Department, Stony Brook University

In his response, sent on Jan. 7, Provost Kaler said,

"Bob - thank you for your note. We are in the process of making our midyear report on our financial situation... I do have to say that I have no reason to be more optimistic than I was previously, but should funds be available I will continue to hold the library books budget as a very high priority...I truly wish I had better news, as I do understand that the current situation is a hardship for those needing to purchase books.

Best Regards,
Eric

Secondly, I recall that Chris proposed, and our committee members present approved the motion that the charge to our committee would be changed slightly from its present, quite short and rather general statement that we advise the Senate on the status of the library, to a more explicit charge, namely that our committee

1. understands the library as an organization, not just collections and understands the information environment in which the library operates;
2. advocates for the library;
3. recommends improvements in the services and operation of the library.

The next procedural step was for me, as Chair of the University Library Services Committee, to inform the Senate Coordinating Council of this proposed change and the fact that our committee voted for it. I did this at the subsequent fall meeting of the Coordinating Council. The next step would be for the Senate to vote on whether to change the charge. I had further communications with the President of the University Senate, Professor Bernie Lane, after that meeting, and can inform you of his response. In an email to me sent on Jan. 8, he said that, "the language of the Library Service Committee

mission is very permissive. Your committee can do what it wishes within the broad charge" and indicated that we can at least informally operate in a manner guided by the explicit three-point delineation above of the charge, pending future more formal actions by the Senate to consider possible modification of the charge.

We discussed this further at the Coordinating Council Meeting that was held yesterday, Feb. 11, 2008, and Prof. Lane reiterated his advice on this. My perception is that he is trying to allow us the maximum flexibility to operate within this new charge, without the necessity of immediately going through a lot of formal bureaucratic actions such as votes by the University Senate. Incidentally, I also reiterated at this meeting yesterday the importance of increased funding for the library and got a sympathetic response from the Coordinating Council.

I look forward to seeing you at the meeting.

with best regards,

Bob