

**VCU Libraries Advisory Committee, April 15<sup>th</sup>, 2016**  
**3<sup>rd</sup> Floor Board Room, James Branch Cabell Library**  
**2:00–3:00 p.m.**

**Minutes**

**Attending**

Matt Bogenschutz, Blythe Bowman, Corey Davis, MaryBeth De Marco, Jose Dula (chair), Les Harrison, Cheng Ly, Whitney Newcomb, Faye Prichard, Valerie Robnolt, Leigh Small

**Absent with notice**

Meredith Baines, David Burton, Jeremy Stultz, Kenneth Warren, Keith Zirkle

**Absent**

Lelia Brinegar, Jennifer Roudabush, Kayla Scott

Staff: Kathy Bradshaw, Dennis Clark, John Duke Teresa Knott, John Ulmschneider, Molly Moshofsky (recording secretary), Pam Fraga (secretary)

**Review and approval of agenda**

The agenda was approved as presented

**Review and approval of minutes from February 2016**

The minutes were approved.

**Revisions to circulation and fines guidelines and practice**

Mr. Clark welcomed everyone to the new conference room, which was designed specifically for board-type meetings and has broadcasting capabilities.

First, Mr. Clark described proposed changes to library hours: Cabell will open at 9am on weekends instead of 10am beginning in fall 2016. Summer hours will be adjusted to accommodate patrons as well.

Second, Mr. Clark introduced proposed changes to library fines guidelines. Currently, undergraduate students check out monographs for 1 month with 3 renewals; graduate students, 6 months with 5 renewals. Once a book is overdue, there is a \$0.25 daily fine until the material is returned. The fine maxes out at \$10.00 and there is an additional \$10.00 processing fee charged at the time of return. These fine guidelines create many transactions that circulations desk and business office staff must process; the revenue generated from fines does not remain in the library budget; and students end up being nicked-and-dimed for their use of the collection. Ultimately, the fine structure damages our trust relationships with students, and possible causes them to make less use of library resources.

To address these challenges, Mr. Clark proposed eliminating daily fines. Instead, after materials have been overdue for a month, the item would be marked as lost, which carries a \$100 material replacement fee. If the material is returned, the fee is voided. Mr. Clark reported that experience

at other institutions suggests that the policy change will result in higher return rates for materials and will reduce administrative costs.

One member asked about ways to change the email messages to borrowers about lost materials, especially with short term loans. The email appears a bit harsh on first receipt. Mr. Clark responded that the lost status email is not the first point of contact when students keep materials past their due dates. There are warning emails that go out beforehand, so the lost materials email should not surprise them.

Another member asked about the recall policy for materials and how to incentivize returns when materials are recalled. Mr. Clark responded that if recalled items are not returned, then students and faculty are encouraged to use the ILL system to get the recalled materials. This reduces delays in getting materials in the hands of users doing the recall.

A third question asked about the guidelines regarding replacing lost items. Mr. Ulmschneider responded that under very rare situations, students may be allowed to replace an item by directly purchasing it themselves and giving it to the library system. Typically, however, the collections and analysis department has very specific requirements for books that enter the library collection, including edition, binding, and publisher requirements.

Mr. Clark noted that Innovative Media loan guidelines will be different than guidelines for monograph loans. Historically, overdue items in Innovative Media are charged \$1.00 a day, maxing out at \$16.00. Borrowers have discovered that under these guidelines, they keep high-end equipment out for the entire semester and just pay a \$16.00 fine at the end – in effect, a remarkably low-cost way to rent high-end equipment. To mitigate this behavior, the daily overdue fee will be \$10 a day maxing out at \$100.00, plus a \$25.00 processing fee when the equipment is returned. This change should encourage more accountability and responsibility among patrons. For repeat offenders, the libraries still can impose the lost fine of \$100 plus the cost of replacement.

One member asked about the ability to send students text alerts about overdue materials. Mr. Clark responded that due to confidentiality and privacy reasons this isn't possible.

It was agreed that moving away from a punitive approach for monographs will likely lead to a better learning environment. Ultimately, the university at large will lose a sliver of revenue, but these new guidelines will have benefit the library budget in other ways. Mr. Ulmschneider remarked that in the past, the university and the state required that the library treat fines and copy income as revenue lines, so that the library system had to take in a set amount during the year in order to meet its budget allocation. That is no longer the case, to the great benefit of students and the library alike.

### **Review of HEETF and STF requests for 2016-2017 - handout**

Mr. Duke reviewed the proposed HEETF and STF requests for 2016-2017. The primary focus would be supporting planned renovations to Tompkins-McCaw Library, especially in the collaborative and learning spaces. These funds are particularly well-suited for updating technology.

In Cabell Library, the new building money funded all of the changes required for video conferencing, replacing big screen monitors in study rooms, and adding monitors to existing rooms. The request for HEETF and STF funding for Cabell is consequently less than in previous years.

The proposals include plans to upgrade the Book Eye scanners, software, computer technology to drive scanners and other materials, and additional cameras for Innovative Media (much requested by students). The proposals also support a refresh of computers in staff and student areas (after a set amount of years, computers are replaced according to university guidelines); more laptops for the TML community; and additional iPads for teaching.

### **Report findings from Ithaca S+R US Faculty Survey - PowerPoint**

Mr. Ulmschneider reviewed the results of the Ithaca S+R US Faculty Survey conducted in spring 2015. The survey provides many insights about what the university community expects from its libraries and how the university community uses its libraries. Mr. Ulmschneider made several observations on the data.

- The online library catalog is growing in relevance after a period of decline.
- Most disciplines are placing less importance on collection browsing (with the exception of the humanities disciplines). It is not known whether this is because there is relatively less browsing space available or just comparatively more diverse research options available for projects now.
- There is no decline in demand for print monographs, and they will remain an important part of the library moving forward. Print is better for in depth reading and digital is more well-suited to searching.
- Faculty rank research results in peer-reviewed journals highest, with blogging ranked very low. When selecting where to publish, respondents marked that impact factor – and the reputation of journal that derives from IF – means a lot. This arises from promotion and tenure criteria, not necessarily whether their published materials will get the most exposure.
- 80% of respondents remarked that they use their personal computers for storing data, so data remains highly vulnerable to damage and loss.

Ultimately, survey respondents observed that library and associated faculty remain very important to the university even with the changes taking place in learning technology. In fact, libraries are being perceived as increasingly important.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:13 p.m.