

**COMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY & SCHOLARLY COMMUNICATION  
MINUTES  
February 2, 2017**

**Present:** Eileen Zurbriggen (*chair*), Chelsea Blackmore, Michael Cowan, Graeme Smith, Gabriela Ramieraz-Chavez (GSR), Elizabeth Cowell (*ex-officio*), Susan Perry (LAUC Chair), Alix Norton (LAUC Vice Chair), Greg Careaga (Head of Assessment)

**Absent:** Karen Ottemann (W,S), Wendy Lin (UGSR)

**Announcements**

Librarian Cowell shared that the library is hosting a symposium this spring (May 31); other university Librarians will be attendance. She invited a member of COLASC to join the planning committee. The Library plans to have break-out sessions, perhaps broaching the topic of services. She will consult with the committee on the specific types of conversations.

**Consultation with Head of Assessment and Planning Greg Careaga**

Last year, Librarian Careaga presented the summary of faculty responses to the Library's faculty survey (from vendor Ithaka S+R) and the committee is consulting with Librarian Careaga about how to build on that information for the COLASC faculty survey. Librarian Careaga shared some highlights from the prior survey. More than one-third of faculty who started the survey did not complete it. For maximum response rates it will be important to keep the survey reasonably short and to have logic that will skip sections that are not relevant for an individual respondent. Librarian Careaga noted that the survey responses raised some questions about faculty's understanding of the library's services. For example, faculty noted their reliance on book and online databases but rate a low level of satisfaction in the usage of books and the database. It's unclear whether the campus service platform (Cruzcat) is important to faculty or if they just want access to resources and don't care much about the gateway itself. The Librarians noted they were working on the library service platform to make the article databases easily discoverable -- they are in the early stage of examining an integrated library system.

Members discussed the critical issues that faculty would be interested in and what questions could be posed to further inform and relay information about faculty research needs. Members discussed how to approach and frame the survey so as to minimize bias. Members raised their concern that faculty may be negatively influenced by the financial implications of their responses, especially due to the Library's budget cuts in recent years. The survey may need to explicitly instruct faculty to indicate the resources and services they would like to have access to, regardless of cost. At the same time, cost/benefit tradeoff questions might be useful. For example, if faculty valued online access to additional journals, what would they give up or trade off to pay for this? The committee discussed whether to use the survey not only to gather information but as an educational tool. For example, asking about digital services could be done in such a way as to provide information to faculty about the Digital Scholarship Commons. The survey results might also be used to support requests for additional funds for the library. The committee discussed whether to use this survey as a means of gathering input about reactions to the Science & Engineering Library project. The introduction to the survey could highlight the fact that changes were made in response to the 2014 survey; this may encourage faculty to complete the survey because they see that it will be effective to do so.

Suggestions for survey questions included: learning more about how faculty approach research. Which of the library's materials do they use? Do they use the physical space? Because research needs vary by division and discipline, it will be important to gather appropriate demographic information. Beyond division and rank it might be helpful to ask about: the point of interaction with the library, where faculty browse, search, and work with materials or information from the library. Chair Zurbriggen shared that individual faculty are sending her comments and feedback about the Science & Engineering Library. Librarian Cowell agreed with the Chair's suggestion that COLASC could serve as conduit for faculty and the Chair will pass along comments, questions or feedback. Librarian Cowell also noted that Dean Koch has shared that none of the faculty in his division raised any prior concern with him about the Summer 2016 project to remove volumes.

The committee determined that the survey will draw upon the open/ended responses from the Library's faculty survey (2014) and will expand with targeted questions. The objective will be to access current satisfaction, unmet needs, values or vision and lastly a focus on priorities given resource constraints. Members will consider using skip logic or sampling to keep the survey manageable. Librarian Careaga agreed to lend his expertise in drafting the survey with Assistant Director Anna Sher and the committee.