ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AGENDA
January 3, 1974, 3:00 p.m., Ag 241

I. Approval of Minutes

II. Unfinished Business
   A. Nominations for University-Wide Committees - Alberti
   B. Status of Reorganization - Alberti
   C. Faculty Data File - Alberti

III. New Business
   A. New Senate Members
   B. Student Community Services - Robert Bonds
   C. Learning Assistance Center - Harry Fierstine, Donald Cheek
   D. CSUC Inter-Library Cooperation - Attachment III-D - Carleton Winslow
   E. Administrative Council Items - Attachment III-E - Lezlie Labhard
   F. Committee Report Format

IV. Announcements
Memorandum

To: Robert Alberti, Chairman
   Academic Senate

From: Library Committee of the Academic Senate

Date: December 3, 1973

Subject: Summary and Interpretation of the Department of Finance Report on Library Cooperation, June, 1973

The Academic Senate's Library Committee has studied the June, 1973 Department of Finance Audit Team Report on library cooperation among the State Colleges and Universities and would like to call attention to the recommendations of the report and its implications for this campus. It seems certain that some reorganization scheme for libraries of the State Colleges and Universities will be put into effect by 1975. It also is likely that the reorganization pattern will follow in some form the recent recommendations of the Department of Finance.

It is the consensus of the committee that the report has basic flaws which apply to the State College and University system as a whole and is menacing for this campus in particular. The following is a summary of what we believe to be the major features of the report as it affects this campus along with an interpretation of the effects of the proposed changes.

I. Organization of a northern and southern library consortia within the state.

Summary. The objective is to create two manageable geographical areas in which bibliographic sharing can occur. The major problem springing from this system, and envisioned by the study, is queuing. The report indicates that a minimum of 33% and a maximum of 40% of library collections are of such "low use" that they would be available for loan. Almost the entirety of the report is designed to quantitatively support this thesis, yet there still remains at least two major questions: (1) the use of books within the library cannot be quantified and will decrease significantly the percentage of books that ought to be available for loan; and (2) the assumption that librarians are somehow equipped to gauge the popularity of a title before it is acquired, and thus classify it as "high" or "low" use.

Generally however, there is an indication that there are books (less than the Audit Team believes) within the State College Library system that are used infrequently enough to be loaned. This situation, coupled with budget restrictions and the increasing cost of books makes the implementation of some form of a cooperative system a reality, despite its undesirability.
Interpretation. The critical problem for this campus, given the reality of cooperation, is inclusion in one of the consortia. As of June, 1973 Cal Poly was not included in either consortia; since then the Director of the University Library has received word that the campus will be a part of the cooperative system. The University was originally excluded on the idea that Cal Poly's benefit to the system was less than the expense of participation. This probably has not changed. The Director of the Library should consequently be concerned whether Cal Poly be granted only a second-class status within the consortia. The danger is the campus receiving the worst of both situations: decreasing library funds, and insufficient bibliographic cooperation. Cal Poly ought possibly to maintain its unique geographical and academic position and press for funds to support a self-sufficient library, or maintain pressure for equality in terms of automation and rapid inter-library loan delivery.

II. Cooperation organized on the basis of subject specialization.

Summary. The report states that the concept of a library as the depository for most scholarly knowledge will only be achieved within subject areas. It is expected that the existing strengths of the various libraries will be the beginning of subject specialization, and that Cal Poly will continue to make an effort to acquire complete scholarly holdings in the sciences.

Interpretation. With each library in the State College and University system engaging in subject specialization there will be a problem created for the low priority bibliographic areas. The report acknowledges that a core of "conventional" books in the non-specialized areas is necessary for all libraries. How broadly this core is defined and the ability of librarians to predict whether a book will become "standard," will have direct relationship to the problem of queuing at various local libraries. The report is premised on the belief that each library's specialized area will correlate with curricular concentration and consequently local use would correspond to those specialized materials. Students and faculty at an individual campus would consequently need less frequently to increase the cost of the cooperative system by going off campus to obtain materials. The 1972-73 Cal Poly Library Questionnaire results indicates however that the probable bibliographic low priority areas for this campus actually utilize the library to a greater degree than those areas where bibliographic coverage will be most complete. This situation will place a double burden on the Cal Poly Library if queuing is to be avoided. It will necessitate the acquisition of complete scholarly holdings in the emphasis areas along with a broad group of "conventional" materials in the "low priority" areas. The report itself indicates that all libraries participating in the consortia "will maintain its high-use collection in every subject."
Memorandum

To: Bob Alberti

From: Lezlie

Subject: Request for time at the next executive meeting

Date: December 3, 1973

File No.:

Copies:

The following items came up at the Administrative Council meeting December 3, 1973; may we discuss them at our next executive meeting.

1. Don Shelton's office will be considering the feasibility of car pools. He needs input - ideas on how to proceed?

2. Jim Landreth will be contacting the Academic Senate on parking regulations - specifically on towing away of illegally parked vehicles (signs to this effect).

3. Doug Gerard presented changes in the Master plan since the last presentation (?). He has requested suggestions on how input might be handled. Suggestions?