LAC Minutes
February 10, 2015

Present:

Absent:
Elizabeth McDonald

Guest:
Ellen Watson

1. Permanent Reserve Collection Policy – Steve Knowlton
A presentation was given to the council on the Permanent Reserve Collection Policy. Security has been one of the main reasons items have been placed on permanent reserve. Data shows that currently books in the permanent reserve room are more likely to be missing than those in the stacks. This may be due to staffing changes in the reserve room. Consensus of the discussion is we are more interested in library materials being used than in them being protected. A new permanent reserve policy was proposed. This presentation is attached to the minutes.

2. Staffing Pool Update – S. Ford
The Staffing Pool was created to provide a pool of trained individuals available to cover temporary staffing gaps in the various departments of the University Libraries. The current list of Staffing Pool representatives was distributed to council members. Current representatives will serve until June 30, 2015. Please let Jill Green, jdgreen6, X8219, know by April 1, 2015, if you will be changing your department’s representative, effective July 1, 2015. Representatives on Staffing Pool will serve a two year assignment. These representatives may be called on to staff:

- areas in departments during employees planned or unplanned short-term absences.
- an area to allow a department or functional unit to come together as a whole for a meeting or other group activity.

The Staffing Pool is managed by a Coordinating Committee made up of Shelia Gaines, Anna Neal, and Elizabeth McDonald. Shelia Gaines is currently heading the Coordinating Committee.

3. Faculty Senate Library Policy Report – S. Ford
The Faculty Senate has submitted their report on the Redefining the Library Report. Copies of this report were distributed to council members. The Faculty Senate Library Policy Report is attached to the minutes. Everyone is encouraged to read the report.
4. **Accessibility in the University Libraries – S. Ford**
   In the last LAC meeting, accessibility at the library was discussed. The RIS department compiled an initial list of what currently exists in the library. We will be adding to this list as other items are identified. The list of accessibility at the library is attached to the minutes. Please submit additional items to Jill, jdgreen6, X8219, so they can be added to the list.

5. **Grant Applications – S. Ford**
   Many grants are available to Library Faculty and Staff. Whenever someone is thinking of submitting a grant application, they should initially discuss the grant with their department head, the Office of Research Support Services, 901-678-2533, and the library’s Business Officer, Shanika Jones, X2209. Grant proposals should also be sent to Dean Ford well in advance of the grant’s submission deadline for her review and signature. A draft document outlining expectations for grant applications was reviewed and discussed. The draft will be reworked incorporating comments made during the discussion.

6. **Planning for Our Vacancies – S. Ford**
   A list of current and anticipated vacancies in the library was given to council members. Vacancies and the priority of filling these vacancies were discussed by council members. This list will be discussed with the Provost in the Dean’s upcoming meeting with her. The list of vacancies is attached to the minutes.

7. **Announcements**

   **Bess Robinson**
   We have one application for the Part-time Librarian position. Other applications are also welcomed.

   **Ed Frank**
   Gerald Chaudron has secured a grant from the Tennessee State Library and Archives for $5,000.00 and some internal funding for a project to rehouse our Memphis Press Scimitar morgue files. The total expenditure will be approximately $10,000.00. He also secured a $1,250.00 State and National Archival Partnership (SNAP) grant from the Tennessee Historical Records Advisory Board for the Carroll Cloar preservation project.
S. Ford
The Hooks Institute will sponsor a luncheon and speaker, on Thursday, February 12, at noon in the UC. The speaker will be Daniel Matlin, a lecturer from Kings College, author of a recent book entitled, *The Corner*.

An LAIII position for the Hooks Institute will be posted this week. This position’s primary role will be digitalizing selected portions of the Hooks Collection.

Meeting Adjourned: 9:58 am
Minutes Finalized: February 19, 2015
Personnel Vacancies – University Libraries

Faculty Position – Vacancies
1. FAC(2785) - Associate Dean of University Libraries
2. FAC(1605) - Assistant to the Dean for Outreach & Community Engagement
3. FAC(2239) - Assistant to the Dean for Planning and Assessment
4. FAC(3337) - Catalog Librarian
5. FAC(1612) - Curator of Special Collections
6. FAC(1334) - Electronic Resources Librarian
7. FAC(3282) - Instructional Services Librarian
8. FAC(2121) - Instructional Services Librarian
9. FAC(1971) - Web Services Librarian

Staff Position - Vacancies
1. Reception Associate (3216) - Administration
2. LA 2 (1714) – Collection Management (anticipated)
3. LA2 (1657) – Collection Management
4. LA 2(2766) - Collection Management

Searches underway:
1. LA 3 (2553) – Collection Maintenance Supervisor, Circulation
2. LA 3 (3395) - Desk Support, Circulation
3. LA 2 (1094) - Preservation and Special Collections
4. LA3 (1259) - Collection Management
5. Adjunct Librarian (RIS)
6. Adjunct Librarian (RIS)

Positions we need but don’t have:
1. Scholarly Communications Librarian
2. Digital Assets Librarian
3. Archivist
4. Health Sciences Librarian
5. LA 3 – Health Sciences Library
The Permanent Reserve collection has two purposes.

1. The first purpose is to serve as a depository for titles that teaching faculty expect to assign for course reading year after year. Having a permanent reserve saves them the trouble of placing the books on course reserve every semester.

   There are currently two such collections:
   - Art and Art History (including Architecture and Photography)
   - Theatre and Dance

   Books should be added to these collections only at the request of teaching faculty.

2. The second purpose is to allow collocation of titles with similar content that would otherwise be scattered in the stacks because they are assigned non-consecutive call numbers.

   There are currently three such collections:
   - Paralegal Studies
   - Graphic Novels
   - Superseded ANSI Standards

   Books may be assigned to these collections based upon the recommendation of teaching faculty, or by Libraries staff or faculty based upon their bibliographic judgment.

3. There is another collection in Permanent Reserve, African-American literature.¹

   - The African-American Literature collection in permanent reserve contains additional copies of literature, biographies, and criticism by and of renowned African-American authors. If only one copy of such a title is in the collection, that copy should be in the stacks. Works of African-American history and other topics are to be shelved in the stacks.

To clarify: The Permanent Reserve collection is not intended to provide additional security against theft.

¹ The presence of the African-American Literature collection in Permanent Reserve originated in a desire for added security for these titles. Upon review of longitudinal data, the belief that locating books in Permanent Reserve reduces theft appears to be untrue. In the interest of saving staff time, the titles in the African-American literature collection will not be moved until further notice.
Proposed Permanent Reserve Collection Policy

Steve Knowlton
LAC, 2/10/15
Permanent Reserve Collection

• Includes sections of
  – African-American literature (and assorted related books)
  – Graphic Novels
  – Paralegal Studies
  – Theatre
  – Art
Current Situation

• Current policy not public
• Generated in 2005 by Chris Matz
• Excludes any mention of subject collections, such as Art, Theatre, Paralegal
• Without a public policy – in fact, without knowing it existed until last fall – Collection Management was diverting numerous titles to Permanent Reserve without a firm idea about the criteria for inclusion
• Need some clarity!
Current Situation

• Current policy not public
• Generated in 2005 by Chris Matz
• Excludes any mention of subject collections, such as Art, Theatre, Paralegal
• Emphasis is on items “that require an extra level of security”
PERMANENT RESERVE GUIDELINES

The Permanent Reserve Collection of the University of Memphis Libraries serves to provide access to items that require an extra level of security, most often because of their content or format. By centralizing these resources, the Permanent Reserve Collection can also enhance patron convenience while assisting library staff in meeting copyright compliance.

Formats and Types of Permanent Reserve Resources

- Art books
- Titles written by or about African-Americans
- Graphic novels and selected comic book-related resources
- Other works, as necessary and prudent

* For the Permanent Reserve Collection, the Library generally does not acquire:

- Resources that invite users to write on pages, fill in blanks, or complete questions by underlining
- Resources that are spiral-bound or in loose-leaf format
- Resources supporting programs or fields of study not taught at the University of Memphis

Resources acquired for the Permanent Reserve Collection should be reviewed at regular intervals and their circulation records checked. Those resources not contributing to the function of the Collection as described above should be withdrawn and/or returned to the general stacks.

Responsibility for Selection and Transfer

Library resources transferred from other collections to the Permanent Reserve Collection must be approved by the DRA Team, which will request the Cataloging Department to note the reason for the transfers and the name of the person requesting this action. While any library staff member or any faculty member can suggest transfers of resources to reserve status, only the DRA Team can authorize them. These measures will help in judging whether the resources should be retained in the Collection as it is reviewed.

Criteria for Retention

Nothing stated in this policy should be interpreted as interfering with the exercise of sound judgment in the selection of Permanent Reserve resources. The statements contained here are only guidelines and should be modified as warranted by the needs of the University of Memphis Libraries’ patrons.
Current Situation

• Despite an extra security gate, items in Permanent Reserve are more likely to be missing
• And, they are less likely to circulate
What’s Going On with These Numbers (Speculation)

• Higher theft in Oversize b/c that is the only area that has had an inventory

• Higher theft in Reserve b/c
  – Reserve Room no longer staffed at all times
  – Tempting books very close to front door

• Lower circulation in Reserve and Oversize b/c patrons still browse (as seen also in the book jacket study; other studies confirm separate Oversize sections have lower circulation)
My Investigations

• Spoke with faculty members in Art, Theatre, Paralegal – they explained the usefulness of Permanent Reserve to their instruction
• Spoke with staff members (esp. Greg Wood) in Circulation to understand the history of the Permanent Reserve collection
• Asked liaisons and circulation staff to weigh in on proposed new policy; received no objections
Proposed New Policy

• Does away with concerns about security
• Clarifies which materials should go into Permanent Reserve, and which should not
• Incorporates recent findings about patron behavior to direct books where they are most likely to be used
Proposed New Policy

The Permanent Reserve collection has two purposes. The first purpose is to serve as a depository for titles that teaching faculty expect to assign for course reading year after year. Having a permanent reserve saves them the trouble of placing the books on course reserve every semester. There are currently two such collections: Art and Art History (including Architecture and Photography) Theatre and Dance

Books should be added to these collections only at the request of teaching faculty.

The second purpose is to allow collocation of titles with similar content that would otherwise be scattered in the stacks because they are assigned non-consecutive call numbers. There are currently three such collections: Paralegal Studies Graphic Novels ANSI Standards

Books may be assigned to these collections based upon the recommendation of teaching faculty, or by Libraries staff or faculty based upon their bibliographic judgment.

There is another collection in Permanent Reserve, African-American literature. The African-American Literature collection in permanent reserve contains additional copies of literature, biographies, and criticism by and of renowned African-American authors. If only one copy of such a title is in the collection, that copy should be in the stacks. Works of African-American history and other topics are to be shelved in the stacks.

To clarify: The Permanent Reserve collection is not intended to provide additional security against theft.

\(^1\)The presence of the African-American Literature collection in Permanent Reserve originated in a desire for added security for these titles. Upon review of longitudinal data, the belief that locating books in Permanent Reserve reduces theft appears to be untrue. In the interest of saving staff time, the titles in the African-American literature collection will not be moved until further notice.
Report of the 2014-2015 Faculty Senate Library Policies Committee
Regarding the University Libraries
January 16, 2015

I. Introduction and Background Information

In September 2014, the Faculty Senate’s President, Dr. Reginald Green, charged the Faculty Senate Library Policies Committee to review and summarize key points presented in a report (the "Redefining Report") that the Redefining the University Libraries Committee ("the Redefining Committee") provided to President Rudd on May 30, 2014. Provost Rudd appointed the Redefining Committee\(^1\) in February 2014 to prepare a visioning report with recommendations for the future direction of the University of Memphis Libraries ("the University Library").\(^2\)

In October 2014, President Rudd and Interim Provost Weddle-West attended a meeting of the Library Policies Committee to discuss the Redefining Report and the results of a survey soliciting responses to that report from University Library faculty and staff and Information Technology Services staff ("the Redefining Report Survey").\(^3\) After that meeting and a discussion with President Green, the Library Policies Committee’s charge expanded to include providing feedback regarding the Redefining Report and identifying funding sources for the University Library other than E&G funding. The Redefining Report did not address funding. To identify alternative sources of funding, the Library Policies Committee reviewed the 2013 report (the "Library Funding Report")\(^4\) of the University Libraries Funding Committee (the "Library Funding Committee"). President Raines appointed the Library Funding Committee in 2012.\(^5\)

This Report of the 2014-2015 Library Policies Committee Regarding the University Libraries presents the Library Policy Committee’s feedback after its review of the Library Funding Report, the Redefining Report, and several publicly available surveys and reports.\(^6\)

---

\(^1\) Membership of the Redefining Committee was comprised of University Library, campus and community leaders. Ellen Watson, Chief Information Officer and Vice Provost of Information Technology, chaired the Redefining Committee. REDCERNING THE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES COMMITTEE, FINAL REPORT 1 (2014). Senator Tom Hrach served as the Faculty Senate representative on the Redefining Committee. Senator D.R. Jones was a back-up for Senator Hrach and did not serve on the Redefining Committee.

\(^2\) See id.; Email from President Rudd to All Faculty and Staff (October 15, 2014).

\(^3\) CENTER FOR RESEARCH IN EDUCATIONAL POLICY, DATA SUMMARY REPORT, REDEFINING THE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES REPORT AND FEEDBACK SURVEY (September 23, 2014). This survey was conducted at the request of Interim Provost Weddle-West. Id. at 1.

\(^4\) UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES FUNDING COMMITTEE, Untitled and Undated Report to Provost Rudd, sent via email from Provost Rudd to Faculty Senators 2012-2013 and Other Recipients (June 10, 2013).

\(^5\) A further discussion of the Library Funding Committee is included under section II.A.

\(^6\) The Library Policies Committee identifies these documents throughout its report.
II. Funding for the University Library

A. Evidence of Funding Inadequacy; Appointment of the Library Funding Committee

The Library Policies Committee notes that there is evidence of inadequacy in University Library funding. Faculty Senate concerns regarding University Library funding lead to President Raines’ appointment of the Library Funding Committee in 2012.

1. Comparison of Funding. A comparison of the University Library’s funding with that of other research libraries indicates a lower level of funding for the University Library. The University Library is a member of the Association of Southern Research Libraries ("ASERL"). For fiscal year 2013, the University Library ranked next to last out of thirty-seven ASERL members for total library expenditures. The University Library is on probation in ASERL due to its level of funding.

2. Difficulty in Providing Resources. There is also evidence of the University Library’s difficulty in providing resources that meet the needs of faculty. The 2011-2012 Faculty Senate Library Policies Committee conducted a survey of faculty in early 2012 to determine what “work arounds” faculty were using to obtain resources when the University Library did not have the resources or online access. Results of the survey indicated that faculty members were using several means to obtain resources including purchasing resources with personal funds and borrowing from friends and colleagues.

3. Appointment of the Library Funding Committee. Following announcement of the results of this survey, the 2011-2012 Library Policies Committee expressed that the University Administration should “give the highest priority to funding the University Libraries.” In April 2012, the Faculty Senate, upon the recommendation of the Library Policies Committee, passed a resolution regarding funding for the University Library. This resolution, among other recommendations, exhorted the President to form a joint faculty-administrative committee that would develop a plan to increase funding for the Library. President Raines appointed the Library Funding Committee in Fall 2012. After receiving the Library Funding Report, Provost Rudd distributed it to the Faculty Senate in June 2013.

---

1 ASERL Statistical Data Backfiles. Fall 2013 Statistical Index, http://www.aserl.org/about/stats. The University Library’s total library expenditures for fiscal year 2013 were $9,169,011. By comparison, the University of Tennessee had $26,006,293 in total library expenditures during that period. Id.
2 MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE 3 (February 21, 2012), http://www.memphis.edu/facultysenate/minutes/1112AY/fs_minutes_2_21_12.pdf (reporting that the survey was in process).
3 MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE 3 (March 27, 2012), http://www.memphis.edu/facultysenate/minutes/1112AY/fs_minutes_3_27_12.pdf (reporting results of the survey).
4 Id.
5 MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE 10 (April 17, 2012), http://www.memphis.edu/facultysenate/minutes/1112AY/fs_minutes_4_17_12.pdf.
6 Email from Provost Rudd to Faculty Senators and Other Recipients 2012-2013 (June 30, 2013).
B. 2014-2015 Library Policies Committee Consideration of Funding

At a meeting with the Library Policies Committee in October 2014, President Rudd discussed the need to identify funding sources for the University Library other than E&G funding. The Library Policies Committee could not do a new investigation but offered to review the recommendations from the Library Funding Committee.

1. Need for More Information. The Library Policies Committee notes that to determine whether specific alternative funding choices will address funding needs, there has to be more information regarding University Library funding issues. This information is not available in the Library Funding Report. In addition, a discussion of University Library funding needs and means of funding must include consideration of the SRI budget model. The following is a list of the information needed before any decision can be made regarding alternative funding recommendations for the University Library:

a. A specification of the amount of money that the Library needs.

i. If the Library is going to maintain membership in ASERL, what amount of funding does the Library need? Does the Library want to initially just meet the threshold requirement? Is there a library that the University Library wants to emulate?

ii. Without regard to ASERL, what amount of money does the University Library need to address collection needs? Personnel needs? Equipment needs? Overall budget needs?

b. A report that reflects a thorough examination of the funding allocation of current Library funds and whether there could be repurposing of funds.

2. Recommendations from the Library Funding Report. The Library Funding Report discussed six possible sources of revenue for the University Library. The Library Policies Committee recommends moving forward with two of those recommendations, as discussed below. The Library Policies Committee does not take a position on the remaining recommendations. Those recommendations require further study once the information described in section 1 above is provided.

a. Recommendation: Hire a University Development Officer for the University Library. This recommendation is based on the Library Funding Report’s Recommendation 3.b. which discussed the need to increase the amount of advancement work on behalf of the University Library. At the time of the Library Funding Committee work, an advancement officer who had worked one quarter time on behalf of the University Library had left. The Library Funding Committee recommended that a development representative spend fifty percent of his or her time on fundraising for the University Library. The Library Policies Committee recommends a full-time development officer.

13 Library Funding Report at unnumbered pages 3-4.
Endowments can augment otherwise limited funding for libraries. Building a base of endowments requires the concentrated effort of professional, full-time development officers with expertise in garnering external support for libraries. Currently, the University of Memphis lacks even a single development officer dedicated to the University Libraries. Anyone interested in donating money to the University Library is directed to the Office of the Dean of Libraries rather than the Office of Development.\textsuperscript{14} While volunteers like the Friends of the Libraries contribute and solicit financial support, volunteers are not a substitute for trained development staff. The hiring of a development officer should take into consideration a means by which this position could generate funding to support the position.

b. Recommendation: The Student Government Association should consider adding a University Libraries Fee of $10 per semester to the Student General Access Fee. This recommendation is based on Recommendation 3.f. in the Library Funding Report.\textsuperscript{15} To institute a new fee, there would need to be a student vote. The fee should be designated for a specific purpose or purposes within the University Library. Information about University Library needs for funding could help inform this choice. Recently, University of Memphis students have shown a willingness to approve increases in student fees for specific purposes. For example, the students approved an increase in fees of $307 per year to fund the construction of a recreation center.\textsuperscript{16} In November 2014, the Student Government Association voted to raise the student activity fee by $10 a year to fund big-ticket entertainment.\textsuperscript{17} Consideration of a fee for a particular library-related purpose should take into account that the University Library already receives some student-paid fees in the form of technology access fees. Students, however, do not designate the use for these fees.\textsuperscript{18}

III. 2014-2015 Library Policy Committee Feedback Regarding the Redefining Report

President Rudd and Interim Provost Weddle-West attended the October 1, 2014 meeting of the Library Policies Committee. At this meeting President Rudd asked the Committee to provide feedback on the Redefining Report. It was difficult to provide feedback because the Redefining Report did not provide adequate data and reasoning to support the Redefining Committee's assertions and recommendations. Overall the Redefining Report is inadequate to support decision making. To provide feedback the Library Policies Committee first identified broad categories of concern in the Redefining Report. The Library Policies Committee then reviewed several publicly available documents to seek additional verification for the identified areas of concern. This section provides the Library Policies Committee's feedback regarding the Redefining Report.

\textsuperscript{15}Library Funding Report at unnumbered page 4.
\textsuperscript{18}The University of Memphis Deans' TAF Committee decides on the use of TAF funds.
A. Area of Concern: Organizational Structure. One of the three subcommittees of the Redefining Committee examined organizational structure of the University Library. The Redefining Report suggests that there is a need to revise an “overly constricting” organizational structure. The Redefining Committee’s recommendation for restructuring is to merge “library and IT Services into a single Information Services unit.” The Library Policies Committee does not take a position on the merger recommendation. This merger is a possible means to change organizational structure. The Redefining Report does not give adequate information to support a change in structure or to assess this specific recommendation. The Redefining Report does not provide clear goals that the merger would help achieve. It does not discuss alternative structural changes and does discuss why the IT merger is the best choice among other alternatives. The Redefining Report does not discuss possible consequences of a merger such as the effect on IT. A decision regarding structural change needs to come after, among other things, an articulation of goals, an identification and review of alternatives, and a review of consequences. The Library Policies Committee recommends that if there is a need to review University Library structure, an outside consultant who is familiar with structural review of academic libraries needs to facilitate this work.

B. Area of Concern: Leadership and Administration. The Redefining Report did not directly address or discuss leadership and administration. Comments contained in the Redefining Report Survey however, did question the effectiveness of the University Library administration and leadership. The Library Policies Committee also reviewed the ClimateQUAL 2012 Report and the University Library faculty reviews of administration from the last three academic years. These documents indicate a pattern of similar issues with University Library leadership and administration across a number of assessments over several years. After reviewing these documents, the Library Policies Committee refers these concerns to Interim Provost Weddle-West to address as the supervisor of the Dean of University Libraries.

C. Area of Concern: Personnel. The Redefining Report recommends a reevaluation of personnel job descriptions “for appropriate classification and compensation.” The Report does not give a reason for this recommendation. Other documentation shows University Library support for this recommendation. The Redefining Committee held a Library staff meeting and an
open campus meeting on April 28, 2014.\textsuperscript{26} At the Library staff meeting Library staff voiced the need to evaluate job descriptions and the library assistant job family.\textsuperscript{27}

The Library Policies Committee recommends a review and evaluation of staff positions in the University Library. This review, coordinated through Human Resources, would focus on the evaluation of individual staff positions to determine appropriate classification and compensation for that particular position. A broader review would encompass examining the library assistant family in the Library. The library assistant family consists of the positions in the University Library that are classified as library assistant I, II, or III. The review would consider, among other things, whether there need to be more levels in this family and the appropriate compensation range.

D. Area of Concern: Services. One of the three subcommittees of the Redefining Committee examined University Library services.\textsuperscript{28} The Redefining Report mentions some examples of services that the University Library could provide but does not discuss those services. Some of the suggestions are for services that already exist. For example, the University Library has “embedded” librarians in online courses.\textsuperscript{29} The Library Policies Committee cannot comment on services because there is no or not enough information in the Redefining Report about the specific needs for services in the University Library.

E. Area of Concern: Facilities. One of the three subcommittees of the Redefining Committee examined University Library facilities.\textsuperscript{30} The Redefining Report does not specifically discuss changes in existing library spaces.\textsuperscript{31} It offers a list of spaces that the University Library should provide to facilitate research and learning.\textsuperscript{32} Suggested spaces are: “group study rooms, multi-purpose instruction spaces, collaborative learning commons, graduate learning commons, silent reading room, writing center and media center.”\textsuperscript{33} The Redefining Report does not describe or discuss these suggested spaces. It references the writing center in connection with supporting University initiatives\textsuperscript{34} but does not discuss how other suggestions could also support University goals. The Redefining Report also does not mention whether some of these spaces already exist. For example, there is a Center for Writing and Communication (Writing Center) located in the University Library.\textsuperscript{35} Providing a writing center is a University initiative that serves the University’s core teaching mission and directly relates to the University’s retention and graduation goals.\textsuperscript{36} The Library Policies Committee supports the use

\textsuperscript{26} REDEFINING THE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES COMMITTEE, FINAL REPORT app. B, at 1, 5 (2014).
\textsuperscript{27} Id. at 4.
\textsuperscript{28} REDEFINING THE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES COMMITTEE, FINAL REPORT 1 (2014).
\textsuperscript{29} UNIVERSITY OF MEMPHIS, UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES, A SELF STUDY 30 (2014),
http://www.memphis.edu/administration/pdfs/Self%20Study%202014.pdf.
\textsuperscript{30} Id.
\textsuperscript{31} See REDEFINING THE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES COMMITTEE, FINAL REPORT 7 (2014) (The Redefining Report states that it does not address “existing spaces.”).
\textsuperscript{32} Id. at 5.
\textsuperscript{33} Id.
\textsuperscript{34} Id. at 4.
\textsuperscript{35} CENTER FOR WRITING AND COMMUNICATION, WELCOME TO THE CWC!, http://www.memphis.edu/cwc/.
\textsuperscript{36} M. David Rudd, U of M to Develop Center for Writers, THE UNIVERSITY OF MEMPHIS PROVOST’S BLOG (March 6, 2014), http://blogs.memphis.edu/provost/2014/03/06/u-of-m-to-develop-center-for-writers/. The Development of a writing center was discussed in the UNIVERSITY OF MEMPHIS UNDERGRADUATE RECRUITMENT, ENROLLMENT AND
of University Library space for the Writing Center, including any future expansion. The Library Policies Committee also supports further exploration with the Office of Space Planning to incorporate or expand the other suggested spaces. The Library Policies Committee also recommends exploration of the suggestions submitted by Kathryn Johnson, Director Space Planning and Utilization.

IV. Submission of the Library Policies Committee's Report and Recommendation

The 2014-2015 Library Policies Committee submits its Report Regarding the University Libraries to the University of Memphis Faculty Senate. The Library Policies Committee recommends that the Faculty Senate approve the transmittal of this Report to the University of Memphis President and Interim Provost and to all University of Memphis faculty members.

The 2014-2015 University Faculty Senate Library Policies Committee
D.R. Jones(Senator, Law) (Chair)
Vania Barraza Toledo (Senator, Foreign Languages)
Lorraine Ann Meiners-Lovel (Senator, University College)
Ladrica Menson-Furr (Senator, English)
Michael Schmidt (Senator, Art)

---

37 A member of the Library Policies Committee, Professor Meiners-Lovel, contacted Dr. William Duffy, Interim Director of the Center for Writing and Communication, regarding the Center's space needs in the University Library. He stated that the space they are using now is fine for the foreseeable future, but their needs may change as they expand the Center's hours and add more tutors.

38 These suggestions are in Appendix C to the Refining Report, McWherter Library—Observations and Recommendations, Space Planning and Utilization, REDEFINING THE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES COMMITTEE, FINAL REPORT, Appendix C (2014).
Report of the 2014-2015 Faculty Senate Library Policies Committee
Regarding the University Libraries
January 16, 2015

Summary

The 2014-2015 Library Policies Committee has completed its charges to: (1) provide feedback regarding non-E&G funding for the University Libraries after reviewing the 2013 report of the University Libraries Funding Committee (the “Funding Report”) and (2) provide feedback on the 2014 report of the Redefining the University Libraries Committee (the “Redefining Report”). The Report of the 2014-2015 Library Policies Committee Regarding the University Libraries presents the Library Policy Committee’s feedback after its review of these two reports and several publically available surveys and reports.

With regard to non-E&G funding: The Library Policies Committee identified information needed before any decision can be made regarding non-E&G funding for the University Library. The Library Policies Committee endorsed moving forward with two of the recommendations in the Funding Report and endorsed further study of the remaining recommendations in that report.

With regard to the Redefining Report: It was difficult for the Library Policies Committee to provide feedback because the Redefining Report did not provide adequate data and reasoning to support the Redefining Committee’s assertions and recommendations. To provide feedback the Library Policies Committee identified broad categories of concern in the Redefining Report. One of the concerns in the Redefining Report related to the organizational structure of the University Library. The Redefining Report recommended a merger of Library and IT Services. The Library Policies Committee took a neutral position on this recommendation because there was no data to support the recommendation. Other areas of concern were: Leadership and Administration; Personnel; Services; and Facilities.

Please refer to the full report for more discussion and details.

The Library Policies Committee requests that the Faculty Senate approve the transmittal of the Report of the 2014-2015 Faculty Senate Library Policies Committee Regarding the University Libraries to the University of Memphis President and Interim Provost and to all University of Memphis faculty members.
Motion by D.R. Jones, Chair of the Library Policies Committee.

Motion: That the Faculty Senate approve the transmittal of the Report of the 2014-2015 Faculty Senate Library Policies Committee Regarding the University Libraries to the University of Memphis President and Interim Provost and to all University of Memphis faculty members.