

**Advisory Group for Research Services and Scholarly Resources
(AGRSSR)
Minutes
July 29, 2008
Library West Conference Room, 429**

Members Present: Joe Aufmuth, Denise Bennett, Christopher Vallandingham, Sam Huang, John Ingram (Chair), Paul Lightcap (for Jason Fleming), Ann Lindell, Peter McKay, Angela Mott, Marilyn Ochoa, Bobbie Parker, Patrick Reakes, Dan Reboussin, Judy Russell, Betsy Simpson, Carl Van Ness, Ben Walker

Members Absent: Michele Crump, HSCL Representative

John apologized for this meeting not being scheduled sooner and explained Judy is sitting in because she will chair this group in the fall while John is on sabbatical.

1. Review of AGRSSR Charge

The AGRSSR charge has been slightly revised. Over the next year John hopes to solidify what this group's objectives are and how it will function within the new library organizational structure. AGRSSR members were asked if they had any questions/suggestions/comments about the charge.

Question: If this is an advisory group where are decisions made and how does this group correlate to Library Council, the Chairs that report to John, etc.?

Answer: This group is separate from the Library Council; however, it will feed into some of what will go on in Library Council. The group is really dedicated only to content and how content is provided to user groups. Right now the group is an advisory group to John; but, he expects as the group develops, how it works and what it does may change.

Question: What about representation from the department previously known as Reference Services?

Answer: Each member serving on AGRSSR from a branch library will represent all aspects of their respective branch.

Question: When sub groups are formed will representation on those groups include individuals outside of the AGRSSR Group.

Answer: Yes, when task forces/sub groups are formed representation will be based upon the issues being addressed.

2. Setting the agenda

AGRSSR members will set the agenda based on feedback from their constituencies.

3. Membership

A couple of entities are not represented on the AGRSSR Group. Digital Library Services is not represented by choice and intention. Business Services is also not represented. Currently, Digital Library Services is under Bill Covey and is not seen as needing to be included based on the new library organization. This may change once the new Associate Dean for Technical & Support Services is hired and on board. Each of these entities will be asked to attend meetings on an as needed basis.

4. Establishing task forces/sub-groups

John asked AGRSSR members if they had suggestions for taskforces/sub groups that need to be formed to address issues now.

Suggestion: Circulation Policy Sub Group with representation from each of the branches to initially meet monthly to handle outstanding issues and then meet on an as needed basis.

Response: John believes the main criteria that Access Support will look at (not legislate) is general library circulation functions; policy and procedures.

Question: Can Access Support create a separate group?

Answer: Judy cautioned against rushing into creating departmental standing committees versus creating a task force under AGRSSR to address specific issues as they arise.

Question: Is it possible to get a list of committees that will continue to meet as well as a list of the committees that have been/will being dissolved? It would be helpful to have this information in order to know how to allocate staffing in reference to committee service.

Answer: Bill Covey is currently reviewing the existing committee structure to compile a list of committees that no longer meet due to the reorganization, are continuing to meet and should be reviewed to determine if they should continue to meet. The deans/director will review this list upon its completion to determine how to move ahead with the committee structure.

AGRSSR members were asked to begin working on planning on the successor to Circle Managers. At last week's Circle Managers meeting John stated the group would be transitioning and their function would morph into something else.

5. Materials budget

John is under the impression the current allocation system was based on the Majors Report. The last time the Majors Report was run was approx. two years ago. It is probably time to review how the materials budget (endowment and operating) is distributed.

Question: How did the allocation systems currently in place come to be?

Answer: It is believed it was loosely related to the Majors Report and perhaps based on percentages; however, there does not seem to be a specific allocation formula. No one seemed to be able to offer a conclusive answer.

6. Endowment funds

Currently, approximately \$424,302.26 is generated by endowments to use to purchase materials. The goal is to grow endowments to such a level that continuations could be supported using endowment funds. The hope is to also eventually be able to use endowment funds to alleviate the need for some of the operating budget. Samuel Huang is/will be working aggressively to build endowments in subject areas; current and new. He has had the opportunity to visit some areas in the library and looks forward to meeting with additional areas. He is trying to determine where the needs are in order to give him and Alicia Antone hard data and some language to use to raise funds. Standardized language for endowments is being drafted to allow for a broader use scope for future endowments, such as, processing, exhibits, etc. Where there are living trustees for current endowments Sam is trying to work with them to restate the purpose to allow for broader use.

Peter McKay distributed an endowment report as of June 30, 2008. A suggestion was made to add a column to provide an estimated annual new income. This would assist selectors in planning future acquisitions. It was noted approximately 4% of the principle will be the new income for the next year.

Over the next year the AGRSSR Group will need to look at how to transition from acquiring content through the operating budget to endowment funds. The group will also need to determine how to serve up the content. Are there mechanisms and/or programs (models) we can look to elsewhere where endowments actually fund public services, i.e. Guitar Hero, Web 2.0, etc.

7. Information technology

John believes this is an area where AGRSSR can play a very strong role because it is more and more through information technology the library is able to provide users with the information they need. Knowing the relationship between the content and how to provide it to users is important. Systems is not represented on AGRSSR; however, representation from this area will be asked to attend meetings on an as needed basis, e.g. their help in self check in machines.

The University will convert to an Active Directory sometime between August 8th & 15th, 2008. Patrons will log on using GatorLink ID; not their 14 digit library number. If patrons experience difficulties logging on they will have to be referred to the UF Help Desk. The Active Directory will only affect computer use and not how patrons use ALEPH.

It was noted that a meeting to discuss library hours needs to be held in the immediate future.

Side issue: Comments were made on the role of individuals recently transferred into Systems and their continued participation in public service. If those individuals wish to continue serving in a public service role and there is an area that can use their services a written request should be submitted to their supervisor in Systems.

8. Digital initiatives

Digital initiatives will be discussed on an as needed basis.

One of the areas that need to continue to be addressed is an evaluation of where individual subject collections fall and where within those collections are opportunities for:

- a. digitization efforts to make the content more available
- b. grant supported digitization efforts
- c. opportunities for cooperation among the CSUL group for sharing information
- d. commercial opportunities

The AGRSSR Group needs to determine how to transition to having selectors review these opportunities and determine priorities for digitization.

Question: Will there be a comprehensive review of current projects?

Answer: Erich Kesse is compiling a list of current projects.