

4/13/2015

To: SJSU Academic Senate

Fr: Daryl Eggers; Chair, University Library Board

Re: Q & A Document

On the subsequent pages you will find a compilation of questions and related information from the ULB pertaining to proposed revisions of the Senate Library Policy. The first section provides information pertaining to the questions raised by Senator Peter. The second section provides information related to questions posed during the Senate meeting on March 2nd. The third section contains answers to questions sent to the ULB from multiple sources.

These questions led to fruitful discussions in the ULB as well as changes to the proposed updates in the Library Policy. In each case where the policy has been updated, the ULB provides a reference to the relevant section of the policy. We are also providing a comparison file that highlights the changes between the readings of AS 1557 on Mar 2 and Apr 27.

Thank you for your time in reviewing all of these documents.

Contents:

- I. Comments/Updates in response to Questions/Suggestions from Senator Peter (pg 1-9).
- II. Questions from the Academic Senate's 1st reading of policy on March 2, 2015 (pg 10-12).
- III. Additional Questions (pg 13-18).

I. COMMENTS/UPDATES IN RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS/SUGGESTIONS FROM SENATOR PETER

1. **Confidentiality.** With regard to confidentiality of patron records, 3.1.2, I would prefer that the phrase “include but are not limited to” from the old policy be retained in the new policy. This revision makes it appear as if those records that the Library will keep confidential have narrowed over the old protections. Since specific records are listed, the revision makes it seem as if any other records that might be created would not be covered under the confidentiality clause.

Comment/Update: As recommended by Senator Lessow-Hurley, we’ve placed here language from the California Public Records Act. We have also incorporated language that sustains this principle of confidentiality for SJSU regardless of any future changes to the California Public Records Act. (Please see 3.1 in the new draft.)

2. **Recall.** With regard to recall of materials that can be checked out—3.1.4—it appears that the option of recalling materials is now gone. I presume this would be a rarer occurrence than it once was because of interlibrary services, but is it never to be used? What about a one-of-a-kind book?

Comment/Update: Reference to recall has been reinstated in 4.1. As always, the library seeks to provide requested materials in the swiftest manner possible.

3. **Complete freedom.** In 3.4, I would prefer that you not delete the word “complete” from the phrase “complete freedom of information” that appears in the old policy. The strongest possible language is needed to fight off the censorship efforts, such as that engineered by Pete Constant (City Council) not so many years ago.

Comment/Update: Agreed. See 3.4.

4. **Check out period for faculty.** In the circulation section, why is the privilege of faculty to check out books until the end of the semester revoked (the old 4.2.1)? Is it just no longer relevant?

Comment/Update: In Section 4.1, we have clarified that faculty semester loans are part of borrowing periods, thus they are not revoked. Faculty loan periods remain 12/1/yy or 5/1/yy. Item 4 also now provides the URL to operational policies which would cover this

in accordance with the original policy's Item 2.7.2. (<http://library.sjsu.edu/policies-procedures>)

5. **Policy vs. regulation.** The policy refers to the Library's "fines and fees" policy (4.3). Please rename that document so as to not use the word "policy." "Policy" has a specific meaning at San Jose State—documents passed by the Senate and signed by the President. Might I suggest "regulations" as an alternative?

Comment/Update: In much the same way that departments and colleges have internal operating policies, the library needs to have operating policies and procedures. They are publicly available and address the details of everyday activities in the library. (<http://library.sjsu.edu/policies-procedures>)

6. **High demand items.** A general question about the ability under the old policy for the University Library to further restrict circulation of "high demand" items. (This was a very contentious issue when negotiating with the City of San Jose which wanted complete and unfettered access to all University materials without restriction. We argued that there could be some portions of the collection that might be so severely impacted by general public use that it could harm our ability to teach certain courses.) This protection is now stricken from the new draft. Question: has there been a careful circulation study of the academic collection to determine if there has been any undue impact on individual disciplines or sub-disciplines that could justify the use of this protection?

Comment/Update: Cross-circulation of the collection is monitored, as there are multiple ways that circulation data can be generated. Cross-circulation statistics can be viewed by title, which is typically conducted by individual liaison librarians using features accessible to them through the library's catalog. Assessing the impact of cross-circulation at this level is a function of the liaison librarian's collection development assignment within a subject area. Additionally, reviews of cross-circulation are done in aggregate, revealing that circulation usage by all patron types has been decreasing over time. The most current review (July 2014-March 2015) of this aggregate data shows public borrowing of the SJSU collection is at 24,930 items, whereas SJSU borrowing of the SJPL collection is at 43,195 items. Thus, the current state of circulation is that SJSU patrons are making greater use of the public collection than the public patrons are of the academic collection.

7. Budget priority for security. In section 6, Security of the collection, the requirement to prioritize the physical security of the collection from natural disasters has been dramatically watered-down (pun intended.) I am concerned that the Library could become prone to flooding either in its basement areas if the seal against the high water table cracks in an earthquake, and on all floors in the event of sprinklers going off. Given these potential catastrophes, why would we want to weaken this language? The new language almost sounds as if the policy is saying “we will protect the print collection but only if we can afford to do so.” Why should the Senate endorse such a retrenchment on safety?

- a. OLD: Installation, regular maintenance, and necessary replacement of flood control equipment, fire suppression equipment, earthquake mitigations, and other repairs and equipment necessary to assure the physical safety and condition of the collection in the event of flood, fire, earthquake, or disaster shall always occupy the Library's highest budgetary priority, after any measures necessary to assure public safety. Regular maintenance of such equipment shall never be deferred.
- b. NEW: In light of budgetary realities, every effort will be made to maintain the physical security of collections from damage, theft and natural disaster.

Comment/Update: See update to 6.1. In addition to regular and periodic testing by outside agencies, high budgetary priority is given to assure the physical safety and condition of the library collection.

8. Browsing. In the Evaluation of the Print Collection policy, the original phrase reads as follows (my highlight):

- a. “Maintaining a high-quality academic Library collection requires periodic evaluation of the collection with reference to the mission of the University and periodic relocating or discarding of materials. In all cases, the primary goals are to improve the effectiveness of browsing and to provide space for new acquisitions.”
- b. Please restore this phrase that has been deleted from the new policy draft. Browsing remains a highly desirable feature of our academic print collection and the Senate should oppose any policy shift that devalues it.

Comment/Update: Agreed. See update to text under policy Sections 1.1, 1.2 and 7. Effective browsing of the print collection is crucial, and its importance has been emphasized.

9. *Departments vs. interdisciplinary programs.* In 7.2 “Withdrawal of Materials” the policy draft reads “The Library recognizes that each academic department has a unique set of needs in regards to library use and materials.” Could this be phrased more expansively, such as using the phrase “both disciplinary and interdisciplinary programs” instead of “academic departments? I am concerned that the collection serves the needs of many programs that cross the boundary lines of academic departments, and they should lose a voice in the deselection process.

Comment/Update: Agreed. See section 7.2.2. Note that departments will still need to be consulted as these are the current organizational units. The cross-boundaries facet can be accommodated both in the identification of relevant departments to be consulted throughout, and in the campus-wide review periods.

10. *Why the discard policy cannot be discipline-based.* In 7.2.2.1 it states that “The liaison librarian will collaborate with the specific department associated with the relevant Library of Congress classification.” I have no objection to this happening, but it is far from sufficient. I wish the phrase “the specific department” read “all associated departments.” Many faculty—I would guess in fact MOST faculty—have teaching needs and research interests that extend well beyond the narrow boundaries of their home department.

- a. To take myself as an example, I am housed in Political Science but am a political theorist. My degree is actually in Politics, not Political Science (Princeton is sensible that way!) Political theory is sometimes classified as political philosophy or as intellectual history and parts of it appear as the history of sociology or as the history of economics or as Classics or as Religious Studies. I would like to have as much of a right to protect a book on Max Weber’s social theory as members of the Sociology department, as much a right to protect a book on St. Augustine’s political thought as a member of the Religious Studies program (housed in the Humanities Department,) as much right to protect a book on Plato’s Republic as a member of the Philosophy Department, etc. And those are just my research interests—and keep in mind that this is NORMAL for many faculty.
- b. To continue with myself as an example, I teach in the Humanities Honors Program as well as Political Science. In the HHP I am expected to integrate Art, Music, History, Politics, Literature, Rhetoric, etc. In order to teach in fields that draw from numerous disciplines outside my own graduate studies, I regular browse for books in those disciplines to help me prep for my teaching. I would like to have a right to protect a book that I will use to prepare me to teach my course even if that book is in art, music, literature, and other fields outside my preparation.

- c. In short, any kind of limitation on decision making about the discard of books that is based on artificial divisions between academic disciplines is unrealistic and flies in the face of 50 years of steadily softening boundary lines in academia. This is the worst feature of the policy, in my view, and makes the current draft unsupportable. Please work on a change.

Comment/Update: The review process is designed to give all faculty campus wide the opportunity to review all items under consideration for withdrawal. The library uses the Library of Congress classification system to sort the library's collection into different subject areas. This review process that begins in 7.2.2.1 includes all departments associated with the particular Library of Congress classification area, and faculty campus-wide are involved in the review process in section 7.2.2.2

Any request to retain books will be conveyed to the departments involved in the final review. We anticipate that those requests would be honored. In the event a department feels strongly about removing an item that has been requested to be kept, the liaison librarian can convene a meeting to discuss the item in question. This potentially results in more cross-disciplinary collaboration among faculty. Language updated in 7.2.2 and 7.2.2.3 clarifies this point.

11. Collection is the property of all of us. Also on 7.2.2.1 the draft policy reads “The liaison librarian will collaborate with the specific department associated with the relevant Library of Congress classification to determine the criteria for reviewing the associated collection.” I am uncomfortable with this conceptually for two reasons:

- a. First, the collection belongs the University and not to single departments. Let's say we have an Economics department that hates Marxism (Lydia, I know that is ancient history—this is a for instance!) What if the Econ department determined that all Marxist economics texts were obsolete, irrelevant, etc. and agreed to discard them. But what if the Political Science Department was filled with Marxists, and wanted to keep those books? Or what if there was simply a club of Marxist graduate students who wanted to keep those books, and no academic department wanted them? Should we really throw them away? We have been through ideological purges before—this is not necessarily farfetched.
- b. Second, past history proves that liaisons and their associated departments can badly error when left to set their own criteria. The discard of 9000 Political Science texts in 1996 is what provoked the original policy on discards. The liaison was very well intentioned and the faculty he consulted paid little attention. The fact that many of the 9000 books proved to be important resources for another department went unnoticed.

Comment/Update: Inclusion of multiple departments in the review process has been clarified and updated in Section 7.2.2

12. Too short a time frame for consultation before discard. In section 7.2.2.2 the policy purports to give interdisciplinary input a chance in the decision to discard books. I have two issues here.

- a. The timeframe given is 30 days. This appears in the old policy, but this time frame has already been proven to be grossly inadequate and will simply lead to more gridlock in discards. For discarding to be done intelligently, faculty need not to feel threatened or rushed. It takes 30 days just to get people's attention during a busy time of the semester. The reaction of faculty looking at a long list of books with inadequate time to consider their merits is to simply throw up their hands and veto every discard. Most of the books being considered for discard are 30 years old or older. Why should a book that has been on the shelf for 30 years be discarded in 30 days?
- b. SUGGESTION: Potential discards should be published at the beginning of every semester, and faculty must provide their input by the end of the semester. This actually gives faculty time to go and physically look at a book and not just play a "hunch" based on a title or author.

Comment/Update: See updates to Section 7.2. The time frame for the campus-wide review (7.2.2.2) is four weeks. However, this four week period is only the second step of a three step process. The final review (7.2.2.3) extends beyond this four-week time frame, and faculty from any department or program can continue to offer feedback through their liaison librarian. We recommend implementation and subsequent review of this proposed process and timeline. If modifications are needed in the future, the ULB can revisit the timeline.

13. New policy unacceptably narrows the final discard decision. In section 7.2.2.3 the final decision to preserve a book is made by "the department that is associated with the scope and range of the material." The existing policy allows any department to act to save the material, the revised policy allows just one department to make the decision—although other departments could offer advice. This in my view is unacceptable for all the reasons indicated in my point 11.

Comment/Update: See language updates to 7.2.2.3. The updated language is intended to clarify the process and provides a way to resolve conflicting views with respect to

withdrawals. In addition, the default position would be that items should be retained if requested at the campus-wide review.

14. *Internal contradiction about criteria for withdrawal.* Section 7.2.3 conflicts with 7.2.2.1. 7.2.3 lays out criteria for withdrawal with 7.2.2.1 says the liaisons will determine them.

Comment/Update: Section 7.2.3 states that these are examples of *general* criteria that may be taken into consideration. They are not necessarily applicable to every subject area. The actual criteria used would be developed in 7.2.2.1 by the liaison librarians in consultation with their departments. Item 7.2.3 presents general criteria commonly used in professional practice. They are the standard starting points in the practice of identifying potential items for withdrawal. Please also see new language in 7.2.3 as it now specifically draws attention to cross-disciplinary and historical research.

15. *Advantages of physical books should be acknowledged.* In Section 7.2.3.1 I would like to see the need for books to be physically and immediately available for browsing to at least be listed as a reason for keeping a book. While electronic copies or interlibrary loan are better than having no access, both are in some ways inferior to having a physical copy, and the superiority of immediately available physical texts should be at least one consideration when determining whether to discard a book.

Comment/Update: To clarify issues with respect to browsing and availability of the print collection, please see language updated in 1.1, 1.2, and 7.2.3.1. The library will continue to develop and maintain both the breadth and depth of the print collection. Decisions with respect to format are best left to faculty in individual departments and programs.

16. *Weight of usage pattern should be minimal at an academic library.* In Section 7.2.3.2 I would like an acknowledgement that a University Library should put little weight on usage in making its determination as to whether to discard a text. (Harlequin Romances probably circulate much better than Plato's Republic, but even if they circulated 10,000 times as much I would not discard the Republic.) I would like to see the original language of the old policy reinserted under this point: "Items, especially single copies, should not be discarded solely because of low use. Liaisons must be aware that any collection that supports student and faculty research will contain valuable materials that do not circulate frequently." This language has been weakened in the new draft.

Comment/Update: See update to 7.2.3.3. Usage is never the sole criterion in making a deselection decision. The original language has been added.

17. Avoid the controversy over book content. In Section 7.2.3.4 the policy lists “content” as a possible criterion for discard. The “content” issue will be decided solely by “the liaison librarian and the specific department associated with that Library of Congress classification to be no longer significant in terms of age, subject, or scope.” But it was in *exactly* this manner that the 9000 Political Science texts that were relevant to History were discarded in 1996. This criterion has already proven to be a minefield layered on top of a booby trap. Judging content is always a very, very dangerous thing in academia where one person’s obsolete is another person’s critical text. Confining the judgment about content to within a narrow disciplinary boundary is especially problematic. I would simply remove this criterion.

Comment/Update: See updated Item 7.2.2. While content remains an important consideration in some areas, decisions based on content will not be limited to narrow disciplinary boundaries.

18. Do not discard the provisions on Advancement. The draft policy completely removes the Advancement portion of the existing policy

- a. 8. Advancement of the Library Collection. University Advancement shall endeavor to raise funds for the support of the Library collection as a high priority. Normally, whenever the University uses the Library facility to help raise funds for the University, a significant portion of those funds should be designated for support of the acquisitions budget of the University Library.
- b. This policy may have ignored or violated by many administrations, but it was a hard fought battle to get it included and the answer should be better enforcement and not elimination of the requirement. This provision established that Advancement has an obligation to raise money for the University acquisitions budget, and that “normally” the Library should receive a cut of the funds raised using the Library facilities. Raising money for Libraries is already much harder than raising it for majors, since alums tend to want to donate to their home departments.
- c. OBJECTION: Why on earth would the Senate want to remove this provision from policy, and undermine advancement for the Library collection? We ought to be using this provision as a tool to help the Library, not conceding defeat by removing it.

Comment/Update: See new Section 9 pertaining to Advancement and funding.

19. Maintaining a print environment. I applaud the decision to add the bullet on line 108. How about slightly modifying it to read “Maintain a broad and deep print collection that is convenient to browse and desirable to use.” Frankly, having a bunch of print books in the basement or in off site locations is no better than only having them in e format. The point is NOT simply to have access to their content, but in helping to provide for an environment conducive to a culture of reading.

Comment/Update: See new second bullet in Section 1.2., as well as new language added to Section 1.1.

II. QUESTIONS FROM THE ACADEMIC SENATE'S 1ST READING OF POLICY ON MARCH 2, 2015

1. Senator Peter stated that given that the top concern by the faculty focus groups was the continued need of print books and given that the vision statement for LOFT mentions clearing books for other uses of the space, could the policy be reworked to ensure the expansion and protection of books.

Comment/Update: Language that reflects the library's commitment to collecting and protecting the print collection has been added in Sections 1.1 and 1.2. The proposed policy states a commitment to developing and maintaining an up-to-date collection that is convenient to browse and desirable to use on the 6th, 7th, and 8th floors of the library. Expansion specific to the print collection will depend on faculty requests for materials and available budget. The format (assuming availability) requested by faculty members is always honored.

2. Senator Frazier asked why Section 7.2.2.1 on criteria for withdrawal has changed since the previous version of the policy. The way it reads now looks like only one department has say over books.

Comment/Update: See updated Section 7.2.2. The proposed process involves multiple departments.

3. Senator Lessow-Hurley recommended citing the Confidentiality Act in Section 3.1.

Comment/Update: Done. See Section 3.1.

4. Senator Brown asked if the library has looked at the studies on reading ebooks vs. print.

Comment/Update: The library is cognizant of the ongoing examination of this topic. With regard to acquisitions, faculty requests for the format desired are honored.

5. Senator asked what happens to a book that is deselected.

Comment/Update: One of a few options:

- a. Books that are withdrawn from the catalog will be housed on public shelving for faculty to take for their personal use as is indicated in the library policy. After faculty have had sufficient time for review, students may take what books remain.
- b. Books will be offered to other libraries and nonprofits as gifts.
- c. After a designated period of time, any remaining books will be offered to the Friends of the King Library Bookstore (a separate non-profit organization) for resale. The Friends of the King Library then periodically make charitable donations to the University Library and San Jose Public Library.

6. A Senator asked why the entire Section 4 on Circulation was removed from the latest version of the policy.

Comment/Update: Much of this section pertains to regular operational matters of the library and are part of their operational policies. New language to clarify this has been added at the beginning of Section 4. In addition, a new Section 4.1 (bringing back language from original policy) provides information on how policies are established.

7. Senator Buzanski asked why the ULB thinks they have the right to address selection in the library's policy.

Comment/Update: The library's collection is its primary resource and regular review and subsequent de-selection of materials is a normal part of all academic libraries' procedures. Hence, the need for it to be part of the Library's policy.

8. Senator Grindstaff asked shouldn't we consider all the factors that contribute to the circulation of books, for example, tracking in-house use.

Comment/Update: Yes. Presently in-house tracking by title is only possible on the 2nd floor. On other floors only counts are available.

The library is actively exploring costs and options for implementing in-house tracking of usage on other floors that would enable tracking by title with the intent to implement something as soon as possible.

9. Senator Kimbarow asked if Emeritus Faculty could be added to 4.4.

Comment/Update: Yes. See Section 4.5.

10. A Senator asked if removing the Circulation section from the policy removes it from under the purview of the ULB.

Comment/Update: Language has been added to the beginning of Section 4 that clarifies where existing guidelines are found. Then, Section 4.1 clarifies that policies are established in consultation with the ULB.

11. Senator Van Selst asked– What is the “intent” of the circulation policy (basically, what is the Philosophy of Circulation)?

Comment/Update: Language added to Section 4 to express the intent of the circulation policy.

12. Student Senator questioned why the Dean is making decisions about specific books being put on Course Reserves for her classes.

Comment/Update: Reserves information has been added to the new 4.1 section, and language that was misleading was deleted. The Dean does not make decisions on course reserves – individual faculty do.

13. A Senator asked why the Library doesn’t consider storing books offsite rather than deselecting them.

Comment/Update: The library’s preference is to keep resources on site, with less frequently used materials retained in compact shelving.

14. Senator Peter asked if the decline in the purchase of print books could be causing the decline in the checkout rates for print books. Does this endanger our operating agreement with the City of the SJ?

Comment/Update: The steady decline in circulation rates of print materials dates prior to ebook availability. The connection between print purchases and checkout rates is indefinite. Comparable declining patterns in circulation have been seen in academic libraries nationwide. We are in compliance with our Operating Agreement with the City of San Jose.

15. Senator Lessow-Hurley asked if the committee would reconsider returning to the previous wording for collection security as “one of the highest obligations” as opposed to “an important obligation” as lowering the bar only lowers the chance for additional funding from the campus.

Comment/Update: See Section 6.1. Language has been modified to reflect security as a high priority and to emphasize regular equipment maintenance, as had been noted in the previous version of the policy.

III. ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS

1. Senator Peter recommended some language changes to the mission statement to reference an educational component to the mission.

Comment/Update: The University Library Board has modified the language to accommodate this suggestion. See Section 1.1.

2. Senator Peter recommended some language to add with regard to browsing in the collection portion of the mission statement.

Comment/Update: See Sections 1.1 and 1.2. The language has been updated.

3. A concern was raised. "Public library users do not have access to ebooks in the SJSU collection. In effect, we are violating a portion of the University Library's agreement with San Jose Public Library."

Comment/Update: Some of the ebooks are accessible by non-university affiliated library users and some are not. Those that are not accessible to the general public on site are those that are a part of the demand-driven ebook program that is in place. None of the ebooks are accessible by non-university library users remotely. This is because of the various individual licensing agreements.

Such a restriction on access is not in violation of the Operating Agreement between the City of San Jose and the University. The following section from the Operating Agreement pertains to this matter.

5.1.4 Electronic Materials.

The University and the City shall each attempt to negotiate licenses or other use agreements for the use by both the Members of the General Public and University Users of the respective electronic material and databases in the Joint Library if such use by the Members of the General Public or the University Users does not require the expenditure of additional funds for such licenses or other use agreements compared to the use by only

the Members of the General Public or the University Users, as the case may be. If such use were to require the expenditure of additional funds for such licenses or other use agreements, either Party shall have the right to restrict access to such electronic material or databases so as not to violate any agreements either Party has entered into regarding the use thereof.

4. Questions pertaining to how the University Library provides access to ebooks for our students and faculty.

Comment/Update:

A. Currently, large packages of ebooks acquired by license (such as Ebrary and Safari) are provided by the CSU Chancellor's Office and not at the campus level, meaning that the licensing does not come out of the SJSU library budget. The Electronic Access to Information Resources (EAR) committee (made up of library faculty from across the CSU) makes recommendations for what should be included in the Electronic Core Collection (ECC). http://www.calstate.edu/library/content/ear_members.shtml

B. Ebooks are purchased at the campus level either through the Demand Driven Acquisitions program (which automatically purchases high-demand ebooks) or selected by liaison librarians as part of the firm order process. These purchases allow perpetual access and are the Library's to keep with archival permissions, if ever needed.

C. Catalog records for ebooks available via the Hathi Trust, or otherwise freely available in the public domain, are loaded into the catalog with no purchase needed.

D. Occasionally we have one-time dollars for special purchases such as a previous year expenditure for ebooks with Student Success, Excellence and Technology Fee (SSETF) dollars or end of year dollars. These are purchased with perpetual access as well.

E. When faculty request a specific title for purchase, they can specify whether they wish to have it purchased as either a print book or an ebook to their liaison librarian.

F. Ebrary's Academic Complete, Springer, Elsevier, Palgrave, etc. and the Demand Driven Acquisitions program deliver multiple simultaneous-user ebooks. When buying individual ebooks, the library buys the multiple simultaneous-user option if available.

5. Question regarding library faculty representation on ULB.

Comment/Update: The current policy reads:

2.6.2.3 Three university library faculty who represent different professional specializations. These faculty will serve for staggered three-year terms.

2.6.3 Faculty members shall be nominated by the Executive Committee and approved by the Senate. Student members shall be nominated by Associated Students and approved by the Senate. Potential faculty nominees to the University Library Board must submit a one-page statement to the Executive Committee indicating their familiarity and experience with Library policy, services, and collections. The Executive Committee shall endeavor to nominate those with the greatest desire to serve and the highest qualifications.

Proposed policy to clarify that library faculty are ‘faculty’ and that they follow the same Committee on Committees process for representation on the ULB:

2.6.2.3 Three regular (tenured or tenure-track) university library faculty who represent different professional specializations. These faculty will serve for staggered three-year terms.

2.6.3 Faculty members, including *Library Faculty*, shall be recruited through normal Committee on Committees processes and approved by the Senate. If there are multiple applicants, potential faculty nominees may be asked to submit a one-page statement to the Executive Committee indicating their familiarity and experience with Library policy, services, and collections. The Executive Committee shall endeavor to nominate those with the greatest commitment to serve and the highest qualifications. Student members shall be nominated by Associated Students and approved by the Senate.

6. Point related to withdrawal procedures: “As you correctly point out, the lines between disciplines are blurred, and the only way we can be sure that needed materials are not discarded (sorry, "withdrawn") is by giving all campus faculty the right to review the lists.”

Comment/Update: Language in Section 7.2 updated. All faculty can review the list in the second step of the proposed withdrawal process. Faculty are involved in all steps of the process, and faculty from multiple departments are consulted.

7. Under this proposed policy revision, will all SJSU faculty have the right to demand that any book from the collection not be withdrawn, as they do now?"

Comment/Update: All faculty can request that a book be retained. The exception is a blanket blocking of all withdrawals. This language for this process is clarified in Section 7.2.

8. Has the ULB gathered data regarding which format students prefer (print or electronic)?

Comment/Update: This likely varies by discipline. Data from the fall survey indicated that there isn't a strong preference for print books. However, when it comes to journals there is a strong preference for electronic format.

Respondents were asked "if, given a limited budget, the SJSU King Library had to choose between a print and an electronic copy of these materials, which would you prefer the SJSU King library to purchase?"

Among faculty, most prefer books to be in print format (41%) while students are more closely divided between either print or electronic books (38%) and print preferred (35%). With respect to academic journals, both groups prefer the electronic format.

	Faculty/Staff			Students		
Type of Material	Electronic Preferred	Either OK	Print Preferred	Electronic Preferred	Either OK	Print Preferred
Books	27%	32%	41%	27%	38%	35%
Academic journals	75%	18%	7%	61%	30%	9%

When asked **how frequently** (sometimes and often combined) they access library resources remotely or within the library building, respondents more frequently accessed library resources remotely

Type of Access	Faculty/Staff	Students
Remotely (from outside the library building)	85%	73%
Visited the SJSU King Library to use its print materials	68%	54%

9. The review for potential withdrawal (weeding) needs to be done at a normal speed and with normal quantities of books.

Comment/Update: Best practices are to review the collection annually, and incremental withdrawal of materials is the norm. Historically, pressures external to the SJSU University Library have resulted in less frequent review and withdrawal of materials. San Jose State University Library needs to return to regular periodic reviews and subsequent withdrawal of materials from the collection. In the short term, however, quantities proposed for withdrawal consideration are likely to be larger than the norm.

10. Is there a limit to the number of books that can be deselected per year?

Comment/Update: The University Library is limited by what is possible given the staff and faculty hours available to invest in this activity. Library liaisons, Access Services staff, and Technical Services staff have many duties, and deselection is just one of their responsibilities.

11. In Item 2.6.2.3: What does "regular" mean?

Comment/Update: "Regular" means tenured or tenure-track Unit 3 faculty. See updated Section 2.6.2.3.

12. Why were 3.3.6 and 3.3.7 deleted?

Comment/Update: That section was condensed to more broadly convey rights and responsibilities of patrons. See Sections 3.2 and 3.3.

13. Why is semester-long faculty checkout proposed for elimination?

Comment/Update: Semester-long checkout periods have not been eliminated, but can be found in the Library's operating policies. See Sections 4 and 4.1.

14. In Item 4.3.5, why eliminate even the possibility of restricted checkout periods? This section on restricted checkout periods is proposed for complete elimination. Yet the library has no data on whether public access to university materials has significantly impacted areas of the collection and caused them to be less available to the SJSU community. This section proposes to eliminate the section on the monitoring of circulation patterns. Yet without that information there is no way to know if parts of the collection are being impacted by heavy public use.

Comment/Update: Language has been added to the policy in Section 4.1.2 to address restricted checkouts. Circulation statistics suggest that the SJSU collection has not been adversely impacted as a result of usage by public patrons.

15. The section on co-location of the reference collection and SJSU ownership marks looks as if it is proposed for elimination. Why?

Comment/Update: Some sections were moved, not eliminated. See Section 5.1.

16. Why is this section (5.3.2) detailing the appointment procedures for adjunct librarians proposed for elimination?

Comment/Update: This is contained in section 5.3 by reference to University policies. The Library follows the same procedures to hire adjunct faculty as all other academic units do.

17. Why is most of the first part of section 6 proposed for elimination? Why the proposed language to weaken section 6.5.3?

Comment/Update: Section 6.1 through 6.2.3 contains the guiding principles contained in the original 6.5.3 policy regarding the security of the collection.

18. Knowledge is highly interdisciplinary. Why are departments now limited to only evaluating materials from one part of the collection (7.2.2.1)?

Comment/Update: See Section 7.2. Updates have been made to clarify the inclusion of multiple departments in the review process.

19. Why is this section proposed for elimination (7.2.3)?

Comment/Update: This process is now more clearly articulated in sequential steps. See 7.2.2.1, 7.2.2.2, and 7.2.2.3.