

Repealed by F98-5

## S81-5 Division of the Library Collection

### Legislative History:

At its meeting of March 9, 1981, the Academic Senate approved the following policy recommendation presented by Senator Paul Betten, Chair, Instruction and Research Committee.

#### **ACTION BY THE UNIVERSITY PRESIDENT:**

"Accepted and approved for action." Signed: Gail Fullerton: March 12, 1981.

### **POLICY RECOMMENDATION REVISED LIBRARY PROPOSAL**

- WHEREAS, The Library Committee has completed the charge of the Academic Senate to restudy the problem of division of the collection between two buildings; and
- WHEREAS, Representatives from each school were reinvited to participate in deliberation and all schools were represented; and
- WHEREAS, The Library Committee unanimously approved the Revised Library Proposal on February 19, 1981; now therefore be it
- RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate endorse the Revised Library Proposal.

### **DIVISION OF THE SJSU LIBRARY COLLECTION AND SERVICES: REVISED PROPOSAL**

FEBRUARY 19, 1981

1. The High/Low use concept is maintained in principle.
2. The science and engineering reference staff will be maintained as a unit adjacent to the general reference area to offer the flexibility of specialized services and yet maintain potential for peak load assistance between these specialists and the general reference librarians. Specialized assistance in humanities, social sciences and education will be maintained.

3. The library staff will be most interested in considering individual faculty requests for older books if specialized requirements can be shown to override the criteria of use and publication date. In addition further refinements and modifications are expected to result from a study of library operations that has been directed by President Fullerton.

4. The cost analysis of the revised library plan is shown under the column designated as Science Proposal C on the next page and is the same as those of the High/Low Use Concept Column. The estimated annual savings of \$217,403 over the Library of Congress Classification division will result mostly from avoiding additional expensive public services staff, duplication and continuing maintenance of card catalogs in both buildings as well as duplication of reference materials.

[Original policy contains a table called "Summary", on file at the Academic Senate Office]

## COST REPORTS - TWO-LIBRARY COMPLEX

### PART II

## BRIEF NOTES ON VARIOUS PROPOSALS, INCLUDING ADVANTAGES / DISADVANTAGES

### 1. Science Proposal - Proposition A

#### Summary of the Plan

Retain the science and engineering collections of bound periodical and book volumes in classifications GA-GC, Q, R, S, T, VK-VM in the West Library. Retain the science reference staff and reference books and indexes in the West Library also. Move the current (unbound) periodicals in GA-GC, Q, R, S, T, VK-VM to the Clark Library. The science collections of bound periodical and book volumes total 162,955 volumes. Thus 164,973 low use books would also have to be placed in the West Library from various other Library of Congress Classifications.

#### Costs

Initial one-time implementation costs are less than other plans, but annual library operating costs and materials duplication costs more than library high/low use plan or Proposition B.

#### Advantages

Would keep present science and engineering collections and services intact, making it more efficient for graduate and faculty users who make considerable, regular use of retrospective low-use materials.

Would require a smaller portion of the social science, humanities and education collections to be placed

in the West Library. Also makes it possible to house all non-science bound periodicals in Clark Library.

A more extensive listing appears in the report, dated 1/29/81, of R. Hassur and M. Billick to the Academic Senate Library Committee.

### Disadvantages

Science and Engineering faculty and students who make regular, considerable use of current periodical literature would be required to make extensive use of both buildings. The periodical indexes for all current and retrospective materials would be in the West Library, but the current periodical issues would be in the Clark Library. The retrospective division with a definite cut-off date (1965) makes it clear to the user which building houses a particular issue. Because the receipt date and binding cycle varies for each periodical title, users seeking issues between one and one and one-half years old would be forced to check both buildings. Periodical issues published within the last five years are much more heavily used in the sciences (presumably by both faculty and students) than the pre1965 periodical issues. While the compromise of moving current science periodical issues to the new building makes Proposition A more economically feasible on the surface, it would be very expensive in use of time for many students and faculty.

A substantial number of less heavily used volumes would still have to be placed in the West Library from history, humanities and education classifications. Since both the history (C, D, E, F) and the humanities (B ex. BF, M, N, P) make extensive use of retrospective materials, it would be difficult to determine which classifications should remain intact. Consequently some portion of all low use books in the remaining classifications would probably end up being placed in the West Library. Thus, the plan probably would not have the benefit of keeping other collections intact. Interdisciplinary faculty and students teaching or completing general education requirements would still be required to make heavy use of both buildings in order to obtain such materials as current bound volumes of Scientific American and Psychology Today.

Full circulation services would only be available in the Clark Library. To keep costs down and use a lower level of classified clerical employee, all fines would be collected and all courtesy cards issued in the Clark Library only.

The plan does not allow for flexible staffing patterns in times of tight budget. If the likely \$20-40,000 cut in library budget in personnel funds in 1981/82 (due to depletion of the State budget surplus) occurs, such cuts could have the following consequences under the proposition A plan:

- a) Library hours could be reduced in both buildings.
- b) Reference service could be reduced in both buildings. If the reference hours were reduced in the West Library, the Library would probably remain open without reference service during the lower use hours. Or, the remaining reference librarians could work substantially increased hours each week on the

reference desk. This would not be an attractive alternative as working over 19 hours per week on the reference desk would make it difficult to retain qualified science reference librarians. A corresponding decrease in reference service would also occur in the Clark Library. During low use periods when the Library was open, there might be only one reference librarian (instead of two) available: Students and faculty would have to wait longer, but would still have some access to reference service during non-peak periods of use.

The plan also perpetuates the current practice of maintenance of the science/ engineering catalog by the science/engineering librarians. This is not true of the high/low use plan, which would relieve the librarians of this largely clerical duty and allow added time for more professional duties, including improved reference service.

## 2. Science Proposal - Proposition B

### Summary of the Plan

Retain the science and engineering reference staff along with the science and engineering reference and index collection in an area of the Clark Library separate from the general reference area. The remainder of the collection would be distributed as outlined in the "white paper."

### Costs

Initial one-time implementation costs are more than Proposition A, but compare favorably to other proposals. Annual operating costs are somewhat more than in the Library High/Low use plan.

### Advantages

This plan would retain the science reference staff as a specialized service unit, always available for specialized help.

The plan provides flexibility if projected library budget cuts are made next year. Hours in the West Library could be reduced when the semester is not in session (with limited paging service). Reduction of reference service (decreases in both science and general reference staffing) would not result in the elimination of reference service altogether during low use periods. At least one reference librarian could be available to answer all types of questions during non-peak periods of library use.

Science and engineering reference users would be closer to the current periodicals or retrospective low use books.

As with Proposal A, some added advantages are listed in the Hassur-Billick report.

### Disadvantages

All collections would be split, necessitating use-of both buildings. When the semester is not in session, the Library may have to offer paging service to the West Library.

No reference service would be readily available for West Library users.

Less of the low-use materials in other disciplines could be housed in the Clark Library than under Proposition A.

The plan requires maintaining a separate science catalog which adds considerably to the costs and should not be necessary. Proposition B would be more acceptable if the science catalog maintenance and update requirement were eliminated. Since the proposed subject split is not a true "subject" split but a split along the lines of the Library of Congress classifications, science librarians would be able to offer improved reference service to users if they used the main catalog, which provides access to all of the library collections (e.g., books on the history of science and mathematics are often classified in the "history" classification rather than the "science". Library of Congress classification). If the catalog maintenance and update requirement were eliminated, science reference staff could increase time spent developing their special expertise and assisting faculty and students with searches in the present budget situation, or be better able to absorb a staffing cut without seriously reducing the quality of service to science faculty and students.

### 3. Library Recommendation - High/low Use

#### Summary of the Plan

Place recent (1970 - to date) and heavily used (books checked out on the average of once every year and one-half or more often) and additional undergraduate materials identified by the faculty and as appropriate in the Clark Library. Retrospective, less heavily used books would remain in the West Library. All recent (1965- to date) bound and current periodicals would be housed in the Clark Library. Pre-1965 periodical issues would be housed in the West Library. Microfilm would be purchased for the few titles which are heavily used prior to 1965 and housed in the Clark Library.

#### Costs

Initial one-time implementation costs are greater than Proposition A. Annual costs are minimal relative to other proposals because of concentration of most user services in the Clark Library, which allows the Library to schedule staff most effectively during both peak and low use periods. Also does not require maintenance and update of more than one catalog because of concentration of all reference services in one building. Relies on use of the circulation data base as a location tool or the low-use book collections. Provides for long-term cost savings because labor costs (involved in manual maintenance of catalogs) are projected to rise much faster than costs of technology.

## Advantages

Much the same as proposition B. See "white paper" for more details.

## Disadvantages

Much the same as Proposition B, except with greater flexibility:

a) Does not retain the science and engineering reference staff as a specialized unit, available at all times for specialized reference service. Science and Engineering faculty are convinced that the consolidation would result in loss of the quality reference service now available.

b) Does not require maintenance of a separate science catalog.

## 4. Library of Congress Classification Split (Faculty Preference)

### Summary of the Plan

All Science Classifications GA-GC, Q, R, S, T, VK-VM for both books and periodicals would be housed in the West Library. Another group of subject classifications, comprising an additional 165,000 bound book and periodical volumes would also have to be housed in the West Library. Most likely would be GF-GV, H, J, K, L because these collections comprise 160,901 volumes. (Placing the humanities classifications in the West Library is attractive, but B [ex. BF], M, N, P comprise over 200,000 volumes. Also, since media will be in the new building, this would be most inconvenient for Music faculty and students).

### Costs

Given the present budget and the expectation of further declines, costs are prohibitive. The high costs are a result of full reference, circulation and periodical services in both buildings for all open hours.

## Advantages

Faculty would prefer all subject collections and accompanying reference service to be in the same building. Would minimize travel between two buildings for faculty whose research is conducted primarily in one or two Library of Congress classifications.

## Disadvantages

Would be more inconvenient than high/low use for faculty and students who primarily use current materials in a great variety of Library of Congress classifications.

The costs of operating fully staffed duplicate reference, circulation and periodicals services would cause a severe decline in services for acquisitions and cataloging of materials and reshelving of materials.

## NOTES:

Equipment money for the Clark Library is in a special fund and is not transferrable to the library personnel budget. It is a one time allocation which cannot be used to cover library operating costs. The present equipment budget will have to be used mainly to buy and install shelving (required to meet earthquake standards) and expand the existing automated circulation system to the new library. The equipment money budget request is in the Dept. of Finance awaiting approval. A cut in the equipment request is expected. If the cut is in circulation equipment for the new building, the Library will attempt to give up the new furniture in order to obtain the necessary circulation equipment. If Finance refuses to allow expenditure of funds on circulation equipment, the library will be forced to use regular operating expense funds to provide automated circulation services for the new building. In the event that regular operating expense funds are insufficient to allow expansion of automated circulation to the new building, at a minimum the Library would purchase one additional circulation terminal for the West Library with the knowledge that an additional library assistant must be hired to operate it. The terminal and modem would cost \$5,000 and the annual salary of an LA I/II is presently \$15,662. This station would serve as a location finding tool for materials in the West Library and would be housed in the Clark Library. Although maintenance costs for automated circulation would be reduced (from \$30,060 to \$20,064), patrons would not have access to automated circulation in the Clark Library or access to terminals (as location finding tools) at all reference and public service desks. Inconvenience to circulation and reference users plus the costs of printed charge slips, make obtaining circulation equipment a first priority - more so than furniture for the new building.

Original policy contains the following tables on file at the Academic Senate Office:

Appendix A: Revisions to annual cost options:

2 tables:

I. High/Low Use Concept.

II. L.C. Classification Division Concept.

Appendix B: Initial costs for Establishin two Library Complex:

4 tables:

I. High/Low Use Concept.

II. L.C. monographs and bound periodical collections with same call numbers.

III. Science faculty proposal A.

IV. Science Faculty Proposal B.

TABLE 1:

Worksheet: Distribution of Holdings Using Science Proposal A.