

# LMIS - Library, Media, and Information Systems

Meeting was called to order by at 15:05 December 1, 2006 by Andrew Nierman.

Present were: Karen Fischer, Bill Dasher, Randy Thornton (representing Theresa Duhart), Yvonne Swinth, Alyce DeMarais (representing Kris Bartanen), Lotus Perry, John Hanson, Katherine Smith, Peggy Firman (guest), Renée De Voursney, Andrew Nierman, and Randy Bentson.

Minutes were distributed too late for proper review, so they'll be considered at a later meeting.

Fischer says we should check out the made for TV movie, "The Librarian".

Thornton reminded us that departmental servers and other computers should be turned off before December 21. OIS servers, such as Alexandria, should be available, but may be out of service if auxillary power has problems. The power-on surge may cause problems, so it is recommended that systems be unplugged to be safe.

Fischer is looking for departments to comment on the draft "Library Periodicals Guiding Principles". She reported that there have more printed media mergers which will affect prices. Hanson asked that better methods be established to permit single article access so that faculty can make important papers available. Fischer agreed that this is important because single articles may be cheaper than general subscriptions. Hanson argued that easy access is important to allow researchers (faculty and students) to follow references. De Voursney and Dasher supported this viewpoint. Fischer wondered if the current budget of \$750k were distributed to get single access, would this be cheaper or more expensive. This leads to the whole issue of the commerce of journal publishing. Fischer reports that in early days, electronic was a free add-on, but now it's either one or the other for a price, with a 25% surcharge for the alternate form. Piecemeal distribution will have a strong effect on the future distribution models. If authors can distribute directly copies of papers presented at a conference, that'll effect forms of "publishing". Informal consensus was that some form of "on demand" will become a common component of library access.

Nierman introduced the "Puget Sound Technology Plan" generated by the Technology Planning Group for discussion. It's been around for a while, but hasn't been discussed, nor have responses been recorded. Firman pointed out that "training" is mentioned, but not given specifics. She also noted that "we" is ill defined. Dasher asked if some part of OIS should be structured to more directly respond to faculty needs. Bentson pointed out that we have an opportunity to determine all the different tasks performed by OIS, so that these tasks can be discussed and allocated resources. The TPG goals aren't prioritized. Hanson noted that sometime in the past, there was a consolidation bringing all computing together into a single authority. He contrasted this with a distributed service model, with OIS acting in support. Fischer suggested that LMIS generate a proposal/report to Sherry Mondou expressing our views on how OIS (and more generally campus computing needs) should be done. Dasher supports this with references to older support models. Firman noted that we cannot go back to older models. Dasher said we need a better interface between faculty and some part of academic computing and support. Firman reported that every institution seems to have different models of how to support computing support. Hanson has one example in mind: Al Vallecorsa's job would be different if he reported to Facilities Services. Bentson noted that Paul Monaghan's position is difficult because he is responsible first to OIS. Perry recalled a Wyatt support person who is no longer present. Thornton distinguished support of academic effort and computer technician. Bentson pointed that the technician's role can still be split between supporting academic labs and some university-wide work (specifically Thompson computer labs vs. deploying Exchange configurations). Fischer noted that strict academic support tasks are being deflected. Thornton noted that there was a review of OIS function, after which Imamshah left. He reports that organizational change will not occur until Imamshah's replacement is hired. Bentson questioned the wisdom of hiring the wrong person who then may or may not make the right changes. DeMarais thinks it's important that we offer alternate models, perhaps including a call for an organizational review along with the hiring

decision. Perry sees our input should also go to TPG. Nierman commented on TPG's report, said it looks good, but asked "how would this ever happen?" Nierman suggested a sub-committee to write a proposal. This proposal received general approval. The sub-committee is charged to draft a proposal for adoption by LMIS. This proposal may be wide-ranging, and should support clear faculty support. Hanson, Firman, De Voursney, and Bentson volunteered for this duty.

Adjourned at 16:07.

Respectfully submitted, Randy Bentson