Members Present:
Jonathan Anderson  Shirley Grubb  Rebecca Moorman
Tia Anderson  Steve Johnson  Alice Tersteeg
Michael Ciri  Shannon Kempton  Susan Warner

Members Absent:
John Attebury  Mark Graves  Todd Walter
Michael Byer  Steven Hamilton
Pat Fitzgerald  Barney Norwick

Guests: Joseph Sears  Amanda Webb

Meeting Agenda:
1. Call to order
2. Approval of agenda
3. Approval of minutes (23-Feb-01 & 5-Mar-01 meetings)
4. Tech Forum updates
   a. Women in Technology
   b. Steve Johnson project / Digital Media Services
5. First reading of Infrastructure proposals
6. Date & time of next meeting

1. **Call to Order** - Meeting called to order at 11:05 AM by chair, Rebecca Moorman.

2. **Approval of Agenda** - Proposed agenda was approved with one addition. Jonathan requested some time to discuss the recent problems that he has been experiencing with EBSCOhost. Rebecca suggested that this item be added after the Tech Forum Updates.

3. **Approval of Minutes** - Jonathan moved to accept the meeting minutes from the February 23, 2001 and March 5, 2001 meetings. Steve J. seconded this motion, which was passed unanimously.

4. **Tech Forum updates** - Tia reported that the “Women in Technology” tech forum went well and involved a laptop demonstration with a hands-on lesson on web page development. Mona Yarnall and Elise Tomlinson put together a good presentation and a detailed handout.

   Steve J. reported that he will be working with Susan to set up a date for his “Class on a DVD” tech forum. The focus of the forum has expanded into a presentation on how Media Services is moving from analog to digital technology. Steve’s project is one example of digital. This will be the last tech forum of the semester.

Jonathan is frustrated because several of the core journals that his MPA students need have become inaccessible via EBSCOhost, the full-text electronic database that is licensed statewide. These resources are essential to the education of his distance graduate students. The library (and users) just learned that the most recent year of a number of titles is being “embargoed,” or made not available, by publishers. Rebecca explained that many publishers are concerned about electronic access to their content, and worried that they will not be adequately compensated for the content. It is not unusual for publishers to change their arrangements with aggregators such as EBSCO, leaving customers (libraries and users) in a bind. Unfortunately, the contract with EBSCO contains fine print stating that they cannot guarantee the availability of particular titles. The library will continue to work with faculty to set up electronic reserves and make other arrangements for resources that students need. Rebecca reported that the library is waiting to learn if funding for the statewide databases will be continued another year by the Alaska State Legislature. In FY01, Karen Crane, the State Librarian, announced that the funding for the statewide database project had been built into the University’s operating budget, which she hoped would make the funding more secure. In previous years, the project was a capital expense, requiring a one-time outlay of funds each year. If the University’s budget is cut then there might not be sufficient funding for the statewide database project. Rebecca also noted that librarians from all over Alaska are working hard to inform the Legislature of the importance of the databases to all Alaskans. Michael C. explained that one of the primary reasons for establishing the tech fee was to help fund the library databases. Even if the statewide license for EBSCOhost is not funded, the UA system libraries will continue to offer some full-text database package.
Shirley wanted to make a note that Michael Byer, Pat Fitzgerald, Steven Hamilton, and Todd Walter were all absent due to official University business and will receive an “excused absence”.

5. First reading of Infrastructure proposals - Michael C. presented the FY02 infrastructure costs. The total of all costs is $151,200 and is pretty much equal to the FY01 request. The major difference is the addition of classroom projector rotation costs. This plan would use the tech fee to fund built-in projectors, at a rate of four per year, in the most heavily used classrooms on campus. The cost of wiring, projection screens, and classroom modifications should come from the Facilities budget.

Rebecca noted that the amount budgeted to library databases would go where it is most needed, not necessarily exclusively for NetLibrary. The funds would be used toward electronic full-text databases if the statewide project is not funded this year.

Michael C. would like to propose a fall special project to purchase a remote audio streaming solution that would give Media Services the ability to broadcast presentations that are given in the Lake Room to distance sites all over Alaska.

Michael C. explained some details about the budget. The FY00 TLTR agreed to earmark at least 5% of each year’s projected revenue for special projects. Because of the university’s budget policies, money to fund a position must be set aside at the beginning of the year, with no allowances for illness, vacation, or turn-over. Therefore, the personnel services line in the TLTR budget is rarely fully spent; this is the case this year. He also noted that in past years any unexpended revenue (i.e., from salary savings) has been applied to the infrastructure costs approved for the next year. This process has made it possible for us to approve infrastructure costs that are higher than our projected budget. One change this year is that the TLTR will need to decide whether to use the unexpended revenue for additional student laptops, or apply it to the FY2002 infrastructure costs.

When asked about the number of computers now on campus, Michael C. said that UAS-Juneau will be going from 157 to 169 student-use computers next year. He said that he would like to get 10 more laptops to move the number of cases up to three (10 laptops per case). Due to course scheduling, Computing Services is unable to meet the demand for laptops at certain times. He would like to get 20 more laptops, but will only be able to get 10 this year due to budget constraints. He will look elsewhere for the funding of 10 additional laptops.

Tia said that she really appreciated the fact that the library does not charge for using the printers. She asked if it would be possible to lower the cost of printing from the microform machines and the copier. Rebecca has been investigating the microform costs, and discovered the older microform machines used to require an expensive treated paper, and that is where the higher cost comes from. Now that student’s fees have bought two microform machines, she will continue to look into whether or not the fee can be lowered. Michael C. pointed out that the library equipment is also used by the public and thus is not funded exclusively by student money. Computing Services is planning to install a printer in the Mourant Building for student use within the next year.

Susan made a motion to adjourn at 12:00 PM instead of at 12:30 PM; Rebecca seconded this motion.

Shirley asked about the status of the student checkout laptops. Susan said that they are being heavily used and are almost always checked out from the Media Center. At the next meeting, Susan will supply statistics of who is checking out the laptops, how often the same person is checking out a laptop, and if a variety of students are having the opportunity to checkout a laptop. If repeat checkouts are causing some students to not have access to the laptops, Michael C. suggested using a system like that in the library. If a book is checked out, a user can place a hold on it, so the first user cannot renew the book. A similar system for laptops would allow a person to renew the checkout ONLY if nobody else was waiting to use it.

6. Date & Time of Next Meeting - The next meeting will be on Friday, April 20, 2001 at 9:00 am in ELIB 210.

Meeting adjourned at 12:00 PM.