

5-10-2017

# Operational Working Group Minutes

Clement Lau

Georgia Southern University, [clau@georgiasouthern.edu](mailto:clau@georgiasouthern.edu)

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/lib-lowg-minutes>

---

## Recommended Citation

Lau, Clement, "Operational Working Group Minutes" (2017). *Library Operational Work Group on Consolidation Meeting Minutes*. 4.  
<https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/lib-lowg-minutes/4>

This minutes (open access) is brought to you for free and open access by the Library Operational Work Group on Consolidation at Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. It has been accepted for inclusion in Library Operational Work Group on Consolidation Meeting Minutes by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. For more information, please contact [digitalcommons@georgiasouthern.edu](mailto:digitalcommons@georgiasouthern.edu).

## OWG MEETING NOTES

OWG Number and Name 26 Library

Meeting Date May 10, 2017

Discussion Points	Decisions or Next Steps
1.Meeting purpose	1. We will decide on the final wording for our Recommendations. We will send them by the end of the week.
2. Final review of Recommendations	<p>2. It was first noted that some of the Recommendations had to be shortened to fit the required template.</p> <p>Concerning the tenure track Recommendation, it was noted that because the Henderson tenure committee currently consists only of tenured faculty, it would not include anyone from Lane until such time as a Lane librarian earned tenure. Does this create an inequity, if only Henderson librarians are evaluating the work of librarians working in a different library, under different circumstances? Or is it sufficient that under the Henderson promotion and tenure bylaws, the Lane librarian serving as supervisor to a Lane candidate must submit a recommendation independent of the promotion and tenure committee's recommendation? It was decided that this topic needed further study, but would not affect the wording of the OWG Recommendation.</p> <p>Two concerns were noted concerning the Recommendation on Vendors. One was that in other Recommendations we had listed students, faculty, and staff as our users, but we had not included staff in this one. For consistency, we revised the Recommendation to include staff. The</p>

	<p>other was to strike the word “electronic” from “electronic resources,” because it was determined that we need to include other entities in addition to electronic resources.</p> <p>In the Recommendation concerning the libraries’ relationship to IT, we added “are responsive to.”</p>
3. Next steps	<p>3. Bede will update the edited Recommendations and share them with Doug for his approval. They will be forwarded to Randy Stuart by the end of the week. Then we will wait for the CIC to approve.</p> <p>Bede recommended that the OWG membership serve as the steering committee for implementation. We can make changes to the membership if we want. We have a progress report due on May 19<sup>th</sup>. There is also a final report which we believe will be done subsequent to the CIC’s approval of our Recommendations.</p>
4.	4.
5.	5.