UNIVERSITY OF OREGON

University Library Committee (ULC)
Annual Report
2015-2016

Committee membership:

Mark Horney: College of Education, Chair
Zena Ariola: Computer Science
Chloe Bosnar: Undergraduate, Political Science
Jack Boss: Music
Richard Chartoff: Chemistry
John Fenn: Arts & Administration
Alison Parman: Graduate Student, Art History
Doris Payne: Linguistics
Jenifer Presto: Comparative Literature
Nicholas Proudfoot: Mathematics
Jimmy Murray: UO Library

Summary/Work Chronology:

The ULC, in consultation with Adriene Lim, Dean of Libraries, decided to use its meetings this year to discuss relevant topics and questions of importance to the Dean and her staff. Meetings followed the general pattern of a brief overview of the topic presented by the relevant library staff members, followed by a discussion among the ULC members of the questions raised in the presentation. For example, the first topic was about the usability of the new interface to the library catalog.

At its first meeting, the committee and the Dean developed the following list of discussion topics:

1. Classroom Functionalities. The Library is charged with helping to design and manage the informational & AV capabilities of all the classrooms on campus. How are these facilities working? What else is needed?

2. Library Spaces. The Library offers a variety of spaces for students and faculty, each with particular resources (e.g., monitors, white boards, etc.) and access policies. How are these working to promote teaching and learning? What other arrangements of space resources might further facilitate instruction?

3. Library Resources to support new Programs and Faculty. The President of the University has put an emphasis on bringing in new programs and faculty. How might the

Library prioritize its current resources, and its acquisition of new resources to support these initiatives?

4. Discovery Interface Functionality. The Library has recently installed a new interface to the collections catalog. How is this working? What could be changed or added?

5. Data Management Plans. Many research funding agencies are now requiring projects to specify Data Management Plans as part of proposals. One purpose for these plans is to provide wider access to data sets. What role could/should the Library play developing and implementing such DMP?

6. Electronic Scholarship and Knowledge Management. How can the Library assist faculty and students in accessing and managing electronic information?

7. Digital Literacies. How can the Library support and extend the digital literacies of faculty and students? By this we mean the skills and knowledge needed to best use informational resources in teaching, learning and research.

8. Materials Access Policy: The Dean and Library faculty/staff are developing a policy related to access to Special Collections and Archives and would like feedback before this policy is finalized.

In practice however, the committee most often focused its meetings on topics related to the Library budget:

October 26, 2015:	Committee organization; report from the Dean of Libraries on the state of the Library; Selection of discussion topics;
November 23, 2015:	Presentation and discussion about the new Discovery Interface, which provides access to the Library catalog;
January 25, 2016:	Presentation and discussion about the Library's collection budget and the possible use of formulas in deciding departmental allocations;
February 29, 2016:	Continued discussion of the use of formulas in the collection budget;
April 18, 2016:	Discussion of the general Library budget in the light of the University's budget realignment process;
May 16, 2016:	Discussion of a resolution to the Senate on library funding, especially for the inflationary costs in the collections budget.

The minutes from these 6 meetings are attached below.

Action(s) Taken:

At its last meeting the ULC voted to develop a letter outlining issues with the Library budget and circulate it to Department Heads and the University administration. We hope by this communication to establish a broad discussion about the role of the Library in the University, and how to establish and sustain it priorities.

Problems/Issues:

There were no particular challenges faced by the committee. The discussion format was well received by committee members, the Dean, and the Library staff. We would recommend it to the ULC for 2016-17.

Recommendations:

We recommend that the ULC for 2016-17, take up the issues raised this year regarding the Library budget, seek to promote a campus wide discussion about the role of the Library, and to engage the University Senate in this process.

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON

University of Oregon Libraries
University Library Committee (ULC)
Fall Meeting, 2015–2016 Academic Year
Monday, October 26, 2015
Time 10:00 a.m.–11:30 a.m.
Collaboration Center, 122 Knight Library

MEETING MINUTES

Present: Zena Ariola (Computer and Information Science), Jack Boss (Music and Dance), John Fenn (AAA), Mark Horney (Center for Advanced Technology in Education), Doris Payne (Linguistics), Nicholas Proudfoot (Mathematics), Adriene Lim (Dean of Libraries)

Guests: Sara Brownmiller, Nancy Slight-Gibney, Shane Turner

Absent: Chloe Bosnar (Student representative), Richard Chartoff (Chemistry)

Welcome and Introduction

Review of Charge and Selection of Committee Chair

- Selection of ULC Chair
  - Mark Horney has agreed to be the ULC's representative for the Academic Council, per an earlier exchange via email, so Adriene proposed that Mark also serve as ULC's Chair.
  - ULC members agreed to the proposal and Mark accepted the role of Chair.
- Group reviewed ULC Charge.
  - Concern was raised that this year's membership does not meet the committee's stated charge: The ULC currently only has 7 faculty, 1 student representative, and no classified staff member.
  - The University Senate is responsible for committee membership selection, not the Libraries, but the Libraries agreed to check with the Executive Coordinator of the University Senate on the status of ULC membership.

Dean's Report

Adriene Lim, Dean of Libraries

- UO Libraries' Strategic Planning
  - The Dean gave members an overview of the current strategy map and goals to date; strategic planning is an ongoing process.
  - During future ULC meetings, individual objectives will be reviewed for members' comments and feedback.
- Improvement of physical spaces
  - Classroom 267B has been improved; current upgrade to Edmiston classroom to make it a more collaborative computer lab; 4th floor Sky Studio, a remodeled space for students to receive TLC tutoring and to have additional study space
- De-accessioning of reference collection and print journals for Business and Economics

    - Unlike most research libraries, the UO Libraries has no storage facility, making it difficult to grow collections indefinitely. The Libraries understand the value of print versions and of browsing the shelves, but there are space limitations; that is the dilemma.
    - Libraries worked with business and economics departments to de-accession selected titles that had digital surrogates and/or were no longer deemed relevant.
- Strategic marketing
    - A push for more marketing and promotion of the Libraries' resources and services, so that the UO community knows what the library has to offer and to maximize use.
    - A member noted a trend over the last couple of years that faculty want to get away from teaching students to use library resources and to focus instead on specialized research.
- Working groups for graduate and undergraduate instruction
    - The Libraries has recognized the need to focus on graduate and undergraduate instruction, and has created coordinators to focus on these.
    - A LibQual Survey, an assessment survey for libraries, is conducted every several years, and a focus group with graduate students was held a few years ago. The survey provides longitudinal data and benchmarks against peers. In the survey, undergraduates wanted more group and individual study space; faculty and graduate students want more resources, such as journals.
    - Members suggested that the Libraries meet with individual disciplines. Most Subject Specialists already reach out to individual disciplines, but instruction outreach has been included in the strategic plan to review what is currently happening and how to make improvements.
- UO Campaign
    - The Libraries' campaign goal was set at $36 million.
    - The Libraries is doing well in fundraising and is close to meeting its goal.
    - Donations have included $2.5 million from an alumnus, and a $1 million endowed directorship for Special Collections and University Archives.
    - Phase two of the renovation of the Price Science Commons is now completed and opened on September 28, but fundraising for the project continues.
- Acquisition of the James Blue collections, an award-winning director, in Special Collections.
- New research guides on the Libraries' website, and a user-initiated room reservation system with room availability on displays throughout the Knight library.
- CMET and Canvas migration project summarized.

Library Budget Briefing

Nancy Slight-Gibney, Assistant Dean

- Preliminary expendable funds for FY2016 = $27,731,887
- The Libraries hires over 300 student workers every year.
- Strategic budget request for collections
    - Funding collections remains an issue.
    - 30% of the overall general budget goes to collections and assess to electronic resources.
    - Five year expenditure trend: trend toward electronic and away from print, overall increase of about 16% for collections and access over 5 years.
    - UO Libraries is below the median Association of Research Libraries and Public AAU universities in terms of collections and access expenditures.

- Gift and endowment funds: Opportunity for special projects like digitization; five positions are partially funded by endowments.
- The national trend is a smaller percentage of university budgets going to libraries.

Topics to address in upcoming meetings? Committee members' perspectives

- Scholarly communication issues
- Collections issues
- Information Technology Strategic Plan
- Digital Humanities and Digital Scholarship Center
- Archiving of research materials or products
    - Data collected by graduate students and faculty for grant proposals
    - Scholar's Bank—how does it work?
    - Issue of confidentiality versus granting institutions' push for shared data.
    - What is the Libraries' role and how does it relate to our mission?
    - The question of storage space for researchers—who covers the cost?

Next meeting: Monday, November 23, 2015 – 10:00-11:30 am – KL Collaboration Center

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON

University of Oregon Libraries

University Library Committee (ULC) Fall Meeting, 2015–2016 Academic Year

Monday, November 23, 2015

Time 10:00 a.m.–11:30 a.m.
Rowe Conference Room, 115H Knight Library

MEETING MINUTES

Present: Andrew Bonamici, Sara Brownmiller, John Fenn, Mark Horney, Katy Lenn, Adriene Lim, Doris Payne, Jennifer Presto, Nicholas Proudfoot, Nancy Slight- Gibney, Shane Turner, Mark Watson

Absent: Zena Ariola, Chloe Bosnar, Jack Boss, Richard Chartoff

Introductions and Announcements

Committee plans for future meetings

- ULC as a level 2 committee (commitment = 15–30 hours/year): The Chair suggested half the time be used for meetings and half the time for preparation of contextual information. The committee was in agreement.
- Review of the proposed discussion topics for AY2015-2016, derived from the Chair's meeting with the Libraries Dean and Associate Deans:
  1) Classroom functionalities: The Library is charged with helping to design and manage the informational and AV capabilities of all the classrooms on campus. How are these facilities working? What else is needed?
  2) Library spaces: The Library offers a variety of spaces for students and faculty, each with particular resources (e.g., monitors, white boards, etc.) and access policies. How are these working to promote teaching and learning? What other arrangements of space resources might further facilitate instruction?
  3) Library resources to support new Programs and Faculty: The President of the University has put an emphasis on bringing in new programs and faculty. How might the Library prioritize its current resources, and its acquisition of new resources to support these initiatives?
  4) Discovery interface functionality: The Library has recently installed a new interface to the collections catalog. How is this working? What could be changed or added?
  5) Data management plans: Many research funding agencies are now requiring projects to specify Data Management Plans as part of proposals. One purpose for these plans is to provide wider access to data sets. What role could/should the Library play developing and implementing such DMP?
  6) Electronic scholarship and knowledge management: How can the Library assist

faculty and students in accessing and managing electronic information?

7) Digital literacies: How can the Library support and extend the digital literacies of faculty and students? By this we mean the skills and knowledge needed to best use informational resources in teaching, learning and research.

8) Materials access policy: The Dean and Library faculty/staff are developing a policy related to access to Special Collections and Archives and would like feedback before this policy is finalized.

- Discussion and decision of proposed topics
  - Topics 5 and 6 would be useful for any departments that collect data.
  - Collections and digital books are part of topic 3.
  - Suggestion to include discussion on the cost of journals and whether we should be subscribing to them, or digital only? The committee could talk about collection management trends in libraries, the UO Libraries current stance (discipline-specific in approach).
  - Today's meeting will address topic 4: Discovery interface functionality.
  - A variant of topic 3 will be discussed in January, topic 8 in February, a combination of topics 5 and 6 in April, and leave April open for issues that may arise.
- Structure of meetings: presentation at the beginning, followed by discussion.

Discussion about the Discovery Interface

- Overview of the Libraries discovery interface
  - The Libraries migrated to a new platform about a year ago.
  - Start at libraries home page (http://library.uoregon.edu/).
  - Various ways to use discovery layer to find an article: sign in required to gain access to full capabilities of the system; access online tab shows location of online sources
- Discussion
  - In the LibrarySearch drop-down menu's label of "Articles," some terms are ambiguous and the location of items is unclear: Are these articles available from UO, from Summit, world?
    - The original search is wide (list of databases indexed), but it can be narrowed down using the left-hand menu bar.
  - When researching a new topic, the researcher often needs to know everything that is out there, not just the sources to which UO has access. Is there a way to do this through the discovery interface or does the researcher have to go to WorldCat?
    - There is a tension between throwing everything at users at once (white noise) and getting the user to what is available and what they want.
    - To do a wider search, click on Databases A-Z and search databases not on the original index.
    - Find Text: intended to let the user know whether the UO Libraries can get the full text or not, matching the citation against our holdings.
  - Google Scholar: UO Libraries upload our holdings to Google Scholar once a week
    - Downside: The user cannot see what content is being indexed.
    - The cited by link is useful, but recursive. Having a cited by link on the UO site would be useful, to trace backward and forward.
  - Additional tools: Advanced Search; E-journals A-Z
  - Suggestion: a workshop at the beginning of the fall term for faculty and students, to review updates to the discovery platform, would be helpful.
    - Bring librarians into the colleges: subject specialists can reach out to

colleges.

- Like the Venn diagram about how collections are organized.
- Suggestion to add “How do I” links to the main page.
- For research in languages other than English, having WorldCat included in the search is helpful.
- Research Guides: “By subject” means general and class-specific, but what do “By group” and “By type” mean? It would be helpful to make this clearer.

Remaining AY2015-2016 meeting schedule:

January 25, February 29, April 18, and May 16, 2016 All meetings 10:00-11:30 in Rowe Conference Room

---

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON

University of Oregon Libraries
University Library Committee (ULC)
Winter Meeting, 2015–2016 Academic Year
Monday, January 25, 2016
Time 10:00 a.m.–11:30 a.m.
Rowe Conference Room, 115H Knight Library

AGENDA

Attendance: Andrew Bonamici, Jack Boss, Sara Brownmiller, John Fenn, Mark Horney, Adriene Lim, Ann Miller, Jimmy Murray, Alison Parman, Doris Payne, Jennifer Presto, Nicholas Proudfoot, Nancy Slight-Gibney, Jeff Staiger, Dean Walton, Mark Watson

Absent: Zena Ariola, Chloe Bosnar, Richard Chartoff

Discussion topic
How the library allocates its collections budget

Dean's Report
Adriene Lim

- Strategic budget requests
  - Collections inflationary requests go forward under this process, and the Libraries asked for approximately $450,000 for inflation only.
  - Reportedly, the UO Budget Advisory Group (BAG) has reacted with frustration at the high inflationary costs of scholarly publishing and some BAG colleagues want to convene a group to solve the problem, but the dean noted that the Libraries share in this frustration, and have been advocating for Open Access for many years, holding workshops on authors' rights, etc. She mentioned that some inflation costs probably should be considered part of the "cost of doing business"— similar to cost for utilities. Some level of inflation might be reasonable as an "as is" increase each year. Libraries share in the frustration as well.
- "Aligning resources" budget-reduction scenarios
  - Administrative and academic units have been asked to submit 1-3% budget reduction scenarios.
  - The libraries is not exempt from this process and the reduction scenarios should apply to the entire general fund budget, which includes the collections budget: 1% would be $225K, 2% would be $450K, and 3% would be $675K.
  - As part of the realignment advice, we will submit proposals for reinvestments as well, such as for collections related to the cluster faculty hires.
  - No decisions have been made to date, but the dean wanted to keep the committee informed. Proposals must be submitted to Academic Affairs by Feb 22.

Discussion

- Intractability of the collections inflation problem: Inflation is not a problem that one institution can resolve alone; it involves the whole scholarly communication system.
- Among some faculty and disciplines, there are moves toward and pressures to not submitting articles to expensive journals.
- Inflation in books as well as journals
- As budgets are cut, costs become more expensive, in the aggregate.
- The libraries looks at multiple sources that track inflation by discipline. Some journals increase prices to push out competing journals; if libraries decide that they need to keep that journal, then they need to cut other journals.

Collections budget allocations

Mark Watson and Dean Walton

- Various approaches to how we spend collections budget
- Materials budget for 2015/2016= $6M, including allocations for monographs and for serials.
- The collections budget allocates differing amounts of funds to the various disciplines across the natural sciences, social sciences, and the humanities.
- Libraries' current distribution of the collections budget: By and large, these allocations are based on legacy decisions whose origin pre-dates the arrival of the staff currently working in the UO Libraries. Over time, adjustments have been made for disciplines whose journals cost more. Current allocations are more historical than data-driven.
- Libraries have long wanted to have a more rational ways to decide allocations, e.g., to create a formula to determine this.
- If you were going to construct a formula to figure out how much each discipline should get, what types of factors would be important?
    - Categories of variables: undergraduate education (programs), graduate students (programs, could be overlap), research by faculty
    - Cost differences across disciplines: way to quantify that?
    - Usage
    - Minimum budget
    - Degree: BA, MA, PhD
    - Weighting
    - Reference/formats/do not circulate
    - Consortial aspect (Orbis)
- Then we need to consider on which factors can we collect data?
- The collection managers have been working on a formula to account for these multiple factors, including:
    - Monograph costs
    - Total people based on faculty FTE plus undergraduate students graduate students by department.
    - Total checkouts based on combined ILL requests, UO local checkouts, digital book usage and correction factor based on ILL (example: lots of fiction shows up

in Sciences ILL requests, so number of loans does not necessarily reflect research needs, so adjust for that).
    - Additional correction factors: % of total budget, base allotment $, current subject monograph budget, adjusted budget
    - Concept of demand: the individual surrogates for demand are flawed, but combined, they are a better representation.
    - When facing budget cuts, we have to think about strategic allocation, resulting in not everyone getting what they want.

Discussion

- Some programs are not listed on the allocation breakdown, for example, African Studies. From where are their allocations drawn?
    - The Libraries does support programs, but the funds come from department/college-level allocations.
- As a university library, there may be programs that are small, but you may still want to support those programs. Coming up with a formula may be problematic because small programs may not be well-supported; smaller programs need a larger minimum.
    - To account for smaller programs, the formula could weight department-size inversely, so that smaller ones get protected better.
- Some library resources get used but do not necessarily get checked out.
    - These factors are incorporated into the formula. Knight Library track books that have been moved from the shelves but not checked out (in-house use statistics).
- How many new programs and departments arise each year? Is money reserved for these new collections?
    - Ideally, this gets rolled into the discipline's allocation.
    - With new programs, few proposals incorporate funding for the libraries for collections. But for the Sports Product Design proposal, we were able to get some money added for collections.
- The Libraries were not consulted about cluster hires. After the hire, we approach the faculty to find out their needs, but some of these needs (medical journals) are expensive. We are expected to support these hires but also being asked to make cuts.
- Institutional accreditation: UO was asked to strengthen access to research materials.
- The Libraries has a model of what has been done historically, so one choice is simply to continue in this way. We have a proposal that some formula be used. Is there any other viable choice besides these two?
    - Blend approaches: apply formula to half, historical allocations for half
    - Reach out to departments to see what is really needed and what can be reduced/reallocated
    - Go to programs and ask what they need to teach this course/program? Then look to see if the resources are being checked out
    - Using historical allocation as a jumping off point for discussions about what more/less is needed
    - During last cuts, small budgets were not cut, but the remaining programs were across-the-board cuts.
- If you use the sample formula, would it drastically affect some disciplines?

  - Yes.
- Perhaps different models should be used for different disciplines: sciences versus humanities, etc.
  - The formula does factor in these differences.
- Weighting undergraduates, graduates, and faculty (FTE: double-counted if in multiple disciplines/programs) the same may not make sense; weight each differently.
- Libraries need to know by August which journals would be cut.

Next steps

- Continue the discussion of collection allocations at the next ULC meeting
- Discussion of aligning resources scenarios

Remaining AY2015-2016 meeting schedule:

February 29, April 18, May 16

All meetings 10:00-11:30 in Rowe Conference Room

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON

University of Oregon Libraries
University Library Committee (ULC)
Winter Meeting, 2015–2016 Academic Year
Monday, February 29, 2016
Time 10:00 a.m.–11:30 a.m.
Rowe Conference Room, 115H Knight Library

AGENDA

Attendance: Andrew Bonamici, Sara Brownmiller, John Fenn, Mark Horney, David Ketchum, Ann Miller, Jimmy Murray, Alison Parman, Doris Payne, Jennifer Presto, Nicholas Proudfoot, Mark Watson

Absent: Zena Ariola, Chloe Bosnar, Jack Boss, Richard Chartoff, Adriene Lim

Collections Budget Allocation

- At the last meeting, the ULC heard about how the libraries could use formulas of various sorts to help predict funding needs for collections.
- The current meeting will be used to discuss how the libraries might move forward, and how they might introduce such ideas to the faculty as a whole. Specifically, what are the characteristics of a formula-based system that you would like to see?

Discussion

- Larger versus smaller formulas
    - Following the ideas of statistician Nate Silver (one poll is flawed, so need to look at many polls), it was suggested that the libraries create a system of smaller formulas instead of using one large, complicated formula.
    - For example, one factor was FTE and the other was cost of materials by discipline. Using these two factors alone to determine the formula for allocations would result in most new allocations remaining similar to current allocations, except for two exceptions in which one unit has been severely underfunded and one unit overfunded.
    - But, the way FTE is calculated for the two units may not accurately reflect scholarly activity. Instead of head count per unit, it may be more accurate to count scholarly units (groups of people who need the same library resources). This would require another small formula to figure out different units of scholarly research areas, although this could be difficult to do.
    - FTE does not take into account the graduate students and faculty that do research in a particular program area, but do not have an FTE in that area. Correcting for this may require the libraries to contact unit heads to get an estimate of the number of faculty and students doing research associated with unit.

- Good judgement versus formal-based allocations
  - The problem is that current allocations appear to be arbitrary and the reasons behind them have been lost.
  - Some members are wary of creating any kind of formula for allocations because they cannot account for all factors and do not necessarily create transparency (formulas can be based on arbitrary factors). An exercising-good-judgement model would be better.
  - Others expressed concern about an only good-judgement model because it would lack accountability and transparency.
  - Most members agreed that a hybrid model would work best.
    - What is the least formula needed without hindering the ability to exercise good judgement?
    - One percentage to good judgement (discretion, for historical corrections, emerging needs, etc.) and one percentage to formula for baseline would be reasonable.
- Regardless of the model adopted, how should it be put forward to the whole consensus?
  - Reach out to units for feedback on what their needs are and what a major cut in allocations would mean for their research and for staying current.
    - Subject specialist work with units and have a say in the allocation process.
  - Have a system for special requests based on units' changing needs.
    - The libraries currently has the Stanley B. Greenfield Award for faculty to request special research materials.
  - Collections policies
    - Subject specialist have been working this year on internal collections policies, but could consider making them available to faculty, as part of the conversation with subject specialists and their departments.
- Core collection
  - What is the core collection per unit?
    - Units for which we are not meeting the core needs would require a wider discussion: provide increased funding for collections, cut program, etc.
    - Could also then imagine going beyond the core collection, for example, to entice new faculty.
    - What resources are absolutely essential to be an R1 institution?
- How do we decide who to take money away from? Key question when discussing reallocation.
  - The last version of the large formula model indicates that the allocations for several departments would need to be greatly reduced, that they have been overfunded in comparison to all other departments. However, given cluster hires, this would probably not be a popular decision.
  - The cut of one expensive database could free up a lot of funds to support other programs. Possibly offer choices: A or B?

  - Cross-the-board cuts is the easy out, but rarely makes sense; instead use differing percentages based on size, sufficiency of core holdings, and impact of cuts. The reasoning: each department has the same right to go on and be sufficiently supported as any other.
- Funding of new majors/programs: Do proposals for new majors or programs include implications for the libraries, such as the cost of additional collections?
  - Proposals include resources needed, but this data does not always come from the libraries and the cost is not always broken down.
  - The libraries has representation on the review committee, but the libraries does not have to sign off on the proposals. If collections funds are not included in the final budget, the libraries has little recourse.
  - Committee to consider the chair taking this issue to the Academic Council
    - A cost analysis of needed resources should be included in all proposals.
    - The libraries should be included in the approval process to review the libraries' part of the cost analysis to ensure that initial and recurring funds will be available for the program.
    - From where should the funding come? If only from existing library funds, this means collection cuts for existing programs that still need to be maintained.

Next steps

- Inflation topic to continue

Remaining AY2015-2016 meeting schedule:

April 18, May 16

All meetings 10:00-11:30 in Rowe Conference Room

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON

University of Oregon Libraries
University Library Committee (ULC)
Spring Meeting, 2015–2016 Academic Year
Monday, April 18, 2016
Time 10:00 a.m.–11:30 a.m.
Rowe Conference Room, 115H Knight Library

AGENDA

Attendance: Andrew Bonamici, Sara Brownmiller, John Fenn, Mark Horney, Adriene Lim, Jimmy Murray, Doris Payne, Jennifer Presto, Nicholas Proudfoot, Nancy Slight-Gibney, Mark Watson

Absent: Zena Ariola, Chloe Bosnar, Jack Boss, Richard Chartoff, Alison Parman

Overview of UO Realignment's Impact on Libraries (Adriene Lim)

- Like many units on campus, the Libraries received a 2% budget reduction for FY2016-2017.
- Collections reduction review (memo from the Dean of Libraries to UO): $115,000 cut to the general budget plus a reduction of $450,000 due to lack of increases to cover expected inflationary costs, for a total of $565,000.
- Personnel: $320,000 reduction, with 2 Officers of Administration cuts (Organizational Development, UX moved to central), a part-time classified staff member; lesser impact on direct mission.
- Marketing and Communications integration: The Libraries budget falls under administration, so libraries C&M were part of the first wave of integration; the libraries lost three staff (no direct report), although they will continue to support the libraries.
- Campus IT Strategic Planning: The Dean explained why the libraries should be except from IT consolidation (except where it would make sense). The Libraries is a major centralized academic IT leader on campus, and the success of our mission is inexorably tied to our technology capacity, such as library-specific software and services, discovery platforms, cataloging, etc.

UO Libraries Collection Costs/Inflation (Nancy Slight-Gibney)

- The Libraries has requested that collection costs be part of "as-is" inflationary adjustments.
- The collection cost inflation rate for FY2017 is 5.5%. Adding that to what the Libraries spent during the current year equals what is needed next year to maintain the collection; we have a hole.
- The Libraries has received increases in the past, but has to request these increases on a year-by-year basis and requests are not always approved; there is a lack of predictability.

- There is a false assumption that not funding inflation will lead to increased open access and will deter publishers from increasing rates.

Discussion

- Does it serve the library well to use the term "IT" when perhaps a term like "scholarship" would be more specific and emphasize that technology is only one component?
    - The Libraries tries to use the phrase "educational technologies/digital scholarship" and steers away from "IT"; these are better labels for explaining what the libraries provides.
- From the perspective of research units, most units have at least one position dedicated to "IT"; UO is looking at consolidating all these fragments to reduce overhead. The Libraries is dealing with a different problem; we have a centralized and specialized service.
    - Positions that help professors and students do research and learn in innovative ways, not to fix computers. Unique and important positions that are not redundant.
- The Dean has argued for a review of redundant services through a thoughtful review process, instead of a cross-the-board consolidation.
- How is the president squaring the idea that we need to be an excellent research institution and cut the libraries' funds?
    - He cares about this, but not cutting the libraries budget would have meant cuts elsewhere.
    - The strength of a university's Libraries is not part of AAU status.
- Members raised the idea of a support letter signed by faculty.
- As a Senate committee, it would be appropriate to send a memo to the Senate expressing the committee's concerns and explaining the critical importance of the Libraries and the negative impact of budget reductions.
    - The Dean will draft main points of concern; the ULC will write a memo.
- Proposed increase in the number of faculty and clusters: a need for additional resources.
- How does budgeting happen with the "branch" libraries? Does this need to be accounted for?
    - Divisions are discipline-based, not branch-based.
    - Inflation is an average of all. There are differences among disciplines, but they are rather small now (used to be larger).
    - Math has moved to archives, free access, before being accepted to a journal. No blind referring in the field. Journals serve as a means to faculty promotion (still need the peer-review)—a stamp of approval—but no one looks at them. Archives have become the main source. Starting more open access journals.
- How does Scholar's Bank interact with the IT issue?
    - It could be argued that there would not be a university repository without the Libraries.
    - The Digital Scholarship Center is also working to support open access.
- Journal subscription packages: how do they work?

- Packages/bundling can help reduce inflation (e.g., Elsevier) and can be a better deal than single subscription.
- We get usage statistics; use is through the roof for Elsevier (general statistics, not broken down).
- Subscribe to individual journals as well

Next steps

- Ideas for draft memo: how reductions impact research, etc.
- Consider submitting a resolution to the Senate.
- Start sending suggestions/corrections to Mark Horney for review at next meeting.

Remaining AY2015-2016 meeting schedule:

May 16, 10:00-11:30, in Rowe Conference Room

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON

University of Oregon Libraries
University Library Committee (ULC)
Spring Meeting, 2015–2016 Academic Year
Monday, May 16, 2016
Time 10:00 a.m.–11:30 a.m.
Rowe Conference Room, 115H Knight Library

AGENDA

Attendance: Andrew Bonamici, Jack Boss, Sara Brownmiller, Mark Horney, Adriene Lim, Jimmy Murray, Alison Parman, Doris Payne, Nicholas Proudfoot

Absent: Zena Ariola, Chloe Bosnar, Richard Chartoff, John Fenn, Jennifer Presto, Nancy Slight-Gibney, Mark Watson

Dean's Update (Adriene Lim)

- The Dean questioned whether the ULC's proposed resolution would have more impact as a memo or petition rather than a Senate resolution.
- There is a systemic disconnect between the desire for more open access and the promotion and tenure requirement for faculty to publish in non-OA, peer-reviewed journals.
- If Open Access journal article processing charges (APCs) get pushed down to faculty and departments, that will not necessarily be less costly, according to some analysis being done now in the library profession.
- Instead of cutting funding for collections, should we focus on changing the promotion and tenure process to allow for more OA publishing instead?
- Various models such as cooperatives have been proposed, but there is skepticism that they would make a significant difference. Some have argued that the subscription model actually is most cost effective and fair (pay based on size), if it were not for some publishers' arguably exorbitant rates.
- Scholarly communication broadly should be discussed at all levels of the university.
- The collections budget allocation formula is currently at the exploratory-level; there is not an actual formula in use at the moment.
- ULC feedback highlights the complexity and issues of creating a formula that would be agreeable to most. The Dean will work with Administration to express these issues and to get their input next. The Libraries then could present this to the next ULC group for further review.

Discussion of Draft Senate Resolution (Mark Horney)

- Mark Horney has received three letters from faculty expressing their concerns regarding collections budget cuts.
- Collections costs/inflation is a complex, world-wide problem; there are steps that can be taken, but the problem is not going to be solved soon or single-handedly.

- A shift in collection development was discussed, e.g., away from having a wide range of resources on hand "just in case" to trying to assess real need instead.
- Moving to single-use fees for accessing articles/resources that are rarely used; this could be cheaper. Note: The Libraries does this now for interlibrary loans, but there are still costs for the libraries.
- Resolution versus memo:
    - Timing is an issue for this academic year; we would not have the resolution ready for the last Senate meeting.
    - True that the resolution might not have an impact, but it would require the President to address the issue.
    - Some members believe that budget issues directly impacting the academic mission of the university are part of the Senate's purview.
    - Benefit of distributing the memo: to get faculty feedback and concerns before considering submission of a resolution next year.
    - The chair suggested rewriting the resolution into a memo/statement to the Senate. In the fall, the new committee could decide whether or not to submit a resolution to the Senate.
    - The committee expressed general support and recommended including inflationary information as one measure.

Next Steps

- The libraries will draft a memo for ULC chair and committee to edit and review via email.
- Address the memo to this year's and next year's president of the Senate, to the Provost, etc.
- Distribute the statement/memo to department chairs and deans.