University Library Committee
Minutes
October 22, 2008

Present: Val Burris, Deb Carver, Andy Karduna, Julie Haack, Frances Cogan, Alisa Freedman, Marilyn Linton, Gordon Sayre.

Guest: Mark Watson, Associate University Librarian for Collections & Access; Barbara Jenkins, Head, Reference and Research Services

The meeting was convened at 8:35 a.m. by Deb Carver, Dean of Libraries. Deb welcomed everyone; introductions followed.

Budget Overview

Deb distributed a handout on the library's FY09 General Fund Budget. The library's total budget (including Law Library, CMET (frmly Media Services) and the Portland Library) is $18.3M. The percentage of costs is broken down into three broad categories:

- labor costs - 63%; $11.5M
- collections - 34%; $6.2M
- supplies & services - 3%; $.6M

The library's expenditures this year are expected to be $500,000 more than last year's, which will exceed the library's budget. This is not a $500K debt - it is a deficit that we will incur this year. (During the 1990's, the Library did accumulate a debt, which has recently been forgiven). In order to address overages in this year's expenditures, we will delay filling vacancies, taking advantage of salary savings. There are several factors that have helped create this budget challenge:

1) The UO's budget model used in the past does not address actual costs. Each year the library has to deal with 7-9% inflation on 40% of its budget. The budget model provides the library with the same augment as the other departments receive; however, this does not provide recurring funds to address inflation.

2) Student minimum wage increases are not covered centrally. The library employs close to 350 students, more than most departments on campus.

3) Classified salary step increases are also not covered centrally. The library employs a large number of classified staff compared to other units on campus. Step increases have cost the Library several hundred thousand dollars.

4) The library has a very small S&S budget (Supplies/Services). The library spends much more than what is allocated due to technology needs. With the exception of Blackboard and some public workstations, there is no central funding for technology. Most of the computers in the library have been purchased with gift funds.

At this time, it is uncertain how the UO's new budget model will affect the library's unique situation. Deb explained that the new model will allow the schools and colleges to keep their tuition money and that the Provost Office will receive state funds to help support central services, e.g., Library, IT, and Student Affairs. Those state dollars are not enough to address the costs, so the colleges/schools will be taxed to help support these areas. It is a more complex model than the one the university has been using, but she is hopeful it will factor in the library's actual costs.

Deb reported that the Provost asked the Vice Presidents, Vice Provosts, and Deans to submit proposals for additional funding earlier this fall. The library submitted five proposals:

1. Hold the library harmless against a possible 2% rescission.
2. Funds for Blackboard licensing fees and classroom technology to address service levels.
3. Collaboration between the library and COE for investment in distributed education.
4. Adjust the materials budget to meet inflation.
5. Recurring money to replace classroom equipment.

The Provost has agreed to hold the Library harmless for any cuts this year, fund costs associated with Blackboard and classroom technology (#2), and $100,000 for materials inflation. Given the impact of inflation, however, this will not forestall a cancellation project next year.

Francie asked how much of the materials budget is used to purchase books. Mark responded that the acquisitions budget is $5,000,000. The breakdown is:

- $3 million for serials
- $1 million for books
- $1 million for electronic resources/databases

Mark added that the movement to electronic books is accelerating at a very fast pace. There is no charge for the library user to look at E-books. More and more faculty are finding them very helpful when conducting research, i.e., their searchability is far superior.

Campaign Update

Deb distributed a handout listing the library's gifts received during the campaign, January 2001 - April 2008. The library's original goal for the campaign was $10M. After reaching that goal early in the campaign, the library was given a stretch goal of $15M, which was also surpassed. The library's gift total, as of 10/21/08, is $19,486,794. A significant portion of the Library's gifts are endowments. The Library receives approximately 4% of the endowment value to spend on programs. Much of the money raised will support collections, technology and endowed positions. Deb noted that unrestricted gift money cannot be used to erase the library's general fund deficit.

Faculty Web Page Overview

Notebook computers were provided to the committee members to browse through the library's new Faculty Services web pages (http://libweb.uoregon.edu/faculty/). Barbara Jenkins, Head,

Reference and Research Services, provided information and was available to answer questions. Barbara led the team who was responsible for putting this resource together. She asked the committee members to provide feedback - it is important to know if faculty are finding what they need. Is it user friendly? Should areas be added? What would be helpful to colleagues in your disciplines? The website is available to everyone, but there are some services that are limited to faculty. After several minutes of browsing through the web pages, several suggestions were provided:

- consider linking the Eugene Public Library web page, which would be helpful for faculty searching for videos, e.g.
- find a way to get back to the faculty services page, rather than going back to the library's main web page
- consider linking page from the University's main page
- send postcards to inform faculty of the new service
- invite faculty to sign up to receive email announcements about new happenings in the library - have a link on the page for them to sign up
- ask subject specialists to have conversations with their faculty about this new service
- post a message in the rotating "Did you know" section on the library's main web page
- make the link from the library's main page red - to make it more visible

Barbara will look into implementing these suggestions. She asked the members to continue using the faculty services website and to send additional ideas/comments.

Priorities for 2008-09

Two documents were distributed, both written by last year's committee chair, Dev Sinha.

1) Strategic Planning for the Library Committee
2) Possible Priorities for the ULC Going into 2008-09

The first document addresses areas on how the library can partner with faculty to improve services to the campus community. Those areas he discusses include better utilization of current resources, reducing costs, increasing profile and revenues, and anticipating future needs. The second document lists seven specific areas that the ULC might consider working on this year:

1. Better utilize Scholars' Bank - how can we encourage use and visibility? What are the benefits?
2. Electronic formats of theses - should ULC advocate to have PDFs of UO theses available?
3. Customized library interface web pages - encourage development of area-specific web pages?
4. Initiate a publishing consortium for faculty and administrators - should we initiate a broad-based coalition to increase involvement with faculty and administrators?
5. Information and technology services subcommittee - should ULC become involved in advising administrators on matters of technology, as it pertains to research & teaching? (similar to the Ed Tech Committee)

6. Funding - explore sources to increase funding to address inflation. Faculty involvement/input is very important when asking University Administration for additional funding.
7. Staffing - help evaluate where priorities are in the library.

Deb added that the ULC has been working on #4 for several years, and continues to do so. Proposals/resolutions have been presented to the Senate as a way to get information on scholarly publishing out to the campus.

Julie asked what other libraries are doing to prepare for the future. Deb responded that she has talked to the Provost about putting together a task force on the library of the future. There would be a broad campus representation on this task force, including 1-2 ULC members.

Andy asked if the ULC plays a role in making budget decisions. Deb replied that most budget decisions are made over the summer during the time of year when the ULC does not convene. She reported that this past summer the decision was made to cut monographs 25%. This decision to cut monographs was made because most monograph titles are easily available through Summit.

Gordon added that the English Department pays for many books that the general campus population wants to read. A cut to its budget has a wider impact on the campus.

It is hoped that the committee can finalize which proposal(s) to work on this academic year.

Chair Selection

At the first meeting each year, the committee selects a Chair. Francie nominated Gordon Sayre. Gordon agreed, but added that he will be away February and March, so will miss the 2nd meeting during winter term. Deb will meet with Gordon to discuss plans for the next meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 10:05 a.m.

Submitted by Sheila Gray