

**University of Oregon
Library System**

Program Review

April 16, 1998

*Time frame covered?
Schedule of the PR*

PROGRAM REVIEW
University of Oregon Library System

Self Study Outline		Page
I.	Organization.....	1
	I.1 Services and programs offered	
	I.2 Administrative structure	<i>GOVERNANCE</i>
II.	Description	7
	II.1 Summarize the historical development of the library's programs. Briefly describe the current state of library services, current objectives, and the methods used to achieve these objectives. Relate the service programs to the needs of society.	
III.	Staffing	10
	III.1 Faculty: describe the different responsibilities of faculty, and how those responsibilities have changed.	
	III. 2 Under-represented Groups: how do the proportions of women and minority groups on the library's faculty compare to the university as a whole and the field nationwide? What specific plans and programs does the library have in place to increase the proportions of traditionally under-represented ethnic and gender groups on the faculty and to support their professional development.	
	III. 3 Staff, GTFs, Student Assistants: describe the extent to which staff, student assistants, and graduate teaching fellows (GTFs) are used in the library.	
IV.	Use of Services and Collections	18
	IV.1 Describe the use of the collections by various constituents. What, if any, new patterns are emerging and what implications do these trends have for future planning?	
	IV.2 Describe the use of basic services (reference, research assistance, etc). What, if any, new patterns are emerging and what implications do these trends have for future planning?	

IV.3 Describe the use of instructional services. What, if any, new patterns are emerging and what implications do these trends have for future planning?

V. ~~Funding, Projects, Leadership~~ 31

V.1 Evaluate the level of internal and external funding. *Fundraising*

V.2 Describe new projects to enhance access to library materials. Describe leadership efforts to improve library service in the state, region, nation.

VI. ~~Evaluation~~ *Planning & Assessment* 40

VI.1 Describe how the library evaluates the quality of its faculty in their various responsibilities. How does the library use the results of these evaluations?

VI.2 What procedures does the library use to evaluate the effectiveness of its services? Are the services as good as they should be? If not, why not?

VI.3 What procedures does the library use to evaluate the quality of the collections? Are the collections as strong as they should be? If not, why not?

VII. ~~Development~~ *Future Directions (SWOT?)* 50

VII.1 What changes in demand are anticipated?

VII.2 Is the library staffed adequately to meet the needs of the campus? If available resources remain the same, how will the library respond to anticipated changes in use of services and collections?

VII.3 Could the services and collections be improved through additional collaboration with internal or external units or organizations?

VII.4 What does the library do to encourage research and professional development?

VII.5 What steps are currently being taken to improve efficiency? Should the library take additional steps?

VIII. Summary 63

VIII.1 Summarize the major strengths and weaknesses and the problems the library faces in the foreseeable future. Review briefly the library's major objectives for the next five to ten years. Would major additional resources be needed to achieve these objectives? How can positive change take place with few or no additional resources?

Appendices:

Appendix A: ARL Statistics, 1983-1997

Appendix B: List of library faculty

Appendix C: *Report from the Governor's Task Force on Higher Education: Summary*

Appendix D: Library faculty evaluation procedures

Appendix E: "Kansas Group" comparators: ARL libraries

I. Organization

I.1 Services and programs offered

The University of Oregon Library's core mission is to support and stimulate instruction and research by providing access to information and information services to scholars at all levels. In a liberal arts research institution, the library is a focal point for learning and scholarly activity in all disciplines represented on campus. It pulls together resources in a wide range of formats and then adds value to these resources by providing organization, easy access, and personalized assistance to those who use the collections. Library facilities, collections, and services are highly visible indicators of the general quality of academic life at a university and are important factors in competitive recruitment and retention of faculty and students. The University of Oregon Library is a critical element in the institution's ability to fulfill its academic mission as a comprehensive research university. It is the only library in the state to have been elected to membership in the Association of Research Libraries (ARL). The University's long-standing membership in the Association of American Universities (AAU) dictates that the library's collections, staff, and services fully support the research role that this membership signifies.

The University of Oregon Library offers the full range of traditional library programs plus some general support services for the campus. In addition to serving the students and faculty, the University of Oregon Library plays a leadership role in information services throughout the state and region. This role has expanded significantly in the past several years through cooperative purchasing, cataloging, and lending programs. Traditional direct services include general reference, specialized research assistance, instruction, collection development, outreach, circulation, and interlibrary loan. Indirect services include acquisitions, cataloging, preservation, and systems support. Campus support programs include media services, graphic arts production, and distance education services.

The purpose of the library's traditional services has remained the same for decades, but the nature and delivery mechanisms have changed radically with the widespread use of technology. To meet its mission, the library has been incorporating educational and information technologies since the 1970s, with the pace of change accelerating rapidly in the past eight years. First processes, then collections, and now services are being transformed as technological developments permeate every aspect and function of research libraries. Since 1983, the University of Oregon Library has invested over \$4 million in this transformation--mainly in the integrated library system, but also in electronic resources, and the Information Technology Centers (ITCs). This estimate

includes hardware, software, and subscription/connection costs but does not include recurring costs such as staff involved in the creation and maintenance of the Janus information system. The most recent enhancements in information technology include the addition of a web server to support the library's homepages and the replacement of character-based terminals with high-performance PCs in the reference areas. In the past two years, the library has made significant progress toward moving from a text-based to a graphical environment which is user-friendly and versatile.

Reference and research services are offered from several locations: the central information area in Knight Library, Documents, Music Services, the ITCs, and the branch libraries (Art and Allied Arts, Science, Law, Maps and Aerial Photography, Mathematics, and Oregon Institute of Marine Biology). Telephone and e-mail reference services are also available to remote users. Two smaller collections exist off-campus but are not currently staffed with professional librarians or technicians. These collections are located at the Pine Mountain Observatory (astronomy) and Portland University Center (urban architecture). These remote collections largely duplicate what is available on campus. Most reference desks are staffed with professional librarians during normal business hours and to some extent in the evenings and on the weekends. During the busy times of the academic term, the central information desk is staffed with two librarians.

The University of Oregon Library offers an extensive instructional program which includes credit classes, specialized workshops, the Information Technology Curriculum, peer advising, and outreach seminars for the business and professional community. During the academic year, approximately 4,000-5,000 students, faculty, staff, and public borrowers participate in the instructional program. Teaching has become one of the most important services provided by the library faculty, and it has received high priority in terms of administrative support and campus-wide recognition.

The University of Oregon Library is the largest research collection in the state. In the past decade, it has grown from 1,675,727 to 2,193,826 volumes – an increase of 31 percent. The total number of serial subscriptions has remained fairly stable over the past decade, although there have been some yearly fluctuations. In 1984/85, the library reported having 17,561 subscriptions. In 1994/95 the figure was 17,259, and in 1996/97 the total reported to the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) was 15,452. Increases have been due to new subscriptions and cataloging projects; decreases have been the result of cancellations.

The collection has many areas of prominence including East Asian vernacular materials, aerial photographs (one of the largest depositories in the U.S.), 20th

century political history, and a wealth of primary source material on the history of Oregon and the Pacific Northwest. Examples of general areas of strength include the life and physical sciences, art history, Russian languages and literature, music, women's studies and gender issues, and Canadian studies. Emerging areas of strength include environmental studies, Southeast Asian studies, and ethnic studies. The library's subject strengths coincide with those areas emphasized within the University curriculum. In 1996 specifically, the UO Library ranked third for cartographic materials among 104 ARL libraries, 12th among 98 libraries for graphic materials (e.g. photographs, slides), and 27th among 102 ARL members for sound recordings.

Beginning in 1992, the library participated in several ARL programs designed to improve services including an extensive self-study and diversity training. As a result, we recognized the fact that the traditional passive approach to public service was not adequately meeting some students' needs. In 1995, the library created a new position responsible for outreach programs. The Outreach Coordinator has launched several new efforts to connect with certain groups and help them make better use of the library's collections and services, e.g., foreign students, student athletes, community college transfers, etc. The newest program involves peer instruction for students who need extra assistance using a large research library.

The University of Oregon Library offers decentralized circulation and reserve services. Circulation supervisors interact regularly to ensure consistent policy decisions. With the growing use of the web, most circulation procedures and policies are now easily available online. Another recent goal has been to introduce cost-effective self-service options. Patrons can view their own records and renew materials from any library terminal or remote location. In 1997, patrons were given the option of requesting books directly from any one of thirteen libraries participating in a regional consortium (Orbis). Books are delivered within 48 hours to the requesting library. Orbis borrowing has had the effect of creating a "virtual library" of nearly 5 million volumes that is easily accessible to students and faculty at each member institution. Most reserve activity is still provided through traditional means. Some progress has been made to establish an electronic reserve system. Staff are working primarily with non-copyrighted material and distributing the information as PDF files.

Through its acquisition program, the library will expend a materials budget of \$4,762,040 in fiscal year 1997/98 to support the instructional and research needs of its users. A new interface between the online catalog and the University's financial information system has improved efficiency and streamlined procedures. The Acquisition Department now accepts order requests through electronic mail and over the World Wide Web.

Bibliographic control for monographs and serials acquired in print, microform, audiovisual and electronic formats is accomplished through the work of in-house cataloging teams, OCLC TechPro and Marcive, Inc. Increased reliance on outsourcing in recent years, combined with "quick" cataloging workflows, has greatly improved productivity while allowing more highly trained personnel to focus on creating original records, enhancing and upgrading existing records and participating in cooperative cataloging programs at the national level.

Delivering needed materials to users in a fast and inexpensive manner drives the staff in Interlibrary Loan to improve service and increase productivity. The recent Association of Research Libraries Interlibrary Loan/Document Delivery study bore out better than average statistics in the areas of turnaround time and unit costs for lending and borrowing. Although statistics continue to show an increase in the number of transactions handled for both campus users and those from other libraries, the deployment of new technology, that has included some local programming, has been able to help staff deliver good service and keep up with demand.

A rising demand for needed repair of Library materials and for commercial binding, coupled with a necessary reduction in the amount of student assistance has made for numerous challenges in the library's preservation program. Still, automation efforts continue to improve material throughput speed and the transfer of 1.0 FTE classified staff has enabled the Preservation Department to absorb responsibility for the Oregon Newspaper Microfilming Project and establish a reformatting unit. Collaborative efforts within the State and region are underway to raise preservation awareness and hopefully bring more resources to bear in this area of activity.

The University of Oregon Library Systems and Automation Department is responsible for maintaining and improving computer systems used by library patrons and staff. Major systems administered by this department include the library's catalog, the library Web server, several Linux systems, a staff Novell file server, NT servers, and a UnipriNT (pay for print) system. This department maintains and upgrades a wide variety of staff and public machines including Windows 95, Windows NT, Mac, X-terminals and character-based terminals. Systems works with other library departments to analyze patron needs, staff workflow, etc. and implement new services and products, occasionally engaging in programming of customized applications. Systems coordinates the library's Web publications and is responsible for technical aspects of integrating commercial database services, CD-ROMs, etc.

Media Services includes housing and access for media collections, audiovisual support for campus classrooms, facilities and technical support for the telecourses and teleconferences, and media production and distribution services. The department serves as the UO head-end for EdNet (statewide distance education) and campus cable (under contract with TCI Cablevision of Oregon, Inc.). Media Services has undergone several changes within the last five years. The Knight Library Expansion and Renovation project provided a new distance education classroom, upgraded broadcast studio and head-end facilities, additional listening/viewing rooms, and increased space for storage, processing, and staff workstations. In addition to the modification and improvements to the physical space, a significant investment has been made in the acquisition of broadcast quality video equipment to support telecourses and general video production. Campus equipment allocations and classroom improvement funds have allowed the purchase of LCD projectors, laptop computers for faculty loan, camcorders for student and faculty use, video monitors, VCRs, projection screens, and enhanced sound systems.

I.2 Administrative structure

The administrative structure of the University of Oregon Library could be described as traditional. It is organized into three major divisions: Public Services and Collections, Technical Services, and Administrative and Media Services. An Associate University Librarian heads each of these three divisions. Special Collections and Archives and the Library Systems and Automation Department both report directly to the University Librarian. The Law Library has a joint reporting relationship with the Law School. The departments are organized by function, e.g., Cataloging, or by location, e.g. Science Library.

Since 1990, the library has made several changes in its organization to improve efficiency and service. The Music Services Department was created in 1992 to provide a more integrated range of services to the School of Music. Microforms was combined with Government Documents, building on a natural overlap between the two collections. Collection Development was combined with Public Services, which allowed for the reduction of administrative staff and the creation of a full-time professional focused on collection management issues. Last year, the archival functions were combined with the Special Collections Department. In Technical Services, a separate Preservation Department was established in recognition of a growing responsibility of all research libraries to maintain their respective collections for future generations of scholars. Since that time, responsibility for newspaper microfilming and the reformatting of fragile library materials has been added to this unit's portfolio. Sharing a strong dependence on the library's bibliographic utility, OCLC, and realizing the possibility of better coordination between acquisitions and document delivery, the Interlibrary Loan

Department joined the Technical Services Division in 1994. In 1996, acknowledging the pervasiveness of information technology throughout the library organization, the Library Systems and Automation Department was moved out of Technical Services and now reports directly to the University Librarian. Currently, Technical Services is undergoing a reorganization that will eliminate the Serials Department and integrate those functions into the Cataloging and Acquisition departments. This restructuring will reduce overlapping tasks and pave the way for instituting "quick cataloging" procedures for material in all formats.

The library has not engaged in a grand overhaul of its organizational structure. Instead, it has made incremental organizational changes and moved responsibilities from one department to another to improve and simplify workflow. The incremental organizational changes that have occurred in the past few years have not adhered to one model or theory. In most cases, functions/units have been consolidated. In a few cases, however, new departments have been created to reflect the emerging importance of service in that area.

There are few standing internal committees. Most cross-departmental discussion and decision making occurs in the bi-weekly meeting of library department heads. However, a number of task forces have been created and charged to consider new services or changes and make recommendations to the library Administration, e.g., Digital Library, Diversity, Student Retention, Disaster Planning, Credit Courses.

The library has ex-officio status on several campus committees including the Undergraduate Council, the Graduate Council, and the University Library Committee. The last is a standing committee of faculty which acts as an advisory body on library policy issues. In addition to these general committees, appropriate subject specialists serve as members of most interdisciplinary committees, e.g., German Studies, Russian Studies, Southeast Asian Studies, etc. Since its inception in 1994, the library has had at least one representative on the Educational Technology Committee which makes recommendations on the advancement of campus-wide technology. In general, the library is very well represented at the campus level. General planning groups, such as the recent "Process for Change" included several library representatives. The library also had two members on the University's Accreditation Team.

II. Description

II.1 Summarize the historical development of the library's programs. Briefly describe the current state of library services, current objectives, and the methods used to achieve these objectives. Relate the service programs to the needs of society.

[See Appendix A for ARL Statistics, 1983-87]

The development of the library's services and collections has followed several trends which are common to most research libraries: the incorporation of technology, the shift from "ownership to access," improved efficiency in technical processing, and increased collaboration.

Beginning in the mid-1980's, the library has taken several significant steps to incorporate technology into its processes, services, and collections. The online catalog was created in the late 1980s, and, since then, the library has been on a steady course to integrate and provide seamless access to the complete range of library information resources. Over time, these efforts transformed what was once a text-based OPAC available via "dumb" terminals into the library's home page--an extensive, web-based information system available to students and faculty in the library via high-speed Pentium class PCs and off campus via direct Internet or dial-up modem connections. In 1994, the library completed a large retrospective conversion project that, by adding over 240,000 bibliographic records to its database, resulted in online access to over 80% of the cataloged collections. Subsequently, the Janus system expanded to include access to other electronic resources including Internet connections to other research libraries as well as citation and full-text databases.

All processes are now either fully automated or take advantage of current technology. Circulation services now allow the patrons to renew their own books online and access their patron record. Many circulation notices are now sent as e-mail messages. Workstations in Technical Services provide desktop access to virtually all the tools needed for acquiring, cataloging and processing materials. All library faculty, and nearly all the staff, have individual access to a networked computer -- a 486 PC or better. Many units within the library are using the Web as an Intranet, creating HTML documents that contain internal policies, program proposals, and minutes of meetings.

The UO Library has followed the trend seen in all academic libraries to purchase fewer titles for the permanent collection and rely more on resource sharing, "lease" agreements, and commercial document delivery. As serial subscriptions and monographs become increasingly expensive, these methods provide

alternative means of getting the information to the user. The UO Library has seen steady erosion in its purchasing power. In five years, serial prices have increased over 50% while the materials budget has increased only 17.5 percent. As a result, the library has purchased fewer books and cancelled nearly 2,000 journal titles (See section VI.3). Most libraries have responded by increasing temporary access to content rather than purchasing expensive titles.

Interlibrary loan (ILL) is the traditional resource sharing method that has been used to provide access to materials unavailable through the library's collection. ILL activity has increased significantly in the past several years. (See section IV.1). Another, more recently implemented method of sharing resources is Orbis, a collaborative effort among several Oregon and Washington academic libraries to create an online union catalog that increases access and interlibrary loan opportunities. UO students and faculty can now search and retrieve titles from the Orbis union catalog of nearly five million volumes. A third method of providing access is through electronic databases and full-text resources. Rather than purchasing these resources, the library is usually limited to a lease or license agreement for a fixed time, often one year. The concept of a library owning all its available resources has changed in recent years. A fourth method of providing access is through commercial document delivery. The UO Library is experimenting with this method as a means of reducing serial expenditures. The School of Business has cancelled several expensive, low use journals, and the library is using the money for on-demand purchase of individual articles from those titles.

Processing costs, i.e., purchasing, cataloging, binding, and preservation, are a significant percentage of the costs of library materials. Not counting personnel expenditures, nor the costs of routine supplies (which can run to more than \$60,000 per year in Preservation alone), these activities add between 8 and 10 percent to the purchase price of materials. The library has taken a number of steps to keep expenditures as low as possible, including careful scrutiny of the costs for OCLC services, the selective application of reinforcement for certain types of paperback materials, and the reduction of replacement costs through an active program of mending and repair.

The last trend that has characterized the historical development of library services and programs is collaboration with internal and external units and organizations (See section VII.3). Collaboration has allowed the library to offer better services to the university community, e.g., through a joint effort with the Computing Center to develop the Information Technology Curriculum. Collaboration has allowed the library to offer better access to more books and journals, e.g., through the Orbis Union Catalog. Collaboration has allowed the library to save money, e.g., through the group purchase of most online electronic

products. Finally, collaboration has paved the way toward a more relevant instructional program, e.g., through working more closely with teaching faculty to construct companion credit courses.

The library's current service objectives and philosophy are focused on several specific areas:

- Improving access to information through the use of technology, interlibrary cooperation, and document delivery.
- Diversifying collections to include online bibliographic and full-text databases, multimedia, sound, and images.
- Enhancing instructional programs to include credit classes, open-enrollment workshops, and collaborative teaching projects with faculty, classroom presentations, freshmen seminars, and specialized orientations.
- Building staff expertise in academic disciplines and developing skills in the areas of information technology, teaching, and public relations.
- Making the library's systems and procedures user-friendly by reducing the multitude of interfaces, simplifying procedures, and developing "self-service" options.
- Improving facilities by expanding network capacity, and study and storage space.
- Soliciting feedback, advice, and direction from different clientele groups on and off campus.
- Participating in regional and national associations/efforts in the areas of library services, scholarly publishing, information technology, and preservation.

These service objectives are designed to meet the curriculum and research needs of the university. They are also designed to keep current with changes in information technology. Students who lack access to a strong library with the capability of making connections to a wide range of electronic resources are at a decided disadvantage in today's information-driven society. The library's programs also place a heavy emphasis on instruction, from individual consultation at the reference desk to credit courses on research methods. The library's goal is to contribute to the life-long learning skills that will be essential, regardless of one's chosen career.

III. Staffing

III.1 Faculty: describe the different responsibilities of faculty and how those responsibilities have changed.

[See Appendix B for a list of faculty].

The library faculty, i.e., librarians, are primarily responsible for the following services: instruction, selection of new materials, direct reference and research assistance and general management in the areas of systems, acquisitions, bibliographic control, personnel, archives and special collections. The librarians are distinguished from other professionals in the library by the MLS degree. There are several non-MLS degree professional positions in systems, development (fund-raising), and media services. In 1996, a number of positions which were formerly classified as "management" joined the ranks of the faculty as Officers of Administration. Officially, this change added fourteen new positions to the library faculty. However, for statistical reporting and for purposes of the program review, the term "faculty" is still used to refer to the librarians.

The University of Oregon has two categories of faculty: Officers of Instruction and Officers of Administration. In 1980, the librarians were changed from the instructional to the administration category. The primary impact of this change was to remove the librarians from the tenured ranks. However, librarians with tenure were allowed to remain in the old system if they so chose. This change has had a significant impact on librarian positions. The university's requirements for promotion and tenure were very difficult for the librarians to meet as they struggled to satisfy stringent publication requirements, often to the detriment of their primary responsibilities. The current requirements for promotion to Associate Professor (with a three-year contract) are broader and more realistic as they incorporate involvement in professional organizations, in addition to publication, into the criteria for advancement. [Note: most librarians in the OUS institutions do have tenure; the P&T requirements are different from their teaching colleagues and are more reflective of the librarians' responsibilities].

The responsibilities of the library faculty have become increasingly complex and more varied. Perhaps the most significant change in the past few years has been the emphasis on instruction, not just for reference librarians, but for all library faculty. The librarians are giving more course-integrated presentations and one-hour workshops and have taken on the added responsibility of teaching credit courses. Some library faculty teach courses in other departments, e.g., Russian, Fine Arts, Music. An average of ten credit courses is offered each academic year.

Technology has also had a profound impact on library processes, services, and collections. Library faculty must be able to function effectively in a networked environment. They must have a thorough understanding of software used to search different databases, programs used to create bibliographies, equipment used to deliver electronic files, packages used to create Web-based courses. Reference librarians must be able to keep up with the phenomenal rate of change in database content and construction. They must also help students navigate the complexities of the Internet and evaluate the quality of information linked to various websites.

In Technical Services, all of the faculty members, save the Head of Acquisition, were hired as catalog librarians to perform original and complex copy cataloging. Over the years, the primary focus of these professional positions has shifted away from the actual work of creating catalog records to the work of supervising and managing the staff and processes associated with bibliographic control. As technological changes have occurred, notably the shift from centralized, shared workstations to distributed, desktop PCs deployed in a networked environment, the librarians have become responsible for mastering and then training staff to harness the power of their desktop systems by using powerful new software, including electronically available cataloging tools. It is now possible to predict the day when librarians in Technical Services will perform little, if any, of the actual cataloging work but rather manage and oversee the work of high level paraprofessionals, coordinate outsourcing contracts, monitor quality control processes, including adherence to national cooperative cataloging standards, and develop procedures to process the materials acquired in an increasingly diverse array of formats.

Media Services faculty and staff support a wide variety of activities, including classroom equipment use; housing and viewing media collections; equipment installation, repair and engineering; video and graphics production; telecourse production and support. These are activities which have been radically affected by the pervasiveness of technological change during the past decade and work assignments will continue to reflect the fast paced environment. In general, the integration of digital technologies into nearly every area of activity has required that all Media staff become fluent in network applications for their own work and to support the work of others. Unfortunately, network integration and staff-wide computer literacy has been slower to materialize in Media Services than in most other Library units. Staff workstations have been in short supply due to budgetary competition with instructional equipment priorities. Also, network technologies received a relatively low level of advocacy and interest from Media Services managers during the early 1990s. All staff members are now equipped with network compatible workstations and are using them effectively for communication and production tasks.

In the future, there will need to be an increased emphasis on faculty training. Training programs have already been established for users of large classrooms and more comprehensive training and orientation programs should be developed. Additionally, Media Services staff are facing changing service demands and markets for their media products. With little UO demand for interactive telecourses (EdNet), video production staff have found new avenues for service for campus academic and outreach programs and contract work for state agencies and school districts. The instructional television (ITV) staff has shifted its emphasis to production as opposed to engineering. Engineering staff members have been able to assist with classroom equipment installations and have also provided valuable consultation in facilities design process (Law Center, for example). ITV faculty have also taken an active role in instruction by teaching electronic media courses in the School of Journalism & Communication. This has led to additional collaborative projects. Finally, as graphics production tools become easier for end-users, graphic artists will need to emphasize instruction and design consultation rather than actual production. This transition is underway.

In Library Personnel, the implementation of the Banner Human Resources Information System (HRIS) module will cause profound changes to the organization and workflow of the payroll and personnel records office. Current staff assignments and classifications will need revision. Furthermore, several major efforts have been the focus for the Head of Personnel Services. This faculty member has been instrumental in helping the library take the lead in providing diversity education and programming for staff. The library is a member of the ARL Partners program and has established a standing Diversity Advisory Committee. Additionally, the Head of Personnel Services has been involved in a UO led project to restructure the Library Technician classification series at the State level in order to better reflect the needs and demands of current services. When the series was written in the mid-80s, relatively few public services staff worked with an integrated library system or with other networked systems on a regular basis. These systems now permeate the entire organization.

In Administrative Services, the implementation of the Banner Financial Information System (FIS) has transformed staff activities from budgeting through package receiving in the mailroom. All Administrative Services staff now make extensive use of networked resources for communication and business process. The system is not easy to use and in some cases has diminished rather than increased staff productivity, especially in payment of invoices. The upgrade to a version that makes use of graphical user interface should make the system much more user friendly. On the positive side, the system can be used to generate excellent management information.

In helping to further the mission of the Orbis consortium, the UO has provided leadership in consortial purchasing and contracting; this provides interesting opportunities for budget managers and purchasing staff in Administrative Services. Beginning in 1998-99, Orbis services to non-OUS institutions will be shifted to a contractual model, which will allow the consortium to accrue income on unexpended equipment replacement funds. Administrative Services staff are also working closely with the consortium in developing an Request for Proposal (RFP) for regional library courier services.

III.2 Under-represented Groups: how do the proportions of women and minority groups on the library's faculty compare to the university as a whole and the field nationwide? What specific plans and programs does the library have in place to increase the proportions of traditionally under-represented ethnic and gender groups on the faculty and to support their professional development?

The proportion of women faculty within the library is substantially greater than the proportion of women faculty campus-wide. The UO Library employs 51.75 FTE library professionals of which 31.75 FTE are women (61%). The total number of tenured and tenure track faculty (.5 FTE or greater) on campus is 609. This figure excludes senior administrators who hold tenured positions in an academic department. Of that total, 195 are women (32%). Women have also been well represented among recently hired library faculty. In the past five years, 16 female librarians have been hired compared to six male librarians. According the Association of Research Libraries (ARL), the UO is very close to the national average. There are approximately 7,000 librarians in ARL libraries of which 63% are female.

It is not surprising, given the historical development of the profession, that a majority of the library faculty is female. Perhaps a more significant indicator of gender representation and equity is the number of female administrators. Women have been well represented on the library's administrative and management teams. Until this past year, at least half of the administrative team had been female. The average among ARL libraries is 51 percent. There are presently 17 department heads on the library's management team; 12 of those department heads are women (70%). This figure is slightly higher than the national average of 63 percent.

Compared to the campus as a whole, the library has a smaller proportion of faculty that qualify to hold "minority" status. Approximately six percent (3.0 FTE) of the library faculty come from under-represented ethnic groups. This figure is slightly lower than the campus and national averages. The university

employs 59 of 609 (10%) faculty of color. According to the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) *1996-97 Annual Salary Survey*, there are 721 minority librarians employed in ARL libraries, or approximately 10 percent. This discrepancy has been acknowledged in several UO Library status reports and self-studies. For the past several years, the library has stepped up its efforts to recruit more faculty of color. Although there are growing populations of Hispanic and Asian residents within the state, Oregon compares less favorably to many other regions in terms of ethnic diversity. For this reason, the library does a national recruitment for all professional vacancies. All positions are posted to various ethnic and minority listservs. The library has also worked closely with the ARL diversity consultant to adopt methods for encouraging minority applicants. The job advertisements include the library's web address which has links to diversity-related news in the library, on campus, and in the community. The library's personnel administrator and the outreach coordinator attend various ethnic caucuses and discussion sections at ALA to establish informal networks within these professional groups. UO Library search committees discuss the goal of diversity and how it differs from Affirmative Action requirements. Future plans include the possibility of establishing a scholarship for minority library student workers or staff members to attend library school. Furthermore, the ARL diversity consultant has been invited back to the library next month (May 1998) to discuss the library's progress and offer additional suggestions which might enhance these recruitment efforts. Although there are several external obstacles (salary levels, location) which make it more difficult to attract minority and hire minority applicants, the library administration has demonstrated a longstanding commitment to creating a diverse workforce.

Future Concerns/Issues

- Libraries are among the most fundamentally democratic institutions in the United States. For this reason, diversity plays an important role in the delivery of library services. The library needs to strengthen its recruiting efforts and hire more people of color to ensure that services and collections are informed by and benefit from broadly diverse and different perspectives.

III.3 Staff, GTFs, Student Assistants: describe the extent to which staff, student assistants, and graduate teaching fellows (GTF) are used in the library.

In addition to the faculty, the library employs 92 support staff and 85 FTE student assistants (approximately 340 students). Of the 92 support staff, 12 (13%) are managers and 6 (6.5%) are professionals; the remaining employees are union-represented (classified). The library also employs three graduate teaching fellows (GTFs) represented by the Graduate Teaching Fellows Federation.

Unlike the typical instructional department, the library deploys staff across a wide range of responsibilities, including but not limited to:

Direct patron services such as circulation, interlibrary loan, stacks maintenance, equipment training (Media Services).

Technical services such as materials ordering and processing, preservation and repair, cataloging, database maintenance, hardware and software support for public and staff servers and workstations.

General administrative and clerical services including reception, scheduling, personnel and payroll, purchasing, accounting, shipping and receiving, supervising and training student assistants.

Compared to other university departments, the library uses relatively few GTFs. There are currently three part-time positions, one each in Knight Library Reference, Government Documents, and Graphic Arts. At one time, the GTFs were responsible for teaching the library skills courses, but, in 1994, their duties were shifted to reference work and other professional assignments. The librarians are now responsible for teaching all credit courses. This shift in responsibility signaled a change in philosophy. Instruction has become the most important public service. As faculty, the librarians need to teach in their area of expertise – research methods and information resources – rather than assign these responsibilities to graduate students from other disciplines.

The GTFs have enhanced library service in several ways. Their specific subject backgrounds broaden the expertise in the reference departments. They have first-hand familiarity with the UO programs and can easily establish a successful rapport with other students. The GTFs have also relieved the librarians of several hours of direct reference desk duty so that more time can be devoted to class preparation and presentations.

Of the 85 total student FTE, 89% work in public service functions, primarily (but not exclusively) in circulation and stacks maintenance. Other public service activities include desk coverage in the Information Technology Centers (ITCs), paging materials from Special Collections, and filling interlibrary loan requests. Approximately 8% of the students work in technical processing (acquisition, serials, cataloging, manuscript and archival processing, materials processing and repair). The remaining students work in administration and in the library's Systems and Automation Department.

The library's staffing levels have been problematic for several years. Staffing levels have been the subject of criticism by the NASC Accreditation team, the

GPO Depository Review team, and the ABA Accreditation team (for the Law Library). Compared to other ARL and public AAU institutions, the UO Library has a shortage of professional and classified staff and relies heavily on part-time student employees to make up some of the difference. In one internal study done in 1991, the library analyzed the work performed by students and found that many (approximately 23 FTE) were handling responsibilities that should be assigned to full-time, appropriately qualified library technicians.

STAFFING PROFILES -- ARL COMPARATORS

Category	ARL Median: FTE	Median % of total staff	Public AAU Libraries Median: FTE	Median % of total staff	UO LIBRARY: FTE	as percent of total staff
Professional	72	40%	100	27.86%	51	22.4%
Classified	134	50%	183	50.97%	92	40.3%
Student	64	24%	87	24.23%	85	37.3%
Total Staff FTE	270	n/a	370	n/a	228	100.00%

This heavy reliance on student assistants has several negative consequences. The relatively high degree of turnover adds to the training and supervision costs. Students are unable to deliver the same quality of service that is expected of full-time experienced staff. Their academic schedules are demanding, and they often miss shifts due to class conflicts. And the funding for student assistants is unstable, which has resulted in budget shortfalls and cuts in services.

Several trends in staffing levels and responsibilities are likely to affect library service for the foreseeable future. Technology has helped to increase productivity by automating many routine tasks. At the same time, increased dependency on networked technology has demanded greater skills and abilities throughout the organization. The management of complex databases, integration of electronic resources, maintenance of numerous servers and public workstations, and the development on online services such as electronic reserves requires sophisticated problem-solving skills and teamwork. Jobs have expanded at all levels within the library, and many staff positions have been reclassified to a higher level. The librarians have assumed new responsibilities such as teaching, supervision of staff, database licensing, management of technical processes, web development, and planning consortium services. Correspondingly and with more frequency, students are often asked to assume responsibilities which were once assigned only to permanent employees.

Future Concerns/Issues:

- The library will need to hire professionals with the subject expertise and pedagogical skills needed to meet the growing demand for instruction.
- Staff and student assistants will need to have a wide range of computer skills to cope with the ubiquitous nature of information technology and strong communication skills to deal with the collaborative nature of most work assignments.
- The library administration will need to make adequate investments in staff development and continuing education opportunities.

IV. Use of Services and Collections

IV.1 Describe the use of the collections by various constituents. What, if any, new patterns are emerging and what implications do these trends have for future planning?

Use of the library's collections has increased significantly in the last decade. In 1985/86, 240,664 items were checked out from the Knight Library circulation desk; ten years later, the figure was 429,910—a 79% increase. For all locations, the library has seen a 17.6% increase in total checkouts for 1997/98 (2/97-1/98) compared to 1995/96 (2/95-1/96).

Use of the library's print collections by its principal constituents—UO faculty, students, and staff—continues to increase. Loans to UO borrowers have increased by 13% since 1995/96. The heaviest borrowers of materials in this group continue to be undergraduates. They are responsible for approximately 50% of all loans. Perhaps the strongest indicator of the library's importance to the campus community is the percentage of students and faculty who use the collection. During the first two terms of the most recent year, *60% of first-year students checked out at least one item.* That number will likely increase by the end of the academic year. This fact disproves the stereotypical image of the freshman who “never sets foot in the library.” For the other undergraduate classes, the library saw equally high percentages: *84 percent of all sophomores, 93 percent of all juniors, and 98 percent of all seniors borrowed at least one item. Among the graduate students, 91% have checked out library books and nearly 98% of the law students have done the same. Impressions of faculty use indicate that they rely most heavily on journals (which do not circulate) and online information. Even with these predilections, 83% of the UO faculty have checked out material from the library.*

As the largest research collection in the state, the UO Library also sees continued and increased use by non-University patrons. Three years ago, non-UO borrowers constituted 12% of the direct loans. Last year they made up 15.1% of direct loans. Overall, on site use by individuals not affiliated with the University of Oregon increased by 45% since 1995/96. With greater accessibility to the library's catalog via the Internet and more emphasis placed on community outreach, the library should expect this demand by external constituents to grow.

In addition to this increase in direct loans by both UO and non-UO borrowers, use of interlibrary lending services has increased significantly. UO faculty and students have made greater demands on other libraries for titles not owned locally. Since 1991/92, the number of interlibrary loan requests by UO faculty and students has increased 56 percent. At the same time, the UO has received more requests from other libraries. These requests have increased 72% since 1991/92. This increased use can be partly attributed to the enhanced access to journal citations available through electronic

indexes. Some of the increase may also be explained by the widespread cancellation of journal titles which results in less duplication across library collections.

The most recent changes in collection use have resulted from the development of the Orbis union catalog and the accompanying patron-initiated borrowing system. After much planning, the 14-member consortium of academic libraries in Oregon and Washington implemented an automated borrowing system among Orbis members in March 1997. The system allows students and faculty to request titles from the catalog screen, and the books are delivered within 48 hours to the patron's library. Since the implementation date, Orbis has been compiling use statistics on a monthly basis. Among the thirteen institutions (Oregon State University is the only Orbis member not participating in automated borrowing activities at this time), the UO has loaned significantly more than any other institution. As the only research library currently participating in the borrowing system, the UO was expected to be the largest net lender. (Net lending is determined by subtracting the total number of items borrowed from the total number of items loaned.) In an average month, the UO will lend 2,000 titles to other institutions (33% of the total) and borrow 970 titles from other institutions (16% of the total).

The Orbis borrowing program has several implications for the UO Library. A major impact has been on traditional interlibrary loan. Since the implementation of Orbis borrowing, the UO Library has seen interlibrary loan requests for books decrease by half. (This makes the increases in ILL noted above even more dramatic. Without the shift to Orbis automated borrowing for books, it is unlikely that the ILL staff could have kept pace with demand.) Orbis borrowing is definitely more cost-effective than traditional interlibrary loan, so the library is able to deliver more services at less cost. The library expects ILL requests for books to continue to decrease because of Orbis borrowing, especially after OSU becomes a full participating member of the consortium. Obviously, another major impact for the UO is increased access to additional titles. The UO borrows more books through the Orbis system than any other member. However, some of the UO's unique collections, particularly in art and architecture, have been used so heavily by other libraries that UO faculty and students' access to these titles has been curtailed. In some cases, "in demand" titles have been blocked from circulation to other Orbis libraries. In the long term, subject specialists from all institutions need to track Orbis use so informed and collaborative collection development decisions can be made.

The online circulation system provides staff with accurate statistics on borrowing. It is more difficult to estimate in-house use of library materials which do not circulate through the system, such as journals. However, the library does estimate in-house use for various non-circulating collections.

- From 1994/95 to 1996/97, shelving of materials used within the Knight Library increased by 29 percent.

- Requests for newspapers (state, national and international) have declined slightly in recent years. Most of this decline can be attributed to the increasing presence of newspapers on the Web. Also, several expensive newspaper titles were cancelled as a result of serials inflation.
- In-house use of printed government documents decreased by 19% between 1995-96 and 1996-97. This change is likely due to the migration of government publications from print to online format.
- The number of music recordings requested for in-house listening increased by 143% between 1995-96 and 1996-97.

The Library is just beginning to use circulation data to analyze use and collection strengths and weaknesses. Anecdotally, librarians report an increased demand for international materials, materials with a regional focus, interdisciplinary resources, and statistical data. The mission of a research library is broader than that of a typical academic library. It includes a responsibility to collect and preserve the scholarly record which extends beyond the purchase of high-demand titles to satisfy immediate curriculum and research needs. Typically, use rates of research collections are low, e.g., 20% or less. Compared to this figure, the UO's use rates are significantly higher. Of the monographs cataloged for locations of Knight, AAA, and Science, which are eligible to circulate, 42.4% have been checked out since May 1993. Now that most research libraries have most of their collections online, there are a number of opportunities to analyze and compare usage.

The use of electronic information, both online and offline, has increased significantly in the past several years. The library regularly experiences heavy demand for its computers, especially in the reference areas. Use of the Instructional Technology Centers (ITCs) is at capacity almost every minute that the library is open. Although the library has increased the number of search terminals and network connections, it has been difficult to keep up with demand. Daily searches of the library's Janus system by both on-site and remote users frequently exceed 7,000. Each week, patrons access the online indexes available through Janus between four and five thousand times. Online access to information is clearly the preferred method of inquiry. The easy availability of these resources encourages students and faculty to browse the different databases to learn more about their topics of interest. The quality of research at all levels has been significantly enhanced by the availability of these services.

Because of the explosion of information technology, library users are demanding increased access to materials in an electronic format. As the library attempts to meet these demands, it faces several challenges. First, there is the funding issue. Electronic resources will continue to put a strain on the library's materials budget. The library

currently spends approximately 6% of the materials budget on electronic databases, but that figure is likely to grow significantly in the next few years. In some cases, the electronic product replaces the print, but when that is not true, the additional expense will mean sacrifices in other areas. Second, the purchase of many full-text and bibliographic databases represents a significant investment. Each product must be carefully tested and compared to similar products for content, coverage, interface design, cost, and access. The library must also analyze use statistics on a frequent basis to make sure that the purchase continues to be cost-effective. Third, increased availability of remote access has several implications for library service. The instruction program must respond to the difficulties that users encounter as they confront frequent changes in database content, design, functionality, etc. Service is further complicated by the array of equipment available to the remote user. Many faculty on the UO campus are still using old, text-based computers (if they are using computers at all)! The library must remain aware of the computer capability of individual users on campus and make appropriate decisions to ensure the widest accessibility. Increased cooperation with Computing Services and outreach to users can effectively prevent further widening of this technological gap. Finally, a related outgrowth of the increased demand for electronic resources is the need to expand users' access to quality printing, scanning, and photocopying equipment.

Non-book formats, including but not limited to compact discs for musical recordings, aerial photos, maps, videos, slides, photographs, manuscripts, and microfilm have also seen increased usage. The development of new technologies--DVD for digital, audio and computer data and DAT for musical recordings--will have impact on the selection and purchase of non-book formats. The library will have to carefully plan for the purchase and proper maintenance of the equipment needed for utilizing these resources.

Finally, approximately 1,300 researchers use the library's special collections, i.e., manuscripts, rare books, and the Oregon Collection, each year. The users (primarily, but not exclusively academics) from around the world come to Eugene to use the collections which support their research. In the past five years, there has been a significant increase in use by Oregon's Native American peoples who are taking possession of their own history. The library has worked in concert with regional tribes to collect and preserve these important historical collections.

Future Concerns/Issues:

- The library needs to prepare for even greater use by non-UO students, faculty, businesses, and community borrowers.
- More data is needed to analyze the strengths and weaknesses of the collection.

- Demand for electronic resources will continue to put pressure on the existing materials budget; use of electronic resources will continue to put pressure on existing equipment and S&S budgets.
- The Library needs to recognize and account for the different skill levels of its users and the widely divergent computer equipment that is used to access electronic information, particularly among the teaching faculty.
- The use of traditional print resources with Web equivalents (newspapers, government documents) will decline. However, the Web is not likely to have a significant impact on total circulation figures for the foreseeable future.
- As more and more materials become available through a single point of electronic access, the collections get heavier use and preservation becomes a greater challenge (currently, every 1,000 circulation transactions produce 6 repairs). Many resources, even those published a few years ago, cannot be replaced.

IV.2 Describe the use of basic services (reference, research assistance, etc.) What, if any, new patterns are emerging and what implications do these trends have for future planning?

The UO Library's reference and research services are used heavily by UO students, faculty, and staff. These services include everything from the short directional question to extensive personalized assistance. The number of reference queries continues to increase – in Knight Library, reference questions have increased between 3% and 15% nearly every year. More questions reflect a new level of complexity. In the AAA Library, for example, 50% of the questions now take between 5 and 15 minutes to research. One reason for this increased complexity is the growing emphasis on interdisciplinary research. Interdisciplinary programs such as environmental studies, women's studies, ethnic studies, and international studies have had a significant impact on library services. Interdisciplinary topics require additional reference assistance because they are often complex and depend upon the use of resources in several subject areas. Demand for reference help is also a function of the continuous state of flux which characterizes the electronic information environment. Students and faculty are hard pressed to keep up with these changes. As a result, the expert assistance of a reference librarian is even more critical than it was five years ago.

Reference services are provided in-person, over the telephone, and through e-mail. As academic and research libraries feel the pressure of increased demands on top of static budgets, some libraries have shifted away from the professionally staffed reference desk. There are more situations where staff and/or well-trained students operate an information kiosk or service center, and complex questions are handled by the librarians on an appointment basis. The UO Library has made some changes in this

direction, but for the most part, information services are still provided in the traditional manner. Desks are usually staffed with at least one professional librarian. Most basic and intermediate questions are answered immediately. Advanced questions requiring more time and preparation may be referred to a subject specialist.

Three major changes in the past four years have had a significant impact on reference and research services: the ubiquitous nature of the Web interface, the widespread availability of electronic resources including full-text databases; and the advent of the Web as a searchable information tool. In 1996, Innovative Interfaces, which produces the library's integrated online system, began using the Web interface for its catalog product. In addition to the catalog, the library has, whenever possible purchased the Web version of most online databases. The Web's graphical interface has also allowed the library to integrate its own information into the Janus system, e.g., subject guides to collections, interlibrary loan forms, and policy statements. Each public service area now has its own website with appropriate links to useful resources. This single, Web-based interface has made the mechanical aspects of searching much easier, and it has relieved the librarians of the nightmare that existed just a few years ago when every product required a different set of oblique key strokes.

The creation of a networked society and the explosion of content, functionality, and hype have increased patrons' demands and expectations of electronic information. The advent of new electronic options such as full-text and the publishing of entire journals online has created a new confusion. The sciences, particularly, are seeing a profusion of electronic products. Some of these are only available electronically, and some are available with online or CD-ROM enhancements. The challenge for librarians lies in keeping abreast of the constantly emerging electronic products, and being able to help patrons navigate the myriad of options and reduce their confusion.

Many UO courses have always included research, writing, and information technology components. Now, courses that used to be fairly textbook-centered such as Accounting, require students to do substantial work via the Web. Disciplines and courses that have always been information intensive, e.g., Journalism, Psychology, have become even more so as students are expected to be proficient in the technology as well as the information content. Although many faculty encourage students to use the Web, there are growing concerns about the reliability of electronic information resources. Librarians are spending more time trying to help students evaluate sources for accuracy and reliability.

Librarians are also coping with a wide variance in the experience and technical skills of users. Many older students, faculty, and staff have minimal experience in using information technology. Some faculty continue to have access to outdated computer technology. This is particularly true in the humanities. The library needs to remain at the forefront of providing training and assistance to those users who find themselves

caught between the limitations of their computer technology and the development of increasingly Web-oriented information systems.

At the same time, many younger students have technical skills but a limited knowledge of how to locate, evaluate, and use relevant information. There is an increasing dichotomy regarding the students' sense of self-knowledge and confidence about finding information and their actual skills at locating useful scholarly resources quickly and efficiently. This dichotomy is a result of user-friendly searching tools on the Web. With search engines such as *Altavista* and *Infoseek*, students can easily find "something" on a topic, but narrowing the topic's scope or finding information rich in facts and analysis is much more difficult. Searches which produce several thousand hits are common, and many students will either pick something from the first ten results or get frustrated with the lack of precision.

Librarians report that the critical thinking skills necessary to pursue complex information retrieval processes and the ability to discern the quality, perspective, and reliability of the information retrieved are lacking. Although the students have a greater awareness of the range of information available via the Web, they seem less able to use periodicals, indexes, and library catalogs. In the past, these basic skills were often developed in high school. Unfortunately, Oregon school budgets have suffered as a result of recent political decisions, and many high schools have reduced or eliminated library services, relying instead on the computer to "do it all." In the past two years, the library has placed a greater emphasis on critical thinking skills and information literacy. Although computers are excellent tools, they do not necessarily improve the users' analytical or deductive reasoning abilities. Reference librarians provide one-on-one instruction and encourage critical thinking during the discussion with the student at the reference desk. Because the student is focused on learning at that time, this can be a very effective "teachable moment."

The growth of networked resources has had another major impact on the library: an increasing need to provide reference and research services to remote users. Many students and faculty now access the library's resources electronically and seek assistance via telephone or e-mail. For the most part, the library has been able to keep up with this demand, but the quality of the service is always a question when the user is not present to help refine the search. E-mail reference service was started in 1995. Although some faculty have become regular users of the service, many e-mail requests are from non-UO accounts.

As is the case with the use of the collections, use of the library's basic services by non-UO patrons is increasing. These patrons are often students from other local colleges (LCC, NCC, etc.) and increasingly from colleges that offer distance education programs in Eugene (Linfield, George Fox, etc.). Corporate use of reference service has also increased as area businesses focus on high technology and become aware of the

library's resources. The UO Library has also seen an increase in the use by high school students and patrons from the community who have fewer resources and services at their secondary schools and public libraries.

The availability of many electronic databases also brings with it the accompanying issue of hardware and software support needed to run these databases. The library increasingly needs to have the equipment and the knowledge to assist patrons with the software and the content of these many and varied resources. There is also the question of permanent access which must be addressed since these databases and their software may not be compatible with the future generations of computers.

In addition to responding to changes and challenges associated with the Web's development, the library has tried to enhance the quality of its services through new initiatives and programs. In 1995, a position was created to focus on outreach services to various groups of students on campus. This program has been a great success. Targeted groups for this service have included international students, students of color, returning students, athletes, and students who need extra assistance using a research library. With this additional effort, these students are beginning to see the library as a welcoming and less threatening environment. This past year, the outreach effort has been carried one step further through the Peer Advising Library Network (PLAN), an effort supported by private funds that enables students to work intensively and individually with trained peer library advisors. This program has been particularly beneficial for students who need substantial basic assistance to effectively use information resources.

Many resources, particularly in the humanities, are still not available electronically. This has meant keeping up with print resources and maintaining the skills needed to find materials in non-electronic formats. Librarians need to continue to maintain their knowledge of print resources, while constantly expanding their breadth of skill with electronic databases. They must also help to counter the belief that all relevant information is now available online. Many students are convinced that if the answer does not appear after one *Webcrawler* search, it does not exist.

Higher education is changing in ways that will affect reference services. Distance education is one of these major higher education issues. Students taking courses remotely need access to information resources in a timely and appropriate fashion. Higher education policy makers are increasingly interested in accountability and being able to make quantitative assessments about the value of such services.

Future Concerns/Issues:

- Increased demand for electronic resources will put pressure on existing equipment. The library will eventually have to phase out most text-based terminals and

maintain an adequate number of high-performance workstations to keep pace with the rapid changes in database access.

- Reference and research services will need to address users' different levels of technical information literacy skills. Younger students usually have stronger technical skills but less ability to find, evaluate, and assimilate information. Older students have stronger critical thinking skills, but are often less able to exploit the technology.
- Demand for remote services will increase. Policies and services will have to address the changing needs of distance education students and other off-campus users.
- The library should examine services offered to non-UO clientele and measure the impact of these services on our ability to meet the needs of UO students and faculty.
- The library needs to build on the success of its outreach program to the campus community.
- The library needs to promote the value of traditional reference collections, so that they are used more frequently and effectively by students.
- The library needs to facilitate more opportunities for staff training in order to keep up with the constant changes in information technology.

IV. 3 Describe the use of instructional services. What, if any new patterns are emerging and what implications do these trends have for future planning?

The University of Oregon Library's instructional program has undergone a transformation over the last four years. Teaching has become one of the most important services provided by the library faculty, and it has received high priority in terms of administrative support and campus-wide recognition. Given the constant changes in information technology, the program is always evolving. The library has made a commitment to keep the program vital, equitable, and efficient. This commitment requires the dedication of the faculty who must keep their technical and teaching skills current, and it requires an ongoing investment in educational technology, equipment, classroom facilities, and electronic resources. It also requires innovation. Technology is changing the way faculty teach and the way students learn. The library's goal is to enhance the ability of all students to fully exploit information resources, to make sure all students have the basic skills necessary to succeed by creating a "technological common ground," and to expand the boundaries of information technology and encourage experimentation.

The library serves several constituent groups, each with their own unique characteristics and instructional needs: undergraduate students, graduate students, returning students, international students, faculty, staff, students from other institutions (including high schools and community colleges), and the larger community. Although the library services a diverse clientele, the program has been structured primarily to meet the needs of undergraduate students. In the Public Services Self Study (1993), the committee included recommendations to expand class and course offerings geared toward graduate students, but no formal plan has been developed. Instructional services for faculty have been enhanced recently with the creation of a new position in the library. The Academic Education Coordinator is responsible for helping individual faculty to incorporate technology into their courses and facilitating faculty training activities campus-wide. The coordinator is in charge of the Faculty Consultants Network (FCN) which also provides individual consultation and sponsors programs such as the annual Technology Fair and seminars on timely topics such as copyright on the Internet.

Prior to 1996, the instructional program was focused exclusively on UO groups. In conjunction with development and outreach efforts, special instructional sessions were designed for alumni and other friends of the university. The library *Links* program has been particularly popular among community business owners and professionals. The library has also seen increased use by local high school students, particularly those in advanced programs. There is a growing interest in creating effective partnerships with the schools. The library faculty has been enthusiastic about expanding the instructional program to include new courses and new groups, but the program may be at capacity now. Without significant restructuring and reassignment of duties, it will be difficult to assume more teaching responsibilities.

Several patterns have emerged which relate to the library's instructional services. Some of these patterns are similar to those found in reference and research services (see Section IV.2). The growth of electronic resources has created a complex information environment. On one hand, the widespread use of the Web interface has made it easier to teach the mechanics of finding information. Many students can use the Web with little or no instruction. On the other hand, the search engines designed to navigate the Web are not the equivalent of library catalogs. They do not always produce precise results, and the number of hits can easily overwhelm the novice user. Performing complex searches often requires searching skills (Boolean operators, proximity operators, and truncation) that many end-users have yet to develop. The library has tried to address this trend by focussing less on the searching mechanics, i.e., which button to push, and more on search strategies. The Information Technology (IT) Curriculum now includes several classes to help students search the Web efficiently, e.g., *Beyond Just Surfing*, and *Getting the Most Out of Your Web Searching*.

Although the Web interface is becoming more common, there are still many inconsistencies in the way different databases work. Some databases allow for keyword searching; others do not. Some databases are available to remote users through IP address detection; others require users to key in their name and ID numbers. Some databases cannot be accessed through a commercial ISP. Some databases are compatible only with certain browsers; others require the latest version of a browser. There are also inconsistencies in the content of databases. In many cases, titles will be added to a database, but in some situations, content will disappear without notice. This constant fluctuation presents an extraordinary challenge for instructors. These details can overwhelm a class, but unless they are covered in some fashion, the students can run into several frustrating roadblocks.

While the trend toward a standard interface is making searching easier in many cases, the proliferation of databases, indexes, and electronic journals is making library use more confusing. Library instruction courses used to focus on the single source for a specific information need. Now, the user is often confronted with several choices. The Janus system includes links to 64 databases from 26 different vendors. For business information, the student has the choice of going to ABI Inform, Business ASAP, General Business File, STAT-USA, Lexis-Nexis, and a tremendous range of free resources on the Web. The library's instructional program has had to include more comparative analysis of the different products in a specific discipline. To address this need, the IT Curriculum has included several workshops which focus on subject areas, e.g., *Web Resources in Art History*. Unfortunately, these classes have been poorly attended. Given the apparent ease of searching the Internet, students may be convinced they know more than they do. In many cases, they are satisfied with the first thing that appears on the screen.

Most incoming students have had some exposure to computers prior to arriving at the university. Many of them know how to use a word processor, how to use e-mail, and how to navigate the Web. For those who do not have these skills, the library has a basic training program, *Get Ready*, offered during the summer orientation weeks and the first week of fall term. But technical literacy is only one piece of information literacy. Many students are noticeably deficient in critical thinking and problem solving skills. To address this need, the library has restructured its credit classes (LIB 101 and LIB 210) to place more emphasis on authority, objectivity, accuracy and currency. These courses have also tried to address other aspects of information literacy: how to define a topic, how to create a useful bibliography, when to use the library's catalog and when to use a periodical index. Information literacy is receiving greater attention in higher education. In Oregon, the *Report from the Governor's Task Force on Higher Education* (See Appendix C for the *Summary*) recognized the value of information literacy and lifelong learning. The library has made some progress toward meeting this worthy goal, but more resources are necessary if the program is to be expanded significantly.

Overall, demand for library instruction is increasing (see Section VII.1). This increase in demand is due to several factors: the library's willingness to expand the program, the emphasis on quality instruction, the increased use of information technology in all disciplines. The library has responded to the increase in demand in two major ways. First, instruction has become a priority service for most reference librarians, and others are strongly encouraged to contribute. Several librarians in Technical Services now teach regularly in the IT Curriculum. Secondly, the library has pursued collaborative partnerships with other units on campus to meet the demand. For example, staff from the University Computing Center help with the IT Curriculum. Collaboration with teaching departments has also helped to improve the relevancy of the library's program. This year, the library developed several companion courses to assist faculty who teach research-intensive courses in various disciplines, e.g., Business, Psychology, and Journalism.

In addition to direct teaching performed by library faculty, the Media Services department plays a major role in supporting campus instructional programs. In the past five years, there has been a significant increase in the use of classroom technology. Demand for functional and reliable AV support, video resources, network connections in the classrooms, etc., has had an impact on Media Services staff. There is a growing need to train faculty on the potentials and limitations of classroom technology. In-class technical support needs to be assured, especially in large lecture sections with complex integrated media requirements.

The Media Services department also has played a critical role in the support of distance education programs. In the past, the primary method of course delivery was through EdNet (interactive video). However, due to the growing interest in fully asynchronous Web courses, the use of EdNet will probably decline in the next few years. Media Service's future role in distance education will depend to some extent on mandates through the Oregon University System (OUS), integration of OUS programs with community colleges, the Western Governor's Virtual University, and other national/international distance education providers and consumers. For example, UO student demand for courses from other institutions would require support of multiple receive site technologies, including EdNet, Instructional Television Fixed Services (ITFS), IP video, etc.

Future Concerns/Issues:

- Changes in technology will continue to challenge library instructors. Programs, such as the IT Curriculum, must remain dynamic and relevant.
- A successful library program must include a blend of practical and cognitive skills. More emphasis should be placed on information literacy and critical thinking.

- Information literacy skills also should be integrated into the university curriculum. The library needs to tailor its instruction to the requirements of other courses and to assist other faculty in incorporating sound information literacy approaches into their own instruction.
- Good instruction takes time; a credit course can easily add 15 hours to a librarian's week. More emphasis on instruction, including credit courses, IT workshops, and course-integrated presentations will require significant changes in current responsibilities.
- Distance education programs will have a major impact on library instruction. The library should begin to develop classes/courses which can be offered to remote students.
- Teaching information technology requires ample access to wired classrooms and good equipment.

V. Funding, Projects, Leadership

V.I Evaluate level of internal and external funding.

Institutional support for the UO Library has remained strong considering the university's general degree of fiscal constraint. Compared to other research institutions, the library receives a high percentage of the total university's general and educational expenditures (E&G).

YEAR	ARL AVERAGE	UO LIBRARY %
1983	3.92%	6.00%
1984	3.83%	5.50%
1985	3.78%	5.11%
1986	3.64%	5.13%
1987	3.74%	5.19%
1988	3.64%	5.61%
1989	3.53%	5.56%
1990	3.45%	5.10%
1991	3.42%	5.36%
1992	3.32%	5.46%
1993	3.29%	5.43%
1994	3.26%	5.35%
1995	3.26%	5.28%
1996	N/A	5.14%
1997	N/A	4.69%

It should be noted that ARL libraries offer a varied array of services which can make comparisons problematic. For example, the UO Library includes campus media services and reports those expenditures to ARL; this function is located outside the library in many institutions. Nevertheless, this figure is an important indication of the UO's commitment to maintaining a research library capable of supporting the full range of educational and scholarly programs.

Despite this relatively strong support, the library faces several budgetary problems. This is most evident in areas such as student assistant wages and supplies and services (S&S), which chronically run deficit balances. As noted in Section III.3, the UO Library employs an unusually large student workforce, and student wage deficits are a chronic budget problem. The library's incrementally

adjusted beginning student wage budget assumes over 90% College Work-Study coverage for the entire fiscal year. Subsidies at this level have not been achieved for more than a decade, and despite several reductions in internal student wage allocations, the budget typically requires nonrecurring augments of at least \$200,000 to balance at year-end. These augments come from salary savings (TBA) when faculty positions remained unfilled for several months. Retaining these funds for student payroll diminishes the library's ability to hire temporary professionals to cover higher level duties while searches are in progress.

One contributing factor to the student wage problem is the absence of CWS-funded students during summer session. Maintaining library services during summer session consumes more than \$100,000 each year – nearly one-half of the budget for the entire fiscal year. Other contributing factors are smaller CWS awards, competition from the off-campus job market, and increases in the minimum wage.

The UO Library, like much of the campus, is also burdened by insufficient funds for basic supplies, services, and equipment. The historic S&S budget reflects the format-static library environment of the 1960s as opposed to the technologically driven 1990s. Pressure to update computers so that they can run the necessary software and provide adequate access to full-text electronic resources has intensified the problem.

During the eight years since the passage of Measure 5 (a property tax limitation initiative), the library and other campus units have borne the effect of several campus budget control and reduction strategies. Changes in central budgeting practice have resulted in de facto S&S budget reductions that compound in subsequent years. Unit-funded classified staff step increases are a good example. Prior to 1992-93, these mandatory step increases were funded centrally. Since that time, the library has lost \$348,799 in recurring S&S budget quota to this category alone.

YEAR	S&S QUOTA	CLASSIFIED SALARIES & OPE FUNDED FROM S&S	Compounded S&S Quota Loss
1990-91	\$81,234	N/A	\$0
1991-92	\$84,273	N/A	\$0
1992-93	\$32,890	(\$51,383)	(\$51,383)
1993-94	\$183,242	(\$55,964)	(\$107,347)
1994-95	\$142,172	(\$59,078)	(\$166,425)
1995-96	\$99,453	(\$43,469)	(\$209,894)
1996-97	\$72,824	(\$17,672)	(\$227,566)
1997-98	(\$171,220)	(\$121,233)	(\$348,799)

During the past three years, the annual budget process has included decrement funding (budget reductions taken out of the typical increases). These most recent cuts are due primarily to falling enrollment, particularly among non-Oregon residents. For 1998/99, the library will likely face a budget reduction of \$290,000. This has accelerated problems associated with the S&S budget quota; the library now begins the year with a negative balance in this category. Overdue fines and campus indirect cost credits have become the primary sources for the library's S&S expenditures. The cuts to supplies, services, and collections have had a negative impact on the user community.

The strength of the library is usually an indication of the strength of the curriculum and research activity on campus. However, it has become increasingly difficult to maintain a quality research library with the necessary investments in an environment marked by diminished state appropriations, falling graduate enrollment, and dwindling federal research support. The answer for the library – and the campus – will evolve from the university's planning efforts such as the "Process for Change" (an in-depth examination of and strategic response to these largely external issues) and from broader reforms and system restructuring at the state level.

Since 1994-95, the library has received direct allocation of student fee revenues through the Educational Technology program. This fee has been used to create the library's two Information Technology Centers (ITCs). These special funds have allowed the library to make dramatic improvements in student access to electronic information. Another important source of internal revenue has been the direct allocation of indirect cost credits (grant overhead). This funding has been used to support special projects such as the creation of online catalog records for the retrospective collection. For the past several years, however, the majority of the allocation has been used to offset reductions in the S&S quota. The library currently receives 2.3% of the total grant overhead funds (ICC). In the future, the library would like to see this percentage increased to be more reflective of overall E&G/library support ratio (see above). The 1998/99 ICC budget allocation will be a positive step in this direction as the receipt of an additional \$50,000 (a 20% increase over 1997/98) will bring the library up to 3.27 percent.

Gift and grant funds have allowed the library to make significant progress in enhancing technology, developing the collections, and improving the facilities. The University Librarian has been aggressive and successful in development efforts, as evidenced by the following programs and services:

Janus: The UO Library is one of the very few public research libraries which have implemented an integrated online library system without *any* new public funds. Beginning with the acquisition system in 1983, the UO Library has used unrestricted gift funds to make equipment purchases and bear other start-up and transition costs for the Janus system. With few exceptions, equipment purchases and start-up costs have been funded by unrestricted gifts. Without these investments the library could not begin to provide the level of service required by today's students and faculty.

Orbis: The Orbis union catalog was established with a \$258,000 one-time start-up grant from the Meyer Memorial Trust and a \$100,000 recurring allocation from the State System of Higher Education.

Library collections: A \$500,000 NEH endowment for research-level materials has allowed the library to purchase several important scholarly collections. Other gifts and grants have supported the purchase of foreign language resources and art history books.

Gifts in Kind: The library's exceptional special collections and manuscript holdings are largely due to gift solicitation and development efforts by current and former curators.

Facilities: The Knight (Main) Library Expansion and Renovation project was the number one priority of the University of Oregon's first capital campaign, launched in 1987. Lead gifts from the campaign were instrumental in leveraging state investment. The legislature provided \$17 million and the balance (\$9.7 million) was funded from private gifts and corporate and federal grants.

Future Concerns/Issues:

- The university's ability to support a strong research library has been threatened by on-going budgetary restraints. A continued pattern of decrement funding will change the fundamental nature of current library services and collections.
- "Doing more with less" has been the pervasive spirit on campus. The library, like most departments, is skilled at taking cost-cutting measures while increasing productivity. However, austerity will continue to take its toll on the staff and on the plans for future improvements in services and collections. In a boom economy, it becomes especially difficult to compete with other states that are reinvesting in higher education.

- The university has shifted from being a state-supported to a state-assisted institution. Gifts, grants, and endowments will become more essential if the library is to maintain its research status. There has been a high level of donor interest in library facilities, collections, and services. The library needs adequate access to these donors if a fruitful match in interests is to be made.

V.2 Describe new projects to enhance access to library materials. Describe leadership efforts to improve library service in the state, region, and nation.

The University of Oregon Library has undertaken a number of projects within the last several years to enhance access to the collections, improve the usefulness of its facilities, and promote library service in the state, region, and nation.

Several cataloging projects are in progress to improve access to the library's collections. From 1992 to 1994, the library worked with OCLC to complete a large retrospective conversion project, which added more than 240,000 bibliographic records to the online catalog. Since that time, work has continued in-house to complete retrospective conversion for sections of the collection that were not sent to OCLC. Last year, the music cataloging team completed the conversion of records for both music scores and sound recordings. Over 20,000 titles were processed and added to the online catalog.

In the past three years the library has taken major steps to improve access to government documents. Several projects have moved the library from a situation in which most of the collection was uncataloged and difficult to use, to the current situation in which the majority of new materials are easily accessible. In 1996, the library began subscribing to the Marcive service which provides bibliographic records for new government documents. These records are loaded into the Janus system. When any item circulates from the older collection, staff in Government Documents create brief records online so that these resources can be more easily located in the future. Other cataloging projects are underway for Canadian depository documents, U.N. publications, and monographs issued by the state of Oregon.

In 1997, the library completed another major project to create cataloging records for the Portland Architecture Library. This collection had previously been unavailable through the Janus system. In preparation for an accreditation review, 1,000 titles were cataloged and another 450 titles were transferred from the AAA and Knight library collections to the Portland branch.

The library has looked closely at the costs and benefits of outsourcing some technical services functions. At present, the library contracts with OCLC TechPro to provide cataloging records for some foreign language materials, e.g., Thai,

Korean, Vietnamese. Without local language expertise, it is far more cost-effective to send these items to OCLC. Because in-house productivity figures are quite high for English, Western European and Slavic languages, there appear to be few service benefits or cost savings from extending the outsourcing program at this point.

In July 1997, the University Librarian charged a task force to create the framework for implementing a digital library initiative. The task force identified sectors of the collection which are the likeliest candidates for converting to digital form, and outlined the key technical issues involved in such an effort. Many university libraries are now engaged in these important efforts to increase access to historical information which currently exists only in print. The exact extent of the UO's contribution to a national digital library is yet to be determined, but there are several unique and important UO resources which would be of significant value to scholars nationally and internationally.

The Web has provided ample opportunity to improve access to information about library services and collections. Easy links are available to subject guides in all major disciplines, instructions on using library services, online request forms, recent acquisitions, maps, directories, and FAQs. The library's homepage has received many compliments for its clarity, organization, and content.

Recently, the library has explored the cost-effectiveness of using commercial document delivery as an alternative to subscribing to expensive, low-use journals. Many research libraries have experimented with this service as a way to maintain access at a reduced cost. In 1997, the library worked with faculty in the College of Business to cancel \$4,000 in subscriptions. The money was transferred to an account with a document delivery service. Faculty can connect to the service online and request specific articles for immediate delivery. The articles typically arrive by fax in less than 24 hours.

Access has also been enhanced through several improvements in the facilities. Since 1990, three major building projects have made the libraries easier to use, more comfortable, more flexible in terms of incorporating new technology, and more appropriately designed given the changes in library instruction and services. The Knight Library expansion and renovation project was funded at \$27.4 million; \$9.7 million was donated through private gifts and corporate grants. The project increased study and stack space by approximately 50 percent. In addition to reader space and materials storage, the project resulted in an integration of three separate building components into one unified library structure. The new facility is flexible, easy to use, and can respond to technological change well into the 21st century. Emphasis was placed on expanded electrical capacity and network wiring in public and staff areas. More

than half of all network wiring conforms to Category 5 standards for high-speed transmission. The building also has many improved features such as two electronic classrooms, the Information Technology Center, a computer-equipped seminar room, and several small study rooms for collaborative research.

In addition to the Knight Library project, the Science and AAA Libraries moved into expanded/renovated space in 1990/91. Although both projects solved some immediate space problems, neither resulted in long-term solutions to the changing character of these collections and services. By 1997, it was evident that both facilities would need to consider off-site storage in order to accommodate the growth of collections. Other facility upgrades which have improved access include the provision of additional stack space for the Math Library and the purchase of new compact storage cabinets for maps and aerial photographs. The Law Library is the next site targeted for expansion, and a recently appointed user group is beginning program development for a new 30,000 square foot project.

The University of Oregon Library has engaged in a number of leadership efforts in the last several years to improve library service at the state and national levels. One of most recent and successful efforts to expand the reach and scope of the library's information system is the development of Orbis. Orbis is a consortial effort that brings public and private academic libraries in the states of Oregon and Washington together to provide members with services ranging from an online union catalog, patron-initiated borrowing and database licensing. Hosted by the UO Library, Orbis administers a cutting-edge resource sharing system that provides 48-hour delivery of materials from the union catalog – the combined holdings of 13 four-year institutions comprising a collection of over 5 million books, sound recordings, films, videotapes, etc. Orbis also serves as the fiscal agent for the Oregon Statewide Database Licensing Project. In this capacity, Orbis and UO staff negotiate contracts, pay invoices, and collect fees from participating libraries including schools, public libraries, and community colleges in Oregon and Washington. Currently, Orbis and PORTALS, the two prominent library consortia in the Northwest are engaged in an ambitious effort to combine resources, eliminate redundancy, and extend services to new communities. If successful, a merger will take the depth and extent of private and public collaboration in higher education to a new level.

In November, 1997 the University of Oregon Library and the Oregon Historical Society submitted a proposal to the Library of Congress/Ameritech National Digital Library Competition to create a digital library collection focusing on the western end of the Oregon Trail. The \$139,393 grant project will digitally capture first-person experiences, Native American perspectives, and resources on the establishment of cultural institutions. Primary source materials will be selectively drawn from manuscript, printed document, photograph, and map

collections at each institution. If funded, this collection of text, images, and sound will form an unparalleled source of popular and scholarly primary documentation on the Oregon Trail.

In 1996, the library received NEH funding to undertake the Oregon portion of the U.S. Newspaper Project (USNP)—a nationwide effort to locate, preserve and provide intellectual access to every newspaper published within the United States and its territories. As the 49th participant to lead the effort to perform the work for its state, the UO Library has hired project staff, purchased equipment and made substantial progress on bringing Oregon newspapers under bibliographic control. To date, bibliographic records have been created for more than 500 newspapers—records that are now available through the library's online catalog, through the Orbis union catalog and through the USNP Union List on OCLC. Work is currently underway to survey all the significant, publicly accessible newspaper collections throughout the state. To help publicize the Project and explain its scope and purpose, a videotape documentary was created under the direction of the library's Media Services unit. Currently, while the cataloging and survey work move forward, the next NEH grant request is being prepared to obtain funds to microfilm previously unfiled Oregon newspapers.

Future Concerns/Issues:

- Technical processing costs must be analyzed and managed effectively to provide faster, better and cheaper methods of providing access to the collections. The UO has taken several steps in this direction. As the costs of materials continue to increase, the library needs to remain vigilant in monitoring and maintaining the best mix of in-house and outsourced operations.
- Commercial document delivery has proven to be a cost-effective alternative to some types of purchases. More exploration of document delivery, perhaps in partnership with Orbis libraries, is needed.
- The digital library efforts nationwide present exciting opportunities for the UO Library. Cost conscious decisions about the UO's participation in these efforts should be made in concert with local service and resource needs.
- Library consortia projects like Orbis will become increasingly important as libraries strive to improve access to their collections, share resources in a timely manner, and band together to obtain favorable license agreements for electronic resources.

- The library will need to define its role in electronic publishing efforts. On some campuses, the library is involved in the university's press operations and the creation of electronic theses and dissertations. These issues are now being discussed at the UO.
- Adequate space is needed to support the growing collections. The renovation of the Knight Library provided growth space well into the next decade. However, the library will have to consider remote storage this year for some of the collections in the branch libraries.

VI. Evaluation

V1.1 Describe how the library evaluates the quality of its faculty in their various responsibilities. How does the library use the result of these evaluations?

[See Appendix D for a complete description of the library's faculty evaluation procedures.]

Librarians receive two or three-year contracts, depending upon their faculty rank, and are evaluated at the point of contract renewal. Librarians who are on two year contracts, i.e., Assistant Professor rank, are also evaluated on alternate years by their supervisor. In effect, this provides a written evaluation every year until the librarian passes the six-year review. The six-year review is an "up or out" process. Although library faculty are not tenured, they are entitled to longer contracts than all other Officers of Administration (OA's) on campus. Longer contracts require a more rigorous evaluation system, and the library decided to mirror the instructional faculty's tenure and promotion process by adopting the "up or out" review after six-years.

Librarians are evaluated and promoted on the basis of three criteria: how well they have performed their primary or major responsibilities, progress made on or successful completion of specific goals, and contributions to the profession. The goal-based component of the evaluation process was adopted in 1992. By focussing on goals in addition to primary responsibilities, the individual can be recognized for professional growth and special contributions which go beyond the day-to-day assignments. The immediate supervisor completes these evaluations. The Head of Collection Development adds a brief statement for subject specialists, and the respective Associate University Librarian writes a statement for each individual for whom a contract renewal is required or a promotion review is sought. These statements, along with letters of support from teaching faculty and colleagues within the profession, constitute the file that is sent to the Library Faculty Personnel Committee (LFPC). The members of the committee, faculty members who have already passed six-year review and are elected by their peers for LFPC service, write a recommendation for the consideration of the University Librarian. The University Librarian also makes a recommendation and then the file is sent to the Vice-Provost of Academic Affairs for final review and the ultimate decision.

In addition to the evaluations completed by supervisors, instructors who teach credit courses are evaluated by their students. The library uses the standard campus-wide form. With the new emphasis on the importance of teaching, these student evaluations are used in many supervisors' reports.

Supervisors are encouraged to meet with each faculty member and discuss their evaluation statement. All written statements are placed in the individual's file and are not confidential. The only exception to confidentiality relates to promotion cases. A faculty member may waive her/his right to see letters of recommendation for a promotion case.

Faculty evaluations are also used in the process of meting out salary increases for meritorious performance; however, funds for merit increases are not available every year with the result that the decision-making process for merit distribution does not always coincide with an individual's evaluation cycle. For this reason, the merit process includes the solicitation of input from all library faculty. Library faculty may write a nomination letter for any colleague for whom they believe special recognition is due. In this way, the library administration can get current feedback on an individual's performance and contributions.

Future Concerns/Issues:

- The expectations of library faculty are changing; in the future, faculty positions will require different as well as higher skills and abilities. The evaluation process must adequately reflect these changes and expectations.
- Many achievements are the result of collaborative efforts and not individual performance. The evaluation process should attach significance to teamwork and leadership skills.
- As expectations change, individuals need clear direction on which new skills are needed to perform the job adequately. All evaluations should include suggestions for improvement in both the performance of primary responsibilities and the maturation of professional development.

VI.2 What procedures does the library use to evaluate the effectiveness of its services? Are the services as good as they should be? If not, why not.

The library's routine evaluation procedures are focussed primarily on individual performance rather than service outcomes and user satisfaction. These performance evaluations, however, have a direct impact on the library's programs by rewarding those with a strong service orientation and setting developmental goals for those who need improvement. The one direct service that is evaluated routinely is instruction. Students are asked to complete an evaluation for all credit classes and some non-credit classes. The form asks students to rate the course content and organization, assignments and tests, and the instructor's enthusiasm, knowledge, and preparedness. The most frequent

criticism mentioned on these evaluations refers to the workload, i.e., too much is expected of the students for the credits earned, but for the most part, the evaluations of library credit courses have been uniformly positive. Instructors routinely get high grades for their enthusiasm and expertise. Evaluations help shape the written performance reviews for librarians. They are also used to revise the instructional program. For example, the IT Curriculum is revised nearly every term based in part on the feedback from students.

Currently, there is no formal mechanism by which library users evaluate or provide feedback on the work of technical services, i.e., acquisitions, cataloging, preservation, and interlibrary loan. Containment of processing costs, along with operational efficiency and productivity, rather than direct user feedback, are more common factors used to evaluate technical services. The UO Library is in the process of gathering detailed cost estimates for various processing tasks, which can be used to estimate current productivity, set new goals, and evaluate outsourcing options and value-added services offered by library vendors.

Since 1990, the library has engaged in two large-scale evaluations or self-studies under the guidance of the Association of Research Libraries (ARL). In 1993, the library conducted a critical self-analysis of all public services. The process took twelve months. The goals of the self-study were to measure the effectiveness of current services, to identify desirable new services, to build skills in planning at all staff levels in the organization, and to raise the institution's awareness of the library's responsibility to provide information services that contribute to the instructional and research programs. Several themes emerged from this document. First, given a diverse community with many special needs, library services needed to be more closely targeted to the interests of clientele groups, e.g., faculty, graduate students, students from different cultural backgrounds, students with disabilities, etc. Second, given the changes in funding for higher education, there is an increased emphasis on the need to maximize efficiency. And third, given the rapid changes that are likely to continue, as a result of technology's impact on library services, the UO Library must be in a state of constant preparedness. Improved staff training and an investment in each individual's ability to understand and effectively use technology are especially important.

Forty-one recommendations appeared in the final report. Since then, several accomplishments have been made in the area of new services including the IT Curriculum, a new library outreach program, team-teaching efforts in courses with a heavy emphasis on research methods, commercial document delivery, electronic request services (reference assistance, ILL, purchase recommendations), workshops for faculty on educational technology (co-sponsored with other units on campus), and a peer library assistance program

(PLAN). Significant progress has also been made in the categories of improved efficiency and staff preparedness, including additional workstations for staff, a local network for Intranet applications, and the development of several core competencies for all personnel.

The final report included a section on evaluation of services to continue the self-analysis process established by the ARL study. This section included the following recommendations: evaluate the quality of reference service, build in timely evaluation procedures for each new service program, evaluate the effectiveness of the library liaison program, use focus groups to measure the relative importance of library services, and develop a program for collecting consistent and reliable statistics. Although there remains a strong interest in a more formal and routine system for evaluating services, less progress has been made in this area.

In March 1995, the library began a second self-study to measure the effectiveness of technical services in supporting the library's mission and to formulate an approach to change that was active, not simply reactive. This process was also conducted with the assistance of ARL. The major outcome of the study was the identification of several areas of strategic importance for the future: cataloging unique/local materials; addressing users' immediate needs through "just in time" services; preservation; creating a single point of access for all library resources and adding value to the Internet. These focus areas have helped to determine priorities and the allocation of resources. Several improvements have been made as a result of the self-study. Personnel are involved in more cross training so human resources can be shifted around depending upon annual fluctuations in workloads. New receipts are handled more expeditiously. Patrons who need a new book cataloged as soon as possible can now get same day service, rather than waiting a week or longer. Some materials which are costly or problematic to process are now sent to OCLC for cataloging – a practice which helps to keep these titles from accumulating and becoming intractable in-house backlogs.

In addition to internal evaluations, a few external opinion surveys have been conducted on library services. The Oregon Survey Research Laboratory (OSRL) conducted a general student survey in 1995 which measured reactions to several campus services. The results of that survey indicated that 82% of the students (n=763) thought the library was doing a good or very good job in meeting students' information needs. The Association of Students at the University of Oregon (ASUO) has conducted two recent surveys on library hours. Nearly all the students who responded to one of those surveys (n=577) indicated that longer hours would be beneficial. The library has agreed to change its schedule to meet more students' needs.

Based on informal feedback, external surveys, internal evaluations, comprehensive self-studies, and use patterns, the library is doing an adequate job in meeting the needs of its users. Services to undergraduates are the library's most notable strength. The heavy emphasis on instruction, outreach, and student retention has contributed to this perception. The quality of services to faculty and graduate students is more difficult to assess. In two recent focus groups with faculty, participants indicated that they could usually get what they needed on their own, without the help of general reference librarians. However, those faculty who used branch libraries indicated that the services were excellent and absolutely necessary for their research. This informal feedback is similar to perceptions expressed at other university libraries. The level of satisfaction is often higher among faculty who use specialized collections staffed with experts in their fields of interest. In the same focus group sessions, faculty were surprised to learn about several new services which had been implemented within the current year. This feedback suggests that satisfaction with library services would be higher if all faculty were aware of what those services were.

In terms of services, the library has several specific strengths: reference assistance for undergraduates, interlibrary loan services, instruction for undergraduates, circulation services and general public relations, rush ordering and processing, services to students disabilities, and outreach services. In the past few years, several services have been improved significantly. For example, the Web has allowed the library to widely disseminate its publications. Most subject specialists now have Websites that help students and faculty in specific disciplines find useful and relevant information in their fields of interest. Services to faculty related to collection development and the use of educational technology have been improved. The library liaison program has been strengthened by the addition of new subject specialists with appropriate graduate degrees. Also, the library now works more closely with units such as the Teaching Effectiveness Program to sponsor technology training programs for teaching faculty. Finally, substantial progress has been made in campus classroom support through the media services section of the library.

Although the library offers a wide range of excellent services, there are several areas which need improvement. Librarians do not have enough time to adequately address complex research questions when they are at the reference desk. They are often busy trying to help several students at once, and if a question is particularly difficult or complex, it may get only a partial answer. A new service, e.g., appointment-based research assistance, might help to address this need.

Cuts in student wages have had a significant impact on services. For example, the library can no longer do periodic checks on the shelves to make sure the books are in their proper location. Shelf reading is a standard service provided by most libraries. Without this service, books can easily get out of order and are frequently "lost" in the stacks. More students and faculty are frustrated because they can not locate a title that should be in the collection. It also takes longer to reshelve books and journals.

Equipment maintenance is another service problem. Inadequate S&S budgets have meant that equipment cannot be replaced as soon as it should be. Older equipment, e.g., computers, photocopiers, microfiche readers, and compact disc players malfunction or break down frequently.

Considering its broad range of activities, the UO Library's Media Services Department (12 permanent FTE; budget of approximately \$500,000) is unusually small and underfunded in comparison to similar units on other campuses. With the existing staff and budget, the unit provides a full range of services—campus-wide classroom support, equipment repair, media collections and viewing, film and video rental and booking, video and graphics production, and distance education facilities. While varying organizational structures make direct comparisons difficult, several analyses have shown the need for at least 7 FTE additional permanent staff. The lack of a recurring equipment replacement and upgrade budget is a serious constraint for a service fundamentally dependent on technology. These two categories suggest an additional recurring budget need of at least \$400,000.

The emphasis on teaching combined with the rapid changes in information technology has created constant pressures on the library faculty to remain well informed and up to date on current software, databases, and equipment. The librarians need more training in pedagogical skills and instructional technology.

Future Concerns/Issues:

- The library needs more quantitative and qualitative data to adequately evaluate its services.
- The library is primarily student-centered. While this may be the desired trend on campus, the library should investigate ways to provide better services to faculty.
- More students in all disciplines are receiving assignments which require the creation and presentation of media. The library's role in providing these

services needs some clarification, and students in most disciplines need greater access to production facilities, tools, training and support.

VI.3 What procedures does the library use to evaluate the quality of the collections? Are the collections as strong as they should be? If not, why not?

The current budget for library materials is \$4,465,348; \$631,621 is budgeted to cover materials processing and automation costs, e.g., OCLC cataloging and interlibrary loan activities, binding, and system maintenance, leaving a balance of \$3,833,727 for books, serials, and electronic resources. The UO Library has experienced the same budgetary pressures which have afflicted all academic libraries, particularly research libraries. Annual inflation for serials has averaged 10% for several years, but the budget augments have averaged only 3.5%. This current biennium has been an exception. The OUS libraries submitted a proposal to the legislature to fund libraries at a rate which recognized these inflationary pressures. The proposal was successful, and the UO library was able to increase the budget in 1997/98 by a total of 5.68%.

The UO Library has been a member of the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) since 1962. ARL compiles comparative data annually on collections, budgets, and staff. The Association uses five traditional data categories to measure relative collection strength among its 121 members: volumes held, volumes added, titles purchased, current serial holdings, and library expenditures for materials. The University of Oregon's ranking compared to other ARL libraries has become an important measure of the library's collection strength. While ARL measurements are quantitative, they still provide some indication of the library's ability to meet the research needs of its constituents.

University of Oregon	1997 Number	Total Ranking	Total libraries reporting	1992 Number	1992 Ranking	total libraries reporting	Pct of change
Volumes held	2245443	77	110	1981160	74	108	0.133398
Volumes added (gross)	56038	72	110	51037	82	108	0.097988
Volumes added (net)	51617	66	110	49371	72	91	0.045492
Monographs purchased	28658	53	93	37180	27	76	-0.22921
Current Serials purchased	10626	61	81	13898	53	75	-0.23543
Current Serials not purchased	4826	51	81	2093	62	108	1.305781
Total Current Serials	15452	87	110	15991	91	108	-0.03371
Total Serials Expenditures	2746832	88	110	2261534	83	108	0.214588
Total Monographs Expenditures	1394675	59	110	1330241	57	108	0.048438
Total Materials Budget	4751861	68	110	3827935	71	108	0.241364

Since 1992, the library's collection has grown approximately 13 percent. (Since 1986, the collection has grown over 30%). While these figures represent a

significant expansion of the collection, the rate of growth has been less than most ARL libraries. Ten years ago, the library ranked 68th out of 106 libraries, five years ago it slipped to 74th, and this year the library is ranked 77th out of 110 libraries. There has been a noticeable drop in the "monographs purchased" category. The library has tried to stabilize its monograph purchases by maintaining a balanced ratio of serials/monographs (70%/30%) and by spending a higher proportion of its total budget on materials compared to most ARL libraries. But these efforts have not been enough to forestall a steady drop in the number of monographs purchased. The library has made substantial progress in the "volumes added" category, which may seem contradictory to the previous statements. This figure reflects an impressive effort by the technical services staff to reduce processing backlogs as well as the addition of several large gift collections.

Since 1992, there has been a 24% drop in the number of serial titles purchased. Despite major milestones, such as the addition of the two millionth volume in 1992, and a significant expansion in electronic databases, one of the most important factors affecting the quality of the collection has been the serials cancellation projects. In 1993/94, the library cancelled \$350,000 in serial expenditures, and in 1995/96, the library began a second project to cancel \$500,000 in serials. Budget augments from the Provost's office, careful management of ongoing commitments, and favorable exchange rates helped the library forestall this problem as long as possible. But by the end of 1992, it became clear that recurring commitments in journal expenditures would soon eliminate all discretionary funds used to purchase monographs. The goal was to keep a more equitable distribution between serial and monograph expenditures, i.e., 70/30. Faculty involvement and cross-disciplinary discussions were crucial to the process, but most faculty consider this reduction to be a critical detriment to their research. If inflation and budgetary increases remain the same for the foreseeable future, the library will have to consider a serials cancellation project every four to five years.

Another important national measure for evaluating collection strengths is the North American Title Count. The North American Title Count (NATC) is a project of the Association for Library Collections and Technical Services (ALCTS), a division of the American Library Association. Conducted every four years, the Count covers titles added to most of the major research libraries in North America and provides a breakdown according to Library of Congress classification numbers. The four largest U.S. federal libraries (National Agricultural Library, Smithsonian Institution Libraries, National Library of Medicine, and Library of Congress) are also represented. Because the UO Library has participated in the Count three times (1985, 1989 and 1997), it provides the library with objective information which can either stand alone or

be combined with other collection analysis tools to identify patterns of collection development. The final product indicates growth in specific subject areas, and allows for some comparison with peer institutions. UO Library completed the title count project in August 1997, but the data comparing UO collections with other institutions will not be available until the summer of 1998. However, compared to its own data count in 1989, the library's collections have increased in all LC classes by 50% or more.

Participation in departmental or college accreditation efforts, program review reports, and the development of new programs or majors have offered the best opportunity for the library to assess the quality of the collections. Most recently, the library has completed reports for the National Architectural Accrediting Board, an accreditation team for the Community and Regional Planning program, and the University 1997 Accreditation Self-Study Team.

The library includes a detailed assessment on the strength of the collections for each program review conducted under the auspices of the Graduate School. For these assessments, subject specialists have checked the monographic and serials holdings of the UO collections against recommended serials lists, noted bibliographies and other subject-specific checklists of significant library materials. These lists and bibliographies are usually issued by scholarly bodies connected to the discipline or compiled by experts in the field. Since 1994-95, the library has issued assessments of its relevant holdings for the following departments or programs: Anthropology, Geography, Architecture, Industrial Relations, Chemistry, Computer and Information Science, Economics, Fine Arts. Subject specialists are presently completing assessments for the History and Geology Departments. Similar statements of library support have been included as a part of initiatives to establish or upgrade these programs and majors: Judaic Studies, Women's Studies, Ethnic Studies, and European studies. The statements for Women's Studies and Ethnic Studies, in particular, confirmed that the library has made great progress toward supporting new areas of research.

Overall, the various assessments demonstrate that the collections of the UO Library have proven adequate to support most of the traditional undergraduate and graduate programs. The strong relationships between subject specialists and departmental library representatives have played an important role in ensuring that the library, through fund allocation and material selection, adequately supports both the curriculum and ongoing research. Faculty are actively involved in the decisions to select all types of library materials and to cancel subscriptions when that has been necessary.

However, for a variety of reasons, the collections are not as strong as they could be, nor, in some cases, are they as robust as they have been in the past. The

factors contributing to the weakening of the library's collections are not new. During the last five to ten years the library has continually encountered high inflation rates for books and serials. Meanwhile the materials budget has not increased to match the inflation with the result that the library's buying power has been diminished. New programs, especially those with specific language requirements, and advanced faculty research continue to be difficult to support. Likewise, there is an increasing demand for non-traditional formats which increase pressure on existing fund lines. Adequate support for either new programs or new formats and initiatives is difficult to muster because separate funding for new programs is often minimal and resources must be carved out of existing library funds. In most cases, the library has had to rely on traditional interlibrary loan or other document delivery methods to get needed items, particularly in science and technical areas.

Future Concerns/Issues:

- As inflation continues to erode the purchasing power of most research libraries, it will become increasingly important to evaluate the strengths and weakness of the collections using both quantitative and qualitative methods.
- Document delivery and resource sharing programs must be maximized to guarantee timely access to content.
- Future serials cancellation projects should be coordinated with other Orbis institutions.
- Pressure to improve access through the purchase of electronic full-text resources should not displace content. Duplication of access (electronic plus print) should be kept to a minimum.
- The OUS institutions must continue to lobby the legislature for funding which reflects the real costs of library materials.
- New programs on campus must address the corresponding demand for new library resources.
- When libraries purchased only print and microform resources, they owned the material and could be assured of permanent (or at least long term) access. Now libraries "lease" electronic information. The issue of perpetual access to these resources is still largely unresolved.

VII. Development

VII.1 What changes in demand are anticipated?

Since 1990, the library has made impressive strides in incorporating technology into procedures, services, and resource delivery. In the Public Services Self Study (1992/93), the library staff recognized the need to exploit the possibilities of self-service operations and to make the collections easily accessible through user-friendly interfaces. To a large extent, the library has realized these accomplishments. Several circulation procedures can now be done by the user at any terminal. Interlibrary loans can be easily placed from within OCLC's FirstSearch and through the Orbis union catalog. The Innovative Interfaces, Inc. (III) INNOPAC system was one of the first integrated library systems to approach an acceptable level of user-friendliness. Most users can sit down at any terminal, text or graphic, and get some satisfactory results without instruction. The switch to PC's in all the reference areas has enabled the library to use the Web as the single interface to the catalog, reference tools, and electronic databases. Arcane command structures associated with text-based terminals have taken a back seat to the intuitive "point and click" system on the Web. The library has begun to purchase many full-text resources and electronic journals which can be accessed easily through the Web from anywhere. In short, the mysteries of manual systems and the limitations of card catalogs have been replaced by intuitive automated systems.

One might expect these changes to reduce the use of traditional library services and collections, but that has not been the case. Since the beginning of the decade, there has been a steady increase in the demand for reference, instruction, and traditional print resources. For many students, automation has served as a magnet to draw them into the library and encourage them to use the services, print collections, and facilities. It should also be noted that the Knight Library Building and Renovation project, completed in 1994, resulted in a library building that is significantly easier to use and much less intimidating. Since 1990, three major libraries on campus have been renovated, and it is likely that these improved facilities have contributed to greater use.

Looking toward the future, it seems appropriate to consider both internal and external forces that affect demand. To a large extent, demand during the next several years will be a function of internal decisions. Demand will correlate with outreach efforts, the instructional program, the availability of technology, collection development, and resource sharing programs. The UO Library's outreach program has been a noteworthy success. If this momentum is continued, it will contribute to an increase in demand for library services. Efforts are underway to identify groups of students who are less inclined to use the

library for various reasons. The barriers which have existed – a lack of information, intimidation, and inexperience – are being broken down through programs such as the Peer Library Advising Network (PLAN), specialized orientations sessions, and better communication with student leaders. In 1994 and again in 1997, the library completed a report on student retention which included suggestions on how the library can be more accessible and useful to students. In 1996, the library formed a Diversity Task Force to heighten our awareness and sensitivity to social differences connected to culture, race, gender, age and background. The ultimate goal of these efforts is to ensure that all users have positive experiences in the library. Together, these efforts create a welcoming environment which will result in more use of the library's resources.

The instructional program has also had a major impact on the demand for services. Although exact figures on past participation are not available, the current estimates are as high as 5,000 students a year. This figure is at least twice what it was in the early 1990's. The dramatic increase has as much to do with available programs and effective marketing as it does with changes in the curriculum and other external forces. In the past five years, the program has gone through several revisions to respond to new developments such as the Web. If the program continues to evolve in a responsive and creative way, it will result in greater use of the library and its services. For example, the library has experimented with several three- and four-credit courses on information technology. These courses usually fill, but the most popular classes are the one-credit introductions to library use and online information systems. At present, the library is planning to add more one-credit companion courses to coincide with the information intensive segments of the curriculum, e.g., Journalism, Marketing, Psychology. The participation in the IT Curriculum has peaked, and current numbers suggest that the existing structure which is based entirely on open-enrollment workshops may no longer be the most appropriate. The possibility of revising the IT Curriculum to include more one-credit courses on information literacy may revive interest and increase demand. A successful instruction program has the same effect as a good outreach program: more students have some basic understanding of library services and resources so they are more inclined to use both. The library has made instruction its top priority in terms of public services, so there is every reason to expect that the program will result in increased demand.

The availability of technology in the reference areas and in the ITC's has also resulted in greater use of the library. At present, approximately 6,000 students use the ITC's each week during the academic year. Although every September more students come to campus with their own equipment, in many cases the library's computers are more convenient to use and may function better in terms of speed, reliability, and available software. The library has invested in

peripheral equipment that most students do not own such as digital cameras, scanners, and laser printers. Investments have also been made in advanced software for Web publishing, 3D graphics, animation, multimedia, etc. On site assistance also makes the library an attractive option for students who are less familiar with computers and information technology. In the future, the impact of technology on demand will depend upon the level of investment. In 1994 and 1995, the students benefited from the use of educational technology funds to improve computer access in the library. No provisions were made, however, to replace aging equipment. Conservative estimates outline the need for an additional \$40,000/year to ensure adequate access and functionality in the ITCs. The same situation holds true for the reference areas. If the service deteriorates due to lack of funding, the library will be seen as an outdated resource, and students will either do without or find suitable alternatives.

Collection development and resource sharing efforts will also affect demand. The acquisition of online databases has resulted in a dramatic increase in use of the Janus system. For example, the journals in one general full-text database are accessed an average of 6,000 times each month. It is unlikely that the print equivalents were used that heavily. Electronic journals, encyclopedias, and indexes are all used more heavily than their print counterparts. In addition to the purchase of electronic databases, the library will likely play a role in the creation of these resources. Digital library projects will generate increased demand on systems staff and central server support. Perhaps the most significant development that will continue to affect demand is the promotion of resource sharing. Through the Orbis system alone, the UO currently borrows an average of 1,000 titles each month from the other members; approximately 2,000 titles are loaned each month to students and faculty at Orbis institutions. As more libraries are added to the consortium, particularly other research collections, the level of resource sharing will increase.

External factors will also have an impact on demand. External factors include changes in the curriculum, distance education, political and economic factors affecting the strength of library services in the state, and content development and easy access to the Internet. The curriculum is evolving in several ways. The trend toward more interdisciplinary programs will create an increased demand for new library resources. The expansion of programs such as Environmental Studies and Ethnic Studies will put additional pressure on the existing materials budget. A second trend in the curriculum which will affect use and demand for library resources is a greater emphasis on global issues and area studies. Requests for materials in different languages, international resources, foreign newspapers, etc. will have a noticeable impact on the budget. A third change within the curriculum that can affect the demand for library services and equipment is the increased use of educational technology. More students will

expect access to software and sophisticated equipment including color printers, color photocopiers, high-end desktops, versatile laptops, cameras, scanners, etc.

Compared to the regional colleges and Oregon State University (OSU), distance education has not been a focal point of the University of Oregon. However, it is reasonable to predict that it will receive more attention in the future. The UO recognizes the need to stay competitive and respond to certain political influences such as the Western Governors Association's interest in the "virtual university." More emphasis on distance education will result in reduced demand for traditional library services, particularly those that are fixed in terms of location. Remote students will rely more on technology to provide them with the access they need. This trend will result in greater demand for electronic resources, easier document delivery, and online library courses and reference assistance.

Since 1990, Oregon has disinvested in public institutions including libraries. Schools have suffered as a result of property tax limitations, and many have had to cut back on library services. Public libraries have also been hurt by similar tax reduction initiatives. High school students and citizens are faced with fewer library options; the result has been a slow but steady increase in external use of the UO's research collections. The library is also seeing increase demand for technology training from the larger community. This demand can be controlled to some extent through internal policies, but in general, the University has leaned toward making greater connections with the community and the public schools. Given these political and economic forces, external use of the library will continue to increase for the foreseeable future.

The development of the Internet is bound to have a significant impact on library use. As the Web becomes the dominant delivery method, the library can expect increased demand for public computers and a resistance to using older technology. Library users will expect more materials to be available online through a single interface, e.g., full text journals, statistical data, newspapers, etc. The proliferation of electronic resources has improved access, but it has also produced some confusion among library users. The face of Janus changes constantly, and both students and faculty need more help in determining which resources are most appropriate for their research needs.

Future Concerns/Issues:

- Most existing internal and external forces will continue to increase demand for library services.

- In the future, there may be less demand for some traditional resources and services such as hardcopy reference works and print reserve collections, but there will be a greater demand for electronic resources, equipment, instruction, and remote services.
- The perceived currency and relevancy of the library's services and collections will have a major impact on demand. Keeping reasonable pace with technological developments is a key factor in the library's ability to serve students and faculty effectively.
- Increased demand by external clientele may create problems for UO students and faculty. The library needs to balance adequate access for primary clientele with political pressures to become part of a "seamless educational system, K-life."
- The growth in information technology has created expectations for immediate delivery. Some users expect all information to be easily available online. As a result, some students wait even longer to begin their research. Others will reject any information that is not immediately available.

VII.2 Is the library staffed adequately to meet the need of the campus? If available resources remain the same, how will the library respond to anticipated changes in use of services and collections?

The UO Library currently employs 51 librarians, 92 support staff, and 85 FTE student assistants (during peak academic term). The library has been able to recruit strong pools of entry-level professionals for most positions. Many of the individuals hired have a second masters degree in a relevant discipline, and all are skilled in areas of information technology. The rigors of the promotion system have ensured a high degree of quality throughout the library faculty. Most of the mid-career and senior librarians are very active on campus and in national professional associations.

The UO Library is extremely fortunate to have a highly motivated and dedicated support staff. Many of these individuals have been in their positions for several years, and their experience and knowledge is a major factor in the provision of quality service. Fast-paced technological change has provided ample opportunities for support staff to assume new assignments and leadership roles within their areas of expertise. The chance to take on new responsibilities, to make more decisions, and to learn new skills has enhanced the rewarding aspects of these positions.

The staffing levels, however, remain problematic and have been the subject of criticism by several accrediting agencies (see Section III.3). Compared to other ARL libraries, the UO Library relies heavily on part-time students and has relatively few clerical support staff. Many students are doing work that would ordinarily be assigned to full-time library technicians with more training and expertise.

Professional staffing is also a problem. The library has identified the need for 9.5 FTE positions to support *existing* university programs. Establishment of new programs, exceptional growth in specific academic areas, and adoption of new technologies will create the need for additional librarians with corresponding subject backgrounds and technical skills. It should also be noted that the 51 FTE figure includes Law and Media Services professional positions which makes the UO Library look comparatively larger. Most ARL libraries count these positions separately, although there is no consistent reporting practice. Also, the 51 FTE figure assumes full staffing which is rarely the case. This Library has suffered very high professional turnover – 26 positions (50%) between July 1990 and December 1994. Vacancies effectively reduced the library's professional staff by an average of 5 FTE at any given time during that period. Vacancy rates have decreased somewhat in the last year, but turnover remains a concern.

Professional salaries are some of the lowest in the state and Pacific Coast region. Even many small public libraries in Oregon pay several thousand dollars more for entry-level librarians. It has not been uncommon for UO librarians to take a comparable position elsewhere for \$10,000 more a year. The second reason for concern is the political instability in the state. Following Measure 5, the property tax limitation measure that forced a shift in state revenues to the local schools, higher education has struggled to maintain its programs. Cost-cutting strategies have raised doubts about job security and contract renewals.

Until recently, the level of student staffing had been adequate. Although the library had been deficit spending, the university was able to cover the budget shortfalls at the end of the year. In 1996/97, the library had to reduce its deficit by half, which resulted in a 20% cut in student expenditures. The cut has resulted in less coverage in the public service areas, and some delays in technical processing. In some cases, support staff and librarians have to do some of the essential duties which can no longer be accomplished with the reduced student hours.

The library has a long history of shifting positions to meet current program needs. Recently, a cataloging position was eliminated to create a position in circulation to handle Orbis transactions. A clerical position in the Science Library was reassigned half-time to the AAA Library to address staffing inadequacies. A position in media services was eliminated to help fund a new subject specialist

for the School of Journalism. Salary savings were accumulated to fund the Outreach Coordinator's position in the Reference Department and a new staff position in the Preservation Department. The library maintains a list of priority positions which reflect changing demand. Every time an existing position comes open, it is compared to the list of new priorities.

Future Concerns/Issues:

- Given the general state of higher education and the financial constraints faced by the university, any new positions will need to be created from existing budgets.
- Further decrements in budget allocations (as described in Section V.1) will likely result in staff reductions.
- If the robust economy continues, retention of highly skilled employees (professionals, staff, and students), particularly those with technical expertise, will be more problematic.
- Consortial activities, e.g., Orbis, will continue to add to existing workloads, e.g., circulation, system support, and collection development. These issues are being recognized in funding requests and legislative proposals, but the local impact has been significant especially considering the already low staffing levels in the UO Library.

VII.3 Could the services and collections be improved through additional collaboration with internal and external units or organizations?

In the past four years, the library has made progress in terms of collaboration with campus departments and other libraries in the region. The primary means of collaboration with internal units, particularly the teaching departments, has been through the library's liaison program. Most librarians have one or more departments which they represent for collection development and instructional purposes. The liaison program has been strengthened recently through changes in hiring practices and enhancements in the instructional program. During the recruitment process for new librarians, the library now places more emphasis on a second masters degree in an appropriate discipline. Faculty in the represented teaching departments are encouraged to participate in the hiring process. These changes have helped to ensure that the librarian will have a sound understanding of the discipline and appreciate the importance of good communication with the teaching faculty. The second change that has strengthened the liaison program has been a new emphasis on collaborative instruction. Beginning this year, several librarians have been working with

selected teaching faculty to develop one-credit "companion courses." (See Section IV.3). The companion courses are designed to give the students a background in relevant resources and research techniques that they can use to succeed in the departmental course. The companion courses are being taught for the first time this spring term.

As mentioned in other sections of this document, the library's outreach program has established strong connections with a number of units on campus including Admissions, Advising, Athletics, various international programs, Continuing Education, Learning in Retirement, Office of Multicultural Affairs, Alumni Association, and several different student associations. Throughout the year, the library collaborates with these internal units on orientation programs, recruitment efforts, alumni events, and workshops for the larger community. Although the library has always had a strong liaison program with individual teaching departments, it is now more visible and better connected to several support units. One particular support unit that has worked closely with the library is the computing center. The two units have collaborated on several projects including the IT Curriculum, the *Get Ready* program, classroom and computer lab design, pay-for-print systems, instructional video production, etc.

The University Library Committee (ULC) is an opportunity to enhance communication between the teaching faculty and the library. The ULC has provided the library with valuable advice on serials cancellation projects, budget allocations, reserve reading procedures, library hours, etc. Although these meetings have been very useful for the library administration, the ULC could function more effectively if it had broader representation.

The library has been involved in a number of efforts to collaborate with external organizations. The most notable effort in this regard is the development of the Orbis Library Consortium. (See Sections I.1 and V.2). Through the creation of the union catalog, the consortium has assembled a collective library of nearly five million volumes. In addition to improved access to library resources, Orbis allows the member libraries to purchase electronic databases at substantially reduced costs. Future consortial programs will focus on cooperative collection development and improved document delivery.

On several levels, the library has collaborated with the other Oregon University System (OUS) institutions in the state. The Interinstitutional Library Council (ILC) is made up of the directors of all OUS libraries. One of the most important functions of the ILC has been to lobby the Chancellor's Office and the legislature for appropriate funding support. Last year, the ILC was successful in obtaining a 10% increase to the materials budgets to address the problem of inflation. Within the OUS institutions, there are also subcommittees which work on specific areas

of library service. For example, the collection development officers in each library meet regularly throughout the year to discuss common issues such as resource sharing. Media Services staff retain appointments to the OUS Distance Education Steering Committee, the OUS Media Council, and the Southern Willamette ITFS Task Force.

Beyond the Pacific Northwest, the library participates in several efforts to improve library service and collections. The UO is currently a member of PACSLAV, a consortium of West Coast libraries with strong collections in Slavic history, languages, and literature. The purpose of PACSLAV is to facilitate resource sharing and cooperative collection development, i.e. one library agrees to purchase an expensive collection and make it easily available to the other members. The library is also a member of ARL's Japan Project which is focussed on facilitating reciprocal borrowing arrangements with Japanese libraries. Since the early 1990's, the library has been developing a strong collection in Southeast Asian Studies. To facilitate this effort, the UO is a member of a Pacific Coast consortium of research libraries with similar interests. To maximize collective resources and minimize duplication, each library within the consortium has taken primary responsibility for collecting and processing materials from one or more specific countries or languages in the region.

Nationally, the library is a member of the ARL and the Center for Research Libraries (CRL). The ARL directors meet twice a year to formulate positions in critical areas such as copyright and intellectual property, the national network infrastructure, and the economics of electronic publishing. CRL maintains research collections of over three million volumes which are available to campus users as an extension of the UO Library. Most of these scholarly resources are expensive and difficult to purchase. For example, CRL's strengths are in foreign doctoral dissertations, foreign newspapers, specialized scientific and technical journals, and large microform sets.

Although the staff have been actively involved in collaborative efforts, the services, collections, and regional standing of the library could be improved through further collaboration and developments in library consortia. There is plenty of room to explore more collaborative teaching projects with UO faculty. At other institutions such as the University of Washington, the librarians and faculty are engaged in a campus-wide effort to improve information literacy and enhance the use of educational technology. In the community and the state, more collaborative programs could be established with both the high schools and the community colleges. For example, the librarians could offer seminars for high school teachers on recent developments in information technology. Orbis could be improved with the addition of other important libraries in Oregon and Washington, e.g., Portland State University and Oregon Health Sciences

University. The UO Library has been very vocal in the need to expand Orbis to include these larger collections. The UO could also play a leadership role in the formation of larger consortia, e.g., the PAC-10 libraries. A research library consortium on this scale would provide ample opportunity to exploit the benefits of resource sharing and cooperative licensing agreements for electronic resources.

Future Concerns/Issues:

- The potential benefits of external collaboration are significant. However, the library needs to remain aware of the added costs, e.g., time. The UO Library must keep its contributions to the group in balance with the need to provide direct support for UO programs.
- The priorities of the consortia must match the priorities of the library. A common mission among the members is key to success.
- International issues are a growing concern to the UO campus. The library should pursue any international collaborative efforts which support the programs and research at the UO.
- UO patrons make relatively limited use of the rich CRL collections. The Library is currently developing a plan to promote the services that are available through the library's membership.

VII.4 What does the library do to encourage research and professional development?

The UO Library has placed the greatest emphasis on involvement in national associations. There are several benefits associated with this involvement. The librarian has the opportunity to establish connections with peers at similar institutions and to learn more about new developments in his/her specialized area of library service. National conferences also provide a stage to present important trends in information technology. The UO librarians have been visible participants in such organizations as the American Library Association, Music Library Association, Art Libraries Society of North America, Society of American Archivists, American Association of Law Librarians, American Society for Information Science, North American Serials Interest Group, and the Association for Asian Studies. With the exception of some new faculty, most of the UO librarians are active in one or more national associations and are frequently asked to present papers, organize programs, or collaborate on publication projects.

The librarians receive travel support and professional leave for most of these activities. Professional contributions have become a major component of the six-year review and promotion to full professor. For example, in considering promotion to professor, the Library Faculty Personnel Committee will evaluate whether the candidate has influenced the course of the profession at the national level through appropriate professional involvement and/or published or disseminated research. (See Appendix D). It is not possible to be promoted without substantial professional activity.

A few librarians are engaged in large research projects, although this has not been the focus for most faculty. The major impediment is time. All librarians are on twelve-month contracts, which makes it more difficult to do substantial research. Articles are less time consuming than major research projects, and several librarians have been able to contribute shorter publications to the library literature. An emerging area related to publication is Web development. For example, one librarian is responsible for creating an internationally recognized Website on East Asian resources.

All levels of staff are encouraged to participate in campus workshops, such as those offered by the Office of Human Resources. The library has sponsored a few teleconferences on subjects such as copyright law, affirmative action, and library support staff issues. Many faculty librarians have participated in off-campus ARL workshops, such as Basic Management Skills, Human Resources Institute, and Licensing Electronic Resources.

Future Concerns/Issues:

- Given entry-level salaries and available funding for travel, it may be difficult for some new faculty to get involved in national associations. The library needs to take additional steps to encourage professional involvement among the newer librarians.

VII.5 What steps are currently being taken to improve efficiency? Should the library take additional steps?

The UO Library is highly productive and efficient, maintaining an ambitious array of collections, programs and services with a relatively small staff. Since 1994, the UO's average ARL ranking (37 out of 110) has been within the top 35% of all member libraries when gross volumes added is compared to the total FTE of professional and support staff. This indicates a fairly high level of productivity given the extent of our human resources.

High rates of productivity are also evidenced by comparison of the UO Library with a narrower group of public university ARL libraries (see Appendix E). Within the OUS-recognized "Kansas Group" of comparator institutions, for example, the UO maintains collections averaging 103% of the group median, with a staff of 82% median and expenditures of 86% median. This reveals a high level of staff productivity with a strong focus on collections and access. Considering that the UO's institutional characteristics average only 68% of the median, this also demonstrates the UO's strong commitment to library programs. Note that the UO offers an unusually high number of Ph.D. programs given its size and number of faculty; all require a critical mass of library support regardless of program size.

Library units and the library as a whole have absorbed post-Measure 5 budget controls and program reductions with minimal reduction of service. Since 1990, we have experienced the loss of year-end support from the Provost's Reserve (approximately \$400,000 per year) and an additional \$400,000 in S&S budget quota. One science librarian (mathematics library) was lost with retirement of the incumbent; other positions have been internally reallocated to address critical needs. A Japanese language cataloging position was abandoned and the function largely covered by outsourcing. The authorities librarian position was reallocated to support Orbis automated borrowing.

The net effect of budget cuts has been buffered by increased revenues from overdue fines, access to grant overhead monies, new work/study programs such as LEARN & TechWork, and relatively high inflation augments in the materials budget. Substitute funding should not be confused with efficiency or productivity, but the Library's willingness to make significant internal reallocations in order to maintain services to students and faculty indicates creativity and flexibility.

It should be noted that the Library has designed specific services in response to campus and system-wide faculty productivity goals. The *Get Ready* technology instruction program for incoming students is a good example. Instructional faculty integrating e-mail and web tools into the curriculum were spending inordinate amounts of class time covering basic how-to information. Training incoming students in basic campus network tools, operating systems, and information resources allows the instructional faculty to concentrate on academic content. Library faculty submitted a successful proposal to the Oregon State System of Higher Education (OSSHE; now OUS) for a faculty productivity grant, developed the program, and ran a pilot in 1996-97. A refined version of the program is now incorporated into the Library Instruction program and was repeated in 1997-98. This is a collaborative effort with University Computing.

Future Concerns/Issues:

- Student wages were reduced 20% across the board beginning in 1996-97. Supervisors have done an admirable job absorbing these cutbacks but we have probably reached the effective limit.
- Beginning in 1998-99, supervisors will be given an expenditure limit for supplies and services (centrally funded until now). These budgets are still to be determined but will probably include a 20% reduction target. It is hoped that by establishing clear expenditure thresholds at the department level, we will be able to reduce supply inventories. Although budget allocations will be distributed, purchasing will still be centralized in order to provide controls and encourage cross-departmental cooperative purchasing where appropriate.
- Public and staff use of networked technologies has generated very substantial needs for recurring supplies and equipment budgets. At the same time, these tools have increased efficiency in information retrieval, information processing, management information, and organizational communications.

VIII. Summary

VIII.1 Summarize the major strengths and weaknesses and the problems the library faces in the foreseeable future. Review briefly the library's major objectives for the next five to ten years. Would major additional resources be needed to achieve these objectives? How can positive change take place with few or no additional resources?

A review of the library's organization chart and an examination of the statistics compiled by the Association for Research Libraries (ARL), along with an analysis of comparator institutions, reveals a medium size, traditionally organized, academic research library. However, as this program review document makes very clear, the staid appearance belies an innovative and dynamic organization that is continually scrutinizing and reinventing its services in order to match the dizzying rate of technological change and meet the information needs of a diverse population of users.

Bearing the indelible stamp of strong leadership provided by the University Librarian over the past eighteen years, the library has developed the singular strength of achieving excellence and innovation through the aggressive development of both monetary and human resources that have been invested and leveraged to produce "cutting edge" programs and services. Gift and grant funds, not public funds, have given rise to technological advances that form the underpinnings of the library's online information system and the Orbis resource sharing consortium. Development efforts have also been instrumental in enhancing the collections and in providing an expanded and renovated facility that provides a place for the historically important print collections to be used and the expanding universe of networked, electronic information to be accessed. National recruitments for all professional positions in the library have improved the caliber of the faculty and have enriched and broadened the range of perspective, experience and expertise that have been brought to bear on both the provision of traditional services and the development of new programs and projects. As the pages of this document reveal, the library is making consistent progress towards achieving its service objectives (see Section II) and demonstrates marked advancement in the areas of developing the collection, improving access to information, establishing beneficial, collaborative arrangements and in providing instructional programs.

At the same time, amidst the positive message that springs from this analysis, a cautionary note is also sounded. Even as many of the technological advances, improvements in efficiency and enhancements of library services are results of an entrepreneurial spirit that permeates the organization from top to bottom, there is also a limit to how far and to how much the library can do in and of its own

resources. Ultimately, resourcefulness and ingenuity will not be able to close the widening gap between the funds available and the funds needed to maintain a collection that supports an unusually high number doctoral programs (See Section VII.5), and provides an extensive array of services that depend on a very substantial need for recurring supply and equipment budgets. Frankly, the library is understaffed, and, given its aspirations, is in danger of overloading and running a highly talented and energetic staff into the ground (See Section III).

The library receives a generous level of funding from the university (see Section V.1), but the combination of the continuing disinvestment by the state of Oregon in higher education and the continuing loss of tuition dollars from non-resident students have produced budgetary constraints at the campus level that add up to an unprecedented threat to the stability of library services. It is in the face of these real and serious fiscal challenges that the library will endeavor to move forward into the next century of its mission and do everything in the power of its monetary and human resources to achieve excellence in supporting and stimulating undergraduate and graduate instruction and graduate and faculty research at the University of Oregon.

Appendix B

Library Faculty

<u>NAME</u>	<u>RANK</u>	<u>POSITION</u>	<u>DEGREES</u>	<u>PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS</u>
Bell, Colleen	Asst. Prof.	Library Instruction Coordinator/ Reference Librarian	1991 MLIS, University of Western Ontario 1987 B. Music, University of Victoria	Association of College & Research Libraries (ACRL): Instruction Section Oregon Library Association Pacific Northwest Library Association American Library Association
Benedicto, Juanita	Asst. Prof.	Social Sciences Librarian	1996 MLS, University of Missouri-Columbia 1994 B.A. Psychology, University of Missouri-Rolla	American Library Association Oregon Library Association
Bennett, Leslie	Professor	Head, Music Services	1979 MLS, University of California, Los Angeles 1977 M.A., Music, California State University, Long Beach 1971 B.A., Music, California State University, Long Beach	Music Library Association MLA—Northwest Chapter
Bonamici, Andrew	Professor	Associate University Librarian For Administrative & Media Services	1984 AMLS, University of Michigan 1983 B.A., Music, Marylhurst College	American Library Association: Library Administration & Management Association (LAMA); Library Organization & Management Section (LOMS)
Brownmiller, Sara	Professor	Systems Librarian	1978 MLS, University of Arizona 1974 B.A., Political Science/History, Incarnate Word College	Association of College & Research Libraries: Oregon Chapter Oregon Library Association American Library Association: ACRL; Reference & Adult Services Division (RASD)

<u>NAME</u>	<u>RANK</u>	<u>POSITION</u>	<u>DEGREES</u>	<u>PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS</u>
Buczowski, Mieczyslaw (Mischa)	Assoc. Prof.	Slavic Librarian	1991 MLS, Simmons College 1985 M.A., International Affairs, California State University, Sacramento 1973 Diploma, Vatican School of Archives (Vatican City) 1972 M.A., Theology, Lateran University (Rome, Italy) 1970 M.A. Sociology, Lateran University (Rome, Italy) 1966 B.A., Philosophy, Obra College (Poland)	American Library Association: Slavic & East European Section; ACRL; Association for Library Collections & Technical Services (ALCTS); Rare Books & Manuscripts Section (RBMS). American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies Oregon Library Association Beta Phi Mu Colorado Alliance of Research Libraries (CARL)
Butler, Barbara A.	Asst. Prof.	Science Librarian (OIMB)	1990 MLIS, University of California, Berkeley 1983 M.S., Range Management, University of California, Davis 1980 B.S., Biology, University of California, Davis	American Library Association Oregon Library Association International Association of Aquatic and Marine Science Libraries and Information Centers (IAMSLIC) CYAMUS (IAMSLIC regional group)
Carver, Deborah	Professor	Associate University Librarian for Public Services & Collections	1984 M.A., Public Administration University of Virginia, Charlottesville 1976 MLS, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill 1973 B.A., Political Science, University of Massachusetts, Amherst	American Library Association: LAMA Personnel Administration Section; RASD MOPSS; ACRL. Oregon Library Association

<u>NAME</u>	<u>RANK</u>	<u>POSITION</u>	<u>DEGREES</u>	<u>PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS</u>
Cawthorne, Jon	Asst. Prof.	Reference/Outreach Services Librarian	1993 MLS, University of Maryland, College Park 1991 B.A., English & Radio Communication, Evergreen State College	American Library Association: ACRL; RASD; Black Caucus (BCALA). Oregon Library Association
Chadwell, Faye	Assoc. Prof.	Head, Collection Development	1988 MLS, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign 1987 M.A., English, Appalachian State University, Boone, NC 1984 B.A., English, Appalachian State University, Boone, NC	American Library Association: Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual Task Force; ALCTS; ACRL. Oregon Library Association
Clayton, Mary	Assoc. Prof.	Associate Law Librarian	1978 J.D., John Marshall Law School, Chicago, IL 1973 MLS, University of Oregon 1971 B.A., History, Illinois State University, Normal, IL	American Association of Law Libraries (AALL) AALL-Western Pacific Chapter
Darling, Karen	Professor	Catalog/Projects Librarian	1975 Diploma in Library and Information Studies, University of London (England) 1973 B.A., German, St. Olaf College, Northfield, Minnesota	American Library Association: ALCTS, Serials Section North American Serials Interest Group (NASIG) International Federation of Library Association
Esau, Kaia Stavig	Asst. Prof.	Architecture & Allied Arts Reference Librarian	1993 M.A., Art History, Bryn Mawr College 1987 MLS, University of Chicago, IL 1979 B.A., Art History, Kalamazoo College	Art Libraries Society of North America (ARLIS/NA) ARLIS/Northwest

<u>NAME</u>	<u>RANK</u>	<u>POSITION</u>	<u>DEGREES</u>	<u>PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS</u>
Felsing, Robert	Professor	East Asian Bibliographer	1984 MLIS, University of Iowa 1979 Ph.D., Chinese History, University of Iowa 1970 M.A., Asian Studies, University of Hawaii 1968 B.A., History, Briar Cliff College	American Library Association Association of Asian Studies Committee on East Asian Libraries Northwest Regional China Council
Frantz, Paul	Professor	Reference Librarian/Journalism	1984 MLS, University of Washington 1977 M.A., English, Portland State University 1972 B.A., English, University of Alberta	American Library Association: Library and Information Technology Association (LITA); Library Instruction Round Table (LIRT).
Gomez, Joni	Assoc. Prof.	Technical Services Law Librarian	1986 MLS, University of Arizona 1981 B.A., Religious Studies, Arizona State University	American Library Association American Association of Law Libraries (AALL)
Grandy, Christine	Assoc. Prof.	Music Catalog Librarian	1972 MLS, University of Oregon 1971 B.A., German, University of Oregon	Music Library Association MLA – Pacific Northwest Chapter
Grenci, Mary	Asst. Prof.	Serials Catalog Librarian	1995 MLS, Southern Connecticut State University 1987 Masters of Music, New England Conservatory of Music 1985 B. Music, Youngstown State University	American Library Association: ALCTS, Serials Section North American Serials Interest Group (NASIG)
Halgren, Joanne	Assoc. Prof.	Head, Interlibrary Loan	1967 MLS, University of Washington 1966 B.A., George Fox College	American Library Association: ACRL, ACRL-- Oregon Chapter Pacific Northwest Library Association (PNLA) Oregon Library Association

<u>NAME</u>	<u>RANK</u>	<u>POSITION</u>	<u>DEGREES</u>	<u>PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS</u>
Hawk, John	Asst. Prof.	Special Collections Librarian	1994 M.A., History, University of California, Berkeley 1993 M.L.I.S., University of California, Berkeley 1989 B.A., History/Literature, Reed College	American Library Association: ACRL, Rare Books & Manuscripts Section (RBMS) Oregon Library Association Northwest Archivists
Helmer, John	Assoc. Prof.	Head, Library Systems	1988 MLS, University of California, Los Angeles 1981 B.A., Applied Mathematics/Economics, University of California, San Diego	American Library Association: Library Information Technology Assn. (LITA) American Society for Information Science Oregon Library Association
Heinzkill, Richard	Professor	Reference Librarian	1964 A.M.L.S., University of Michigan 1955 B.A., English, St. John's University, Collegeville, Minnesota	American Library Association Oregon Library Association Association of College & Research Libraries ACRL – Oregon Chapter
Holman, Jill	Asst. Prof.	Electronic Services Librarian	1993 M.I.L.S., University of Michigan 1991 B.A., History, Kalamazoo College	American Library Association: ACRL, Instruction Section; Social Responsibilities Round Table
Hyatt, Dennis	Professor	Law Librarian	1974 Masters of Law Librarianship, University of Washington 1972 J.D., University of Washington 1969 B.A., Political Science, University of Missouri, Columbia	American Association of Law Libraries (AALL) AALL – Western Pacific Chapter Pacific Northwest Law Library Consortium Beta Phi Mu

<u>NAME</u>	<u>RANK</u>	<u>POSITION</u>	<u>DEGREES</u>	<u>PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS</u>
Jenkins, Barbara	Assoc. Prof.	Head, Reference Department	1982 MLS, University of Chicago 1978 B.A., Biology, Earlham College	American Library Association: Library Administration & Management Association (LAMA); Reference and User Services Association (RUSA) Association of College & Research Libraries (ACRL); ACRL – Oregon Chapter
Johnson, J.Q.	Professor	Academic Education Coordinator	1977 M.A., Political Science, Stanford University 1973 A.B., Mathematics, Harvard College	DECUS; A.C.M.; SigComm; IEEE Communications Society Affiliate; CHIFOO CAUSE Coalition for Networked Information (CNI) The Internet Society
Klos, Sheila	Professor	Head, Architecture & Allied Arts Library	1983 A.M., American Civilization, Brown University 1977 MLS, State University of New York at Geneseo 1976 B.A., Art History & Fine Arts, State University of New York at Brockport	Art Libraries Society of North America (ARLIS/NA) Association of Architecture School Librarians International Federation of Library Associations (IFLA): Art Libraries Section
Lenn, Kathleen	Assoc. Prof.	Reference Librarian/Education	1985 MLS, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign 1983 B.A., Psychology/Teaching, Eastern Illinois University	American Library Association Association of College & Research Libraries (ACRL): Education & Behavioral Sciences Section; Bibliographic Instruction Section
Lincicum, Shirley	Asst. Prof.	Catalog Librarian	1995 MLIS, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign 1993 B.A., History, Oberlin College	American Library Association American Society for Information Science (ASIS)

<u>NAME</u>	<u>RANK</u>	<u>POSITION</u>	<u>DEGREES</u>	<u>PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS</u>
Long, Linda	Assoc. Prof.	Manuscripts Librarian	1987 MLS, Brigham Young University 1979 M.A., Archives Administration/ History, Case Western Reserve University 1978 B.A., History, Seattle University	Society of American Archivists (SAA) South Willamette Archivists & Curators Northwest Archivists
Majdic, Michael	Asst. Prof.	Television Producer/Director	1993 M.A., Communication Sangamon State University 1984 B.A., History, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign	University Film & Video Association Mid-Oregon Production Arts Network Oregon Wireless Instructional Network
McTigue, Bernard	Assoc. Prof.	Director, Special Collections and Archives	1980 M.A., Art History, Hunter College 1974 MLS, Columbia University 1973 B.A., Columbia University	American Library Association: Rare Books and Manuscripts Section Asociation Internationale de Bibliophilie American Printing History Association Bibliographical Society of America and Children's Literature Association
Midkiff, Stephanie	Asst. Prof.	Law Reference Librarian	1994 MLS, University of Kentucky 1985 J.D., University of Kentucky College of Law 1978 B.A., English, University of Kentucky	American Association of Law Libraries American Library Association
Nesbit, Angus	Asst. Prof.	Law Reference Librarian	1992 J.D., School of Law, University of Oregon 1985 MLIS, University of Pittsburgh 1984 B.A., Anthropology, University of Maine, Orono	American Association of Law Libraries AALL – Western Pacific Chapter Beta Phi Mu

<u>NAME</u>	<u>RANK</u>	<u>POSITION</u>	<u>DEGREES</u>	<u>PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS</u>
Panchenko, Alexey	Asst. Prof.	Business Reference Librarian	1995 MLIS, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign 1994 M.B.A., University of Oregon 1991 B.A., Russian Language & Literature, Moscow Peoples' Friendship University (Russia)	American Association for Advancement of Slavic Studies American Library Association American Society for Information Science Special Libraries Association
Paynter, Robin	Asst. Prof.	Reference Librarian/Area Studies	1993 MLIS, University of Wisconsin, Madison 1987 B.A., History (Southeast Asia), University of Wisconsin, Madison	American Library Association: Reference and Adult Services Division (RUSA); ACRL Association for Asian Studies: Committee on Research Materials for Southeast Asia (CORMOSEA)
Pike, Cory	Asst. Prof.	Science Reference Librarian	1994 MLIS, University of Washington 1989 B.A., Classical Civilization, Wesleyan University	Special Libraries Association (SLA) North American Sport Library Network (NASLIN)
Robare, Lori	Asst. Prof.	Catalog Librarian	1992 MLIS, University of California, Berkeley 1986 M.A., Translation & Interpretation (French/English), Monterey Institute of International Studies 1982 B.A., English & Foreign Literature, Lewis & Clark College	American Library Association: ALCTS Oregon Library Association
Shipman, George	Professor	University Librarian	1967 MLS, University of Michigan 1965 M.A., History, Western Michigan University 1963 B.A., History, Albion College	American Library Association Association of Research Libraries

<u>NAME</u>	<u>RANK</u>	<u>POSITION</u>	<u>DEGREES</u>	<u>PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS</u>
Slight-Gibney, Nancy	Asst. Prof.	Head, Acquisition Department	1990 MILS, University of Michigan 1986 M.A., Anthropology, University of Oregon 1978 B.A., Anthropology, University of Oregon	American Library Association: ALCTS, LAMA, ACRL
Smith, Ted	Asst. Prof.	Documents Reference Librarian	1992 MLS, University of California, Los Angeles 1982 B.A., Political Science, California State University, Long Beach	Documents Interest Group of Oregon (DIGOR) American Library Association: ACRL, LITA, Government Documents Round Table Beta Phi Mu
Smith, Terry	Assoc. Prof.	Catalog Librarian	1978 M.S., Interdisciplinary Studies, University of Oregon 1976 MLS, University of Oregon 1972 B.S. Purdue University	American Library Association Online Audiovisual Catalogers (OLAC)
Sotak, Diane	Asst. Prof.	Science Reference Librarian	1996 MLS, Syracuse University 1988 B.S., Natural Resources, University of Michigan	Alaska Library Association American Library Association: ACRL
Stambaugh, Laine	Assoc. Prof.	Personnel Librarian	1987 MLS, University of Arizona 1986 M.A., Linguistics, California State University, Long Beach 1977 B.A., Russian, California State University, Long Beach	American Library Association: Library Administration & Management Assn., Personnel Administration Section (LAMA/PAS); REFORMA: Association to Promote Services to the Spanish-Speaking Oregon Library Association

<u>NAME</u>	<u>RANK</u>	<u>POSITION</u>	<u>DEGREES</u>	<u>PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS</u>
Stark, Peter	Professor	Head, Map & Aerial Photography Library	1978 MLS, University of Washington 1976 B.A., History, University of California, Berkeley	American Library Association: ACRL, Map & Geography Round Table Western Association of Map Libraries Oregon State Mapping Advisory Committee State Affiliates Conference, Earth Science Information Center (U.S. Geological Survey)
Stave, Thomas	Professor	Head, Documents & Microforms Department	1974 MLS, University of Washington 1972 B.A., English, Whitworth College	American Library Association: ACRL, ACRL-- Oregon Chapter; Government Documents Round Table (GODORT) Documents Interest Group of Oregon (DIGOR)
Stirling, Isabel	Professor	Head, Science Library	1977 MLS, Western Michigan University 1970 B.A., English Literature, University of California, Riverside	American Library Association: ACRL; Science & Technology Section; Instruction Section; University Library Section; International Relations Round Table American Chemical Society: Chemical Information Division Special Libraries Association: Physics, Astronomy & Mathematics Section; Pacific Northwest Chapter International Federation of Library Associations (IFLA) Oregon Library Association California Academic & Research Libraries (CARL)
Storch, Susan	Asst. Prof.	Archivist	1994 M.A., Archival Methods, University of Massachusetts, Boston 1990 B.A., Political Science, McGill University	Society of American Archivists (SAA) Association of Records Managers & Administrators, International (ARMA) Northwest Archivists (NWA) Southern Willamette Archivists & Curators (SWAC)

<u>NAME</u>	<u>RANK</u>	<u>POSITION</u>	<u>DEGREES</u>	<u>PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS</u>
Sundt, Christine	Assoc. Prof.	Visual Resources Curator	1972 M.A., Art History, University of Wisconsin, Madison 1969 B.A., Art History, University of Illinois, Chicago	Art Library Society of North America (ARLIS/NA) Association of American Museums College Art Association of America (CAA) Museum Computer Network Visual Resources Association (VRA)
Tabb, Bruce	Asst. Prof.	Catalog Librarian	1991 MLS, Southern Connecticut University 1989, Masters in Music, Yale University 1987 B. Music, College Conservatory of Music, University of Cincinnati	Oregon Library Association American Library Association; ACRL Rare Books & Manuscripts Section; Western European Specialists Section Society for the Advancement of Scandinavian Study Music Library Association National Flute Association
Wang, Hsiao-Guang	Assoc. Prof.	East Asian Catalog Team Leader	1986 MLS, Rutgers University 1984 B.A., French, Douglass College, Rutgers University	American Library Association Association for Asian Studies; Committee on East Asian Libraries (CEAL) OCLC CJK User Group
Ward, Heather	Asst. Prof.	Humanities Librarian	1997 MLIS, Indiana University 1997, M.A. History, Indiana University 1992 B.A., History, University of Portland	American Library Association Oregon Library Association
Watson, Mark	Assoc. Prof.	Associate University Librarian for Technical Services	1986, MLS, University of Chicago 1983 M.A., English Literature, Washington State University 1981 B.A., English/French, Whitworth College	American Library Association: ALCTS; LITA

**HIGHER EDUCATION
AND THE
OREGON ECONOMY**

*Report of the Governor's Task Force
on Higher Education and the
Economy*

The Task Force recommends a fundamental overhaul of Oregon's higher education policy framework and governance. • This includes developing a broader perspective on the State's interests in higher education, centered on the needs of individual learners and the economy, and recognizing a broad array of resources within and beyond Oregon to address these needs. • It includes recognizing competitive market forces and encouraging competition as well as collaboration among providers. • It includes integrating the State's investment in, and purchase of services from, state universities, community colleges, and private colleges and universities. • It also includes decentralizing the Oregon State System of Higher Education and shifting more policy authority, responsibility, and accountability to each institution.

SUMMARY

Higher Education Matters To Oregonians and to Oregon's Economy

Oregonians are entering a new era in their requirements for higher education services. A growing economy and changing workplace are intensifying the skill and knowledge levels demanded by employers. For recent graduates looking for employment and for workers already employed, higher education is the key to greater job security, higher pay, and expanded career opportunity.

Changes in the economy, in the workforce, and in higher education itself suggest a need to rethink what we get and want from higher education. To take a fresh look at this issue, Governor Kitzhaber formed the Governor's Task Force on Higher Education and the Economy.

Six Trends Affect Higher Education in Oregon

The Task Force has found at least six distinct trends that have a direct bearing on the state's institutions of higher learning.

Trend 1. As Oregon's knowledge-centered economy continues to evolve and grow, higher education is becoming critical to the economic security of Oregonians and the long-term health of our economy. Across

nearly every sector, demand is growing for highly skilled professional and technical employees — and the pay for such employees is climbing. There is a significant clamor for employee capabilities nurtured by the liberal arts. In today's workplace, employers value workers with historical perspective, critical thinking skills, and competence in mathematics, speaking, writing, listening, and collaborative effort. They lament that too many Oregon college graduates are deficient in these attributes.

There is a significant clamor for employee capabilities nurtured by the liberal arts.

Trend 2. Shortages in critical skills and specialties are impeding growth in Oregon industries right now, and they loom even larger in the near future. Employers are having difficulty filling skilled high-wage positions even while many Oregonians with less education struggle to earn reasonable incomes.

Employers are having difficulty filling skilled high-wage positions even while many Oregonians with less education struggle to earn reasonable incomes.

Trend 3. A surge of highly educated newcomers is dramatically changing the educational profile of Oregonians, competing successfully with Oregon graduates

for good jobs, and taking jobs for which other Oregonians don't qualify because they lack necessary education and skills. Too many of the new, high paying jobs are going to well educated newcomers. While this job-education mismatch is not unique to Oregon, it suggests an opportunity if Oregon can better align its higher education offerings with the needs of Oregonians and the Oregon economy.

Trend 4. Learning and work are blending as never before, and that blend is lasting a lifetime. The market for higher education has grown well beyond young, post-high school adults going off to school for a traditional four-year program. A large and growing segment is made up of working adults who are either enhancing their job skills or retooling for new positions and careers.

Trend 5. The Oregon market for higher education is being scrambled by increased competition among existing providers, competition from new entrants, and new learning technologies. Many of Oregon's private colleges and universities are becoming more competitive for students. Outside providers of advanced education see opportunities to meet the new demand for instructional services, and a number of them are beginning to establish a presence here.

Higher education is becoming a buyer-defined market. Buyers want programs that provide what they need, when they need it, and how they need it delivered.

Even large companies are offering instruction to employees to fill needs unmet by traditional institutions or new providers. Also, more organizations and more individual employees are using new interactive technologies to tap higher education resources beyond Oregon's borders, including the Internet.

In this changing environment, higher education is becoming a buyer-defined market. Working students especially say they want learner-centered instructional services, particularly programs that provide what they need, when they need it, and how they need it delivered. Institutions that hope to meet such market demands must be responsive, flexible, results-oriented, accountable, and entrepreneurial.

Trend 6. State funding is declining even while the total demand for higher education and its value to individuals and the economy are growing.In passing tax limitations,

Oregon voters have expressed a determination to impose limits on the spending growth of State Government. Within this framework, the voters have also directed more dollars to such costs as prisons, in effect reducing what is available for higher education. As the State has reduced its investment in higher education, it has shifted much of the cost to students in the form of higher tuition. State funds now account for less

As the State has reduced its investment in higher education, it has shifted much of the cost to students in the form of higher tuition.. State funds now account for less than 20 percent of the operating budgets of Oregon's seven public universities .

than 20 percent of the combined operating budgets of Oregon's seven public universities (down from 41 percent in 1960), and student tuition is now the largest source of operating income. This shift raises the question of how much direct authority the State, as a secondary funder, should exercise over individual institutions as they are forced to seek other sources of revenue to fulfill their missions.

The Vision for Learner-Centered Higher Education

As the first four trends above make clear, higher education is a central resource, a key to Oregon's aspirations for a prosperous, knowledge-based economy. Given the importance of higher education, the Task Force believes that Oregon needs to reshape its vision and expectations of higher education. Learners and their needs at every stage of adult life must lie at the heart of this renewed vision. At a minimum, schools must pay more attention to several things:

There is evidence that Oregon institutions are taking steps to become more learner centered, to extend their market reach, and to form new alliances and delivery arrangements.

- Providing younger students not only with up-to-date knowledge in particular disciplines, but also skills in critical thinking, problem solving, communication, and teamwork
- Providing younger students a smoother transition from school to the workplace, particularly through such learning experiences as internships
- Anticipating and serving the lifelong academic needs of adult learners with degree and non-degree instructional offerings in a variety of learning models and settings
- Focusing the resources of the university's instructional programs and research and development capabilities on the strategic needs of the economy.

The Way Oregon Thinks About and Governs its Higher Education Resources Impedes Their Ability To Serve Learner Needs

Recent developments suggest that established colleges and universities see the changes coming and are moving in these directions, particularly in making younger students more job ready and in serving the continuing education needs of adults. Such responsive service confirms the Task Force's belief that many leaders and faculty within the schools of higher education want to reach out to learner markets and meet their needs. Unfortunately, leaders who want to pursue such initiatives must do so in a policy and governance framework that hasn't kept pace with technological and competitive changes in higher education, that in some cases impedes initiative to serve learners, and in other cases does not reward such initiative. Structures that impede or fail to reward market responsiveness have also grown up in the individual institutions themselves.

The Task Force finds six principle barriers to progress in Oregon higher education:

Barrier 1. At the highest level of State policy making and governance, we compartmentalize the way we think about higher education and thereby limit our opportunities to better serve students. Oregon governs its universities and community colleges separately from each other, and it rarely recognizes the valuable resources represented in private and out-of-state schools. As institutions become increasingly learner centered and market oriented, we envision a revolution in higher education delivery in the decade ahead through a proliferation of alliances among institutions within Oregon and throughout the globe. Such alliances are already forming. In this environment, the lines between institutions will blur and service territories will expand. State policy and governance need to accommodate these shifts or they will get in the way. As such alliances grow, there must be a consistent funding policy so such joint ventures can grow with market demand. As community colleges and university offerings become more integrated, so should the State's support and governance role.

By focusing on what learners need and what resources -- all resources -- are available to meet those needs, State Government will play a more constructive role in supporting the education of citizens.

State Government also needs to broaden its view of higher education to encompass more than public institutions. Higher education is increasingly becoming available from a range of sources both in and out of state. By focusing on what learners need and what resources — all resources — are available to meet those needs, State Government will play a more constructive role in supporting the education of citizens. At the same time, Oregon's schools of higher education should think of the world — not just Oregon — as their market. Our schools should be able to market their best offerings widely, to help cover fixed costs and stay competitive.

Barrier 2. Protectionist policies that assign particular schools exclusive rights to geographic territory and program offerings constrain initiative and opportunities to serve customers. Laced throughout the structures of Oregon higher education governance today are laws and regulations to review and potentially restrict the program offerings of individual campuses. These review requirements were put in place to assure quality control and to avoid duplication of services by State System schools. Unfortunately, efforts to prevent duplication inhibit program initiative and choice, which must be central characteristics in the new higher education market. The State System should encourage all institutions to explore vigorously new markets inside and outside of Oregon (as long as those outside are not subsidized by Oregon taxpayers). Creating this kind of climate will spark the kinds of new learning

Efforts to prevent duplication inhibit program initiative and choice.

opportunities Oregonians need, and it will enable Oregon schools to be competitive in the emerging global market for higher education services.

Barrier 3. The State's higher education budgeting and finance system is unwieldy, and it severely limits incentives for schools to respond to new needs. The leaders of Oregon's public and private colleges and universities and its community colleges are all adapting to the new competitive environment in higher education. However, they do not all enjoy the same incentives to compete. State universities are saddled with a ponderous budget process that involves at least three levels of review, and the incentives for expansion into new areas often are limited. Community colleges, under a new distribution formula have stronger incentives. Private schools have the strongest incentives of all to adapt to new needs.

A State System campus attempting to meet new needs today essentially has three routes to fund new programs. First, it can seek additional dollars beyond the base budget in a special request to the Legislature. Second, it can cut dollars from an existing program and redirect it elsewhere. Third, it can offer the new program, in hopes that it will attract additional dollars in tuition and other support to cover the costs.

Right now, pursuing any of these choices is more difficult than it needs to be. In a time of scarce dollars, seeking additional funds for new programs rarely is successful. Even when successful, such efforts can take months or even years. The system, by design, is slow to respond. Cutting funds from older programs to move into new areas is also very difficult. This is one reason why engineering education, which has clearly been a high priority need throughout the decade, has received limited additional support. Entering new markets with the hope that additional dollars will follow is risky as well as difficult. Most of the State general fund dollars and nearly all tuition revenue generated by State System campuses are allocated to schools using the Basic Allocation System (BAS) model. The model is biased to fund existing programs. It is inflexible in addressing needs for new programs, or existing programs in new locations.

Barrier 4. The State Government process for financing higher education obscures the State's understanding of the services it is buying and their cost. The State's process for financing the State System, despite its complexity and detail, actually obscures a clear understanding of the services that the State is buying and what they cost. The process also fails to provide comparative data for programs elsewhere, which would enable the State to determine if similar services are available from private or out-of-state sources at better quality or cost.

The State's process for financing the State System, despite its complexity and detail, actually obscures a clear understanding of the services that the State is buying and what they cost.

As demand for higher education expands, more of the costs for services will be borne by individuals, employers, and federal subsidies. In this environment, the State will need to be clearer about what specific services it chooses to support, and at what funding levels.

By one estimate, for example, a dental student in Oregon receives over seven times more State support per year (about \$35,000) than an undergraduate student (less than \$5,000). In another case, the State has no direct way of comparing the tuition support per student at community colleges (about \$2,600 in State dollars plus \$800 in local property taxes) with the support it provides for undergraduates in the State System during the first two years, primarily because there is no ready way to calculate the State System number.

Such implicit choices are not necessary bad, but they are being made without good data, without a clear understanding of the trade-offs and alternatives, and without benefit of public discussion. This lack of clarity also hampers institutions trying to serve market needs by creating inflexibility in pricing services.

Barrier 5. The State System's focus on central authority requirements detracts from a necessary focus on the customer. The cumulative impact of the State System budget and program approval process is that too much management time by college and university leadership is focused on central governance issues. This robs school leaders and faculties of the time, energy, and staff support they need to stay in touch with learner markets and make program improvements. No one in particular is at fault for this problem. It is built into the system.

Oregon Health Sciences University, which recently spun off from the State System, reports enormous savings in senior management time that was spent in attending to State Board reporting requirements and meetings, as well as addressing executive and legislative branch requirements. In important ways the Legislature and the State System have addressed some of the cumbersome red tape created by State executive requirements. In SB 171, passed in the 1995 session, the Legislature exempted the State System from various State agency procurement and personnel rules. This is a helpful step, but the larger problem remains.

Barrier 6. The flexibility and market responsiveness of individual institutions are hampered by significant internal constraints. As demand grows for degree and non-degree services, individual institutions will need to rethink their offerings in light of market opportunities. For some campuses, this will also require review of internal budget and management processes, tenure policy, and faculty governance. Although the Task Force has not focused directly on these issues, many Task Force members believe these internal organizational barriers to be as significant, if not more significant, than state-level barriers. However, in context of the overall recommendations of the report, addressing barriers within individual campuses is more appropriately a matter for each local school rather than

a statewide issue. The state framework is designed to encourage a review of mission and process by each institution.

**Possible Solutions to Barriers
That Keep Oregon Higher Education
from Responding Adequately to Learner Markets
and the Needs of the Knowledge Economy**

Barriers	Recommended Solution
State Level	
1. Compartmentalized governance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Merge higher education funding streams under one board responsible for defining service needs and contracting for services • Establish one authority responsible for all program certification • Think worldwide about sources of higher education services for Oregon students and markets for Oregon institutions
2. Institutional protectionism	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change State policy to open markets for providers of higher education
3. Weak incentives to focus on customer needs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Redesign financial allocation models to tie dollars directly to student enrollments
4. Budgeting processes that obscure what specific services the State is buying	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop a budget that specifically identifies the kinds of higher education services the State wants to buy and that budgets specific dollars for those services as a matter of conscious policy choice
5. Excessive focus on State System governance and requirements at the expense of a focus on the customer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grant semi-autonomous and possibly autonomous status to each state university; use performance contracting to purchase services in which the State has an interest
Institution Level	
6. Institutions have significant internal constraints on market responsiveness.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Let institutional autonomy and competition in the marketplace create incentives to become more responsive to learner needs and market demands • Encourage institution-level boards of directors to create a policy framework for responsiveness to market opportunities

Policy Perspective Makes a Great Difference

The State of Oregon's policy framework is a key point of leverage in addressing these questions. The Task Force believes the State should reconsider basic assumptions that it makes on 1) what is needed from higher education, 2) how individual institutions can be empowered to constantly assess and meet educational demands in a timely way, and 3) how to support access to higher education services by Oregonians. We believe Oregon

can begin to make progress by changing two perspectives:

First, policy makers should expand their horizons when considering the higher education resources that are available to Oregonians. They should think beyond our public higher education institutions and also consider the private resources inside Oregon as well as other resources worldwide that could team up with our public institutions to give Oregonians access to a wide array of learning opportunities.

Second, State policy makers and public officials should stop thinking of Oregon public universities as State agencies under their direct control. They should give our public institutions the freedom and flexibility to reach beyond traditional markets with a wide variety of new learning services. These include markets outside Oregon and markets for services in Oregon that are not necessarily supported by State dollars. State Government should view individual institutions more as independent entities from which services can be contracted than as State agencies.

These changes in perspectives will dramatically enhance the opportunities for Oregonians and their education institutions to thrive in the global economy and the global higher education market that will emerge in the 21st century.

With these two perspective in mind, state-level policy making should encourage free entry of competitive public and private institutions into the market subject to quality review. State policy should define with much more precision the specific services State Government chooses to support, and then develop mechanisms for procuring those services from our institutions through contractual relationships.

Principal Recommendations: Conform Public Policy To Support a More Learner-Focused and Competitive Higher Education Environment

The Task Force recommends a fundamental reorganization of Oregon's higher education resources, in particular by decentralizing the Oregon State System of Higher Education and shifting more policy and budget authority, responsibility, and accountability to each institution in the system. The Task Force specifically proposes the following:

1. Change the State's role to strategic guide and buyer of services. The principal role of the State boards in higher education should be to identify special and long-range needs for higher education, to advocate for resources to address those needs, and to allocate State funds to purchase particular services provided by public, and, in some cases, private institutions. For example, the State Board of Higher Education should not regulate or micro manage institutions that now comprise the State System, but should instead propose to the Legislature and contract the services in which Oregon has a public interest: student education, research, and community service. In purchasing services from individual campuses, the State Board may decide to establish tuition policies and performance

requirements as a contract condition.

2. Make each State System campus semi-autonomous. The Task Force believes that each State System institution should have the freedom and flexibility to meet the needs of its markets and compete for market share on its own merits. To do this, each campus should have the latitude, if it chooses, to establish its own governing and policy structures in accordance with its mission, including its own governing board, much as private institutions (and community colleges) do today. Each institution would continue to receive a share of share of State resources as now, but those resources would be distributed on a per-student basis according to the number of students the institution is able to attract in market competition with other providers of higher education. State subsidy might be adjusted for differences in costs among programs (but not among schools) where such costs are quantifiable and reasonable based on a sampling of similar programs. Centralized support services now provided through the Chancellor's Office might still be purchased by individual institutions, but at their discretion.

The Task Force believes the state's public institutions of higher learning, with new-found freedom and flexibility, should be challenged to grow into new markets with new services, under the financial discipline that comes with autonomy. Each campus should periodically review its strategy and operations. This review should examine new means of delivery as well as internal personnel policies, budgeting, and other practices in order to make the institution more responsive to learner needs.

State-assigned service territories and program offerings are becoming less relevant and more tenuous as learners gain more say in what they want from higher education and as new forms of distance and interactive learning technologies come into play.

3. Encourage all Oregon institutions of higher learning to form alliances to serve the needs of Oregon learners. As a matter of policy, Oregon should encourage both its public and private institutions to seek out and form the alliances that competitive organizations often find advantageous in serving growing markets. State-assigned service territories and program offerings are becoming less relevant and more tenuous as learners gain more say in what they want from higher education and as new forms of distance and interactive learning technologies come into play. Alliances between and among State System schools, community colleges, private institutions, on-line providers, and new entrants to Oregon should be welcomed. If they make sense to the partners and to learners, they will make sense for Oregon.

Recommended Intermediate Steps in Reforming Higher Education Governance

The Task Force recognizes that many issues need to be addressed as Oregon pursues

the directions recommended here. Full implementation will take a number of years, and require legislation. However, there are four steps that should be taken right away.

1. The State System should explicitly grant each of Oregon's public universities greater autonomy. While the specifics need to be carefully considered, we believe each school should be afforded flexibility to expand program offerings (subject to approval by accreditation boards), to offer programs in new geographic locations, and to form alliances with other institutions to serve learner needs.

2. The State System should rebuild its model for funding State schools. The BAS model should be replaced with a performance-contract based system. The new model should allow the Board to decide explicitly what higher education services it wants to buy or what investments it wants to make on behalf of Oregonians, and then to buy those services or make those investments through performance contracts with schools. The State will determine what services it wishes to purchase, and individual schools will become, in effect, independent suppliers receiving dollars for performing those services.

3. The State should encourage each State System campus to set its own course. The Governor should ask the Board of Higher Education to appoint an advisory board for each institution in the State System. The board and president of each institution should work together to develop strategy, policies, and plans in the context of institutional autonomy. The State Board should regard this grant of partial autonomy as the foundation upon which each institution in the State System can later request greater or full autonomy.

4. The Governor should create a new budget model for funding higher education. The Governor should ask the State System to prepare two funding models for deliberation for the 1999-2001 budget. One would be based on current practices. The other would be based on the State purchasing services or making investments through a contract-for-services process.

Additional Recommendations the State System Can Act on Immediately

To complement this new governance and budgetary framework, the Task Force recommends four steps to strengthen the connections between higher education and the economy.

1. Require institutional accountability for higher learning among graduates. Each school receiving State funds should systematically measure the proficiency of

Graduates should be measured for the ability to write and speak well, apply scientific methods, demonstrate mathematical skills, think critically, and demonstrate other core knowledge.

graduates to assure that all of them can write and speak well, apply scientific methods, demonstrate mathematical skills, think critically, and demonstrate other core knowledge the school deems to be essential for all graduates. These measures should complement skill and knowledge standards of the Proficiency-based Admission Standards System (PASS), which is currently being developed by the State System to govern admission of first-year students.

2. *Expand internships and practicums* Many Oregon institutions are expanding internships and practicum experiences to provide additional context for learning and to prepare students for life and careers beyond school. Employers find students with such experiences to be better prepared for work. Employers and schools should join together to expand internships at all levels.

3. *Expand engineering and technical education offerings.* Oregon businesses are reporting shortages in engineering and technical fields across many industrial sectors, especially in the growing high technology sector. As one of its first initiatives, the Task Force developed a strategy aimed at enhancing engineering education, both to address industry need and to learn how schools respond to a direct initiative to meet a market requirement. The Governor and Legislature supported SB 504, which creates an Engineering and Technology Industry Council to allocate a \$5 million fund in engineering education in public and private institutions. Using the initiative for engineering education as a model, we recommend turning to another critical problem: insufficient capacity to train technicians for the semiconductor industry. The lessons learned from addressing this need should be studied and applied to other higher education needs.

4. *Apply higher education resources to K-12 school transformation.* Oregon colleges and universities educate most of the new teachers entering practice in Oregon. The way these professionals are prepared is critical in transforming Oregon's K-12 schools to a standards-based mode of educating children. The K-12 reforms under way in Oregon will insure that students have high academic and work-ready skills when they leave high school. All public and private colleges and universities should be asked to thoroughly and jointly review their teacher training programs and work with the state School Transformation Advisory Council (STAC) to align these programs more effectively with school transformation. Not only will this benefit K-12 education, it will ultimately reduce the need for freshman-level remedial classes for students who leave high school unprepared to do college-level work.

Guiding the Transition That Will Encompass all of Higher Education

The steps above will address some of the most pressing problems in the State System, but they won't resolve all of Oregon's needs in higher education, particularly issues that transcend the State System. The Task Force vision for higher education will involve a

transformation that goes beyond the State System and that will, by itself, require broader perspective and guidance. The Task Force recommends that the Governor create a Higher Education Transition Council made up of civic and business leaders, and representatives from the Board of Higher Education and the Board of Education. This panel, which would sunset in a specified period, would be staffed to carry out the technical work of redesigning the way that the State of Oregon invests in and governs higher education. In particular, the Transition Council would:

- Propose measures to ease the transition to autonomy by schools in the State System.
- Design new finance, budgeting, and tuition policies consistent with the recommendations of this report and the Governor's Task Force on Higher Education Access.
- Recommend new policies and governance procedures for program authorization and certification.
- Recommend a permanent structure for higher education governance, including roles and structures for State agencies that represent Oregon's public interest in higher education. This would include the State System, the Office of Community College Services, and the State Office of Degree Authorization, and it would indicate whether and how the State's now-separate functions of funding its interest in community colleges and public universities should be aligned or merged. It would also recommend the State's role in utilizing the resources of private colleges and universities.
- Consider whether Oregon should have an advisory council to guide State investment in science and technology instruction and research, and, if so, recommend the structure and function of this body.

Appendix D: Faculty Evaluations

ANNUAL EVALUATIONS

Annual evaluations are conducted for faculty on two-year contracts, who have not yet completed the sixth-year review. The purpose of the annual evaluation process is to review and assess the faculty member's accomplishments of the past year, and to measure progress towards goals set at the beginning of the evaluation period. This process requires direct involvement of the faculty member and direct supervisor, who writes the evaluation documentation. Annual evaluations are the essential record of long-term performance and are among the primary documents considered during contract renewal, promotion and six-year review, and post-tenure reviews.

Criteria for Library Faculty Evaluation

The performance of each library faculty member will be formally evaluated on an annual basis for faculty members who have not yet completed the six-year review, and during contract renewal/post-tenure review/promotion review for post-six-year faculty using the performance criteria outlined below. Each faculty member is expected to have demonstrated accomplishment and continuing progress in all three areas of the performance criteria.

[NOTE: The set of Faculty Evaluation Criteria in the *UO Faculty Handbook* for both Officers of Instruction and Officers of Administration (upon which these present criteria are based) may also be consulted in the evaluation process. Library faculty are Officers of Administration, but their resemblance to Officers of Instruction, particularly in the areas of teaching and research, is strong enough to merit consideration of Officer of Instruction criteria in appropriate areas].

PERFORMANCE CRITERIA

1. **GOALS**

- a. Develops goals that are challenging, appropriate for the position, and readily assessed.
- b. Keeps goals current through continuous monitoring, consultation with own supervisor, and adjustments made where necessary.
- c. Accomplishes these goals successfully.

2. **PROFESSIONAL ROLES**

- a. Is effective in own professional roles, as identified in "Statement of Major Responsibilities."

- *Applicable to activities in public services:*
Is effective in providing assistance to users in their use of library and information resources.
- *Applicable to technical processing activities:*
Is effective in the acquisition, organization and preservation of library collections.
- *Applicable to collection development activities:*
Is effective in the selection, building and management of appropriate collections.
- *Applicable to library instruction:*
Is effective in the teaching of library use and research.
- *Applicable to administrative activities:*
Is effective in the administration, coordination or supervision of library units, activities, or systems.
- Is effective in the application of judgment, analytical skills and, as appropriate, subject knowledge.
- Maintains performance during crises or when assuming demanding responsibilities.
- Is respected in areas of competence or responsibility.
- Seeks new challenges and provides creative ideas.
- Adapts effectively to changing circumstances and requirements.
- Makes effective use of innovative techniques and tools.
- Works constructively and effectively with others.
- Communicates effectively with faculty and others outside the library, as appropriate.

3. **PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND SERVICE**

Makes significant contributions to the profession through some or all of the following:

- Relevant research activities, including publications, papers delivered, manuscripts prepared, works of art, public performances, and work in progress.

- Participation in appropriate professional organizations.

Undertakes activities that produce professional growth, including some or all of the following:

- Attendance or participation at conferences, seminars, workshops and professional meetings;
- Additional formal education that enhances professional development;
- Constructive use of sabbaticals and leaves of absence;
- Participation in appropriate professional organizations;
- Awareness of current developments in the profession.

Provides service to the library, university and community through some or all of the following:

- Contributions to the development of the department and, as appropriate, of related units;
- Service on library, university or OSSHE committees;
- Participation in community activities or service on behalf of private or public bodies, in which one's professional expertise or position makes a significant contribution.

Merit Money

In years when merit money is available, Library Administration will solicit nominations for and by individual Library faculty members. This replaces past practice of assigning numeric rankings (adopted 5/5/94 by the Library Faculty) for this purpose. Decisions regarding merit will be based on any combination of the following criteria:

- a) the degree to which the individual met a predetermined set of challenging goals;
- b) significant contributions to the profession and the Library/University;
- c) significant improvement in skills and abilities;
- d) and/or unusual challenges or circumstances which were handled effectively.

It is assumed that the individual is effective in his/her professional duties, and that merit money is allocated for *exceptional* effort. Library Administration may consider all faculty as potential recipients of merit pay, not just those who have been nominated. The names of those faculty who have been selected to receive merit will be published and distributed to Library Faculty, accompanied by a short narrative of their meritorious achievements.

Timetables

The period of performance being evaluated is *October 1 through September 30* each year. Supervisors complete evaluation reports and submit completed documentation to the Personnel Librarian after it has been signed and discussed with the faculty member by *December 31*. Criteria for evaluation is based on performance, major responsibilities, professional development progress, and goals. In alternate years (during contract renewal or at six-year review point), the individual faculty member will be asked to write a personal report covering the last contract period. That is due to the Personnel Librarian on *November 1*. At that same time, department heads and/or AULs will be asked to write an update report, covering the last contract period (or five years), which is due *December 31*. Strict adherence to the schedule allows for submission of promotion and/or other salary increases prior to the beginning of the new fiscal year.

Notification Procedures for Annual Evaluations

Letters describing the annual evaluation process and stating deadlines for submission of materials are sent to all faculty near the end of the review period by the University Librarian or Personnel Librarian.

Documentation for Annual Evaluation

The supervisor addresses the following:

1. Statement of Major Responsibilities (developed with faculty member)
2. Progress on goals for the past year
3. Proposed set of new goals for the upcoming year (proposed by faculty member)
4. Narrative report of activities for the past year, based on #s 1-3 above, and also based on "Criteria for Evaluation" mentioned above.
5. Statement regarding collection development activities, if applicable, from Head, Collection Development.

Summary of the Annual Evaluation Process

The supervisor meets with the faculty member to discuss the evaluation, and to discuss performance goals and statement of responsibilities for the upcoming year. The faculty member has the opportunity to respond to the appraisal before a recommendation is considered final, and must indicate either concurrence or disagreement with the narrative appraisal. If the faculty member wishes to comment on the evaluation, a supplement should be attached to the document prior to its forwarding to his/her personnel file. Quarterly meetings (approximately September, December, March, June) should take place between the faculty member and supervisor to review and discuss goals for the upcoming evaluation period.

Appeals to Annual Evaluations

Evidence to support the appeal should be attached to the evaluation document prior to its forwarding to the next level of review or to the personnel file. If a faculty member wishes to challenge the appraisal, he/she may grieve the decision according to the procedures defined in OAR Chapter 571, Division 3. Prior consultation with the Personnel Librarian or University Librarian is suggested.

**CONTRACT RENEWAL
(INCLUDING SIXTH-YEAR REVIEW)**

Untenured librarians are reviewed during the final year of their current contract for purposes of contract renewal. Such reviews are conducted according to procedures defined in the University of Oregon Faculty Handbook, UO Policy Statement 3.400, and OAR Chapter 580, Division 21. The sixth-year review is an expanded contract renewal review which: a) includes solicitation of letters from references outside the Library; b) is conducted concurrent with a promotion review; c) if successfully completed, generates three-year fixed term contracts and promotion in rank to Associate Professor; and d) if unsuccessful, results in a one-year "timely notice" contract. Criteria used in contract renewal reviews are the same as those used in the annual evaluation.

Timetables

The following timetables should be considered *typical*. There will be exceptions resulting from factors such as reduced FTE or credit given for previous experience in other institutions.

- 1) **Entry level**: an entry-level librarian will normally be awarded a series of three successive two-year contracts. In the second year of each contract period, a review will be conducted for purposes of contract renewal. The third such review will constitute the sixth-year review. Following successful passage of the sixth-year review, the faculty member will be awarded three-year contracts.
- 2) **Instructors**: Individuals appointed to the Library Faculty at the Instructor rank are not eligible for promotion in rank. Contracts will never exceed two years in length, per University regulations. In the second year of each contract period, the instructor will submit a personal report of activities during the last contract period to the immediate supervisor. A review will then be conducted by the immediate supervisor, resulting in a recommendation for continuing or non-continuing reappointment. That recommendation is forwarded to the University Librarian for endorsement. If successful, the individual will be awarded a new two-year contract. If unsuccessful, "timely notice" will be given, per University regulations.
- 3) **Limited seniority**: some librarians with previous professional experience may be appointed on initial 2-year contracts, but with possible credit toward the six-year limit. This credit amount will typically be determined by the faculty member, the University Librarian, and the Provost when the initial offer is being negotiated. Determining factors might include, but are not necessarily limited to:

- a. length of service in other institutions
- b. rank held in previous appointments
- c. type of institutions in which prior experience was gained
- d. presence of graduate degrees other than the MLS or other required degrees
- e. qualitative assessment of exceptional potential for long-term success in the appointment being offered.

In such cases, the sixth-year contract renewal review would be conducted at an earlier date.

- 4) **Senior positions:** department heads and senior administrative librarians are often appointed on an initial three-year contract at the Associate Professor rank. Because faculty appointed to these positions usually have six years or more professional experience and have often achieved tenure or have passed some other form of "up-or-out" review in another institution, the six-year rule will not normally be applied to these faculty members. They will be reviewed for purposes of regular contract renewal in the final year of each contract period.

Notification Procedures for Contract Renewal

Faculty members to be reviewed for purposes of contract renewal will be notified by letter from the University Librarian. These letters will normally be mailed in the early fall in order to allow ample time for preparation and review of the case file.

Documentation Required for Contract Renewal

NOTE: Documentation for the "sixth-year review" duplicates that compiled for a promotion review (see below).

For purposes of contract renewal, the following materials will be solicited by the University Librarian, compiled by the Personnel Librarian, and reviewed by the Library Faculty Personnel Committee:

1. Personal Statement describing accomplishments since last contract renewal or, if still in the first contract period, since initial appointment.
2. Annual evaluations since last contract renewal or, if still in the first contract period, since initial appointment.
3. Updates of annual evaluations from:
 - a. supervising Department Head
 - b. Associate University Librarian with administrative jurisdiction or University Librarian
4. Statement from Head, Collection Development regarding subject specialist activities

Additional materials from faculty and staff outside the line of supervision may be requested if supervisors and/or the Library Faculty Personnel Committee require such information to conduct their review. Such materials might include but are not necessarily limited to:

- a) Letters from Library faculty outside the direct line of supervision with whom the faculty member has worked closely during the review period.
- b) Deans, department heads, faculty members, administrators, or other members of the University community with whom the faculty member has worked closely during the review period.
- c) OSSHE staff or other State officials with whom the faculty member has worked closely during the review period.
- d) Relevant experts outside the University or State System who can testify regarding the nature and quality of the faculty member's professional performance and/or contribution to their discipline.

These materials must be solicited by the University Librarian. The faculty member under review will be informed by the University Librarian when any such materials are requested.

The Committee will also examine unsolicited comments which have been placed in the faculty member's personnel file during the review period. Faculty members are to be informed when such materials enter their files.

Reviewers

The completed dossier is reviewed by:

- 1) the Library Faculty Personnel Committee, which drafts a recommendation for or against renewal,
- 2) the University Librarian, who endorses or refutes the Library Faculty Personnel Committee's recommendation, and
- 3) the Provost.

When the review process is completed, the faculty member will receive a letter from the Provost. These letters are normally mailed sometime before June 30. In a successful case, the Provost typically extends an offer of a fixed-term appointment of a length suggested by the University Librarian. In an unsuccessful case, the Provost will extend a non-renewable contract of a length sufficient to provide timely notice (see below).

Faculty members are notified when their case has passed from the Library Faculty Personnel Committee to the University Librarian. The University Librarian or designee may meet with faculty members to review the file before it is forwarded to the Provost. Faculty members should keep in mind that review files are part of their permanent personnel record and that they have rights of access to their contents (or, if they have waived rights of access, to a summary of the contents) at any time.

Timely Notice

If a contract is not renewed for reasons other than cause or financial exigency, timely notice of termination will be given as follows:

- 1) At least three months before termination for a faculty member in the first year of a fixed-term appointment;

- 2) At least six months before termination for a faculty member in the second year of a fixed-term appointment (years of service must be consecutive);
- 3) At least 12 months before termination for a faculty member in the third or subsequent year of fixed-term appointments (years of service must be consecutive).

Appeals for Non-Renewals

If a sixth-year committee review results in terminal notice, the faculty member may submit an appeal based on alleged procedural or substantive error to the Provost. The Provost will review the appeal with the help of the University Librarian or designee. (See UO Policy Statement 3.400; OAR Chapter 580-21-305).

NOTE: "The non-renewal of an appointment in other than promotion and tenure cases as set forth in OAR 571-03-015 and 571-03-016 shall not be subject to the hearing processes of [the] grievance procedure [for academic employees]." (OAR 571-03-017).

PROMOTIONS

Members of the Library faculty hold academic rank as Officers of Administration (some Library faculty appointed before 1981 are Officers of Instruction). Criteria used in evaluating Library faculty (except for Instructors) for promotion in rank are the same as those used for contract renewal and annual evaluation reviews. Officers of Instruction are also required to meet criteria for original research and publication as applied to members of the teaching faculties.

Standards for Promotion Reviews

In December, 1992, the Library Faculty drafted and adopted the following: "The performance criteria set out in the 'Library Faculty Annual Evaluation' document will be used. Those criteria address: 1) the accomplishment of goals, 2) performance in professional roles, and 3) professional development and service. In conducting its review, the (Library Faculty Personnel) Committee will seek to determine whether the candidate has demonstrated a high degree of effectiveness in his/her professional role(s) in the UO Library. Regarding professional development and service, it will also seek to establish whether the candidate is perceived by professional peers to have become a recognized expert in his/her area(s) of competence.

Additionally, in promotion to *Associate Professor*, the Committee will evaluate whether the candidate has influenced the course of the profession beyond the institutional level through involvement in appropriate professional organizations and/or through research that has been published or disseminated through recognized professional channels.

In considering promotion to *Professor*, the Committee will evaluate whether the candidate has influenced the course of the profession at the national level through appropriate professional involvement and/or published or disseminated research."

Timetables for Promotion Review

Unlike reviews for contract renewal, promotion reviews to the rank of Professor are conducted at the option of the individual faculty member. Sixth-Year reviews and promotion to Associate Professor are mandatory. It should be pointed out that although a faculty member can seek promotion at any time, early promotions (based on anything but years-in-rank) are considered very exceptional and normally require departmental initiation. It is suggested that faculty members considering any promotion option discuss their plans beforehand with relevant supervisors and administrators, the Personnel Librarian, members of the Library Faculty Personnel Committee, and University Personnel Committee (Officers of Instruction only).

- 1) **Entry level**: an entry-level librarian will normally be appointed with the rank of Assistant Professor. Individuals appointed to faculty positions which do not require a Master's-level degree may be appointed as Instructors, Research Associates or Research Assistants, and are not eligible for promotion in rank. Final determination of academic rank is subject to the approval of the Provost and the Office of Affirmative Action.
 - a) The first promotion review for an entry-level librarian would be conducted after completion of the fifth year of appointment (the six-year limit).
 - b) After the faculty member is promoted and serves five years in the new rank, notification of the promotion option will be provided every year until the option is exercised again.

- 2) **Limited seniority**: some librarians with previous experience may be appointed as Assistant Professors but with "credit" toward the six-year limit. This credit amount will normally be determined by the faculty member, the University Librarian, and the Provost while the initial offer is being negotiated. In most such cases, the option for early promotion review would be written into the Offer of Academic Appointment. Determining factors might include but are not necessarily limited to:
 - a) length of service in other institutions,
 - b) rank held in previous appointments,
 - c) type of institutions in which prior experience was gained,
 - d) presence of graduate degrees other than the MLS or other required degrees.

- 3) **Senior positions**: department heads and senior administrative librarians are usually appointed on initial three-year contracts with the rank of Associate Professor and are eligible for promotion after five years in rank. Appointment to the rank of Professor is possible in some cases. For Associate Professors, after the fifth year in rank, notification of the promotion option will be provided every year until the option is exercised.*

[* Anniversary dates for purposes of promotion are rounded to the nearest July 1. Example: a new library school graduate appointed in July 1997 would be reviewed for promotion during the 2002/2003 fiscal year with promotion effective July 1, 2003. A librarian appointed in January 1998 would not be reviewed until 2003/2004, with promotion effective July 1, 2004.]

Notification Procedures for Promotion Review

Faculty members eligible for promotion will be notified by letter from the University Librarian. These letters will normally be mailed in *July* to allow ample time for preparation and review of the promotion dossier.

Documentation Required for Promotion Review

It is the responsibility of the University Librarian/Personnel Librarian to compile the promotion dossier to be forwarded to the Provost. Faculty members who wish to be reviewed, though, must provide the following documents:

1. *Notice of intent* to be considered for promotion (due to Personnel Librarian by *August 15*)
2. *Waiver option*. Because the promotion review process requires solicitation of letters from references outside the University of Oregon Library, faculty members are provided with various options regarding the confidentiality of these references.
 - a) *Option #1: Waiver of all access to the dossier*, including the recommendation of the Library Faculty Personnel Committee. This option allows committee reports to quote freely from reference letters even when letters have been forwarded in confidence. Such a waiver does not preclude the faculty member from requesting a summary of the file materials, including letters of reference, which does not allow the authors to be identified.
 - b) *Option #2: Waiver of access to referee's letters only*. This option keeps letters from outside referees confidential but allows the faculty member access to evaluative materials provided by supervisors and to committee recommendations. The faculty member may request a summary of the reference letters which does not allow the authors to be identified.
 - c) *Option #3: Retention of full right of access* to the dossier, including letters of outside references.
3. A *list* of the names and current addresses of references. There should be no fewer than three, and in most cases, not more than eight names provided.
4. A *personal statement* describing *goals* and accomplishments since last promoted or since initial appointment.
5. A current *résumé* or curriculum vita.

In addition to the outside references, the University Librarian will request updates of the annual evaluation from the supervising department head and Associate University Librarian with administrative jurisdiction.

Additional materials from faculty and staff outside the line of supervision may be requested if reviewers require such information. Such materials might include but are not necessarily limited to:

1. Letters from Library faculty outside the direct line of supervision with whom the faculty member has worked closely during the review period
2. Deans, department heads, faculty members, administrators, or other members of the University community with whom the faculty member has worked closely during the review period
3. OSSHE staff or other State officials with whom the faculty member has worked closely during the review period
4. Relevant experts outside the University or State System who can testify regarding the nature and quality of the faculty member's professional performance and/or contribution to their discipline.

These materials must be solicited by the University Librarian, University Faculty Personnel Committee (Officers of Instruction only), or the Provost. The faculty member under review will be informed when such materials are requested.

Reviewers will also consider unsolicited comments which have been placed in the faculty member's personnel file during the review period. Faculty members are to be informed when such materials are placed in their files.

Reviewers

The completed dossier is reviewed by:

1. the Library Faculty Personnel Committee, which drafts a recommendation for or against promotion,
2. the University Librarian, who endorses or refutes the Library Faculty Personnel Committee's recommendation,
3. The University Faculty Personnel Committee (Officers of Instruction only), and
4. the Provost.

Faculty members are notified when their case has passed from the Library Faculty Personnel Committee to the University Librarian.

The University Librarian or designee may meet with faculty members to review the file before it is forwarded to the University Faculty Personnel Committee (Officers of Instruction only) or Provost. Faculty members should keep in mind that review files are part of their permanent personnel record and that they have rights of access to their contents (or, if they have waived rights of access, to a summary of the contents) at any time.

Appeals

Barring evidence of illegal discrimination in a promotion case (OAR 571-03-010), grievance resolution procedures of the University are limited to "challenges to procedural accuracy and assertions of arbitrary and capricious conduct in the exercise of academic, peer, or administrative judgment in decisions concerning [promotion]. Requests for further consideration of a disputed promotion case shall be made in writing to the Provost." (OAR 571-03-016)

POST-TENURE REVIEW

Those members of the Library Faculty who achieved tenure as Officers of Instruction prior to 1981 are reviewed every five years for purposes of post-tenure review. The procedure for post-tenure review relates closely to the regular review process for faculty. Objectives of post-tenure review are to encourage, to reward, and to support the continuous development of faculty members and, through the process of peer review, to identify tenured faculty members who merit special recognition or who need special assistance.

As mentioned above, post-tenure reviews are required at least every five years. Earlier reviews may be requested by the faculty member, the department head, or the University Librarian; requests for early review shall be in writing and shall include reasons for early consideration. Any review for promotion shall be substituted for the post-tenure review. In addition, a tenured member of the faculty or administration may request, in lieu of the post-tenure review a special review conducted by the Library Faculty Personnel Committee or the University Personnel Committee through the regular review process. In 1992, the Library's Post-Tenure Review Committee was disbanded, due to insufficient in-house candidates to serve on the committee. With permission from the Provost and a change in the Library's Bylaws, the Library's Faculty Personnel Committee was issued the charge of conducting these post-tenure reviews.

Documentation Required for Post-Tenure Review

Documentation for the post-tenure review consists of:

1. A statement by the faculty member of scholarly, scientific, professional or artistic accomplishments, goals, and plans.
2. An up-to-date vita and bibliography.
3. Annual evaluations since the last review.

Additional materials may be requested if the Library Faculty Personnel Committee or University Librarian require such information to conduct the review. Such materials might include but are not necessarily limited to:

1. Statements for supervising Library department heads or administrators summarizing the past duties and responsibilities of the faculty member, including pertinent information concerning the conditions of appointment.
2. Summaries of student evaluations, if the faculty member has had classroom

teaching responsibilities

3. Letters from:

- a. Library faculty outside the direct line of supervision with whom the faculty member has worked closely during the review period.
- b. Deans, department heads, faculty members, administrators, or other members of the University community with whom the faculty member has worked closely during the review period.
- c. OSSHE staff or other State officials with whom the faculty member has worked closely during the review period.
- d. Relevant experts outside the University or State System who can testify regarding the nature and quality of the faculty member's professional performance and/or contribution to their discipline.

4. Supportive documents such as copies of publications, manuscripts, reviews, etc.

These materials must be solicited by the University Librarian. The faculty member under review will be informed by the University Librarian when any such materials are requested.

The post-tenure review is conducted by the Library Faculty Personnel Committee. The Committee will summarize its review in a report which is forwarded to the faculty member, the University Librarian, and the Provost. Faculty members are notified when their case has passed from the Library Faculty Personnel Committee to the University Librarian. The University Librarian or designee may meet with faculty members to review the file before it is forwarded to the Provost. Faculty members should keep in mind that post-tenure review files are part of their permanent personnel record and that they have rights of access of their contents at any time.

Please refer to OAR 580-21-140 and UO Policy Statement 3.150 for further information.

<p>CALENDAR OF EVALUATION ACTIVITIES</p>

JULY

- 30 - University Librarian (via Personnel Librarian) queries eligible candidates who wish to be considered for promotion review (other than six-year review) for upcoming year.

AUGUST

- 15 - Decisions regarding promotion review and waiver option are due to Personnel Librarian.
- 31 - List of referees for Sixth Year and Promotion Review are due to Personnel Librarian
- 31 - Personnel Librarian prepares final caseload and forwards to Library Faculty Personnel Committee.

SEPTEMBER

- 1 - Letters go out to faculty members requesting personal statement, etc.; to supervisors; to referees.

- 30 - All faculty members meet with immediate supervisors to review/set/discuss goals for upcoming year(s).

NOVEMBER

- 1 - All personal reports/statements regarding contract renewal, promotion review (including sixth-year review), and post-tenure review are due to Personnel Librarian.

DECEMBER

- 31 - All supervisor evaluation reports for pre-six-year review faculty are due to Personnel Librarian.
- 31 - All supervisor (including department head and/or AUL) contract renewal and/or promotion review reports are due to Personnel Librarian.
- 31 - Head, Collection Development submits statements regarding subject specialist activities
- 31 - All faculty have quarterly meeting with immediate supervisor regarding goals.

JANUARY

- 1 - Library Faculty Personnel Committee begins caseload deliberation.

MARCH

- 31 - Library Faculty Personnel Committee completes caseload deliberation.
- 31 - All faculty have quarterly meeting with immediate supervisor regarding goals.

APRIL

- 15 - University Librarian completes caseload endorsements and forwards to Personnel Librarian.
- 30 - Personnel Librarian forwards all completed caseloads to Academic Affairs.

JUNE

- 30 - All faculty have quarterly meeting with immediate supervisor regarding goals.

JULY

- 1 - All promotions and new contracts become effective.

UO Library ARL Statistics 1983-97

CATEGORY	YEAR:														
	1997	1996	1995	1994	1993	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988	1987	1986	1985	1984	1983
COLLECTIONS															
Volumes Added, Gross	56,038	60,511	53,713	53,411	45,650	51,037	48,250	41,880	41,937	39,362	60,452	46,737	46,190	53,471	46,811
Volumes Added, Net	51,617	57,180	51,753	51,451	43,163	49,371	46,793	40,346	40,801	39,293	59,021	32,514	35,982	52,868	46,537
Volumes Held	2,245,443	2,193,826	2,127,527	2,075,774	2,024,323	1,981,160	1,931,789	1,844,996	1,844,650	1,804,926	1,765,633	1,706,612	1,675,727	1,639,745	1,586,877
Monographs Purchased	28,658	29,543	32,070	27,546	33,358	37,180	34,817	33,442	27,533	30,962	54,913	48,120			
Current Serials Purchased	10,626	11,262	12,282	11,277	13,898	13,898	14,787	16,182	16,015	16,038	15,477	14,949			
Current Serials Not Purchased	4,826	4,997	4,977	4,513	4,016	2,093	3,989	5,005	5,009	5,043	5,059	3,319			
Total Current Serials	15,452	16,259	17,259	15,790	17,914	15,991	18,776	21,187	21,024	21,081	20,536	18,268	17,561	17,208	17,011
Microforms	1,924,778	1,906,570	1,888,835	1,888,835	1,973,513	1,923,685	1,850,228	1,798,556	1,761,082	1,697,564	1,628,570	1,486,211	1,288,562	1,156,073	1,068,547
Government Documents	473,881	468,411	468,072	468,072	497,091	465,277	451,454								
Manuscripts and Archives	58,002	57,802	57,802	57,802	41,073										
Cartographic Materials	819,916	819,340	815,804	815,804	825,967										
Graphic Materials	993,217	983,933	983,933	983,933	991,871										
Sound Recordings	51,233	49,890	49,262	49,262	50,625										
Video and Film	6,403	5,897	5,425	5,425	3,070										
Computer Files	501	306	141	141	79										
SERVICES															
Total Interlibrary Lending	29,023	25,577	23,644	18,034	18,694	17,211	16,062	15,431	14,931	14,239	12,878	10,606	9,124	9,544	12,297
Total Interlibrary Borrowing	13,247	12,519	11,230	9,933	8,888	8,781	8,535	7,300	8,019	8,078	6,358	5,549	5,066	5,068	4,584
Group Presentations	427														
Presentation Participants	5,931														
Reference Queries	37,024	46,201	44,850												
Initial Circulation	386,423	374,263	442,352												
Total Circulation	467,636	456,680	514,990												
Reserve Circulation	130,575	152,800	143,701												
STAFFING															
Professional Staff	54	54	54	51	51	51	51	51	51	50	50	50	51	42	45
Support Staff	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	91	87	89	87	83	82
Student Assistants	74	74	74	74	74	74	74	74	74	74	74	61	57	48	53
Total Prof. + Support Staff	146	146	146	143	143	143	143	143	143	141	137	139	138	125	127
Total Prof.+Support+Student Staff	220	220	220	217	217	217	217	217	217	215	211	200	195	173	180
EXPENDITURES															
Materials															
Expenditures for Monographs	\$1,394,675	\$1,373,363	\$1,424,639	\$1,159,307	\$1,191,958	\$1,330,241	\$1,156,159	\$1,014,081	\$934,232	\$912,555	\$971,517	\$892,896			
Expenditures for Serials	\$2,746,832	\$2,891,599	\$2,595,039	\$2,558,342	\$2,616,853	\$2,261,534	\$2,284,436	\$1,915,970	\$1,825,722	\$1,611,696	\$1,340,333	\$1,212,073	\$1,223,281	\$1,008,345	\$957,957
Expenditures for Other Materials												\$34,758			
Misc. Materials Expenditures	\$610,354	\$583,305	\$526,972	\$795,003	\$199,034	\$236,160	\$190,737	\$169,322	\$266,598	\$410,355	\$277,665	\$413,098			
Total Materials Expenditures	\$4,751,861	\$4,848,267	\$4,546,650	\$4,512,652	\$4,007,845	\$3,827,935	\$3,631,332	\$3,099,373	\$3,026,552	\$2,934,606	\$2,589,515	\$2,552,825	\$2,312,004	\$2,220,282	\$2,034,426
Expenditures for Binding	\$149,797	\$141,299	\$141,355	\$143,638	\$148,797	\$142,584	\$140,353	\$116,302	\$93,474	\$144,161	\$201,925	\$110,074	\$100,213	\$85,130	\$80,841
Personnel															
Professional Salaries and Wages	\$2,001,276	\$2,082,393	\$1,965,897	\$1,875,432	\$1,832,944	\$1,879,772	\$1,773,040	\$1,597,205	\$1,493,291	\$1,339,964	\$1,310,208	\$1,242,371			
Support Staff Salaries and Wages	\$2,238,933	\$2,054,527	\$2,054,527	\$1,953,299	\$1,940,332	\$1,752,865	\$1,614,130	\$1,506,964	\$1,444,679	\$1,354,719	\$1,217,951	\$1,174,256			
Student Assistant Wages	\$742,433	\$860,579	\$761,835	\$737,734	\$679,663	\$705,517	\$654,414	\$605,161	\$555,642	\$567,389	\$515,560	\$273,993			
Total Salaries and Wages	\$4,982,642	\$4,997,499	\$4,782,259	\$4,566,465	\$4,452,939	\$4,338,154	\$4,041,584	\$3,709,330	\$3,493,612	\$3,262,072	\$3,043,719	\$2,690,620	\$2,713,883	\$2,658,740	\$2,437,193
Other Operating Expenditures	\$1,195,123	\$1,131,254	\$1,433,493	\$1,131,407	\$1,623,717	\$1,471,179	\$1,134,850	\$993,958	\$1,123,126	\$828,506	\$573,507	\$472,281	\$112,168	\$242,089	\$267,105
Total Library Expenditures	\$11,079,423	\$11,118,319	\$10,903,757	\$10,354,162	\$10,233,298	\$9,779,852	\$8,948,119	\$7,918,963	\$7,736,764	\$7,169,345	\$6,408,666	\$5,825,800	\$5,238,268	\$5,206,241	\$4,819,565
INSTITUTIONAL															
Total Fulltime Students	14,718	14,555	14,203	13,440	13,863	14,160	15,195	15,247	15,769	14,868	14,632	14,030	13,507	13,075	13,226
Total Fulltime Graduate Students	2,662	2,856	2,666	2,548	2,722	2,783	2,921	2,959	2,917	2,768	2,748	2,037	2,005	1,991	1,941
Ph.D.s Awarded	148	172	133	174	257	230	198	180	184	138	131	191	166	237	206
Ph.D. Fields	45	45	45	45	47	48	48	48	48	42	42	42	42	49	49
Total Teaching Faculty	629	633	709	688	688	688	688	667	642	629	964	634			

KANSAS GROUP COMPARATORS: ARL LIBRARIES
Source: ARL Statistics, 1996-97

SURVEY CATEGORY	COLORADO	IOWA	KANSAS	OKLAHOMA	OREGON	UNC- CHAPEL HILL	GROUP AVERAGE	UO AS % OF AVGE	Group Median	UO AS % OF MEDIAN	
COLLECTIONS											
Volumes Added, Gross	50,533	110,813	84,168	45,088	56,038	151,508	83,025	67%	70,103	80%	
Volumes Added, Net	43,459	71,060	82,347	34,246	51,617	144,684	71,236	72%	61,339	84%	
Volumes Held	2,715,702	3,822,656	3,532,810	2,610,071	2,245,443	4,819,186	3,290,978	68%	3,124,256	72%	
Monographs Purchased	31,148	49,435	43,126	16,082	28,658	73,030	40,247	71%	37,137	77%	
Current Serials Purchased	17,185	19,752	17,481	15,762	10,626	21,592	17,066	62%	17,333	61%	
Current Serials Not Purchased	11,288	19,386	15,783	708	4,826	22,294	12,381	39%	13,536	36%	
Total Current Serials	28,473	39,138	33,264	16,470	15,452	43,886	29,447	52%	30,869	50%	
Microforms	5,685,353	5,934,537	3,094,881	3,645,383	1,924,778	4,189,938	4,079,145	47%	3,917,661	49%	
Government Documents	1,658,705	1,028,427	680,631	1,382,845	473,881	1,589,238	1,135,621	42%	1,205,636	39%	
Manuscripts and Archives	27,183	11,870	17,511	11,802	58,002	22,402	24,795	234%	19,957	291%	
Cartographic Materials	200,055	356,831	317,629	148,072	819,916	304,525	357,838	229%	311,077	264%	
Graphic Materials	347,850	227,820	2,754,772	195,065	993,217	534,678	842,234	118%	441,264	225%	
Sound Recordings	46,705	22,486	27,163	2,229	51,233	125,326	45,857	112%	36,934	139%	
Video and Film	10,178	7,304	16,075	4,082	6,403	34,617	13,110	49%	8,741	73%	
Computer Files	7,184	6,924	4,987	1,790	501	4,814	4,367	11%	4,901	10%	avge UO in collections categories 103% of Kansas Group median
SERVICES											
Total Interlibrary Lending	35,389	55,232	46,334	27,259	29,023	50,707	40,657	71%	40,862	71%	
Total Interlibrary Borrowing	17,686	21,397	23,083	25,292	13,247	10,793	18,583	71%	19,542	68%	
Group Presentations	785	785	n/a	622	427	1,171	758	56%	785	54%	
Presentation Participants	12,472	13,037	n/a	9,744	5,931	16,952	11,627	51%	12,472	48%	
Reference Queries	245,735	104,125	n/a	228,504	37,024	239,214	170,920	22%	228,504	16%	there are obviously reporting discrepancies here.
Initial Circulation	710,495	n/a	n/a	187,723	386,423		428,214	90%	386,423	100%	
Total Circulation	971,809	619,742	1,359,301	257,803	467,636	1,671,520	891,302	52%	795,776	59%	avge UO in services (not inc. reference)
Reserve Circulation	178,739	99,008	n/a	81,448	130,575	146,935	127,341	103%	130,575	100%	84% of Kansas Group median
STAFFING (FTE)											
Professional Staff	55	95	89	48	54	123	77	70%	72	75%	
Support Staff	121	129	109	79	92	206	123	75%	115	80%	
Student Assistants	64	81	96	57	74	110	80	92%	78	95%	
Total Prof. + Support Staff	176	224	198	127	146	329	200	73%	187	78%	avge UO in staffing
Total Prof.+Support+Student Staff	240	305	294	184	220	439	280	78%	267	82%	82% of Kansas Group median
EXPENDITURES											
Expenditures for Monographs	\$1,567,422	\$1,875,645	\$2,098,988	\$692,244	\$1,394,675	\$2,995,190	\$1,770,694	79%	\$1,721,534	81%	
Expenditures for Serials	\$4,942,630	\$3,719,730	\$3,459,917	\$3,610,714	\$2,746,832	\$4,830,491	\$3,885,052	71%	\$3,665,222	75%	
Expenditures for Other Materials	\$923,230	\$949,133	\$126,501	\$187,031	see monographs	\$1,241,060	\$685,391	n/a	\$923,230	n/a	
Misc. Materials Expenditures	\$631,331	\$288,795	\$228,306	\$183,427	\$610,354	\$418,130	\$393,391	155%	\$353,463	173%	
Total Materials Expenditures	\$8,064,513	\$6,833,303	\$5,913,712	\$4,673,416	\$4,751,861	\$9,484,871	\$6,620,279	72%	\$6,373,508	75%	
Expenditures for Binding	\$195,672	\$232,458	\$150,962	\$91,022	\$149,797	\$357,987	\$196,316	76%	\$173,317	86%	
Professional Salaries and Wages	\$2,125,876	\$4,604,391	\$3,375,943	\$1,974,101	\$2,001,276	\$5,273,161	\$3,225,791	62%	\$2,750,910	73%	
Support Staff Salaries and Wages	\$3,566,490	\$3,412,804	\$2,606,028	\$1,164,199	\$2,238,933	\$4,601,772	\$2,931,704	76%	\$3,009,415	74%	
Student Assistant Wages	\$793,419	\$871,428	\$933,187	\$590,041	\$742,433	\$800,452	\$788,493	94%	\$796,936	93%	
Total Salaries and Wages	\$6,485,785	\$8,888,623	\$6,915,156	\$3,728,341	\$4,982,642	\$10,675,385	\$6,945,989	72%	\$6,700,471	74%	
Other Operating Expenditures	\$902,899	\$2,697,839	\$1,994,180	\$1,398,251	\$1,195,123	\$2,873,579	\$1,843,645	65%	\$1,696,216	70%	avge UO in expenditure categories
Total Library Expenditures	\$15,648,969	\$18,652,223	\$14,974,010	\$9,891,030	\$11,079,423	\$23,391,822	\$15,606,246	71%	\$15,311,490	72%	86% of Kansas Group median
INSTITUTIONAL INFORMATION											
Total Fulltime Students	21,135	21,586	20,907	15,222	14,718	19,590	18,860	78%	20,249	73%	
Total Fulltime Graduate Students	2,286	5,323	4,573	1,972	2,662	5,178	3,666	73%	3,618	74%	
Ph.D.s Awarded	328	364	239	168	148	389	273	54%	284	52%	
Ph.D. Fields	40	62	66	44	45	59	53	85%	52	87%	average UO Institutional characteristics
Total Teaching Faculty	1,217	1,052	1,641	809	629	2,417	1,294	49%	1,135	55%	68% of Kansas Group median

KANSAS GROUP COMPARATORS: ARL LIBRARIES
Source: ARL Statistics, 1996-97

SURVEY CATEGORY	COLORADO	IOWA	KANSAS	OKLAHOMA	OREGON	UNC- CHAPEL HILL	GROUP AVERAGE	UO AS % OF AVGE	Group Median	UO AS % OF MEDIAN	
POTENTIAL PRODUCTIVITY MEASURES											
Volumes Added (Gross) Per Prof+ Support FTE	287	495	425	355	384	461	401	96%	404	95%	
Volumes Held Per Total FTE	11,315	12,533	12,016	14,185	10,207	10,978	11,872	86%	11,666	87%	
Materials as Percentage of Total Expenditures	51.53%	36.64%	39.49%	47.25%	42.89%	40.55%	43.06%	100%	42%	103%	
Salaries/Wages as Percentage of Total Expenditures	41.45%	47.65%	46.18%	37.69%	44.97%	45.64%	43.93%	102%	45%	99%	
Current Serials Per Teaching Faculty FTE	23	37	20	20	25	18	24	102%	22	112%	note low number of UO faculty
Ratio of Total Circulation to Volumes Held	36%	16%	38%	10%	21%	35%	26%	80%	28%	75%	this gross figure not as meaningful as targeted use studies by ACS & CD
Total Circulation per Library Support + Student FTE	5,253	2,951	6,631	1,896	2,817	5,290	4,140	68%	4,102	69%	
Total Circulation per Academic Patron (Student + Faculty FTE)	43	27	60	16	30	76	42	72%	37	82%	
Total Circulations per Student	46	29	65	17	32	85	46	70%	39	82%	
Total Circulation per Graduate Student	425	116	297	131	176	323	245	72%	236	74%	
Total Circulation per Faculty	799	589	828	319	743	692	662	112%	718	104%	
ILL Borrowing per Faculty+Grad Student	5.05	3.36	3.71	9.09	4.03	1.42	4	91%	4	104%	
ILL Net Lending Ratio	200.10%	258.13%	200.73%	107.78%	219.09%	469.81%	242.61%	90%	2	104%	
Materials Budget Expenditures per Student	\$381.57	\$316.56	\$282.86	\$307.02	\$322.86	\$484.17	349	92%	320	101%	
Materials Budget Expenditures per Graduate Student	\$3,527.78	\$1,283.73	\$1,293.18	\$2,369.89	\$1,785.07	\$1,831.76	2,015	89%	1,808	99%	
Materials Budget Expenditures per Faculty	\$6,626.55	\$6,495.54	\$3,603.72	\$5,776.78	\$7,554.63	\$3,924.23	5,664	133%	6,136	123%	note low number of UO faculty
Library Salaries & Wages per Student	\$306.87	\$411.78	\$330.76	\$244.93	\$338.54	\$544.94	363	93%	335	101%	
Library Salaries & Wages per Grad. Student	\$2,837.18	\$1,669.85	\$1,512.17	\$1,890.64	\$1,871.77	\$2,061.68	1,974	95%	1,881	99%	
Library Salaries & Wages per Faculty	\$5,329.32	\$8,449.26	\$4,213.99	\$4,608.58	\$7,921.53	\$4,416.79	5,823	136%	4,969	159%	note low number of UO faculty
Total Library Expenditures per Student	\$740.43	\$864.09	\$716.22	\$649.79	\$752.78	\$1,194.07	820	92%	747	101%	
Total Library Expenditures per Grad. Student	\$6,845.57	\$3,504.08	\$3,274.44	\$5,015.74	\$4,162.07	\$4,517.54	4,553	91%	4,340	96%	
Total Library Expenditures per Faculty	\$12,858.64	\$17,730.25	\$9,124.93	\$12,226.24	\$17,614.34	\$9,678.04	13,205	133%	12,542	140%	note low number of UO faculty
Serials Expenditures Per PhD Program	\$123,565.75	\$59,995.65	\$52,422.98	\$82,061.68	\$61,040.71	\$81,872.73	76,827	79%	71,457	85%	
Total Materials Budget Per PhD Program	\$201,612.83	\$110,214.56	\$89,601.70	\$106,214.00	\$105,596.91	\$160,760.53	129,000	82%	108,214	98%	may indicate that collection support is well-balanced/appropriate within peer group
Total Library Expenditures Per PhD Program	\$391,224.23	\$300,842.31	\$226,878.94	\$224,796.14	\$246,209.40	\$396,471.56	297,737	83%	273,526	90%	