

University Library Committee
Minutes
November 20, 1997

PRESENT: James Bailey, Peter Gilkey, Lucy Lynch, John Nicols, Gordon Sayre, James Schombert, Ray Weldon, Sergey Yuzvinsky.

ABSENT: Frances Cogan, Margaret Prentice, Regina Psaki.

GUESTS: Deborah Carver, Associate University Librarian for Public Services & Collections; Faye Chadwell, Head of Collection Development.

The meeting was called to order by Peter Gilkey, chair, at 1:35 p.m. Gilkey asked if there were any corrections or additions to the November 11th minutes. Schombert and Bailey replied that they were incorrectly listed as being absent. Gilkey will make those corrections. The minutes were then approved, as amended.

REPORT FROM CHAIR

- Gilkey reported that several ULC members were able to meet with William Wakeling, the second candidate for Associate University Librarian for Technical Services. On behalf of the ULC, Gilkey submitted a written comment on the candidate to the search committee.
- Gilkey reported that he and John Nicols have discussed the suggestion made at the Nov. 11 ULC meeting that Nicols draft a memo to the Faculty Advisory Committee addressing classroom issues and problems. Gilkey and Nicols concluded that the ULC is not the appropriate venue to deal with classroom concerns. Rather, it was suggested that Gilkey email key individuals on campus who would have a role to play in classroom discussions and ask how to proceed. The result being that the Senate Executive Committee will take up this issue in January.

MONOGRAPH/SERIALS BUDGET (cont.)

The committee continued their discussion from the Nov. 11 meeting on how to allocate an additional \$17,600 for purchase of monographs. Carver handed out a revised sheet that provided two different allocation amounts for individual departments to purchase monographs. It also included departmental allocations for purchasing new serials - those amounts were derived from responses provided by the individual departments. The monograph allocations, however, are the result of using a test formula. The formulas are outlined in another handout she distributed.

The method used for Column A is based on a formula using the following criteria:

- % of total publishing output - costs and titles
- % of total UO faculty (weighted)
- % of total graduate head count (weighted)
- % of total undergraduate head count
- % of total student credit hours (weighted according to growth from 88/89-95/96)

The method used for Column B uses the same factors above, but applies the calculations to a five-point scale.

Most agreed that the results in Column A seem more accurate than the results in Column B. Column B appears to be a more democratic approach because the difference in amounts distributed to fund lines is not as widely variant as in Column A. Gilkey asked why the weighted factors of 1.5, 2.0, 2.5, etc. were chosen. Chadwell responded those are standard weights from what other libraries have used. Graduate students at the UO are the heaviest users of monographs, which is why they are weighted. Gilkey pointed out that there is a disproportion between Columns A&B for Ethnic Studies and OIMB. Carver agreed that there does appear to be some miscalculations, which she will review.

Nicols stated that the formula's criteria might not reflect a very accurate model. For example on spending patterns, some departments buy monographs for other departments that do not have the necessary resources. It may be that a formula cannot account for these purchasing decisions. Also, some of the multidisciplinary lines, Pacific Studies for example, do not have their own faculty and yet they have a fund line. Lynch suggested that giving less weight to faculty and increasing the weight of SCH might be fairer to the multidisciplinary lines.

Gilkey suggested splitting the analysis - half based on historical efficiencies and half based on the new formula. Chadwell stated that Column A is a fairly good representation of how allocations have been calculated in the past. Some areas would need to be boosted, for example, AAA.

Nicols added that there is no difference in Humanities and SEAS since neither has faculty positions, but that SEAS receives an allocation. There appears to be equity problems with this test method. Chadwell responded that there is a library general fund line available for purchasing material outside discipline-oriented book budgets, especially to address multidisciplinary or interdisciplinary concerns and requests of new and developing programs. Carver suggested putting a portion of the \$17,600 into that discretionary fund and allocating the remaining money based on the percentage of what departments are currently expending for regular monograph purchases. Schombert suggested that if this method is used, that a \$100 base be used for all lines. All agreed. Gilkey suggested that the issue of inequity between programs that Nicols brought up be addressed at a future meeting.

In sum, the committee agreed to put \$5,000 in the library's general acquisition fund and distribute the remaining \$12,600 based upon the historical pattern with a \$100 minimum allocation per department. Carver and Chadwell will inform the ULC how the \$5,000 will be spent. Carver will also send to the members a comparison of Column A to the historical distribution of resources, per Gilkey's request.

The committee authorized the chair to act on any issues that may come up between now and the next meeting. S. Gray will send out schedule requests so that winter term meeting dates can be established.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

Submitted by
Sheila Gray