

University Library Committee
November 14, 2007
Meeting Minutes

PRESENT: Melissa Baird, Deb Carver, Howard Davis, Priscilla Elder, Alisa Freedman, Julie Haack, Andy Karduna, David Levin, Alexander Mathas, Tze-Lan Sang, Dev Sinha

GUESTS: Andrew Bonamici, Associate University Librarian for Instructional Services; Mary Greci, Acting Head Metadata Services & Digital Projects; Barbara Jenkins, Head, Reference and Library Instruction; Mark Watson, Associate University Librarian for Collections & Access

The meeting was called to order by Deb Carver at 1:05 p.m. Introductions followed.

SUMMARY OF LAST YEAR'S ACTIVITIES

Deb provided a brief summary of the ULCs past work. Historically, the focus has been on traditional collections – the struggle to maintain those collections. Several years the ULC was involved in the difficult decision to cancel serial subscriptions. Other topics of discussion have included instruction, educational technology, and media services role on campus.

Last year's committee focused on reviewing a resolution that the Senate passed in 2001. Its focus was on addressing rising costs of scholarly journals by urging the library to collaborate with other libraries to increase access to scholarly titles and by providing recommendations for faculty regarding author rights. The resolution was a good start to bringing awareness to these issues, but was too broad. A sub-committee was formed last year to look into whether another resolution was appropriate, but there was not enough time for that group to research it.

The committee also had discussions on Open Access (such as Scholars Bank) and other campus solutions to make content more accessible. The focus was on how to encourage faculty to not sign away all of their author rights to publishers. Members of the committee spoke with their colleagues about copyright issues and it was discovered that there is a great deal of confusion and misunderstanding about scholarly rights. Some have concerns that publishers will not accept their material if they wish to retain their rights. Deb added that Open Access systems do not replace journals, but rather enhance access. This is one way in which libraries can address escalating journal prices.

LIBRARY UPDATES

University of Oregon Campaign. Deb reported that the library met its original goal of \$10 million early in the campaign. The library was then issued a stretch goal of \$15 million, which was also met. The library has now raised close to \$18 million. These gifts will support content, programs and services, and three endowed positions, including a new position in the science library. Deb emphasized the key to the library's success in fundraising has been faculty involvement.

Provost Request for Library Funding

Deb reviewed a document to the Provost on restoring library collections and services. The overall funding picture for the library is not good. The library's ranking in the Association of Research Libraries index has dropped dramatically over the past few years. This is largely due to the decline in support experienced as a result of the funding model change in the 1990s. The University is unable to address inflation costs which we experience each year. The increase in technology has had a large impact on

the library. All of the library's equipment is purchases with gift money because the library does not have a recurring equipment budget.

Provost Brady asked for a plan addressing what it will take to get the library where it should be. She is committed to addressing the needs of the campus. The proposal section outlined in the plan is listed below (not including appendices). [NOTE: These are recurring dollars-\$4.35M annually; collections are subscriptions; salaries are annual.] Fundraising is not the answer. In order to generate this amount of dollars annually, an endowment of \$100 million would be necessary.

Proposal

The following proposal would put the UO Libraries at the mean of our comparators (adjusted for student FTE). The total amount of new investment is \$4.35 million (above inflationary increases).ⁱ

1. \$2 million – collections (for program improvement, in addition to \$350,000 annually for inflation)
2. \$350,000 – UO Portland Library and Information Commons
3. \$275,000 – professional salaries (in addition to current practice of covering salary and OPE increases, to increase the entry level salary and address resulting compression and create some additional parity with selected IT positions on campus)
4. \$375,000 – additional permanent positions (professional librarians, IT support, and classified)
5. \$350,000 – OPE associated with salary increases and new staff
6. \$1 million – technology

In addition to these financial investments, the Library needs to make some adjustments in its reporting, e.g., count 13 more of our twenty OA positions as "professional."

If the UO had these resources for FY06, it would have resulted in our being ranked 79th overall in the ARL expenditure index, up from 103. ⁱⁱ This is approximately the ranking we had in the early 1990's. In terms of public AAU institutions that are also members of ARL, this would have brought us up to 30th out of 34. We are currently at the bottom of this list.

If the implementation occurred over three years, the Library's budget would need to increase accordingly (not including any new centrally funded salary increases).

FY08	\$1,800,000 (investment plus inflation)
FY09	\$1,800,000 (over FY08 base, investment plus inflation)
FY10	\$1,800,000 (over FY09 base, investment plus inflation)
FY11	\$ 400,000 (over FY10 base, inflation only)

If the implementation occurred over five years, the Library's budget would need to increase accordingly (not including any new centrally funded salary increases).

FY08	\$1,220,000 (investment plus inflation)
FY09	\$1,220,000 (over FY08 base, investment plus inflation)
FY10	\$1,220,000 (over FY09 base, investment plus inflation)
FY11	\$1,240,000 (over FY10 base, investment plus inflation)
FY12	\$1,240,000 (over FY11 base, investment plus inflation)
FY13	\$ 400,000 (over FY12, inflation only)

The library's current budget is \$17M. Even though \$4 million does not seem like an ambitious amount, it is a 24% increase.

Success of the plan depends on the degree of faculty support. Several letters of support from faculty discussing their ability to do research were attached to the document. A recurring theme in the letters was that the UO is an AAU institution and it is critical to provide the best possible services to the campus community. It was suggested that the ULC explore ways to help promote this plan.

Faculty Web Page Initiative

Barbara Jenkins, Head, Reference and Library Instruction, discussed the redesign of the library's web page on faculty services. She reviewed the current page with the committee, adding that the new design will focus more on research, access, teaching and technology. The committee members viewed a draft of the new page and were asked to complete a questionnaire on what they would like to see included. It is important to get faculty's perspective on what the new page should look like. Several suggestions were provided:

- Publicize it more to the campus – many faculty are unaware it exists
- Have a link directly from the main page
- Consider having a link to this page on the UO's faculty handbook page

The initiative group will review the questionnaires and include that information into their design. It is hoped to have the page completed by the end of winter term. There will be a testing phase in which the ULC and other faculty members will be asked to provide feedback, before it is finalized.

Scholars' Bank

Mary Grenici provided a brief overview of Scholars' Bank (SB), the library's open-access digital repository created to capture, distribute and preserve the intellectual output of the University of Oregon. (see <https://scholarsbank.uoregon.edu/>) There are many faculty on campus who are not aware that Scholars' Bank exists. She distributed two handouts – one showing Scholars' Bank communities for the departments represented on the ULC, and the other listing liaisons for the represented departments.

Scholars' Bank includes intellectual output from current and former faculty, staff, or students. Currently, there are over 4,300 items. Items in Scholars' Bank are permanent. They are deleted only if there is a factual error, copyright infringement or privacy concerns.

There are several reasons to consider depositing works into Scholars' Bank:

- 1) High visibility - last year there were 65,000 – 75,000 views per month, with 45,000 – 50,000 actual downloads of files per month.
- 2) Long-term stability and retention.
- 3) Level of access can be set by the author.
- 4) Captures the research being conducted on campus.
- 5) Recruiting tool for graduates.
- 6) Gives students' work exposure (e.g. theses, dissertations), helps with job search.

Concern was raised about publishers allowing authors to post their material in SB. Deb responded that more and more faculty are including addenda to their copyright agreements that give them the right to post in institutional repositories. Mary stated that most license agreements of major publishers do include guidelines on depositing into an IR, specifying anything from pre-print to post-print.

Mary stated that she would like to work with one or several of the departments represented on the ULC to find out what their faculty would consider storing on SB. Published research, PDFs, posters, videos? If anyone/department is interested, please contact Mary at mgrenici@uoregon.edu.

ULC PRIORITIES FOR 07/08

Deb asked the committee for agenda items they would like to discuss this year. Several suggestions were made:

- 1) Library's budget model; expenditures
- 2) Improving services to meet the AAU benchmark
- 3) Focus on where the library should be in 5-10 years

Deb will put together a list of current issues for the committee to decide where to put its attention this academic year.

CHAIR SELECTION

Deb will contact some members to inquire about their availability to serve as this year's chair.

The meeting adjourned at 2:20 p.m.

ACTIONS ITEMS:

1. Deb prepare list of potential agenda ideas; email to committee for feedback
2. Prepare budget overview for next meeting
3. Deb to call members re. Chair

Submitted by Sheila Gray