

University Library Committee
January 23, 2008
Minutes

PRESENT: Melissa Baird, Deb Carver, Howard Davis, Alisa Freedman, Julie Haack, Andy Karduna, David Levin, Eric Mentzel, Gina Psaki, Dev Sinha, Mary Tucker.

GUESTS: Andrew Bonamici, Associate University Librarian for Instructional Services; Jon Jablonski and John Russell, members of Learning Commons library initiative.

BUDGET OVERVIEW

Deb Carver distributed and reviewed a handout on the library's budget for 06/07. The overall operating budget for last year was \$17.8 million. Approximately 80% comes from general funds, with the remaining 20% from several sources: Ed Tech fees, ICC, fees and fines, service centers, grants, and gifts. The library has raised close to \$20M during this campaign, which is twice the library's original goal.

The library's expenditures for 06-07 totaled \$18.3 million. The breakdown of expenditures is:

Staffing/Personnel	56%
Collections	20%
Electronic resources	14%
Technology	5%
Other S&S	4%
Staff Development	1%

In past years, staff and collections expenditures were about the same. Staffing costs have risen dramatically over the past four years. The only resource available to address salaries has been the materials budget. Technology is another area that the library has to fund, mainly using gift funds. These factors – inflation, labor and technology – have impacted services and collections. Our rankings within the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) have dropped from 74th to 107th (out of 113 research libraries). Since the early 1990s, the library has eliminated 3500 serial titles and has cut 7 FTE in positions since 2000.

As a result of these concerns and last year's accreditation report citing the library collections as one of the eight areas needing improvement, the provost asked the library to submit a restoration plan – what it will take, every year, to keep the library holding steady.

The restoration plan discusses several factors that have contributed to the decline in support from the university since the 1990s are:

- The change in the funding model does not systematically address the inflation of scholarly resources.
- Costs of journals increased 8-10% each year, while the library's budget only increased 0-3% per year.
- The library employs more classified and student employees compared to other academic units on campus; some of the salary and wage obligations associated with classified staff and student assistants are self-funded.
- Technology costs have not been centrally funded, with the exception of ed tech allocations.

It is important to also recognize several steps the library has taken to try and mitigate the impact of inflation:

- resource sharing efforts, working closely with OSU
- more access to titles through Orbis Cascade Alliance
- efficient document delivery system to desktops
- pay-per-view allowing faculty to download articles from journals that the library does not subscribe to

The restoration plan's proposal shows that the library would need \$1.8 million, plus inflationary increases, each year for the library to stay in good standing among the ARL libraries and the AAU institutions. Melissa asked if the library applies for grant monies. Deb responded that the library does have several grants for various projects, but noted that grants are often made for special projects and have little impact on core services. A suggestion was made that the ULC might consider getting involved in grant writing for the Library.

Alisa suggested the need for a stronger educational DVD collection, with a focus in the humanities. Deb replied that the library does not have a separate budget to purchase DVD's/videos – those purchases come from the standard departmental allocations. She did note that Orbis partners are becoming more liberal with their loaning of videos. Dev inquired whether it would be possible to transfer videos electronically. Technically, this could be possible but there would be many intellectual property issues.

Deb will inform the committee of Provost Brady's response to the proposal.

UNDERGRADUATE RESEARCH AWARDS (<http://libweb.uoregon.edu/general/libaward.html>)

Andrew distributed two handouts on the library's Undergraduate Research Awards Program. This program is made possible by the Jon and Lisa Stine Endowment and the Milton C. and Barbara B. Sparks Endowment. The focus of the awards is to recognize undergraduate students who apply the library's resources to original research and scholarship. There are two awards of \$1,000 each and two honorable mention awards of \$500 each. For students who are still enrolled, the award is in the form of a scholarship; students who have already graduated receive a cash award. The recipients and their instructors, family and friends are recognized at an event in the spring and the students' work is placed in Scholar's Bank, which is a great opportunity to publish their work.

Twelve – fifteen applications are received each year. The library would like to increase that number. The committee was asked to send suggestions to Andrew (bonamici@uoregon.edu) on how the library might do a better job of promoting the program. The library currently posts news stories on the library's website, in *Inside Oregon*, and runs advertisements in the *Daily Emerald*. Library subject specialists are also encouraged to inform faculty in their disciplines. One suggestion provided was to announce the winners at a football game, which would be a good way to draw attention to the program. One committee member asked how the deadline of January 31 was determined. Andrew responded that the committee needs time to review and judge the applications in time to have the scholarship award posted to the student's account for spring term and make plans for the awards ceremony. Eligibility is based on the calendar year, not the academic year. It is possible to reconsider the timing if that seems to be a factor in the application process.

The awards committee that reviews the applications consists of faculty members and administrators from the library, ULC, Undergraduate Studies, and Office of Financial Aid/Scholarships. Deb asked if anyone would like to serve on this year's committee and both Gina and Melissa volunteered.

KNIGHT LIBRARY LEARNING COMMONS

Jon Jablonski and John Russell, members of the library's Learning Commons Initiative, showed the committee preliminary plans for redesigning several spaces in Knight Library to be more efficient and effective, taking into consideration technology and service points. The goal is to not have any underutilized spaces in the library. The proposed changes include:

- Relocating reference desk and reference collections to the Document Center area; reference items not heavily used would be moved to the stacks areas.
- Move ITC from 2nd floor to first floor reference area.
- Move 2nd floor current periodicals to first floor area.
- Convert video viewing room to study lounge.
- Map collection move to current R/CP area on 2nd floor.
- 2nd floor ITC space will be used for laptop use.
- South Reading Room on 2nd floor will include exhibit space.

There are not any plans to change the third floor at this time. The fourth floor may include a video viewing room. Other areas that may be considered for change include faculty and graduate studies, the Daily Grind, and Media Services.

A comment was made that re-doing spaces every five years might be too much of an investment. Jon responded that the library will be putting together a set of principles to serve as a guide on redesigning space, which will probably focus on a ten-year cycle. Committee members were asked to visit these areas and bring comments to the next meeting. Jon will send the plans as a pdf file in 1 – 2 months, after library staff have reviewed the proposed changes. The ULC will have an opportunity to review the plans before they are finalized.

PRIORITIES FOR FY08

Deb distributed a handout listing "UO Libraries Strategic Priorities 2008." The six areas include: digital content, scholarly communications, improved search interfaces, educational technology, facilities, and Portland Center. Deb asked everyone to review these priorities and at the next meeting, the committee will discuss which areas to focus on.

CHAIR SELECTION

Dev volunteered to serve as this year's chair.

The meeting adjourned at 11:35 a.m.

Action items:

- 1) Committee members to visit the areas that may be relocated and bring comments to the next meeting.
- 2) Committee to review Priorities handout to discuss at next meeting.

Submitted by Sheila Gray
February 20, 2008