

University of Oregon Libraries  
**University Library Committee (ULC)**  
Winter Meeting, 2015–2016 Academic Year  
Monday, January 25, 2016  
Time 10:00 a.m.–11:30 a.m.  
Rowe Conference Room, 115H Knight Library

**AGENDA**

Attendance: Andrew Bonamici, Jack Boss, Sara Brownmiller, John Fenn, Mark Horney, Adriene Lim, Ann Miller, Jimmy Murray, Alison Parman, Doris Payne, Jennifer Presto, Nicholas Proudfoot, Nancy Slight-Gibney, Jeff Staiger, Dean Walton, Mark Watson

Absent: Zena Ariola, Chloe Bosnar, Richard Chartoff

**Discussion topic**

How the library allocates its collections budget

**Dean's Report**

*Adriene Lim*

- Strategic budget requests
  - Collections inflationary requests go forward under this process, and the Libraries asked for approximately \$450,000 for inflation only.
  - Reportedly, the UO Budget Advisory Group (BAG) has reacted with frustration at the high inflationary costs of scholarly publishing and some BAG colleagues want to convene a group to solve the problem, but the dean noted that the Libraries share in this frustration, and have been advocating for Open Access for many years, holding workshops on authors' rights, etc. She mentioned that some inflation costs probably should be considered part of the "cost of doing business"— similar to cost for utilities. Some level of inflation might be reasonable as an "as is" increase each year. Libraries share in the frustration as well.
- "Aligning resources" budget-reduction scenarios
  - Administrative and academic units have been asked to submit 1-3% budget reduction scenarios.
  - The libraries is not exempt from this process and the reduction scenarios should apply to the entire general fund budget, which includes the collections budget: 1% would be \$225K, 2% would be \$450K, and 3% would be \$675K.
  - As part of the realignment advice, we will submit proposals for reinvestments as well, such as for collections related to the cluster faculty hires.
  - No decisions have been made to date, but the dean wanted to keep the committee informed. Proposals must be submitted to Academic Affairs by Feb 22.

## *Discussion*

- Intractability of the collections inflation problem: Inflation is not a problem that one institution can resolve alone; it involves the whole scholarly communication system.
- Among some faculty and disciplines, there are moves toward and pressures to not submitting articles to expensive journals.
- Inflation in books as well as journals
- As budgets are cut, costs become more expensive, in the aggregate.
- The libraries looks at multiple sources that track inflation by discipline. Some journals increase prices to push out competing journals; if libraries decide that they need to keep that journal, then they need to cut other journals.

## **Collections budget allocations**

### *Mark Watson and Dean Walton*

- Various approaches to how we spend collections budget
- Materials budget for 2015/2016= \$6M, including allocations for monographs and for serials.
- The collections budget allocates differing amounts of funds to the various disciplines across the natural sciences, social sciences, and the humanities.
- Libraries' current distribution of the collections budget: By and large, these allocations are based on legacy decisions whose origin pre-dates the arrival of the staff currently working in the UO Libraries. Over time, adjustments have been made for disciplines whose journals cost more. Current allocations are more historical than data-driven.
- Libraries have long wanted to have a more rational ways to decide allocations, e.g., to create a formula to determine this.
- If you were going to construct a formula to figure out how much each discipline should get, what types of factors would be important?
  - Categories of variables: undergraduate education (programs), graduate students (programs, could be overlap), research by faculty
  - Cost differences across disciplines: way to quantify that?
  - Usage
  - Minimum budget
  - Degree: BA, MA, PhD
  - Weighting
  - Reference/formats/do not circulate
  - Consortial aspect (Orbis)
- Then we need to consider on which factors can we collect data?
- The collection managers have been working on a formula to account for these multiple factors, including:
  - Monograph costs
  - Total people based on faculty FTE plus undergraduate students graduate students by department.
  - Total checkouts based on combined ILL requests, UO local checkouts, digital book usage and correction factor based on ILL (example: lots of fiction shows up

- in Sciences ILL requests, so number of loans does not necessarily reflect research needs, so adjust for that).
- Additional correction factors: % of total budget, base allotment \$, current subject monograph budget, adjusted budget
  - Concept of demand: the individual surrogates for demand are flawed, but combined, they are a better representation.
  - When facing budget cuts, we have to think about strategic allocation, resulting in not everyone getting what they want.

### *Discussion*

- Some programs are not listed on the allocation breakdown, for example, African Studies. From where are their allocations drawn?
  - The Libraries does support programs, but the funds come from department/college-level allocations.
- As a university library, there may be programs that are small, but you may still want to support those programs. Coming up with a formula may be problematic because small programs may not be well-supported; smaller programs need a larger minimum.
  - To account for smaller programs, the formula could weight department-size inversely, so that smaller ones get protected better.
- Some library resources get used but do not necessarily get checked out.
  - These factors are incorporated into the formula. Knight Library track books that have been moved from the shelves but not checked out (in-house use statistics).
- How many new programs and departments arise each year? Is money reserved for these new collections?
  - Ideally, this gets rolled into the discipline's allocation.
  - With new programs, few proposals incorporate funding for the libraries for collections. But for the Sports Product Design proposal, we were able to get some money added for collections.
- The Libraries were not consulted about cluster hires. After the hire, we approach the faculty to find out their needs, but some of these needs (medical journals) are expensive. We are expected to support these hires but also being asked to make cuts.
- Institutional accreditation: UO was asked to strengthen access to research materials.
- The Libraries has a model of what has been done historically, so one choice is simply to continue in this way. We have a proposal that some formula be used. Is there any other viable choice besides these two?
  - Blend approaches: apply formula to half, historical allocations for half
  - Reach out to departments to see what is really needed and what can be reduced/reallocated
  - Go to programs and ask what they need to teach this course/program? Then look to see if the resources are being checked out
  - Using historical allocation as a jumping off point for discussions about what more/less is needed
  - During last cuts, small budgets were not cut, but the remaining programs were across-the-board cuts.
- If you use the sample formula, would it drastically affect some disciplines?

- Yes.
- Perhaps different models should be used for different disciplines: sciences versus humanities, etc.
  - The formula does factor in these differences.
- Weighting undergraduates, graduates, and faculty (FTE: double-counted if in multiple disciplines/programs) the same may not make sense; weight each differently.
- Libraries need to know by August which journals would be cut.

**Next steps**

- Continue the discussion of collection allocations at the next ULC meeting
- Discussion of aligning resources scenarios

---

Remaining AY2015-2016 meeting schedule:

February 29, April 18, May 16

All meetings 10:00-11:30 in Rowe Conference Room

---