

University of Oregon Libraries
University Library Committee (ULC)
Spring Meeting, 2015–2016 Academic Year
Monday, May 16, 2016
Time 10:00 a.m.–11:30 a.m.
Rowe Conference Room, 115H Knight Library

AGENDA

Attendance: Andrew Bonamici, Jack Boss, Sara Brownmiller, Mark Horney, Adriene Lim, Jimmy Murray, Alison Parman, Doris Payne, Nicholas Proudfoot

Absent: Zena Ariola, Chloe Bosnar, Richard Chartoff, John Fenn, Jennifer Presto, Nancy Slight-Gibney, Mark Watson

Dean's Update (Adriene Lim)

- The Dean questioned whether the ULC's proposed resolution would have more impact as a memo or petition rather than a Senate resolution.
- There is a systemic disconnect between the desire for more open access and the promotion and tenure requirement for faculty to publish in non-OA, peer-reviewed journals.
- If Open Access journal article processing charges (APCs) get pushed down to faculty and departments, that will not necessarily be less costly, according to some analysis being done now in the library profession.
- Instead of cutting funding for collections, should we focus on changing the promotion and tenure process to allow for more OA publishing instead?
- Various models such as cooperatives have been proposed, but there is skepticism that they would make a significant difference. Some have argued that the subscription model actually is most cost effective and fair (pay based on size), if it were not for some publishers' arguably exorbitant rates.
- Scholarly communication broadly should be discussed at all levels of the university.
- The collections budget allocation formula is currently at the exploratory-level; there is not an actual formula in use at the moment.
- ULC feedback highlights the complexity and issues of creating a formula that would be agreeable to most. The Dean will work with Administration to express these issues and to get their input next. The Libraries then could present this to the next ULC group for further review.

Discussion of Draft Senate Resolution (Mark Horney)

- Mark Horney has received three letters from faculty expressing their concerns regarding collections budget cuts.
- Collections costs/inflation is a complex, world-wide problem; there are steps that can be taken, but the problem is not going to be solved soon or single-handedly.

- A shift in collection development was discussed, e.g., away from having a wide range of resources on hand “just in case” to trying to assess real need instead.
- Moving to single-use fees for accessing articles/resources that are rarely used; this could be cheaper. Note: The Libraries does this now for interlibrary loans, but there are still costs for the libraries.
- Resolution versus memo:
 - Timing is an issue for this academic year; we would not have the resolution ready for the last Senate meeting.
 - True that the resolution might not have an impact, but it would require the President to address the issue.
 - Some members believe that budget issues directly impacting the academic mission of the university are part of the Senate’s purview.
 - Benefit of distributing the memo: to get faculty feedback and concerns before considering submission of a resolution next year.
 - The chair suggested rewriting the resolution into a memo/statement to the Senate. In the fall, the new committee could decide whether or not to submit a resolution to the Senate.
 - The committee expressed general support and recommended including inflationary information as one measure.

Next Steps

- The libraries will draft a memo for ULC chair and committee to edit and review via email.
- Address the memo to this year’s and next year’s president of the Senate, to the Provost, etc.
- Distribute the statement/memo to department chairs and deans.