

University Library Committee 1995-1996

Minutes for October 25, 1995

PRESENT: Peter Gilkey, Lucy Lynch, Theodore Palmer, Leland Roth, Joseph St. Sauver, George Shipman, Ray Weldon

ABSENT: Frances Cogan, John Gage, William Orr

GUESTS: Deborah Carver, Assistant University Librarian for Public Services and Collections; Bart Alexander and Bill Washburn, student representatives (to be officially appointed by the President's Office)

Summary: The meeting dealt with the serials cancellation project. The committee recommended cutting \$500,000 in the serials budget. In the future, the committee will discuss both the method of determining the level of cuts for various units and the kinds of cuts which will be made.

Detailed Minutes

The meeting was called to order by Peter Gilkey, chair, at 4:03 p.m. Per Joe St. Sauvers prior request, Gilkey amended the minutes of the 10/11/95 meeting to reflect St. Sauvers concerns with increasing the membership of the committee. Gilkey asked St. Sauver if he would like to add another amendment to the minutes which addresses alternatives to cutting serials. St. Sauver responded that it would not be necessary as that issue will continue to be discussed today. A motion was made to approve the minutes as posted on the Web. That motion was seconded and all voted in favor to accept the motion.

Three handouts were distributed: meeting agenda, 1994/95 UO Library Budget- (ARL statistics) summary, and the document University of Oregon Library Statement of Goals, Evaluation, and Needs Assessment. The latter document is for the members to review for discussion at a later time.

Committee Representation

Gilkey reported that he is in contact with Dave Hubin, Presidents Office, about getting two additional members appointed to the committee to ensure a broad representation of the academic community. Hubin has indicated that President Frohnmayer will be naming two people within the next week or so. Gilkey also stated that he has requested from Keith Richard, university archivist, a copy of the 1921 legislation that established the committee, which he will then share with the committee. *NB: This has been posted on the www)*

Gilkey introduced the proposed student representatives (Bart Alexander and Bill Washburn) who will become members of the committee as soon as official notification is received.

Serials Cancellation Project

Deborah Carver distributed two items for discussion: a draft of a memo to University Faculty on the serials cancellation project, and a handout listing four issues to be addressed by the ULC. The four issues need to be resolved before the cancellation project can begin. The four issues are:

- 1. Conduct serials cancellation this year or postpone?

- 2. How much to cut? \$500,000 or less?
- 3. How to implement the serials cancellation project? Cut \$500,000 titles at once or implement over three years (for example)?
- 4. Levels of cuts: across-the-board percentage, or cuts based on average inflation rates for each fund?

Gilkey asked what collaborative process means, as referred to in the memo to faculty on the serials cancellation project. Carver responded that faculty will be involved not only in reviewing titles targeted for cancellation in their disciplines, but will also be able to review titles in other disciplines. She added that this memo is only the first of a series that would be distributed. Its purpose is to alert the faculty of what is going to take place. Another letter will follow explaining what model, or process, will be used to determine the level of cuts and to identify the titles that will be cancelled. The ULC will review the various correspondence to faculty prior to their distribution. Shipman stated that the model used during the 1992/93 cancellation project consisted of a 20% across-the-board procedure, with a few exceptions. Each department received a list of journals for their disciplines. The library departmental representative was responsible for facilitating discussions with their faculty members on the list of titles. After the lists are reviewed by the departments' faculty, the list was returned to Collection Development and then reviewed by faculty in other departments with shared interests.

Gilkey emphasized that we are not talking about journals, but that we are talking about continuing acquisitions.

Carver again stated that it would be extremely helpful if the committee could respond to the questions (the 4 issues listed above) during this meeting. If it is decided to go ahead with the project, the process must begin within the next two weeks. It is a very time consuming to process identify titles, and reach consensus among the faculty.

St. Sauver added that he would like to continue discussing alternative funding sources, rather than proceeding with this half million cut. In the UO Budget Summary (ARL handout on statistics), #19 (library materials-misc) represents approx. \$700,000 - a very substantial figure. He asked what misc consists of. He suggested that it might be possible for some of the \$700,000 to be shifted to support acquisitions. Shipman responded that the miscellaneous category supports bibliographic control of the collections. He explained that in the 1950s and 60s monies were expended primarily in acquiring monographs and serials owned by the purchasing library. Since the 1980s there has been a shift in philosophy to include provision of access to databases and resources owned by others. Shipman would resist reducing funding in those areas. Carver stated that the miscellaneous category included access to online databases, interlibrary loan charges, system maintenance fees, etc. Specific items in the miscellaneous line will be broken out for the next meeting.

Weldon stated that he is not comfortable with micro-managing the Library's budget decisions. Gilkey asked if we should, or should not, try to squeeze savings out of other areas of the library to save serials? Palmer responded that he does not wish to examine the Library's budget decisions, but would like to be assured that the serials cancellation is the best answer. He asked what the result of Shipman's proposal to the Provost was, as discussed in the Oct. 11 ULC meeting. Shipman responded that the Provost said he would ask the Deans if they would be willing to cut approximately 6% from their S&S

budgets to help the Library postpone a serials cancellation. After further discussion with the Provost, it was felt the Deans would not be willing to endorse the proposal, so it was decided to not present it.

Bill Washburn asked if there are other less expensive formats available, e.g. electronic versions. Shipman responded that, generally speaking, electronic formats are more expensive.

Washburn also asked if it is possible to look at less expensive vendors. Carver stated that there is a limited number of vendors. Vendor discounts and reliability in service are part of the Library's selection process.

St. Sauver again stressed that he believes a half million cut in serials is too drastic. He believes other alternatives should be investigated. For example, raise copier costs or shift allocations from other library areas. Washburn asked how much money would be generated by raising the copier costs. Carver responded that she does not know what that figure would be. Library copy service is self-supporting. The income generated pays for maintenance, supplies, and staff salaries to operate the Copy Service. Shipman said that copiers in libraries are available to keep mutilation of materials at a minimum. Libraries do not want to make the cost of copies too high that patrons would turn to tearing out pages.

The question was asked if the Library has investigated the public borrowers' fees -- could it be raised to generate more income. Carver responded that the fee was recently raised to \$30/yr. The UO Library has few public borrowers, so it is unlikely that raising this charge would result in a substantial increase in income.

Referring to the ARL statistics handouts, St. Sauver asked what the difference is between #19 (Library Materials-Misc) and #21 (contract binding). Shipman stated that he will get further explanation of what #19 consists of.

Weldon stated the ULC must make a decision on the immediate problem of whether or not to proceed with the cancellation. The ULC can discuss later the structural components of implementing the process. He moved that the ULC decide to approve the cut, discuss the structural problems at a later time, and close off discussion of the budgetary matters. The motion was seconded by Palmer. Five were in favor; 1 opposed; 1 abstained.

Palmer made a motion to begin a process to identify a \$500,000 savings in continuing acquisitions; amount may be amended. Washburn asked why the Library does not cut \$150,000 on a yearly basis in order to avoid a large amount at one time. Carver said it would be advantageous if faculty identified \$500,000 worth of titles now, which could be cancelled over several years. Serials cancellations are very time-consuming for library staff and university faculty/students and would be very difficult to do on a yearly basis. However, Carver added that an advantage of implementing the process over a period of time results in a more constant amount for book purchases. Carver asked that the committee provide answers to the 4 issues at this meeting if possible:

- 1. this year vs. next year
- 2. need target figure
- 3. one time or over a period of time

- 4. cuts across the board or cuts based on inflation rate per fund

St. Sauver stated that he believed the \$500,000 is a figure the Library is using to cause faculty to insist that the Library be given more money to avoid this drastic cut in serials. Should we have to cut at this level? Palmer stated that no matter how much the budget increases, it is not going to go up 12% each year to cover inflationary costs of serial prices. There is no control over publishers. It may be that \$500,000 at this time would hopefully allow some sustainability for the next several years.

St. Sauver asked that an amendment be made to Palmer's motion to include that if we follow through with the cut, that we do not look for additional resources elsewhere to offset the cut. There was no second to this amendment. A motion was made to call the question. All but one were in favor of calling the question.

Palmer's previous motion was again brought to the floor - to begin a process to identify a \$500,000 savings in continuing acquisitions; amount may be amended. The motion passed; the student representatives, not official voting members of the committee at this point, indicated they would have voted one in favor and one opposed.

Lynch moved that we begin to phase in serial cuts this budget year. Palmer seconded the motion. 5 voted in favor, 1 opposed, 1 abstained. Students voted in favor.

There was some discussion on which model to use for the process (issue #4). Palmer stated in principal, it could be a 20% across-the-board cut, but that it might be considered only a goal that each unit should identify - leave room for flexibility. Gilkey asked that discussions on the models continue and be addressed at a meeting in two weeks. Weldon asked that the previous models be put on the Web in order to be prepared for the meeting. Carver will work with Gilkey on what information the committee will need, e.g. across-the board, cut by inflation rate. Gilkey asked that members email Carver concerns they may have over the next two weeks.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:15 pm.

Submitted by Sheila Gray Oct. 27, 1995