

Minutes University Library Committee 14 Oct 1997

PRESENT: James Bailey, Frances Cogan, Peter Gilkey, John Nicols, Regina Psaki, Gordon Sayre, James Schombert, George Shipman.

ABSENT: Lucy Lynch, Ray Weldon, Sergey Yuzvinsky.

GUESTS: Deborah Carver, Associate University Librarian for Public Services & Collections; Mark Watson, Acting Associate University Librarian for Technical Services.

SUMMARY

The committee directed Gilkey, as chair, to:

- present a report to the senate from the ULC supporting the "pay for print" policy recently implemented by the University Library.
- introduce a motion adding a non-voting Ex Officio member from the Library to the Undergraduate Council.

The ULC received the 1997/98 materials budget report from the library and will discuss it further at the Nov. 11 meeting. The ULC voted to support the Orbis membership policy.

DETAILED MINUTES

The meeting was called to order by Peter Gilkey, chair, at 3:33 p.m. Introductions were then made. Gilkey stated he had invited the ASUO and Oregon Daily Emerald to participate in the meeting, but neither group sent a representative.

Gilkey stated that the Senate changed the charter of the University Library Committee last spring to read "The Library Committee shall serve as a faculty oversight committee reporting directly to the Senate." Because of that change, the ULC is to submit reports to the Senate on various library issues.

PAY FOR PRINT POLICY.

A memo to John Moseley, Provost, from University Librarian George Shipman was distributed, which discusses the Library's new pay for print policy. The library recently started charging patrons \$.10/page for laser printing. The cost to print one page is \$.07. With the extra \$.03, the Library can enhance software and equipment. Shipman stated that an estimated 2.5 million will be printed this year if free printing continues; if the Library charges, we can expect that number to be cut in half. The memo explains that the Ed Tech fees support less than half of the printing that occurs in the Library. The costs to the Library for providing free printing is approximately \$50,000-\$60,000/year. If free printing were to continue, the Library would be forced to absorb those costs into its supplies & services budget. Shipman added that the Library has a \$700,000 budget deficit to deal with and cannot fund \$60,000/year in printing costs. He gave four options that the Library would have to consider if the pay for print policy were not in effect:

- 1) Take away the printers, forcing patrons to download to diskettes
- 2) Cut library hours
- 3) No new enhancements to hardware/software
- 4) No new equipment

Shipman reported that he sent a survey to the Association of Research libraries asking them three questions:

- 1) Do you charge a fee for computer printing? If so, how much?
- 2) If not, do you plan on doing so?
- 3) Do you have a technology fee supported by students?

To date, thirty-two responses have been received. Eighty-four percent are charging now or planning to do so in the near future, with the majority charging \$.10.

Schombert asked what other options the Library considered before implementing the pay for print policy, for example, would it be possible to monitor what people print to help cut down on waste. Carver responded that we do not have enough staff to monitor what people print. Carver added that the library launched an appeal campaign last January to try and reduce waste but with little impact. Giving students a certain amount of free printing per year was also discussed, but it would be very expensive to do this and we would have no way of reclaiming unused copies.

Nicols stated that he began putting class notes, etc. on the web for his classes last year, which worked very well. This year, because of the new pay for print policy, he is receiving numerous complaints from students about the process – departments are shifting their costs to the student by making class information available only on the web rather than handing out hard copies. Nicols added that students do not see the whole picture – they are unhappy about having to pay \$.10/page to print off class items. They may not be realizing the money they are saving in not having to purchase footnotes, packets, text books, etc. Sayre added that he doesn't believe students should be charged for printing documents that they personally are not producing or authoring.

Shipman stated that the Library's ed tech funds have been used to support low tech items, such as printing and maintenance. Those fees are not supporting new equipment purchases, full-text databases, etc. The Library has funded those items through private gifts. Full-text databases average \$40,000-\$45,000/year; FirstSearch is \$75,000/year. He believes the Library's ed tech funds should not be supporting printing costs, but should be used for upgrading software, equipment, resources, etc.

Shipman said that University Computing and the Library formed a group a year ago to begin researching the costs associated with free laser printing. Both departments agreed that it is necessary to start charging a \$.10 fee starting fall term '97. Pay for print has been suspended in the computer labs. Costs will be looked at the end of fall term to determine if University Computing will enforce the pay for print policy winter term.

Schombert commented that many students enroll at the UO because of its reputation of being "highly wired." He sees the Library as the place that should provide printing for students.

Nicols made a motion to direct Gilkey, as chair, to write a brief statement to present to the Senate saying that the University Library Committee supports the Library's recently implemented pay for print policy. The motion was second by Cogan and all voted in favor to accept the motion. Gilkey will draft the statement and forward it to ULC members for comment before sending it to the Senate President. Gilkey will post the final statement on the ULC's web page.

MATERIALS BUDGET.

Carver distributed a document on the Library's 1997/98 materials budget. In summary, the legislature provided an additional 5% increase on top of the standard 3.5% increase to the materials budget. Unfortunately, because of this year's 3% holdback required by UO departments, a portion of the 5% legislative increase will be used to offset the holdback. The Library has identified four areas to support:

- 1) delay the serials cancellation project two years
- 2) add \$10,000 into the "new serials" line
- 3) add \$25,000 into the "access" line for new electronic resources
- 4) add \$17,620 (3%) into the "monograph allocations"

In order to achieve these improvements, the materials budget needs to be increased by 5.68%, which is the largest increase in many years.

The memo also discusses issues in this year's gross materials budget – prepayment carryovers, automation (JOP), new databases, serials continuations, approval plans, new allocations, document delivery, contingency fund, and monograph allocations.

Shipman asked the committee if they would endorse this document, which is the standard procedure at the first meeting of the ULC. Gilkey suggested that the members review the budget summary more thoroughly and be prepared to discuss it further at the November 11 meeting.

ORBIS.

A copy of an email from John Leahy to Gilkey was distributed. Leahy is raising two issues:

- 1) request for Orbis access for students/faculty enrolled in UO programs at the Bend Center, and
- 2) COCC becoming a member of the Orbis consortium

Shipman stated that any student enrolled in a class offered by an Orbis member institution at the Bend Center will have access to Orbis services. Because COCC is not an accredited, baccalaureate degree granting institution, it does not qualify for membership in Orbis.

Cogan made a motion to have Shipman's email response posted on the web with the ULC's endorsement. The motion was seconded with all in favor to accept the motion.

NOTICE OF MOTIONS.

A new agenda item was introduced by Shipman. A handout on Notice of Motions was distributed. Shipman ask the ULC to consider submitting a request to the Senate asking to have an amendment made to the membership criteria of the Undergraduate Council to include a representative from the Library. One of the charges to the Undergraduate Council is to "identify opportunities to create new programs and screen all college and school proposals for new academic majors, minors, degrees, and certificates." It is important that Library be consulted in order to determine if the Library has the appropriate resources to support a new program.

A motion was made, and seconded, to have Gilkey, as chair, write a short statement to the Senate on amending the membership criteria to read "4 Ex officio, nonvoting" instead of "3", and to add "1 from the Library". All voted in favor with no further discussion. Gilkey will send the statement to the ULC for approval before sending it to the Senate President.

Next meeting.

The next ULC meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, November 11. The discussion items for that meeting will include approval of Oct. 14th minutes, materials budget endorsement, and IMC mission statement.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

Submitted by
Sheila Gray
October 17, 1997