University Library Committee 1995-1996

Minutes for November 8, 1995

Summary
The Library Committee voted to recommend using an inflation based model to implement the $500,000 serials budget cut. This is "Option 1" of the table given at the end of these minutes. The items to be cut will be identified at the beginning of the process, but the cuts will be implemented in 3 phases to avoid "spikes" in the "discretionary" budget. The committee will again meet November 29 to further discuss the procedure used to implement Model 1.

Detailed Minutes
PRESENT: Bart Alexander, Frances Cogan, John Gage, Peter Gilkey, William Orr, Theodore Palmer, Leland Roth, George Shipman, Bill Washburn, Ray Weldon.

ABSENT: Lucy Lynch, Joseph St. Sauver.

GUESTS: Andrew Bonamici, Assistant University Librarian for Administrative and Media Services; Faye Chadwell, Head, Collection Development; John Moseley, Provost.

The meeting was brought to order by Peter Gilkey, chair, at 4:00 pm. The two students in attendance, Alexander and Washburn, have not yet been officially appointed to the committee, although the President's Office has informed Shipman that their appointment letters are in the process of being mailed. Gilkey asked if were any objections to allowing the students to participate as appointed members at this meeting; there were none.

The October 25 minutes were approved with no changes or amendments.

Gilkey welcomed Provost Moseley, who was attending in order to learn more about the serials cancellation issues being discussed by the ULC.

ARL Statistics
Gilkey introduced Andrew Bonamici, Assistant University Librarian for Administrative and Media Services. Bonamici distributed a revised version of the ARL statistics, which was discussed at the October 25 meeting. He indicated the changes from the original version are in italics. Page three shows the breakdown of the categories misc. library materials and other operating expenditures. Bonamici pointed out that on page 4, you will see that this year's expenditures are higher than last year's expenditures because of two major programs which the library administers: Orbis union catalog and Information Technology Centers.

Serials Cancellation
Gilkey distributed a spreadsheet illustrating the different models of serials cuts and reviewed what the columns represent. He asked that Model 4 (columns 11 & 12) not be considered as its information is irrelevant. The first model (columns 5&6) bases the cuts on an average inflation rate for an individual fund line. Columns 7&8, Model 2, assumes that all funds contribute evenly to the overall inflation rate and therefore each fund would be cut by 20% - across the board. Columns 9&10, Model 3, represents

funds that are grouped by broad disciplines, then cut based on an average inflation rate within that discipline. Faye Chadwell, Head, Collection Development, stated that the inflation rate is calculated on a 4-year average taken from information gathered from Library Journal. Palmer stated he would like to see the 1990/91 expenditures for all these departments and find out what our own internal inflation rate is, taking into account the last cut which came during that period. There are departments at the University of Oregon that are not similar to the national average, and so it may be that the local inflationary rate if higher or lower than the national figure.

Gilkey stated that there are two issues to address during this meeting:

- 1. How to allocate the cut? 2. What model would the committee like to suggest be used to implement the cut?
- Gilkey asked how the committee would like to proceed with these two issues. Shipman suggested that the ULC reach a consensus on which of the three models seem to be most preferable. Beyond that, the Library has suggested that the university departmental representatives and library subject specialists work together to identify which titles to cut, and then determine which titles would be cut in the first phase, second phase, and third phase.

  Gilkey stated that we should consider library holdings on a system-wide basis before decisions are made to cut various titles. Chadwell has documentation on holdings within the OSSHE-system. The UO Library works with the other libraries to make sure there is at least one copy of a title within the system.

  Gilkey stated that Joe St. Sauver had proposed another model at the last meeting. As Joe is not in attendance to further discuss his proposal, the committee decided to proceed with discussing the three models listed on the handout. It was decided to let each committee member indicate which model they prefer. Palmer favors Model 1. He believes Model 1 would be easier to explain to the departments and would stabilize the amount their allocations have grown. Cogan did not make a recommendation. Alexander would like to see the actual inflation rates for this university used with Model 1 and also put a cap on the percent to be cut. This suggestion is basically what Model 4 represented - putting a cap of 25% on the cut and a floor of 15%. That model basically only affected Chemistry, which is why it was decided to not consider it. Model 4 is essentially Model 1, with a ceiling placed upon the percent. Washburn believes that Model 1 penalizes the departments when in fact it is the publishers who are responsible for the high serial costs. He indicated he prefers Model 4 with the 25% cap. Shipman responded that he understands Washburns concerns, but that maybe it is time for scholars to stop submitting to publishers whose journals are outrageously priced. Moseley added that this topic was discussed at the NASULGC Council of Academic Affairs summer meeting. He believes we need to take back the intellectual property generated by university faculty. Publishers currently take universities intellectual property and then sell it back at increasing rates. He believes we need to encourage faculty to publish in journals that are the most cost effective and Model 1 may encourage faculty to begin thinking that way.

  Orr stated that he prefers Model 1. Weldon also favors Model 1, but added that he is more interested in the mechanics of implementing the process. He would like to see these figures as targets rather than concrete figures.

Gage agrees with Moseleys thoughts on intellectual property, but does not see how Model 1 would encourage faculty members to publish in more cost effective journals. Model 1 is relative to the inflation rate by discipline and not by journal. If departments are given information on actual costs of subscriptions and inflation rates, there is no guarantee that the most expensive journals will be the titles chosen to cut.

Gilkey believes that Model 2 is unfair to disciplines such as the humanities. He consulted several faculty on campus regarding Model 3. The only argument given for support of that model is that is takes care of interdisciplinary problems rather than having to assign each one to each other. He favors Model 1.

Roth asked if this library is aware of what titles may be cut by the other OSSHE libraries. He suggests that at least one of the OSSHE libraries retain a title which could be obtained via interlibrary loan. Shipman responded that the libraries within the system are aware of each other's holdings. Shipman added that the next phase of Orbis is direct borrowing by students and faculty from the member libraries - the idea is that the requester would have the item at their home library within 24 hours. A grant proposal for this phase is in the process and if approved, this component should be available by fall 1996. Roth concluded that he too favors Model 1.

T. Palmer moved that we use Model 1 as the basis for the cut, with the assumption that there may be some adaptations involved. That motion was seconded with no further discussion. All voted in favor of this motion.

Gilkey announced that he and Shipman have been asked to attend a meeting of the Graduate Council November 15. Shipman stated that there apparently is a perception that the library is moving towards technological offerings at the expense of books. Shipman will address those concerns with the council.

Moseley thanked the committee for permitting him to attend this meeting and suggested that we may need to look at longer term solutions rather than cutting periodicals. Shipman suggested having a joint discussion between the Interinstitutional Library Council and the Academic Council on what OSSHE could do in terms of high cost publishers. Moseley stated that he would mention this topic at the next Academic Council meeting.

Roth stated that it appears that the disciplines which have the highest rate of inflation are also areas that could have close ties to business and that it may be that some of these high cost journals are published specifically in a format designed for the business community. He wonders if perhaps there might be a way of getting some assistance from these disciplines that have direct ties to industry.

Shipman responded that the library is trying to raise money for two endowments - one for acquisitions and one for information technology. Each endowment is $4 million. We are targeting businesses as well as individuals and foundations. Also, the University of Oregon, as a public university, has three fundamental missions-instruction, research, and service. The library is conducting outreach to business and professional groups to make sure they are aware that the library is a significant resource available to them.

Gilkey stated that it has been suggested that we might consult with OSU on how they proceed with their purchase of technology and acquisitions. The committee does not feel it is necessary at this point.

Weldon asked if the mechanics on how making the cuts can be discussed. Shipman responded that Deborah Carver, Assistant University Librarian for Public Services and Collections, and Chadwell are putting together a package on how to proceed with the cuts. That package consists of a letter being sent to department heads and departmental representatives outlining the rationale behind the decision to cut titles, the timetable that we need to work with, and the dollar amount for their discipline. It is hoped to have that letter sent before the end of this term. The final cut list must to be completed by April. The committee will meet Wednesday, November 29 at 4pm to review the contents of this package. Weldon stated he is interested in seeing whether it is feasible to develop a feedback mechanism that would make it possible in the 2nd or 3rd years to not have to follow through with the cuts. Gilkey asked that this material be sent to the ULC by November 22 in order for them to prepare for the Nov. 29 meeting.

Gilkey suggested that the members email Shipman or himself suggestions of other items they would like to have specifically addressed in the package that Chadwell will put together.

Faculty Studies
Shipman would like the committee members to begin thinking about the use of faculty studies. We would like to inform faculty that the studies are again available and that we want to target assistant professors who are working towards tenure. Should we continue with this current user policy, or look at other options? Gilkey stated that we will make every effort to address this issue at the next meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:01 pm.

Submitted by Sheila Gray November 14, 1995

Proposed Budget Cut Options

- Option 1=inflation based per unit.
- Option 2=20% across all units
- Option 3=inflation based per broad grouping
- FundBudgetInflBudget OPTION I OPTION 2 OPTION 3
-
- Name 94-95 Rate 95-96 CUT % CUT % CUT %
- AAA 3837510.5 42388 681416.1 847820 681416.1

- BUS 9176917.2107591 2686825.0 2151820 2686825.0
- EDU 3482911.9 38976 704318.1 779520 704318.1
- JOUR 823910.1 9069 141015.5 181420 141015.5
- ANTH 1937213.7 22026 450720.5 440520 407518.5
- ECON 3458517.2 40548 1012625.0 811020 750118.5
- GEOG 23807 4.9 24977 1987 8.0 499520 462118.5
- LISC 1112913.0 12580 246319.6 251620 232718.5
- POLI 18519 8.2 20038 258012.9 400820 370718.5
- PPPM 12590 8.2 13623 175412.9 272520 252018.5
- PSYC 5497913.4 62330 1248220.0 1246820 1153118.5
- SOCI 17 191 13.7 19546 4000 20.5 3909 20 3616 18.5
- CLAS 1222310.1 13455 209215.5 269120 232817.3
- COLI 141410.1 1557 24215.5 31120 26917.3
- DANC 115011.3 1280 22117.3 25620 22117.3
- EAST 625910.1 6890 107115.5 137820 119217.3
- ENGL 2119310.1 23329 362715.5 466620 403617.3
- GERM 14298 9.9 15709 239615.2 314220 271817.3
- HIST 4954612.8 55871 1074019.2 1117420 966617.3
- LING 838110.1 9226 143415.5 184520 159617.3
- MUSI 16307 9.1 17795 252714.2 355920 307917.3
- PHIL 844910.7 9356 154016.5 187120 161917.3
- RELI 1648810.7 18257 300416.5 365120 315917.3
- ROMA 2103314.3 24048 512021.3 481020 416017.3

- RUSS 353213.4 4006 80520.1 80120 69317.3
- THEA 174810.1 1924 29915.5 38520 33317.3
- BIOL 28625713.6 325076 6592020.3 6501520 7411722.8
- CHEM 31937121.8 388878 11803230.4 7777620 8866422.8
- CSCI 4575411.1 50822 860616.9 1016420 1158722.8
- EXMS 904611.3 10070 173917.3 201420 229622.8
- GEOL 74563 8.8 81138 1116613.8 1622820 1850022.8
- MATH 14435811.1 160348 2715216.9 3207020 3655922.8
- NEUR 7334013.4 83146 1665120.0 1662920 1895722.8
- OIMB 786513.6 8932 181120.3 178620 203622.8
- PHYS27723315.8 320968 7426723.1 6419420 7318122.8
- These tables have been manually retyped from spread sheet to be presented to the University Library Committee so typing errors are possible. When totals are included from Area Studies and Library General, the cuts in "serials" come to approximately $500,000.