

**COMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY & SCHOLARLY COMMUNICATION  
MINUTES  
April 26, 2018**

**Present:** Karen Ottemann (*chair*), Chelsea Blackmore (*F&S*), David Brundage (*W&S*), Michael Cowan, Mircea Teodorescu, Alix Norton (LAUC Chair), Rachel Jaffe (LAUC Vice Chair), Gabriela Ramirez-Chavez (GSR), Kelsey Mcdaid (USR)

**Absent:** Jennifer Horne, Kyle Parry, Elizabeth Cowell (*ex-officio*)

**Announcement & Member's Items**

Chair Ottemann inquired if members would be interested in learning more about the Library's use of the University Library spaces. Members discussed the benefit of understanding the available space and its use as a part of the committee's purview and agreed that learning how the space is organized would be pertinent in thinking about trade-off productively. Issues relating to space will only get worse over time.

LAUC representatives informed members that the new library integrated system will go-live date on June 20<sup>th</sup> and Cruz Cat will overlap for ten days before it's discontinued.

**Discuss University Library Budget**

The committee reviewed and discussed Librarian's Cowell March 27 response to the committee regarding the Library's budget. Member Cowan provided the committee a brief overview of the Library's budget and had the remaining questions:

- Based on John Bono's forum presentation, the library's total collection expenditures for 2016-17 were about \$3 million and the non-CDL portion of those expenditures was around \$1.3 million. Request clarification on the other \$1.7 million.
- The non-CDL data in the letter accounts for about \$933K in non-CDL expenditures (\$409K for non-CDL serials access, \$197K for eBook access, \$298 for print books, and \$36K for physical media items). Given the \$1.3 million number above, the committee thought they were missing about \$370K and so need to figure out if this is correct.
- According to the Library's November 14, 2017 memorandum, "Impending Cancellation of Library Subscriptions," the library is faced with cutting up to \$200K in expenditures over the next three years in response to the changed CDL funding formula. That memorandum focuses on cuts to its CDL expenditures, but not to potential cuts in other library expenditures.
  - Is the \$200K the total cut to its expenditures that the library anticipates?
  - How much of the cuts does the library anticipate absorbing from its non-CDL collections expenditures? What criteria will it use to make these decisions?
  - Does the library anticipate absorbing any cuts from other parts of its \$8+ million budget? What criteria will it use to make these decisions?
- Request a spreadsheet of the library's current overall budget (or at least the 2016-17 budget), a spreadsheet reflecting expenditures in appropriately detailed categories?
- Is ARL membership a realistic middle-term goal for the library? What specific benchmarks does the Library need to meet in order to have a realistic shot at ARL membership?

**Journal Collection Consultation with Collection Development Librarian Kerry Scott**

Librarian Scott requested to consult with the committee on the information for the upcoming serial cancellation. She reviewed the webpages created to inform faculty about the serial collections cut. It identified the structure, process and timeline. She noted that specific journal subscriptions data are available but the usage data is not yet available. They plan to organize the journal list by the call number and also create a glossary page to explain the data. A question was raised regarding the definition of databases, and there were varying agreement on the term among members, it will need to be clarified with faculty.

Librarian Scott noted that journals are paid a year in advance therefore the impact to faculty will be delayed. Members raised the importance of building in structures or mechanisms for departments to provide comments or feedback.

Members discussed various ways to view access and think about "access" of journals. It can be defined in various ways, for example, functionally the time and ease for faculty and undergraduate students to "access" information. It could potentially be calculated by the average cost to get the item or the number of views or downloads. The committee then discussed identifying open access journals and professional society to support as opposed to for profit journals. Librarian Scott will

review the journal titles for any overlap and will add information about open access. Members suggested including undergraduate advisors in the Library communications.

Members learned that ILL is guided by the borrowing agreement - "use principle" - therefore libraries are not charging each other, although if it was to be calculated by staff time per transaction, it would be approximately eleven dollars.

Librarian Scott shared that a decrease from the non-collections budget will impact library services and program. Members were still unclear about the Library's rationale for using the collections budget to cover the \$170,000 journal cost increase as opposed to other sources.

The committee would like to be a part of the decision making, preferably at a higher level and decided to draft a correspondence to Librarian Cowell to learn more about the rationale to cover the cost with the collections budget as opposed to other areas of the Library's budget.

### **Review of Strategic Academic Plan**

The committee reviewed the list of internal campus barriers identified by the campus as part of the Strategic Academic Plan process. Members identified the following issues of importance to the committee:

- Lack of coordinating structure/support above divisional level (for intra-divisional efforts). COLASC thought a current problem is that there is not a structure that allows for equal voice for the library compared to the Dean's. In other words, we need a Dean level person that speaks for the Library.
- Difficulty in knowing where/how to access campus resources
- UR's poor fundraising track record
- General lack of administrative staff support (that forces faculty to increasingly work on non-research, teaching, and academic service responsibilities)
- Poor campus information sharing
- Lack of graduate support funding
- Lack of coordination among deans, vis a vis support for library needs
- Lack of training for faculty on teaching our diverse student body
- Space assignment and utilization practices that place non-library services in library space

### **Review COLASC Faculty Survey**

Each member reviewed a section of the survey and drafted a one paragraph summary. Members discussed the Library Resource, Service, and Resources for Teaching sections. They raised issue with the survey methodology and discussed ways to improve the questions and response stems to provide better information in future surveys.