

## SENATE LIBRARY COMMITTEE

October 14, 2015

Minutes of the Meeting

*[These minutes reflect discussion and debate at a meeting of a committee of the University of Minnesota Senate; none of the comments, conclusions or actions reported in these minutes reflect the views of, nor are they binding on, the Senate, the Administration or the Board of Regents.]*

[In these minutes: Budget update, E-book trends and challenges]

PRESENT: Chair Pro Tem Neil Olszewski, S. Douglas Olson, Michelle Brasure, Bomin Kim, Reilly Ruechel, Nicholas Mandal, Joseph Deters, Ron Hadsall, Matthew Rosendahl Theresa, Beaulieu, Wendy Lougee, Bo Hu, Marlo Welshons

REGRETS: David Fox, Andrea Johnson, LeAnn Dean, Owen Williams, Mary Beth Sancomb-Moran, Jill Trites, Vicki Graham

ABSENT: Andrea Johnson, Joan Howland, Daniel Pesut, Vicki Graham, Evan Roberts

GUESTS: John Butler, Connie Lenz, Charles Spetland, collection development officer, University Library

**1. Welcome:** Chair Pro Tem Olszewski welcomed the committee and the members introduced themselves.

**2. Budget update:** Wendy Lougee, University Librarian, presented the potential components of the University Libraries' budget/compact request. As background for the committee, she reviewed the University's budget model in which the Libraries are categorized as a cost pool and its budget is attributed to colleges based on a weighted headcount metric.

The budget and compact process for cost pools occurs in the fall and colleges go through their process in the spring. This is spaced out so colleges can plan their budgets in consideration of what the cost pools look like and how their budgets will be affected.

The compact and budget process is the time to document priorities, highlight financial concerns, request new money, and outline how the Libraries plan to align priorities with the University's strategic plan. This year the Libraries were asked to forecast what a .73% reduction in their budget would look like. This would be a proposed \$282,000 recurring reduction for the Libraries. Usually there are three funding criteria: if something had a safety, contractual or legal obligation attached to it (e.g., licenses or inflation for content); something that had a prior commitment attached to it; or, an unusual opportunity. This year's instructions were limited to the first two criteria. Final budget results occur in June and a preliminary number is delivered in February.

Lougee discussed the Libraries strategic plan and reviewed how programs are aligned with the University's plan. The Libraries' strategic plan includes relevant components: data management services; newly launched publishing services; collections investments; and, a preservation

system for digital content. She also addressed curriculum and a series of initiatives to save students money. In the fall of 2015, programs to reduce the cost of course materials have saved students \$700,000. This was accomplished by helping faculty identify openly available items, licensing content, and funding incentive grants for faculty to identify alternative content and redesign courses. The Libraries assumed responsibility for the Copyrights Permissions Center, which is expected to have a positive financial impact this year. Lougee discussed the work being done with the Center for Educational Initiatives to help redesign curriculum. Libraries also reached out to the broader community to build partnerships through “reciprocal engagement,” such working with Minitex services, building external partnerships (e.g., Umbra), and a range a public programming. For the excellence and rejecting complacency portion of the University’s strategic plan, the Libraries are working on a comprehensive collection management plan and creating an organizational culture to promote values of knowledge, openness, service, collaboration, and diversity.

Lougee addressed what the Libraries are asking for in their budget. Of the \$16.2 million spent on collections, about 75% was digital and licensed. Regardless of the format, 80% of what was purchased had a recurring financial commitment (e.g., journals). There was a projected 6% inflation rate from publishers overall.

This year the Libraries are asking for \$638,000 for collection inflation and license increases. A second request is associated with collection management and storage. Lougee explained storage sites for collections are full and many libraries are over capacity. Lougee noted the University is exploring the acquisition of a warehouse to store collections. The moving of two million volumes is expected to cost about \$500,000. The third request of \$300,000 is for the management of the campus profiling system for researchers (Experts); this service is currently supported with collegiate funds, but is not part of the cost pool.

Professor S. Douglas Olson questioned the effectiveness of Experts, as the profiles do not represent the humanities well. It was suggested that Experts be added as a future agenda item.

The budget process provides a time to alert the University to areas of concern, Lougee explained. Some of these concerns include the minimum wage rising, which had a significant effect on the Libraries, one of the largest employers of students on campus. Also, the Job Family Study caused significant salary compression. The ongoing issue of maintaining 12 libraries across campus continues to be a recurring cost.

The Libraries were asked to project the impact of a \$282,000 reduction in its budget for FY17. Since 2010, there have been \$7m reduced or reallocated within the budget. The Libraries staffing is lean, including 15 FTE voluntary layoffs last year. Collection inflation was underfunded by \$400k last year. Lougee said that when faced with reduction, the decision comes down to cutting people or content and the Libraries were proposing that collection funds would be the target for this potential cut. She said that the University Library staff levels were almost at the bottom of other Committee on Institutional Cooperation or CIC (“Big Ten”) schools. The University has 100 less staff than it’s peers, for example.

Olson asked about the 6% inflation by publishers. Lougee said that 6% was much better compared to the 1990s when inflation was around 15-18%. Charles Spetland, collection

development officer, University Libraries, said the 6% reflected the average across all disciplines. Large packages with multiyear commitments help keep costs down. With books, a ten-year average is 3.7% for an inflationary increase. Science packages and databases saw the largest inflationary increase.

Bo Hu asked if there was a mechanism to dispose of old collections. He said that in his field old collections are worthless. Olson said that his discipline regarded old collections as very important material. Lougee said that the CIC schools had an agreement and were participating in some shared print storage for journals. If the University had the digital equivalent of the paper materials, that could be relied on while the paper was in shared storage. Olson stressed the importance of being able to reference older collections.

Lougee said the big issue is seeing how big libraries will handle monographic collections. Something in an open shelf cost typically about \$5/year to maintain and digital copies cost .85 cents to maintain, while storage was in between. The Libraries are looking at how to coordinate what items would be stored at which location within CIC institutions. Neil asked if there was an opportunity to lobby the state/federal government to help fund more space since the Libraries store government publications. Lougee said that the Libraries were, by law, the official government depository for Michigan, Minnesota, and South Dakota. It is the University's responsibility to store these items.

Hadsall asked how the Libraries dealt with the big hit they took on collections and if the hit would occur again this year. Lougee said that the Libraries received \$400k less than what was asked for FY16. The Libraries received a one time financial assistance from the provost as bridge funding of \$412k over two years. The Libraries will have to cut more journals and reduce commitments to monographs if there is another cut. Lougee stressed that the Libraries need staff. Hadsall said that supporting Libraries is essential to the growth of an institution and he saw this as supporting both staff and collections. Being pushed to the bottom of the Big Ten is not where the University wants to be.

Neil asked if a letter supporting the compact process had been written previously. Rosendahl said that it had been discussed but wasn't clear if it had been done. Neil said that it was clear that the members agree that it is important to support collections and that the committee could write a letter. He said that he could follow up with Chair Fox.

**3. E-book Trends and Challenges:** Spetland distributed a handout pertaining to e-books. He addressed how the Library acquired e-books, their delivery formats and platforms, pricing, advantages and challenges associated with e-books, the demand driven method of acquiring e-books, and the Bookstore partnership project. The handout is available here:

<https://drive.google.com/open?id=0B-bKrnrsb3jAOHZzdEJkVXVDY3BRRTRKMzRxTURHRk1QT3ZV>

Olson asked if there was any way to know how many hard copy books were purchased and never used. Spetland said that about 30% had circulated and the percentage of use of e-books was a bit higher. Most of the demand driven purchases see consistent use over time. Lougee said that the correlation between an imprint date and actual use was very low.

Olson asked about closing the holes in certain online resources such as HathiTrust. Spetland responded that HathiTrust is made up of what Google has digitized and that there are gaps in the content. Lougee said that there are 26 partners, including the University, working with Google to digitize volumes. The partners provide volumes and Google digitizes them at no cost. Publishers filed a lawsuit against HathiTrust and Google. HathiTrust is a non-profit so it has more flexibility within copyright law than Google does. When Google digitizes, if the book is in copyright it can be searched and snippets accessed. If the books are out of copyright, the whole book is accessible. Lougee said that the University is still sending things to Google if anyone has anything that can fill the current holes.

Hadsall said he was unaware that courses were partnering with the Library. He said that all of the College of Pharmacy's textbooks are digital through a pilot project. They are purchased through the Bookstore via scholarships. He asked if the college should rethink their process. Lougee said that, historically, the Library has had a policy of not purchasing textbooks. The Library is working on picking course readings, which are not textbooks, to make available in a digital format. The Library is also looking at high enrollment courses and would buy one textbook to keep on course reserve.

Lougee solicited an opinion from the student representatives on the committee regarding their preference of hard copy text versus digital. The ease of note taking and the cost of books were cited in their decision of e-books versus traditional books by Reilly Ruechel, Nicholas Mandal, and Joseph Deter. As an international student, Bomin Kim prefers a traditional book. Hadsall added that faculty is becoming well versed in how to annotate in e-books to highlight important sections.

Lougee noted that print and digital both have preservation problems. There is investment occurring for preservation of both types. Spetland mentioned that a lot of consolidation is occurring with e-book publishing.

Deters asked which format is easier to cite when conducting research. Spetland said that typically electronic versions are easier because they provide the citation in proper format. Lougee said that two years ago a study was done and the result was that many students preferred hard copies. Digital tended to be easier for print disabled students. Also, the ability to link digital content into Moodle was convenient.

**4. New Business:** Lougee said that Chair Fox had interest in discussing trends in digital scholarship with an overview of scholarship changes at the November meeting. For the December meeting there was interest in looking at policies in federal agencies for open publication/open data.

Hearing no further business, the meeting adjourned.

Avonna Starck  
University Senate