Senate Library Committee
Meeting Minutes
Wednesday, May 12, 2010
10:15 ~ 11:45 a.m.
Morrill Hall, 238A

[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 represent the views of, nor are they binding on, the Senate, the Administration or the Board of Regents.]

[In these minutes ~ The University Libraries' Budget; SLC Budget Subcommittee Report]

Present: Jennifer Gunn (chair), Owen Williams, Mary Beth Sancomb-Moran, J. Woods Halley, David Zopfi-Jordan, Wendy Lougee, Monica Howell, Jonathan Binks, Isaac Fox, Shannon McCrindle, LeAnn Dean, Bill Sozansky, Jennifer Alexander, Jay Hatch, Michelle Englund, Anatoly Leberman, James Orf, Suzanne Thorpe

Regrets: Elizabeth Fine, Danielle Tisinger, Stephen Gross

Absent: Joan Howland, Timothy Germain, Jonathan Lundberg

Guest: Catherine Tweedie, Libraries Director of Finance

Chair Gunn called the meeting to order at 10:15 a.m. Gunn mentioned a couple of errors to the April meeting minutes' attendance list and one correction in content. Accepting the corrections, members approved the April meeting minutes unanimously.

Chair's Report ~ Jennifer Gunn

Chair Gunn reiterated the two policy resolutions she drafted and sent to members via email for a vote. The resolution statements are as follows:

> 1. We recommend to the Faculty Consultative Committee that the University of Minnesota adopt an Open Access Policy for journal articles similar to the policies enacted by MIT, Harvard, and the University of Kansas. The following language echoes that of the MIT policy, with blanks left to specify the appropriate local bodies to develop and implement the policy:

> 2. We recommend to the FCC that a faculty-led committee be established to work towards adoption and implementation of an Open Access policy at the University of Minnesota. This committee could address the following issues:

- Final wording of a resolution

- Who would oversee the implementation and exceptions to the policy at the University

- Procedures for revisiting the policy (e.g., 3 years vs. 5 years and by what body)

- What the policy will cover (e.g., types of publications)

- Inclusion of graduate students and other community members engaged in research and publishing under the policy

- Institutional financial support for authors' fees in pay-to-publish open access publications

- Conduct an educational campaign to inform the campus community about an Open Access policy, suggested for Fall 2010, with a view to having the appropriate faculty, P&A, and graduate student constituencies vote on this policy by Spring 2011.

Gunn stated that she received 10 votes in favor of the resolutions and she forwarded the resolutions to the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC). She informed members that the resolutions would be presented at its May 27th committee meeting. Gunn said that the second resolution includes a proposed timeline to the FCC; it would be ideal to have the policy adopted by Spring 2011. Gunn added that the policy would only cover articles in scholarly journals at this point.

Chair Gunn informed members that there is a Senate Library Committee-sponsored forum this afternoon in Walter Library from 1:30 to 3:30 p.m. on scholarly publishing and values. Open access will be included in the presentation. She encouraged those interested and able to attend.

University Libraries Budget Overview ~ Wendy Lougee & Catherine Tweedie

Ms. Lougee began by reminding members that the University's budget model has dramatically changed how costs are charged to colleges. She stated that the Provost is in the process of expanding the charge of the Budget Model Advisory Committee and considering what may need to be changed within the charge and scope of the committee. She continued, saying the University's budget is broken down into cost pools (such as Libraries, Facilities & Maintenance, Student Services, Information Technology) to support the work of the University; each cost pool's budget is attributed on a different basis. Cost pools conduct budget/compact reviews in fall, while colleges do so in spring, incorporating cost pool charges in planning. The method of assigning costs back to colleges varies. Budgets are attributed to colleges based on relevant metrics such as energy consumption, square footage, weighted headcount, and common goods needs like information technology services. Lougee said that the weighted headcount method was not perfect, but rather a surrogate data point to apportion costs.

Ms. Lougee used the FY11 budget to show members the phased steps in building the Libraries cost pool. She said the three main elements are:

1) Operations and Maintenance budget (the budget the Libraries are provided)
2) Utilities and debt (added to the cost pool, but not in the Libraries budget)
3) "Double step down" charges, in which the costs of other relevant cost pools are added to the Libraries' cost pool (e.g., central administration, IT, FM). The sum total of these three steps is then attributed to the colleges, with the second and third steps adding substantially to the Libraries' cost pool.

Chair Gunn asked if these figures are comparable to other universities and Ms. Lougee concurred that they are.

Using her PowerPoint presentation, Ms. Lougee walked members through slides depicting the Libraries non-sponsored budget components and strategy and showing the Library budget in percentages. She pointed out that they generate a large amount of revenue-bearing services such copy services, document delivery and corporate services, which accounts for 5% of their revenue (with net revenues approximately $150,000).

Ms. Lougee said that like other units at the University, Libraries have recurring funds and one-time funds. Gifts income (largely designated to special collections) is 4% of the Libraries' expendable income. She indicated the Libraries intentionally overbudget, taking into account lapsed salaries that occur in the year. The resulting one-time funds from vacant positions will also be used to cover the 27th pay period this year. Lougee said vacated positions within Libraries have been held during the hiring pause and others have been eliminated.

Ms. Lougee illustrated the Libraries' expense budget breakdown including all funds (recurring and one-time). This breakdown reflects the divisions of the organization. The last slide depicted the breakdown of the collection budget by discipline clusters for FY10. Lougee stated that those funds are both recurring and one-time dollars. Over the years, Lougee said some costs have shifted from managing physical collections to managing the necessary technology-related infrastructure for electronic content. She said IT currently has approximately 20 people on staff managing ~900 workstations, an enterprise system, and many other systems and services. She stated that they are still working on next year's budget, which is likely to experience more cuts before it is settled.

SLC Budget Subcommittee ~ J. Woods Halley

Professor Halley began by explaining that the subcommittee was studying expenditure distribution rather than funding sources. Halley presented a table displaying the percentages of all-funds, non-acquisitions funding by department. He said they were interested in getting comparable data from other universities and attempted to do so by web surfing but that did not result in any success. He contacted the directors of libraries at Indiana University, University of Illinois, Penn State, Ohio State and the University of Wisconsin, asking for data. They received a positive response from the University of Illinois indicating a willingness to help but they have received no data thus far. Halley still thinks it is a good idea to determine how non-expenditures are divided.

Halley relayed the subcommittee's three suggestions to members, which are as follows:

- Information technology and technical services (acquisitions, cataloging, book processing) together account for 25% of non-acquisitions expenses (15.5% of total expenses). We recognize the importance of investments in this area and are eager to discover where we fall among our library peers. As the full committee has discussed, there are many issues for libraries surrounding the development and use of information technology, and the committee should continue to study library activities in information technology partly in

order to form a clearer idea of the appropriate level of investment.

- We think it would be useful to obtain information on the library expenditure per faculty member and per student in the various units as a way to gain perspective on where the resources for library services are going in the university. (Of course we are mindful that there may be good reasons for discrepancies between fields in this regard.) Again, comparison with comparable institutions in this respect would be useful.

- We recommend that the SLC retain this subcommittee in the 2010-11 academic year to complete this study, particularly with regard to obtaining data from comparable institutions.

Mr. Sozansky said he was concerned about the micro level of scope in the subcommittee's research and thinks it would be more important to look at the macro view of library budget expenditures. He does not think the micro level view of the budget is the committee's purview. Fox countered that if it is not the role of the committee, then why have the committee? Halley said that it would be good to know how the budget is divided up and spent by headcount and that the information is qualitative, not quantitative. Professor Alexander suggested creating a rubric for library comparison information and added that perhaps they try another avenue in their data-seeking measures. Ms. Lougee stated that the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) collects data and produces an annual expenditure ranking and other variables which she has shared with the committee in the past. She noted additional comparative data – e.g., that the University Libraries is about 100 full-time employees smaller than peers. She noted that ARL is moving to collecting library profiles as other measures of size and service transactions do not provide a picture of activities; she offered to share the University Libraries profile but that it is now a couple of years old.

Mr. Williams noted that the first sentence in the subcommittee's first recommendation should be reworded because the 25% figure listed is inaccurate because it includes more than information technology; Halley explained how he derived that figure. Chair Gunn said that the substantive questions of the role of Information Technology versus Technical Services (collection acquisition and processing) relate to the broader questions of digitization and modern tools being used. She said it would be good to understand how library operations are changing and what trade offs are occurring because of those changes. She stated that often times, the dollars spent in operations is not directly related to a specific function of the Libraries. Therefore, the relationship of cost to value of function may be unclear. She thinks that information would assist in moving forward with fund management. Halley said that one needs to be concerned that investments in IT can become obsolete very quickly. Ms. Lougee said that every fall, the overall budget is reviewed and planning begins. She reminded members that budget data, trends and budget themes were shared every year with the Committee and asked if it is useful to see these together. Some members agreed it would. Professor Hatch said that he thinks a more detailed budget would bring more understanding to the committee on Library Services. Members agreed that today's overview of the budget was helpful.

Members discussed having the subcommittee continue next year with the goal that their research be completed and presented by the end of next year. Halley said some summer work on it should

be done to expedite the results. Hatch pointed out that the subcommittee would be incomplete because he will not be a member of the committee/subcommittee after the end of the current academic year. Gunn mistakenly noted that Professor Halley was also rotating off the committee [this is not the case]. Professor Orf said that he could not do the research alone over the summer. Gunn recommended tabling the question of the continuation of the committee until fall, when the SLC has a new chair and new membership to consider the questions for the budget subcommittee. She made a friendly amendment to the motion to that effect; it was seconded and passed unanimously.

End Notes

Chair Gunn thanked members for their service and read off the names of those whose appointments were ending in June. She encouraged remaining members to continue on with the committee's work.

Hearing no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:50 a.m.

Lisa Towry
University Senate Office