

LIBRARY COMMITTEE
MINUTES OF MEETING
APRIL 16, 2003

[In these minutes: Welcome, Patriot Act Update, State of the Budget Update, Serial Cancellations Update, Library Support Statement]

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

PRESENT: William Phillips, Chair, Sue Engelmann, Wendy Lougee, Bill Sozansky, Elaine Challacombe, Lael Gatewood, Jill Barnum, Leon Satkowski, Thomas Scanlan, Ray Wakefield

REGRETS: LeAnn Dean, Joan Howland, Owen Williams, Jennifer Alexander

ABSENT: April Schwartz, John H. Anderson, Isaac Fox

I). Professor Phillips called the meeting to order and welcomed all those present.

II). US PATRIOT ACT UPDATE: Librarian Wendy Lougee referenced the Patriot Act article that had been distributed to members by email prior to today's meeting. To begin, Ms. Lougee noted that most states have laws that make records about a user's library activity confidential and this information can only be disclosed with a warrant. In an electronic library environment, however, new issues are surfacing and some of these include:

- What constitutes a library transaction? Is it just circulation of a book? How does use of the Internet fit in?
 - Because most library workstations do not require user authentication, it is virtually impossible to know who used a particular computer.
 - Some of the data that is collected is not in the libraries' control but rather under the aegis of people that manage networks.

Taking all of these factors into consideration, it is difficult to identify the boundaries that constitute library information. In response, libraries are steadfastly adhering to their long-standing set of principles that involve protecting patron privacy. For example, every attempt is made to ensure that all library systems disassociate the user's name from the activity as

soon as possible. Additionally, the University Library has implemented a new policy that outlines for staff how to respond to requests for information from federal agents or other law enforcement officials. To conclude, the implications of the Patriot Act are chilling in terms of:

- Compromising libraries' principles when it comes to anonymity and privacy of users.
- The inability to define what constitutes a library and how this might intersect with state law.
- Lack of consistency in terms of the information that is being requested by federal agents and other law enforcement officials.

Members briefly engaged in a discussion of this issue.

III). STATE OF THE BUDGET UPDATE: Ms. Lougee noted the initial budget target reduction amount was \$640,000, but, in light of the fact that a large percentage of the Library's budget is based on staff turnover and capturing savings in salaries, it was agreed there needed to be a deeper cut because as staff is reduced there will be less savings to capture.

Additionally, the Libraries are experiencing an extraordinary amount of cost increases over which they have no control an example of which are insurance costs, etc. Based on this, the new budget target for reduction is \$1.2 million, and, so far, approximately \$900,000.00 has been cut. To date, Ms. Lougee has not heard anything regarding the next round of cuts and will assume this is a good sign. The Library will not know until approximately late summer whether any of the requests in the compact will be granted.

Yesterday, Ms. Lougee attended a CIC (Committee on Institutional Cooperation) directors meeting and she provided Senate Library Committee members with information on how other institutions in the Big 10 are fairing. The following information was shared:

- In Wisconsin schools and colleges were cut 4%-6% but the Library only received a 2% cut.
- OSU is faced with a \$2 million cut over 2 years.
- Indiana has a one-time cut of \$90,000 but has received new money to build an on-line virtual environment for their multi-campus system.
- Illinois was cut 1.5% but received some of that money back in one-time monies. Additionally, Illinois received \$300,000 in new monies for their collection.
- Penn State will only face a one-time \$80,000 cut. Ms. Lougee noted that Penn State Libraries receive little in state money despite the

fact they are a state school and they will receive close to \$2.8 million per year in IT fees that are distributed centrally.

- Because of a dip in their endowment fund, the University of Chicago, will only realize a 6% increase in these funds. Additionally, they will receive a 2% increase in their budget.
- Northwestern University will receive an increase of 3% to their budget.
- Iowa will probably not receive any collection monies this year and has gone through several years of very serious cuts.
- Michigan will realize a \$2 million cut after several years of significant growth in budget.

The bottom line is that the University of Minnesota is in relatively comparable company.

Ms. Lougee explained how the Library's funding from ICR changed as the institution moved to IMG (Incentives for Managed Growth). To better illustrate what has taken place with the Library's budget, she promised to email members a spreadsheet clarifying the Libraries' ICR income over the past few years.

IV). SERIALS CANCELLATIONS: Ms. Lougee noted that vendors must be notified of subscription cancellations by August. Since 1995 the University has experienced a reduction of some 8,000 titles out of approximately 37,000 titles. Additional facts that were shared included:

- Currently, the University's serials commitments are costing \$6 million annually and the institution is averaging a 9% increase every year.
- The Library is facing dramatic increases in licensing costs.
- As the University cancels some of its subscriptions, vendors are assessing increased service charges.
- The University's collection budget has been cut by \$90,000 this year as part of the Library's mandated give back to the institution.

Ms. Lougee was asked by Professor Phillips to expand on the Elsevier agreement. Ms. Lougee noted the University's contract with Elsevier, a major publisher of scientific and social science journals, represents

17% of the Library's serials budget. Last year's agreement with Elsevier for both print and electronic publications cost the Library \$1.6 million for 700 titles. When the University told Elsevier last year it planned to cut 100 lesser-used titles as a means to save money, Elsevier told the Library that by doing so would increase the Library's payment to \$1.8 million.

The Library explored several different scenarios and decided to only purchase electronic versions of Elsevier titles. By doing this, as well as reducing the number of titles it purchases from 700 to 660, the University can save \$200,000. There will also be ancillary savings such as binding, re-shelving, etc. as the University moves away from print publications. It was further noted that faculty would still have the option to access publications the University no longer receives through inter-library loan and obtain a needed publication from another institution. Additionally, Elsevier sells its articles for \$30 each. Once the University/Elsevier license is finalized, Ms. Lougee would like to establish a formal way to engage faculty from all disciplines who are concerned about publishing trends to provide the Library with some insight and direction on how to proceed in the future.

V). DRAFT STATEMENT OF SUPPORT FOR THE LIBRARY:

Professor Phillips led a discussion on the proposed draft statement drafted by Professor Wakefield in support of the Library. Professor Phillips asked the committee 3 questions:

1. Does the committee wish to issue such a statement?
2. What changes would the committee like to see incorporated into the draft statement before them?
3. Who should this statement be addressed to?

The committee engaged in a discussion of the draft statement. In addition to some wordsmithing, the following ideas suggested:

- The draft statement should be worded more strongly in order to have an impact.

- Send the statement to Executive Vice President and Provost Christine Maziar and possibly others as well.
- Make the case for the need to increase the electronic infrastructure for the University system statewide. Use the argument that this is an enterprise-wide venture that will benefit not only the Twin Cities campus but the coordinate campuses as well.
- A suggestion was made to not request a specified dollar amount for the Library in its statement, but rather use this statement as an opportunity to let the administration know about the decline in funding and the need for funding.
- A concern in the draft statement that singled out research library systems. Because research is only one aspect of a library system, the suggestion was made to include information on the effect of undergraduate teaching. In this member's opinion, by stressing research makes it appear the Library is self-serving.
- Include statistics on the Bio-Medical Library as a large purveyor of inter-library loans and emphasize the important role it plays with the various medical industries in the state.
- Stress the inter-relationship between the University Libraries and MINITEX and how this benefits libraries throughout the state.
- Include examples of what will happen with a reduction in funding. Ms. Lougee stated that if individual members could express in their own words what a reduction in library resources and services means to their discipline this could give a more meaningful sense of impact.
- Include quantifiable data that will illustrate the impact of a funding reduction. Ms. Lougee noted a significant indicator of impact is the dramatic increase in inter-library loans, which cost the Library money (national data indicate \$15 - \$30 costs to borrow a publication). As the University purchases fewer monographs and journals these publications must be obtained elsewhere.
- Outline the total Library expenditure per dollar of external research.

Professor Phillips noted that these are all excellent suggestions. He then volunteered to revise the statement and will circulate it to the committee for further input. Once a final draft is completed, it will be sent on to EVPP Maziar and the Senate.

VI). Hearing no further business, Professor Phillips thanked members for their service on the committee in 2002 - 2003 and adjourned the meeting.

Renee Dempsey
University Senate