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No future scheduled AY 2008 FLC meeting.

Minutes of February 14, 2008 - approved

Minutes of March 13, 2008 - approved

University Librarian’s Report – Rich


b. Article 2: Elizabeth Mezick. “Return on Investment: Libraries and Student Retention”. The Journal of Academic Librarianship, Vol. 33, No. 5 pp 561-566 – Rich circulated selected pages from these articles and discussed salient points. Both articles found a positive correlation between library expenditure and student success (graduation rates in Article A and retention in Article B). The full articles are available in the FLC directory.

c. AY 2008 Budget

We have a 2008 tentative budget of $1,140,000 for library materials. Rich pointed out the materials budgets for the last few years and noted that NJKI was funding certain key databases during those years allowing us to allocate the budget to other materials. Also, the discount on the Scopus contract allowed us to absorb materials price increases.

d. AY 2009 Library Estimated Budget

Rich reviewed the two planning budgets that were discussed at the last meeting- Planning Budget A (PBA) and Planning Budget B (PBB) and reminded the committee that PBB was voted on at the last FLC meeting. Rich provided circulation statistics showing the breakout of circulation between undergraduates, graduates and Faculty and staff (main and architecture).
Updated Peer Data Comparison

Rich displayed the peer data on screen (compiled by Doreen) and reviewed with the committee. In every category except one NJIT is in the bottom 50% of our peer group, and in most we are in the bottom quartile.

AY 2009 Database Re-Voting Results

Erin circulated and reviewed the database re-vote results and highlighted the changes, the main change being that ACM Digital Library moved up to #3. Rich reminded the committee that if the projected library budget projections hold we will not be able to fund the entire list and we have a budget shortfall of approximately $104,000.

Rich reviewed the procedure noting that in the absence of a special case made by one of the librarians any database that did not receive any votes would be dropped from the list. This year Applied Science Abstracts did not receive any votes and will be dropped and the $5,817 subscription will be reallocated.

Rich surveyed the Reference Librarians and asked them based on their experience which database they would cancel and the consensus was INSPEC. At a cost of $29,000 it could not be justified based on usage and Erin conducted an overlap analysis between INSPEC and Scopus and stated that 1,300 of INSPEC’s 3,000 titles are not covered by Scopus. These results are available on FLC website. It was also noted there is overlap with IEEE and SciFinder Scholar.

Motion was passed to cut the INSPEC database 7-0. The next database for discussion to cut was Omnifile. Erin conducted an overlap analysis with Academic Search Premier and Omnifile has 67% unique full-text content. Stephen noted that this is a core undergraduate tool and is the electronic equivalent of the older, bound reader’s guide. Davida also noted that the librarians are teaching to this tool and referring students to it frequently and she worries about the discontinuity of now cancelling it. Rich asked Provost Nelson about the possibility of some one-time funding to pay for Omnifile. Provost Nelson responded that there is no certainty about anything.

Paul Ranky suggested that we should use research grant overheads to contribute to funding the databases, as is done at other institutions. Ian suggested we look to the Senior Administration to prioritize the programs and use that to determine which databases to cut. Stephen pointed out that the departmental ranking list does not represent the databases most used by students. For example, Academic Search Premier is highly used by undergraduate students but does not rank highly on the list.
Rich suggested we cover the shortfall using half the book budget and half the database budget. If we decide to pursue this course and assuming that NJKI funds Academic Search Premier and Business Source Premier, we still need to cut an additional $20,000 from databases. Rich reminded the committee that NJKI withdrew funding from the last portion of the year and we had to take money from the book budget to fund. Lisa and Gabrielle asked if there are any start-up costs or if we would be disadvantaged in any way if we cancel database subscriptions and then want to re-subscribe later. Erin said that the only database that functions that way is the archival database JSTOR which is not on the table for a cut. **A motion was passed to take half of the budget shortfall from the books and half from databases.** Priscilla cautioned against getting locked into the 50/50 split because things could develop over the summer and Rich may have to make an alternate decision if things change.

Priscilla noted that the nature of usage of the Main Library and Architecture Library are very different and suggested that perhaps separating them in terms of budget would make more sense. She asked if there was ever a time in the past where there was a top level resource allocation of Main vs Architecture. Rich said that it would be possible to separate out Architecture to about 80%, the remaining 20% being shared resources. It was noted that originally the Architecture Library has a separate budget but it was a very small, department library at that time. Rich reviewed the book budget formula components with the Committee. Rich recommended that we proceed with separating the Architecture and Main libraries for budgetary purposes. Lisa asked how under that system we would decide the amount of allocation and where to cut. Erin noted that historically architecture has been separated or protected by a variety of means so perhaps it makes sense to acknowledge this and break it out as a branch library.

Priscilla also noted that the FLC should be an integral part of the new program development. She noted that many of the new programs (except Architecture) have not filled in the “library” line item in their budgets. Davida and Rich both pointed out that the Liaison Librarians made detailed recommendations for each of the new programs. Rose noted that these did not make it on the program budgets she has and asked to receive the materials.

Rich opened the floor for additional suggestions and comments. He said that if he had to make the decision right now for database cuts we would cut Applied Science Abstracts, INSPEC and Omnifile. Haymwanntee suggested we do some further analysis on the usage statistics. For example, SciFinder scholar has two user licenses, could we go down to one. Bruce said it would be very difficult and Erin said you don’t save much money by going down to one, something around only $2,000.

The meeting was adjourned.