Minutes
Faculty Library Committee Meeting
Thursday, Sept. 16, 2010, 2:30-3:55 pm
Library Room 2032


1. Minutes of April 22, 2010 – Minutes approved

2. Report of University Librarian

   a) Provost Ian Gatley is scheduled to attend the October 7\textsuperscript{th} FLC meeting

   b) In the 2002 Middle States accreditation report, the library was cited for having too few books, not enough space, and too few staff. The Periodic Review Report issued in 2007 acknowledged that improvements had been made. We are now buying fewer books, have less staff, and less space than in 2002. Middle States is coming up again and we will have to address these issues. They will expect FLC members to be knowledgeable about the information. Rich Sweeney, Davida Scharf, and Haymwantee Singh represent the library on several of the Middle States subgroups.

   c) AY2011 Non-Personnel Budget is the same as last year. The good news is that the budget was not cut. The bad news is that prices for the integrated library system, journals, and databases have increased. This means that there will need to be cuts in journal acquisitions. We have no budget for part-time staff and do not have authorization to fill the vacant subject librarian position. Davida Scharf, Haymwantee Singh, and Bruce Slutsky have had to take on the departments that were taken care of by Andrea.

   d) Library and Middle States PRR. There is not a committee that deals solely with the Library, but Haymwantee is on the committee which includes Library issues and will report back to the FLC as work on the committee progresses.

   e) Price increases for materials were not budgeted. In a short term fix, we were able to move to a calendar year payment for the Wiley subscription which means that we only have to pay for 6 months of it in this fiscal year and frees up approximately $30K. Due to very last minute budget allocations to the State Library, Academic Search Premier will be paid for by the state again for this year. It is not likely to be paid by the state next year. We had a credit for Business Source Premier due to last minute funding by the State a couple of years ago. This allows us to upgrade to Business Source Complete for this fiscal year. Next year we will either have to find funding for them or drop them. They are currently ranked 6 and 7 on the database ranking list.
Janice Daniels asked if there is a way for us to be proactive in getting more money for the Library. This lead to a lively discussion. Rich would like to see library appropriations linked to research dollars, as is done in some other academic libraries. Money for the library could possibly be included as part of the overhead costs or direct costs in grant proposals. There is concern that an increase on the costs would make grant proposals less competitive. David Lubliner asked if the Library is allowed to have outside revenue income. The answer is: Not unless the university approves it. He suggested that renting ebooks through the library could give us income. Andrew Hill asked if there is data available on what peer institutions budget for libraries. This is done every couple of years, and we always rank toward the bottom.

David Lubliner, Burt Kimmelman, and Janice Daniels volunteered to form a task force to address the issue. They plan to meet before the next FLC meeting.

3. **Journal Formula, Cancellations and Additions for 2011**

Each department provides a ranked list of journal titles and when we receive the budget in July or August, the money budgeted for journals is run through the journals formula which is based on university data for the department (number of faculty, number of undergraduate degrees granted, number of Masters degrees, granted, number of Phd.s granted, and amount of research dollars) and average price for the past 4 years. Funds are distributed as far down the list as possible. Titles that are not funded will be slated for cancelation unless they are funded through the $20,000 that is set aside at the beginning of the process to be used at the discretion of the Provost (aka Provost’s set aside). The Provost can either select specific titles to fund, or, as has been the case in the last few years, have the money distributed through the formula (without journal price averaging).

Concern was raised over the large number of possible cancellations for Civil Engineering. Erin explained that the list seems disproportionately large because, although the journals are usually included in a package from ASCE, they are listed separately until the funding for the 33-title package is secured. If there are enough higher-ranked titles to secure the funding for the package, the lower-ranked titles that are currently marked for cancelation will be part of the package. It is expected that the Provost’s set aside will provide the funding for the package and these titles will not be canceled. If this doe not happen, Erin will work with Janice to re-rank the list or make substitutions as necessary.

Finalized lists must be submitted to Erin by September 30th. Substitutions of equal or lesser value may be made as long as they are not ranked by any other departments.

4. **Springer – Individual Journals, Prioritized Journals, or Database?**

We currently subscribe to 16 individual Springer titles worth $20,000. This level of purchasing makes us eligible to be part of a group purchase with other academic libraries and gives us access to over 1200 additional titles. Over the past few years it has become more difficult to determine how to deal with online journal packages: should they be treated as databases or as individual journals? Right now Springer is listed both on the database ranking list and on departmental journal rankings lists. This is a problem because if a journal drops too far down the rankings list and is no longer funded, it could mean that we aren’t at the $20,000 level and
will lose access to the 1200+ additional journals. We obviously don’t want this to happen. There are three options:

1) Keep the individual titles on the departmental ranking lists, but make a commitment to rank them first (or at least high enough to keep) for a designated period of time (e.g. 3 years).

2) Move Springer over to Databases budget. This would mean decreasing the Journals budget by $20,000. This would benefit departments who have ranked Springer journals in the past because they would no longer need to rank them and can go farther down their ranking list (although with less total money to spend). Those departments who don’t currently rank any Springer journals would be at a disadvantage because they would have less money to spend on their current ranked list.

3) Do what we are doing now and risk losing the additional titles. This is not a good option.

Rich’s recommendation is option 1. A formal vote was postponed until the October meeting because the representatives of some of the heavily affected departments were not present. Erin will run a mock scenario of what would happen if option 2 is selected. She noted that if option 1 is selected there would probably still be some leeway in that a department could switch titles if there were a dramatic cost increase for a title to which they are committed.

David Lubliner suggested that, in order to deal with a steadily decreasing budget, when possible we should replace current journals with open source free journals and investigate available free e-books.

Meeting was adjourned at 3:55. Agenda items that were not addressed in this meeting will be postponed to the October meeting.

Submitted by Lisa Weissbard