Faculty Library Committee Meeting  
Thursday, March 3, 2011 2:30-3:55 pm  
Library Room 2032

Minutes


Absent: Zeynep Celik, Reza Curtmola, David Lubliner, Neil Maher, Min Song, Jim McHugh, Trevor Tyson, Yuan-Nan Young, Stephen Tricamo, Salman M. Farooqui, Pravandeep Singh, Ann Hoang, Maya Gervits

1. Minutes of October 7, 2010 – Approved
   A new member of the FLC was welcomed; Raquel Perez-Castillejos from Electrical Engineering.

2. Report of the University Librarian
   a. Library resources price increase impact
      Price increases are less severe than in the past, but are still an issue. Income for the libraries is not going up, but operating expenses are rising. 2011 journals have been reduced, details follow.

   b. AY 2010 Library IPED Report
      Doreen Mettle took leadership for this report which was distributed at the meeting. The library went from 13 professional librarians in 2008 to 12 in 2010 due to the Technical Reference Librarian position left vacant when Andrea Spender resigned, and there was no authorization given to fill the vacancy. Book expenditures in 2008 were $242,000 and decreased to $116,000 in 2010. E-book expenditures were $11,474 in 2008 and decreased to $8,000 in 2010. E-serial expenditures decreased from $674,000 in 2008 to $528,000 in 2010. Interlibrary Loan and Document Delivery has more than doubled due to the implementation of Rapid ILL, and general increase in the use of Interlibrary Loan by faculty and students who need to retrieve materials that are not available in our collection. This trend is indicative of budgets at libraries requesting materials from us have been slashed at least as much as ours. Doreen suggested that the uniqueness of our collection makes us a likely “go to” library for technical books and articles. Total expenditures, including salaries and wages, decreased from $3,332,346 in 2008 to $3,207,119 in 2010. Reference presentations increased to 330 in 2010 from 185 in 2008, and the total attendance at all presentations almost doubled for the two years. Davida added that this represents a change in the reference librarians’ focus to collaborating with the faculty, rather than waiting for people to approach them. Total library opening hours have gone down as overtime and late operating hours have been eliminated and part-time staff have been reduced.
3. **Springer – Individual journals, prioritized journals or database?**

**Decision needed for AY 2012**

The Springer package requires us to purchase about $21K of individual titles to qualify for the database of 1200 titles. Due to the funding situation, one of the titles in the database fell off of a department’s funding line, putting the database access in jeopardy. Mechanisms were discussed for how to secure the Springer package – it was decided at a past meeting to annually evaluate the titles. If during the evaluation process a Springer title falls below a line on somebody’s ranking list, someone will be asked to pick it up by funding it out of another department or the Provost Set Aside. There is $1500 in fees that have to be paid in order to have online access to Springer titles. Springer is on the databases list and will be voted on using 50 points and then ranked. The question is whether Springer will be taken off the list because it is not funded out the databases budget; it is funded out of the departmental journal money. Or, are we leaving it on the list but changing the dollar amount to $1500 as that is the amount being funded out of databases budget? In essence, we subscribe individually to 16 journals for about $21,000, and then pay another $1500 in fees, which gives us access to all 1200 titles. This led to questions by a faculty rep about who looks at “other” titles we get in the database and what usage do they get. Erin would like to get per-journal statistics to see what the usage of these other titles would be, but we would not be able to tell who used it, for the purposes of what department should bear the cost. On the database usage sheet distributed, usage is shown in the aggregate. Erin will get back to the FLC as soon as possible if this information is possible to get. The security of the package is in question, as well as the funding source of the $1500 in fees. A motion was made to take the $1500 in fees off (with all departments bearing the burden in the form of reduced journal budget) the top of the journals budget, assuming that there is enough in the budget to purchase the amount of journals needed to secure the package. Motion was seconded, and after much discussion, passed unanimously. This will go forward unless not enough individual journals (about $20,000 worth) are purchased to buy the package. Erin will amend Journals Procedure to reflect this. Another motion was made by an FLC member that if the required amount of journals are not purchased to receive the package deal, then the money should be taken from the Provost Set Aside. This was not seconded, but discussed further. Usage data on the journals will be analyzed before the next meeting so that this issue can be revisited. Davida added that you cannot get the data on who exactly is using which journal.

4. **Database vote procedure for 2012 (Date due: March 31st)**

Databases for 2012 are voted on this month and are due on the 31st. Database votes will be used from last year if a new vote is not submitted. Erin requests all department reps to submit a new ballot this year, as titles will have been removed since last year included some that are no longer on the database list: Springer, Nature Weekly, Inspec, AppSciWeb, Communications and Mass Media Complete (which is now funded by journals). Business Source Premier (highlighted in yellow on the spreadsheet) will not be funded by the state next year, and was funded this year due to an outstanding credit. Academic Search Premier may also not be funded. The vote is important this year for these two databases especially. Archival databases such as JStor are not voted on currently. The importance of archival information from these databases (i.e. JStor) was discussed so that students can have a complete historical picture, and so should remain off the ballot and paid for off the top of the database budget. A motion was made to take Academic Search Premier and Business Source Premier off the top before any other databases are funded. Motion was then remade to take only Academic Search Premier off the top of the budget because it was argued that Business Source Premier would favor the subject discipline of Business and its department, and the former is multidisciplinary and essential to all subject areas. The motion was
passed with one abstention. Academic Search Premier will be removed from the vote but not from the top (Ranked A) of the ranked list, so that it is a reminder for the future. The FY2012 database procedure is as follows: every rep gets 50 points to distribute among the eligible databases listed on the ballot Erin will email to everyone. Votes are then tallied, and ties for the totals are broken by the rank of the prior year. Prior voting data is available with the FLC documents online.

5. **Journal formula, final cancellations, and additions for 2011**

2011 Final Journal Cancellation list (42+ titles)

Erin distributed the 2011 final cancellation list. We lost 19 titles this year, rather than 42. Before utilizing the Provost Set Aside, the list did not include certain package titles that were rescued by picking up a package deal. 16 titles were saved with the $20K Provost Set Aside, 4 titles were saved independently by the Math department who funded them, and 8 titles were saved by picking up the ASCE Civil Engineering/All titles package. Rich said that while this is a negative scenario, it is better than what was the case in 2010. We gained 3 new titles but they are lumped with the current subscription list.

**Provost Set Aside distributed by formula**

Erin reviewed the process for FY12 journals procedure, which is unchanged from last year. The libraries are given a lump sum to purchase journals, the architecture library is taken off the top and is not a part of the journals formula, and they receive a proportionate sum of the total from which to purchase their materials. Provost Set Aside of $20K comes of the top of the original lump sum as well. The PSA is redistributed after the cancellations list is reviewed by the Provost (who decides if there is anything on the list he may or may not wish to salvage) following the determination of each departmental budget and we fund down each list as much as possible to determine these cancellations. The formula is calculated and run using percentage weights on University data pulled from institutional research – 30% full-time faculty, 5% undergraduate, 15% Master, 20% PhD degrees granted, and 30% research dollars - averaged across three years. Over time the distribution from the average journal pricing has changed. This is heavily weighted toward the more expensive journals being paid for now. The PSA may also be applied to something other than bona fide journals. Rich stressed that a ranked list of journals needs to be submitted for each department by the end of this semester, otherwise the same ranked list for the same department will be used from the year before. Erin posts all lists before the April meeting, where this will be discussed again, and changes are to be submitted by the departmental reps before leaving for the semester. Nature weekly and Science are removed from the journal list and are highest priority, safe from elimination. Erin will edit the journals procedure with this information.