

Senate Growth and Development Committee
December 11, 2015, 10:00 A.M.
Hall Dorm Bldg. Rm 123

AGENDA

- 1. Introductions**
- 2. Approval of Minutes of 11-19-15 (attached)**
- 3. Discussion with Peter Diplock, Assistant Vice Provost for CETL***
 - a. Overview of CETL**
 - b. Expected growth areas**
 - c. Relationships to graduate education and TA training**
 - d. Ways the Senate can assist CETL's mission**
- 4. Next meeting TBA**

**<http://cetl.uconn.edu/>*

Senate Growth and Development Committee 2015/2016

Meeting Minutes 11/19/15

10:00-11:15 am

Senate Conference Room, Hall Dorm

Members Present: Larry Renfro (Chair), Joseph Crivello, Andrew Moiseff, Dave Benson, Larry Silbart, Greg Bouquet, Tracie Borden, Karl Guillard

Members absent: Maria Gordina, Faquir Jain, Kristen Schwab, Suzanne Wilson, Silbart, Kathy Hendrickson, Lyle Scruggs, Robert Bird, Alec Calva (GSS)

Guest: Vice Provost Martha Bedard

Approval of Minutes: First order of business was to accept the minutes for the 10/30/15 meeting, with one correction – Karl Guillard was present.

Discussion with Dr. Martha Bedard, Vice Provost for Libraries:

Financial Status: Dr. Bedard reviewed the impact of past and future cuts on the operation of the library. She pointed out that there was an expectation that NextGen monies would flow to the library to make it a world class library, when the opposite has happened. We are in the bottom quartile of research universities in terms of the services offered by our library. We need a 50% increase in the library budget to offer the services commonly offered by our peer aspirants. The last five institutions admitted to the AAU had library budgets in the range of \$30 million. The UConn library has shrunk to \$20 million and an additional potential \$1.2 million cut in the coming year. The cuts include salaries and fringe benefit costs. A description of the goals and processes for the library's comprehensive collections review was provided to the Growth and Development Committee by Dr. Bedard (attached).

Criteria for Advancement: Dr. Moiseff asked Dr. Bedard what she considered to be categories for improvement. To provide world-class services, Martha related that staffing needs to increase as does collections and services. We then discussed the role(s) and cost(s) of the Interlibrary Loan Service (ILS), which is the 9th highest nationally and far greater than at our peer aspirant institutions. Dr. Silbart asked if services were proportional to the student population, but no data could be immediately provided. Dr. Benson asked who determined the rankings. Dr. Bedard indicated that the rankings were done by the Association of Research Libraries – looking mainly at expenditures.

Interlibrary Loan: Dr. Bedard indicated that fewer than one-half of one percent of ILL requests are denied. Cost is one factor, but there are other restrictions such as copyright which cannot be overcome.

Open Source Textbooks and Collections: Dr. Crivello asked about the positive and negative impacts of open source textbooks and collections. Dr. Bedard related that programs exist on campus to develop open source textbooks and that there are a number of sites with open source textbooks. Open Stax College was an example. A Babbidge Library website organized by discipline is in development.

Discussion of Possible Revenue Sources for Library: The Provost has set up a taskforce to assist the Faculty Library Advisory Committee and Dr. Bedard with an effort to reduce the cuts and, if the cuts go through, possible layoffs of staff. Strategies to increase the Library budget included suggestions such as *i.* a student library fee (a \$50/semester fee would raise \$2 million); *ii.* Tuition; *iii.* Office of Vice President for Research (2.5% of the 58% F&A charge on grants is justified on the basis of library services); and *iv.* Fundraising (the Library has no Development Officer).

Status of University Librarians: We also discussed the fact that at many other aspirant institutions library staff with Ph.D.s have faculty status. The consequences of such a change at UConn were discussed.

The Committee thanked Dr. Bedard and adjourned at 11:10 A.M.

UConn Libraries' Comprehensive Collections Review

Overview: We face a projected shortfall in our FY2017 collection budget of *approximately* one million dollars. We calculated this projected shortfall through an analysis of our collections expenditures in the context of current and anticipated reductions to the Libraries' overall budget. The projected shortfall reflects ongoing annual inflation in resource subscription costs of approximately 5%, and it also reflects the need to allocate funds for the purchase of books.

Goal: The goal of the comprehensive review is to prepare the Libraries to meet the projected shortfall in FY2017. We aim to carry out the review in a way that engages UConn faculty so that we can minimize the negative impacts of reductions in collections expenditures.

Process¹: The review process began in the summer of 2015 when we started compiling detailed lists of subscribed journals, journal packages, and databases. The lists include data such as subscribed resources' cost, usage, cost-per-use, alternate coverage and access options, and year-to-year cost differences. For the titles within journal packages, we plan to compile additional data concerning the number of times that UConn researchers have published in them and also the number of times that each title has been cited by UConn researchers.

Once the process of compiling data on subscribed resources is complete (projected for December), the data will be shared with the Libraries' collection managers. These collection managers will carry out an initial assessment of the subscribed resources to identify potential ways to reduce collections expenditures. The anticipated outcome of this initial analysis will be a list of resources that bear further analysis. This additional analysis may result in the discontinuation of one or more publisher-specific e-journal packages in favor of individual subscriptions to only select current e-journals within the packages. The analysis may also entail cancellations of certain databases, individually subscribed print and e-journals, and other resources.

Early in the 2016 spring semester, our subject specialists will share with faculty information concerning those resources that have been highlighted for further analysis. This information will provide a framework and starting point for conversations regarding the impacts of collection reductions. The conversations between the Libraries and faculty will occur throughout the semester and will be used as a basis through which we collaborate to iteratively develop and revise plans for making collection reductions. These plans will entail not just cancellations but will also consider how best to allocate for the purchase of books in light of reductions to the collections budget.

By the conclusion of the spring semester, we aim to have identified the specific actions that we plan to take to reduce collection expenditures in FY2017. These planned actions will be shared on the Libraries' website. Once FY2017 begins and we have specific information on our collections budget, we will make any necessary final changes to the actions before implementing them early in the 2017 fall semester.

¹ As we precede through the comprehensive collections review process, circumstances and input from the UConn community will impact how the process unfolds. The process described in this document is subject to change.