

University Committee on Libraries
February 21, 2003

The meeting was called to order at 7:30 a.m. at Cafe DeGrasta by Chairman Walter Pratt. Also in attendance were John Adams, Harvey Bender, Wesley Calvert, Stephen Dumont, Roger Jacobs, Marsha Stevenson, Stephen Silliman, David Smith, John Weber, Gordon Wishon, Jennifer Younger, guests Gay Dannelly and Dan Marmion, and secretary Melodie Eiteljorge.

The minutes of the meeting of January 23, 2003, were approved as written.

Director's report:

- * Michael Keller, university librarian at Stanford, will be on campus to give two presentations on April 24.
- * The Advisory Council for University Libraries meets April 24-25.
- * Younger's State of the Library address, January 9, 2003 was distributed to the committee prior to the meeting.
- * It is once again time to establish a Foik Award Committee. Any committee members who are willing to serve should contact Younger.

Update on library options - Dan Marmion, and Statistics on student printing - Gordon Wishon. Desired outcome: learn what the average use is of the assigned quota and what options this might suggest for tying in student printing in libraries with this quota.

Marmion reported that the Libraries are investigating technology in regard to printing. In Hesburgh Reference and in the Business Information Center (BIC), we began a two-step process last fall. The first step is to send a print job to the print queue, the second to release it from the printer. In addition, the BIC took another step and tied public computers into the quota system. They concluded that it is possible to apply this technology to the Libraries. The next question is policy issues. Would this require an adjustment in the quota? We will look at this over the next few months.

Marmion also noted that we have an extensive amount of printing done by people outside Notre Dame. We are looking for ways to allow them to print but to charge them for it.

Weber asked about the possibility of using CD burners to allow people to save files. Stevenson replied that we are using that technology

in the microtext department. Machines with that capability are expensive, and we have only three at this time. Dumont added that people with Notre Dame afs accounts can save files to their afs space.

Adams suggested that we charge for CDs rather than give them away and that we sell the equivalent of copy cards for printing to outside users.

Dumont asked who will be setting the policy on printing. Marmion responded that the Libraries will work in conjunction with the OIT. Wishon added that UCCIS set the previous policy and that this is a subject of interest to them.

Wishon next reported on use statistics, which suggest we need to make an adjustment in the quota. He does not yet have last fall's statistics, but he was able to provide an examination of spring 2002 print patterns.

Currently the quota is 1000 pages per academic year. The following statistics are based on one semester. These statistics are for undergraduates only:

- * 50% of students used fewer than 200 pages for the one semester.
- * 84% used fewer than 400 pages.
- * 96% used fewer than 600.
- * 99.3% used fewer than 800.
- * Less than 1% of students used the entire quota.

Younger noted that these statistics do not include printing in the library.

Stevenson added that increased use of electronic reserves is a big issue and one that will impact the statistics.

Dumont asked if there is any way to break down statistics on electronic print requests vs. self generated. Wishon replied that he doesn't believe that is possible with the mechanism in place.

Pratt stated that it seems the goal would be to decrease the quota rather than increase it. Jacobs disagreed, noting that the shift to digital resources and not having material available in paper format forces the use of electronic, which increases printing.

Wishon stated that he is aware of the fact that we are forcing changes. He does not want to erect barriers that are too difficult to overcome.

Adams suggested that another perspective is that we are providing more access and that our role is to provide content, not the ability to print it out.

Stevenson noted that making information available on a screen is not the same as providing it in print form. The reading experience is much different.

Wishon stated that the intention of a quota system is not to recover or shift costs. It is merely to control cost and printing behavior. Marmion added that it eliminates waste.

Bender noted that we should be mindful of tuition and that printing is a small part of the experience of attending the University. Jacobs recalled that some time back UCCIS added a surcharge and built it into tuition for technology, including printing.

Dumont pointed out that we do not provide free photocopies. Why should we provide free printing?

Younger stated that she would like the library to be part of a campus system and that she will work with Gordon Wishon. The library wants to reduce its dollar costs associated with printing in the library, but not necessarily to eliminate all support for printing.

Silliman suggested that increasing printing quotas could be handled in the same way we handle increasing afs space. It could be done upon request for those few who need it.

Library priorities and strategies for managing a 5% cut in FY03/04 budget. Desired outcome: UCL advice on meetings with college deans, department chairs, UCL members and department library committees/liasons

Younger noted that time was short because of the meeting at 8:00 between UCL members and the Director of Libraries Review Committee. Thus, she prepared and sent her comments in advance:

"I have reported to the library staff and faculty on the budget cuts for the library and more specifically on our plans for budget cuts that will come from the library salary budget. We will do our best in regard to maintaining library services, operations and collections/access to information in the context of our strategic plan, budget cuts and maintaining reasonable work loads for staff. As is being done in colleges, departments and other campus units, we will have to modify library services in accordance with new realities.

The budget instructions for the library confirm the cuts to our budget: 5% in the unrestricted (University allocation) and 3.5% (projected average in restricted funds) which together is a total cut of about \$740K. Therefore, our library plans emphasize that we will set priorities for tough times. The first priority is "Honor commitment to library staff and faculty for jobs, recognition and salaries." We are committing to employment for all individuals, but will hold some positions vacant to stay within budget and offer opportunities for voluntary (and temporary) reductions in schedules.

We have modeled a 5% cut in the library collections budget and will be discussing how to accomplish that in multiple forums over the next several months, including the Libraries' Collection Development Committee and forums, UCL meetings, and in meetings with colleges and departments. Gay Dannelly and the Libraries' Collection Development Committee have announced one measure that will be effective this spring. To contain costs and maintain content, we are changing our BNA (North American general) approval plans to accept trade paperback bound books instead of cloth hardbound books when the two are published simultaneously. If the cloth edition is the only option or is published several weeks before the paper edition is available, we will then take the cloth edition. On an annual basis, we anticipate dollar savings of over \$30,000 even though we will bind any oversized or unusually long books received in the trade paperback version. Other libraries that have made this change have substantiated the feasibility of this approach in maintaining content, facilitating use and providing for preservation appropriately. Also, subject librarians, particularly in those disciplines where the materials are hard hit by inflation continue to seek ways to meet information needs effectively and are discussing proposals for buying fewer books in those areas."

Jacobs suggested that UCL discuss the possibility of writing to the provost in regard to the effect of a 5% cut in the collections budget and whether the collections budget should be spared from a cut. Younger agreed to put this on the March agenda.

At 8:00 a.m., the Director of Libraries Review Committee joined the elected members of UCL.

Respectfully submitted,

Melodie Eiteljorge
Secretary