



University Committee on Libraries
118 Hagggar Hall
Notre Dame, Indiana 46556-5636

UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME

Phone: (574) 631-7763
Fax: (574) 631-8883
e-mail: David.A.Smith.367@nd.edu

September 29, 2005

Academic Council
Office of the Provost
300 Main Building
CAMPUS

RE: University Committee on Libraries, Annual Report, 2004-05

Dear Members of the Academic Council:

Unlike reports coming from the UCL over the past 5 years, this year's report will not emphasize the discrepancy between Notre Dame's rising scholarly ambitions and its declining library resources. This change of focus is not due to a change in circumstances – it is simply because the facts are now widely-known. The North Central Association's 2004 accreditation report states "Serious financial concerns related to the library persist and need to be addressed." "The library is underfunded. . ." and "This budget allocation strategy does not support the strategic priority to advance as a research institution."

In the past five years, incoming research funding has more than doubled, now topping \$80.8 million. In the past six years, members of the Notre Dame faculty have won 20 fellowships from the National Endowment for the Humanities, more than any other college or university in the country. The number of faculty members who have received fellowships in the arts, humanities, and social sciences over the past five years places us among the top six research universities in the country.

Over the same interval, our Association of Research Libraries ranking *fell* from 51st to 58th.

It is a truism that you cannot be a great university without a great library. Notre Dame does not have a great library. We have great library faculty and staff, but too many of our collections are too weak to support Notre Dame's rigorous and expanding scholarly dreams. Collections are the laboratories of many of our best researchers; they help us to earn the credentials necessary for participation in the public square; they either invite or discourage our students' intellectual pursuits; they foster or frustrate the interdisciplinary work of our colleagues, and they are a significant component in the ARL rankings. Collections are Notre Dame's Achilles' heel.

While one-time and ad hoc funding is most welcome, it is time to regularize these increments as permanent parts of a vastly increased library budget. It is simply *unfair* to continue increasing the scholarly standards applied to our faculty and students without proportionate increases in the infrastructure necessary to meet these standards. And it is unrealistic to believe Notre Dame can be a great university without a great library.

Charge and Context of the Committee

As stipulated by Academic Article IV:3(f), the *University Committee on Libraries* (UCL) reviews policies and practices relating to library resources and services and provides oversight of the development of the libraries. It comprises *ex officio* administrative members, elected faculty members representing each of the major academic units, and both graduate and undergraduate student members. The UCL constitutes a principal interface between the campus units responsible for providing information resources and services, and it also serves as a communications link between the libraries and the University community.

By now, it can confidently be assumed that all members of the Council are aware of the extraordinary transitions occurring in scholarly publishing. In only the last 12 months Google™ has announced its breathtaking ambition to digitize all or major portions of the collections of libraries at Harvard, Stanford, the University of Michigan, and the University of Oxford as well as The New York Public Library. The National Institutes of Health (NIH) has announced a new policy requiring that reports emanating from Federally-funded research be made freely available via the NIH digital repository, *PubMed Central*. Considered on their own, these two initiatives are landmark publishing events, attracting substantial scholarly, trade, and public interest. Many others could be cited (e.g., open access publishing, institutional digital repositories). Simply keeping track of relevant developments is a challenge; anticipating their implications for the University, setting policy, and planning strategically in the face of such upheaval has been challenging for us all.

We invite the Academic Council to bookmark the UCL website for further information about these and other trends in scholarly publishing and academic library development and to see related Notre Dame materials:

<http://www.library.nd.edu/ucl/>

Paradigm Shift

In this year's report, the UCL would like to begin by noting a less spectacular, but locally quite remarkable, transition being made by our own Libraries. Partly by design, partly owing to technological advancements, partly as a matter of economic exigency, and for the first time in the history of the University, it is fair to say we no longer *aspire* to having all scholarly materials on campus.

Throughout the present report the Council will see much of this year's UCL time was expended on programs such as document delivery, inter-library loan, electronic packages, and reciprocal borrowing privileges. If the old paradigm involved *acquiring* as much material as possible, the new paradigm involves providing timely *access* instead. Recognizing this paradigm shift helps clarify a variety of library and UCL issues and decisions.

Electronic Package Use Analysis

Perhaps the most significant issue addressed by UCL this year concerned the high cost of electronic journal packages (e.g., Elsevier's ScienceDirect, Kluwer/Springer, Wiley). As the Council may be aware, a preliminary analysis of electronic package use, undertaken in the spring of 2004, suggested that use of e-journal packages from Springer and Kluwer were insufficient to justify their high cost. The

library then developed a plan for re-subscribing to print versions of some but not all of the higher use Springer and Kluwer journals, and faculty input on the plan was sought. The e-journal package crisis served as a catalyst for expanded awareness of library issues across the campus.

The cancellations were ultimately averted. In July of 2004, Provost Hatch judged that, in light of the ongoing work of a Provost-appointed Library Task Force, and to permit broader campus-wide and longer term perspectives to be brought to bear on the issues involved, it would be prudent to defer a decision on electronic packages for another year. Therefore, the Springer and Kluwer packages were funded with generous one-time resources from the University.

When UCL convened in the Fall of 2004, it took up the general issue of electronic package use. Across many meetings over the course of the academic year, we examined a variety of different kinds of data, including actual use of specific resources (e.g., journals, articles), in-package and out-of-package costs, and centrality of materials to their respective fields, in an attempt to derive a model that would permit rational and pro-active policy in this complex area. The methods, results, and recommendations coming out of this extensive analysis are provided in the Appendix to this report. As might be expected, simple solutions did not offer themselves. The wisdom of cancelling clearly varied by package. Many important variables are in constant flux. For instance, within a week of the Provost's decision to provide ad hoc funding to retain subscriptions to the Springer and Kluwer e-journal packages, the two companies merged, and the subsequent revised pricing schedule from the combined entity meant that continuing our electronic subscriptions still made economic sense (leaving us especially grateful for the generous support that enabled us to remain subscribed). Other influential but fluctuating determinants of e-journal package economics include foreign exchange rates; publisher pricing schemes; document delivery costs; consortial agreements; patron use patterns; new academic initiatives; the changing scope of campus scholarship, technology, and staffing; and inter-library loan costs and efficiency.

If there is a clear bottom line to all of this, it is that this type of analysis must now become a constant component of library planning. In particular, the temporal dimension must be kept in mind so that short-term exigencies do not prompt long-term mistakes. A system for gathering more comprehensive use and value (centrality to the field) data has been underway since the UCL analysis began, and the additional year's data will be a valuable resource. Unfortunately, the other clear finding from this analysis was that library funding cannot keep pace with inflation either in or out of the packages.

Inasmuch as electronic packages are so often at the core of campus discussions of library funding challenges, the Council is encouraged to carefully review the Appendix to become familiar with the pertinent issues.

Other Issues Addressed by UCL

While much of the UCL's time was devoted to electronic packages, the Committee also considered other issues critical to the Library's functioning. Detailed reports on most of these topics are available at the new UCL website (<http://www.library.nd.edu/ucl/>), which contains basic committee links such as the membership roster, meeting minutes and agendas, annual reports to the Academic Council, and ad hoc committee reports. The new UCL website also has links to general information resources such as those tracking trends in contemporary scholarly publishing and academic library news.

Additional UCL items of note:

- Not addressed by the e-journal package report, but a significant component of UCL's discussions, was the potential for hyperinflation of electronic packages to distort acquisition patterns by drawing funds away from monographs, a process that could be especially harmful to the arts and humanities. The disproportionate use of endowment funding for the arts and humanities collections in comparison to collections in the social sciences, sciences, and engineering, coupled with one-time funding of the packages, has mitigated this distortion, but this phenomenon demands constant vigilance. The Provost's Library Task Force report coming later this term will address inter-disciplinary dependencies in more detail.
- The library website has been completely redesigned and has been very well received by patrons. It is now database-driven, which is a very significant, albeit relatively transparent, advancement.
- Student printing in the library is now part of the campus-wide print quota system. Various quota subsidies are now available.
- Notre Dame has joined the Academic Libraries of Indiana state-wide on-site reciprocal borrowing program.
- A Provost Libraries Task Force, chaired by Chris Maziar, has been meeting all year. This is an extremely welcome opportunity not only to elevate administrative awareness of library struggles but also to elevate awareness campus-wide. Five UCL members served on the Task Force. A draft of the Task Force's final report has circulated, and a final version should come out this Fall. The UCL was especially pleased to see that the Task Force involved the Office of Development early in its process.

Task Force sub-committees included:

- Arts and Humanities
- Science, Social Science, and Engineering
- Vision and Mission
- Library internal communication has been studied. Various recommendations have been made and implemented in order to expand and improve internal channels of communication.
- The Library has assumed responsibility for the campus website's search engine.
- Library goals for new Development campaign include:
 - Funding for information services and resources in five broad areas:
 - Science and Engineering
 - Business
 - Humanities
 - Social Sciences
 - Arts and Architecture
 - Hesburgh Library renovation

- Campus and external grants and funding:
 - In a model of library, college, and faculty collaboration, the Library and the College of Arts and Letters (6-7 different units) received over \$200,000 in Equipment Restoration and Renewal grants from the Graduate School.
 - The library also won a National Endowment for the Humanities grant to preserve four thousand endangered 19th and 20th century books on the Catholic tradition
 - An Institute of Museum and Library Services grant was won to introduce 42 diverse, college-bound graduating seniors to the profession of academic librarianship
- The UCL again offered its assistance to the Faculty Senate, should that body wish to consider scholarly publishing resolutions similar to those coming from faculty Senates at various top universities. Among those resolutions discussed were ones endorsing open access, recommending an institutional digital repository, and recommending action on negotiating e-journal packages.
- The library is commended for its excellent partnership with OIT to provide extensive EndNote training and support.
- The Document Delivery Task Force reported to UCL. An extended document delivery pilot project for faculty in psychology, biological sciences, and engineering was described. Various models of document delivery were discussed, including library mediated versus unmediated ones that are either subsidized or not subsidized. Document delivery costs appear to be doubling every year.
- UCL co-sponsored a series of lectures and meetings with Peter Suber, an expert on open-access scholarly publication.

The 2005-06 budget gave cause for some optimism in the UCL. Although no funds were added to the salary budget for restoration of the 12.75 FTE positions cut in FY03/04, an additional \$300,000 in recurring funds has been added to the library acquisitions budget. A 1% increase in the non-salary budget and a 3.5% increase in endowment income for library collections added an additional \$150,000 to the acquisitions budget. Ordinary budget increments following a period of dramatic erosion of purchasing power will not, however, address institutional ambitions. And of course none of these funding initiatives address the personnel positions lost over the past few years. More and bolder remediation is needed.

Finally, the *Chair* of the UCL was gratified to have been invited to the 20 January 2005 meeting of the Academic Council to discuss last year's Annual Report. Although that report was ultimately deemed for information only and not for discussion, the *Chair* of the UCL would be happy to return this year to support any discussion deemed useful by the Council.

University Committee on Libraries 2004/05

David A. Smith, Chair, Psychology
 John H. Adams, Biological Sciences
 Craig Barbolla, Undergraduate Student Representative
 Susan Blum, Anthropology

Wesley Calvert, Graduate Student Representative
Roger Jacobs, Law School (ex officio)
Agnes E. Ostafin, Chemical Engineering
Walter “Jack” Pratt, Law School
Charles Rosenberg, Art, Art History and Design
Andrew Sommese, Mathematics
Marsha Stevenson, University Libraries
John Van Engen, History
John A. Weber, Marketing
Gordon Wishon, Office of Information Technology (ex officio)
Jennifer A. Younger, Director of Libraries (ex officio)

APPENDIX

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON LIBRARIES: 2004/2005 JOURNAL PACKAGE ANALYSIS

May 6, 2005

An analysis to determine the potential savings of leaving the Big Three journal packages was carried out by the Libraries' Collection Development Committee in 2003-2004 and presented to the University Committee on Libraries in December 2004/January 2005.

Fiscal assumptions:

The University Libraries will manage its funds in the ways that best serve the University as a whole and the teaching and research programs currently in place.

The University Libraries must operate within the fiscal resources made available to them from the University.

The University Libraries will take advantage of campus programs, seek both internal and external opportunities, and pursue campus, state and consortial partnerships to leverage available funds and to identify additional resources.

Assumptions and constraints of the 2003/2004 package analysis:

- In conjunction with faculty input regarding critical titles, cost per use emerged as the most significant evaluative principle. Impact factors and journal half-life were also acknowledged as important indicators of value.
- The anticipated document delivery of outstanding downloads was anecdotally set at 20%. The document delivery cost per request was set at current prices (\$30-\$33).
- The use data (total number of requested downloads) was from one full year only (2003).

Findings, observations and recommendations:

- Potential savings varied considerably from package to package.

Analysis should focus on each individual package and not on the packages as a single aggregate.

- The relative distribution of titles across disciplines also varied from package to package.

Leaving a package based on cost per use will change the historical distribution of subject-specific funds.

Nevertheless, the broad coverage of package access ensures the quickest response to new

directions in research.

A decision to leave any specific package may require a greater consideration of the disciplines as a "whole" rather than as discrete parts.

Balancing the good of the whole with the good of its parts may require various strategies.

- Though undetermined, the overhead cost of leaving the packages was anticipated to be significant.

"Delinking" of unsubscribed titles, the realignment of current subscriptions and the maintenance of a process that would monitor these subscriptions based on cost per use would all require significant planning and resources.

Nevertheless, staying in the packages will also require on-going analysis and evaluation. Since the conditions and use of package subscription can change dramatically, analysis of their cost effectiveness should be done on an annual basis and in such a way that provides time for adequate consultation. This process should be greatly aided by the Libraries' newly created a "Serials evaluation database."

- "In package" inflation of subscriptions provided by multi-year contracts is less than Aout of package inflation.

Notre Dame has been on one year contracts for the last three years due to budget restraints and uncertainty regarding financial ability to retain packages..

Analysis of the packages should also include a projection of this differential in order to determine when it wipes out any real savings.

Nevertheless, regardless of contract length, the "in package" inflation rate of electronic journal subscriptions is still higher than expected increases to the Libraries' material budget.

Implications

- Leaving Kluwer/Spriner

PRO: Significant commitment reduction (\$179,089)

Annual inflation based on the cost of only the individually subscribed titles, an amount one third less than the full package cost.

Return of collection flexibility to the title level.

Opportunity to develop the organization and expertise to deliver and maintain 1) an enhanced program of electronic document delivery and 2) a collection evaluation process based on cost per use.

CON: Reduction of immediate electronic access to package titles, affecting primarily

Mathematics.

Loss of broad coverage provided by immediate electronic access to the full package list.

Teaching and research opportunity costs related to reduced journal access.

Library opportunity costs related to Adelinking unsubscribed titles and the development of the organization and expertise to deliver and maintain 1) an enhanced program of electronic document delivery and 2) a collection evaluation process based on cost per use.

Uncertainty regarding cost of and access to previously subscribed backfiles.

Higher annual inflation rate applied to individually subscribed titles than to the full package of a multiyear contract.

Initial draft prepared by Dave Jenkins in consultation with Parker Ladwig and Gay Dannelly, 5/5/05.