

University Committee on Libraries  
January 21, 2005

The meeting was called to order at 7:30 a.m. at Café DeGrasta by Chairman David Smith. Also in attendance were John Adams, Susan Blum, Wesley Calvert, Agnes Ostafin, Andrew Sommese, Marsha Stevenson, John Weber, Jennifer Younger, guests David Jenkins and Nigel Butterwick, observer Gay Dannelly and secretary Melodie Eiteljorge.

The minutes of the meeting of December 3, 2004 were approved as written.

Director's Report: Younger announced that it is time once again to appoint a Foik Committee. An announcement has gone to Joy Vann-Hamilton for *Notre Dame Report*. John Weber and Wesley Calvert volunteered to serve. Committee members are welcome to contact Younger or the secretary with suggestions for additional members and/or a chair.

On January 20 Younger gave her fifth annual State of the Libraries Address to library faculty and staff at McKenna Hall. President Elect Rev. John Jenkins, C.S.C. joined the meeting, made some remarks and participated in a question and answer session. In her remarks, Younger identified transformative priorities coming out of the goals and priorities of library departments and committees, including: service delivery on the first floor of Hesburgh Library; collections and services - from "collection development" as a separate focus to "collections and services" as an integrated focus; and developing greater self-sufficiency in technical skills - individually and collectively.

Younger also announced that the Libraries, in collaboration with the College of Arts and Letters, received funding from the Equipment and Restoration Fund from the Graduate School for the purchase of several major sets of books and serials (in digital or microformat), including an archive of *Early American Imprints* and a Chicano Studies serials collection.

In regard to the 2005-06 budget, we are awaiting instructions from the Provost Office. Dannelly added that we are preparing for one of two scenarios: a flat library materials budget, or one to meet inflation.

UCL Website: Stevenson reported that she, Andrew Sommese, secretary Melodie Eiteljorge, Eric Morgan (Head, Digital Access and Information Architecture) and Elaine Savely (Library Web Developer) met to discuss the committee's proposed new web page. Work has begun on that. The secretary will provide a url link once the site is ready for review.

Continuing discussion on analysis of e-journal package use --  
guest Dave Jenkins

Jenkins distributed a document on "The Methodology for Analyzing the Packages". When the initial analysis was done, Kluwer/Springer emerged as a candidate for cancellation in terms of considerable dollar savings. However, given the uncertainties on inflation rates and increased prices that have been identified since, the counter argument is strong as well.

Before continuing discussions, Smith suggested that a small subcommittee of the UCL prepare a summary statement, including a set of principles and conclusions, for submission to the Provost's Library Task Force. It was agreed that this would be useful and that it should be appended to the UCL minutes.

Discussions continued with some of the following observations:

Analysis has been heavily geared toward the metric of use, not inherent value.

The library has considered what journals we would need to subscribe to if packages were cancelled.

Numbers for downloads are changing rapidly from year to year. Many titles in the packages are ones to which we have never subscribed individually in the past, and many of those are getting high use. Many are new. On the other hand, many titles that we subscribed to individually in the past no longer get high use.

One advantage of packages is that the broad range of titles included supports new or changing research programs.

Question: Do we have access to electronic journals to which we have dropped subscriptions? Yes, we have access to many through our participation in the NorthEast Research Libraries Consortium (NERL) and through other online databases, which include full text articles in journals.

Contracts with publishers generally provide access as long as the publisher is maintaining the site. Historically, publishers are not responsible for archiving. This means they will only provide a data dump. Libraries throughout the country are looking at ways to retrieve and archive this information. No library can archive everything. This will lead to a coordinated and national archiving program.

Question: If a faculty member pays for and downloads an article, does the library receive a copy? The answer is no.

Platforms and technology change. Sommese noted that he still has access to information he downloaded years ago, but the formatting and symbols sometimes change.

Question: Has the percentage of the library budget spent on books and journals changed? Yes, it has declined several percentage points in the last five years. One reason is that the salary budget has continued to increase every year while the non-salary University allocation has remained flat.

An analysis of e-journal package use should be done annually. However, what may look like the best decision one year might not be best over three years. Perhaps we should look at it every year but make decisions every 2-3 years.

We should consider dynamic analysis. As people become more familiar with how to download material, use will change. We don't want to prematurely make decisions based on past use.

Question: Why do we make decisions by discipline? One reason is that it puts selection into the hands of people who are closest to those subject areas. However, "subject" means anyone who uses the material. The user population is anyone on campus.

It is a time of transition. It seems there is a competition and that units look out for themselves. There is also a sense of inequity, although it is not possible to look at every area the same way because of variables, such as differences in journal costs, etc. We must also consider the broader perspective and overall good. While it is good to ask for input, the library must make the decisions. We should also look at downloads over a longer period of time.

Question: How are we measuring the value of a journal for subscription? Librarians consult faculty members in the department and ask for their priorities and/or other value assessment. Librarians work individually with departments and as a result, there is some variation in the consulting process. It differs from subject to subject.

It seems we have three variables for analysis: faculty ranking, use, and cost. Faculty ranking and use don't necessarily correlate. Is it possible to come up with a metric across the University for value? ISI publishes impact factors, but not for the humanities.

Citations for journals might be considered an impact factor rather than a use statistic. The library has some data on citations from faculty at Notre Dame.

We must also think of document delivery as a viable means of getting content. Immediate access is an issue, but document delivery is much faster than in the past, particularly for journal articles. Younger suggested we consider emerging document delivery models at the next meeting.

The following committee members agreed to collaborate on a summary statement: Smith, Sommese, Dannelly and Weber. Jenkins will work with them.

In an earlier email to the committee, Blum raised a question about books that are stored in carrels but not checked out by the carrel holder, and are thus inaccessible to other patrons. Butterwick responded that the library policy is to check out books if you are going to leave them in a carrel overnight. However, with self checkout it is not easy to check. We are looking at technical solutions.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:10 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Melodie Eiteljorge  
Secretary