

October 9, 2008

MEMORANDUM

TO: University Senate Members

FROM: Kenneth G. Holum
Chair of the University Senate

SUBJECT: University Senate Meeting on Thursday, October 16, 2008

The University Senate will meet on Thursday, October 16, 2008. The meeting will convene at **3:15 p.m.**, in **Room 0200, Skinner Hall**. If you are unable to attend, please contact the Senate Office¹ by calling 301-405-5805 or sending an electronic message to senate-admin@umd.edu for an excused absence. Your response will assure an accurate quorum count for the meeting.

The meeting materials can be accessed on the Senate Web site. Please go to <http://senate.umd.edu/meetings/materials/> and click on the date of the meeting.

Meeting Agenda

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of the September 15, 2008, Senate Minutes (Action)
3. Report of the Chair
4. Report of the Senate Executive Committee
 - Amendment to the membership of the Research Council in the Bylaws (Action)
5. Approval of Research Council Slate 2008-2009 (Action)
6. Report of the University Library Council (Information)
7. Special Order of the Day
 - Joel Oppenheimer, Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA)
 - Douglas Duncan, Vice President for Administrative Affairs
 - Purple Line Discussion*
8. New Business
9. Adjournment

¹ Any request for excused absence made after 1:00 p.m. will not be recorded as an excused absence.

University Senate
September 15, 2008

Members Present

Members present at the meeting: 92

Call to Order

The Senate Chair-Elect Miller-Hooks called the meeting to order at 3:07 p.m. and explained that Chair Holum could not attend the meeting because he was recovering from multiple summer surgeries. She expressed his regret in missing the first meeting of the semester but suggested that he hoped to be back to Senate business for the October meeting. She reminded all Senators to state their name, department and constituency when they speak at the microphone.

Approval of the Minutes

Senate Chair-Elect Miller-Hooks asked for additions or corrections to the minutes of the May 6, 2008 meeting. Hearing none the minutes were approved as distributed.

Senate Chair-Elect Miller-Hooks asked for additions or corrections to the minutes of the May 8, 2008 meeting. Hearing none, the minutes were approved as distributed.

Report of the Chair

Senate Chair-Elect Miller-Hooks gave an update of summer Senate business. She stated that she had been working with Chair Holum and the Provost's office in the implementation phase of the Strategic Plan. They have jointly identified members to serve on the General Education and Post-Tenure Review Task Forces. She stated that the selected members have been invited to serve and once the membership is finalized, the taskforces will be charged and begin their meetings. She further stated that the Provost had also established a Library Task Force to analyze the issues raised in the Strategic Plan. This task force has already been constituted and charged. The membership will be posted on the Senate website. Chair-Elect Miller-Hooks also explained that she was working with Mel Bernstein, VP for Research to revive the Research Council. The council has been dormant for the past few years and has now been re-constituted with a full membership.

Report of the Senate Executive Committee

Chair-Elect Miller-Hooks reported that the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) identified that because of a clerical error, substantive erroneous changes had been inadvertently made to the Bylaws in two sections. These changes were included within the version that was voted on in the May 8th spring 2008 meeting of the Senate. The SEC unanimously approved a motion to revert the Bylaws to their correct state in those two sections. Chair-Elect Miller-Hooks opened the floor to discussion. Hearing none, she called for a vote. The vote was 1 against, 1

abstention and the majority approved the changes to the Bylaws. The amendments to the Bylaws passed.

Chair-Elect Miller-Hooks introduced Reka Montfort, Director of the Senate, to give an update on the new Senate website. Montfort reported that the Senate Office created a new Senate website this past summer. She explained that the new site contains descriptions and information extracted directly from the Bylaws. She also stated that the website now features secure areas for committee working documents, a calendar of various meeting dates and spotlights on past & present senators who have shared their experiences while serving on the Senate.

Approval of the Standing Committee Slates

Chair-Elect Miller-Hooks stated that there have been several changes to the slate since the materials were distributed to the Senate. She noted there were some changes and a few corrections that were noted on a slide at the meeting. She stated that the Committee on Committees made a motion to approve the standing committee slate as presented. She asked if there were any objections. Hearing none, she called for a vote of the Senate. The result was 0 No, 1 abstention and the majority Yes. **The motion to approve the slates as presented passed.**

Approval of the University Library Council

Senate Chair-Elect Miller-Hooks announced the slate of new members to the University Library Council which was submitted by the Committee on Committees. She asked if there were any objections. Hearing none, she called for a vote of the Senate. The result was 0 No, 1 abstention and the majority Yes. **The motion to approve the slate as submitted passed.**

Approval of the University IT Council

Senate Chair-Elect Miller-Hooks announced the slate of new Senate representatives to the University IT Council. She asked if there were any objections. Hearing none, she called for a vote of the Senate. The result was 0 No, 1 abstention and the majority Yes. **The motion to approve the slate as submitted passed.**

She also stated that the membership of the Research Council had just been finalized. The slate will be presented at the next Senate Meeting.

Special Order of the Day President C.D. Mote

Chair-Elect Miller-Hooks introduced President Mote.

President Mote gave his regrets that Chair Holum could not attend the meeting. He also thanked the Senate for its partnership with the administration to advance the University.

President Mote highlighted some of the student accomplishments from the past year including:

- The National Academic Quiz Tournament Championship.
- The American Mock Trial Association's National Championship.
- 1st among U.S. universities & 2nd place worldwide in the Department of Energy's Solar Decathlon.
- 1st Place in the America Helicopter Design Competition.
- 1st Place in the International Autonomous Underwater Vehicle Competition.
- National Title for the Competitive Cheer Team.
- ACC Championship for the Wrestling Team.
- Six athletes were named to the U.S. Olympic Team in Beijing.
- The Mighty Sound of Maryland marching band turns 100 this year.

President Mote also noted that the admission rate of our students to law schools this past year has reached 75% (up from 63% three years ago).

President Mote highlighted several teaching milestones including:

- A top ten ranking by the National Council on Teacher Quality for our teacher-preparation in mathematics.
- A new Ph.D. program initiative in the Business School which will increase doctoral stipends by 45% and provide research and travel support for selected students.
- 700 additional gifted high school students of color were invited to attend the University Honors Portz Summer Program.
- An honor of our Summer Program in Research and Learning by the American Mathematical Society.
- 40 African-American students earned their Ph.D. at Maryland this year, the largest in our history. This ranks us first among AAU members and 8th nationally.

A few of his research highlights included:

- \$400 million raised in external research support this year.
- \$12 million awarded to the START program.
- \$5 million awarded to the National Avian Flu Research Project.
- Recognition by R&D Magazine of two university creations in its "100 most technologically significant products introduced into the marketplace," including a new optical method for detecting individual neutrons by Michael Coplan, IPST and a software tool to manage and track wildfires by Robert Sohlberg, Geography.
- A new Physics Frontier Center from the NSF after a competition of more than 300 applicants.
- A newly created UM Center for Applied Electromagnetics by the Office of Naval Research.

- A new NOAA National Center for Weather and Climate Prediction is under construction in the M Square Research Park.

President Mote also gave an overview of our rankings across various groups, but concluded that we are at the top 0.1% overall.

President Mote addressed how sustainability and climate change issues had captured the campus' attention.

- We have signed onto the American College & University Presidents Climate Commitment to reduce carbon emissions.
- The campus is now officially designated as an arboretum with about 6,600 trees and more than 50 species.
- A renovation of the Washington Quad with new green space with soil produced from composted food.

President Mote also discussed how we will go from the strategic plan to strategic action. He stated that in order to lead, the University "must simply take charge and create its future". He said that we will build a three-way partnership with the campus, the State and our alumni and friends in order to deliver \$1.6 billion of the \$2 billion necessary to implement the Strategic Plan. He believes that our internal commitment is essential in raising the remaining \$400 million from the State. He explained that implementation of the plan had started with a large number of plan recommendations being taken up this first year.

He also explained that a General Education plan would be completed this year by a committee jointly appointed by the Senate and administration and that the plan had been introduced to leadership from the Governor's office, the Maryland House of Delegates, the Maryland Senate and our strongest private supporters. They all endorsed our aspirations for the State.

President Mote stated that the Senate's initiative in setting this course will have a strong impact on the University's history. He believes that "no example of shared governance will stand out as more significant than the Senate's participation in and endorsement of the plan". He said that despite the current financial downturn, we must "have sufficient determination to succeed".

President Mote closed with an allegory of a mountain stream and its relationship to the University. He explained that much like the stream's interaction with its terrain, the University must direct its knowledge through our own created course. We must adjust to fluctuations and prepare for dryer times. He then compared his allegory to the Strategic Plan. He explained that the plan call for increasing flow of knowledge while creating new tributaries from faculty research and feeding existing ones like funding scholarships. He stated that the plan builds reservoirs to main flows during lean years and it works to redirect flow to avoid stagnation. He believes that "the actions of our strategic plan will increase the abundance of our stream as well as move its flow more swiftly, more uniformly, and more effectively.

President Mote opened the floor to questions.

Senator Docherty, Operations Management asked President Mote to comment on his involvement in the Amethyst Initiative and how it will affect the campus.

President Mote explained that the Amethyst Initiative is a recommendation to promote discussion of policies of alcohol consumption in young people. It is intended to have a serious dialogue of all issues, including looking at lowering the drinking age. He explained that there are various issues related to alcohol consumption, including direct and unintended consequences. He supports the discussion of this topic, but in no way was supporting lowering the drinking age. He explained that there will be a day-long campus event this fall (October 30th) to examine all sides of the issue.

Unidentified, asked how a sudden “flash-flood” would impact the plan.

President Mote responded that he would have to think about a situation where a ‘flash-flood’ develops and there is too much money and you end up ruining the infrastructure. He suggested that we can worry about that later.

Senator Tervala, American Studies, asked if President Mote supported a Good Samaritan or Medical Amnesty Policy.

President Mote stated that he believed that this was an issue being discussed by the Senate and did not want to preempt the Senate’s work on it. He said ultimately we have to do the right thing to get help to people that need it.

Chair-Elect Miller-Hooks thanked the President Mote for his time.

New Business

Hearing no further business, Senate Chair-Elect Miller-Hooks adjourned the meeting at 4:18 p.m.

February 12, 2008

MEMORANDUM

TO: William Montgomery
Chair, University Senate

FROM: Boden Sandstrom
Chair, Senate Student Conduct Committee

SUBJECT: Report on charge by the Senate Executive Committee to review Proposal on Discipline and Calls for Emergency Medical Service (Senate document Number 07-08-20)

The Senate Executive Committee charged the Student Conduct Committee to review a request from Anastacia Cosner for a "Senate review of disciplinary policies that apply to students who call for Emergency Medical Services for a drug or alcohol related illness or overdose."

The Student Conduct Committee (SCC) did extensive research on this subject by reading articles and surveys on medical amnesty policies (MAP) and soliciting opinions on MAP from the members of the University Community who would be knowledgeable about the current practices on campus and the possible impacts of such a change in policy. The SCC held a three-hour meeting on January 24, 2008 to discuss the wealth of information we gathered and analyzed. As a result of this meeting, we passed the following motions:

Motion #1:

It was moved that the Student Conduct Committee not recommend a change to the Code of Student Conduct at this time.

This motion was carried unanimously.

Motion #2:

The Student Conduct Committee recommends that the Senate Executive Committee:

- ascertain which recommendations of the Alcohol Task Force* have been implemented to date
 - conduct or work with the Alcohol Coalition to conduct a survey to determine students' awareness of, and reaction to, suspected alcohol poisoning
 - investigate the feasibility of an anonymous campus "hot-line" for reporting suspected alcohol poisoning
 - develop or work with relevant campus or student groups to develop an educational tool such as a "business card" or magnet containing relevant information on the signs of alcohol poisoning and appropriate sources of help for distribution during the upcoming academic orientation period (Fall 2008).
 - examine the appropriateness of current penalties for alcohol violations imposed by Resident Life on residents of University-based housing.
-

*for clarification purposes (University of Maryland Alcohol Task Force Final Report March 2004)

This motion was carried by a majority.

We are not recommending a change in the Student Conduct Code at this time for the following reasons:

First, the SCC feels strongly that it is premature to institute a Medical Amnesty Policy by changing the Student Conduct Code due to lack of sufficient information and data. The question of what students do or do not do in regards to calling for help in a drug or alcohol emergency is, at the present, under-documented. The research, available to date, however, does reveal one important fact: education has the largest impact on students' willingness to call for help in such situations. There was also a consensus that, because of the differences in alcohol poisoning and drug overdoses and their related penalties, any MAP deliberations should consider them separately. On and off campus policies for these two concepts would need to be considered separately as well.

Second, we spent a great deal of time collecting data and analyzing data. Perhaps one of the most critical outcomes of our research was that we learned that we were not qualified to recommend solutions at this time. Design and implementation of a MAP need to involve multiple stakeholders - students, staff in Greek and resident life, campus police, on- and off-campus healthcare providers, the University of Legal Affairs, members of the surrounding community, and off-campus local, state and federal law enforcement agencies. However, we discovered that the campus has already done much research on these issues and continues to do so. We would like to direct you to the work of the current UM Alcohol Coalition, which is considering a MAP as well as additional ways to better educate the University community, and the past reports of University of Maryland Alcohol Task Force Final Report (March 2004) and Report to the University of Maryland Board of Regents Summary of Alcohol and Substance Abuse Prevention Programs from the University of Maryland, College Park (February 2006).

Third, we discovered that Fraternity and Sorority Life, Resident Life and Office of Student Conduct practice a progressive disciplinary process that takes into account violation severity, mitigating or aggravating circumstances, and past disciplinary offenses while agreeing that education is a key component of the process. While not directly related to the SEC charge, the SCC recommends that Resident Life policies be examined to make sure that they are consistent with those of the Office of Judicial Programs, etc. and that they contain an educational component. The SEC may wish to consider referring this matter to the Directors of Student Conduct and Resident Life for further consideration. In contrast, however, there are no statistical data that indicate the penalties for reporting medical emergencies are unduly severe or act as a deterrent from seeking medical assistance.

Fourth, J. Terrance Roach, Chief Counsel for the University, pointed out that the "Code of Student Conduct is a Board of Regents policy, not a campus policy over which the President has control. Only the BOR has the authority to make substantive changes to it. For that reasons, it is important that any proposal presented by the President to the

Regents be supported by careful research convincingly demonstrating the need for change.” (Roach, J. Terrance. Email to the author. 20 Dec. 2007.)

Fifth, the SCC reviewed a recently released national survey conducted by the University of Virginia examining MAPs at colleges and universities nationwide. Eric Hoffman, co-chair of the UM Alcohol Coalition and Coordinator of Campus Alcohol Programs at the University forwarded these results to the SCC. The following data are from his summary. Limitations of the study included a small sample size (61 institutions) and an inherent bias in that most responders either have a MAP in place or are considering one. Only 4 of the 17 institutions with enrollment over 12,000 students were public institutions (such as UM). Approximately 50% of institutions require an educational component for students when using the policy and a follow-up education class following infractions. The survey results indicate mixed results on the perceived effectiveness of MAP policies and the difficulty of getting all campus constituents on board. For more information see:

Survey Results

http://www.surveymonkey.com/sr.aspx?sm=4kAmd_2f_2fe_2bHy40n0Nz_2bkOzPB2eGU799kBJK_2bXm6Vopw_3d

Comparison of the responses of Private and Public institutions and a summary of open-ended responses

<http://www.virginia.edu/case/about/documents/masummary.pdf>

Sixth, the SCC also read a major report on the outcome of a MAP at Cornell University in 2002. The report indicated that there was both an increase in calls to emergency medical services and hospital emergency room visits for acute alcohol intoxication. However, the MAP developed at Cornell is a protocol not a change to the Cornell Code of Conduct and education is a major component of the MAP.

(Lewis, Deborah K. and Marchell, Timothy C. “Safety First: A Medical Amnesty Approach to Alcohol Poisoning at a U.S. University. International Journal of Drug Policy 7 (2006). <<http://www.sciencedirect.com>>)

In conclusion our extensive research on this topic has shown that there is insufficient data both for the UM Community and at comparable institutions to warrant the recommendation of a change to the UM Code of Student Conduct. Rather, we believe the best course of action is to concentrate on education and information dissemination about alcohol poisoning. Therefore, in Motion #2, the SCC recommends that the SEC work with the UM Alcohol Coalition to conduct a survey to determine students' awareness of, and reaction to, suspected alcohol poisoning. We also recommend an emphasis on creative ways to get information to the students about alcohol poisoning, such as establishing an anonymous campus "hot-line" and work with relevant campus or student groups to develop an educational tool such as a "business card" or magnet containing relevant information. The Committee strongly recommends a deadline of September 2, 2008 for survey completion and distribution of an educational tool. The SCC also encourages that the SEC promote collaboration with the existing components of the UM campus who have expertise in the arenas of alcohol use and research on a MAP and to see that they get the necessary resources to continue this work.

STUDENT CONDUCT COMMITTEE
Summary Action Report
2007-2008

The Student Conduct Committee received one charge from the University Senate, (**Senate Document Number 07-08-20**), and action on an appeal relating to a plagiarism case in violation of the University's Code of Academic Integrity.

Appeal

Dr. John Zacker presented a substantial report at the Student Conduct Committee meeting on December 10, 2007, relating to an appeal by a student on plagiarism and the decision of the Honor Council. He stated the arguments from the student to be considered by this Committee are: 1) That he received an unfair hearing due to procedural error; 2) That the decision of the honor board was arbitrary and capricious and, 3) That the sanction is grossly disproportionate to the offense.

Voting on Appeal Arguments

1. That a procedural error occurred and the student received an unfair hearing – The majority of the committee agreed that this was not the case.
2. That the decision of the honor board was arbitrary and capricious - The committee unanimously agreed that this was not the case.
3. That the sanction itself is grossly disproportionate and capricious to the Offense - The majority of the committee agreed that this was the case. The student had been found “responsible” for another count of academic dishonesty in the same semester and this was considered an aggravating factor by the original board. However, the majority of the committee felt that since the two offenses occurred so close together in time and the student did not have the opportunity to learn from his first before committing second, that both offenses should be considered essentially concurrent.

The Committee agreed upon a sanction of “suspension withheld”, and ‘XF’ on the student transcript, monitoring of the student by the Office of Student Conduct until his graduation, and a community service requirement. Specifically, the student must undergo training with the Office of Student Conduct so that he may conduct at least two informational sessions on academic integrity for the University's Athletic Department. The student must also provide hard-copy documentation that he completed the online academic integrity seminar (as he claims) and the community service requirement as described above in order for the reduced sanction to be upheld. If the student fails to meet any of these criteria, the sanction will default to the original recommendation of a one-semester suspension. It is the hope of the Committee that the student will learn more about the consequences of his actions from this reduced sanction and that he will not commit any further acts of academic dishonesty.

Proposal on Discipline and Calls for Emergency Medical Services (Senate Document Number 07-08-20)

At the meeting of the University Senate Executive Committee on October 25, 2007, Dr. William Montgomery, Chair, University Senate, presented a "Good Samaritan" proposal from Anstacia Cosner. Since this proposal might eventuate in a change in the Code of Student Conduct it fell under the purview of the Student Conduct Committee. The report on Ms. Cosner's proposal was due on or before Wednesday, February 13, 2008 from the Student Conduct Committee.

The Student Conduct Committee (SCC) did extensive research on this subject by reading articles and surveys on medical amnesty policies and soliciting opinions on Medical amnesty policies (MAP) from the members of the University Community who would be knowledgeable about the current practices on campus and the possible impacts of such a change in policy. The SCC held a three-hour meeting on January 24, 2008 to discuss the wealth of information gathered and analyzed.

Action

1. It was moved that the Student Conduct Committee not recommend a change to the Code of Student Conduct at this time. The motion was carried unanimously.
2. It was moved that the Student Conduct Committee recommend that the Senate Executive Committee: ascertain which recommendations of the Alcohol Task Force have been implemented to date. (See attached report dated February 12, 2008 to William Montgomery from Boden Sandstrom, Chair, Student Conduct Committee.

It was moved that the Student Conduct Committee recommend that the Senate Executive Committee appoint a Task Force to implement recommendations of this Committee in a timely fashion and to gather further data related to the usefulness of medical amnesty on this campus. The motion was unanimously carried.

Attachment

Amendment to the Membership of the Research Council

This amendment would allow for the Dean of the Graduate School to have a representative as an ex-officio member of the Research Council.

8.2.b Membership: The University Research Council shall consist of thirteen (13) appointed members and ~~nine (9)~~ ex officio members. The appointed members shall be the Chair and eight (8) other faculty members; one (1) staff member; and three (3) students, including at least one (1) graduate and one (1) undergraduate student. The ~~nine (9)~~ ex officio members shall be a representative of the Vice President for Research, a representative of the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost (non-voting), ~~a representative of the Dean of the Graduate School~~, a representative of the Dean of Undergraduate Studies, the Director of the Office of Research Administration and Advancement, and the Chairs of four (4) subcommittees of the University Research Council as follows: Research Development and Infrastructure Enhancement Subcommittee (RDIES); Research Advancement and Administration Subcommittee (TAAS); Intellectual Property and Economic Development Subcommittee (IPEDS); and Awards and Publicity Subcommittee (APS). The Chair shall be a tenured faculty member.

Deleted: ¶
eight

Deleted: 8

Deleted: eight

Deleted: 8

Research Council**10/8/2008**

Jordan Goodman	Chair	CMPS	2011
Denise Clark	Ex-Officio-Dir of ORAA	ADMN	2009
Thomas Castonguay	Ex-Officio-Grad Sch Rep	AGNR	2009
Mahlon Straszheim	Ex-Officio-Prov Rep	BSOS	2009
Francis Duvinage	Ex-Officio-Ugrad St Rep	UGST	2009
Ken Gertz	Ex-Officio-VP Research Rep	ADMN	2009
Avram Bar-Cohen	Faculty	ENGR	2010
Kelly Clifton	Faculty	ARCH	2009
Avis Cohen	Faculty	CLFS	2010
Sally Koblinsky	Faculty	SPHL	2010
Mike Long	Faculty	ARHU	2010
Daniel Perez	Faculty	AGNR	2009
Matthias Ruth	Faculty	PUAF	2009
Amanda Woodward	Faculty	BSOS	2009
Anupama Kothari	Graduate Student	ADMN	2009
Adam Smith	Graduate Student	CLFS	2009
Cynthia Hale	Staff	GRAD	2010
Jonathan Hood	Undergraduate	CMPS	2009

July 29, 2008

From: University Library Council

To: University Senate
William Montgomery, Chair, 2007-2008
Reka Montfort, Director

Re: Annual Report to the Senate, 2007-2008

This document is the annual report to the Senate required by the bylaws of the ULC. The report is in three parts: (1) report on activities; (2) assessment of current state of library; (3) recommendations for Senate attention.

Part I: Report on Activities

Activities for 2007-2008

1. Funding and management of library collections

The greatest attention during the current academic year in the ULC focused on various dimensions of the crisis in the materials budget of the library. Following a charge from the provost in the fall, the ULC devoted two months to understanding and reviewing the budget structure and current decision making policies relating to the libraries' materials budget. Another four months (six hours of meeting time in the ULC as a body and additional time in subcommittees) were devoted to several proposals for revisions in this process. This work involved two directions: informing the provost and the campus community of the depth and importance of the problem, and reviewing the policies of the libraries to make certain that it was being a good steward of the resources provided and was responding properly to the crisis. Our work in the first direction resulted in the resolution calling for a Blue Ribbon Task Force (see below). Our work in the second direction resulted in an extensive report on management of acquisitions forwarded to the Dean of Libraries at the end of the year (see Appendix A).

2. Blue Ribbon Task Force on Libraries

The investigation in the state of funding levels for the libraries has reached the point where the status of the libraries as a research resource are in doubt (see "State of the Libraries" below), Given this well established underfunding and the changes that are taking place in access to scholarly resources, the ULC believes it is time to envision the appropriate library for the university's missions, to assess the current library system against this standard, and to contemplate alternative strategies to achieve this vision. In a resolution (see Appendix B), the ULC recommended that the provost "convene a task force including outstanding researchers and teachers from across the campus to envision the collection for the University of Maryland libraries appropriate to the research and teaching expectations of the university." The provost received the resolution positively and is currently forming the task force.

3. *Strategic Planning*

Through its chair, the ULC worked with the Dean of Libraries, the Senate Chair, the Provost, and the Strategic Planning Steering Committee to develop an acknowledgment in the strategic plan of the importance of quality libraries to a world-class university. The result is placement in the *Critical Enablers* section of the strategic plan. We believe this is an appropriate place for the libraries, emphasizing that it is a shared, essential resource for the excellence of the university.

4. *Other Activities*

- Co-sponsored with the libraries and the provost a “Town Hall Meeting” in October. (See the “State of the Libraries” section)
- Reviewed the need for an offsite storage facility for the libraries. The ULC acknowledged the intense need for this facility and endorsed the request that it be added to the facilities budget. (See Appendix C)
- Reviewed the integration of electronic reserves into the ELMS system. The ULC participated in a demonstration of the new system and provided advice to the libraries on implementation.
- Reviewed implementation of past reports of the ULC. (See update below.)

Update on Activities from 2005-2007

1. *Liaison Study*

In 2005-2006, the ULC submitted a report to the Dean of Libraries recommending major attention to the Liaison structure through which the libraries manage communication with academic colleges and departments. Although a task force from the libraries has made recommendations pursuant to this report, the ULC reported to the Dean that it was unhappy with the speed of implementation of the recommendations. The libraries have formed an implementation committee to supervise further work on this issue.

2. *New Programs*

In 2005-2006, the Council submitted a report to the provost on changes needed to improve the funding of appropriate library resources for new curricular and research initiatives. This report was staffed by the office involved in the Middle States review, so progress in implementation was slow. There are two critical dimensions to the report. The first was funding new program collections. Soft funds were provided to the library for some of these initiatives in FY07. Converting these to permanent funding did not occur. It is fair to say that to date the ULC’s

recommendations have not been followed fully in this regard. The other critical dimension was enhancing the process of evaluating the library needs of new programs. This process has, in fact, been implemented, but really through Associate Provost Phyllis Peres' work with departments and colleges through the PCC. Our recommendations should be fully implemented structurally so that they are woven within the institutions of PCC review rather than depending on the personal initiative of the administrator involved. An update of the PCC processes currently underway should accomplish that.

3. *Bylaws Revision*

In 2006-2007, the Council submitted revised bylaws to the Senate. These were approved by the Senate and the President. They were fully implemented in 2007-2008, including the seating of the Senate Chair-Elect (Ken Holum in 2007-2008) as an ad hoc member of the ULC.

Part II: Assessment of Current State of the Libraries

Current Strengths of the Libraries

In fall 2007, the ULC cosponsored, with the libraries and the provost's office, a town meeting that drew faculty from across the campus to comment upon their satisfactions and dissatisfactions with the libraries. The meeting provided an expanded view of the issues revealed in the LibQual survey of user response to library services. The ULC heard a report on this meeting in January 2008.

The libraries generally received praise in the dimensions termed "Affect of Service" and "Library as Place." The former represents the service dimension of librarians' work, the latter reflects the improvements in the physical library. There is no doubt that the librarians who assist students and faculty with their library related tasks are a strength of the institution.

The shortcomings of the libraries were identified in the survey and in the town meeting as related to the quality of the libraries' collection. Part of this response is the inevitable difficulties occasioned by the transition to a more fully accessible electronic library. But in addition, it is clear that the erosion of the materials budget has created difficulty for faculty in teaching and research.

The Structural Problem with the Materials Budget

The most severe threat to the libraries is the state of the budget.

Dimensions and causes of the crisis The problem of funding in the materials budget is a result of several factors.

- Consolidation in the publishing industry. The consolidation of publishers and the inelastic

demand curve in library demand for published research have combined to provide a permissive environment for publishers to dramatically increase the prices of published material.

- The commercialization of research publications. The last decade has witnessed many professional organizations that once served as stewards of academic research negotiating publication rights to journal publishing houses. The arrangements, although often retaining some control of content, have subjected the pricing of journals to the market forces above.
- Problems with the US dollar. The diminished purchasing power of the US dollar and the acquisition of American publishing by European publishing houses has meant not only the inflation in the cost of international publications, but even for many American-edited publications.
- The availability of new electronic-driven products. As many print materials have been converted to electronic, minor one-time savings have been realized. But the electronic format has led to the development of significant new library products that employ the computer for ever more sophisticated indexing and cross-referencing. These new products greatly enhance research, but they also are products which a research library must acquire. Because they are new products rather than print-conversions they add significantly to pressure on the materials budget.

Together these four problems have resulted in inflation averaging ten percent per year for nearly two decades. Despite doubling the materials budget over the last eleven years, the university's funding now falls \$ 1.35 million *short of the annual maintenance budget required to provide the same library funded in FY97* (see Appendix D). Thus, the inability and/or unwillingness to match inflation in research materials has led to the current crisis.

Peer Institution Comparison. For many years, comparisons have been made between the university's libraries and those of its peer institutions as a measure of the state of our support. (Currently, we are the significantly smallest library, 46% of mean volumes of our peers and 67% of smallest peer; have access to the fewest journals, 42% of mean serial titles of peers and 75% of the peer with the next fewest; only spend 68% of the mean expenditure of our peers for collections and 92% of our lowest peer.)

Such comparisons at this time serve only to hide the ugly truth: *the more informative comparison today is with an average research library, not our peers.* On this scale we are behind, but not hopelessly so. (Our collection is only 106% of the median collection size of ARL libraries; we own only 81% of the serials titles of the median ARL library; our expenditures for materials are now 95% of the ARL median; and our tenuous position of mediocrity is eroding since we are adding only 72% of what the median ARL library is adding.) The support being received for acquisitions in the university libraries is targeting us to be an average institution, not a world class

institution of distinction. (See Appendix E)

Faculty and student discontent with the resource level. The LibQual survey and the town hall meeting pointed to the state of serials collections and access to the content of academic literature as the focus of discontent with the libraries. Support for the libraries during the debate on the strategic plan is another indication of the concern. The faculty clearly and unequivocally perceive the growing insufficiency of our collections. Graduate students echo this judgment.

Impact on faculty and student research. Another troubling sign of the erosion of our collection is the dramatic increase in interlibrary loan activity. Requests to solicit material not in our collections from other libraries have increased 151 percent over the period 1996-2006 (to give force to the degree to which this is related to the state of our collection realize during that same period request to UM libraries from others libraries increased only 40 percent) and 68 percent in the three years since 2002 when recisions in the materials budget began. This increase obviously challenges the financial benefits of further cuts since expenses including copyright fees are involved for excessive use of interlibrary loan. *We are now cutting into the research so vital to our faculty and students that they are seeking this literature even with the delays inherent in interlibrary loan.*

There is a cruel irony that is increasing the frustrations of users with our collection. The electronic age is supposed to dramatically decrease the time from need to delivery for library resources. But limitations on our library space are pushing more and more of our collection into offsite storage with days of delay in delivery. And subscriptions, licenses, and volumes we do not own are pushing access into interlibrary loan that can lengthen days to weeks. Desktop electronic delivery (available only to faculty) eliminates the trip to pick up material but does not remove the lengthening delays.

The Centrality of the Libraries to Campus

The Council was gratified by the evolution of the strategic plan that identified the library as one of the *critical enablers*: “the essential conditions and tools required in order to achieve the University’s vision.” This speaks to the libraries’ role at the core of what makes a strong university. As an idea, the libraries are an efficiency device, a way for a university to pool its critical need for a connection to the accumulating fruits of research from across the globe. A common library avoids duplication of resource demands and encourages access to resources from other disciplines in the work of researchers. It follows that the libraries are not simply another school competing for the scarce resources of the university. Rather, they are a central institution provided by the campus for the benefit of all the colleges, and all students and faculty. It is that role that the strategic plan emphasizes for the libraries.

As the libraries are a critical enabler, so it follows that they can be critical disablers when the resources are insufficient for achieving the university’s goals. It is that danger that we now face. The insufficiency is documented in the Lib-Qual survey of library users, affirmed in the Town Hall

meeting, acknowledged in the self-study completed in spring 2007 for the Middle States review, and now the strategic plan puts those demands in a context that says inattention to the libraries critically threatens the university's goals to become a world-class university.

Addressing the crisis in requires a repositioning of the libraries as a shared common resource that all on campus call upon as we improve the university, even if our call on the libraries may differ from discipline to discipline. The thinking that the libraries are competitors of the colleges rather than a shared resource for them is a part of the failure of will on this campus in regards to the libraries. Of course, a dollar spent on libraries cannot be spent on hiring teachers or increasing salaries in the colleges. Yet, there is a vast difference between the enhancement of a shared, essential resource, and the zero-sum game of competition among the colleges.

Leadership in the Libraries

Dean Lowry's decision to resign as Dean of Libraries came after the ULC's final meeting of the year, so the ULC did not discuss this eventuality. I am certain that the ULC would have expressed its deep appreciation for Dean Lowry's twelve years of leadership of the libraries. His stewardship will forever be marked as the time when the libraries moved into the electronic era. That very difficult transition has taken place with a sure step and a speed that has facilitated research on the campus. His leadership has made the University Libraries a more responsive and effective institution.

Attention turns inevitably to selecting a new Dean of Libraries. Among the many issues faced in 2008-2009, this will be another that promises to have a long term impact on the quality of the libraries as a shared resource contributing to the teaching and research of the university.

The Prospects for 2008-2009

The next year promises to be a turning point for the funding situation in the libraries. A long series of events will climax this year. Over a three year period we have seen: (1) the Middle States self-study with its identification of addressing the libraries as essential to the campus's progress, (2) the ULC review of the acquisitions budget during the current academic year, (3) the strategic plan's identification of the libraries as a critical enabler to the success of the campus, (4) the Blue Ribbon task force now being appointed by the provost, and (5) the visit of peer library directors planned for the next academic year. Perhaps the search for a new Dean is the sixth element in this chain. The attention of the Senate and the executive committee to issues related to the libraries during 2008-2009 will be crucial to the trajectory of the library for many years to come.

Part III: Recommendations for Senate Attention

1. *Working through the coming reviews with the provost.* If this is a crucial year for the libraries, it is imperative that the Senate continue to monitor the review being conducted

within the provost's office. The Senate and its executive committee are a powerful voice for campus priorities. In its role as a participant in the dialogue about priorities, the council calls on the SEC to help support a continued focus on the library resource crisis and to help with its resolution. The ULC is continually in contact with the provost concerning these issues, but its focus on library issues gives it far less force in communicating the impact of the erosion of the libraries on faculty and student research than can be provided by the SEC.

2. *Addressing the changes in dissemination of scholarly material.* The last two provosts have observed, quite rightly, that a large portion of the difficulty in providing appropriate resources through the library was the inflation in research materials that has averaged 8-10 percent annually over the last two decades. Changes in the way in which scholarship circulates in the academy impact the economics of publishing. The Senate needs to get a handle on these changes. Developing a solution to the libraries crisis will undoubtedly involve an awareness and central response by the faculty. This response certainly involves education of faculty on the changes taking place in different configurations and with different pace in the various academic disciplines that compose the modern university. Two years ago, the Senate Faculty Affairs Committee considered a resolution, similar to that passed at many other universities, calling for an awareness of the behavior of researchers on the economics of the publishing industry. The senate leadership failed to take these issues to the Senate floor. The time for attention to these issues is long overdue. Inaction in the face of the current crisis is eroding the quality of the university by narrowing the quality of its connections to the emerging explosion of research productivity. As the next year proceeds, the Executive Committee should work with the provost's office to provide the leadership in the Senate necessary to effect any solutions proposed for the funding crisis.

Conclusion

The academic year 2007-2008 has been a frustrating one for the University Library Council. The great difficulty in addressing the crisis in the materials budget within the context of difficult economic times has been obvious to the council. The ray of hope is the curve now in place toward addressing the structural problems that have created this crisis. We very much appreciate the support of Chair Montgomery, Chair Elect Holum who has served as the Senate's ad hoc member of the ULC, the Senate Executive Committee, and the Senate Office in our endeavors.

Approved by the ULC and respectfully submitted, July 2008

Jim Klumpp, Chair
James Baeder
Sue Baughman, Dean's Representative
Bernard Cooperman
Kurt Finsterbusch

Sandra Greer
Trudi Bellardo Hahn
Ken Holum, Senate's Representative
Oliver Kim
Heather Nathans
John Newhagen
Phyllis Peres, Provost's Representative
Carlen Ruschoff
Bjørn Stillion Southard
Ray Weil

Appendix A: Review of Management of Acquisitions Budget
Appendix B: Resolution Calling for A Blue Ribbon Task Force
Appendix C: Resolution on Offsite Storage Facility
Appendix D: Changes in Library Budget, FY97-08
Appendix E: Power Point on Comparison of UM Libraries with Peer Institutions

Copies: Nariman Farvardin, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost
Charles Lowry, Former Dean of Libraries
Desidor Viktor, Interim Dean of Libraries
Ken Holum, University Senate Chair, 2008-2009
Martha Nell Smith, Chair-select of the ULC
Members of the ULC

Appendix A

Review of Management of Acquisitions Budget

Review of Management of Acquisitions Budget

Section 1: Description of the Review

During the 2007-2008 academic year, the University Library Council (ULC) conducted an extensive review of the policies guiding the expenditure of the acquisitions budget. In September the ULC met with the provost, who requested that the council review expenditure processes with attention to maximizing the value of the funding. In October the council gathered relevant policies that guide the distribution of the acquisitions budget with the assistance of the Libraries' Collection Management Department. During November and December the ULC met with those in the libraries charged with decisions on acquisitions. A series of proposed changes emerged from these sessions that guided the ULC's discussions in January through April. This report describes the conclusions drawn from these discussions.

Section 2: General comments on the crisis in collections

The review of the policies was a discouraging exercise tinged with desperation. It became clear to the ULC that regardless of how the deck chairs were arranged, the Titanic was sinking. Strategies for survival have kicked in and provide as much as can be expected.

Nevertheless, the message is clear: If the greatness of a university depends on access by its students and faculty to the accumulated knowledge of inquiry, Maryland will not become a great university without addressing the state of support for its shared research collections. For many years, comparisons have been made between the university's libraries and those of its peer institutions as a measure of the state of our support. Currently, among our peers, we are the significantly smallest library (46% of mean volumes of peers, 67% of our smallest peer); have access to the fewest journals (42% of mean serial titles of peers, 75% of next fewest peer); only spend 68% of the mean expenditure of our peers for collections and 92% of our lowest peer.

Such comparisons at this time serve only to hide the ugly truth: the more informative comparison is with an *average* research library, not our peers. On this scale we are behind, but not hopelessly so. Our collection is only slightly larger (106%) than the median collection size of ARL libraries; we own only 81% of the serials titles of the median ARL library; our expenditures for materials are now 95% of the ARL median; and our tenuous position of mediocrity is eroding since we are adding only 72% of what the median ARL library is adding. The support being received for acquisitions in the university libraries is targeting us to be an average institution, not a world class institution of distinction.

Although certainly there is some failure of will in funding the libraries, the principal problem is the impact of the economic dislocations in publishing of academic material and their impact on the purchasing power of funding. Library materials continue to inflate at approximately ten percent per year. The libraries, the faculty of the institution, and the administration can all lament this fact, but at the moment only the libraries are taking *any* positive action to address the problem. The University Senate had the opportunity a couple years ago to address the problem but ultimately passed. The administration for several years had a program in place to recognize the inflation but in times of budget constraint abandoned it. The administration has exempted the libraries' materials budget from selected budget cuts during this time, but the limits of this approach are evident in the fact that today the libraries are \$ 1.35 million dollars per year short of funding the *same* library that they funded in FY97 (see appendix D). The libraries' record of pursuing strategies to manage the cost structure as well as it can be managed is not being matched by our other sponsors.

The strategies that we identified within the libraries are numerous. The library has managed the transformation to electronic resources with sophisticated policies that maximize the speed of conversion without sacrificing the safety of the collection. The library has pursued several joint purchase agreements, particularly through the USMAI libraries, although such agreements are often constrained by anti-trust restrictions. Purchases are managed through pre-payment, profiled approval plans, and other arrangements that earn per item discounts. Furthermore, policies outline active processes of reallocation that update acquisitions as fields of study and the university's priorities change. The effort of the libraries to maximize savings in a way that is consistent with their mission appears to the ULC to be substantial.

In sum, the ULC's investigation affirmed:

- The principal problem in the current crisis is the failure to adjust the funding in the face of great inflation in publishing.
- This problem is made more severe by decades of insufficiency in funding the libraries' collections at rates comparable to research libraries at public universities such as our peers.
- The problem has reached a critical point in which the viability of UM libraries as a research facility is at risk.

After extensive investigation, perhaps the most thorough external investigation in decades, the ULC is generally satisfied that the library has been a good steward of resources in this time of crisis.

Section 3: Recommendations to address the materials crisis

In moving to recommendations to the libraries, two observations form a context for our work. First, even though we applaud the stewardship of the libraries over the acquisitions process, we did find places where we believe current policies are not bearing their full fruit and places where

we believe changes in policy are appropriate. Second, we recognize that during the length of time required for a thorough review such as ours, the acquisition decisions at the library do not stop. Therefore, we have divided our recommendations into those for immediate implementation to meet the current crisis and those that have a longer term impact and that we expect to be implemented in FY2010 and FY2011.

Current Recommendation 3.1

The erosion of the materials budget over the last few years has restricted the university's acquisition of new products, particularly electronic resources. The ULC recommends **that the libraries take deeper cuts than are required by the FY09 budget to permit greater reallocation of funds toward additional purchases, subscriptions, and licenses.**

Current Recommendation 3.2

The ULC considered the role of aggregators (databases that collect journals and provide indexing to their inventory) as a substitute for subscriptions to individual journals. When the university licenses an aggregator it does not acquire the content of the journals, only temporary access to them. Thus, the vicissitudes of the aggregator's contracts with journals in future years determines the university's archive. In short, the university loses control of the journal archive and cannot assure an archive of content for its investment. In addition, typically journals will embargo current issues in their contract with the aggregator, thus denying the most current research to our researchers. On balance, the ULC believes that access to journal content *only* through aggregators presents substantial disadvantages to a research library. Such aggregators should be exploited primarily for their search capabilities, even with the full text access they may coincidentally provide. Nevertheless, when making decisions about journals to cut from the libraries subscription lists, availability from an aggregator may properly influence decisions on particular journals. The ULC recommends **that the libraries compile and provide to decision makers in the serials process, including departmental liaisons, information on current aggregator journal access. This information should be accompanied by explanation of the limitations of aggregator access.**

Current Recommendation 3.3

The ULC reviewed the "pay-per-view" (PPV) option offered by some publishers. Under this option the university does not purchase the archive for the journal in a subscription, but licenses access to the archive on a per-article basis. The difference between the PPV option and acquiring an article through interlibrary loan is seamless to the user, unless the PPV option is available electronically in real time. In the latter case the PPV option and normal subscription access are seamless to the user. PPV also has the drawback of the university not owning the archive, thus continued access to the material depends on the continued availability of PPV from the publisher. Thus, the PPV cost is cumulative over years, so quantifying savings can be difficult. The ULC is concerned that the use of the "PPV" label not mislead users (see Appendix A.1). Nevertheless, PPV ought be pursued either as a direct access strategy or as an ILL strategy if it saves money. The ULC recommends that **collection management design a limited experiment to test the economics of true pay-per-view.**

The ULC intends that the libraries should implement the three recommendations above as soon as possible, including for FY09.

Recommendation 3.4

Generally, the response to budgetary constraints has been an annual assessment and response in collection management. We believe that the current crisis is severe enough that this horizon is no longer appropriate. Thus, **the ULC charged collection management to develop a multiyear plan for addressing the crisis and present it to the ULC in Fall 2009 for review and recommendation.**

Section 4: Analysis of present library collection decision policies and infrastructure

The ULC considered a broad range of current policies and processed a number of proposals to alter them (See Appendix A and below). Generally our approach was to be critical of these policies, to understand the reasons for them, and to see if they were meeting their objectives. We recognize that libraries have a responsibility in tight budget times to maximize return on the collections dollar in every way they can. But we also recognize that libraries also have a stewardship imperative that goes beyond current funding and is continually cognizant to the responsibility of a library in a research institution as an ongoing resource for the accumulation of knowledge. In short, library materials expenditures are not simply for consumables but also are an investment that must be maintained and grown to serve the university's future. We believe that the current collection policies demonstrate the balance required between prudence of expenditure and responsibility to maintain a research collection. We believe, however, that there are substantial problems with the infrastructure that implements those policies. We therefore recommend **immediate priority in collection management, and in central library administration where required, to the infrastructure supporting acquisition policies.**

The Structure of Acquisitions

Generally, the acquisition of material falls into four categories. These are treated differently in policies and have different decision structures. Those decision structures involve in some way four influences: (1) defined policies, (2) the central collection managers of UM libraries, (3) the selectors assigned to various academic disciplines, and (4) the users represented most prominently by liaisons to the library in each department or college.

- 1) Books and monographs. The bulk of purchasing in this category is made through a profiled purchasing plan. This structure saves considerable cost to the library and avoids a labor intensive book selection process. Exceptions, books or monographs falling outside the plan or rejected under the profile but still needed by users, are supported through budgets for departments
- 2) Journal and periodical subscriptions. The bulk of subscriptions for journals are managed through a process that identifies subscriptions with particular academic departments or colleges. (A small number of subscriptions are managed as "general interest.") A well

developed process of triennial review provides for reallocation of these funds within departmental lists. There is no distinction within this process between electronic and paper journals. Migration from paper to electronic access to journals is governed by defined library policies.

- 3) Electronic Databases. Today these fall into two general categories. The first make material formerly in print available in electronic format. Typically these products enhance the search and indexing capabilities in using the material. The second are new products that accumulate electronic material under a single search capability. Notable in this last category are journal aggregators that make many journal titles available with overarching search capabilities. The journals included in these arrangements are under license to the aggregator and cannot be controlled by individual libraries. Decisions on databases are centralized in the library. This arrangement seems appropriate because of the high cost and interdisciplinary content of such databases. Review of these new products has been managed in the past through a “big ticket item” competition, but that has been suspended recently because of the lack of funds to support new high-cost purchases. Collection management is currently conducting a review of aggregators to assess duplication of content with an eye toward cancelling expensive databases that do not justify their cost with unique material.
- 4) Standing orders, serial publications, and occasional monograph series. These are managed within the processes employed for journal and periodical review.

The ULC reviewed this structure and policies that support it. The council notes that the libraries articulate a philosophy that, to the extent practical, decisions on collections should involve the academic units most closely related to the subject matter of a portion of the collection. We endorse that philosophy. But we also identify some weaknesses in the infrastructure supporting that philosophy and in its current implementation.

Books and Monographs

We have no recommendations in terms of the current process in books and monographs. The combination of profiled purchase with a flexible supplement process seems to balance efficiency and the quality of the collection. We do note, however, that the viability of the system supplementing the profiled purchase with a user-sensitive budget depends on the robustness of user input processes. Our analysis and recommendations below point to weaknesses in that system that need attention.

Journals and Periodicals, print and electronic

We spent considerable time and effort on the process through which journal and periodical subscriptions are cancelled and reallocated. That process continuously reallocates scarce journal resources towards the needs of the various academic disciplines established as priorities by UM. The process, when it functions well, provides consultation with users in shaping the collection. At the same time, our analysis indicates the potential for two undesirable side-effects that would

deserve attention: (1) Cross disciplinary research is disadvantaged; and (2) Currently no mechanism for redressing disparity in depth of cuts across disciplines.

Recommendation 4.1

The ULC recommends that the libraries develop a method for assessing these two side-effects of the current process, and explore options to address the problem.

Beyond these side-effects, the ULC also identified a series of weaknesses in the implementation of current journal review policy that are tied to the infrastructure for that process. (See Appendix B). We list these here:

- The quality of consultation with users depends on a liaison system that has not been upgraded at this point in response to earlier reviews and plans. Through one of its subcommittees the ULC has expressed dissatisfaction with the lack of urgency to this point in addressing fundamental weaknesses in the liaison system. (see Appendix C)
- The process lacks intensive and uniform training of faculty contacts that are to participate in this consultation. Current training relies on the decentralized contacts between selectors and departmental liaisons, a system that is uneven at best.
- The terms of the expectations in the library and among the faculty about departmental involvement in the process are unclear. Certainly selectors bring expertise that faculty do not have, and faculty bring a knowledge of needs of their department's research and teaching that the libraries do not have. Is the relationship one in which the selectors will make decisions with input from faculty? Is it a joint decision making process between libraries and departments? Are faculty to be participants at all in the decision or merely data-points with a role similar to data on usage, inflation, price of serial, and so forth? Roles need to be clarified.
- The criteria that should guide decisions are not clear, and where those criteria are chosen is not clear. Should academic units be in on this process? Partnership? Is the development of criteria the domain of centralized collection management?
- Consultation with departments after lists of discontinued subscriptions have been compiled is flawed. The length of this list alone is a barrier to effective consultation, and the time provided has to be sufficient to allow reasoned decisions.
- Usage data available in this process, while seemingly improving, do not appear to rise to the quality commensurate with a high priority in decisions about serials. There is widespread distrust of these data and confusion about its robustness does not provide an endorsement for their use. This problem leads to flaws in other statistics as well such as a "cost per use" figure. Usage data seem in theory to be useful, but the libraries either need to work to improve these data or recognize that they are insufficient for decision making.

An attitude that “this is the best we can do at this time” is corroding of the integrity and legitimacy of the serial selection process.

Where in other times these flaws might be tolerated, these weaknesses simply must be addressed by the libraries because cuts now being made are eroding collections in fundamentally corrosive ways.

Recommendation 4.2

Clarify the philosophy, expectations, and roles of academic units and selectors in making decisions about collections.

Recommendation 4.3

Establish better training for faculty in departments involved in the process.

Recommendation 4.4

Clarify criteria that should frame decisions and the methods by which such criteria may be evaluated and altered.

Recommendation 4.5

Develop a realistic calendar for annual decisions that respects faculty input and permits sufficient decision timetables within the library. That timetable should recognize reduced faculty availability over the summer.

Recommendation 4.6

Study and make recommendations for ULC review of ways to expedite the second round of review (following the identification of journals for elimination from the subscription list). The objective of this review should be to provide manageable processes to permit input from departmental liaisons in the process.

Recommendation 4.7

We recommend an intensive review of the data profile provided to liaisons in making decisions. This includes realistic assessment of the quality of the data and communication of the reliability of the data to those involved in decision making. The purview of such a review should include ways to strengthen data. This review might be best implemented by a task force composed of management, library selectors, and departmental liaisons, and it should make a report to the ULC.

Electronic Databases

There is probably no place within the materials budget where the impact of the budget problems has been felt as severely as in electronic databases. These are often expensive to license (the library calls them “big ticket items”). In addition, the problem with these is not simply inflation in licensing fees but also that new products are always coming on the market that return value but for considerable expenditure. In times of budget crisis, the dimensions of these expenditure

demands erodes other collections more rapidly.

The ULC acknowledges the libraries' current effort to review aggregators for duplications that may lead to cancellations of licenses. In addition, we have acknowledged the need to examine the importance and value of new products in recommendation 3.2.

Database decisions are made above the departmental level. We do not see that this should be any different. But we do believe that effective methods of discerning research needs for these databases are important to the decisions on these databases.

Standing orders, serial publications, and occasional monograph series

Because the process for these publications parallels that for journals and periodicals, our observations about weaknesses in the infrastructure of that process address this process.

Section 5: Conclusion

The general result of the ULC's review of the current materials budget is a sense of the inadequacy of current funding and a general appreciation for the careful management of that budget by the libraries. Yet, with no prospect for improvement in funding in the near future, even limited flaws in the decision making process become important in maintaining the collection. We sense a turning point has been reached where over the next few years current practices and policies are going to be reviewed to insure that decisions are as sound as possible. We hope the libraries will consult the ULC regularly during that review.

At the same time, we repeat that it is imperative that the university administration work to provide funding for library materials consistent with the university's role as a research institution. We note that over the last two years provosts have granted the materials budget exemption from some of the severest of the budget cuts suffered throughout the institution. This exemption has helped in the short term. Yet, a sound collection for a major world-class university library will require that the evolving policy and procedures of the library be supplemented by attention to the structural problems in funding the libraries' collections.

Recommendation 5.1

We recommend that, in addition to consultation on specific recommendations indicated above, the libraries return to the ULC no later than Spring 2011 with a comprehensive report on the implementation of these recommendations.

Approved by the University Library Council, July 2008

Appendix B

Resolution Calling for a Blue Ribbon Task Force

February 2008

A Resolution of the University Library Council February 2008

Whereas, the provost has noted that the university's aspiration to be a top ten public institution will be questionable without access to the research and teaching resources of a top ten university library;

Whereas, the university community consistently identifies the collections of the university libraries as inadequate even to their minimal expectations for a library at a research institution (University Library LibQual survey);

Whereas, this response is consistent with statistics indicating that the university's library system, comparable to four of its peers in 1990, has fallen to last among its peer institutions by a wide margin (Association of Research Library statistics);

Whereas, the high levels of inflation in the cost of library materials that have eroded the university's collections show no sign of easing in the future;

Whereas, the electronic revolution is now producing significant improved products to enhance research and teaching, resources that greatly increase the demands on the libraries' budget to license such materials;

Whereas, over just the last two years the university libraries have initiated cuts that canceled nearly one-fourth of all journal subscriptions and licenses;

Whereas, the real dollars (adjusted for inflation in library materials) to support the libraries' collections have fallen by over \$1 million since 1997 despite increases in actual dollars (statistics supplied by the library and provost's office);

Whereas, estimates of future trends indicate another \$1.9 million shortfall in funds necessary to support current collection levels by FY11, necessitating another 20 percent cut in acquisitions (collection management office);

Whereas, best forecasts are that funding from state and tuition sources that traditionally support the library budget will not increase significantly in the coming years;

Whereas, our assessment is that the burden of this erosion in the quality of the libraries' collections has fallen most heavily on the research mission of the university, including the interdisciplinary and specialized literature that defines the frontier of research interest;

Whereas, the Middle States Self-Study endorsed by the university recommends an assessment of the state of the library as a central campus resource;

and whereas, the campus is currently engaged in an exercise of strategic planning, and the state of the central campus library resources certainly has strategic implications on the future success of the campus as a research and teaching institution;

Be it therefore resolved that the University Library Council calls upon the provost of the University of Maryland to convene a task force including outstanding researchers and teachers from across the campus to envision the collection for the University of Maryland libraries appropriate to the research and teaching expectations of the university. We recommend that such a task force:

1. Within the framework of the university's strategic plan, identify the goals and characteristics of a top ten public university library system charged with providing a central collection of research materials to its students and faculty;
2. Assess the current collections of the University of Maryland libraries using this standard;
3. Propose strategies that it deems appropriate to provide such a library to the students and faculty of the University of Maryland.

Approved unanimously by the University Library Council at its meeting, February 1, 2008.

Appendix C

Resolution on Offsite Storage

February 2008



UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNICATION

2130 Skinner Building
College Park, Maryland 20742-7635
301.405.8979 TEL 301.314.9471 FAX
www.comm.umd.edu

February 25, 2008

To: Provost Nariman Farvardin
From: University Library Council
James F. Klumpp, Chair
Re: Resolution on offsite storage

In response to your request, at its February 21, 2008, meeting, the University Library Council reviewed the material justifying the request for funding for the University System of Maryland (USM) sponsored offsite shelving facility to accommodate, preserve, and service the library collections of The Johns Hopkins University (JHU) and all of the USM institutions. After that review, the Council approved the following resolution relating to the need for the facility at the University of Maryland (UM):

In order to continue our course towards excellence and to maintain a library collection appropriate to our peer institutions, the University must continue to acquire library materials at an accelerated rate. To address the storage and access issues that this policy implies, the University Library Council:

- 1) recognizes the need for an expansion of the off-site storage capacity for the University Libraries.
- 2) endorses proceeding with construction of a jointly administered site with Johns Hopkins University as outlined in the proposal, assuming a suitable partnership agreement.
- 3) recommends that, in activating this facility, the University and the University Libraries should:
 - a) continue to explore alternative possibilities for efficient volume storage on or near campus or in collaboration with other area institutions;
 - b) negotiate (and enforce) legal arrangements with JHU that increase UM control over pricing and other matters at the jointly administered facility;
 - c) explore methods for de-accessioning multiple copies of volumes held in storage by the various institutions, guaranteeing however that we will gain permanent equal rights of access to all volumes held jointly in the storage facility;

- d) explore alternative methods of delivery from storage (such as high quality scanning on demand or page turning technology supporting online browsing of monographs);
 - e) explore possibilities for increasing the flexibility of the current system so as to allow transfer of material from off-site storage back into the current collection as needed;
 - f) continue to evaluate the methods and results of off-site storage as part of the collection development policy of the libraries.
- xc: Charles Lowry, Dean of Libraries
William Montgomery, Chair of the Campus Senate
University Library Council

Appendix D

Changes in Library Budget, FY97-08

**UM Libraries Acquisitions Budget*
Hard Budget FY97-FY08**

Fiscal Year	Increase to base	Decrease to base	Estimated Serials Inflation (%)	Estimated Monograph Inflation (%)	Budget to maintain FY97 Collection level †	Total base budget for materials
FY97	--	--	10	4.5		\$4,577,601
FY98	--	--	10	1.9	\$ 4,941,566	4,577,601
FY99	\$1,400,000	--	10	1.3	5,303,559	5,977,601
FY00	120,000	--	10	.03	5,686,084	6,097,601
FY01	1,250,000	--	10	.4	6,168,095	7,347,601
FY02	500,000		7.5	.8	6,524,038	7,847,601
FY03	360,000	\$158,163	9	1.9	6,993,264	8,049,438
FY04	395,500	606,782	10	7.1	7,629,838	7,838,156
FY05	400,000	94,058	10	2.2	8,265,103	8,144,098
FY06	250,000	--	8	7.8	8,904,066	8,394,098
FY07	300,000	--	8	10	9,608,591	8,694,098
FY08	400,000		10	4.4 ‡	10,440,161	9,094,098
TOTAL	\$5,375,500	\$859,003			(\$ 1,346,063) Shortfall	\$4,516,497 Net Change

* The above figures are exclusively hard budgeted amounts for the years in which they occurred. These figures may differ significantly from actual expenditures due to the carry-over of encumbrances and prepays from year to year. Some increases, as well as decreases, began as soft money adjustments in the previous year. For instance, soft money adjustments to the FY97 and FY98 budgets were a total of \$1 million, which prevented any cuts in journals or other acquisitions purchasing during those years. These funds were not hard budgeted until FY99 and were supplemented by an additional hard budget increase of \$400,000. A soft money increase in FY07 for new programs was not continued in FY08, in effect halving the FY08 increase in net funds. Thus the net change from FY97 to FY08 has been \$4,316,497 or a nearly a doubling in spite of the Annapolis mandated budget cuts of FY03-FY05. It is worth noting that the only increase that was specifically awarded in excess of inflation was for the FY01 budget that was intended to make gains in collecting. The result was the only significant annual expansion of the serial and book acquisition that has occurred since 1991. For the 10-year period the UM Libraries experienced an inflation rate that has been fairly stable if higher than the CPI or HEPI, at 8-10%.

† Estimated budget compiled by taking FY97 budget, inflating the serials portion by the serial inflation rate for each year, and the monograph portion by the monographs inflation rate for each year. The binding and preservation services portion of the budget is set by contract and inflated by the terms of the contract. This contract is up for renegotiation in FY08.

‡ Preliminary Estimate

Appendix E

Power Point on Comparison of UM Libraries with Peer Institutions

Assessment and Response

Problems motivating current ULC
actions

State of collection is identified by faculty
as **greatest failing** of library

- In Lib-Qual survey, the materials availability factor is **27%** below faculty's definition of "satisfactory" collection, and even 15% below the definition of a "minimum" collection

LibQual survey of library patrons, Fall 2004

- Library summit reported **deterioration in access** to resources for research *and teaching*

Report on Library Summit, December 2007

Comparison with peers shows faculty reports are **realistic assessment** of collection

- We are the significantly **smallest** library; **46%** of mean volumes of our peers; 67% of smallest peer (UNC)
- We have access to the **fewest** journals; **42%** of mean serial titles of peers; 75% of next fewest peer (UNC)
- We only spend **68%** of the mean expenditure of our peers for collections (\$9.2M versus \$12.8m); 92% of our lowest peer (UNC: \$9.4m)

ARL statistics FY06 (excluding law and medical libraries)

We are not closing the gap; we are **widening the distance** to being the library of a **top 10** university

- We are adding **fewer** volumes than any of our peers: **29%** of the mean of our peers; only **58%** of our closest peer (UCLA) in FY06
- Our serials collection has fallen from **50%** of the mean of peers in FY01 to **42%** of mean in FY06

ARL statistics, FY01, FY06 (excluding law and medical libraries)

We are in a position where being an average research library is now threatened

- Our collection is only 106% of the median collection size for ARL libraries
- We own only 81% of the serials titles of the median ARL library
- Our expenditures for materials are now 95% of the ARL median
- This tenuous position of mediocrity is eroding; we are adding only 72% of what the median ARL library is adding

ARL statistics, FY06

Our current trajectory **worsens** the problem rather than addressing it

- In real dollars (materials budget adjusted for materials inflation), despite doubling our gross expenditures on materials, the annual materials budget is now over **a million dollars short** of *maintaining* the collection we had in 1994.
- The library estimates that by FY2011, without increases in the materials budget, we will lose another **\$1.9 million** of purchasing power; a further cut of 20% in library resources available to our campus.

from data provided by library and provost's office

Aside from comparisons, the **dimensions** of the current cuts are dramatic

- **25%** of our current journals have been cut in the last two years
 - By FY2011, nearly **half the current journal subscriptions** of two years ago will be gone
 - Our effective cut in published monographs over the last two years is around **18%**
 - By FY2011, we will be receiving **only around 60 percent** of the published scholarly monographs we received two years ago
-

The widening gap of our resources is falling on **vital** aspects of the university's research goals

- As our collections retreat to core holdings in disciplines, **interdisciplinary** holdings have been eroded.
- The **depth** of our collection has eroded as core holdings are maintained and more specialized research literature eliminated.
- **Foreign language** resources have eroded even as research is internationalizing.
- **Ancillary collections** (such as law and medical) that support our research are targeted since they do not relate directly to the disciplinary matrix of our teaching mission at College Park
- As our resources erode, interlibrary loan requests have increased (up 151% from 1996 to 2006; 68% since 2002), forcing a **protracted timeline** for research projects and grant applications depending on access to past literature

from review of titles cut for FY07, FY08

The problem with the library budget appears **structural**, not transitional

- Library materials support is generated from state/tuition funds. The president has indicated **state funds will not increase** in the foreseeable future. With tuition increases now central to state politics, **revenue from tuition will also be a limited source of funds**
- President urges improvement in research funding, but library support included in **overhead** for research grants is **siphoned to other uses** and never reaches the library
- President urges foundation support, but foundation support **does not generally support maintenance**, nor are general library collections a priority for donors.

President's speech to University Senate, September 2007

We approach crisis . . .

- We still have an excellent **undergraduate** quality library
 - The library that would support a **top ten** research institution is **receding** farther into the distance
 - Our standing as even an **average** research library is **now in the balance**.
-

Approaches guiding and being considered by ULC

1. ULC is addressing a list of specific questions from the library collection management team to guide the immediate cuts that are being implemented in the collection
 2. ULC is conducting a more general review of the libraries' policies that currently shape the process and product of collection decisions.
 3. ULC is considering issuing a “worst case” challenge to the library, recognizing that the fundamental nature of the library as a resource is changing and asking the library to plan for a library whose goals fall short of a top ten, or even a top flight research institution.
 4. ULC is considering a challenge to the provost (or to our three sponsors), declaring that we perceive an emergency, that we judge the status of the library as a facility for researchers seriously at risk, and requesting that the provost appoint a blue ribbon task force to assess the kind of library we should expect at a top ten research institution and advise the provost on what would be needed to provide such a library for the use of our researchers and students.
-

To take back to the ULC

- Your response to the blue ribbon proposal?
 - Your suggestions on how we can assist you in addressing what we perceive as crisis?
-