Senate Library Advisory Committee
Monday, October 30, 2000, 1:00 pm
Library South Colloquium Room 8th floor

Present: Philo Hutcheson (Chair), Charlene Hurt, Sadhna Diwan, Bill Evans, Brian Jefferson, Hugo Mendez, Roger Presley (Guest – Pullen Budget Ofc), Michael Vaughn, Tom Whalen and Linda Vincent.

Several Pullen budget charts were reviewed and discussed with the following observations:

Chart on Recent Materials Budgets Comparison with Peer Institutions – The peer institutions are from a list recognized by the Board of Regents as such. Not all peer institutions responded. It was recommended that George Mason, Temple and Wayne State be contacted again for data. Also that law and medical library data not be included if at all possible and to remove aspirational institutions (Univ of Calif at Irvine and Univ of Washington). Also requested was that the comparison be made according to FTE per capita and change the data sort to chart from the largest to the smallest budget. Compared to the institutions charted, Pullen ranked low with only two institutions having lower budgets.

A question was raised as to whether or not Galileo was included in the data presented. Galileo offerings were considered but not included in our numbers. R. Presley stated that an estimate may be obtained from the membership for inclusion.

Changes in Budget FY 96-00 – Overall observation was that Pullen was showing good strides; however, it was agreed that the Library and SLAC should continue to request increases in the base budget while relying less on the contingency budget. The question was raised, how common is funding with contingency versus base funds? C. Hurt indicated that there was a long history at Georgia State University (GSU), but she had not encountered it as much at other institutions. T. Crimmins indicated that the contingency funds give GSU the ability to handle funds from one fiscal year to the next without losing funds.

It was recommended that Pullen inquire of peer institutions how much of their budgets come from contingency funds versus base budget funds. This information could be used in support of Pullen’s request to increase base and decrease contingency funding.

C. Hurt indicated that there is one policy change Pullen is contemplating, which is to not spend as much on books.

% Of Book Prices to CPI – The strong drop in the area of book price for Pullen is probably attributable to the initiation of the approval plan and will probably begin to move upward again.

Cumulative % Increase of Periodical Prices FY 96-00 – In reviewing this chart, discussion turned to the vendors for electronic journals. There appear to be monopolistic practices in place. C. Hurt indicated that there is a lot of press on this subject, especially with publishers outside of the US. There is activity to reduce the vendors’ hold on the market. The SPARC group, which Pullen belongs, is encouraging scholarly societies to compete with the biggest STM publishers to keep costs down. Most institutions have not realized the saving in increasing purchases of electronic resources.

Growth in Electronic Journal Titles – The data do not include Galileo journals. Some of the journals have duplicate print copies; varies according to the packet purchased. C. Hurt indicated that databases might include more than one title. There are approximately 9000 titles in Pullen and Galileo combined.
Relationship of Total Budget to Electronic Expenditures – P. Hutcheson indicated that it was important to show the Library was making an effort to increase electronic resources. T. Crimmins recommended showing the dollar amounts. C. Hurt asked the committee to show the chart to colleagues and let the Library know their response. Any increase in the Library’s budget needs faculty support.

T. Crimmins indicated that one strategy would be to cut print copy of materials available in Galileo. C. Hurt stated that publishers are protecting the market for print copies. Even in consortia agreements, there’s usually a requirement to retain a print subscription or pay the equivalent. C. Hurt – Galileo has more popular journals whereas Pullen purchases most scholarly journals. Pullen is working through ASERL to drop titles in JSTOR where each institution agrees to keep certain titles, eliminating duplicates. Pullen is systematically reducing duplication. For example, Pullen no longer subscribes to the Journal of Academic Librarianship in paper. The committee asked that a strategy be drafted and presented to SLAC for sharing with their respective constituencies.

L. Vincent questioned the impact of this reduction on ILL and whether faculty realizes the turnaround time might increase on ILL requests. C. Hurt said the focus is on electronic journals. JSTOR is microfilm backup and also a format that patrons use infrequently. S. Diwan suggested that the use of CARL UnCover might lessen the impact on ILL.

Other topics:

Student Technology Fee – Of the 16 proposals submitted; eight were approved fully for the current semester and four for future semester.

Universal Borrowing – GIL is developing a system for universal borrowing among state supported college and university libraries and eventually may try to expand this to all of Georgia.

S. Diwan raised the issue of Library Access for student with disabilities – C. Hurt indicated that technology fee requests in support of increasing access were moved up in priority. Disability Services prefer that students work through that office. Pullen does have magnifying readers on the second floor of Library South. Pullen is conscience of the widths maintained between the stacks for access and has several wheelchair accessible computer terminals. C. Hurt will check if there is anything else and is open to any suggestions to add equipment to increase access for those students with disabilities.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:20 pm.

Next meeting is November 30, 2000.

Carmen Newton
Library Human Resources Officer
Recorder