MINUTES

Library Faculty Meeting
Tuesday, April 20, 2004
3:00-4:30 pm
Illini Union, Room 314B

Paula Kaufman, presiding, called the meeting to order at 3:00 pm after it was determined that a quorum was present. Thanks were given to Scott Schwartz and Alvan Bregman for their classical guitar duet performance preceding the meeting.

1. Approval of faculty meeting minutes of February 17, 2004
   The minutes were approved by a motion from Bill Maher, seconded by Jo Kibbee.

2. Introduction of new librarians
   Sue Searing introduced Ron Banks as the half-time Visiting Reference Coordinator in the Education and Social Science Library. Ron joined the Library on March 22, and is taking over coordination of reference activities and supervision of graduate assistants formerly handled by Lynne Rudasill, who is now spending half her time as the Global Studies Librarian at the campus Center for Global Studies.

   Ron has an undergraduate degree in therapeutic recreation and the MLIS from UIUC, with a master's degree in special education from SIU-Carbondale. Previous positions include working at the library of the Virginia Commonwealth University and, for the past eight years, working at the ERIC Clearinghouse on Elementary and Early Childhood Education. His most recent activities there included supervising the information services operation and Live virtual reference. He will be the administrator for the Education and Social Science Library’s Live Chat operation that will roll out this fall. Currently he is immersed in Graduate Assistant hiring.

3. University Librarian’s report - Kaufman

   Paula issued a welcome back to Caroline Szylowicz. She informed everyone that Bruce Swann was released today from the hospital. He is on his way to full recovery from pneumonia and she gave thanks to the Arts and Humanities people for helping with the Classics library. She also announced that Jing Liao has been battling cancer and hopes to be back by fall.

   Paula thanked everyone for the turn out for the National Library Workers day. It was a fun celebration, and she intends for it to be an annual event. She then asked people to go to the 1st floor of the main library and read what colleagues have written.

   She alerted the faculty that the upcoming issue of Inside Illinois will have an article about serials pricing issues along with an article on Sousa Archives and Center for Band Research.
Paula also reminded the faculty that Doug Vinzant will be in the Illini Union, Friday at 8:30, to talk about current state prospects and budget and help us to understand the politics in Springfield.

Jo Kibbee asked if he will be giving a presentation. Paula answered that yes, there will be a presentation as well as a question and answer session.

4. **Committee reports**
   Executive Committee – German

The Executive Committee has met three times since our last faculty meeting. We met on April 7th, April 14th, and April 19th.

At the April 7th meeting, we discussed the FY05 budget with Rod Allen. He gave such a clear presentation that we asked him to come talk to us today to help set the stage for our discussions. We discussed several personnel matters and recommended a paper preparer for an untenured faculty member. EC assigned peer review committees and assigned replacements for committee members that were leaving the library. We approved the name change proposed by Becky Smith from the Commerce Library to the Business and Economics Library. During question time Paula shared information about the Library's Budget Hearing. We also discussed the seating (or lack of it) in the tunnel. Paula will ask Jeff to put a note out explaining what is happening.

During question time at the April 14th meeting, we asked about the time frame for selection of reviewers for promotion cases. The P&T calendar was checked and Division Coordinators were reminded of the April 1st deadline.

We also asked about the replacement for the Liberty Dial Service. [At yesterday's AC meeting, Systems recommended using a phone card and dialing into CITES not using the 800 number.] We discussed possible early promotion cases. Should candidates decide to proceed, EC recommended the paper preparers.

Evaluators were also selected for a promotion and tenure case. EC brainstormed names to forward for the portraiture request as asked for by the Chancellor’s Committee on the Status of Women. Names selected included Katherine Sharp, Eleanor Blum, Martha Friedman, Sara Lo, and Marion Sparks.

We received an update on a possible spousal hire. EC began discussing the issue of the number of divisions that was brought up at a faculty meeting. We discussed the original intent of the divisional structure, how they function now, and how we would like them to function in the future. We will continue this discussion at a future meeting.

Most of the meeting on the 19th was devoted to discussing the FY 05 operational budget document. We discussed a personnel matter. EC also discussed paper
preparer assignments again and asked Paula to have Kim work on gathering a list of experienced paper preparers and paper preparer interns.

There were no questions.

5. Other reports

Rod Allen made a short presentation (similar to the one he made for EC) regarding the Library budget. Overheads for the talk are included in the formatted version of this minutes document, and will be attached as an Excel File.

Overhead One: Where the Budget Started This Year (FY04)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel</th>
<th>$16,244,551</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>$7,469,366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas</td>
<td>$1,036,435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Ac</td>
<td>$6,800,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wages</td>
<td>$938,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Collections $11,337,886
Operating $1,958,436
FY04 Total $29,540,873

Overhead Two: The FY04 State Budget for the Library

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY04 STATE BUDGET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$6,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$8,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$12,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$14,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$16,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$18,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Personnel $16,244,551 54.99%
Collections $11,337,886 38.38%
Operating $1,958,436 6.63%
### Overhead Three: Pie Chart of FY04 Library Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>FY04</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Salaries</td>
<td>$7,469,366</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Salaries</td>
<td>$1,036,435</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonacademic Salaries</td>
<td>$6,800,750</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wages</td>
<td>$938,000</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expense Pool</td>
<td>$1,895,053</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>$11,401,269</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$29,540,873</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FY 04 Categories**

- **FY04**: $7,469,366
- **$7,469,366**
- **$1,036,435**
- **$6,800,750**
- **$938,000**
- **$1,895,053**
- **$11,401,269**
- **$29,540,873**
**Overhead Four: Breakdown of Personnel Budget for FY04**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee Category</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>$7,469,366</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas</td>
<td>$1,036,435</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Ac</td>
<td>$6,800,750</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wages</td>
<td>$938,000</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overhead Five: Review of FY04 Budget looking towards FY05**

**FY05 BUDGET POSSIBILITIES**

**FY04**

Personnel

- Academic: $7,469,366
- Grads: $1,036,435
- Non-Ac: $6,800,750
- Wages: $938,000

Collections: $11,337,886

Operating: $1,958,436

**FY04 Total**: $29,540,873

**Overhead Six: Known Deficits to the FY05 Budget, Assuming no Decrease in State Monies**

*Assume best case scenario = no decrease (cut) from FY04:*

Known FY05 Additional Costs:  

**Deficit**
1. GA Health Benefits (net of reduction to 35%) $19,700
2. Minimum Wage impact $85,300
3. Debt payments
   - Oak Street $200,000
   - Chemistry $100,000
   Total $300,000
4. Deficit repayment $69,000
   Assumes repayment of $200,000 in FY04
5. Restore FY04 Systems Cut $100,000
6. OCLC increase $32,000

**Total of Known additional costs(deficit)** $606,000
2.05%

---

**Overhead Seven: Potential Savings/Reductions for FY05**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Savings/Reductions for FY05</th>
<th>Net Deficit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Reduction of Grads to 35%</td>
<td>51,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ILCSO savings</td>
<td>87,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Elimination of staff vacancies from FY04</td>
<td>186,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 LTAs, 1 LTS, 1 LOA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total of Potential savings/reductions</td>
<td>324,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.95%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount to be reduced on July 1 = $281,260 assuming **zero** funds for:
Oak Street! **CAN**
Facilities! **WE**
Systems networking! **DO**

**But if we did:**
$281,260 must be reduced from categories at top of first page.
Operating budget is at minimum level and assume that
Collections and Academic are not to be considered (Grads already reduced).
Maintaining on traditional basis

$281,260 wholly from Personnel would require elimination of (layoffs) 14 staff equals 6.6% of current staff (excluding vacancies) in addition to 9.7% last year.

Other Options

1. Use of Collections to pay OCLC and/or ILCSO:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ILCSO</td>
<td>$263,221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCLC</td>
<td>$333,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$596,221</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Use of rescission monies

3. Others??

Maria Porta asked for clarification on collections and equipment. Rod answered that Almost everything listed under equipment is the collections. She then asked for a repetition of what the Library has in deficits fr FY04. Repeat to remind what we have for FY 04. Rod answered that there several unavoidables, such as GA health benefits, minimum wage increases for student employees, debt repayment, and systems money.

Cindy Ingold asked for Rod to repeat the FY04 total. Rod answered that it was $29,547,873.

Tim Cole asked if we are looking at the same magnitude cut next year as we were last year. Rod answered yes.

Rod then identified areas where the Library can save money. ILCSO membership is $87,000 less, though OCLC membership is $42,000 thousand higher. GAsips have been reduced to 35%. There are currently five staff vacancies which, if held open, could save $186,000. These figures produce a net increase of about $282,000, but this does not include the necessary costs for Oak Street, Chemistry, facilities, and systems updates.

He added that we need to develop other options and ideas to eliminate layoffs. The Library could pay ILCSO & OCLC membership out of the collection budget, which would not affect the purchases by canceling. There are also the recession monies ($300,000) that we have yet to hear about.
Tim Cole asked if the campus will require recession money to be put aside. Paula answered that we do not know for sure. The Governor has a bill to require agencies to hold back 2%. Do not know if that will trickle down to us.

Mary Stuart asked if all the notes could be posted on the web or through email. Rod Allan answered that they would (posted to LIBFAC-L, April 23, 2004).

Esther Gillie asked how realistic it is that we focus on the "best case scenario" of no cuts. Paula answered that the provost has repeatedly pledged to protect our budget. It was confirmed last week that the University budget will be cut by 2%. This is why she and Rod think that a flat budget is the best case scenario.

Lynn Wiley asked if the student wage increase is figured into the numbers Rod presented and if we will be expected to cover that increase. Rod answered yes to both questions.

Paula summarized that this past fiscal year (FY04) the Library lost 75 FTEs, many of which were student hours, but this was mitigated by the receipt of a one time offset by the Provost to keep Undergrad open until 3am. The Library also received a $125,000 one time for student wages, and Oak Street. This may not happened again, and is an extremely serious situation.

Tim Cole asked that Rod mentioned staff vacancies, but are there any Faculty searches currently happening? Paula answered that EC determined that they need to go forward on all positions at present. She reminded the faculty that there had been requests for 18 new positions, but the Library is only going forward with 5. There are no planned retirements in FY05 that she is aware of at this time. Rod added that when people retire, the Library still has payouts, which push the immediate savings of retirements out a bit.

Paula summarized that the outline of proposed operating changes sent out by the Budget Group is based on the ideas that have come forward during the past year's discussions. This document is the first attempt to look at the way to preserve the best that the Library is, but they are open to all ideas. It is important to maintain a balance between collections and personnel.

Although we are currently in a Capital Campaign, the purpose of those funds is to build a strong foundation for the future, not to serve our immediate needs. While we have tried to protect the collection budget bottom line, we have lost considerable buying power. As an example, Lisa German told Paula today that the EBO (European Blanket Order) fund is almost gone and that has never happened before. The collections budget is a very vulnerable part of the Library's overall budget.

Mary Stuart asked if we have any visiting faculty on the State funding. Cindy Kelly answered that we do not, they are all on grant funds.
Bill Mischo stated that it would be useful for the faculty to know where the Library budget stands compared to other ARL institutions. Bob Burger answered that while he does not have the figures in front of him, he recalls that last year we were right around the median for personnel to collections ratio.

Paula added that we are not alone in this situation. Almost everyone reports budget pressures and layoffs. Even private schools are hurting, just in different ways.

The faculty were instructed to break up into small groups to discuss the budget document as well as thoughts on whether cuts should come from the personnel or collections budget, or both.

**Group reports**

After time for small group discussions, each group was asked to have one person report on their discussion. The following points are listed under the presenters' names, but are representative of the group, not the individual.

**Bill Mischo's group**
- Re-look at open Faculty positions: we are in the process of five searches. How would it look to lay off staff if we are in the middle of faculty searches? We must think in terms of morale.
- Consider redeploying staff. Creating teams of librarians as well as staff to increase flexibility.
- Balance cuts between collection and personnel; impossible to absorb all of the cuts in either. Would like to see the balance between personnel and collections.
- Investigate the closing of libraries. To solve our budget problems we must stop 'nickle and diming' our solutions, we need a more radical approach.
- Consider nine month contracts for faculty.

**Alvan Bregman's group**
- Reduce hours or close libraries during breaks
- Pursue unpaid leave for faculty
- Increase revenue. Materials that could be turned into a product - product development and licensing.
- Consolidate services, such as imaging.

**Jodi Seibold's group**
- There should be a list of possible layoffs – positions, not names. Each position should be addressed individually.
- Revisit the academic searches in progress and possibly combine positions with a current search.
- "Image vs. Service". Service is more important than image. Programs like bibliographic instruction are a value-added service, but not necessary.
- Think of changes that may cost upfront, but have savings in the long-term, such as a humanities library.
- Endorse Al Kagan’s student fee proposal
David Griffith's group

- Reduce graduate assistantships to 25%
- Prohibit duplication
- Consider nine month appointments
- Encourage internal voluntary reassignments to fill current needs (such as we have done in Vet Med, Labor, and Rare Books and Special Collections). Be more creative in filling positions.

Lynne Rudasill's group

- Need to question if we afford more 'stuff' without personnel, assuming we want to maintain our role as a research institution.
- Decentralized circulation is something that should be investigated
- Swat teams are a good idea, but there needs to be buy-in or people won't do it well.
- Eliminate duplication of indexing and abstracting services.
- Strongly endorse the Library fee idea.

Esther Gillie's group

- The Library is already at minimal staffing levels, making any further cuts will decrease access. We need staff to process and serve the collections.
- Cuts, if necessary, should be made in collections.
- Identify who we are serving (students, faculty, the State of Illinois, etc).
- Identify the strengths of our collections and rethink collection development in regard to these strengths.

Becky Smith's group

- Balance cuts between collections and personnel
- Place ILCSO & OCLC costs into the collections budget
- Avoid layoffs
- Encourage retirements
- Centralizing processes when it makes sense

Greg Youngen's group

- Avoid personnel cuts as it affects the performance of library services.
- Take ILCSO and OCLC out of collections money.
- The Library has a responsibility to the University and community to continue employing people.
- Use collection dollars to stave off layoffs if necessary.
- Areas/staff that can be consolidated should be - we need more flexibility
- Collection development policy should be more judicious - share the responsibility with others instate
- Electronic resources and collections creating new positions, not reducing them
- We still have a significant commitment to the print
- Need commitment of personnel to Oak Street project in the short-term
• There is not enough attention paid to services - loss of personnel costs in service.

Rod Allen's group
• No consensus in group on protecting or cutting collections budget
• If we do cut or reduce collection money it should not be across the board
• Review duplicate titles
• Reviewing Faculty vacancies
• Investigate reducing hours and designate core libraries
• Do not move ILCSO and OCLC to collections
• No consensus on the FY05 budget document.

Lisa German's group
• Need to shift personnel to most critical areas of service and develop a flexible work force
• Moving ILCSO/OCLC to collections
• Investigate cuts in duplicates and e-resources
• Important to distinguish between protecting people and protecting the activities that people do.
• Stop writing grand plans for things that we never do.
• Trust people to do their job.
• Use unit heads better
• Too many committees
• Buy in to the "team" environment - good communication is essential.
• Website should be thought of as a central service

Paula summed up the comments by saying that she and the budget group will look at these and come back with a more formulated set of plans at the next faculty meeting

Draft Resolution for Library Fee (Kagan)
Al Kagan proposed discussion on the draft resolution, below:

Whereas the University Library budget crisis is intensifying,

And whereas many universities charge library fees to all students,

Resolved that the University Library faculty advocates the implementation of a library fee for all students to help fund all functions of the University Library,
And resolved that this resolution be sent to all deans, center and program directors, as well as the Senate Committee on the Library and the Chancellor and Provost.

Al stated that one of the most appealing aspects to the library is the departmental library structure, and the Library need to find an ongoing stable source of money to support that. What ever we do this year should be temporary and able to be undone.
He stated that many universities charge library fees for all students and proposed that our University should also charge a library fee for all students.

Bill Maher seconded the motion for discussion.

Bill Mischo asked how many of our peer institutions charge a library fee. Paula answered that South Carolina State has a $25 fee, Penn State has a technology fee, and Texas A&M has a $9 per credit hour fee.

Jo Kibbee stated that Al's preface to the resolution is to endorse maintaining our present structure, but asked how that structure helps the undergraduates we are proposing to charge? Will they feel that this is something that they want to preserve?

Barbara Henigman asked how much control the Library would have to enact the fee and use the money. Paula answered that it depends on the type of fee. Student fees and tuition fees are handled differently.

Lyn Jones added that the last student fee was for renovating and updating Assembly Hall, which required a student vote. Very detailed plans and discussions were presented to the students over a nine month period. She added that it is a very labor intensive process to get that student vote, and the Library should anticipate a lot of staff time dedicated to the process. She recommended that the Library may have to bring someone in to work with the students.

Lisa Hinchliffe asked for clarification if the fee is intended to maintain departmental structure. Al answered that that was personal preference, not a formal suggestion. Lisa added that a number of user groups are not addressed with this discussion. Would we charge faculty and courtesy card holders? We don’t know enough about fees. She added that she worries about the student reaction, we don't want to become adversarial with the students over this.

Lura Joseph agreed. If there is a fee everyone should pay it, including faculty

Bill Maher suggested that there are a lot of questions that need to be addressed in order to fully look at idea. Need an amendment that says there is sufficient interest to create a proposal.

Betsy Kruger seconded Bill Maher’s amendment.

Amendment: The faculty votes an expression of interest in examining library fees. A small group will be appointed to examine a more fulsome proposal for discussion at a later faculty meeting.

Motion carried, Paula will develop a small task force to investigate this further.

6. Old Business (none)
7. **New Business** (none)

8. **Announcements**

   Cindy Kelly announced that there are over 200 notes on the walls of the 1st floor of the Main Library. Everyone on your staff should have their name on the wall. Notes will be collected until Friday at 5pm.

   Jennifer Hain Teper announced that a small group trying to organize a happy hour for interested library faculty & staff once a month. E-mail Jennifer or Michael Norman if you are interested.

   Lyn Jones noted that Al Hallene, who had donated the funds for the 10 millionth volume along with his wife, Phyllis, passed away from cancer. The Hallene family has left a legacy on campus. Al served as both president of the Alumni Board as well a president of the Foundation Board.

   Thanks we given to Jameatris Johnson for helping with the meeting minutes in the absence of Kim Reynolds and Donna Hoffman.

   The meeting adjourned at 4:50.