

University Library Committee

October 26, 2021

Present: Daniel Badoe, Chris Brown, Rufaro Chitiyo, Stuart Gaetjens, Mark Groundland, Tammy Howard, Sheila Kendrick, Amber Lovell, Joseph Maupin, Lora Ramsey, Matt Smith, Julie Stepp for Nancy Kolodziej, Emily Vaughn.

Executive Officer: Doug Bates

Resource Person: Amy Hill (Research Office)

Absent: Sandra Bohannon, Jeff Womack, Sid Bundy

Welcome --Members of the committee were welcomed to the fall University Library Committee meeting by Chairperson Chris Brown. A quorum was in attendance for the meeting via "Teams".

Agenda -- Mark Groundland made a motion to approve the agenda, Julie Stepp seconded the motion, and it carried.

Minutes -- The minutes of the February 23rd, 2021 meeting were distributed via email. There were no corrections to the minutes; and they were approved after a motion by Mark Groundland and a second by Julie Stepp.

The minutes from the October, 2020 meeting are still outstanding. Since Sharon Buckner was not in attendance at that meeting, Chris recorded the meeting; but he cannot access the recording now. He has ITS looking at the file to try to retrieve it. If successful, those minutes will be presented for the spring meeting or via email.

Dean's Report -- Over the summer, Provost Bruce approached Dean Bates and asked him to give his library budget presentation at a Deans' meeting in September. Dr. Stinson and a few others were in attendance as well. Doug has shown this information to the ULC previously but reviewed it again for the current attendees.

- In **1986-87**; the library materials budget was **\$637,741**.
- In **2021-22**, the library materials budget is **\$609,249**.
- In **2010-11**, the library received **\$390,000** in TAF funds to purchase library materials.
- The library now receives **\$0** in TAF money for library materials.
- In **2014-15**, a reallocation of funds from the Provost's Office cut the library materials budget by **\$158,580**.
- In **2016-17** and **2017-18**, university budget cuts totaling **\$122,000** were made to the materials budget.

- **This is a total decline of \$671,000 in the materials budget over the last 6 – 7 years.**
- The percentage of the University’s budget given to the library has been reduced from .73% to .36%.

Last year the library was given one-time money of \$150,000 for materials. We asked and received permission from the budget office to spread this amount over 3 years, so effectively a \$50,000 increase for 3 years; but it is temporary money, not permanent funding.

Doug reviewed the three sources of funding for library databases:

- 1) TTU pays for via the Library Materials budget, (estimated cost \$559,055 for FY 22.)
- 2) TBR/TN E-campus
- 3) TN Electronic Library

Prior to enactment of the Focus Act, the TBR spent \$300,000 - \$400,000 to provide databases to the TBR schools. One of these databases is CINAHL which is used heavily by the nursing students and faculty (22,000 uses last year.) TBR is no longer planning to pay for this database after the end of this fiscal year. However, it will cost TTU Library \$16,732 to pick up this database plus another \$2,500 for the other three health-related titles that were provided by TBR. Doug is advocating that the people who need/use the products will have to advocate for the purchase of the product because he has not been successful in getting an increase in the library’s budget. Tammy Howard says “we do not have a choice.” Nursing is generating increased research dollars for the university. She requested a meeting with Doug along with several folks from the School of Nursing to get information about this situation and coordinate a plan of advocacy.

Rufaro asked how does the University claim to be a research university when it doesn’t support the library.

Doug referred to his spreadsheet presentation of R2 doctoral schools with engineering programs that shows TTU ranks in last place for library funding among 83 schools!

The University Research Office gets a percentage of the research funds generated for the university. Someone is going to have to advocate for a portion of those funds to be used for databases to support research.

Mark Groundland says he spoke out as a part of Faculty Senate regarding the library materials budget, and it has not been effective.

Tammy says Nursing has grown their programs, their research, and their grants. The results of this growth need to be shown in dollars and cents in terms of how the university is benefiting, as well as the National Rankings TTU has been receiving and touting. If the products are not available to support the Nursing program (and others), the funding for the university as well as the National Rankings is going to decline.

Doug also showed the library's materials budget in comparison to the other LGI schools in TN. Again, TTU is in last place. We receive \$400,000 less than Austin Peay!

There was a discussion of where students are getting their information for their research and the use of Google Scholar. Tammy asked if Google Scholar shows in EagleSearch. She suggested the possibility of adding Google Scholar to the Library's website along with EagleSearch to make it more prominent.

The library has been asked by the budget office to prepare a plan for FY 22-23 for the possibility of a 2% and 4 % budget cuts. Additional guidelines from the Provost Office asked us to prepare a plan for a 2% and 4 % increase, as well. A 4% budget cut would be about \$90,000. A 2% cut would be about \$45,000. Once again, the materials budget will be impacted.

Julie Stepp spoke to an advocacy plan. She suggested sticking to 3-4 main points to get the word out as a group and to make more connections. The presentations need to be more concise to show to their Deans, Chairpersons, and co-workers. What makes the most impact?

Amy Hill, asked if any student fees were going into the library budget? No, it is all E & G money.

Chris says there is some difficulty on the faculty end at least for Biology, when you ask the question "What would we want from more dollars for the library?"

Stuart says the library has to cover at least a 5 percent increase every year for inflation costs on materials. This is currently about \$30,000 each year as a baseline increase to keep all the database titles we currently have. If you don't get at least an additional \$30,000 each year, you have to cut database subscriptions every year.

The committee members need a 1-page impact document to present.

Matt suggested a one-page summary based on inflation. This would include the number of titles, the number of uses, the cost, programs tied to these, and revenue tied to those programs.

Adjournment – Mark Groundland made a motion to adjourn, seconded by Matt Smith, and the motion was approved.

Minutes by: Sharon Buckner

Approval: March 29, 2022