

**Advisory Group for Research Services and Scholarly Resources
(AGRSSR)
Minutes
August 12, 2009
Library West, 429**

Present: Joe Aufmuth, Steve Carrico, Robena Cornwell, Michele Crump, Ann Lindell, Angela Mott, Marilyn Ochoa, Cathy Martyniak, Bobby Parker, Patrick Reakes, Dan Reboussin, Judy Russell, Laurie Taylor, Rachel Schipper, Betsy Simpson, Christopher Vallandingham, Carl Van Ness

Not present: Denise Bennett, John Ingram, Stephanie Haas, Michele Tennant, Ben Walker

I Budget

Judy responded to the budget agenda item with several updates of general interest:

The Libraries have received no response to our request for stimulus funding. Ed Poppell (VP, Business Affairs) is now meeting on the next set of priorities including energy efficiency and building renovations.

Library materials allocations are now distributed to selectors' budgets but these totals remain provisional pending completion of the serials cancellations project (Steve Carrico said it's about 3/4 done and expects it to be completed by the end of August). Some e-resources are moving to new budget centers. DSR \$300k has been incorporated for Elsevier bill and TIPS funds revised to accommodate HSCL integration.

Wallace McLendon has requested a review of DSR funds distribution (currently 16% HSCL) based on formula that counts graduate students but not the professional students that. Judy expects that any review of distribution must also include the expense site since there are many cost shared resources and on average HSCL currently covers 20% of these. SUL members are also raising issues of cost sharing formulas.

An area of change for the campus budgeting process is the RCM (Responsibility Center Management) model that is currently in use at UF in a "shadow" mode (to be tweaked and monitored to prepare for implementation next year). We expect to get data from the exercise in Sept. and will learn from that how library funds will flow. Judy explained that the idea behind the model is that revenue generating centers (course registration in a given college, clinics income, research grant awards) would keep a percent of their income to remain in their units. Each unit has some dollars to keep local and must pay their "fair share" of rent, bills, tax, overhead or whatever it may be called to cover services they use. Weights will have to be applied to various user groups. About 20 ARLs use RCM, with U. Michigan an early adopter. The model can change behavior, creates disincentives to duplicating services across colleges, etc. and we will be expected to pitch our budget to the other deans (who are "tax payers" in this system).

Judy quickly mentioned her work on a program review for the libraries, similar to what Provost Glover asked of all academic program deans. What are the top ten performing programs in each college, or those that are runners up and could be brought into the top ten? What non-budget constraints are limiting these from performing at that level? She's requested assistance of many librarians (as she did at our SASC dept. meeting) and now has a draft; she said she'll circulate a final report when completed. She noted that the Provost extended the deadline for the libraries, so we can respond to the deans lists regarding collections.

II Digitization priorities. Spreadsheet. Weighting / capacity issues.

Not everyone has submitted prioritized lists. Some that were submitted weren't counted but Lela provided a "rough draft" spreadsheet of rankings (my quick assessment of the highest ranked projects is this: Florida Digital newspaper Library #1 with 6 "high" rankings; a second tier with 3 "highs" each consists of Florida and the Civil War, Abraham African Rare Books, WID, FL Ag Docs, Antique Maps and the UF Fight Song; things get a bit fuzzier after that and it may not be worth going further since voting was incomplete). Discussion focused in part on how to make sense of about 20 rankings for 20 projects where no project got more than 2 exact matches. Groupings of High, Med. Low were suggested for analysis but Judy also requested we resubmit our priorities, separating ranks into 3 categories: ** / externally funded / internal.

Guidelines for resubmission were vague but we expect an update beforehand to include additional information on funded or finished projects (Florida Caribbean Architect was mentioned as a small, ongoing IA project similar to Florida Anthropologist; Joe noted that the aerial photos proposal received its award), notes indicating which require preservation analysis, level of cataloging effort, level of required internal processing by DLC, which are clear candidates for external processing at the Internet Archive.

There was additional discussion about ranking IA projects, determining quotas/weighting/priority for high-volume projects that could by themselves use all available capacity, etc.

Carl and Dan submitted together our principles and priorities based on discussions in the departmental meeting.

III LibAnswers

Peter McKay presented LibAnswers knowledge base "faq" type Q&A system for LibGuides, distributed a handout, led discussion of funding and surveyed interest in a general library subscription. Price is \$1,099/year (plus add-ons of \$60 if custom url requested and \$90 for iPhone/XML/API). Additional UF subscriptions lower fees for others at the institution. TIPS funding was suggested since this would have a campus-wide impact and is relatively low cost.