

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
SENATE ASSEMBLY

Minutes of Assembly Meeting, September 19, 1977

ATTENDANCE Present: Members Aupperle, Barnett, Bornstein, P. Jones, Olken, M. Brown, Butler, Caldwell, Uttal, B. Cohen, Cooper, Corpron, Crichton, Diamond, Dingle, Downen, A. Edwards, Elving, Fowler, Gay, Gordon, R. Harris, Heers, Herbert, Hildebrandt, Hungerman, L. Jones, Kaplan, Kish, Leary, Lindberg, Livermore, Millard, Morley, Naylor, Penner, Saxonhouse, Portman, Proctor, Gedney, Schanck, Shannon, Wight, Simonds, Sinsheimer, Tilly, Tonsor, Votaw, West, White, Schulze, Lehmann

Absent: Members Angus, R. Browne, Christensen, P. Cohen, Coon, O. Edwards, Fekety, Gelehrter, Gray, J. Harris, Juvinal, Merte, Romani, Stross, Trojan, Winans, Northcutt

Guests: Dr. Frederick Wagman, Director, University Library; Professor W. Robert Dixon, Chairman, Tenure Committee

CALL TO ORDER The meeting was called to order by Chairman Lehmann at 3:15 p.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES The minutes of June 20, 1977 were approved as written. There were no questions about SACUA minutes.

ANNOUNCEMENTS a. Lehmann introduced Hildebrandt as Assembly parliamentarian.

b. The Assembly was reminded of the State of the University Address by President Fleming and the Faculty Awards Ceremony to be held at Lydia Mendelssohn Theatre, October 3 at 8:00 p.m.

c. Lehmann described SACUA discussion of Assembly Committee membership. He announced that it is SACUA's intention to regard each Assembly member as available for service on one Assembly Committee. Some of the reasons behind this intention are: 1) increased opportunity for communication between committees and the units represented by Assembly members; 2) opportunity for the Assembly to hear reports on committee work from its own members as well as from committee chairmen and executive officers. Assembly members will be considered available as replacements on committees for the remainder of this year and for appointment next year.

NOMINATIONS & APPOINTMENTS a. Janice Lindberg, Assistant Professor, Nursing, was nominated by SACUA to replace Weeks on SACUA. The Assembly approved her nomination unanimously.

b. A panel of four faculty members was approved for selection to membership on the Committee on Communications.

Professor B. Cohen asked about the function of the Committee, and Lehmann described its history and its charge: to convene symposia on issues of University-wide concern. Currently, there is a potential issue in the sanctions some are proposing against South Africa.

REPORT ON
THE BOOK
BUDGET

Lehmann described the sorry state of the current book budget, the history of its uncertain funding, and the concern of SACUA. He then introduced Dr. Frederick Wagman, Director of the University Library.

Wagman began by citing a report on the book budget from 1905-06. Dr. Koch, then director of the Library, wrote that although his budget had increased substantially over the preceding decade because there were so many new journals, the percentage he was able to spend on new monographic acquisitions had decreased 25%. Our current book budget is only 20% lower than last year--though Dr. Wagman added that Dr. Koch did not have to face the problem of inflation that we have.

He then cited some statistics. The rate of inflation in the publishing industry has been about 12% a year over the last eight years. Since 1967-69 the inflation has been 135%. It costs 86% more for books (monographs) and 160% more for journal subscriptions. The average price of a book in 1970 was \$8.40. This year it is \$19.72. The rise in the cost of subscriptions to journals is even more astounding. For example, Chemical Abstracts and Indices has gone from \$1,460 to \$3,000; The Journal of Physics from \$312 to \$1500; the Bibliographie de France from \$75 to \$513; and the Journal of Fish Biology has risen 425% from \$20 to \$105.

The Library, like the rest of the University, has had to get along on less during recent years. The book budget has only remained respectable because of generous year-end allocations from the administration. Because of the higher utility costs this year, that allocation to the book budget this year is \$250,000, a total of \$401,000 less than last year. The Library has reduced its staff by 59 full-time positions in recent years, but it has preserved its acquisitions funds. The year-end funds, which have been crucially important in recent years still have certain built-in disadvantages as a means of paying for acquisitions. Because they are non-recurring they cannot be used for journal subscriptions. To subscribe to a journal when one knows that the subscription might have to be cancelled the next year would be disastrous. The result of this dependence on year-end funds has been that nearly 65% of the official book budget now goes for journal subscriptions (as compared with 39% a few years ago), and the year-end funds are used to buy individual monographs.

For many years certain internal measures have been in force to control our expenditures for journals. There have been cuts in duplicate subscriptions, and in little-used journals. There has been an effort to hold the number of subscriptions for which we pay to between twenty and twenty-two thousand. It is assumed that the maintenance of journal subscriptions should be given priority because it is possible to buy monographs in later years. This is not true of foreign scholarly books which go out of print quickly. One cannot long postpone the purchase of important monographs, especially those printed abroad.

Wagman then turned to possible solutions. The basic solution, he said, is more money in the official book budget. It will take time to raise this to a satisfactory level. In the meantime, we will probably continue to need year-end funds for some while. Most peer university libraries have more substantial official book budgets.

He reminded Assembly that the Library competes for funds with the units it seeks to serve. Thus a substantial increase for the Library will mean a decrease in some other area of the faculty's interests. He did not think, however, that a sizable increase in the book budget will cause a serious disproportion in the Library expenditures relative to the University's total General, Educational expenditures.

He then cited some other sources of funding and of economy: plans for a National Journal Loan Center in which the Library of Congress would supply key support (although the larger university libraries would be expected to be the immediate source of most loans); federal grants for research libraries (again based partly on the extent of the library's inter-library loans); a possible slow-down in the publication of new journals because of the high costs of production; changes in format of journals (though a changeover to microform publication, for example, might not cost less); the offering of printed or microform journal articles on demand only (though it is not clear that this will save money). He ended his prepared remarks by emphasizing the importance of improving the book budget and pointed out that the University Administration gives this a high priority and is very sympathetic to the need.

Discussion began with Hildebrandt asking about the large numbers of duplications of books and journals in the various branches of the Library system. Wagman first pointed out in response that certain libraries, like the Business Administration Library, were autonomous. The University has a history of resisting the establishment of independent libraries, and of restricting the proliferation of branches, but has not been wholly successful. Then he acknowledged, that duplications do exist. He added, however, that some duplication is necessary, given both the demand for use and the demand for convenience.

Simonds asked about the extent of the loss sustained by the Library through theft. Wagman replied that the problem of theft is nation-wide, and described the electro-magnetic detection system now in use in the Library. A survey of the UGLI and of other collections reported an annual loss of approximately 1%.

Elving asked about the consideration given the needs of the Library by the Budget Priorities Committee. Wagman thought the consideration has been favorable in that the Library has been cut less in recent years, when there were operating budget reductions, than other units.

Kaplan then asked if the Library were slipping into a second-rate position, one that we cannot recover from. Wagman replied that the deterioration of our position was a real concern. Our position would be worse if it were not for the year-end funds.

Saxonhouse asked about the role of special funds in the book budget. Wagman said that about \$100,000 annually came from special funds, a relatively small percentage.

Tonsor pointed out the probable relationship between the growth of the Administrative budget in the University and the decline in the state of the Library. The Administration seemed to him reluctant to consider its own growth. Elving then related the issue to the economic status of the faculty. Over the last twenty-five years a general attrition has taken place in working conditions, and the decline in the book budget of the Library is but another--though especially serious--proof. He asked, what action can SACUA take? Perhaps we need, he said, to take some action that makes clear the impediment to our own work and the work of the University that these cuts occasion.

Lehmann noted that the cuts in personnel already sustained by the Library seem bound to reduce the quality of the Library.

Jones asked Wagman to describe the Library Council. Wagman related that it was a committee of eight members, appointed by the Regents upon nomination by the President, to whom the Library Director recommended candidates, and advisory to him on questions of distribution of budget and policy generally. In his recommendations he tries to reflect the different disciplines of the faculty.

Livermore, noting the disgraceful fact that the official budget for books has risen by only 17% in the last decade, asked how the Library made its choices among books published in America. Wagman responded by saying that selections were made by a large number of specialists, including faculty. Between ninety and ninety-nine thousand volumes were purchased last year. Although that figure is down from a high of 146,000, it is still a rather high number.

B. Cohen asked Wagman to comment on the next generation of libraries. Will there be a more sophisticated handling of operations? Wagman described the development of Computerized Bibliographical Indices, which will supply a reader with a bibliography pertinent to his subject. He also described the degree of automation in the Library and technological advances in cataloguing. Cohen then asked about increased cost. Wagman replied that the use of automation resulted in long-term saving because of a reduced need for personnel. The great determinant of how libraries will operate may be the manner in which information is made available. If traditional methods of publication do not change, libraries will be limited in the changes they might effect.

Hildebrandt noted that some libraries seem better off than ours. What are other libraries doing, he asked, to find more resources? Wagman cited three traditional sources of money: foundations, friends' groups and alumni. Foundations generally do not give grants to libraries for books. The Clements Library, the Michigan Historical Collections, and the Art Museum already have friends' associations here, which would compete with an organization of the Library's own, and the gifts of friends' groups are usually for special acquisitions rather than routine purchases. The effect of alumni-giving would not be great enough in all likelihood. The University of Illinois Library has benefited from an annual grant from alumni giving, but the amount each year is not large.

Hildebrandt suggested the possibility of faculty assessments.

Caldwell asked if the Budget Priorities Committee could be strengthened in combatting non-academic expenditures in the University. Lehmann said, yes, and assured Assembly that the issue has continuing priority.

Gordon asked if the State Legislature used the Library much. Wagman responded that he knew of little such use. Votaw asked if the Library charged outsiders for services, and Wagman replied that services were restricted, but there was no charge.

Kaplan then introduced a Resolution:

Senate Assembly views with concern the present and anticipated inadequate funding of book and periodical acquisitions by the University Library, and proposes that an adequate acquisitions fund be included as a permanent part of the annual official budget. Funding of the Library should not be heavily dependent on year-end allocations. Assembly requests SACUA to impress on the Library Council and other appropriate agencies the

importance of a thorough analysis of present and future problems faced in maintaining the quality of the Library and to report to Assembly on its findings by February, 1978.

Elving suggested that a student fee might be collected, like the one chemistry students pay for laboratory use. Wagman cited a proposal, still hanging fire, to charge fees for Library use by those not registered students or members of the faculty. The assessment of a general fee would be a hot potato in years when we raise tuition, he thought.

Tonsor addressed the resolution and questioned the term "adequate"--a slippery term. He offered to insert a percentage figure that would guarantee adequacy. Bornstein, however, expressed concern at being locked into any figure. He thought Assembly was insufficiently informed to do so. Jones agreed that naming a percentage figure was perhaps unwise, but reminded the Assembly that the resolution instructs SACUA to become informed and come back with a report.

The question was called and the resolution passed without dissent.

RESOLUTION
CONCERNING
TENURE
COMMITTEE

Lehmann introduced Professor Dixon, Chairman of the Tenure Committee, who proposed a resolution: That the membership of the Tenure Committee be increased from five to nine Senate members, with staggered terms of three years each.

Dixon explained that the change in the membership of the Committee was needed in order to perform properly the Committee's new charge--to examine and make recommendations on tenure policy throughout the University. Before this new charge, life on the Tenure Committee had been very peaceful--there have been no hearings on cases of dismissal for the last four years. He said the current committee of five members has met and begun preparing for an interim report to the Assembly in November.

Bornstein asked what the relation of the Tenure Committee was to other existing appeals procedures.

Lehmann and Dixon both responded, referring to Regental Bylaw 5.09 that establishes the Committee and its special functions. It is one of several procedures in use throughout the University.

Elving reminded the Assembly and Professor Dixon that tenure means more than job security. He trusted that other mutual obligations of the University and the faculty would be considered. He asked if increasing the size of the Committee would facilitate its work. Lehmann replied that it would, and the proposed size makes it analogous to other Assembly committees. Corpron noted that the work on tenure policy would be of necessity extensive and probably require subcommittees.

Shannon asked if membership would be representative. Lehmann replied that SACUA would try to make it so.

Kish asked if more business was expected. Lehmann replied that we want no more business under Bylaw 5.09. The new work concerned tenure policy, not hearing more cases.

The resolution passed unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT The Assembly adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

Earl J. Schulze
Senate Secretary

bc