

## University Library Committee

Minutes: April 17, 2010

The breakfast meeting was called to order at Elmer's at 9:15am by Chair Stephanie Christelow. Members in attendance were Nancy Devine, Kay Flowers, Cathy Gray, Andrew Holland, Vitit Kantabutra, Linda Leeuwrik, Kathleen McCulloch, Pamela Park, Jean Thomas, and Rick Williams. Guests were Sandra Shropshire, James Teliha, Leonard Hitchcock, Janet Higgins, Jenny Semenza, Spencer Jardine of the library, and Martine Beachboard of the Mass Communications department.

Introductions were made around the tables, and Kay suggested that we adjust the agenda to accommodate a few guests.

Library Instruction Program, Spencer Jardine presented a review of the instruction statistics by semester since spring 2005. He reviewed what is normally taught in the library presentations for ACAD 101 and Comm 101, although the class requirements have changed. Library 121, once taught as the in-take for the College of Education library science program, hasn't been taught since they dropped the program in 2005. Kay would like to offer the course again through the ACAD department as an 8-week course, although it has to go through Curriculum Council.

Jenny Semenza presented a summary of her findings while on sabbatical related to library instruction programs. There are three institutions that have information literacy programs in their curriculum, and those institutions have hired more staff to cover all their instruction. Another university has a program to teach the instructors, others embed the information literacy component into their courses, while 19 institutions are struggling to develop a program. Jenny proposes that ISU work toward including it in the entry-level course for each degree program. In addition, the current program suggests English 101 instructors use the online tutorial, English 102 instructors schedule a class presentation close to the time students are beginning to work on a research paper. And, when the Library 121 course is offered, the focus will be toward non-traditional and at-risk students.

Comments from ULC members:

- the library instruction program and services need to be included in the faculty orientation each fall
- Kay Flowers would also like to have someone from the library on the Curriculum Council group that is reviewing the new goals

## Minutes

Rick Williams noted that the minutes did not include the discussion about department allocations after the move to Library 268. The minutes were amended to include that the discussion would

continue on April 17. Andrew Holland moved the amended minutes be approved, and Rick Williams seconded, the minutes were approved.

### **Old Business**

By-laws change: As per the discussion in September, Vitit Kantabutra moved the by-laws reflect the change of the Staff Council representative, rather than one each from Classified and Professional staff. Jean Thomas seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

### **New Business**

Election of ULC Chair for 2010-2011: Stephanie Christelow asked if anyone was interested, and Kathleen McCulloch said she is willing to serve as chair. Vitit Kantabutra nominated her, Nancy Devine seconded the nomination, and she was elected unanimously.

Allocation Formula: Sandra Shropshire distributed a corrected page and additional charts related to the allocation information sent via e-mail. The full report will be presented to Dr. Vailas next week. As expressed in March, the counting of clinical students and faculty research needs are not included in the formula, as the graduate school could not provide information about the research theses programs vs clinical (non-thesis) programs. Kay Flowers shared that Dr. Vailas is disappointed that the allocations are not formulaic, but rather have many relative factors. The allocation formula will be phased in, and there should not be massive adjustments for the departments to deal with at this time. As more funds become available, they will be used to bring everyone up to where they should be, with minimal cuts. According to Dr. Vailas, every department should have their basic needs covered, and those faculty that need more materials need to locate funding, or departments can “adopt a journal.”

James Teliha suggested each department report the number of theses, dissertations, graduate projects and degrees granted so this formula can be implemented more fairly. For example, Sandra noted that we have no citation studies from Pharmacy to document the research needs of their students and faculty.

Sandra Shropshire asked for a statement from the ULC on the allocation formula report. Several people collaborated to make the following statement: The ULC has been involved in the discussion of the allocation system, agrees with the concept of the allocation formula and weighting research needs. However, various areas need to be “tweaked” and should include goals of 85% to 115% of published materials in an area. The book allocations are more easily adjusted than journals, simply because of the nature of subscriptions.

Kay Flowers said the allocation formula is going to the deans and vice-presidents, in addition to Dr. Vailas. They need to know that the library needs more money to develop the collection to the standards recommended for each program.

Kay Flowers said the library needs to go into a strategic planning mode. The ULC needs to review the library mission and goals, and revise the “wish list” should more funds become available through the development office. Kay said that normally endowments have a minimum of \$10,000, however journals can be endowed, although they usually are much less.

Stephanie Christelow suggested that at the department meetings in August, the ULC members promote library instruction and the endowment of journals by faculty.

Library Budget: Kay Flowers said the library will probably escape additional budget cuts, and inflation should be covered for 2011 by prepaying subscriptions. However, legislators need to be re-educated about factoring inflation rates in the budget.

Library Golf: Kay Flowers reported the event went well on April 10, and receipts totaled nearly \$2400. In addition, the book sale brought in about \$2000. One-half of the money from the book sale has been added to the Domitz endowment for the library collection. Kay is trying to build an endowment for the law library, but it isn't in place yet.

The meeting adjourned at 12:10pm.

# BYLAWS OF THE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY COMMITTEE (ULC), IDAHO STATE UNIVERSITY

April 2, 1984  
Revised and Approved: April 17, 2010

## **Name, Role and Mission**

The name of this group is the University Library Committee. Its role and mission is as follows:

1. Approve distribution of book budgets for all campus units and provide recommendations.
2. Encourage timely expenditures for books.
3. Discuss and make recommendations concerning policy for reduction or expansion of Library budgets for all campus units.
4. Discuss and make recommendations concerning policy for setting Library departmental budgets for books.
5. Discuss and make recommendations concerning policy for periodical purchase and review of use.
6. Act as University Library Committee policy reporters to departments and colleges. Establish contact with departmental liaisons and report to committee on suggestions or problems.
7. Establish communication with departments and help engender positive attitudes toward the Library. Help explain internal workings of the Library to departments.
8. Support Library and Library staff in working for budget increases and other matters of mutual concern.
9. Act as an advisory group for the University Librarian

## **Membership**

The committee is composed of eighteen (18) voting members from the following constituencies:

Business (1), Education (1), Engineering (1), Health Related Professions (1), Humanities (2), Natural Science (1), Pharmacy (1), Physical Sciences (1), Research Centers (1), Social Sciences (2), College of Technology (1), Library Faculty (1), Undergraduate Student (1), Graduate Student (1), Staff Council (1).

A constituency is defined as the permanent members of the unit or organization.

The University Librarian is an ex-officio, non-voting member.

Faculty members are elected or appointed by the faculties of the designated constituencies during the spring semester. The length of a faculty member's term is three (3) years. Since terms are staggered among the membership, approximately 1/3 of the members retire each year. In constituencies with multiple representation, only one member of a department may serve at any one time. Mid-term vacancies will be filled by appointment of the Dean for the remainder of the unexpired term. Such appointments are to be made from the faculty of the constituency suffering the vacancy.

A formally selected faculty member may serve a second term. Additional terms are permissible once the faculty member is off the committee for a minimum of one year. Exceptions can be made at the college level.

The Council of Professional Employees (COPE) and the Classified Employees Council (CEC) representatives are appointed by those organizations to serve one-year terms with eligibility to serve a second term. The Graduate and Undergraduate representatives are chosen annually by the ASISU Student Senate.

Regular attendance at meetings is strongly encouraged. Excessive absences may subject a member to recall.

### **Officers and Their Duties**

A Chair is elected annually in the last meeting of the spring semester. The previous Chair conducts the election of officers in the last meeting of the spring. The duties of the Chair are to prepare agendas, to call meetings and to conduct the business of the committee between meetings. The Secretary (library staff member) keeps records and circulates minutes and notices of meetings.

### **Meetings**

A minimum of two (2) meetings is to be held each year, one in the fall for evaluation of expenditure of the departmental book budgets, the other in the spring for approval of departmental book budgets and election of the new chair. Additional meetings are held when appropriate. Any two (2) members may request a meeting within 15 working days of the request unless the 15<sup>th</sup> day falls during a regularly scheduled break for summer session or Christmas holidays. Then the next regularly scheduled meeting must consider the substance of the request.

A quorum consists of one-half of the voting membership. Only informational meetings shall be held without a quorum.

### **Amendment of Bylaws**

These bylaws may be amended by a majority vote of the voting membership.

# Status Report on Development of Allocation Formulae for Distribution of Library Funds

Report authored by Sandra Shropshire  
April 15, 2010

The Library presents its work to date to address the assignment given to it by Dr. Vailas, that is, to develop a rational method for distributing Library funds among the departments at ISU, identifying a “core” and a “research” collection. The result is three formulae, each addressing a different aspect of the collection.

## **Formulae Creation**

The information available on the composition of a “core” or a “research” collection for an academic library is scarce to non-existent. There is little guidance to be derived from library collection comparisons among peer institutions, from accrediting agencies, or from within the library literature, on what groups of journals, books or databases, for example, should constitute either a core or a research collection. Therefore, the Library has developed a method for establishing funding levels that could be used to support these two types of collections, and recommends that the faculty in the relevant departments continue to be relied upon to select the items that comprise those collections.

The charge to the Library has been interpreted as follows: “core teaching” will refer to that part of the collection that addresses the fundamental teaching resource needs of a university, and “core research,” will refer to that part that addresses fundamental research resource needs. Though a distinction between teaching and research resources is assumed in the construction of this method, the Library recognizes that these categories overlap significantly. In addition, as is suggested by the meaning of the word, “core,” the collections that are created and sustained by the allocations which these formulae generate are not expected to fulfill all of the research needs of students and faculty. Interlibrary loan, it is assumed, will remain a vital source of additional information resources.

The Library’s work addresses both the President’s charge to the Library and conditions within the academic publishing industry. It establishes allocations for the collection with two factors in mind 1) Intended use distinguishes between undergraduate users, for whom materials serve primarily an instructional purpose, and graduate and faculty users, for whom materials primarily support research and 2) Format recognizes that books and journals each have distinct pricing and publication behavior, and that they are utilized to varying extents among disciplines. The interaction among these four factors produces results in the need for creating four distinct allocations 1) Core Teaching Books 2) Core Teaching Journals 3) Core Research Books and 4) Core Research Journals. Critical elements of each formula are discussed below.

The formulae are adjustable, according to the amount of funds that the Library has available; their presentation below is tailored to the level of the Library’s total appropriated capital funds

for the 08/09 fiscal year that were used for each department, i.e. subject-based books support. The formulae are not designed to address the non-subject collection support provided by the Library, which includes the provision of reference works and resources of general interest, as this was felt to be out of the scope of the charge.

### 1) **Core Teaching Books.**

For the formation of the undergraduate core teaching allocation, this formula assumes that the composition of the undergraduate collection at a mid-sized academic library such as ISU should represent a full spectrum of subject areas, and should not be driven by local quantitative factors such as student or faculty headcounts, programs offered, etc.

**BPU: Book Publication Universe.** Data was gathered by Blackwell Book Services, the Library's primary book vendor and vendor commonly used by academic libraries, from its Collection Manager database, at <http://cm7.blackwell.com/cm/>. The database contains catalog records of all books sold by that book vendor, and probably constitutes the most complete record of international book publishing in existence. During the summer of 2009, Blackwell operated an "approval plan" for the Library which enabled local bibliographers, with the assistance of faculty, to create "profiles" for all subject areas/departments. Those profiles constituted a sorting device that selected, from all qualifying published books, those that had the potential to be useful additions to ISU's collections. The criteria used to sort included detailed subject breakdowns and other factors such as intended audience, format, language of publication, etc. The Collection Manager database contains annual cumulations of books published, sifted through subject-area profiles, and those totals, averaged over a two-year period, were used to generate BPU numbers.

**Y: The Percentage Used to Generate the Undergraduate Core** There is no documented way to ascertain what percentage of the total number of books published in a subject-area will qualify as essential books for a core undergraduate collection. Book reviews available at the time of publication may be helpful in identifying candidates for core stature, but it often takes years for the true status of a book to be determined, and even then, the likelihood that qualified scholars would agree about the long-term value of a book is slim. It might be argued that Y should vary from subject-area to subject-area, but there is virtually no chance that agreement could be reached among faculty regarding the assignment of such percentages. The virtue of using a single Y for all subject-areas is that is a practicable solution that treats all subject-areas equally.

An additional complicating factor is that the total number of academic books that is published is of a quantity such that buying any amount other than a small percentage of the total is out of reach for the Library's budget. Therefore, since the value of Y cannot be determined by any objective measures, the departments' undergraduate core teaching book allocation has been set at 8% of the total disciplinary publishing output,

an amount which, if totaled for all ISU departments, would require approximately one-half of the FY08/09 subject-based book budget at ISU.

**ABC: Average Book Cost.** The average cost per book is derived from total book costs and total books published for each ISU subject area as provided by Blackwell.

**Formula for the Core Teaching Books Allocation, by Department:**

$$BA:UC_{D1} = (BPU_{D1} \cdot y) \cdot ABC_{D1}$$

Where:

**BA:UC<sub>D1</sub>** = Book Allocation for the Core Teaching Books collection, for Department D1.

**BPU<sub>D1</sub>** = Book Publication Universe. An average of the number of books published, 2007-2009, for the subject area of Department D1.

**Y**= a percentage figure thought to be sufficient to enable purchase of an ongoing core collection for the undergraduate collection. For the purposes of this discussion, that percentage was 8%.

**ABC<sub>D1</sub>**= Average Book Cost for subject area of department D1.

**2) Core Teaching Journals.**

The undergraduate core teaching journals allocation is represented by the full-text journal content within the Library's premier undergraduate full-text database, *Academic Search Complete*, which is currently paid from non-subject Library funds, and has an annual cost of \$ 49,874.00. From non-subject Library funds, the Library also subscribes to a number of popular, mass-marketed periodicals in paper format that are suited to some undergraduate use.

**3) Core Research Books.**

Unlike the Core Teaching Books allocation, this figure is largely driven by local factors and the nature of the discipline. The untreated portion of the FY08/09 subject book budget has been set as a target for calculating the faculty/graduate core research book allocation, (see Core Teaching Books, above).

**FG : Faculty/Graduate points.** The basic faculty/graduate point figure is intended to represent the level of demand for research materials by the faculty and graduate students in a particular department. The basic unit is the FTE figure, but that figure is weighted according to whether it represents either a full-time faculty member or a graduate student at the masters or at the doctoral level. Only those faculty who are required to conduct research in order to receive promotion and the granting of tenure are counted. Clinical faculty are excluded, as are faculty at the rank of instructor. Faculty who are categorized as "Research faculty" are counted. The weighting of



graduate students assumes that the research demands of doctoral students are less than those of faculty, but greater than those of masters students.

Faculty FTEs have been taken from the Idaho State University Operating Budget. 2009/2010. Graduate student FTEs have been taken from Idaho State University Graduate Enrollment by Level and Status. Fall 2009  
<http://www.isu.edu/areg/stats/docs/EnrollmentFall/GradMajorsFall.pdf>

**BD: Book Dependency.** It is generally acknowledged that there are differences in the degree to which research in academic subject-areas is dependent upon the use of books and journals. Generally speaking, the pattern of dependency corresponds to the differences between the hard sciences, the social sciences, and the arts and humanities. Journal use is very heavy in the hard (and medical) sciences, moderate in the social sciences, and lightest in the arts and humanities; conversely, book use is less pronounced in the hard sciences, etc.

It is through citation studies that the degree of book and journal dependency is usually ascertained. Citation studies, as the name suggests, draw inferences from source references in academic research works. The types of works mined for this data range from undergraduate research papers to dissertations to professional faculty publications. Interpretations of the data are applied to a variety of topics in intellectual history and the sociology of knowledge, and to such prosaic purposes as the evaluation of faculty for promotion and tenure, and the formulation of collection development policies in academic libraries. Historically, though citation studies date back to the 1920's, they began to flourish in the second half of the twentieth century with the publication of databases that indexed citations, such as what was then called *Science Citation Index* (and in its digital form is now called *Web of Science*.)

Fortunately for the Library's purposes, it is common for the type of publication cited (monograph, i.e., book, periodical, dissertation, government document, etc.) to be taken note of in citation studies, and such studies usually focus on particular disciplines. Moreover, virtually all disciplines across the academic spectrum have received treatment in the library literature, at one time or another. As a result, data on book vs. journal use can readily be gathered for use in evaluation of the degrees of dependence of various subject-areas.

#### **Formula for the Core Research Books Allocation, by Department:**

$$BA:RC_{D1} = \{[(FG_{D1} \bullet BD_{D1})/TWFG] \bullet z\} \bullet ABC_{D1}$$

Where:

**BA:RC<sub>D1</sub>** = Book Allocation for the Core Research Books collection, for Department D1.

**FG<sub>D1</sub>** = Faculty/Graduate points for Department D1. Calculated by summing the official FTE figures for full-time faculty members (excluding clinical faculty and instructors), the FTE figures for master's students, divided by 4, the FTE figures for doctoral students, divided by 2.

**BD<sub>D1</sub>** = The degree of Book Dependency, expressed as a percentage of the overall comparative book and journal dependency for Department D1's subject area.

Hence: **(FG<sub>D1</sub> • BD<sub>D1</sub>)** = Weighted Faculty/Graduate points for Department D1

**TWFG** = Total weighted Faculty/Graduate points for all Departments

Hence: **[(FG<sub>D1</sub> • BD<sub>D1</sub>)/TWFG]** = Department D1's percentage of total weighted faculty/graduate points.

**Z** = the total number of books it is estimated can be purchased during the course of the fiscal year, given budgetary restrictions, for support of faculty and graduate student research. For the purposes of this discussion, that number was 2000.

**ABC<sub>D1</sub>** = average book cost for subject area of department D1.

#### 4) **Core Research Journals**

The quantity--in combination with extreme variations in cost--of peer-reviewed journals complicates the formation of this formula. Accommodations must be made to account for facts such the following: although the number of relevant academic journals in English is equal to that in Chemistry, the average price of the English journals is \$ 200.00 (2009 price) and of the chemistry journals is \$3,500.00 (2009 price.) The JPUP element of this formula was created in an attempt to address this.

**JPUP: Journal Publication Universe.** The number of qualifying journals published in a discipline was culled from a manual review and count within the subject categories present in the serials directory, Ulrichs, <http://oboler.isu.edu:2094/UlrichsWeb/>. This directory is a standard directory used to present cost, subject, publication, format availability, etc. Qualifying journals were restricted to those that were peer-reviewed, in English, and currently published. Only those journals relevant to ISU's academic disciplines were counted. When a subject category used within Ulrich's did not directly correspond to an ISU discipline, relevant journals were selected by a title-by-title review. The resulting publication figures were multiplied by average journal cost per discipline to arrive at total disciplinary journal costs. Those average costs are published annually by *Library Journal* (Van Orsdel, Lee and Kathleen Born. "Reality Bites: Periodicals Price Survey 2009." *Library Journal* 134.7 (2009):36-40. *Academic Search Complete*. EBSCO. Web. 27 Mar. 2009.

<http://oboler.isu.edu:2048/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=38593127&site=ehost-live>

**JD: Journal Dependency.** See discussion of Book Dependency, above.

**X & Y:** These terms are variables. The assignment of .5 to both does not represent an unalterable judgment. There may be reasons to assign greater weight to either the journal publication universe percentage or the faculty/graduate points. Doing so will alter the allocation to some degree, but will not do so dramatically, as the tables below suggest.

**TAJF:** Total Available Journal Funding. This figure represents the sum of the previous year's subject-based journals expenditures, plus any other expenditures from non-subject funds that support particular subjects. One example is the annual Institute of Electrical Engineers (IEEE) electronic journals package subscription at \$22,450.00, paid out of non-subject funds, that clearly supports engineering. The Library intends to reassign such resources to its subject funds in the future in order to provide a more accurate accounting of subject-based support.

#### Formula for the Core Research Journals Allocation, by Department:

$$JA:RC_{D1} = (WFGP_{D1} \cdot x) + [1 - (JPUP_{D1} \cdot y)] \cdot TAJF$$

Where:

**JA:RC<sub>D1</sub>** = The Journal Allocation for the Core Research Journals collection, for Department D1.

**WFGP<sub>D1</sub>** = Weighted Faculty/Graduate points for Department D1 expressed as a percent of total Weighted Faculty/Graduate points

=  $(WFG_{D1}/TWFG) \cdot 100$ , where:

**WFG<sub>D1</sub>** = Weighted Faculty/Graduate points for Department D1

=  $FG_{D1} \cdot JD_{D1}$  where:

**FG<sub>D1</sub>** = as above

**JD<sub>D1</sub>** = The degree of Journal Dependency, expressed as a percentage x 100, of total book and journal dependency for the given department's subject area.

**TWFG** = Total Weighted Faculty/Graduate points for all departments

**X** = the weighting of the Weighted Faculty/Graduate points, expressed as a percentage (in the current formulation of the calculation, this is set at .50)

**JPUP<sub>D1</sub>** = Journal publication Universe for Department D1, expressed as a percentage of the total Journal Publication Universe.

=  $(JPU_{D1}/TJC) \cdot 100$ , where:

**JPU<sub>D1</sub>** = Journal publication universe, in dollars, for D1

= The number of scholarly journals in the subject area of Department D1 multiplied by the average cost of those journals, in dollars.

**TJC** = The Total Journal Cost for all departments.

**Y** = the weighting of the Journal publication Universe for Department D1 expressed as a percentage (in the current formulation of the calculation, this is set at .50)

**TAJF** = Total available journal funding.

### **Formulae Discussion**

The Library has formed one way to calculate the allocation of Library resources. It recognizes that any formulae that seek to perform that task are bound to have shortcomings, and, because of the nature and complexity of the universe of academic knowledge, some measure of subjectivity in the development of the formulae and the gathering of data was unavoidable. To begin with, data is available from disparate sources, is presented using non-standard descriptors, and, hence, must be somehow normalized or re-phrased into categories that reflect ISU's disciplinary offerings. Additionally, the publishing universe is vast, and it is inevitably a matter of estimation to arrive at publication figures for subject areas. Also, there do not seem to be reliable lists of "core" library materials, particularly from the library literature or accrediting agencies. Finally, singular guidance on allocation formula creation from within the academic library profession is non-existent. There are many published formulae, all reflecting particular institutions' needs and their political circumstances and all differing in exactly what acquisitions are being addressed, and what factors are being included in the calculations. Among these, there seems to be no generally accepted formula for library allocations, although discrete aspects of some published formulae have been adapted for this work.

The work is also the result of an active and ongoing collaboration with the University Statistician, Teri Peterson. The primary reflection of her contributions lies in the formula's current articulation, in which the Core Research Journals allocation, which represents 76% of the Library's total FY 08/09 subject funds, considers two factors to which equal weights have been assigned. Working with Ms. Peterson, the Library performed analyses varying the weights of the factors using both factor analysis and logarithmic analysis. As neither of these methods yielded substantially different results than the equally-weighted method, it was determined to frame the discussion of this formula in terms of the last of these approaches. Assigning different relative weights of these factors is another aspect of the formula that can be adjusted, to reflect emphases and/or priorities deemed to be desirable.

Below is an example of the formula's effects upon the core research journals allocation for four selected ISU departments under three scenarios that reflect 1) emphases on the journal publication universe 2) equal weightings of the journal publication universe and of faculty/graduate points and 3) emphases on faculty/graduate points. This table is offered as an illustration of the variance that the data can produce and as a starting point for a discussion on weight assignment:

<b>Department</b>	<b>Predicted Core Research Journals Allocation-- Emphasis on JPUP</b> (WFGP=.05, JPUP=.95)	<b>Predicted Core Research Journals Allocation-- WFGP and JPUP are equal</b> (WFGP=.5, JPUP=.5)	<b>Predicted Core Research Journals Allocation— Emphasis on WFGP</b> (WFGP=.95, JPUP=.05)	<b>FY08/09 journals allocation with packages included (equivalent in meaning to formula's Graduate/Faculty Core Research Allocation)</b>
<b>Biology</b>	237,244.00	176,717.00	116,191.00	383,488.00
<b>Educational Leadership</b>	2,030.00	15,559.00	29,087.00	9,846.76
<b>Engineering</b>	80,544.00	79,919.00	79,293.00	64,824.00 (42,374.00 +22,450.00 IEEE journals package)
<b>English</b>	9,256.00	13,938.00	18,620.00	16,576.00 (16,226.00+350.00 .25 EEBO maint. Fee)

In the early stages of this work, the Library conducted a survey of the faculty about which journals they considered to core for their respective disciplines. The survey received a return rate that was unsatisfactory, which suggests, perhaps, that this is not a survey-able topic. Additionally, the work has included consultation with Drs. Steve Adkison, Barbara Adamcik and Linda Hatzenbuehler, as well as numerous sessions with the University Library Committee (ULC). The ULC has been providing valuable input and has been kept up-to-date with the progress of this work.

### **Next Steps**

Since the effects of the effects of these formulae vary considerably among departments, it may be advisable to implement the formula over time, or in some other modified way, or as new funds become available. The Library recognizes that President Vailas may wish to conduct discussions on this matter, or on making any adjustments to individual formulae, and that any implementation would optimally take place at a fiscal year change, and is ready to proceed accordingly. The Library is prepared to produce detailed allocation predictions as needed, although work on a few remaining elements remains to be completed. Additionally, the Library is preparing to modify its accounting and data collection techniques to adjust to the requirements of the annual data collection that will be necessary to the formulae implementation.