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Recommendations to Improve Funding for Henderson Library

Submitted by: Tim Giles

2/2/2009

Motion:

Recommendations
• Georgia Southern should consider directing to the Henderson Library budget dollars from a per-credit-hour charge for all or selected classes, such as those taught entirely online.
• Georgia Southern should explore alternatives to current technology strategies. For example, should so much of the student technology fee continue to fund desktop computers? Freeing up some of the technology fee from continually updating hardware would enable the University to redirect funds to databases and other electronic library resources.
• Henderson Library should be a higher priority in Georgia Southern University fundraising, especially online since the library web site receives so much traffic.
• Every year the library committee should conduct a library comparison of comparable in-state and out-of-state peer institutions to assess the distribution of library funds and report the results to the faculty senate, noting how Georgia Southern University is addressing these expenditure gaps.

Rationale:

The problem with funding for the Henderson Library stems from underfunding of Georgia Southern in general. An examination of peer institutions supports this claim. For example, Appalachian State University’s library receives 3.0% of the university’s
total funding, but spends $462.27 for “Total Library Expenditures Per Person Enrolled;” Georgia Southern is provided with 4.3% of the university’s funding, but spends only $225.17 for “Total Library Expenditures Per Person Enrolled.” The first recommendation that additional funding be garnered from a per-credit-hour charge is modeled on the University of Texas-Pan American. Doing so at Georgia Southern, according to data provided by the Provost’s Office for fiscal year 2008, would provide over $1.1 million. Online courses also pose additional library costs in terms of providing resources for students who are far from campus. Second, the committee suggests that the continued support of computer hardware through the student technology fee be examined; for fiscal year 2009, computer hardware expenditures accounted for $1 million of $1.2 million from the student technology fee. Third, the committee recommends a more visible profile for fundraising for the library, especially on its web pages. Finally, the library committee plans to continue to monitor progress made with this issue on a yearly basis and report on it to the faculty senate.

 Senate Response:

MOTION: “Recommendations to Improve Funding for Henderson Library Resources,” Tim Giles (CLASS) circulated a revised motion. He then reported that the Library Committee’s examination of data from Peer and Aspirational Institutions indicated that Georgia Southern lagged in terms of FTE funding, which was problematic given the University’s new role as a doctoral research institution. On March 28, 2008, the Faculty Senate requested a comprehensive plan to increase Georgia Southern University’s fiscal expenditures in Henderson Library’s collections and resources. The Library Committee has since met four times to follow-up on this charge. Giles the presented the recommendations on the part of the Library Committee, including charging per student credit hour based on a model of the University of Texas-Pan America. According to data from the Provost’s Office, doing so would net approximately $1.1 million for Georgia Southern. The Library Committee also suggested looking at the way the technology fee is currently spent, most of which is currently spent on hardware, and making library fundraising a higher. Tim Giles (CLASS) then moved as follows: The Library Committee recommends that:

- Georgia Southern consider directing to the Henderson Library budget dollars from a per-credit-hour charge for all or selected classes, such as those taught entirely online.
- Georgia Southern explore alternatives to current technology strategies.
● Henderson Library be a higher priority in Georgia Southern University fundraising, especially online.
● The library committee conduct a yearly library comparison of comparable instate and out-of-state peer institutions to assess the distribution of library funds and report the results to the faculty senate, to assess the distribution of library funds and report the results to the faculty senate, noting how Georgia Southern University is addressing these expenditure gaps.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) Senate Moderator asked for a second and then opened the floor for questions.

Michael Moore (COE) asked who represented faculty on the Technology Committee. Tim Giles (CLASS) responded that nobody on the Library Committee is also specifically on the Faculty Senate, but added that Jonathan Harwell had sat in on a number of meetings and provided quite a bit of information from the Technology Committee. Linda Bleicken (Provost) added that Christine Ludowise from CLASS represents faculty on the Student Technology Fee Committee and that the Dean of the Library also sits on the Student Tech Fee Committee.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) Senate Moderator then called for a vote and the motion passed unanimously.

Correction made at March 24, 2009, Senate meeting: The last sentence should read "information from Henderson Library’s Online Tuition Revenue Task Force."

President’s Response:

From Dr. Grube 5/4/2009: Below are my responses to the recommendations adopted by the Faculty Senate at their February 16, 2009, meeting, as provided in your memorandum of February 17, 2009.

RECOMMENDATIONS:
• Georgia Southern should consider directing to the Henderson Library budget dollars from a per-credit-hour charge for all or selected classes, such as those taught entirely online. **Georgia Southern will consider the redirection of a proportion of budget dollars from online programs to support electronic resources.**

• Georgia Southern should explore alternatives to current technology strategies. For example, should so much of the student technology fee continue to fund desktop
computers? Freeing up some of the technology fee from continually updating hardware would enable the University to redirect funds to databases and other electronic library resources. Library resources such as desktop computers, paper, toner, and student assistants are currently funded through Student Technology Fees. In addition, the Technology Advisory Committee is currently reviewing the Technology Information Resources Strategic Plan. A part of this review will include the consideration of alternatives to current technology strategies.

• Henderson Library should be a higher priority in Georgia Southern University fundraising, especially online since the library web site receives so much traffic.

• Every year the library committee should conduct a library comparison of comparable in-state and out-of-state peer institutions to assess the distribution of library funds and report the results to the faculty senate, noting how Georgia Southern University is addressing these expenditure gaps. This is an ongoing effort. The Dean of the Library collects such data each year, and these are an input to budget building process in Academic Affairs. These data can be made available to the Library Committee.

RATIONALE: The problem with funding for the Henderson Library stems from underfunding of Georgia Southern in general. An examination of peer institutions supports this claim. For example, Appalachian State University’s library receives 3.0% of the university’s total funding, but spends $462.27 for “Total Library Expenditures Per Person Enrolled;” Georgia Southern is provided with 4.3% of the university’s funding, but spends only $225.17 for “Total Library Expenditures Per Person Enrolled.” The first recommendation that additional funding be garnered from a per-credit-hour charge is modeled on the University of Texas-Pan American. Doing so at Georgia Southern, according to data provided by the Provost’s Office for fiscal year 2008, would provide over $1.1 million. Online courses also pose additional library costs in terms of providing resources for students who are far from campus. Second, the committee suggests that the continued support of computer hardware through the student technology fee be examined; for fiscal year 2009, computer hardware expenditures accounted for $1 million of $1.2 million from the student technology fee. Third, the committee recommends a more visible profile for fundraising for the library, especially on its web pages. Finally, the library committee plans to continue to monitor progress made with this issue on a yearly basis and report on it to the faculty senate.

This is a corrected copy of the response I sent you on May 4, 2009, regarding the above-referenced subject. Some of the text of my response was inadvertently omitted (note bullets 2 & 4). Below are my corrected responses to the recommendations
adopted by the Faculty Senate at their February 16, 2009, meeting, as provided in your memorandum of February 17, 2009.

Recommendations:

• Georgia Southern should consider directing to the Henderson Library budget dollars from a per-credit-hour charge for all or selected classes, such as those taught entirely online. *Georgia Southern will consider the redirection of a proportion of budget dollars from online programs to support electronic resources.*

• Georgia Southern should explore alternatives to current technology strategies. For example, should so much of the student technology fee continue to fund desktop computers? Freeing up some of the technology fee from continually updating hardware would enable the University to redirect funds to databases and other electronic library resources. *Library resources such as desktop computers, paper, toner, and student assistants are currently funded through Student Technology Fees. In addition, the Technology Advisory Committee is currently reviewing the Technology Information Resources Strategic Plan. A part of this review will include the consideration of alternatives to current technology strategies.*

• Henderson Library should be a higher priority in Georgia Southern University fundraising, especially online since the library web site receives so much traffic.

• Every year the library committee should conduct a library comparison of comparable in-state and out-of-state peer institutions to assess the distribution of library funds and report the results to the faculty senate, noting how Georgia Southern University is addressing these expenditure gaps. *This is an ongoing effort. The Dean of the Library collects such data each year, and these are an input to the budget building process in Academic Affairs. These data can be made available to the Library Committee.*

RATIONALE:

The problem with funding for the Henderson Library stems from underfunding of Georgia Southern in general. An examination of peer institutions supports this claim. For example, Appalachian State University's library receives 3.0% of the university's
total funding, but spends $462.27 for “Total Library Expenditures Per Person Enrolled;” Georgia Southern is provided with 4.3% of the university’s funding, but spends only $225.17 for “Total Library Expenditures Per Person Enrolled.” The first recommendation that additional funding be garnered from a per-credit-hour charge is modeled on the University of Texas-Pan American. Doing so at Georgia Southern, according to data provided by the Provost’s Office for fiscal year 2008, would provide over $1.1 million. Online courses also pose additional library costs in terms of providing resources for students who are far from campus. Second, the committee suggests that the continued support of computer hardware through the student technology fee be examined; for fiscal year 2009, computer hardware expenditures accounted for $1 million of $1.2 million from the student technology fee. Third, the committee recommends a more visible profile for fundraising for the library, especially on its web pages. Finally, the library committee plans to continue to monitor progress made with this issue on a yearly basis and report on it to the faculty senate.

Attachment: Library Committee Report on Improving Resources for Henderson Library