Strategic Direction 4
Second Report

| Strategic Direction 4 - Enhance the library resources available to the University of Maine System and the state of Maine by supporting a high-quality, integrated System library consortium built on the foundation of a single well-supported doctoral/research library at the University of Maine, and individual resource libraries at each of the other universities. Continue to develop a State-wide digital library to support all citizens of Maine. |

Executive Summary

The University of Maine System libraries have an extensive history of collaboration, most exemplified by our shared online catalog URSUS, which includes the collections of eight libraries of the University of Maine System, the Maine State Library, the State Law and Legislative Reference Library and the Bangor Public Library, and Maine Info Net, the shared statewide catalog which links the collections of all Maine libraries. A unique partnership exists between the UMS libraries and the Maine State Library that facilitates selection and delivery of statewide access to electronic indexes and databases, ensuring that all Maine libraries and citizens in smaller, rural areas receive the same basic resources as the larger libraries. This virtual, digital library is a centralized service that the State Library and UMS Libraries offer, and Maine has been recognized nationally for this level of collaboration that delivers universal access and new combinations of resources, services and delivery systems made possible with digital technologies.

Continuing the collaboration and seeking new partnerships

The UMS Libraries will further develop their historic partnership into a more structured and formal commitment to collaborative collection development, information technology services, information literacy, staff development, and technical operations. Fogler Library at the University of Maine in Orono will be formally recognized and supported as the lead System and State research library and support the research needs of faculty at all campuses.

The UMS Libraries will also seek partnerships and collaborations on their campuses where the libraries must be mission driven to succeed in supporting their own communities. For instance, UMF might be designated the UMS education library, but it is also identified as the public liberal arts college of Maine, and as a result will also need to develop a well-rounded collection for that mission.

Securing the partnership of libraries statewide: Creating the Maine Info Net organization

Over a period of the next three to five years, the UMS Libraries and the Maine State Library will implement the major directions proposed by the NELINET Consulting Solutions in their July 2003 Report. Chief among the recommendations is the need to advance growth, awareness and support for Maine Info Net as a gateway for library services, by formalizing the partnership between the Maine State Library and the UMS Libraries. A memorandum of understanding was signed by the Chancellor and the State Librarian in August 2005 to begin this process. Key to the success of this agreement is the hiring of a jointly funded, Chief Information Officer who will represent the interests of the UMS Libraries and the
private academic libraries, as well as public and school libraries. A search is underway and it is hoped the position will be filled during the Spring Semester of 2006.

**A single well-funded research library requires an increase in Fogler Library’s base budget**

In order for Fogler Library to expand and solidify its role as University of Maine System leader in the development of research collections and establishment of expanded digital collections, Fogler must be well supported financially and the physical restraints must be removed. The Library needs an increase in its base budget to fund research collections, the digital library and to provide for adequate staffing.

- The plan calls for an increase of $1 million each year in base funding for the library's acquisitions budget to compensate for current materials inflation costs and to acquire materials that the library was unable to purchase in past years. Over five years, there would be a $5 million increase. After that the materials budget could be indexed for annual inflation.

- The library would receive a larger but decreasing portion of the bond funds as follows: Year 1: $3 million; Year 2: $2.5 million; Year 3: $2 million; Year 4: $1.75 million; Year 5: $1.5 million. This could be accomplished by moving 10% of the bond money from facilities to Library.

- The library would receive 4% of indirect costs obtained from grants over the 2004 baseline. By 2010, this would mean the library would be getting the equivalent 2% of all indirect costs, which is the average for academic libraries in the U.S.) The 4% of indirect cost would be taken off from the current 25% going to facilities and administration. These funds would support the research needs of the grant researchers and expanded doctoral programming.

Fogler Library has a functionally obsolete building and is at capacity. A special campaign should be launched for the construction of a 96,000 square foot addition to accommodate collections and services, to provide appropriate study spaces, to remove the center core stacks, and to address safety and accessibility issues.

**Addressing the need to increase the UMS Libraries URSUS budget**

The future success of the University of Maine System Libraries depends on continued growth and development of the statewide digital library. One major limitation to further expansion of the digital collections has been the necessity and ongoing uncertainty of cobbling together funding at every step. Grants, bonds and other one-time funding for years have been the backbone of this initiative. For the libraries to continue to make online and other technologically based resources available to all students, faculty and staff on all campuses as well as Maine citizens, a solid base investment in the continued development of the digital library are critical.

The budget outlined below is based on a proposed funding formula, intended to stabilize support for the centralized (core) services covered by the URSUS digital library budget. Equally important, it is intended to be and responsive to the ongoing development and growth of the digital library for all Maine’s citizens. Two possible inflation indexes are proposed for consideration. The budget does not provide for capital equipment acquisition or replacement.

**Understanding the library’s primary role**

The UMS libraries are both virtual and physical spaces, as well as social and learning centers for their respective campus and public communities. The library’s primary role on campus is to educate users by
collaborating with faculty to promote information literacy and critical thinking, and to evaluate these outcomes through assessment. Each library is a unique expression of the cultural heritage and characteristics of the place in which it is located. Individually and as a consortium, the libraries confront the realities of budgetary constraints and challenges posed by the transition from print to electronic publishing.

**Background of the Process**

At an introductory planning meeting with 18 members of the Strategic Direction #4 group present, four subgroups were formed based on the four goals published in the Implementation Planning Process (January 2005). The goals and the subgroup’s focuses are:

- Develop a clear and comprehensive vision for the future of libraries in the System and throughout the state;
- Develop an effective and collaborative UMS Library system consortium founded on one strong, well-funded research library at the University of Maine.
- Continue to create a strong collaborative relationship between the UMS Library consortium and the State Library, and aggressively expand the Statewide integrated digital library to meet the needs of the UMS and all of Maine; and
- Establish a permanent base-budget investment in the digital library.

SD #4 subgroups met individually throughout the spring semester of 2005 by phone, in-person, and using video conferencing technology. Subgroup conveners met twice with the co-chairs to verify direction and progress. An end of semester meeting of all SD #4 members was held in late April to hear draft reports and collect feedback.

Each SD #4 subgroup was convened by UMS library professionals. They were charged with preparing draft subgroup reports reflecting their work through the end of April, and including recommendations that move the agenda forward and serve as discussion starters. To support the work of the subgroups, strategic planning documents prepared by the UMS library directors over the last five years where distributed and discussed, allowing the subgroups to become knowledgeable about the work done to date. The summer and fall 2005 were used to finalize draft one, collect feedback on the initial recommendations, and prepare objectives and strategies to actually effect implementation.

During the spring and fall 2005 semesters, the UMS Library directors meeting with their colleagues from the State, Bangor Public and the Law and Legislative Reference Library (The URSUS Digital Library Group), as well as with SD# membership continued to address the issues raised within the SD #4 goals and refine the draft document.

**Strategies and Recommendations for Implementation**

| Goal 1 - Develop a clear and comprehensive vision for the future of libraries in the System and throughout the state |
**Vision Statement**

The UMS Libraries have a critical and vibrant role on campus, off campus, and in the State in preparing students and all Maine citizens to function successfully within the global and creative economies and to be life-long learners. The UMS Libraries are a consortium that works collaboratively and cooperatively, along with the other URSUS libraries, to provide systematic and efficient library resources and services. Digital technology provides the means to offer universal access to all users and to provide new combinations of resources, services, and delivery systems. The Libraries offer both virtual and physical spaces and are centers of learning on their individual campuses and serve their public communities. By partnering with faculty in the learning process, the UMS Libraries actively promote and teach information literacy and support research. The Libraries are engaged in continual assessment of their outcomes and effectiveness in providing information and services to students, faculty, researchers and Maine citizens.

**Goal 2 - Develop an effective and collaborative UMS Library system consortium founded on one strong, well-funded research library at the University of Maine**

The UMS Libraries will further develop their historic partnership into a more structured and formal commitment to collaborative collection development, information technology services, information literacy, staff development, and operations. Fogler Library will be formally recognized and supported as the System and State Lead Research Library.

**Recommendations**

Recommendations for Goal 2 fall into two broad areas and address potential ways to develop an effective and collaborative consortium (2a), and address the budget and space constraints that confront Fogler Library (2b).

**Goal 2A  Develop an effective and collaborative UMS Library system consortium**

The UMS Library System consortium is strong and has been successful, but to continue to provide the resources and services demanded by users it has to move forward into more collaborative efforts.

**Collection Development Journals**

The UMS Libraries will become more collaborative and efficient when selecting and providing access to expanding digital collections. The UMS Libraries will seek to eliminate duplicate subscriptions by evolving collaborative collection development for online serials. Collection development staff will create a core collection of journals in electronic formats for the University of Maine System libraries with licensure agreements that address archival concerns, while phasing out hard copy journal subscriptions where complete online documents exist. License agreements, where feasible, will take into consideration the needs of researchers across all campuses.

**Collection Development Monographs**
The UMS Libraries will develop a cooperative collection development strategy that will allow each campus to build local general collections but also encourage the development of non-duplicative, campus strengths to benefit the entire consortium. (For example, perhaps Farmington is the designated strength for undergraduate materials in education). Cooperative strategies will also eliminate unnecessarily duplication of little used or very expensive items in the state. UM and USM currently use approval plan software which can be used to facilitate such coordination. (Possible model: Tri-College Consortium in Pennsylvania).

Information Literacy

The UMS Libraries will work cooperatively to share information literacy best practices, course guides, and classroom successes with the goal of producing robust and integrated literacy programs at all campuses. Information Literacy programs not only meet NEASC information literacy expectations but ensure that Maine students are receiving these essential skills across all campuses. Given the minimal staffing at most campus libraries working cooperatively will help maximize skills, resources and best practices.

Research

The UMS Libraries will recognize the research needs of faculty at all campuses and will work collaboratively to provide access to collections and services where necessary. This collaborative will bring a strong emphasis to research statewide.

Partnerships and Centers for Learning

The UMS Libraries will constantly seek partnerships and collaborative opportunities on their campuses. Today’s academic library is not merely a repository of resources and the source of user services, but a true center for learning on our campuses.

Delivery Service

Maintain the System commitment to the very successful statewide delivery service for tangible items.

| Goal 2B | Develop a well-funded research library at the University of Maine |

Fogler has provided leadership in the areas of developing research collections, establishing the digital library - URSUS, Maine Info Net, full-text electronic database resources, and material delivery. To continue this work and establish the foundation for future success, Fogler must be well supported financially and the physical restraints removed.

Research Collections Funding

Fogler Library needs an increase in its base budget to acquire resources that will address research needs across the System. This plan does not eliminate the need for the other campus libraries to specialize in their own local collections to support the research specialties of their individual campuses, such as the Acadian Archives at UMFK, the Osher Map Library, or the Muskie School of Public Service resource collection at USM. The campus libraries must be mission driven to succeed in supporting their own
communities. For instance, UMF might be designated the UMS education library, but it is also identified as the public liberal arts college of Maine, and as a result will need to develop a well-rounded collection to support that mission.

Staffing requirements

Fogler Library needs funding to hire the staffing needed to develop technologies, services, needed by Fogler Library and the consortium.

Budget requirements

Fogler Library’s budget has to be indexed against inflation and it needs a funding formula that allows it to grow as the University’s numbers of students and programs grow, including a share of campus research funds, external grants, and internal and external bonding opportunities. We estimate that within five years journal inflation will require an additional annual expenditure of $2.6 million just to maintain current library subscriptions. Other research institutions have been increasing their library budget to account for journal inflation, approximately 11% annually. For example, UNH went from a budget of $8.8 million in 2002 to $14.1 million in 2004 and the budget will increase by $500,000 next year.

- The plan calls for an increase of $1 million each year in base funding for the library’s acquisitions budget to compensate for current materials inflation costs and to acquire materials that the library was unable to purchase in past years. In other words, over five years there would be a $5 million increase. After that the materials budget could be indexed for annual inflation.

- The library would receive a larger but decreasing portion of the bond funds as follows: Year 1: $3 million; Year 2: $2.5 million; Year 3: $2 million; Year 4: $1.75 million; Year 5: $1.5 million. This could be accomplished by moving 10% of the bond money from facilities to Library.

- The library would receive 4% of indirect costs obtained from grants over the 2004 baseline. By 2010, this would mean the library would be getting the equivalent 2% of all indirect costs, which is the average for academic libraries in the U.S.) The 4% of indirect cost would be taken off from the current 25% going to facilities and administration.

Digital Library

Fogler Library’s role as the System leader in the development and expansion of the UMS digital library requires additional funding for commercial databases, the creation of local databases and e-portfolios, establishing an institutional repository and other digital resources. Specialized staff, hardware, and software will be needed to accomplish this role.

Physical Space Issues
Fogler Library’s current space problems must be addressed. Fogler’s responsibility as the “single UMS doctoral/research library” requires that it maintain collections for the future generations of users. Space is needed to meet this requirement and to meet the needs of staff and users.

Fogler Library has a functionally obsolete building and is at capacity. It has very limited individual study space, lacks any group study space, and houses a collection of only one million volumes. As such the library does not appropriately support the educational and research requirements for the University, the UMS System, it’s legislatively designated role as the State’s Business Science and Technology library, and other community, library and State demands. Space is needed for these multiple purposes.

Construction of a 96,000 square foot addition is necessary to accommodate collections, services, and to provide appropriate study spaces be redesigned and the center core stacks removed to address safety and accessibility issues.

To ensure the most cost effective storage solution for collection growth, installation of compact shelving and a mezzanine in the Library Annex building is required. To move beyond the needs of UM to the UMS and the State an addition to the annex is needed. This will provide long-term growth space for collections.

The creation of a “Last Copy Center” will serve libraries throughout the state. A last copy center is a central facility managed by librarians that would allow Maine libraries to preserve titles that might be weeded from other collections due to space or usage concerns. Such a facility would permit all libraries to discard their copy of the item going to the Last Copy Center, thereby saving space in local libraries. The storage facility would also provide interlibrary loan services or electronic document delivery of the material upon request.
### Proposed Increases for Fogler Library Base Budget

- **Base budget increases in Fogler Library staffing to meet UM and System needs:**  
  $477,699

  Five professional staff for the following responsibilities:  
  Two public services librarians to continue the work of virtual reference, manage the  
  last copy center, provide B.I. support, continue subject liaison work including  
  collection development at UM, and provide research and reference assistance to the state.

  Three technical services staff to do the programming for locally created databases  
  and products, to assist UMS libraries in processing materials as needed, to work on  
  issues with commercial databases, to work on implementation and issues from  
  commercial service providers, to maintain and troubleshoot problems with any  
  technical issue both at Fogler Library and for the System.

  Four support staff for the following responsibilities:  
  Operate last copy center, including document delivery solutions, provide for more  
  building hours in the library, operate digitizing equipment, provide more service  
  hours for some departments, support of technical services librarians.

  Two FTE student staff for the following responsibilities:  
  Provide support for the hours and services listed above.

- **Base budget increase at Fogler Library for research acquisitions:** $1,000,000
  $1 million increase in base funding for each of five years for acquisitions.

- **Base budget increase for inflation:**  
  Index UM Library budget for inflation based on Association of Research Libraries 10 %

- **Bond funding share:**  
  Provide a share of the UM facilities bond money to the library.

- **Indirect cost share from UM grants:**  
  Provide 4% of indirect cost recovery to the library from all UM grants and contracts.

- **Funding for Fogler Library addition and renovation:**  
  $26,000,000
  Build 96,000 square foot addition to Fogler Library and upgrade existing library  
  to meet ADA, HVAC and workspace needs (addition only, no renovation).
Goal 3 - Continue to create a strong collaborative relationship between the UMS Library consortium and the State Library, and aggressively expand the statewide integrated digital library to meet the needs of the UMS and all of Maine

Recommendations

Recommendation: Over a period of the next three to five years, implement the major directions proposed by the NELINET Consulting Solutions in their July 2003 Report to UMS.

The consultants provide recommendations that “would identify the branding and terminology to support the quickest and most complete statewide understanding of the services so it is possible to market the benefits of Maine Info Net to the students, faculty and staff members, the state legislature, the general public, as well as the participating libraries.” Maine Info Net is viewed as a multi-type collaborative effort for all the citizens of Maine.

Upon implementation of these recommendations, Maine Info Net will become the primary gateway or portal to library and related information for all citizens in Maine, in much the same way OhioLink, and Illinet have provided access for Ohio and Illinois citizens. The University of Maine System, Colby, Bates and Bowdoin Colleges’ local library systems will continue to serve and be recognized by their local users as their own library system, but it will also become crystal clear that Maine Info Net is the umbrella or overarching library structure and information portal for the libraries of the State of Maine.

Since its inception, the University of Maine System URSUS (digital) library budget has shared in the purchase and delivery of electronic resources offered through Maine Info Net where better prices and negotiating leverage are available on the larger scale statewide basis. Today, legislative, bond, PUC e-rate, and University dollars together provide the foundation digital resources for all Maine library users. Maine Info Net’s expansion and branding will bring all of these resources together under one roof for the user.

NELINET Consulting Solutions makes the following set of recommendations, and they are endorsed by the SD #4 Task Force:

Recommendation 1: A new Info Net Board with members representing all participants will be created:

The Board will be a membership organization while assuring substantial accountability to and participation of the membership. For general program delivery, Info Net can be thought of as a “consortium of consortia,” with groups such as MINERVA, URSUS and others acting as the access system service providers, and Maine Info Net providing services to these groups (and their member libraries). The access system service providers are funded through local appropriation of funds. The Info Net services are state funded through the Maine State Library and the University of Maine System. This relationship can be visualized as below. (Note: the chart below is intended to be illustrative, and not exhaustive.)
The Maine Library Commission acting through the Maine State Library; and the University of Maine System will be formal partners and the sponsors of Maine Info Net. It is essential for the Maine Library Commission, the Maine State Library, and the University of Maine system to continue to have a significant presence and voice in the continuing development and support of Info Net. The Maine Library Commission and the University of Maine System should be the primary sponsors of Info Net. The two bodies should formalize through a Memorandum of Understanding the nature of the sponsorship and the roles and responsibilities of each of the partners.

**Reporting Relationships and Authority**: Maine Info Net will function in a “sponsored program model” in which Info Net would have its own separate elected Board to which it would report. This Board would be sponsored jointly by the Maine Library Commission and the University of Maine System. The two will share decision-making power on the most significant issues, such as the employment of the CEO (Executive Director) and establishment of Info Net policies. The new reporting structure is illustrated below.
Recommendation 2: Maine Info Net will have a CEO and dedicated staff

a. CEO will report jointly to the UMS and the Maine Library Commission
b. CEO position will be funded by the UMS and the Maine Library Commission

Probably the biggest shift required relates to the involvement of the University of Maine System as a formal partner with the Maine Library Commission in the administration of Maine Info Net. This will require that the Office of the Chancellor accept and formalize a previously informal role, i.e., that it will fully represent the interests not only of the University System, but also of all other members of the higher education community in the state, whether those institutions are private or public.

The Reporting Relationship illustration above also includes an important “dotted line” relationship between the Info Net Board and its two sponsors and units, the Maine Library Commission and the University of Maine System. Although the formal reporting relationship is to the Library Commission (and not to the State Library), in practice the Maine State Library will serve as the conduit to Info Net for support from Maine Library Commission, and to act as the representative of the interests of public and school libraries. In addition, the State Library will provide technology support and staff in support of the program, and (although not illustrated) serve as the sponsor and represent the interests for MINERVA, unaffiliated libraries, etc. To ensure continuing positive relations, the Maine State Library will have a permanent seat on the Info Net Board.

To enable this model, the Maine Library Commission and the University of Maine System office should develop a Memorandum of Agreement to delineate the responsibilities of each of the parties, separately and jointly.
Recommendation 3: Maine Info Net should be Constituted as an independent entity with member institutions (a membership organization)

Governance Model: Any recommended governance model (see illustration below) must not require undue risk, must be affordable, and must enable Info Net to have a clear identity, and have a legal and program status that is recognized by others (particularly by the legislature). Ideally, the governance structure should encourage the organization to be agile and to demonstrate entrepreneurship. The structure must be highly inclusive of all types of libraries. organization must be must build upon the Therefore, it is maintain the active Maine State Library Maine System.
Recommendation 4: Maine Info Net requires sustainable funding and reasonable dues ultimately becoming self-sustaining

It is recommended that Info Net continue to be funded primarily from state funds as provided through the Maine State Library. In addition, Info Net members should be charged annual dues (to cover basic infrastructure and overhead costs that are of common benefit to all members), and fees for optional services where each member library can choose whether or not to participate.

The chart below summarizes the anticipated initial major programs and services of Info Net, and the potential source of funding to support those services. In some cases, the service may be funded from only one source of funds, while other services may be funded through a combination. For example, a ground delivery service which currently has baseline funding provided through the University and state funds, may be augmented in the future via general dues, with individual libraries having the option to supplement the basic services if they pay extra fees to do so. Similarly, state funds may be used to fund some e-resources common to all institutions, but Info Net may also negotiate for other resources sought by only a portion of the membership, with the latter paid through optional fees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Dues</th>
<th>Optional Fees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Administration</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union catalog and resource sharing</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although it might be desirable to expect the state to pay all expenses related to Info Net, realistically Info Net should not overly-rely upon any one funding source. By expanding the funding streams, Info Net not only will not be subject to the vagaries of state revenues, but it also will enable Info Net to provide services that the libraries desire but that the state might be unable or unwilling to support (or to support in full). The latter services might include:

- development and implementation of a marketing program for libraries on the availability and use of Info Net;
- supplemental electronic resources, which might be purchased in part from state funds and in part from member contributions;
- staff for communications, such as web site updating, or for facilitation, such as to convene and coordinate committee meetings;
- technology consulting and support; and,
- management of the holdings database and the Maine union list of serials.

While the working group recommends creation of a dues and fees structure, the exact cost of dues cannot be estimated in any more detail until there is a further articulation as to what costs the dues must support. However, the working group recommends that any dues structure must be viewed by the general membership to be “reasonable.” It is also recognized that any dues or fees may not be met favorably by members. In part, members have developed an unrealistic set of expectations because some of the current operations have been supported through informal subsidies. For example, the University of Maine System and the Maine State Library have been supporting MINERVA at a rate that does not cover the true direct and indirect costs. As long as such informal subsidy continues, it is possible that libraries will not feel any pressure to do something about permanent funding.

(Details of the following recommendations are available in the NELINET Consultants’ Report)

Recommendation 5: Maine Info Net should establish and enforce standards and policies for member participation in the union catalog

Recommendation 6: Maine Info Net should have a clear identity and brand name

Recommendation 7: Marketing and public relations must be developed that focus on its three key constituent groups: libraries, library users and funding sources

Recommendation 8: Maine Info Net should aim to become the Maine library portal to the world of information
Recommendation 9: Info Net should raise the level of library practice with the state by providing new tools and promoting best practices

Recommendation 10: Use InfoNet’s expansion as the opportunity for librarians to reinvent themselves to further respond to the state’s citizens’ future library and information needs especially with new information seeking behaviors

The Maine Info Net staff, lead by a new CEO, and built from current UMS URSUS library and Maine State Library staff members would be responsible for marketing, managing membership dues, and delivering services: the union catalog, delivery, e-resources (databases), standards, portal management, and training.

The current UMS Library Directors’ Council will continue in its current configuration serving as one of the consortia members albeit one of the two that sponsors and supervises the Maine Info Net CEO and provides policy direction to him or her and the Board.

Budget

Goal 4 – Establish a permanent base-budget investment in the digital library

The future success of the University of Maine System Libraries depends on continued growth and development of the statewide digital library. One major limitation to further expansion of the digital collections has been the necessity and ongoing uncertainty of cobbling together funding at every step. Grants, bonds and other one-time funding for years has been the backbone of this initiative. For the libraries to continue to make online and other technologically based resources available to all students, faculty and staff on all campuses as well as to Maine citizens, a significant investment in the continued development of the digital library is critical.

The budget outlined below is based on a proposed funding formula (modeled after those in other states), and is intended to stabilize support for the centralized services covered by the URSUS digital library budget. Equally important, it is intended to be responsive to the ongoing development and growth of the digital library for all Maine’s citizens. Two possible inflation indexes have been proposed and are described below. The formula balances demands on resources by type and level of academic program, and for the first time in UMS history, includes a “New Program Factor” for adding new resources when new programs are approved. The budget does not however provide for capital equipment acquisition or replacement

In an effort to move beyond maintenance of services and systems (at current levels), the formula also includes a modest increase of $50,000 annually to support startup and testing of digital initiatives. This “initiative fund” is apportioned in the budget equally to the base funding and the campus assessments. Once a high priority digital initiative has been tested and readied for Maine’s statewide digital library, separate internal or external funding will be required to proceed.
FUNDING FORMULA FOR BASE BUDGET STABILITY:

Introduction and Budget Notes:

Funding formulae are commonly applied to fund auxiliary services such as libraries. The formula developed below is a slightly modified version of one of the most common formulas in use. The approach is straightforward and is based on the number of student credit hours taught at each campus by academic level of student:

- Each campus is assessed a certain amount to pay for Systemwide library services.
- The assessment levied varies by the mission of the campus and the number of student credit hours taught by the campus.
- In most cases, twenty-seven percent of the student credit hours are exempt from assessment because not all academic programs use the library services and resources at the same level. For credit hours in law or doctoral programs, the exemption is twenty percent.
- Base funding categories are provided by UMS as has been the case since the inception of the URSUS Budget for System-wide library services.

- Accounting for inflation is critical to maintain the needed resources for scholarship and teaching. Two inflation factors are used in the example below. The Higher Education Price Index (HEPI) factor is a widely used index and is applied to certain software packages with traditionally low inflation rates (code 542, below). The HEPI index factor is 3.5% in the example below. The electronic databases are inflated using the nationally recognized Association of Research Library (ARL) rate. The rate in the example below is 10% as specified by ARL for 2004.

- The initial funding estimate is based on historical data.
- The student credit hours are 2004 data.
Budget estimates and categories:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formula Element</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Estimated Need.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base 100</td>
<td>Non Fac Salaries</td>
<td>$66,756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base 190</td>
<td>Employee Benefits</td>
<td>$35,295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base 200</td>
<td>Wages</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base 300</td>
<td>Student Wages</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base 400</td>
<td>UNET</td>
<td>$29,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Programming</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base 401</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base 410</td>
<td>Memberships</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base 420</td>
<td>Supplies &amp; Materials</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base 428</td>
<td>Lunch / Catering</td>
<td>$2,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base 430</td>
<td>Telephone/Telecom</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base 440</td>
<td>Postage &amp; Shipping</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base 460</td>
<td>Computer Service</td>
<td>$918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base 480</td>
<td>Travel In-State</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base 490</td>
<td>Travel Out-State</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base 541</td>
<td>Hardware</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base 660</td>
<td>Inter Dept Serv (UNET)</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base 700</td>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>URSUS (HP)</td>
<td>$6,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>Services Non-Emp</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEPI Index 413</td>
<td>Subscriptions</td>
<td>$204,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARL Index 542</td>
<td>Endeavor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OCLC Authority</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Docutek (ERef, Reserves) $7,000
Innovative (URSUS) $63,576
Digital Initiative fund $25,000.00
New Program Fund $250,000.00

Basic Formula:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Source of Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base Budget categories +</td>
<td>System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEPI Inflation factor for code 542 only +</td>
<td>System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Databases +</td>
<td>Campus assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARL inflation factor for databases +</td>
<td>Campus assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Initiative +</td>
<td>System assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Program addition (2005-06)</td>
<td>System assessment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Credit Hours by Campus, 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UM</th>
<th>USM</th>
<th>UMA</th>
<th>UMF</th>
<th>UMPI</th>
<th>UMFK</th>
<th>UMM</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>20,773</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>1,750</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate</td>
<td>111,786</td>
<td>76,501</td>
<td>16,863</td>
<td>30,627</td>
<td>17,249</td>
<td>11,092</td>
<td>7,065</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>10,181</td>
<td>11,919</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>1,886</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,167</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Degree</td>
<td>3,913</td>
<td>8,683</td>
<td>4,447</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>1,474</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>2,126</td>
<td>$0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>127,766</td>
<td>101,635</td>
<td>42,083</td>
<td>31,298</td>
<td>19,402</td>
<td>13,603</td>
<td>9,995</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example using 2004 SCH:

Assessment with 27%/20% credit hour exemption

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UM</th>
<th>USM</th>
<th>UMA</th>
<th>UMF</th>
<th>UMPI</th>
<th>UMFK</th>
<th>UMM</th>
<th>Exemption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 266.82</td>
<td>$ 15,164.29</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$495.67</td>
<td>$1,277.50</td>
<td>$586.92</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate</td>
<td>$81,604</td>
<td>$55,846</td>
<td>$12,310</td>
<td>$22,357</td>
<td>$12,592</td>
<td>$8,097</td>
<td>$5,157</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>$8,175</td>
<td>$9,571</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>$1,886</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$4,167</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$4,167</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Degree</td>
<td>$2,142</td>
<td>$4,754</td>
<td>$2,435</td>
<td>$368</td>
<td>$807</td>
<td>$417</td>
<td>$1,164</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$93,807</td>
<td>$74,604</td>
<td>$29,909</td>
<td>$2,725</td>
<td>$13,894</td>
<td>$9,791</td>
<td>$6,908</td>
<td>$251,639</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base Funding</td>
<td>System</td>
<td>$290,445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEPI inflation factor (code 542 only)</td>
<td>System</td>
<td>$3,851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Initiative</td>
<td>System</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$319,296</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Element

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Databases</td>
<td>assessment</td>
<td>$204,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARL Inflation Factor</td>
<td>assessment</td>
<td>$20,402</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Total $ -

New Program Factor $250,000

Grand Total 793,721

Decision-Making Matrices

**Goal 1** - Develop a clear and comprehensive vision for the future of libraries in the System and throughout the state

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority (urgency, benefits)</th>
<th>Cost (financial and effort)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goal 2A** - Develop an effective and collaborative UMS Library system consortium

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority (urgency, benefits)</th>
<th>Cost (financial and effort)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Goal 2B  Develop a well-funded research library at the University of Maine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority (urgency, benefits)</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Goal 3: Continue to create a strong collaborative relationship between the UMS Library consortium and the State Library, and aggressively expand the statewide integrated digital library to meet the needs of the UMS and all of Maine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority (urgency, benefits)</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Goal 4  Establish a permanent base-budget investment in the digital library

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority (urgency, benefits)</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implementation Timeline:

Summer 2005: Update and revise recommendations and finalize draft one

Fall 2005: Distribute draft one to campus and community constituencies and prepare draft two with objectives for implementation by January 31, 2006

Spring 2006: Collect further feedback, finalize draft three including planning with State of Maine on Maine Info Net and prepare final report for April 2006 with objectives and assessment measures
APPENDICES
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Chancellor Westfal’s Reaction to Draft One

September 8, 2005

Dear Dr. Abbott and Dr. Albert:
I want to thank you for your leadership of the Strategic Direction 4 Implementation Planning Committee. As you know, the imperatives and outcomes of this Direction are crucial to the future of the University System and its goal of building an expansive, high-quality, integrated library system that will allow greater dissemination of information for our students and the citizens of Maine. As such, the work of this committee has a significant impact on nearly all aspects of the Strategic Plan—making your work all the more challenging and important.

The Strategic Direction 4 committee's high level of expertise, cooperation, and intensive work comes through in this First Report, which superbly demonstrates how effective and productive this process can be when faculty take the lead. In fact, your report should serve as a model for other committees, as they prepare for next year's work.

I would like to share with you my comments on the Report and provide guidelines for preparing the second and third reports. I considered its overall strengths and weaknesses; its consistency with the Strategic Plan and Implementation Plan; and the effectiveness of its delivery. Overall the report is excellent—visionary, detailed, relevant, and clearly presented. Most importantly, each recommendation effectively connects to the goals of the Strategic Plan and follows the methodologies outlined in the Implementation Plan. By dividing the work among four subcommittees, you were able to generate a significant number of specific, original ideas for improving and expanding UMS libraries in areas addressing overall vision, the library consortium, collaborative initiatives, and base-budgeting. The documentation of budgetary data was very helpful, as well.

There is one area that warrants further exploration going forward into next year's work. I would like the committee to go into greater detail about its proposal for a new InfoNet Board. Future recommendations should articulate a more specific plan for how this would work collaboratively, and should address contractual matters and institutional alignment.

Looking ahead to the second and third reports, your goal will be to build on the work already done and to formulate a clear plan of action that focuses on outcomes and assessments. The second report will be, essentially, a first draft of the final report, rather than a separate sequential document. Conceptually, I would like the committee to ask the questions: What will this plan look like in two years? How will we know we have accomplished our goals? From these questions, the committee should be able to frame a set of outcomes and assessments for full implementation that acknowledge the most relevant intersections with other Strategic Directions.

Because budgeting is a significant factor for implementation, the committee should prioritize its recommendations by following the "Decision-Making Matrix" on the following page, which will help establish the goals that are most or least urgent and most or least costly. In terms of format, the second report should begin with an executive summary, followed by revised recommendations that include outcomes and assessments. The total length of the report should not exceed 10 pages.

These are preliminary guidelines for approaching the next round of reports. We will discuss this further at the upcoming Implementation Planning retreat on September 16, which will serve as a kick-off to next year's work.
Once again, I thank you and your committee for your hard work and commitment to higher education in Maine. Already your contributions have begun to make a positive difference, and I look forward to the coming year as the integration of the planning process leads us to full implementation next spring. Please feel free to contact me with any questions or comments.

Sincerely,

Joseph W. Westphal
Chancellor

Sample “linkage letter” sent to other Strategic Direction Chairs

December 13, 2005

Dr. Joe Wood, Provost
Chair Strategic Direction #1
711 Law Building
University of Southern Maine
Portland, ME. 04102

Reference: Linkages between and among the Strategic Directions of the UMS Strategic Plan

Dear Joe,

I hope this finds you well and making progress on draft two of your Strategic Direction Report. As you are aware, all of the SD’s were asked to make our best effort at identifying and supporting integration between and among the 11 Strategic Directions. You won’t be surprised to learn that SD #4 Task Force members want all of the other SD’s to be connected to and support SD #4: Enhancing Libraries and Library Resources. While that is a bit “tongue-in-cheek,” we do feel there are important areas where we must be formally linked as the implementation process moves ahead. The obvious and most important linkages for us are:

- SD #1: Quality of Academic Programs
- SD #2: Faculty Development
- SDs # 3 & 8: Distance Learning Enterprises
- SD # 5: Strengthening and Expanding Research
- SD # 7c: Information Technology
- SD # 9: Advancement and Advocacy

We also welcome suggestions in other areas of the document.

After debating how to proceed with bridging the separation between the various Strategic Direction Reports, we decided to send you the draft statement below. From our perspective it will inform the readers of your report about the relative importance of library resources to your specific topic. We
would encourage you to send us language to include in our SD #4 Report that supports your topic and area.

Please make an effort to include the following language in your SD #1 Report. You are of course welcome to edit it as you see fit. Should you have questions or want to discuss this proposed linkage language, contact either of us.

Proposed “linkage” language from Strategic Direction #4 (Enhancing Libraries) recommended for inclusion in your Report:

SD #1: Quality of Academic Programs:

Achieving the UMS Libraries’ vision and goals expressed in Strategic Direction #4 (Enhancing Libraries) has a direct relation to the quality of academic programs and in student success expressed in Direction 1. Campus Library resources and services must be considered in the process of academic program review and planning and are among the core factors in program quality. The Libraries have a key role in promoting and providing information literacy. Information Literacy is an expectation of NEASC accreditation, appropriate to general education outcomes and an important element in student success.

Thank you very much for your consideration

Sincerely,

Co-Chair Thomas E. Abbott, Ph.D.

Co-Chair Rachel E. Albert, Ph.D. On behalf of the membership of SD # 4

CC: Elsa Nunez, Vice Chancellor

Current Challenges and Concerns Facing Academic Libraries

Scholarly and Scientific Communication

- Innovative new ways of communicating new knowledge using advanced information technologies
- Impact of open access “publishing” and the need to facilitate change in the exchange of scholarly information
- Potential for significant changes in publication process using the World Wide Web
- Need to support parallel paper and electronic methods of knowledge dissemination

Change in Higher Education

- Sustained economic pressure on the entire UMS.
- Pressures to increase distance education and the blurring of geographic boundaries
- Political pressure and need to work beyond traditional UMS boundaries
- Changing needs of long-term learners
- Challenge of integrating information literacy in general education process, across all disciplines

**Changing Role of the Library**
- Need to redefine library collections and services for the digital era
- Support for an environment that encompasses both print and electronic resources
- Necessity to collaborate with new partners to fulfill the mission
- Libraries forced to compete with private sector for information delivery and retrieval
- Need to preserve the value of research as a process

**Information Literacy**
- Integration of information literacy skills into the larger curriculum
- Need to understand the economic, legal, and social issues surrounding the use of information, and access and use information ethically and legally
- Need for users to know how to evaluate information and its sources critically
- Need for users to acquire and maintain important life-long learning skills

**Technology Infrastructure**
- New and changing infrastructure needed for electronic resources
- Operations funding for technical infrastructure to support digital library

**Increased Cost and Amounts of information**
- Scientific information inflation rate of 12% annually for the past decade
- Rising costs and decrease in publication of scholarly monographs
- Cost of scholarly print publications have been increasing at an annual rate of 7%
- High cost of providing access to (licensing) scientific databases
- Libraries are acquiring a decreasing percentage of the published literature due to increasing costs of digitized materials
- New forms of electronic information are available, needed, and heavily used--and do not necessarily replace paper
- Information needed by faculty and students is increasing exponentially in the sciences
- Interdisciplinary research/new fields of research have increased faculty need for new information

**Organizational Culture**
- Library, academic, and technological planning often done in isolation from each other.
- Libraries are less integrated into campus and UMS information infrastructure than is desirable
- Tension between campus autonomy and "System"
- Diversity of library users
- Changing information seeking behaviors of newer younger users
Funding
- Lack of funding for inflation and added new academic programs in library budgets
- UMS library allocation funding model does not reflect changes in library functions and responsibilities nor academic program expansion

Human Resources
- Lack of widespread expertise in areas critical to instituting change and adopting new technologies
- Recruitment hampered by low salaries

Information Market Place
- No new business model has emerged for digital information publication costs
- Increasing tendency to price by transaction
- Rapid pace of technology and business change
- Intellectual property law shifting away from "fair use" and in favor of the publisher
- Content providers experiencing difficulty absorbing enormous change into their business practices
- Lack of standards for content
- Open access policies v. information as a commodity (intellectual property rights)