- 1.9 million dollars is being cut from the UConn library system in 2015 and 2016.

The Library's budget has been reduced by 6% in FY16 and an additional 3% is anticipated in FY17 for a total of $1.8 million.

- 7.5 jobs in the library have already been cut this summer/early fall.

In July 2015, the Library notified 7.5 staff that their positions had been eliminated for fiscal reasons.

- Acquisitions are being reduced by 2/3 this year in the humanities, social sciences, and sciences.

During FY16 and FY 17 actual acquisition (collection) cuts will total 14% across a variety of material types and disciplines. Through careful planning, cost sharing, and extensive negotiations, cancellations in all disciplines totaled $115,552 for this renewal cycle. Next year (FY17), in order to reach our two-year total of $950,000, we will be conducting a comprehensive review of the collection including faculty input and other sources.

- Next year, it is proposed that acquisitions be eliminated entirely.

We reduced the book acquisitions budget this fiscal year as a stop gap measure while we conduct the comprehensive review. No decisions have been made on any future allocations. Faculty will be fully engaged in the process.

- Next year some of the major electronic journal packages we subscribe to will be eliminated.

Major electronic journal packages will be examined during the comprehensive review. It is premature to say whether, or which, electronic journal packages may be eliminated. We may elect to retain crucial content outside of the standard publisher package, which increases in cost 7% per year on average.

- As of 2012, UConn libraries already had the lowest staff ratio when compared to its rival public institutions (i.e. before this round of layoffs).

Based on publicly available 2012 Association of Research Libraries data, UConn Libraries did have the lowest number of staff compared to our established peer and aspirant institutions.

- As of 2012, our library already spent less per student on our library than

rival institutions.

Publicly available information published by NCES in 2012 report library expenditures per student. The comparative list is fellow Carnegie High Research Institutions. Out of 107 Very High Research Institutions, of which we are one, University of Connecticut ranks 100 in library expenditures per student. 2012 data before budget cuts and includes Health and Law.

• Despite the fact the UConn ranks 9th in the US for ILL borrowing, one person in ILL staff has already been fired.

This is referring to 2012 Association of Research Libraries data. The data indicates the need for access to a broader and deeper collection; however, the elimination of this .75 position through layoff was a result of an analysis of our Interlibrary Loan staffing and anticipated changes in our Interlibrary Loan technology. Our capacity to borrow materials will not suffer from this change. We do not believe the reduction in ILL staffing will impact the overall capacity in fulfilling the service mission.

• As of this fall, ILL has been instructed to refuse requests deemed too expensive. Despite its impact on research, this policy was implemented with no announcement, advance warning or consultation with the faculty.

No changes were made this fall that would lead us to refuse faculty requests that would have been previously approved. The most recent change was to revise our previous practice of paying up to $80 in royalties per item on top of associated service fees. We reduced this to $40 each and are not aware of any impact on the research endeavor from this shift. We will continue to collect data and revisit this policy is necessary.

Methodology
  • Data informed. Data started the discussion.

Letter:
Someone(s) did a lot of homework and gathered this information from a number of public sources including NCES, ARL, and others. For example, the assertion that UConn is ranked 57th by US New & World Report is accurate for National Universities in 2016.

On the first page the author refers to a lack of systematic plan. On the contrary, we have devised communicated our process and are further refining a comprehensive review of our collections (http://lib.uconn.edu/services/collections/uconn-

[libraries-collections-review/](libraries-collections-review/)) that goes beyond simple cost per use or other quantitative measures. We use data as a starting point for discussion with faculty, and a sole decision point.