

**BUDGET MODELS FOR FINANCING OF THE SHARED LIBRARY COLLECTION**  
**Discussion Points for SLASIAC**  
2/21/03

- 1) The problem:
  - a) Planning and budgeting for development of UC library collections is currently influenced by three factors:
    - i) Continued growth in the cost and volume of scholarly publications, exceeding the normal capacity of the State to fund
    - ii) Additional funding limitations imposed by the current state financial crisis
    - iii) In response to these factors, the continuing strategic shift from purely campus-based collections to increased reliance on resource sharing and other collaborative initiatives, including development of shared collections
  - b) Some characteristics of the UC collections budget
    - i) Total 2002-03 (Library Materials + Binding, all budgeted funds): \$63.7 million
      - (1) Campuses: \$58.2 million (91%)
      - (2) UCOP: \$5.5 million (9%)
    - ii) Shared collection budget (including print subscriptions bundled with digital): \$24 million (38% of total collections budget)
      - (1) Campus - \$18.5 million (77%)
      - (2) UCOP - \$5.5 million (23%)
    - iii) Prospects for growth (exclusive of special limited Partnership provision to address historic shortfall):
      - (1) Campus library materials budgets are supported by funds for enrollment growth and non-salary price increase, at discretion of Chancellors
      - (2) UCOP library materials budgets are supported by non-salary price increase funds and special requests to the State.
  - c) Conclusions
    - i) Shared collections will continue to grow in size, scope and importance
    - ii) Financial support for the growth of shared collections will increasingly depend on funds allocated to the campuses
    - iii) It is therefore critical to examine current practices for financial support of shared collections and identify equitable financing models to support continued growth.
- 2) Issues for shared collection financial models
  - a) Ease of understanding, maintenance, verification of data
  - b) Equitable treatment of campuses, particularly as between growing and mature campuses
  - c) Recognizing, securing, and equitably allocating the benefits of systemwide leverage
  - d) Incentives for participation in and contribution to the shared collection
  - e) Incentives for essential continuing campus investment in local collections
  - f) "Free-rider" problems
  - g) Balancing investments in print and digital
  - h) Recognizing and capturing tradeoffs between operating and capital outlays
  - i) Recognizing and appropriately addressing service quality and cost tradeoffs as between local collections, resource sharing, and shared collections