

California Digital Library

Budget Background 2014-2015

11/18/13

CDL provides approximately **20 award-winning shared services** for the direct benefit of campus libraries and other campus units, as well as students, faculty and staff. This service portfolio is heavily influenced by the [Council of University Librarians' \(CoUL\) Systemwide Plan & Priorities FY2014-2017](#). The CDL Executive Director participates as an equal member of the Council and helped develop the priorities. In many cases, CDL is the coordinating agent or provides the infrastructure for realizing the specific priorities. Because CDL also has its own programmatic priorities relating to applied research and external partnerships, it is often called upon and is well positioned to respond to emerging initiatives. Recent examples include:

- *Funder requirements for data management plans*: in collaboration with seven other libraries, CDL built the Data Management Planning Tool to assist researchers in producing credible plans, now used by over 800 institutions.
- *Western Regional Storage Trust*: CDL serves as the administrative host and developer of analysis software for the initiative to enable members to share the preservation of the scholarly record for print journals.
- *UC Open Access policy and U.S. Office of Science and Technology Policy directive*: CDL is supporting the implementation of the UC policy, including deposit of publications for open access into eScholarship. CDL has also been invited to join the SHared Access Research Ecosystem (SHARE) proposed by ARL, AAU, and APLU in response to the OSTP directive for open access to publications and data for federally funded research.
- *Digital Public Library of America*: CDL will become a “content hub” for contributing UC libraries’ cultural heritage materials to this national initiative.

Almost any budget change will thus have a direct effect on students, faculty staff, and various campus units as well as campus libraries.

As demonstrated in the “University of California Budget for Current Operations, 2013-2014”, these services represent a sound investment for the University. **CDL’s content licensing initiatives alone saved \$60.6M in 2012-2013.** Other ways of looking at value are represented in the following statements.

The CDL operates at an annual **cost-equivalent of \$65 per UC faculty, student, and academic staff member** (based on 2012-2013 budget and data). When narrowed to a focus on what the University spends on *education per student* (\$16,840 on average), and the cost of UC library services per student FTE (\$1,028), CDL’s cost per student at \$76 adds less than 1% to the cost and contributes extraordinary value in content and services.

Expenditure per student in 2012	
By the University	\$16,840
By Campus Libraries	\$1,028
By CDL	\$76
CDL Cost as % of University Cost	0.45%

The return to the University on these investments has been summarized by former Director of Systemwide Library Planning Gary Lawrence (updated with 2012-2013 figures):

With a core budget of about \$17 million, the CDL attracts an additional \$32 million annually in voluntary co-investments from campus libraries and uses the resulting \$49 million pool of funds to deliver about \$60 million in direct benefits to campuses, supports an additional \$33.9 million in measurable indirect benefits, and provides a technical platform and a leadership capability which fosters development of a host of service innovations that could not readily be supported by our ten campus libraries operating independently.

Between 2008-2012, CDL took budget reductions of approximately 20% with a loss of 14 staff. These reductions were absorbed primarily through reductions in technical infrastructure costs (due to decreasing costs for hardware, better management of economies of scale, and making use of options provided by data centers at UCOP, UCB and SDSC); decrease of 85% in the budget for one-time content purchases; staff attrition or repurposing; and a successful track record for obtaining grant funding.

In FY2012-2014, CDL received a permanent budget augmentation totaling \$2.46M distributed across the last two fiscal years to support the 21st Century Content and Collection Services Initiative: cover ongoing content increases, leverage other purchases, convert legacy collections to digital form, support open access publishing, and reduce costs of collection management. This proposal was prioritized by CoUL and the SLASAC Budget Sub-Committee. These funds have

- supported the development of a Digital Asset Management System to be used by seven campus libraries,
- provided funds to acquire ebooks and to leverage six major publisher negotiations with another three in progress,
- preparations for the UC Open Access policy. In anticipation of the policy, CDL received an additional one-time augmentation of \$115,000 for FY 2013-2014 to acquire tools for making the publication deposit easier for faculty (in progress).

Even modest budget reductions will undermine economies of scale, purchasing power and cost avoidance for content acquisitions, and the ability to support CoUL priorities through various services. Indeed, **reductions would reverse the progress made from 2012 to date.** All of the existing and emerging services contribute directly to the recruitment and retention of faculty since they are commonly provided by peer institutions and expected as part of the information infrastructure for research institutions.

The Council of University Librarians re-affirmed on November 15, 2013 the **principles developed by the SLASAC Budget Sub-Committee in 2012** when it considered budget decreases for CDL:

1. Avoid shifting costs to campuses:
 - a. Consider fairness of cuts *across* campuses—more disparity makes it harder for campuses to compete on other fronts as well.
 - b. Focus first on programs that are less interdependent between campuses and CDL.
2. Avoid doing irreparable harm to CDL programs that have been identified as essential to the UC libraries *and* to campus services.
3. Save revenue-generating (or potentially revenue-generating programs).

Scenarios for budget reductions of 5%, 10%, 15% all involve significant degradation of service to campus libraries, students and faculty as well as imposing additional burdens on campus libraries. Due to the interconnected nature of most services and the fact that part of the value proposition is staff with specialized expertise, meeting the 15% target would be devastating.