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What’s Important for Stakeholders to Know? (But They Don’t Need to Know it All!)

• Our contribution to student and faculty success
• Our contribution to institutional mission/visibility
And, perhaps . . .
• Accountability/Efficiency/Effectiveness
• Use
• Revenue generation (including fund raising)
• Comparisons with others

Understand the need! Understand the audience!
Keep it simple! Stay on message! Focus on the user!
What Isn’t Important to Stakeholders

• How it’s done
• How hard it is to do
• Too much detail; too many needs (laundry list)
• Narrative without data; data without narrative
The Institutional Setting
University of Washington Budgets 2009-12

• Legislature cut state funding to UW by $200 million (50%)
• Individual unit budgets reduced by 15% to 30%
  – Libraries collections budget cut by more than $2 million
  – 40 positions eliminated (including some layoffs)
  – 4 branch libraries closed; hours reduced; services curtailed

However:
Substantial increases in undergraduate resident tuition
  14% annually in 2009-11; ~20%~ in 2011-12 (50%+ over 3 years)
  Students % of education funding rises from 30% to 70% in 8 years

Thriving research enterprise - $1.4 billion in sponsored research in FY10. UW ranks 2\textsuperscript{nd} in federal research $’s
UW FY 2012 Budget Preparation

Budget impact FY 11 and potential impact of 5% - 10% reductions in FY12

• Program Narrative (4 pages)
  – Key Goals, Strategic Approaches, Measuring Success

• Program Evaluation Criteria (academic units)
  – General data/size, quality, diversity, collaborations, student demand, revenue/sustainability, impact, uniqueness, centrality, value to state, strategic relevance, faculty input

• Program Evaluation Metrics (Libraries could choose ours)
Libraries Had Long History of Assessment
Data Collection and Use

• Large scale user surveys every 3 years since 1992
• In-library use surveys every 3 years beginning 2002
• Focus groups/Interviews
• Observation (guided and non-obtrusive)
• Usability/User-Centered design
• Usage statistics/data mining
• Performance metrics

Information about assessment program available at:
http://www.lib.washington.edu/assessment/
UW Libraries Program Evaluation Metrics

SATISFACTION/IMPORTANCE/IMPACT (SURVEYS)
Faculty and student overall satisfaction
Faculty and student collections satisfaction/importance
Faculty and student services satisfaction/importance
Library importance to work of faculty and students
Facilities importance and satisfaction
Librarian liaison visibility and satisfaction

EFFICIENCY MEASURES
Turnaround time for reshelving
Turnaround time interlibrary loan
New collections processing time
Service response time
Cost per article download

COMPARATOR RANKINGS
ARL Investment Index
ARL Total Expenditures
ARL Collections Expenditures
ARL Salary Expenditures
ARL Median Salary
ARL Interlibrary Loan
ARL Monographs Purchased
ARL Staff
ARL Services

LIBRARIANS/STAFF CONTRIBUTIONS
Librarian professional leadership
Librarian/staff presentations & publications
Librarian/staff diversity
Librarian teaching

USAGE/COUNTS
Print collection use
Online resources use
Interlibrary loan and document delivery
Journal article downloads
In-Person visits
Remote visits
Online tutorials use
In-Person instruction, training, consultations

SIZE
Collections (including e-resources)
Staff (by group)
Hours
Facilities (including seats/equipment)
Donors/annual giving

EXPENDITURES
Collections
Personnel
Operations
UW Libraries 2012 Budget Planning Strategy: Selective Focus and Persuasive Data

Priority investment areas to:

• Halt erosion of quality and maintain competitiveness
  – Restore collections funding to support research enterprise
  – Maintain hours of opening/access to libraries

• Provide flexibility to meet demand/address changes
  – Support core and emerging services

• Upgrade facilities to meet increased student demand
  – Invest in key libraries to improve student access/success
Importance of Library Services/Resources
(2010 Triennial Survey - Scale of 1 “Not Important” to 5 “Very Important)

Collections/Services Importance by Group

- Collections most important to faculty
- Library facilities most important to undergrads

Faculty Book/Journal Importance by Academic Area

- Books
- Journals >1990

Collections
Discovery tools
Info services and instruction
Physical spaces
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% = marking 4 or 5 and mean scores</th>
<th>Faculty 1634 surveys (39% response)</th>
<th>Graduate Students 680 surveys (32% response)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Keeping current in your field</td>
<td>96% (4.66)</td>
<td>90% (4.53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being a more productive researcher</td>
<td>93% (4.63)</td>
<td>93% (4.64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enriching student learning experiences Overall academic success</td>
<td>77% (4.18)</td>
<td>92% (4.60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making more efficient use of your time</td>
<td>87% (4.45)</td>
<td>80% (4.21)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Decade Long Term Slippage in Library Expenditures: UW & ARL Comparators

UW Seattle
- 2003-05: $35 million
- 2005-07: $37 million

ARL Public
- 2003-05: $32 million
- 2005-07: $40.5 million

Annualized expenditures
Falling off the Cliff: ARL Preliminary 2009-10 Collections Expenditures as Percent of 2008-09

UW 89.1%
Average Annual Number of Books Purchased:
UWS & Median of ARL Comparators  (2003-05 to 2009-10)
Students Pay More and Get Less
Focus on Access

During past 5 years:

- Entrance counts up 6% (same increase as enrollment)
  - 250,000 more visits per year
- Total hours open a week down 26%
- Seating reduced by 3%
- Number instruction sessions down by 40%
  - Fewer librarians & graduate assistant instructors
- Student employee hours reduced by 20%
- Undergrad satisfaction dropped between 2007 and 2010
Faculty and Students Gave Their Support

• Faculty Council on University Libraries initiated the establishment of the Faculty Fund for Library Excellence (and used our library assessment data!)
• Students increased the amount of student technology fee funding for the Libraries
• Faculty and student focus groups held by the Provost reiterated the need to increase library support for collections and hours
# UW Budget Decisions Based on These Priorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIORITY ORDER</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Specific budget instructions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preserve access for students</td>
<td>Academic units with high # students had increase/low cut</td>
<td>Preserve access to high demand classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide learning support</td>
<td>Units with significant learning support services received increase/low cut</td>
<td>Preserve library collections and hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain student support services</td>
<td>Units with significant student support services received increase/low cut</td>
<td>Preserve student jobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain security, safety and/or compliance</td>
<td>Low cut</td>
<td>Enhance undergrad recruitment &amp; support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain faculty support services</td>
<td>Low to medium cut</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
UW Libraries and College of Arts and Sciences received highest net investment increases

Libraries *new* investment funding included:
- $250,000 to maintain library hours of opening
- $250,000 to maintain student hourly jobs
- $2 million in collections-related funding

$16.5 million for undergraduate library renovation

Provost commended Libraries for metrics and faculty/student support
Libraries Dean Betsy Wilson’s “Budgetary Thanks

UW Libraries Budget Town Hall June 22, 2011

The President and Provost

Faculty Council on University Libraries

Faculty and Students

Libraries Cabinet

***Libraries Assessment Team***

But, most of all you (Libraries staff)