(The Senate and Senate Committees should use the following form for officially communicating recommendations to the Provost. Such committees would include: UCC, UPC and Executive Committee of the Senate along with any other committees which provide recommendations directly to the Provost.)

Senate Recommendation to the Provost

Originating Body____Faculty Senate_ **Originator**_:_Michael O'Loughlin, President

Date submitted__June 18, 2009____ Requested Effective date ___ASAP_____

Recommendations: At the May 7th meeting of the Faculty Senate, the Senate unanimously passed the following resolution: " The Senate strongly encourages the Salisbury University administration to make increased funding for the library an annual priority."

Attach any supporting documentation: Library Committee report, details both the history and present comparative library budgets that exhibit the troubling status of the University's library.

Action Taken by Provost: Date 6/22/09

X Recommendation Accepted _____Recommendation Not Accepted

_____Recommendation returned to Originating Body for further review (see attached)

Disposition for Approved Recommendation:

X President	X VP Student Affairs
X Faculty Senate Chair	X VP Finance
~~X Forum Chair~~	X School Deans
_____ Webmaster	_____ Graduate Council
_____ Catalogue Editor	_____ Provost Council
_____ Student Handbook Editor	_____ Other: _____
_____ Faculty Handbook Editor	_____

provost/scw/0302

Library Committee Report to the Faculty Senate, May 7, 2009

Resolution:

The Senate Library Committee presents a resolution asking the Senate to strongly encourage that the Salisbury University administration make increased funding of Library resources an annual priority.

History:

Whereas, the 2006 final Middle States report to Salisbury University noted that one of the strengths of the university included "a revitalization and re-focus on the library as essential to the academic enterprise," and whereas the 2006-2008 strategic plan included a goal of "providing resources, including a new facility and an enhanced operating budget, to make the library a focal point of learning, scholarship, interaction and invention among students, faculty and staff."

The Senate Library Committee would like to point out that despite modest increases, progress in advancing the library facilities and resources do not address the real needs of the library.

Documentation:

- In 2000, Salisbury University ranked 10th out of 11 performance peer institutions in number of volumes held. In 2006, SU ranked last.
- Since 2000, departmental book allocation funds have remained unchanged and are projected to remain at current levels.
- The table below compares Salisbury University's collections to its peer institutions.

2006 National Center for Education Statistics
Comparison of Library Holdings for Salisbury University

Library Name	Books, Serial Back Files, Other Paper Materials	Current Serial Subscriptions	Books, Serial Back Files, Other Paper Materials Per Person Enrolled (FTE)	Audiovisual Materials	Microforms	Total FTE 12 month Enrollment
Comparison Group* Average	628,423	10,499	78.17	34,454	1,247,968	7,950
Comparison Group* Median	512,131	3,183	72.19	24,314	1,120,092	7,687
Library Of Interest						
Salisbury University, MD	269,550	1,235	38.55	1,105	750,971	6,993

*comparison group: SUNY-Fredonia, SUNY-Oswego, SUNY-Plattsburgh, University of Massachusetts-Dartmouth, Bloomsberg University, Southeast Missouri State University, Millersville University, University of North Carolina-Wilmington, University of Northern Iowa.