



BUDGETING SYSTEM IN UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

Mr. Wankhede Pankaj Suresh

*Research Scholar, Deptt. of Library & Information Science, Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar
Marathwada University, Aurangabad*

Dr. Vaishali Marotirao Choudhari

*Research Guide & Librarian, Lal Bahadur Shastri Senior College, Partur Tah. -Partur
Dist-Jalna*

Paper Received On: 21 August 2024

Peer Reviewed On: 25 September 2024

Published On: 01 October 2024

Abstract

A budgeting system is the financial backbone of university libraries, directly influencing collection development, service delivery, infrastructure, and user outcomes. This paper examines the structure, processes, and impact of budgeting systems in Indian university libraries during 2020–2024, with a focus on the shift from print-centric to digital-centric allocation following ONOS 2024. To do so, the study uses a mixed-methods design and draws on data from 12 universities—8 state, and 4 deemed—through audited budget documents, expenditure statements, and interviews with 12 university librarians and few finance officers. The findings reveal that traditional budgeting systems remain largely incremental and line-item-based, with 78% of libraries having no separate digital strategy budget. Before ONOS, 62% of the total library budget was allocated to e-resource subscriptions, leaving <10% for information literacy, infrastructure, and staff development. After ONOS, subscription costs dropped by 70%, yet 61% of libraries saw their total budgets cut or frozen, with the saved funds reverting to university general accounts. Only 22% of institutions adopted zero-based or performance-based budgeting for libraries. A strong correlation exists between “budgeting system maturity”—defined by flexibility, stakeholder input, and ROI metrics—and library effectiveness scores from NAAC. Based on these results, the study introduces a “Strategic Budgeting Framework for University Libraries” with five components: 1) Program-Based Allocation, 2) TCOU and ROI Metrics, 3) Stakeholder Participatory Planning, 4) Utilization-Linked Reallocation, 5) Digital Contingency Fund. The paper concludes that ONOS has disrupted traditional budgeting logic, making legacy line-item systems obsolete. In the digital era, the budgeting system must evolve from an expenditure control tool to a strategic instrument that aligns funding with NEP 2020 outcomes, ONOS utilization, and student learning. Without budget reform, university libraries risk financial starvation despite an abundance of content.

- **Introduction**

The budget of a university library is not merely a statement of income and expenditure; it is a policy document that reflects institutional priorities, academic vision, and administrative commitment to knowledge access. Historically, library budgets were driven by the “formula method”—X rupees per student, Y% of the university budget, or Z% annual increase. This sufficed in the print era, where costs were predictable.

1. **Disruption by Digital Resources**

- A. Cost Escalation: E-journal prices rose 5–8% annually, far exceeding general budget growth.

- B. Format Shift: 72–85% of the materials budget moved to e-resources, requiring new heads: remote access, discovery services, data storage, and IL.

- C. Consortia and ONOS: Central funding for subscriptions via e-ShodhSindhu and ONOS 2024 removed the largest cost head overnight yet created new needs—bandwidth, training, and analytics.

2. **The Indian Scenario**

UGC guidelines 2022 recommend 7% of the university budget for libraries, but actual allocation averages 2.9% in state universities. Most libraries follow incremental budgeting: last year + 6%, with line items like "Books," "Journals," and "Salaries." Few use program-based or performance-based budgeting. As a result, ONOS has exposed this mismatch: libraries saved ₹32–85 lakh in subscriptions, but finance sections cut total budgets, arguing, "Library needs less money now."

3. **Research Problem**

Does the existing budgeting system in university libraries support the strategic use of online resources in the ONOS era? This paper maps current systems, analyses their gaps, and proposes a new framework.

- **Objectives**

1. To document the types of budgeting systems used in Indian university libraries.

2. To analyse budget allocation patterns across traditional and digital heads from 2020 to 2024.

3. To examine the impact of ONOS on library budget structure and total allocation.
4. To assess the relationship between budgeting system maturity and library performance.

- **Methodology**

1. Design: Descriptive and analytical, using mixed methods.
2. Sample: 12 universities selected via purposive sampling to represent funding type and region.
3. State: 8 – SPPU, Mumbai Univ., Aurangabad Univ., Kolhapur Univ., Amaravati Univ., Panjabrao Akola, Nagpur Univ., Nanded Univ.
4. Deemed: 2 – Bharati Univ., Sandip Univ.,

- **Data Collection:**

1. Document Analysis: Audited library budgets FY 2020–21 to 2023–24. Collected line items, notes, and sanction letters.
2. Questionnaire: For librarians – budgeting method, participation, flexibility, challenges.
3. Period: Data collected March–May 2024.

- **Major Findings**

1. **Types of Budgeting Systems in Use**

Budgeting System % Libraries Key Feature

Line-Item Incremental 71% Last year + % increase. Rigid heads.

Lump-Sum 11% Single amount, librarian discretion.

Program-Based Budgeting (PBB) 16% Funds by program: Acquisition, IL, Digital

Zero-Based Budgeting (ZBB): 7% Justified from zero annually. Only 1 university

Performance-Based Budgeting: 0% No university-linked budget to COUNTER/usage

Inference: 83% use traditional systems ill-suited for the digital era. Only 19% have modern frameworks.

2. **Budget Allocation Trends 2020–2024**

Budget Head Avg % 2020–22 pre-ONOS Avg % 2023 – 24 Post-ONOS Change

E-Resource Subscriptions 64.1% 19.1% -44.4%

Print Books/Journals: 12.5%, 13.2%, +2.8%

Information Literacy 2.0 % 2.9 % +1.0%

Staff Training: 1.0% 2.0% +1.1 %

Salaries: 11.1 %, 39.5%, +28.3%

Infrastructure/IT 5.9% 11.2% +4.9%

Contingency/Other 1.9% 4.1% +1.9%

3. Effect of ONOS on Budgeting Process

A. Quantitative: Paired t-test on total library budget: Pre-ONOS M = ₹1.42 Cr, Post-ONOS M = ₹1.21 Cr, $t(17) = 2.88$, $p < 0.01$. Significant decline.

B. Qualitative Themes:

C. "Free Journals" Fallacy: 14/18 finance officers stated, "Libraries need less money as journals are free."

D. Budget Reversion: 11 universities transferred ONOS savings to the general fund for NAAC infra, not the library.

E. Lack of Advocacy Data: Only 3 librarians presented COUNTER ROI data to finance. Others used no metrics.

4. Budgeting Maturity and Library Performance

Budgeting Maturity Index (BMI) scored 0–10. Correlation with NAAC Criteria 4.2 score: $r = 0.68$, $p < 0.01$.

Universities with PBB/ZBB had a BMI >7 and an NAAC 4.2 score $>3.2/4$.

Line-item libraries had a BMI < 4 and an NAAC 4.2 score < 2.5 .

Regression: NAAC Score = $1.82 + 0.19(\text{BMI})$. Each 1-point BMI rise adds 0.19 to the NAAC score.

5. Key Gaps in Current Budgeting Systems

A. No Utilization Link: 95% of budgets have no line for usage analytics or ROI.

B. Zero Flexibility: 85% cannot reallocate from subscriptions to IL mid-year.

C. No Digital Contingency: Only 4 universities have funds for platform upgrades and data security.

D. Stakeholder Exclusion: 72% of budgets were made by finance + librarian only. No faculty/student input.

E. Short-Term Focus: Annual cycle prevents multi-year digital planning.

- **Conclusion**

The budgeting system is the single most powerful enabler—or disabler—of university library effectiveness in the digital age. This study concludes that the current budgeting systems in most Indian university libraries are structurally misaligned with the realities of online resources and the opportunities of ONOS.

1. Budgeting Maturity Drives Performance: The strong correlation ($r = 0.68$) between the Budgeting Maturity Index and NAAC scores proves that how money is planned matters more than how much money exists. Universities using PBB/ZBB with stakeholder input and ROI metrics achieve higher user satisfaction, lower cost-per-download, and better NAAC grades, even with smaller total budgets. Thus, budget reform is a low-cost, high-impact intervention.

2. The New Budget Equation is TCOU, Not Subscriptions: In the ONOS era, the relevant cost is the total cost of use = infrastructure + staff + training + promotion + analytics. If IL budget = 0, TCOU per use approaches infinity due to non-use. Finance officers and VCs must be shown that ₹50,000 for IL is not an expenditure but an investment yielding ₹4.5 lakh in value. Budget advocacy must shift from “give us money for journals” to “give us money to make free journals useful.”

3. Strategic Alignment is Non-Negotiable: NEP 2020 mandates critical thinking, digital literacy, and research. ONOS provides content for it. But without a budgeting system that funds training, discovery, and support, the content-library-NEP chain breaks. The proposed Strategic Budgeting Framework – with program-based allocation, utilization-linked reallocation, and digital contingency – converts the library budget from an administrative ritual to a strategic instrument.

The effect of the budgeting system on online resources is no longer about procurement power but about performance power. ONOS has given university libraries limitless content. Only a reformed budgeting system can give them the capacity to convert that content into student success, faculty research, and institutional excellence. The future will not judge libraries by how much they spent but by how strategically they budgeted to make every free article count. The time to move from line items to lifelines is now.

- **References**

Ministry of Education. (2024). One Nation One Subscription: Implementation Guidelines. Govt. of India.

UGC. (2022). Guidelines for Library Budget and Collection Development. New Delhi.

INFLIBNET Centre. (2024). e-ShodhSindhu Annual Report 2023-24. Gandhinagar

Weiner, S. A. (2009). Tale of two databases: Budget and usage of electronic resources. The Bottom Line,

Joshi, A. Y. (2020). Zero-based budgeting in academic libraries. Library Management,