

**FACULTY UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON  
COUNCIL ON UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES**

The Faculty Council on University Libraries met at 2:30 p.m. on Thursday, **May 14, 2001**. Chair Richard Kielbowicz presided.

**PRESENT:**     **Professors** (Richard Kielbowicz, Chair), Chance, Dunston, Greulich, Harrison, Kerr, O'Neill, Schepp and Zick;  
                  **ex officio members** Spillum, Williams and Wilson;  
                  **Invited guest** Charles Chamberlin, Deputy Director of Libraries;  
                  **Guest** Martin Seelye Martin, Research Professor, Oceanography

**ABSENT:**     **Professors** Sullivan, Sutton and Tanimoto;  
                  **ex officio member** Booth, Easterling, Fuller and Soper.

**Approval of minutes**

The minutes of April 9, 2001, were approved as written.

**UIF: “The Senate Executive Committee approved a Class ‘C’ resolution to exempt the Libraries from UIF cuts. This resolution will be voted on by the full Senate on May 24<sup>th</sup>. The council will need to decide what position to take, and we should outline arguments supporting our position.” (Richard Kielbowicz) – Richard Kielbowicz and Seelye Martin**

Kielbowicz said his letter to the Provost on behalf of the council was in progress when the Senate Executive Committee approved the following Class “C” resolution presented by Professor Seelye Martin at the May 7<sup>th</sup> SEC meeting:

The University Library system plays a central and essential role in university education and research. Because existing and potential budget cuts pose a serious and immediate threat to the health of this system, we therefore move that the University Libraries be immediately exempted from all UIF cuts and the Chair of the Faculty Senate transmit this motion to the President of the University.

The resolution passed, with two opposing votes, one of which was cast by President McCormick, who is hesitant to start making exceptions to the campus-wide terms of the University Initiative Fund. It was pointed out that certain administrative units serve programs across the campus in diverse ways, yet are not exempted from making their 1% UIF contribution.

Kielbowicz noted the possible dilemma facing the council. If the full Senate were to vote in favor of the resolution, the council may (*de facto*, if not officially) cease to be eligible for future UIF grants. And as Betsy Wilson told the council, the Libraries definitely wants to take advantage of the UIF, whenever possible. “We want to participate in the new UIF,” Wilson said. “In some UIF proposals, we’ve been included; in others, we haven’t been. But we want to continue to be included, and to submit our own UIF proposals.” She said the Libraries needs to develop its research capacities, and the UIF may be one way to enhance and to sustain that research development.

Wilson expressed appreciation of the effort to attain exemption for the Libraries from the 1% UIF contribution, but said she also appreciated President McCormick’s concern about “making exceptions” with individual units. She said President McCormick – who is a noted historian – is a strong advocate of the Libraries, and knows the importance of having one of the country’s finest research libraries at UW. So, while she gratefully acknowledges the concern and consideration shown by Professor Martin and the Senate Executive Committee, as well as the council, she understands the position President McCormick was compelled to adopt. And the Libraries will continue to “have a need for reallocation,” she noted.

Wilson said the Libraries has a vital need for the allocations set out in the Libraries Budget Request for Library materials: 2001-2003, and delineated in the January 18, 2001 council minutes. “We need to keep

our purchasing power in tact,” Wilson said. Upwards of \$2.63 million is needed for cost increases. This figure includes the Law Library.

Martin said the UIF will be cut back in the next several years, as more support will have to be found from private sources. He said it would not be fair to disqualify the Libraries from UIF consideration, even if the Libraries were exempted from having to make its 1% UIF contribution.

Zick said he is concerned that, if the resolution should pass in the Faculty Senate, the administration might consider the Libraries to be “OK,” and not to be in need of the kind of initiative offered by the UIF. He suggested the passage of the resolution, in that event, could hurt the Libraries.

It was pointed out that there are universities whose libraries are exempt from reallocation schemes (UIF-like programs) and that still allow their libraries to benefit from reallocation. For university libraries with a desire to be innovative (e.g., in fields such as electronic archiving, in which, as this council knows, the Libraries is deeply involved), funding available through reallocation initiatives is invaluable.

Wilson reiterated her gratitude to the council, but also her concern that the Libraries would be seen as “privileged” if exempted from all UIF cuts. Thus she would echo the concern expressed by Zick, that the Libraries might be perceived as being much better off than they are, if the resolution were to pass the Faculty Senate.

Asked by O’Neill if the Serials Acquisition Budget is uppermost in the minds of the Libraries at present, Wilson said, “Our serials review is grim: At an average cost of \$850 per title, we’re looking at 1400 serials titles that would have to be cut to cover the shortfall if cost increases are not funded.”

Kielbowicz asked the council: “Should we communicate that our overriding concern is the overall budget status of the Libraries?” And he asked if he should still send the letter on “UW Libraries and the UIF” that was in progress when the Senate Executive Committee approved the Class “C” resolution. “Send the letter,” Zick advised. Harrison agreed, and suggested that the council should act according to its conscience, and not fret about what interpretation will follow from its action.

The MOTION was made to vote on the Class “C” resolution which, again, is worded as follows:

The University Library system plays a central and essential role in university education and research. Because existing and potential budget cuts pose a serious and immediate threat to the health of this system, we therefore move that the University Libraries be immediately exempted from all UIF cuts and the Chair of the Faculty Senate transmit this motion to the President of the University.

THE CLASS “C” RESOLUTION WAS PASSED BY A UNANIMOUS VOTE OF VOTING MEMBERS OF THE FACULTY COUNCIL ON UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES IN ATTENDANCE. (9 VOTES IN FAVOR; 0 VOTES OPPOSED)33

### **Libraries’ Website: Serials Review Project FAQ – Betsy Wilson**

Wilson distributed a “Serials Review Project FAQ” from the Libraries’ Website. Ten questions are posed in the “Serials Review Project” Website, with detailed answers following. Wilson recommends the Website both for the information it offers FCUL members regarding serials review information, and as an example of the kind of work being done by the Libraries on the Internet.

Prior to the 10 sets of questions and answers, Wilson states that: “I have asked our librarians to plan for a possible reduction affecting the Main (non-Health Sciences) materials budget of \$1.5-1.8 million for the biennium, representing approximately 10-13% of the 1999-2001 biennium’s allocation for information resources.”

### **Nicholson Baker and Preservation – Betsy Wilson**

Wilson distributed a three-page response to Nicholson Baker's *Double Fold*, a book just published "that has focused attention on some of the problems research libraries face in helping to preserve our intellectual and cultural heritage."

Wilson said many of the allegations Baker makes in the book about libraries making bad decisions are erroneous. "It hasn't happened the way he suggests it has," Wilson noted.

Gary L. Menges, University of Washington Libraries Preservation Administrator, wrote the response, which is entitled, "Nicholson Baker and Preservation."

Menges, among other observations, writes the following:

"Although we do not share some of Mr. Baker's conclusions, we welcome the attention he has focused on the preservation challenge."

"The University of Washington is fortunate to be located in an area with environmental conditions that are not as detrimental for the preservation of library materials as in some other locations."

"Although critical of library brittle books programs, Mr. Baker is particularly concerned about newspapers which offer special challenges.... Newspapers are, however, a major preservation problem as they are particularly susceptible to damage from use and deteriorate rapidly if not stored under good environmental conditions. Newspaper backfiles also require huge amounts of space to store. The quality of newsprint and the space to house newspapers are real concerns for libraries."

"We share Mr. Baker's concerns for the poor quality of early microfilm done before the preservation community developed standards for film stock and microfilming. All microfilming currently done for the Libraries is done to national standards using polyester film stock and is checked for quality control."

"The University Libraries has recently placed a new emphasis on preservation. *Preserving Washington's Collections: Strategies for the New Century* (July, 2000) discusses the changing environment for preservation, provides some background information on the Libraries' preservation program and makes recommendations for strengthening our preservation program. Many of these recommendations have been or are being implemented."

"The Libraries share Mr. Baker's concern for preserving materials in their original format. A pilot program, for example, to use the Bookkeeper deacidification process to stabilize acidic materials already in our collections is planned."

"The University Libraries is charged with preserving an irreplaceable collection of enormous value, a collection that continues to grow and expand in size, scope, and format. As *Preserving Research Collections* states, 'Future preservation efforts in research libraries will require a strategic vision that integrates the need for maintaining print resources with the opportunities offered by digital technologies. Adding to the challenge of balancing conflicting needs is the problem of limited financial resources. If libraries are to preserve scholarly resources either in their original formats, or as reformatted surrogates, substantial economic and technical investments are necessary.'"

### **New FCUL Chair for the 2001-2002 academic year – Greg Zick**

Greg Zick was unanimously selected to be the new FCUL chair for the 2001-2002 academic year. Zick is a professor in the department of Electrical Engineering.

Brian Taylor  
Recorder

