

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
FACULTY COUNCIL ON UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
THURSDAY, February 26, 2009, 2:00-3:30 p.m.
Smith Room, Suzzallo Library

Chair Charles Wilkinson called the meeting to order at 2:05 p.m.

Meeting Synopsis:

1. Review and approval of minutes from meeting of January 22, 2009
 2. University Libraries' budget planning update — Lizabeth Wilson, Dean of University Libraries
 3. Presentation and discussion of draft resolution from the Scholarly Communications Committee — Charles Wilkinson, Chair, FCUL and SCC
 4. Discussion of plans and possibilities for further development of the institutional repository in the context of the SCC resolution — Tim Jewell, Director, Information Resources and Scholarly Communication, UW Libraries
-

1. Review and approval of minutes from meeting of January 22, 2009

Chair Wilkinson noted that guest Cynthia Fugate had made last minutes changes to the January minutes that had been sent out prior to today's meeting. He asked members to look over the set of updated minutes and to make a motion to approve them. A motion was made and seconded. Hearing no amendments to the minutes, they were approved.

Wilkinson mentioned that the Secretary of the Faculty is looking for nominations for faculty councils and committees. He noted that FCUL has several members who are cycling off next year and has heard from some who would like to renew their membership. Wilkinson asked members who were cycling off the council to send him recommendations for their replacements.

2 University Libraries' budget planning update — Lizabeth Wilson, Dean of University Libraries

Dean Betsy Wilson updated the council on the budget planning of the University Libraries. She explained the 8%, 10%, and 12% budget cutting scenarios that each school and college provided to the Provost. Members were handed copies of the Libraries' letter to the Provost that lays out in detail its proposed cost cutting measures for each incremental cut, as well as the tremendous impact those cuts will have to the faculty, students, and community members who use the Libraries' services. Council members also received a summary sheet that highlighted the Libraries' strategic business plan that identifies how reduction in funding will affect the Libraries' budgets for materials, operations, and personnel. Wilson explained that the Libraries wants to know the proposed budget plans of the other colleges and schools because their interests are closely interwoven, and it wants to be in sync with them. She emphasized that these are only scenarios and that they will continue to have discussions with the Libraries' stakeholders.

Wilson walked council members through the key features of the Libraries' proposed plan. One of the most harmful cuts will be felt in the materials budget which, with market pressures increasing costs, will require about \$758K in new funds for the Libraries just to maintain its current purchasing power. Wilson noted that they have proposed to take the largest cut to the operating budget, with a proposed 10% initial cut. Overall, the Libraries has a limited ability to raise new revenue, and is in the process of looking at all its fee bases now.

A discussion began around the issue of the Libraries' proposed consolidation of branch libraries and the loss of small departmental libraries. Wilson was asked about using available shelf space at the Sandpoint facility or at campus libraries. She explained the costs associated with maintaining a space and the Libraries' need to lower fixed costs. Council members expressed concern about permanently losing a space once it is given up. Charles Chamberlin described a model under consideration to save space and money, by placing two or three librarians in particular departments so they are close to the clients they serve, but have no collections. There is a task force currently looking at these issues. Chamberlin noted that the Libraries is concerned about undergraduate students who are the primary users of the physical libraries and its collections. Wilkinson asked if there was an opportunity for saving departmental libraries as study centers for students. It was noted that the decisions on space will be made by the Provost. Wilson offered the idea of using spaces collaboratively, such as the Libraries' shared space in the Geography department that functions as a data center.

Wilson enumerated the impacts of 10% and 12% budget cuts to the Libraries' operations, materials, personnel, and services budgets. A 12% budget reduction causes her particular concern because it would mean closing the larger libraries by 5 p.m. weekdays and offering fewer weekend hours. Over 1,000 undergraduate students use Odegaard Library from 11 p.m. to 7 a.m. nightly, employing the Libraries' 24/5 hours of service that are highly prized for offering a safe, secure environment for students to study or use computers.. Wilson explained the budget scenario evaluation process and timeline. She pointed out that the Libraries' real budget reduction figures for the materials budget must be coupled with the 1.5% rescission taken this academic year, which means the Libraries would be experiencing a 7.7% cumulative cut before taking the 8%, 10%, and 12% budget reduction scenarios.

Isabelle Bichindaritz asked whether the budget scenarios include the UW-Bothell and UW-Tacoma Libraries. She explained that while the budget scenarios are for UW-Seattle, the materials budget for the three campuses is interconnected. Mark Kot inquired whether it was possible to offer the Provost a swap of particular branch campus space for other needed space. Wilson entertained the possibility of negotiating for space, but noted the need for fewer locations. Katherine Thornton noted the impact of closures upon graduate students who often lack suitable office space and require access to a study space in the Libraries. Pam Mitchell inquired about the process by which the Librarians will work with departments on the reduction in services and materials. Tim Jewell explained that the subject librarians have been meeting to prepare for that, and are compiling the needed tools and lists. The information will formally go out to faculty in a letter from Dean Wilson around the first of April.

A discussion began about the challenge in getting the publishing institutions to budge on their rate increases. Tim Jewell explained the complicated nature of the challenge and how they are going about

dealing with it. Mark Kot recommended transparency in the budget reduction system so that faculty members could understand the issue and see that it is a fair process. Jewell noted that subject librarians have been told that there is a place for advocacy and a place for the good of the whole, in the process of fairly and openly reducing materials across disciplines. Members also shared their thoughts on the issue of resource sharing in the time of budget reductions, and alternative sites that might be used for student study areas.

3. Presentation and discussion of draft resolution from the Scholarly Communications Committee — *Charles Wilkinson, Chair, FCUL and SCC*

Chair Wilkinson updated the council on the Scholarly Communications Committee's (SCC) draft resolution that was sent out to them. He welcomed members' feedback on it. Wilkinson noted that the committee has met several times and discussed what to include in the resolution, described as a work-in-progress. Wilkinson felt that it was clear that they couldn't pursue a mandatory policy, especially given the current budget situation. Rather, he tried to emphasize faculty members' awareness of the journals they are buying, so that they are purchasing in a responsible way. Wilkinson noted that the disparity between the sciences and technology and the arts and humanities is part of the differences in culture in different disciplines. He explained that he decided to focus on author's rights rather than an open access policy, with the ideas of using the university repository as an element of the author's rights argument. He stressed the importance of the repository for faculty. Wilkinson noted that he sees the repository needs to be more visible and accessible but sees the challenge with the current budget situation.

Wilkinson pointed out that the repository currently has only 5 communities listed. He suggested that the Libraries have someone put in communities for every department or school so that it looks like there is a structure that encompasses the entire university. Wilkinson stressed the importance of the repository in making the resolution work, and as the basis for a successful open access policy. He gave the timeline for the next SCC and Faculty Council on Research meetings, noting that he could see a finished draft of the resolution going to each committee for its approval, before being voted on by the Senate Executive Committee and Faculty Senate in April. Wilkinson noted that they are running out of time, and welcomed any feedback on the resolution.

4. Discussion of plans and possibilities for further development of the institutional repository in the context of the SCC resolution – *Tim Jewell, Director, Information Resources and Scholarly Communication, UW Libraries*

Jewell acknowledged that the repository is too difficult to find and the issue must be addressed. He explained that they want to focus on acquiring faculty publications and graduate student dissertations. Jewell described the initiatives in place to establish the repository. He noted that efforts have been made to acquire a lot of materials in a short period of time in order to give a

certain amount of heft to the repository. The repository has started off with a small handful of journal publishers with open access friendly policies that has allowed them to pull in approximately 1200 articles across a variety of disciplines. Jewell noted that they also expect to acquire UW dissertations in pdf format in the same time frame, with a delivery from ProQuest in March. He wasn't certain how quickly they could turn them around to be available in the repository.

Jewell also discussed work flow issues connected to developing the repository. For example, the requirement that they get an author's signature or indication they have the right to make their articles available. Jewell also sees a need for them to work with authors to make certain they know their publication rights, and to work with publishers to make certain they get them. Jewell sees this as a necessarily slow process. This is why they are starting with open access friendly publishers. Jewell sees the next level of acquisition needing more resources, and time. He was asked if the open access published articles need an individual author's signature of approval for deposit. Jewell explained that they are planning to offer faculty an opt-out mechanism to secure their approval. He noted that in general the permissions and copyright issues will need to be addressed. Jewell also explained a procedural aspect discussed in the SCC that would give faculty blanket permission for deposit in the repository. He noted that the procedural elements still need to be worked out.

Jewell was asked if the Libraries was prepared to handle success with the repository. He replied that they are not yet worried, but a greater number of deposits will require more server space. While there are no costs for the open access software, there would be costs associated with local development, troubleshooting, and design. A discussion began about funding the repository, providing support to faculty members, and selling the idea to the university administration. While there are some opportunities to put resources into the repository (Allen Endowment, Indirect Cost Recovery Fund), there is no clear model yet for efficiently acquiring articles from faculty. A concern was expressed that SCC wants to see the resolution pass this year and at the same time does not want to burden the Libraries with a lot of problems. Members discussed promoting the UW repository by pointing to other institutions who are leaders in the field, and showcasing it as a competitive feature of a publically funded university. Wilkinson pointed to Boston University's resolution that endorses open access archiving, but does not make it mandatory. Wilkinson noted that Boston's approach was somewhat backwards because they don't have a repository and yet are striving to build support for one. Wilson expressed her support for the resolution's push and its work toward building a sustainable, robust repository. Kot suggested a way to tie the archival work to the University Development Office that would highlight the repository. Joyce Cooper shared her sense that the repository will be successful once faculty understand how to use it.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

Minutes by Melissa Kane, Faculty Senate, mmkane@u.washington.edu

Present: Faculty: Bichindaritz, Cooper, Kot, MacLachlan, Mitchell, Seaburg,
Wilkinson (Chair)

President's Designee: Wilson

Ex Officio Reps: Song, Thornton

Regularly Scheduled Guests: Chamberlin

Absent: Faculty: Diment, Laird, Retman

Ex Officio Reps: Banerjee, Barker