

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

The Faculty Council on University Libraries met at 10:30 a.m. on Thursday, **January 31, 2002**. Chair Greg Zick presided.

**PRESENT:**     **Professors** (Greg Zick, Chair), Brown, Greulich, Kerr, Martin, Moy, Sauer and Tanimoto;  
                  **Ex officio members** Ogburn, Spillum, Stride and Wilson;  
                  **Guests** Gordon Aamot, Acting Assistant Director of Libraries for Research and Instructional Services; Ada Emmett, graduate student, Information School; Greg Hatch, graduate student, Information School.

**ABSENT:**     **Professors** Chance, Schepp, Sullivan and Sutton;  
                  **Ex officio member** Fuller.

**Approval of minutes**

The minutes of January 10, 2002, were approved as written.

**Scholarly publishing – Greg Zick and council**

Zick said the council has identified five areas of focus in scholarly publishing that it wants to look into (these are tentative names): *policy, process, prototypes, proposals*, and *partners*. He asked the council to consider these areas of focus in the following ways: 1) *Policy*: What is the University's, or the Faculty Senate's, written policy on these matters, especially as regards the quality of scholarly publication and resultant faculty review?; 2) *Process*: the "value principle": How to evaluate what our colleagues do. Where, in any of these new approaches, does peer review and selectivity play a part?; 3) *Prototypes*: Projects and experiments past, present, and future that are relevant to this problem.; 4) *Proposals*: The Mellon Foundation, etc., organizations that are funding this transformation; *Partners*: UW Press, NIH. etc.

Zick said he would like the council to have an open discussion today "about what members have found" in their reflections on these areas of focus.

Moy said she had two additional areas of focus to suggest – abiding by the arch alliteration – *Professional Persona* and *Pennies/Prices*. Moy said that traditional journals are sponsored by national organizations, which have large audiences. Large audiences translate into a higher number of manuscript submissions, which results in a higher rejection rate, which ultimately makes print journals more prestigious. In stark contrast, electronic journals often are created under financial constraints that, coupled with weak marketing efforts, make for smaller audiences, fewer submissions, and lower rejection rates. So while the refereeing process may exist for both types of journals, the "perceived value" of print journals is vastly different than that of electronic journals, Moy averred.

Zick said that faculty, in making choices in scholarly publication, "are interested in publishing in the highest quality journals (based on peer review) for reasons of promotion, prestige, and impact in their field." They do not have as much interest in electronic journals because they are new and do not have equivalent reputations. Martin said there is "no interest in E-journals in Oceanography, and yet the entire department, as it seems, wants all E-journals to be online."

Wilson said an exacerbating factor is that many online journals charge university libraries up to \$10-15,000 for a title, which is far more than they charge their individual subscribers. She said the occurrence of society journals transitioning from print to electronic publication is worrisome because of the potential loss of subscription totals that print journals require to sustain their revenue. It is sometimes the case that these journals charge libraries more for their electronic versions so that they may charge their individual subscribers less. Part of this cost goes to funding the transition infrastructure for moving from print to electronic. Sauer said that, in Physics (as in other departments), "pre-print was an issue; the value placed

upon pre-print areas as opposed to that placed upon printed areas.” Ullman said that, in the College of Arts and Sciences, pre-print was “considered useful [in the promotion and tenure process], but not as much as print.”

#### Ada Emmett and Greg Hatch

Zick introduced guests Ada Emmett and Hatch, graduate students in the Information School who had met with Ogburn about their interest in scholarly communication and conducting a class research project that would benefit the Libraries. Ogburn had suggested that they contact Zick to meet with the council to offer their assistance.

Emmett said, “Greg Hatch and I are in a research methods class in the Master’s program, and have been asked to do a research study. We are interested in scholarly publishing issues, and have been doing exploratory work. We would appreciate the opportunity to learn what questions the council would pose to faculty concerning scholarly publishing issues.”

It was suggested that the attitudes toward these issues would vary considerably depending on whether the faculty being queried were tenured or untenured. It was noted that the faculty on the council represent a wide spectrum of academic disciplines, and that Emmett and Hatch might wish to interview some of them. Council members said they would gladly consider whatever queries Emmett and Hatch might have.

Asked what the study, or survey, would target, Emmett said, “It depends on whether we do a random sample of faculty, or choose from a group of smaller departments.” Ogburn recommended that she and Hatch speak with Steve Hiller, Head, Science Libraries and Assessment Coordinator of University Libraries, who has conducted several large-scale surveys on behalf of the Libraries. Emmett said they would do so, and added: “We need faculty response, but we do need it fast, and the survey must be completed in several weeks.” Greulich said they will be limited in the conclusions they are able to extrapolate from a limited survey; and Wilson said their study could best serve as a “pilot project.” Emmett and Hatch readily agreed.

It was pointed out that some junior faculty (faculty on tenure-track but without tenure at present) cannot take the risk of publishing in “alternative” venues. Emmett asked if the University could adopt a policy that would change the weight given to traditional journals (in tenure and promotion consideration), and that would increase the weight given to E-journals and other alternative modes of publishing. Though different disciplines would offer different answers to this question, for the most part traditional journals will continue to hold their supremacy in scholarly publishing, the council responded. The same answer was given when the notion was proposed that faculty could deposit articles in the National Electronic Article Repository to be used in the tenure and promotion process. Brown said an “alternative peer review process could be considered; the president could be asked to form a Task Force.” Wilson said, “Yes, this is a shared issue, not just an issue for the Libraries.” She added, “We met with Alvin Kwiram, Vice Provost for Research, and learned how our facilities and administrative cost of 1.5% of the budget is set up. We wondered if there might be a way to reconfigure that 1.5%. But of course that is a policy decision.”

Wilson said an overriding concern is that “the Libraries is supposed to make faculty more productive; but as the University cuts access to information, that ability is diminished. So it is very important that we recognize the need to protect the infrastructure.”

Zick said to Emmett and Hatch, “A few interviews could give substance to your survey. Faculty have been affected by this process in different ways. An important journal may have been dropped from the library list; they may have discussed this issue as a member of an editorial board or with departmental colleagues; or they may not be aware of the problem. With regard to promotion and tenure policy, the provost and Faculty Senate would usually not write a rule to change, but more likely to review, policies from the department or college level. The process starts with the question: How do you measure someone for tenure? Has the faculty member made an impact in his or her field?” Zick also noted that, in some instances, “conferences become more significant than journals.”

Emmett and Hatch said they need 20 people for their survey. Greulich said, "You'll find a lot of heterogeneity as to how departments approach these issues. If you're talking about the whole campus, you'll need to consider 'cluster' samples, stratification." Again, Steve Hiller was recommended as someone who could help identify sources for Emmett and Hatch.

Wilson said, "The University of Washington has upwards of 25 people serving on the editorial boards of the most expensive journals in scholarly publishing. You might well gain something educational out of discussions with some of those faculty." Emmett, mischievously charming, said, "We [she and Hatch] could ask a kind of question that faculty could not, because we're 'naïve graduate students'." Emmett and Hatch were told that they could query participants in the March 2000 Forum on Scholarly Publishing. Zick said, "If you look at the business model of Biomedicine vs. that of the Humanities, you see a huge disparity between funding, on the one hand, and degree and quality of exposure, on the other; but as to the number of journals, Biomedicine comprises only about 20% of them."

Zick said, "What you're doing is a good step to gather information. We could have you visit us again later in the year and apprise us of the findings of your survey."

Zick said that, in the end, "We are advisors to the Libraries, and I'd like to review, by the end of the academic year, what the Libraries are doing in this area: possibly a review of the Libraries' interaction with the campus, and where the Libraries are going in the future. I intend to keep talking about this. Scholarly publishing is an important issue."

Zick said that, eventually, the council may want to make recommendations to the provost on scholarly publishing as it bears on University Libraries. "It is the Libraries' problem because, when a journal is cut, people sometimes blame the Libraries, not knowing the broader picture."

#### **Budget cuts and the Libraries – Betsy Wilson**

Ogburn suggested that the council assist the Libraries in communicating to the faculty and provost the impact potential budget cuts would have on collections and services. The Libraries has already experienced significant strains on services and information resources due to the UIF reallocation process and the inability to keep up with inflation on scholarly publications.

Wilson said University Libraries is in the process of preparing for anticipated budget cuts that will take effect on July 1, 2002. A 5% budget cut for the University is anticipated. The Board of Regents are not likely to balance the budget cut by the very high increase in tuition (if the UW indeed was given local control of tuition setting) that would be needed to do so.

The Libraries' situation would be difficult. "A large amount of the Libraries' budget comes from the state, whereas no more than 16% of the University's budget overall comes from the state," Wilson noted. 80% of the University's budget comes from research grants and other sources.

"If we take a 5% cut," Wilson said, "there is a serious problem for us. With unfunded material cost increases (i.e. serial inflation), we could end up taking a 13% cut to our materials budget purchasing power. We have a limited ability to create new revenue, and we do not want to take drastic measures such as charging for every take-out in our libraries, which would go completely against the grain of what we want the Libraries to be." Wilson said the anticipated budget cuts "threaten the Libraries' information infrastructure. And what is most important is not to impair the long-term health of the Libraries."

Wilson said the Libraries is confronted with a "publication dilemma: We are operating on an economic model that cannot be sustained." It was noted that many major universities in the nation are facing this same problem. Wilson said two major agenda items on the presidential agenda of AAU institutions are: 1) space; and 2) the cost of scholarly publications.

#### **Library service points and collection locations review – Betsy Wilson and Gordon Aamot**

Wilson said, "We are changing the nature of resource processes. University Libraries has added branch libraries since the 1930's and 1940's. But anticipating the budget cuts, and considering ways to generate revenue, we are looking at our service points and collection locations to see what can be consolidated. And to this end we have formed the Task Force on Libraries Service Points and Collections Review Group, headed by Gordon Aamot, Acting Assistant Director of Libraries for Research and Instructional Services."

Wilson said the Libraries now has fees for non-affiliated members, and other modest service fees, but this income constitutes very little new revenue.

Current collection locations for the Libraries include Sand Point (approximately a million volumes); five different shelving locations for the East Asian Library; and a large storage space in the basement of Kane Hall. "We have started to look at collection locations to see what can be consolidated to save money," said Wilson. "We need to be consultative in this process, and this council is at the top of the list of those whom we need to consult."

In the Guidelines for the Reorganization, Consolidation, or Elimination of Major Library Services, Programs, and Facilities, the Director will: 1) Initiate detailed discussions with the affected program and personnel. The appropriate faculty library committees, including the Faculty Council on University Libraries, will be involved at this initial stage; 2) Analyze possible/proposed actions in the context of the Libraries' Strategic Plan; 3) Prepare a detailed written explanation and justification of the proposed actions; 4) Make available the detailed report and recommendations to all affected parties for comment and discussion. Generally, at least one month will be provided for this review; 5) consult and involve the Provost and Librarian Personnel Committee during the review process; and 6) Implement the proposed action, informing all parties of the final decision.

Aamot, who is leading the Review Group, said, "Our charge is to review our present service and collections configurations and to recommend changes that can better support user and library staff needs in the most cost-effective manner. These changes may include consolidation of service points and/or collections within a facility, consolidation of existing library units, alternative collections housing recommendations such as compact shelving or off-site shelving, ways to use current library space more effectively, new services to add or existing services to remove. The group should take into consideration the use of remote shelving facilities at Sand Point and other locations."

Other points for the group to consider are the timing or phasing of recommended changes and associated costs. While Aamot stressed that budgetary concerns are not the sole driver of the review, nonetheless cost savings or expenses that would accompany any recommended changes must be provided in the report the Review Group will submit to Wilson by May 31, 2002.

The Review Group is expected to "consult widely within the Libraries and to involve the broader UW community in its review."

Aamot said, "There is no quick fix. We have short-term and long-term goals. Our work could lay out the blue-print for strategic planning for the Libraries."

Aamot said half of the Libraries' service points are within Suzzallo and Allen libraries. As for collections, he said consideration is being given to the consolidation of the Libraries' Special Collections within Suzzallo Library.

The Libraries is very interested in building a Fine Arts Library facility (FCUL visited the Drama, Music, and Art libraries a couple of years ago, and saw in what lamentable repair those facilities are, and how desperately in need of space they are), but the funding for that project, given the budget cuts, is not forthcoming from state funds. In that effort, the Libraries would be integrating its vision statement with that of the College of Arts and Sciences for the Fine Arts Center and would be hoping to make the effort a capital campaign priority.

Aamot said a major question the Review Group is being asked to consider is whether the library branches are being used effectively or not. Most branches are currently “collections-based” and could perhaps be remodeled so as to be more “people-centered,” especially with the rise in E-journals and the like. Aamot said, “In the future, we’ll see more ‘cooperative collections’ between different institutions.”

When asked where the Libraries’ internal budget cuts would come from, in the next biennium – since the cuts that would result from the recommendations of the Review Group would come at a later date – Wilson said, “We will ratchet down our collections (both print and electronic), and perhaps sustain fewer FTE positions among our staff, and do whatever else we are impelled to do.”

**Next meeting**

The next FCUL meeting is set for Thursday, February 28, 2002, at 10:30 a.m., in the Petersen Room of Allen Library.

Brian Taylor  
Recorder