

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

The Faculty Council on University Libraries met at 3:30 p.m. on Monday, **January 25, 2005**, in 36 Gerberding Hall. Chair Seelye Martin presided over the meeting

**PRESENT:**     *Professors* Seelye Martin (chair), Bulgac, Kerr, Schepp and Wilkinson;  
                  *Ex officio members* Allen, Fuller, Gadgil, Sercombe and Wilson;  
                  *Regular guest* Charles Chamberlin, Deputy Director of Libraries;  
                  *Guests* Paul Constantine, Associate Director of Libraries Research and Instructional Services, Libraries Administration; Thom Deardorff, Coordinator for Access Services, Libraries; Kirsten Spillum, Manager, Suzzallo Circulation, Libraries.

**ABSENT:**     *Professors* Goodkin, Lavelly, Martin, Sales and Sutton;  
                  *Ex officio member* Ogburn.

**Synopsis**

1.     Approval of the minutes of November 22, 2004.
2.     Announcements.
3.     Impact of Loan Code Changes (25 minutes) – Paul Constantine, Thom Deardorff.
4.     Institutional Committee on Scholarly Communication (15 minutes) – Betsy Wilson.
5.     Status of NIH Initiative (10 minutes) – Betsy Wilson.
6.     Electronic Theses and Dissertations (15 minutes) – Betsy Wilson and Jimmy Allen, GPSS representative.
7.     General discussion on future items of interest for FCUL agenda (all, 10 minutes).
8.     Other business.
9.     Adjourn.

**Approval of minutes**

The minutes of November 22, 2004 were approved as written.

**Announcement – Betsy Wilson**

Wilson said her visit, on the first day of Winter Quarter, to virtually all UW Libraries branches – she went to 49 units, including stops at Harborview, UW Bothell and UW Tacoma – was once again an excellent experience, and once again unhampered by rain. Wilson said she greatly enjoys this annual ritual.

**Impact of Loan Code Changes (25 minutes) – Thom Deardorff, Betsy Wilson and Kirsten Spillum**

Wilson said, “In the last academic year we reviewed the Libraries Loan Code and made certain changes. The council was briefed as to what those changes were, and endorsed the changes. The changes were accepted by the Board of Regents, and subsequently were implemented.”

Deardorff, by way of background, said, “We last changed the Loan Code in 1995. In reviewing the Code, we found that a lot of library users did not understand the fine system, and we found that a lot of material was overdue. We decided to change the Code and move towards a more standard public library-style system of fines. Prior to making the changes we talked to FCUL, and to other relevant committees, and held a public hearing. The revised Loan Code went into effect on September 21, 2004. Under the revised system, the fines stay at \$50 cents a day, and commence on the fifth day after the item is due. A bill of replacement is issued on the 20<sup>th</sup> day after the book is due. Fines “top out at 20 days,” Deardorff noted. At that point, a billing fee and a bill for replacement will be issued. Date due notices are issued via E-mail two days before items are due. The date due notices have been widely praised as being very helpful to borrowers. The recall period has been changed from 14 to seven days after the initial seven-day period. Overdue items have dropped 75% from December 2003 to December 2004, Deardorff emphasized.

Circulation is up 18%, much of which is the result of renewals. Spillum said she heard from a graduate student who had accrued fines at the UW and then attended a university where fines were not imposed, and realized that “fines are good,” that otherwise there is no incentive to bring books back. Spillum also said people have been “very pleased by the reminders they receive that their books are due,” corroborating Deardorff’s similar observation. Spillum said there is “a learning curve” during this transitional period, as borrowers gradually become accustomed to the revised Loan Code. Deardorff said a publicity campaign was conducted to familiarize people with the changes in the Code.

Deardorff said that one major result of the revised Loan Code is that “it is easier for people to renew.” Wilkinson concurred, saying, “It is indeed a good system now. And it’s so much easier to pay fines now; you can do it online, using your credit card.” Deardorff said this echoes the generally favorable response to the availability of online payment of fines.

### **Institutional Committee on Scholarly Communication – Betsy Wilson**

Wilson introduced the council to her proposed idea for an important new committee: the Institutional Committee on Scholarly Communication. By way of background, the draft of the proposal states that “there is a need for a University-wide body to address issues related to the system of communication and dissemination of scholarship and scholarly resources.” It further states that, after a discussion with a variety of stakeholders (including the Acting Provost, the Vice Provost for Research, and the Chair of the Faculty Senate), “the Director of University Libraries proposed the establishment of a Presidential Committee on Scholarly Communication.”

Wilson said that, when President Emmert visited the Libraries in the summer of 2004, she shared her idea with him of the proposed new committee, and he thought it a good idea. The Acting Provost and Faculty Senate Chair Ross Heath also supported the idea. As to the charge of the committee, it would be advisory to the President and the Provost “on issues, concerns, policies, and actions related to the system of communication and dissemination of scholarship and scholarly resources”. It would “create a vision and a plan that will create demonstrable and sustainable change; and recommend strategies and determine measures of success.” It would “identify and review UW organizations, systems, policies, and practices that are integral to the system of scholarly communication; and explore how members of the UW community can make a difference in the roles they play (e.g., faculty member, editor, author, reviewer, subscriber); and examine how the promotion and tenure structure could support and reward actions directed toward changing the system.”

The charge would further be to “foster substantive University-wide conversations; develop communication channels to the UW community to keep it apprised of the work and the progress of the committee; and bring significant developments and issues in scholarly communication to the attention of the UW community as warranted.” It would recommend “actions, resources and tools needed to implement the vision; and identify where investments of resources can achieve high impact and lead the UW to adopt new models.” It would “identify existing and potential key alliances and partnerships; and draw other universities into the conversation at the highest levels of administration and faculty governance.” It would recommend “means to continue the progress achieved by the committee as the environment continues to evolve and to make a sustainable system of scholarly communication a continuing priority of the University.” And it would “document the work and the outcomes of the committee.”

Wilson said the committee “would need to be a large group”. One group of proposed members would be selected “by virtue of their position or responsibility and/or by their interest as change agents”. Co-chairs would be a representative from the Libraries and a faculty member designated by the Faculty Senate. Members would include the chair of FCUL; the chair of the Faculty Council on Research; the Vice Provost in Tech Transfer; the Associate Vice President /Director of Federal Relations; the Associate Dean, Office of Research and Graduate Education, Health Sciences; the Vice Provost for Research; the Dean of the Graduate School; the Director of the University of Washington Press; and a representative of the Graduate School.

Another group of members would be “7-10 faculty and librarian change agents chosen from all three campuses.” There would be “consultations” with the Board of Deans; with the Faculty Senate; with the Libraries Scholarly Communications Steering Committee; with outside scholars, administrators, and consultants as needed; with FCUL; with the Faculty Council on Research; and with the Research Advisory Board. Staffing for the committee will be provided by University Libraries. Wilson said she hopes the Acting Provost will appoint the committee “in the next month or so”. The committee would report to the Provost. She asked for council reactions to the proposed committee.

Bulgac suggested “reducing the number of members and perhaps inviting certain people to specific meetings.” He recommended a committee of “ten members or so”. He felt it would “be more effective to have fewer people on the committee”. Wilson said it is “important to have a specific group [of representative members] on a committee concerned with this issue”. Asked if the committee would deal with issues such as Elsevier, Wilson said it would deal with many kinds of issues related to scholarly communications, including such issues as the SPARC initiative, NIH, and other issues.

### **Status of NIH Initiative – Sherrilynne Fuller and Betsy Wilson**

Fuller told the council that on September 3, 2004, NIH issued a call for comment on their proposed policy to require that NIH supported peer-reviewed manuscripts be deposited in NLM’s PubMed Central resource — the free online digital repository of full-text life sciences literature. PubMed Central was established in 2000 by the National Library of Medicine. The current status is that PubMed contains 162 journals and 350,982 full-text articles. There are various embargo periods.

Fuller said libraries, publishers, and many other groups have endorsed the NIH plan. “An unlikely group came together,” she pointed out. She said there are many journal publishers who oppose the initiative. But powerful journals such as The New England Journal of Medicine have endorsed it. “Scientists hold the real power in this debate,” Fuller stressed.

The draft policy requests, but does not require, that NIH-funded investigators submit electronically to the NIH the final, peer-reviewed author’s copy of their scientific manuscripts. The author’s copy will be embargoed from release by NIH for six months after the publisher’s date of publication. This provides at least a six-month delay between final peer review and the time at which the copy becomes publicly available in the NIH Library of Medicine’s (NLM) PubMed Central (PMC) <http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/>. NLM offers a permanent archive (unlike journal publishers).

It is NIH’s intent that the policy will preserve the critical role of journals and publishers in peer review, editing, and scientific quality control processes. As for archiving, the proposed policy does not mandate that PMC will be the sole repository of NIH-funded published research information. In fact, NIH welcomes a multiplicity of archiving approaches. Regarding the current environment, advanced computing technologies and a networked environment are creating an infrastructure that supports new research capabilities, expands the ability to build upon and connect the work of many scientists, and facilitates exploration of new scientific frontiers. Concerning what is wrong with the current system, it does not provide NIH with the stable archive of publications that it needs to manage its research portfolio, set priorities, and ensure the permanent preservation of these NIH-funded published findings. The proposed policy would provide the patient and/or physician electronic access to NIH-funded publications six months after their publication for no fee. Currently, in order to gain access to NIH-funded published findings, a patient or physician not affiliated with an academic medical library or research hospital must personally visit a medical library, order a copy of the article from the author or the library and wait for delivery, or have a personal subscription to the journal.

NIH supports the current publishing process by providing direct costs to investigators for publication costs. It also provides funds to grantee institutions that use these funds for library journal subscriptions and electronic site licenses. And NIH encourages publication of NIH-supported original research in scientific journals. This will not harm the quality of peer review. NIH knows that publication in peer-reviewed journals is a major factor in determining the professional standing of scientists. Institutions use publication in peer-reviewed journals in making hiring, promotion, and tenure decisions. Peer review is also a

hallmark of quality for journals. As for impact on scientific publishing, NIH is not aware of evidence that indicates that libraries and individual subscribers are likely to cancel subscription because of the NIH policy. Articles derived from NIH funding accounted for more than half of the total published articles for only one percent of these journals. With respect to authors and journals continuing to copyright, funding recipients may continue to copyright works arising from NIH-funded research.

As to the impact of the policy on NIH investigators, NIH-supported grantees are currently required to submit as part of their yearly progress report a copy of all newly published manuscripts and manuscripts accepted for publication. And public access submission is a request and not a requirement. As for what it will cost NIH to implement, by building on an existing information technology infrastructure housed at the NLM, the NIH public access policy can achieve an exceptionally cost-effective approach.

Fuller emphasized that “journals claim that this open access has not affected their subscriptions. If anything, their subscriptions are up. This is about long-term archiving, not about immediate access. This is the open peer-review process. We need open access to this literature. People cannot just hope to find what they want in print journals.”

Wilkinson asked if the budget for PMC would be increased substantially under this proposal since there is often considerable delay in making abstracts available online at present. Fuller said she was not aware of delays. Wilkinson commented that, although the open access concept was an excellent one, several major scientific societies that publish not-for-profit journals oppose significant details in the current form of the NIH proposal. More discussion of the proposal with all stakeholders is necessary.

Asked what FCUL might do to help, Fuller said, “You can educate your colleagues about the balanced perspective on this issue. You can help raise the level of conversation, and help us get the message out. It’s a gradual process. And Betsy Wilson’s proposed Institutional Committee on Scholarly Communication would help too.” Martin said, “This will be one of the biggest issues of the decade in the Libraries.” Wilson said, “We need to identify points of change: to see where change can actually take place.” Fuller encouraged the council: “You make progress in a university by conversations and dialogues. You can help with this dialogue.” And Bulgac urged that the gist of today’s discussion be sent to departmental chairs.

### **Electronic Theses and Dissertations – Betsy Wilson and Jimmy Allen, GPSS representative**

Wilson introduced GPSS representative Jimmy Allen, a graduate student in Strategic Planning for Critical Infrastructure, who said that GPSS unanimously passed a resolution supporting the Libraries’ initiative to archive, among other digital materials, electronic theses and dissertations in the DSpace Institutional Repository. As was noted in the minutes of the November 22, 2004 FCUL meeting, “DSpace is meant to provide access to and be a preservation of digital materials created at the institution.”

Allen said GPSS was extremely appreciative of Wilson’s visit to speak with GPSS senators about the initiative. “It speaks to academic freedom,” said Allen, “and to academic prestige.” He said GPSS wants to lobby the Faculty Senate to endorse the initiative as well. Wilson told the council that Betty Feetham, Acting Dean of the Graduate School, will be convening a group to encourage electronic theses and dissertations. Feetham, said Wilson, enthusiastically supports such a move. Wilson noted that “theses would still be in the catalog.” Allen said GPSS feels blessed to have Libraries leadership supporting the move to electronic archiving of theses and dissertations. “It’s the future,” he asserted. Wilson told the council that the electronic theses and dissertations can be found by going to the online catalog and using Google. She said the council could put the GPSS resolution on the Agenda of the next FCUL meeting.

### **General discussion on future items of interest for FCUL agenda**

The following items were suggested for future council agendas:

- 1) a visit to the Health Sciences Library: a tour conducted by Sherrilynne Fuller (Martin).
- 2) a discussion on the ways the Libraries sets up liaisons to different departments (Kerr)
- 3) a discussion on ways for the council to play a more proactive role (Bulgac).

**Next meeting**

The next FCUL meeting will be held on Tuesday, March 1, 2005, at 3:30 p.m., in the Petersen Room of Allen Library (4<sup>th</sup> floor).

Brian Taylor  
Recorder