

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

The Faculty Council on University Libraries met at 3:30 p.m. on Monday, **November 26, 2001**. Chair Greg Zick presided.

PRESENT: **Professors** (Greg Zick, Chair), Brown, Chance, Greulich, Kerr, Martin, Moy, Sauer, Schepp, Sutton and Tanimoto;
 Ex officio members Ogburn, Spillum, Stride and Wilson;
 Regular guest Charles Chamberlin, Deputy Director of Libraries.
 Guest Jon Blake, UW Libraries

ABSENT: **Professor** Sullivan;
 Ex officio member Fuller and Soper.

Approval of minutes

The minutes of October 22, 2001, were approved as written.

Breadth of Scholarly Publishing – Geoffrey Sauer, Greg Zick, Jon Blake and others

Zick said the council's Subcommittee on Scholarly Publishing met and had an excellent discussion on several aspects of the rapidly changing and increasingly complex movement in scholarly publishing. He then asked Geoffrey Sauer to give a summary of the types of scholarly publishing discussed.

Sauer corroborated Zick's assertion that University Libraries must decide what role it wants to play in this movement. (Zick has stressed on more than one occasion that this movement is taking place whether people want it to or not. It is a fact of university life that is changing several important aspects of what faculty do, including how – and with what ownership – faculty publish, the promotion and tenure process, ways of sharing research while it is being developed, and publishing ventures at the home university of faculty in which they themselves can participate.)

Sauer mentioned the Technical Communications Library as an excellent Web site for the council to look at: it is a portal to online publications.

Zick summarized the several kinds of scholarly publishing that the council will want to discuss. One is the "traditional journal, which is the most focused kind of publishing at present." Another kind of scholarly publishing is "non-traditional: this is a way of having an "ongoing dialogue, of providing a broader dialogue." There are also "individual sites that serve as resource reference links." And there are "class Web sites" ("My job is to teach. Here's how I do it.").

Zick said it is "not the Libraries' current role to archive current class Web sites." But he said the Libraries will play an important role in new online scholarly journals. It was suggested that the Libraries must decide what that role will be. What will the Libraries be archiving? And the Libraries should seek out other universities to be involved in the evaluation process, and find out what roles those universities are playing in online scholarly publishing.

What effect could faculty involvement in online publishing (and participating in an online journal being published by one's own university) have on promotion and tenure, and on other processes?

Zick said, "These issues go far beyond the Libraries," but he stressed the importance of the Libraries paying close attention to them.

Blake noted that the Faculty Council on Research discussed the Public Library of Science initiative regarding issues of copyright ownership – including the surrendering of copyright ownership – and issues

of preservation. People do not know just how they are going to archive, in many respects. This council can be of help, Blake said.

Zick said the current economic model of publishing is not sustainable. "Do we want to have a voice in the transition that is inevitably taking place?" he asked the council. Ogburn said that what some libraries have been doing is to take on the publication of online journals themselves. They have helped foster new "hybrids of scholarly publication." But she noted that there is not yet a "firm model for online scholarly journals." Blake said many university-wide symposia have been sponsored by the Libraries, but it might be time now for the Libraries to "do something more pointed." He mentioned such "new phenomena as soliciting reviews online, or offering specific kinds of editing online.

Blake reported that Library Liaisons has submitted the names of faculty whom they felt were good bets for being interested in alternative scholarly publishing. The Libraries has a list of 15 faculty to be contacted in the future for further exploration and examination of available software supporting electronic journal publishing. The Libraries has a self-reporting database of over 300 UW faculty who serve in some sort of editorial capacity. Among these are 42 editors-in-chief and 104 associate editors.

The thrust of all this, said Blake, is that these interested faculty should be approached to find out if they are serious about a commitment of this kind. Then the various available software systems should be studied to see which is best suited. And finally, it should be determined if one or two of the 15 "interested" faculty want to go ahead with the project.

"FCUL could take up this exploration simultaneously, and see where it goes," said Zick. "A mechanism would gradually move the host activity to another university; or the host university could continue to serve as host."

The University of Washington Press has not expressed an interest in electronic journals to this point. "But things change fast," it was noted. And Wilson observed, "With a new model, the University's Press might be interested. It's simply been too expensive in the past for that to have happened."

Zick said the NIH online publication, Pub Med Central, has a very prominent status nationwide. Wilson said, "If you receive NIH funding, you publish in Pub Med Central." Copyrights are non-exclusive; you own "author to journal" rights to your publication.

Asked if the provost has offered support for online publication ventures at the University, Wilson said he has offered "both moral and financial support to do transformational work, which could include the University's doing an online scholarly journal in conjunction with another institution." Brown asked if this meant specifically that the University would be sponsoring an online journal. Wilson said, "That's a possibility, but we have to see if that's the proper road to take. We wouldn't set up a publishing house, but we could enable the dissemination of scholarly research in a new way."

Tanimoto said, "There already are some good university-sponsored scholarly publications." Ogburn said, "There are other features than those that traditional journals have that could be put into play, but the question would be cost." Blake said, "There's an incredibly engaging intellectual side to all of this. Very provocative issues."

Zick noted that what is not changing is the role of editor/reviewer. "We don't know how publishers will make money, but there will always be a desire for quality." The council could help with the process of putting up a journal, he suggested, and could put it "out on the table." The council could make a recommendation to the Faculty Senate, and could submit a focused report to the provost in a quest for more than moral support. Sauer said, "This could be an effective collaboration between faculty and the University, something that has not happened all that frequently hitherto."

Sutton said, "Publishers are in *their* position because all of us are willing to give away our rights." But, as Wilson noted, "I hear that, yet people want to get published, and get their work noticed." Sutton said, "Perhaps we should give the University *more* power in this respect. Perhaps we should change the

copyright ownership, and give that to the University. That would certainly help the Libraries, and the University wouldn't have to be overly involved."

Wilson said the obverse side of the increased support for serials in recent years has been the concomitant decline of the scholarly monograph. Blake said the publishing of scholarly monographs has plummeted by two-thirds in recent years.

Zick asked if there are any electronic journals on any campus prestigious enough to support promotion or tenure or a minimal pay raise. Brown said she would look into this and report back to the council. Sauer said "Postmodern Culture" at Virginia Tech is an example of such a prestigious journal. "But that journal is also in print," he noted. Zick said, "None of us knows of such a publication on this campus, but perhaps the University could collaborate with another major university on such a publication."

Tanimoto said that a lot of scholarly conferences "are doing everything electronically" even now. Zick said IEEE is the largest professional organization of its kind in the world, and their online journals are the premier journals in the field. And they are also in print. Though they are "a successful model," the pertinent question is: Are their prices escalating too much? Ogburn said it is important to be mindful that these journals "were already prestigious before going electronic." In the end, Zick stressed, these journals "have set standards, promoted quality work and promotion and tenure, and served the community well." Wilson qualified this last observation, saying, "The library is an extension of the community."

Sauer said, "The micro-payment system (so much per page read by readers) could eventually be a threat to libraries." Zick corroborated this: "There will be per-page charges soon, whether that goes to university library systems or not." And the specter of student fees to use the libraries in universities is looming, he said. "If it happened, students would say, 'I won't pay all these fees; I'll just pay per page.'"

Tanimoto said, "We need studies of new models." Sutton said the National Science Digital Library is due to open in 2002, "and this will come upon the national agenda." Ogburn said, "Our goal [in the Libraries] is to have quality material online. The National Science Foundation (NSF) has not always been concerned with this goal. It has not been its concern to build libraries." She said the Mellon Foundation is interested in sponsoring models for digital scholarship on university campuses.

FCUL could be helpful in setting up a pilot program for online scholarly publication at the University of Washington, it was suggested.

Zick said today's discussion has produced several key areas to consider. He asked council members to send him their ideas via E-mail between now and the next FCUL meeting. He asked that they consider five particular areas:

- 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.)
- 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?)
- Prototypes (Projects and experiments – past, present and future – that are relevant to this problem.)
- Proposals The Mellon Foundation, etc. – organizations that are funding this transformation.)
- Partners (UW Press, NIH, etc.)

Next meeting

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

Brian Taylor
Recorder

