

University Library Committee Annual Report

2000-2001

CHARGE:

The University Library Committee (ULC) reviews, consults on, advises, plans for, and receives reports and recommendations on the performance of library services, automation, budget, administrative structure, and allocation of resources. Responsibility for keeping the faculty informed of major issues and for creating opportunities for the faculty to discuss priorities also falls to the committee (see Faculty Policies and Procedures 6:46 B).

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS AND ACTIONS:

Several issues threaten the General Library System's (GLS) standing as a first-rank research facility. The ULC encourages participation by UW faculty in these issues and the committee welcomes the advice of faculty members.

The ULC makes the following recommendations:

1) BUDGET: The ULC recommends that an annual increase to the collections budget be included in the budgets of UW-Madison libraries to maintain the quality of holdings.

2) STORAGE AND SPACE: The ULC affirms a recommendation made in its 1998-1999 Annual Report that Middleton Library be used as an interim auxiliary storage facility.

3) PLANNING FOR A NEW LIBRARY: The ULC recommends that plans begin now for the construction of a completely new library building.

4) NEW TECHNOLOGY AND FUTURE LIBRARY NEEDS: The ULC recommends that a full-scale examination be made of the challenges and opportunities that new media present to the General Library System with the goal of offering a strategy that will assure the GLS's continued leadership as a major research institution.

5) TEMPE PRINCIPLES FOR SCHOLARLY PUBLISHING AND FACULTY INVOLVEMENT: The ULC endorses the Tempe Principles which seek to alleviate serious challenges posed to scholarly publishing by electronic media, the increase in volume of publications, and escalating publication costs, and the ULC strongly urges UW faculty participation in efforts to find solutions to these challenges.

6) UNIVERSITY ARCHIVES: The ULC endorses the recommendations of the University Archives Committee which call for improvements in the collection of materials of permanent historical value pertaining to the university's past.

BUDGET ISSUES:

The ULC recommends that an annual increase to the collections budget be included in the budgets of UW-Madison libraries to maintain the quality of holdings. Prior to the 1999-2001 biennium, libraries had gone through ten years without a state-funded increase for the library book budget. The situation damaged the libraries' ability to keep pace with peer institutions and resulted in the cancellation of more than 8,000 journal subscriptions. In a recent report of holdings of university research libraries in the United States and Canada for 1998-1999, UW ranked 34th in volumes added and was behind such institutions as the University of California, Davis, and the University of Iowa in current journals and other serials holdings (Chronicle of Higher Education, 9/1/2000, p. 50).

The base budget increase for all UW System libraries for the 1999-2001 biennium was tremendously helpful in reversing this downward trend. We on the ULC are grateful for this added support and for the improvement in the library collections that it has made possible. But we are concerned about a return to no budget increases for collections. We fear that libraries will go back to cancellations and cuts in comparison to other peer research universities, who are moving ahead with annual budget increases continuing to average more than 5 percent per year.

Library collections in both print and increasingly electronic formats remain at the core of our University's ability to support quality teaching and research. The costs for materials in both formats continue to rise at an alarming rate. Journal costs, which account for more than half of the library acquisitions budget, are increasing at a rate of 8 percent annually. The costs of scholarly books, both foreign and domestic, are increasing at a rate of 4 percent annually. The inflation rate for electronic information is often higher than price increases for printed materials.

The continued development of international research collections at UW-Madison is necessary for faculty to remain competitive for funding and programs. Access to current knowledge continues to be an essential requirement of a quality higher education in all professions and fields of advanced study. All of the peer institutions of UW-Madison continue to receive regular annual budget increases for print and electronic library collections. State Universities in Illinois, Ohio, and Michigan are receiving increases of nearly 10 percent annually.

We are confident that all cost savings that can be realized internally are already in place. Our libraries are at a point that if we do not have additional funds on an annual basis for collections, we will fall further and further behind.

STORAGE AND SPACE:

Two problems confront the GLS regarding space and storage -- one is of a short-term nature, the other long-term. In the short-term, Memorial Library is rapidly approaching capacity. The GLS adds no less than 60,000 books annually and needs between one and two miles of shelf space each year to accommodate these additions.

In the long-term, serious thought needs to be given to constructing a new library facility. Memorial Library is now nearly a half century old. Over that half century major changes had taken place, and continue to occur, in the way information is created and stored. The ULC has attempted to point to the magnitude of these changes in the section "New Technology and Future Library Needs."

With regard to the immediate issue of storage, one of the greatest problems facing libraries today is that of sufficient space to house their rapidly growing collections, and Memorial Library is not exempt. In many libraries across the country alternate shelving and storage strategies have been formulated and implemented. The building additions to Memorial in the 1970s and 1980s have served to forestall such strategies on the UW-Madison campus; however, current estimates show that Memorial will be effectively full by 2005, and several campus libraries have already reached that point. This does not mean that all the shelves are filled, but rather that they have reached an occupancy rate of 75 percent to 80 percent, the point at which only continuous and expensive shifting and reorganization of the collections can accommodate further growth. A committee charged to look into issues relevant to planning future growth concluded that a shelving facility will be required in the next five years, and a special Storage Committee was formed with the specific charge of drafting criteria for selecting library materials that most appropriately belong in a centralized campus shelving facility rather than in primary shelving facilities across campus.

The University Library Committee discussed at some length the preliminary recommendations and their implications. **The Committee unanimously recommended that Middleton Library be used as an interim storage facility. This recommendation reaffirms a position taken by the ULC in its 1998-1999 Annual Report (see attached Report).**

Another solution would be to construct a completely new library building and to convert Memorial into the major research library for the humanities. **The ULC recommends that plans begin now for the construction of a completely new library building.**

A new committee will be constituted to examine possible solutions and make specific recommendations on all the issues that have been raised in the preliminary report of the storage committee and in the discussions of the ULC. Faculty members will be a part of all discussions of these crucial questions.

NEW TECHNOLOGY AND FUTURE LIBRARY NEEDS:

During the year the ULC attempted to assess trends that are likely to influence publishing, information storage, and more generally the nature of libraries in the near future. One of the most provocative reports the committee considered was a study of the Library of Congress's response to changes being brought by computers and other digital media. The report, sponsored by the National Research Council, appeared in summer 2000, and it argued that computers and other new communication technologies are bringing changes that "rival or exceed those that grew out of the development of the printing press in the fifteenth century." These developments constitute nothing less than a "revolution that challenges the traditional role of libraries in contemporary and future society." The report speculated that during the coming decade online publishing may well increase the number of new books appearing in the United States from the current 50,000 a year to "hundreds of thousands per year." But the challenges posed by electronic media go well beyond problems related to volumes of works published. The report recommended that libraries now "should be actively assessing the possibility that they will be called upon in the future to be the repositories of whole classes of artifact quite unlike what they owned before, placing very different demands on their various skills." This report concluded that the Library of Congress, the world's largest repository of scholarly material, is being overwhelmed by the digital revolution and that without major innovations in its policies, the LC may well decline from a position of leadership to a peripheral role.¹

If, as this report argues, the Library of Congress, with its large resources, is having difficulty keep pace with the changes brought by new media, it behooves other major research libraries to plan for the future with special care. The ULC believes that the General Library System's leadership is well aware of the challenges posed by new media and that it is doing a good job of keeping abreast of developments with the resources at its disposal. But the changes underway in new information technologies are occurring with such rapidity and may be of such magnitude that their full measure is hard to assess. **The committee therefore recommends that a full-scale examination be made of the challenges and opportunities that new media present to the General Library System with the goal of offering a strategy that will assure the GLS's continued leadership as a major research institution.**

TEMPE PRINCIPLES FOR SCHOLARLY PUBLISHING:

The ULC considered the serious challenges posed to scholarly publishing by electronic media, the increase in volume of publications, and escalating publication costs. It also looked for ways to increase faculty involvement in these vitally important issues. In November, the committee discussed the "Principles for Emerging Systems of Scholarly Publishing" – commonly known as the "Tempe Principles" – developed at a May 2000 conference in Tempe, Arizona. The conference, which was coordinated by the American Association of Universities, the Association of Research Libraries, and the Merrill Advanced Studies Center of the University of

¹ See *LC21: A Digital Strategy for the Library of Congress* (Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press, 2000), Quotations, I-1, 8, 9

Kansas, issued guidelines that attempt to build a consensus among academic entities interested in guiding the transformation of the current scholarly publishing system.

The Tempe Principles recognize that the current publishing process has become overly expensive for the academic community, and that costs need to be contained to ensure that faculty and students will have access to relevant research in the future. The recommendations include a call for continued use of electronic publication capabilities while at the same time continuing to develop processes that ensure the quality of scholarly work. Readers should have access to information about the evaluation procedures the work has undergone. The Principles call for electronic publications to be archived in a secure manner. To achieve a balance between owners and users in this digital environment, the Principles give attention to copyright and fair use issues, as well as to privacy guarantees. Other principles advocate reductions in the time between submission of a manuscript and its publication, emphasize quality over quantity when evaluating faculty publications, and ask that faculty publish in reasonably priced scholarly journals.

The ULC unanimously voted to endorse the Tempe Principles, but with an amendment that notes “publishing of knowledge for future generations cannot be entirely left to market forces.” The endorsement brings the Principles to the attention of the Faculty Senate and University Committee, and also means that they can be incorporated into discussions and negotiations with the editorial boards of scholarly publications. The University Library Committee believes the Tempe Principles are consistent with earlier ULC recommendations.²

The Tempe Principles read as follows:

1) The cost to the academy of published research should be contained so that access to relevant research publications for faculty members and students can be maintained and even expanded. Members of the university community should collaborate to develop strategies that further this end. Faculty participation is essential to the success of this process.

2) Electronic capabilities should be used, among other things, to: provide wide access to scholarship, encourage interdisciplinary research, and enhance interoperability and searchability. Development of common standards will be particularly important in the electronic environment.

3) Scholarly publications must be archived in a secure manner so as to remain permanently available. In the case of electronic works, a permanent identifier for citation and linking should be provided.

4) The system of scholarly publication must continue to include processes for evaluating the quality of scholarly work, and every publication should provide the reader

² See *Annual Report of the 1998-99 University Library Committee*.

with information about evaluation the work has undergone.

5) The academic community embraces the concepts of copyright and fair use and seeks a balance in the interest of owners and users in the digital environment. Universities, colleges, and especially their faculties should manage copyright and its limitations and exceptions in a manner that assures the faculty members access to and use of their own published works in their research and teaching.

6) In negotiating publishing agreements, faculty members should assign the rights to their work in a manner that promotes the ready use of their work, and should choose journals that support the goal of making scholarly publications available at reasonable cost.

7) The time from submission to publication should be reduced in a manner consistent with the requirements of quality control.

8) To assure quality and reduce proliferation of publications, the evaluation of faculty members should place a greater emphasis on quality of publication and a reduced emphasis on quantity.

9) In electronic as well as print environments, scholars and students should be assured privacy with regard to their use of materials.

UNIVERSITY ARCHIVES:

Storage space has been a major problem for the University Archives for the past several years but this year improvements are underway as the Archives has been given additional quarters in Steenbock Library. Other important issues, though, face the University Archives. A search is underway for a new head Archivist. As with the library system in general, new media pose difficult challenges for the Archives. Ways need to be found to expand the Archives collection of university materials of permanent historical value. During the past year, an administrative change went into effect. Henceforth, the University Archivist, who had previously reported to the Director of GLS, will report to the Head of Special Collections. It is expected that this change will give the Archives increased visibility. **The University Archives Committee has made several recommendations related to these issues and the ULC endorses these recommendations. (See the University Archives Committee 2000-2001 Report attached.)**

CREATING POSITIVE CHANGE IN SCHOLARLY COMMUNICATION:

As it has in the past the University Library Committee devoted time and attention to issues related to scholarly communication. UW-Madison is recognized as a leading institution in worldwide efforts to develop more cost-effective methods of disseminating research findings. The UW-Madison University Library Committee was among the first in the country to confront directly issues which have been frequently reported on in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* and elsewhere.

The UW-Madison Libraries are founding members of SPARC, the Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition. SPARC is a worldwide alliance of research institutions, libraries and organizations that encourages faculty and researchers to assert greater control over the information resources that they create.

During 2000/01 the ULC discussed two new initiatives launched by SPARC and its allies. The first is called "Create Change," which provides both the background information and analysis of the crisis in scholarly communication. Its primary goal is to promote discussion and understanding of opportunities that scholars have to influence pricing and access policies of journals, support alternatives to commercial journals, and foster change in the academic reward system that promotes greater availability of scholarly research.

"Create Change" will be followed in 2001 by "Declaring Independence," a program that seeks to engage academic editors and members of journal editorial boards in a performance review of the specific journals titles that they create. "Declaring Independence" provides the tools to help editorial boards diagnose whether a journal is fairly priced, widely accessible, and performing successfully in meeting the needs of the research community. For those researchers who conclude that their journal is not performing as it should, the program offers strategies for moving the intellectual property created by researchers to a publishing model that can better serve the research community.

COLLABORATIVE ONLINE SCHOLARLY PUBLISHING:

UW-Madison libraries have embarked on an activity in the arts and humanities which is intended to provide a model for collaborative activities that are interdisciplinary, library and curricular based, and involve campus and private funding. The pilot project is in design and decorative arts. The Chipstone Foundation of Milwaukee is a major partner in the project as part of its mission to promote and stimulate research and education in material culture. The joint partnership has created an original aggregator Web resource which collects information from a variety of existing resources in addition to new material that includes information on new program development at Madison in material culture studies.

The site will include collections of individual images and links to image databases. One of the goals for the project is to allow campus students to search an idea and locate documents, images and references, much like a virtual encyclopedia of the objects of material culture. As part of the site, the library is assessing the feasibility of developing a single campus virtual collection of images from the myriad small collections of images located in specialized libraries as well as

faculty and departmental collections used for teaching purposes. The intent is to broaden the scope of the campus library to include images as well as monographs, serials and databases. This project reflects the reality that many programs across campus are heavily dependent upon visual resources for both teaching and research. Students would have access to the great wealth of existing image resources in a systematic, easily accessible manner, and images would have much broader and more frequent use while retaining appropriate copyright and ownership restrictions.

OTHER ISSUES:

Report from the University Library Committee Survey Subcommittee:

The University Library Committee appointed a survey subcommittee in the spring of 2000 to address the library needs of graduate students. The committee used focus groups to obtain information from graduate students on the libraries' physical facilities and services. Comments were made on everything from electronic information to circulation policies to the condition of bathrooms. The information will be reviewed by library staff to determine what steps can be taken to improve the environment for graduate students. The libraries will report on this activity at a fall meeting of the ULC.

2000/2001 UNIVERSITY LIBRARY COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Elected Faculty (voting members)

Virginia Boyd
 Arnold Alanen
 Christopher Kleinhenz
 Thomas C. Osborn
 Eric Triplett
 Dietrich Uhlenbrock
 Stephen L. Vaughn, Chair
 Amy Wendt

Appointed Academic Staff (voting members)

Susan H. Hellstrom
 Alice Honeywell

Ex Officio (non-voting members)

Phillip Braithwaite
 Casey Nagy

Students (voting members)

Lisa Petrov
 Paula Seeger

Librarians (non-voting members)

Ken Frazier
 Steve Barkan
 Ken Rouse
 Robin Rider