

University Library Committee
Annual Report
2005-2006
(approved by ULC October 12, 2006)

I. Committee Charge

The University Library Committee (ULC) reviews, consults and advises on, 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)

II. Summary of Recommendations and Actions

Primary issues during 2005-2006 included space and storage facilities, research and learning spaces, scholarly communication and digital publishing, the collection budget, library collaborations and partnerships, and the role of the libraries in the campus community.

Some of the issues addressed by the ULC during this academic year included:

1) Acquisitions Budget and Collections

The collection budget remains a challenge. ULC members suggested ways to work with the university and legislature for increased funding and supports continuing efforts to generate alternative funding.

2) Scholarly Communication and Open Access Publishing

The Office of Scholarly Communication and Publishing (OSCP) was established in 2006 and made significant progress in efforts to work with the university community to support sustainable open access models for digitally publishing scholarly research and works. ULC supports open access publication of journal articles and will assist the libraries in working with the research community to disseminate information on open access publishing and OSCP.

3) Library Partnerships

Partnerships and collaborations have increased during the last year in all areas of the libraries. The libraries value the opportunities to continue these important collaborations to support the teaching and research mission of the university as well as to play an important role in the preservation and conservation of important research and scholarly materials. The ULC continues to be a conduit for further collaborative projects.

4) Library as Place

The libraries, in partnership with other campus departments such as the residence halls and the union, are evaluating study and research space on campus. ULC supports the continuing efforts of the libraries to provide a wide variety of study space on campus.

5) Space and Storage

The ULC has participated in discussions regarding space issues and supported the submission of an issue statement to the Campus Planning Committee for a high density conservation facility to be built in partnership with the Wisconsin Historical Society. Implementation work on this facility is progressing.

III. Detail of Current/Past Year's Activities and Issues

1. Acquisition Budget and Collection

The collection budget has remained flat over the past few years and no additional funds are anticipated for the 2nd year of the current biennium. This may result in a large impact on competitiveness if no increase in collection funding occurs in the next biennium. It also impacts the university's ability to attract graduate students if the libraries cannot support research programs and graduate studies.

Statistics presented:

1. Recent ARL statistics reveal that UW has fallen out of the top ten of public universities for funding of collections.
- 2) UW has fallen into bottom quartile of CIC schools. Only Michigan State and Purdue have smaller budgets.
3. University of Minnesota ranks above UW for funding of library facilities, salaries and collections.
4. UW-Madison is unable to participate in cooperative buying within the UW System and with other schools in the CIC.

The ULC has consistently supported steady increases in the library's acquisitions budget, but has come to recognize that current materials costs and rising prices are no longer sustainable. Several discussions ensued regarding the funding of the library collections and how ULC can facilitate increases in the collections budget. Suggestions included: writing an editorial for the newspapers on the importance of the library and detailing the collection budget crisis; looking to the University of Minnesota and how they were able to enlist the help of university alumni to make the case to the legislature for increased funding; potentially involving the support of the Public Representation Organization of the Faculty Senate.

2. High Journal Costs, Rush Delivery, and Scholarly Publishing

Journal prices continued to increase two to three times the rate of inflation making annual cancellations a necessity. While the cancellation of journals remains problematic for the entire research community the libraries have attempted to ameliorate the effects by expanding the rush delivery service and implementing the Office of Scholarly Communication and Publishing. Discussions with the ULC provided the library with valuable input into the implementation of these services.

The libraries expanded their Rush Delivery service to support the needs of the campus community and to offset the cancellation of journals. The libraries' rapid article delivery

service provides copies of journal articles (for journals not owned on campus) to university researchers on their desktops usually within 24 hours. The service has proven to be a cost-effective alternative to having local subscriptions for some high-cost, low-use journals.

In spring 2005 the ULC proposed a resolution that was passed by the Faculty Senate (Final Faculty Senate Resolution in Support of Accessible Scholarly and Scientific Publication Submitted by the University Library Committee. Passed by the Faculty Senate in March, 2005; Faculty Document 1839). The purpose of the resolution was to make faculty and academic researchers more mindful about how and where they choose to publish.

Building on these concerns, and faculty support, the Libraries implemented the Office of Scholarly Communication and Publishing (OSCP) in 2006. OSCP provides consulting services in support of new models of scholarly publishing, guidance and referral services on copyright and publisher contracts, assistance with submitting research materials to open access repositories, and information about current issues in scholarly communication and publishing. This office will also provide increased opportunities for collaborations with the University of Wisconsin Press and University Communications. <http://oscp.library.wisc.edu/>

The Libraries also discussed with ULC how to best work with campus researchers to submit publicly-funded research for publication in open access journals. Several ULC members attended faculty meetings to discuss and promote this issue.

3. Libraries and Information Technology

A review of information technology on the UW-Madison campus occurred in spring 2006 and was reviewed by the ULC. One result of that review was a campus discussion on the relationship between the libraries and DoIT. Although many smaller UW System campuses have a CIO who also supervises the IT, this arrangement is not done at larger research libraries. Anne Lundin (representing ULC) submitted a letter (Appendix 1) opposing such a structure where the UW-Madison Libraries would be placed within the administrative responsibilities of a campus information officer. Among other things the letter cited the libraries' role as research and academic support and not as an information technology shop.

4. Service Consolidation

The ULC supported the efforts of the library administration to consolidate two major service points. The first occurred when the six interlibrary loan/document delivery shops on campus were consolidated. The consolidation is proving to be a success in improving service and reducing expenses.

The second major consolidation will be the two units of the UW Archives. The two units will be combined into one facility in the Steenbock Library. Funded by the Parents Fund, this new facility will allow greater access to the UW Archives.

5. Library Web site

The libraries conducted an analysis and redesign of the entire library Web site. This involved

many staff throughout the library system and required new architecture, design, page content, and the development of templates.

6. Humanities Research Institutes Collaboration

The Institute for Research in the Humanities is moving from Washburn Observatory to Pres House. In the future the Institute along with the Arts Institute may join the Center for the Humanities in Memorial Library. These collaborations will be instrumental in advancing the support for research in the humanities. The libraries will work closely with these departments on new models for scholarly communication.

7. Preservation and Conservation Facility

The Libraries are continuing their progress in partnership with the Wisconsin Historical Society to build a new preservation and conservation facility. The Campus Planning Committee approved the proposal. The new facility is the linchpin for the libraries' future strategic planning. With this facility campus the campus will not need to construct new library buildings. The facility will free up current library space for study & research, provide space for storage of growing collections, and will allow modernization of our preservation and conservation units.

IV. Other Issues and Developments

1. Development for collections and services

The Parents Enrichment Fund (the UW Foundation campaign focusing on raising funds for library services to students) continues to provide substantial resources for improving library study facilities and expanding library services to undergraduates. Contributions to the Parents Fund garnered close to \$420,000 in donations earmarked for the campus libraries. Last year the Parents Enrichment Fund supported such projects as the remodeling of the Journalism Reading Room and new study spaces in Memorial Library.

2. Common Book Program

The Libraries and the Friends of the Libraries provide the books and support for the "Common Book Program." Through this L&S Honors Program, the libraries send all of the 450-500 incoming honors students a book during the summer written by a University of Wisconsin-Madison faculty member. This year's book is Tim Tyson's *Blood Done Sign My Name: A True Story*. The books are used by students for book discussions with the author, presentations, and in community service programs where retirement groups are sent copies of the books and the students lead book discussions.

<http://www.honors.ls.wisc.edu/SiteContent.aspx?id=92>

V. Future Priorities

1. Collections budget
2. Space issues
3. Develop and implement a long range strategic plan for campus libraries
4. Focus more heavily on development and alternative funding for libraries
5. Increase campus collaborations in development of library initiatives

V1. Summary/Recommendations

The support and involvement of ULC in ongoing library activities continues to be very important. ULC has been instrumental in conveying to faculty/senate and colleagues the importance of such issues as the collections budget, the preservation facility, and the future of the libraries with regard to DoIT. ULC support is also important in creating additional opportunities for collaboration on a variety of activities from publishing to development. We hope to continue enhancing this important relationship and that ULC will continue to play an important role in maintaining the Libraries' reputation as a great research library.

V11. Committee Membership (2005/06)

Elected Faculty (voting members)

Anne Lundin (SLIS), Chair
Linda Hogle (Medical History & Bioethics)
Evelyn Howell (Landscape Architecture)
Michelle Nelson (Journalism & Mass Comm.)
Joseph Mason (Geography)
Kenneth Potter (Civil & Environmental Engineering)
Teryl Roper (Horticulture)
Marc Silberman (German)

Appointed Academic Staff (voting members)

Susan Breckenridge (UW Press)
Susan H. Hellstrom (Engineering)

Students (voting members)

Salim Mohammed
Catherine Degen

Ex Officio (nonvoting members)

Phillip Braithwaite (Budget Planning and Analysis)
Jocelyn Milner (Academic Planning & Analysis)

Librarians (nonvoting members)

Steve Barkan (LCC Liaison) (Law Library)
Sarah Calcese (Wendt Library)
Ken Frazier (Director, General Library System)
Elsa Althen (Biology Library)

(Appendix 1)



To: Members IT External Review Team

From: University Library Committee
Anne Lundin, Chair

Date: March 2, 2006

The University Library Committee would like to go on record in opposition to an organizational structure placing the UW-Madison Libraries within the administrative responsibilities of a Chief Information Officer.

One of the issues to be considered during the external review of the information technology organization and resources of UW-Madison is the reporting lines for the director of the Division of Information Technology (DoIT) and the director of the university libraries. The organizational model specifically mentioned in the list of questions posed to the review team is a Chief Information Officer (CIO) to whom both DoIT and the campus libraries would report. We note with interest that the review team will meet directly with the university governance committee for technology (the Information Technology Committee) but no arrangements have been made to gather input from the University Library Committee. While we recognize that the organization relationship between the university libraries and IT is only one of the many issues you will address, we believe that it is important for you to know the views of the University Library Committee.

The organizational structure placing the director of libraries under a Chief Information Officer is rarely used by the largest research universities in the United States. While this model has been used successfully by smaller academic institutions, often with a librarian serving as the CIO, it is not suitable for universities that aspire to maintain great research libraries. To the best of our knowledge, all of the library dean/directors of the twenty largest public universities report to the administrative equivalent of the Provost—the chief academic officer of the university.

The reasons for this are many, but the most obvious is that libraries are academic support services, not information technology shops. While they are intensive users of IT systems and networks, research libraries are not fundamentally about IT. Neither do we see any inclination on the part of libraries to replicate IT infrastructure or duplicate the services of the Division of Information Technology. Instead, we have observed close and creative cooperation between libraries and IT on the UW-Madison campus.

It is also important to appreciate that large research libraries like Wisconsin's serve as cultural institutions for the state. Our campus libraries have massive and growing print collections that require the support of

conservators, archivists, subject area and language specialists—an array of professional expertise unrelated and largely unfamiliar to the IT world. We also have reason to fear that the printed assets of university libraries—which are so vital to scholars in the social sciences, history, humanities, and the arts—are not highly valued by many IT administrators.

Additionally, the university library system is made up of numerous units. The focal point, the center that provides leadership to the whole, is the General Library System, and its director. The governing structure that is set up through the ULC and the leadership groups in the campus libraries are effective in establishing strategic directions within a very complex library system. The director of the GLS, functioning as chief of this system, is able to exercise leadership, allocate new resources, and provide leadership among peers across the country.

We believe that there is a necessity for mission-driven leadership in university libraries that would be diluted to the detriment of the entire university if the director of libraries reported to someone whose primary focus is IT.

We would welcome an opportunity to provide additional input for this review process.