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CHARGE:
Shall advise the University Librarian on the administration of the University library system; formulate, together with the University Librarian, the basic policies governing the acquisition of library materials and the use of such materials; allocate, with the advice of the University Librarian, the book funds which are not specifically designated; submit to the Chancellor, through the University Librarian, its advice on the establishment or discontinuance of library service units outside of the general library building; review the University Librarian’s budget request; and report annually to the Faculty Council.

BUDGET STATUS:
Protecting the materials budget continues to remain the Library’s highest priority. As has happened for several years, the Academic Affairs Library avoided cuts to its acquisitions program in the current fiscal year largely because the University Administration protected the library materials budget from permanent cuts. The University Administration continues to recognize the centrality of the library collections, both electronic and print, to the academic mission of the university, by exempting the materials budget from mandated cuts. It has also for several years transferred one-time allocations to the campus libraries to help cover the escalating costs of serial
subscriptions and electronic resources. Without these allocations, the libraries would have had to make major cuts in subscriptions and book purchases. Thus, in the current year the campus libraries will spend $2,453,350 on library materials from non-recurring funds. Approximately $1.1 million of this money came from 02/03 end-of-year allocations by the University Administration to pay for serial subscriptions. The uncertainty of such funding requires that the libraries plan for serials cancellations and a reduction in monograph purchasing for next year. The Law and Health Sciences Libraries were able to interrupt two consecutive years of budget-driven cancellations this year only because of the infusion of year-end funds from the University Administration. Additional measures taken by the Library also helped to safeguard the acquisitions program. As in past years, the Library postponed building repairs and equipment replacement and held positions vacant (with consequent strain on the existing staff), diverting funds to support the purchase of library materials. Although these strategies have enabled the library to maintain the collections, the lack of sufficient operating funds is beginning to be felt as the buildings and equipment age and cannot be replaced and repaired. As has been noted in this report in the past, the long-term solution is sufficient additional permanent funding to enable the Library to purchase the electronic and print information expected and required in a leading research institution.

In its annual budget planning documents submitted to the Office of the Provost, the Library has identified the following major budget needs:

- A permanent increase of $2,907,040 to purchase library materials at the 2003/04 level and eliminate the reliance on one-time funding to support the materials budget.
- Restoration of the annual library materials budget inflation component, previously provided through the continuation budget.
- Increase in support for building maintenance and equipment replacement cycles and provision of capital support for a renovation of Davis Library which is now twenty years old.
- Funds for technology upgrades and additions to the library technology infrastructure.
- Funds to begin planning for a high-density book repository off campus.
- Funds for the second year of the two-year Integrated Library System and Online Catalog replacement.

As has already been stated, the University Administration has made support of library collections a major priority. To assist further in meeting that need, it also made available to the library an additional permanent allocation of Facility and Administrative Funds. This welcome permanent addition to the library F&A budget is helping the libraries meet some of the most critical campus information needs.

**ELSEVIER NEGOTIATIONS:** The Libraries are increasingly subject to pricing models for electronic access to journal packages that are inflexible and jeopardize the ability to manage costs and make collection decisions that support all disciplines equitably. A clear example of this problem is the recent unsuccessful negotiation by TRLN Libraries,
including Carolina, with Reed-Elsevier. In January 2004, the Provosts at Carolina, Duke, and NCSU announced that the three institutions would not renew their consortial license with Elsevier for electronic access to Elsevier titles. The institutions took this bold step because the proposal from Elsevier for a new license did not meet two important objectives. Those objectives, as stated in the announcement from the Provosts, were “to regain and maintain control over library collecting decisions in order to meet the constantly evolving information needs of faculty, researchers, and students; and to manage overall costs in order to keep Elsevier expenditures consistent with materials budgets that have not been increasing at anywhere near Elsevier’s annual inflation rate.” The Library consulted closely with faculty across the university and with the Administrative Board of the Library in making this decision. The fact that the three Provosts announced the decision jointly is indicative of its importance to the three universities and its impact on the future of scholarly communication. At UNC, 109 Elsevier journals were canceled. Print and, therefore, guaranteed archival access was dropped for others. The Library, however, paid Elsevier less money in 2004 than it paid in 2003 rather than the significant increase it would have paid under the proposed license renewal. The Library is making every effort to minimize the impact of this decision on teaching and research by providing critical information as quickly as possible from alternate document delivery sources. As is discussed below, the library hopes that the Elsevier decision will lead to further discussions about alternatives to the current scholarly communication model. It is clear that there is no possible budget model that can sustain the escalating costs of scholarly communication indefinitely.

COLLECTIONS:
As noted in the budget section, the Library will continue to purchase serials and books at or near the levels of the past few years for FY03-04. This is due to the significant support provided by the University Administration in the form of one-time funding and the transfer from within the library budget of operating funds by deferring maintenance and critical operating needs. In the budget-planning proposal, the campus libraries noted that they are increasingly reliant on non-recurring money to fund the ongoing library materials budget at a level adequate to support the teaching and research needs of a major university. This problem is compounded by emerging programs and areas of interest that require substantial new commitments to the acquisition of library materials and the growing importance and increased cost of electronic information. These include growing global studies areas such as South Asia and new areas of research and teaching not previously supported on campus. The libraries do continue to acquire important new resources in all formats and in many languages. The cost of licenses for electronic resources, which generally supplement rather than replace print materials, also rises unabated. This threatens the libraries’ ability to provide continued access to core research materials, and to continue participation in consortial agreements. The campus libraries estimate they need $2,907,040 in new continuing funds in future years to purchase library materials at the 2003/04 level. It should be noted that full-text in electronic format is increasingly available to support the Humanities as well as the Sciences and Social Sciences. This year the library added these major databases supporting the Humanities: *The Eighteenth Century Collections Online*, the full text of most English language publications from the 18th Century; *Black Drama from 1850 to*
1900, an online collection of plays written by African Americans; and the Evans Early American Imprint Collection, a collection of American texts published before 1800. These add to and enhance the substantial print collections in these areas held in Davis and Wilson Libraries and provide powerful tools for research in the Humanities.

SCHOLARLY COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE PROPOSAL:
In 1998, the University Committee on Copyright, appointed by then Provost Richard J. Richardson, produced its final report which made several recommendations related to campus copyright policies and programs. Subsequently, a standing committee on copyright was established. A recommendation to establish an Office of Scholarly Communication, however, was not implemented due mainly to budget limitations.

This year the Scholarly Communications Committee of the Administrative Board of the Library recommended to the full Board that the proposal to establish an Office of Scholarly Communication be revived. This suggestion was approved by the Board, which decided to discuss the proposal with the University Committee on Copyright to develop an updated jointly sponsored proposal.

The purpose of the Office would be to assist members of the University community in dealing with copyright issues that arise in the course of creating original work and in the use of existing copyrighted works for teaching, research, and service, and would offer legal advice when appropriate. The Office would also provide legal advice to libraries and other agencies in the University concerning copyright and licensing issues affecting access to scholarly communication. The Office would promote awareness of copyright law in the community, including a working understanding of ongoing judicial interpretations of copyright law and proposed changes in laws. The Director of the Office would be housed in the University libraries and report jointly to the Associate Provost for University Libraries and the University Counsel.

NEW ONLINE CATALOG:
Following an extensive review of four alternatives, library staff chose to replace the current DRA Classic system, which includes the online catalog and the circulation system, with the Millennium system developed by Innovative Interfaces, Inc. The DRA Classic system, which was selected in 1991, was purchased by another organization in 2001 and they intend to move DRA Classic sites to their software.

With financial support from the Office of the Provost, a contract was signed with Innovative Interfaces in November 2003. Work on the migration of all data to the new system has begun. The new system will offer increased functionality and more comprehensive information. Millennium will further integrate our operations with those of the Health Sciences and Law libraries. Users of the catalog will enjoy additional capabilities such as display of receipt status on current journals, "on order" materials will be integrated into the online catalog, and easier links from indexing and abstracting services to full text online articles will be available. The new system will be in full operation in January 2005.
**ELECTRONIC RESERVES:**
The biggest challenge facing Electronic Reserves (E-reserves) is the escalating cost of copyright licensing fees. Due to the popularity of the service, the size of the Reserves operation has grown from 2,185 items in 1999-2000 to over 18,000 items in 2002-2003. In 2002-2003, the library paid over $62,000 to make E-reserves services freely accessible to faculty and students. Costs are projected to exceed $70,000 for 2003-2004. This cost, at its current rate of growth, poses a clear threat to the library’s long-term ability to afford and manage this service.

Discussion with faculty and the Library Administrative Board members has made it clear that faculty users of E-reserves are largely unaware of the costs associated with the service. Further, observation of faculty behavior has led to the conclusion that E-reserves is frequently being used as a replacement for coursepacks. The Board discussed ways in which the E-reserves user population could be educated as to the effects of practices that bypass traditional coursepacks and textbooks; it also explored options for managing and/or distributing costs.

In addition to the rising popularity of E-reserves, current copyright policies in the Undergraduate Library limit the number of materials for which the library can claim ‘fair use.’ The potential of broadening the library’s current interpretation of ‘fair use’ was discussed by the Board, including the implementation of practices followed by some of the other ARL libraries. Interpretation of ‘fair use’ provisions as described in Section 107 of the Copyright law continues to be controversial, however, and opinions are divergent on the best approach to ‘fair use’ interpretation.

**USA PATRIOT ACT:**
Although Library policies, professional ethics, and North Carolina State Law all seek to safeguard patron privacy, the USA PATRIOT Act (Uniting and Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism), passed in October 2001, broadly expands the surveillance and investigative powers of law enforcement agencies. Under its provisions, agents of the FBI and other law enforcement agencies may, upon stipulation to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act Court of “possible relevance” to terrorism, seize library records, computer hard disks or “other tangible items,” or install software on library computers to track use. A task force consisting of representatives from the Academic Affairs, Health Sciences, and Law Libraries was appointed in FY2002/2003 to draft a privacy policy and guidelines for library staff to follow in dealing with law enforcement agencies. The privacy policy, which includes the relevant portion of State law, is mounted on the Library’s Web site <http://www.lib.unc.edu/aoffic/policies/privacy.html>. Following discussion of the act and its ramifications for libraries, the Board drafted and approved the following resolution:

Resolution on the USA PATRIOT Act and Related Legislation, Regulation and Directives
Whereas the Library of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill has a long and distinguished history of supporting the research and teaching of North Carolina students, faculty, staff, and other library patrons;

Whereas protecting the confidentiality of library users promotes the free and open exchange of knowledge and ideas;

Whereas the USA PATRIOT Act and other recently enacted laws, regulations, and guidelines increase the likelihood that the activities of library users, including their use of computers to browse the Web or access email, may be under government surveillance without their knowledge or consent; and

Whereas increased surveillance of these activities threatens civil rights and liberties guaranteed under the Constitution;

Resolved, therefore, that the Administrative Board of the Library of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill:

1. Strongly condemns those provisions of the USA PATRIOT Act, and of any other current or future legislation, regulation or guidelines, that erode privacy, access to information, and Constitutional rights;
2. Opposes the use of government power to suppress the free and open exchange of ideas and published information;
3. Urges the Library of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill to defend and support user privacy and free and open access to knowledge and information; and
4. Supports the actions of the American Library Association on its passage of the Resolution on the USA PATRIOT Act.

The resolution, which was shared with other library directors, sent to the University News Service and the Gazette, has been mounted on the Library Web site <http://www.lib.unc.edu/aoffice/issues/patriot.html>.

DEVELOPMENT AND EVENTS:
The Library continues to progress toward its goal of raising $35 million during the Carolina First campaign. With 59% of the campaign over, we have raised 61% of our goal, $21.5 million. Significant new estate gifts were received from Gladys Hall Coates, Josephine Weeks, Margaret Susan Lewis and Lucile Turner. New endowments were established by the Lucius N. Littauer Foundation to support collections in Jewish Studies and by the John W. and Anna H. Hanes Foundation to honor Joe A. Hewitt. Eugene W. Earle’s gift of recordings to the Southern Folklife Collection has received wide publicity, as did Daniel Breen’s gift of comic books to the Rare Book Collection. An effort to match a challenge made by the original donor of the Joel Williamson Fund has resulted in gifts that more than double its original size.
The Friends of the Library has sponsored numerous events this year. The Music Library welcomed everyone for a reception in its newly renovated space in Wilson Library on August 25. Photographer Hugh Morton entertained a large crowd with a talk and North Carolina Collection exhibit celebrating his newly published UNC Press book, *Hugh Morton’s North Carolina*. The University Archives opened an exhibit on graduate education at Carolina with a reception and a talk co-sponsored by the Graduate School. Alumnus and collector Dave M. Davis, M.D., shared a selection of early maps from his extensive collection for an exhibit, talk and reception in the Melba Remig Saltarelli Room. The Rare Book Collection hosted an exhibit and conference on The Beats in America. The eleventh Winter Stories program, the Friends of the Library book sale, and an exhibit of the photographs of Jan Hensley rounded out the schedule. The Library is also a co-sponsor for the North Carolina Literary Festival, to be held on the campus of NC State from April 15-17, 2004.

**SALARIES:**
Librarians’ salaries continue to be low in comparison to peers in the Association of Research Libraries (ARL). In 2002-03, UNC-Chapel Hill average librarian salaries ranked 66th out of 114 in the ARL salary rankings. UNC librarians did not receive raises in 2003-04 and fell to 78th out of 114.

This year the Library Administration focused on classified staff salaries, which had not been raised since July 2000. Data collected to support a proposal for an In-Range Salary program for classified staff, showed that on average library employees are making only 82% of their qualifying salaries. To address this problem, our first priority is to give all classified staff a 3% increase. The next step will be to bring all employees up to at least 80% of their qualifying salaries. This plan will affect 144 out of 152 employees (8 of whom are ineligible because their salaries are at the top of the range) and will increase staff salaries overall.

Funding for the Library’s In Range Salary Program will come from reserve funds. In the past, reserve money has been used to reclassify positions, to supplement funds for new hires, and to cover budget cuts. Now, reserve money will be used to supplement the In Range Salary Program as well. Since this program depends on the availability of funding, it must be phased in over time.

**CONCLUDING SUMMARY:**
The year reported on is the last in the lengthy tenure of Joe A. Hewitt as University Librarian; he retires as of June 30th, 2004, but will continue as Professor in the School of Information and Library Science. Tributes will be paid to him elsewhere, but the Board wishes to record its gratitude for his long years of service, his sensitivity to faculty concerns and quickness to address them, and his affability. Our annual reports mark the steady progress of the Library to national and international eminence under his guidance. A graduate student in SILS shared with the Board a paper she had written comparing our library with an ancient English library of great renown, in which she characterized that library primarily as a center of learning and ours as a center of information. There is substantial truth in this generalization, but our Library is a center of
learning, too, and that this is the case is in great measure due to Dr. Hewitt’s efforts to preserve and enhance its excellence.

The Board’s attention has been heavily taken up with the matters summarized above as the Elsevier Negotiations and Electronic Reserves, and as we have discussed these issues (often at great length) it has been brought home to us how integrally they concern all aspects of the academic mission of the University. Indeed, we have more than once been surprised at the degree to which our business in general demonstrates that the frequently repeated maxim that the Library lies at the center of the University is not just a facile claim. We have found much of the Board’s work to be exacting and urgent, and we commend service on it as an excellent way to become involved in genuinely pan-University concerns. We trust that relations between the Administrative Board and the new University Librarian who is about to be appointed will be as warm and productive as ours have been with Dr. Hewitt.