

Appendix G

Response to Questions from Drs. Palaima and Martinich Lorraine J. Haricombe, Vice Provost and Director, UT Libraries

1. What were the nature, frequency and extent of consultation with the faculties of art history, musicology, and theater and dance from 2016 to the present (and expected going forward) in determining how to manage the removal and de-duplicating of books and journals in the Fine Arts Library?

- Distinction must be made between the procedures followed in preparing for a major project such as the DFA 4th floor renovation and the procedures followed for routine curation of the collection on an ongoing basis.
- The DFA 4th floor renovation was a large project of strategic importance to the college that had to be completed on a very ambitious timeline, less than 18 months from initiation to completion, in order to meet the College's requirement that the new facilities be available for the beginning of Fall semester 2017 classes.
- For the DFA 4th floor renovation project, the procedures/timelines were:
 - Jan 2016: Provost's Office approved funding and project planning began.
 - Jan 2016: Interim FAL Librarian joined CoFA Dean's monthly Deans, Directors and Chairs meeting to brief them on the upcoming changes. They requested a direct email to faculty advising them of the same.
 - Feb 2016: Email communication was sent to faculty in all CoFA departments alerting them to the nature and scope of the project, projected impact on the onsite collection, and general parameters for selecting materials to be sent to storage.
 - April 2016: Interim Head Librarian attended meeting of the Art History faculty to update them on the project, again describing the nature and scope of the project, projected impact on the onsite collection, and general parameters for selecting materials to be sent to storage.
 - August 2016: Interim Head Librarian attended music department faculty meeting to update them on the project.
 - Feb – Aug 2016: Throughout this 6-month period of initial communications and planning, some individual faculty responded with questions or concerns about specific titles or subject areas and subject librarians tried to find a way to work around those.
 - Feb 2016 – Feb 2017: Librarians and library staff identified library materials from 4th & 5th floors to be relocated, sent selected materials off-site, and consolidated remaining materials on the 5th floor.
 - Librarians and library staff developed lists of books, scores, and serials to consider for storage and/or withdrawal, focusing on non-serial titles that had been in the collection for more than five years and were identified as no or low use titles.
 - Librarians and library staff developed lists of serials volumes to be sent to storage, focusing on titles with large runs of volumes more than three years old.
 - Those lists were reviewed by subject librarians who flagged titles that should remain due to their need for research and teaching activities based on their knowledge of the field and individual faculty members. Subject librarians contacted individual faculty members for assistance as needed.
- For ongoing curation of the collection, librarians and library staff will follow procedures similar to those described above, but at a smaller scale and with more time available for review and consultation with the proposed CoFA advisory Council.

What is your understanding of the nature of research in these fields, particularly with respect to two important points:

(a) the 20,000 journal volumes that were removed in fields where the journals are essential for study and teaching; and

(b) the critical role that browsing and ready access to books, scores, and scripts plays in these disciplines?

The answer to this question, in general and with respect to the points listed below, is that library directors at tier 1 research universities have a well-developed overall understanding of the scope and variety of research methods and needs across the entire range of scholarly fields present in most American universities. Cognizant of the need for specialized knowledge of faculty research interests, often at the departmental level, we employ and support subject librarians such as those working in the Fine Arts Library to develop the localized knowledge to inform collection curation. The decisions made about FAL materials to be sent to storage reflect their collective understanding that CoFA faculty value browsing access to materials of all formats as an integral part of their research practice, and that they prioritize browsing access to monographs and scores over serials as a general, but not exclusive, rule.

- 2. Circulation of items from the FAL is currently 90,000 plus items. Can this be dismissed as “low” circulation, when in addition many resources are used within the library itself and not checked out?**

I agree that this is not an insignificant volume of checkouts in a single year. Compared to the circulation volume of the past decade, it does reflect a significant decline, though. Admittedly, we do not know why there is a decline. We know that browsing is a key research strategy for CoFA faculty and that some view browsing as key to students’ understanding of the field. We do not currently have reliable measures for browsing behavior. My goal is to explore new ways of identifying the areas that are “hotspots” to help us better understand user behavior.

- 3. The website of the Joint Library Facility at Texas A&M specifically states that ownership “rests with both institutions.” In what sense then are the materials still “owned” by UT? Can they readily be restored to the libraries in Austin, should that become desirable in the future?**

Materials stored in the JLF facility are governed by policies that allow both systems (UTS and TAMU) to “count” the materials as their own. Based on the policy, materials that are owned by UT that have been claimed as RICs by other partners cannot be returned without approval of all participating libraries. Moving forward we will work with the CoFA Advisory Council to explore strategies for eligible materials to be returned, if desired in the future.

In your letter of March 16 to the Provost and in Prov. McInnis’s statement in the FC meeting of March 19, Harvard and peer institutions were described as following the same principles of library management that are used at UT Austin. Please discuss how the changes made to the UT Fine Arts Library relate to practices at Harvard and at a significant peer, Cornell University.

Universities may use different methods of faculty engagement. In general, though, the guiding principles libraries employ in collection management include criteria like usage, duplication, and condition of item, to help determine which titles to move offsite. Our librarians use similar variables. It is true that they may not have engaged *every* single CoFA faculty member given the tight timeline they were given to vacate the site for construction. However, some faculty took the time to engage our librarians and that resulted in retaining some of the selected materials onsite.

According to Vice President for Harvard Library Sarah Thomas, transparency and faculty consultation are the cornerstone of all policy involving the reallocation of space in the branch libraries; further, she notes that stack space has not been reduced in Harvard’s core libraries (Widener, Pusey, and Houghton). Harvard’s Fine Arts Library, though it has been physically moved to a new venue in recent years, maintains an impressive footprint in its current venue. This is because Dr. Thomas and the chief branch librarian have been keenly aware that the fine arts remain a browsing-intensive discipline with strong commitment to maintenance of print collections on site.

One highly competitive peer, Cornell University, has just announced a massive *expansion* of physical collections in the Ho Fine Arts Library, placing its book and journal collections at the center of its mission.

How do you see these policies squaring with those at UT Austin?

I agree that transparency and faculty consultation are necessary components of any discussion involving the reallocation of space. Decisions about space allocations for branch libraries e.g. in CoFA or EERC or the Jackson School of Geological Sciences are the prerogatives of the deans of those colleges. Our role in all of these facilities has been to manage the library facility in that space and to provide analysis of the usage of the collections, space and other services that we provide on behalf of that college or school. Moving forward the proposed CoFA Advisory Council will be directly engaged about these issues in their college.