A broad range of working scholars and librarians convened on March 24–25, 2005, to surface scholarly trends in the use of the global record and identify issues and build the community of conversation around strategies for ensuring the survival, preservation, and use of the global historical record. The conference was organized and hosted by Yale University on behalf of the Association of American Universities (AAU)/Association of Research Libraries (ARL) Global Resources Network (GRN). The GRN advisory committee participated actively throughout and will follow the conference with an enhanced planning process identifying next steps. Similar conferences held in other parts of North America may expand the conversation, and targeted GRN projects designed to improve access and use of such materials will also be under discussion. The conference was cosponsored by the Yale Center for International and Area Studies (YCIAS) and the Yale University Library, and took place in the welcoming and appropriate facilities of Luce Hall, YCIAS’s home. There the walls are lined with maps that provocatively show different ways of viewing the world, both technically (different projections of a global community) and historically (maps from different times and places).

YCIAS Associate Director Nancy Ruther welcomed the group, and University Librarian Alice Prochaska expanded upon the themes and goals of the conference. She noted that discerning scholarly research trends is important for a whole range of academic disciplines. Documents; physical artifacts; the written, visual, and physical records in all their innumerable forms, are fundamental to living in an environment of laws and proof, to understanding our identity and our universe, and moving forward our societies. Information in the virtual technological universe can be at least as vulnerable as in the physical—and in many ways even more so—to loss, destruction, and distortion. “If,” she noted, “we think about the ways in which documentation supports life, then we are also telling ourselves something about the fundamental importance of our work, and the immensity of our charge to get it right.”

Prochaska continued: “This conference brings together librarians, archivists, and academic administrators with scholars whose research depends on the materials libraries and archives provide. We hope for a wide-ranging and enlightening dialog here on the theme of preserving the scholarly record in the international sphere. We need to consider the trends in scholarship and the gaps in the record: where will the gaps arise in the future, and where is the record most vulnerable? What can we do to preserve vulnerable and endangered materials? How can the librarian’s understanding of what is possible, the threats and the opportunities, work most effectively with the scholar’s knowledge of what may be needed most and what may be most valuable in the future?”

Identifying the Challenges

The conference opened with a keynote address by Jonathan Spence, Sterling Professor of History at Yale. Spence is perhaps the most distinguished western scholar of Chinese history living and working today, well known for books such as The Memory Palace of Matteo Ricci. President of the American Historical Association for 2004–2005, Spence’s theme during his term of office was to promote awareness, preservation, and use of archival materials. His own career has drawn heavily on experiences in Chinese archives since the 1960s and he was admirably...
prepared to give the conference its direction and intensity of commitment to common goals. Spence challenged conference attendees with key questions about access to world resources, such as: what is to be saved, by whom, for what purpose, where, and does “ambiance” of archives matter? Interspersed with these probing questions were tales of research challenges in archives from the U.K.’s Public Record Office (now National Archives) to remote hamlets in China.

David Stam, Librarian Emeritus of Syracuse University and a historian of libraries—and most recently of polar regions—addressed speakers and members of the GRN advisory committee on the first evening. He noted that while the issues being addressed now may feel new and different, they in fact have nearly everything in common with the burning questions facing scholars and librarians 30 or more years ago, early in his career. Like the proverbial iceberg, perhaps one tenth of materials are in view at any time, many are changing and disappearing—loss is inevitable. Resources are thinly stretched, it is hard to know where to begin archiving, and numerous tales of serendipitous discovery by scholars suggest that it is hard to know which materials will be useful in the future. He advised the audience to be pragmatic rather than perfectionist; to recognize that large segments of the record will be lost; to admit that subjective guesses are better than none; to cultivate scholar-librarian connections; and to retain optimism.

The subsequent formal sessions of the conference may be grouped into four categories: discussion of access to and uses of traditional media; discussion of uses of new media; working sessions on themes and issues; and a concluding discussion that included direction-setting.

Traditional Media and Formats
Speakers on the use of traditional media included two Yale faculty and a distinguished European librarian. Graham Shaw, Head of Asian, Pacific, and African Collections, and Program Director of the Endangered Archives Program, at the British Library, opened the second day’s sessions by reporting on exciting developments at the British Library, funded by the Lisbet Rausing Foundation, in a comprehensive program to support endangered archive projects around the world. The Endangered Archives Program focuses on less-developed regions of the world, marked by a keen awareness that the losses to archives are more often the result of human activity than natural depredation. The particular interest of the British Library is in archives in nonwestern countries and especially those in private, noninstitutional hands, but they survey a wider range of collections as well.

For each archive with which the British Library agrees to work, the project will be able to make a grant, usually on the order of £50,000 to locate the collection, assure a suitable home, and take appropriate steps to make backup copies. (A condition of the arrangement is usually that the British Library itself receives such a preservation copy, whether microform, digital, or in another medium.) At the present time, the proposal review committee is looking at a first batch of proposals that will result in up to 34 fully formed projects, many of which the British Library hopes to fund on the first iteration. Among the collections Shaw described were home movies of Chinese family life in colonial Java and radio archives from the Balkans and Iran. Two-thirds of the first-round proposals come from scholars and others in North America and Europe, but three-fourths of the resources come from Asia, Africa, Latin America, Eastern Europe, and Micronesia.

At the same time, the British Library is able to make a limited number of grants on the order of £10,000 for pilot projects that may lead to more extensive involvement and is able to grant four six-month bursaries per year for librarians and archivists from around the world to come to the British Library and work in their area of interest. The library hopes to build a community of global leaders and practitioners who will preserve and document important materials and, at the same time, build awareness of the importance of such activity and transmit a sense of best practices to colleagues around the world.

The second presentation in this session came from a professor/librarian team. Ben Kiernan, Whitney Griswold Professor of History at Yale, spoke of the history of Cambodia and its regimes (with six dramatic changes since 1945) and of the 1975–79 Khmer Rouge regime in particular. Kiernan is known worldwide for his work on genocide studies and especially for his deep knowledge of the history of Cambodia and the horrors of the Khmer Rouge regime. With the overthrow of that regime in 1979, there came the surprising discovery that the Khmer Rouge had in fact been meticulous record keepers and documenters of their own savagery. (In the course of the day, a theme emerged: some of the most brutal regimes have been the most careful record keepers.) At Phnom Penh’s infamous Tuol Sleng prison, when the leaders of the Khmer Rouge regime—sensing their imminent overthrow—ordered the destruction of records, the prison commander shockingly preferred to spend his final hours in power assuring that the last of his prisoners had been murdered, so an extraordinary trove of records survived. At another provincial prison, an immense quantity of material survived, though much of it had gone up literally in smoke—used by local people as cigarette papers. Finally, in 1996, when Kiernan-led efforts were well under way to preserve documents, a
vital trove of records from the Khmer Rouge secret police came to light.

Richard Richie, Curator of the Southeast Asia Collection in the Yale University Library, then took the stage to tell of the trials and travails of assuring the preservation of these archives in Phnom Penh, where he himself had flown a World War II-vintage microfilm camera and set up the work flow that brought undeveloped film back to the U.S. The film was reviewed in the U.S. and, often enough, orders were sent back to Phnom Penh to reshoot pieces of the record that had not been satisfactorily imaged. The great value of this project lay in making the material far more widely available, but also in assuring the simple survival of the information by making it possible for microform copies outside Cambodia to give confidence that no internal power struggle could destroy a vital record of humankind’s inhumanity to its own.

The third speaker in this series was Laura Engelstein, Henry S. McNeil Professor of History at Yale, a specialist in Russian and Soviet history mainly of the late 19th and 20th centuries. She took the audience through a tour of the adventures of Russian archives through the two great 20th-century regime changes, those of 1917 and 1991. The revolutionaries turned out to have a strong interest not only in documenting their own struggle, but also in preserving records of earlier times, as much to document the horrors from which they thought they had rescued the country as anything else. Even with superb archives, there are numerous real obstacles, including endless bureaucratic ones, as well as many political, and even more resource-based. For example, one of the treasured libraries that Engelstein has used most, formerly miserably inhospitable and cold, now is closed down for renovation or rebuilding. The archives themselves have now moved well outside normal city limits, are nearly impossible to access, and it is not clear when or if or where the archives will be opened again. Thus, for some time, authoritative study of imperial Russia will not be possible.

### Enter the New Media

The session on new media archives introduced a similar team of scholars and librarians. David Germano, Associate Professor of Religious Studies at the University of Virginia, depicting himself as a recovering narcissistic textualist who had made himself into a new kind of scholar by his engagement with primary materials and the contemporary digital practices of preservation and use, outlined his work on Tibetan and Himalayan materials and showed examples of the resulting Web-based archive that he and his colleagues are building. He described in detail the challenges of representing unusual texts and their contexts and interconnections that cross multiple cultures, nations, and institutions. His project is marked in particular by a strong sense of ethical responsibility to the often-beleaguered communities it studies. He demonstrated how the project team has combined video footage of scholars and poets with textual records of what they are saying on the video or of the texts they are discussing, so that those with little or no familiarity with the languages can follow and understand the substance of what is being preserved. The project also includes the makings of a kind of Tibetan “OED”—of a very new kind, wherein participants around the world submit information of the kind that used to go on slips to a shed in North Oxford for the *Oxford English Dictionary*, but now the information can be input directly through a Web interface in a collaborative project spanning the globe. The final demonstration was of a gazetteer of Tibet and the Himalayas with remarkably deep and rich information and mapping that continues to grow more complex and useful, mixing textual, visual, audiovisual, and mapping materials. A three-dimensional navigable model of an important monastery was linked to database text and image libraries that give a full and vivid sense of the place and its community.

Next, Priscilla Offenhauer, Research Analyst in Area Studies in the Federal Research Division of the Library
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of Congress (LC), spoke as a researcher addressing the challenges of navigating a digital environment. Her work within what is effectively a research institute inside LC has her regularly producing reports for other government agencies on assorted topics such as current Chinese immigration/emigration, military history for a training program for U.S. Army generals, history of the German military, history and current state of Dutch and Danish space programs, and the worldwide history of human trafficking. For the latter project, she detailed how a wide range of gray literature that she brought to light was consequently collected and built into a database and digital archive by the client agency. She captured vividly how that study required bringing together and then preserving, ad hoc, materials that would not be discovered by standard research models. Her closing account was of the large-scale program the U.S. Army carried out for decades to train its general officers. Difficulties came, first in the 1990s, when what used to be done on paper was increasingly compiled in more ephemeral digital form, and then after September 11, 2001, when the whole project was veiled in security classification. As a result, the research materials she developed for the training became essentially unavailable.

The last speaker on this section of the program was Joanne Rudof, Archivist of the Fortunoff Video Archive for Holocaust Testimonies at Yale. Her moving account described both the way in which new material comes to light today, 60 years after the end of World War II, and the risks to which materials are liable as media change. An important collection of witness testimonies was made by a researcher who died in 1961 and who had used reel-to-reel wire recording techniques. Mimeographed transcripts of these recordings have been microfilmed, but a book published on the basis of these materials did such an ambitious job of re-editing and retranslating that there is real need to go back again to the most original form of evidence to check and compare the accounts. The Fortunoff archive opened in 1982 and has since been used by hundreds of visitors intensively. The results are more widely varied in scope and genre than would ever have been imagined, with books and articles in a dizzying variety of disciplines, documentary film, as well as substantial work with courts and other government agencies to identify witnesses and organize testimony. There is progress in preservation and upgrading of quality of, for example, the pre-1961 wire recordings, but at the same time, a veritable Noah’s ark of video formats comes into the archive’s hands, each technology requiring its own special handling.

“Obsolescence is guaranteed,” Rudof noted soberly.

Engaging the Participants

The afternoon discussion and breakout sessions were, on the evidence of the reports afterwards, wide-ranging and lively, responding thoughtfully to the morning presentations and adding to a sense of direction. Any account is necessarily impressionistic and scattered, but issues discussed included: the usefulness of open source principles and practices in assuring access and preservation; issues of rights and permissions (with such poignant questions as when and how permission is given by witnesses to tragedy for their accounts to be opened to scholars or published more widely); calculation of the right mix of players to have at the table for GRN strategic discussions (not only librarians, archivists, and scholars, but commercial publishers, learned societies, government agencies, and representatives of the museum community); progress on a registry of digital objects and progress on creation and use of Universal Resource Names; potential cooperative allocation of discretionary resources so as to increase capture of resources for our institutions and the scholarly common; the possibility of a systematic effort to identify archives throughout the world and with it an effort to communicate to archivists what their role and responsibilities can be; and finally the need for enthusiasts—the people who can make good things happen.

Trends and Approaches:

A Summation by Donald Waters

The concluding session was introduced by ARL Executive Director Duane Webster, who expressed the thanks of the AAU/ARL GRN and all participants to those who had made the day possible and introduced Donald J. Waters, Senior Program Officer at the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, for final reflections.

Waters’s wide-ranging talk was not simply a recapitulation of the meeting, but a work of important reflection in its own right. Has, he asked, the problem of global-resources archives been articulated sufficiently and with sufficient clarity? He identified two main issues: (1) primary and secondary source materials in other countries are not being collected comprehensively enough to sustain scholarship; and (2) new formats are emerging more quickly than we are keeping up with them. He proposed three ways to move ahead in response to these difficulties:

1. Focus on broader policy and economic issues that impact the collection of primary and secondary source materials.
2. Emphasize forms of cooperation and competition among libraries.
3. Build cooperation in technical, human, and methodological infrastructures.

Waters cited sobering statistics about the dwindling role of the U.S. in scientific and technical education and productivity, which is marked as well by the rising role of global partners in education. For example, the number of doctorates in all fields received by U.S. citizens in the last 30 years has actually declined by 5%, with even sharper declines in the physical sciences and engineering, but the total number of doctorates awarded here has grown strikingly, all due to foreign nationals working within our system. The implications of this for thinking about roles and responsibilities in collecting the global record need to be addressed.

But there are positive signs as well, of which Waters particularly emphasized the transformation of pedagogy from the theoretical to the practical, thus increasing reliance on primary materials for pedagogy. Rising capacity elsewhere may mean that global responsibilities can be more widely distributed around the world. Preservation of the global record is, after all, a global responsibility.

Economic and policy questions will become more urgent and require us to address issues of cooperation and competition, particularly as enterprises such as Google provide greater access to printed publications. The resultant penetration of the commercial sector into the academy increasingly makes it hard to distinguish libraries based on their holdings; they will instead be distinguished by their special collections of rare and unique materials. If distinction is based on special collections, then libraries are largely in competition and cooperation becomes inherently more challenging. At what levels should libraries compete or cooperate? At a minimum, they should cooperate effectively in formation of common infrastructure and organized distribution of finding aids, for whatever service is provided requires interoperability and speed of access. They can compete in the services they actually deliver. The organized dissemination of resources, moreover, will give rise to large issues of resources for the sustainability of these efforts on an appropriate scale.

The questions for Waters are: At what level should the Mellon Foundation exercise its interventions? What incentives are needed in the humanities to create and sustain such projects? The foundation discusses these topics with discipline-based groups of scholars and librarians on a regular basis. Three methodological issues have surfaced for him in these conversations:

- Language issues: Interest in language programs is lagging and dropping. Time to completion for doctorates does not give time to comprehend adequately language and culture.
- Sustainability and business models beyond initial investment: There is a need for exposure to various kinds of sustainability options and models.
- Intellectual property: Legal protection is given in some countries to archives; now “archives” can be almost any information on any computer. Old definitions do not cover the current definition of archives. Libraries are short of legal expertise, which is closely tied to sustainability issues.

Waters concluded his remarks with an example from the Mellon Foundation’s engagement in a large project to document and preserve materials in the silk-road community of Dunhuang, China, where huge library collections were rediscovered early in the 20th century. The initial agreement to do this work was completely inadequate and so Mellon engaged in protracted and difficult negotiations, which required a combination of knowledge, creativity, and diplomacy.

**Personal Thoughts about Future Directions**

Few pastimes are as informative and stimulating for librarians and archivists as hearing some of today’s leading scholars describe the ways in which they work, the deep meaning of that work for them, and the value of their scholarship for current and future generations. In a concentrated one-and-a-half days, the GRN conference hosted at Yale provided a delicious and all too infrequent collegial opportunity to listen, reflect, and plan.

The AAU/ARL GRN project grew directly out of the AAU Research Libraries Project, whose initial work in 1991–1994 recognized access to global resources as one of the main challenges facing research institutions. Increasingly, member universities had begun to position themselves as “global institutions,” demand for foreign materials to support scholarship and teaching was rising rapidly, and available resources were not growing sufficiently to meet the demand. The 1994 “Report of the AAU Task Force on Acquisition and Distribution of Foreign Language and Area Studies Materials” recommended technological solutions via a distributed, cooperative approach. That report specifically recommended three distinct pilot projects in areas of Latin American, Japanese, and German resources; each of the three projects has moved forward, variously, with the Latin America project finding its way with the most...
alacrity. Now, some 10 years later, the initial project grouping has expanded beyond the original Latin American Table of Contents initiative, which itself is long past pilot phase, finding a permanent place in the Latin Americanist Research Resources Project. The various subprojects are facilitating access to information of specific types for their regions of the world.

But, the gap between university ambitions and available resources has, if anything, widened. During the last 10 years, AAU and ARL member institutions have intensified their global ambitions and self-definitions. Yale, the institution I know best, is surely typical of many others in its emphasis on recruitment of the best possible students, faculty, and researchers from around the world; in developing and attracting world and educational leaders to its doors not only for diplomatic visits but also for leadership seminars in all aspects of higher education activity; expanding its research and study abroad opportunities; signing partnership agreements with universities in emerging countries such as China; opening courses or campuses abroad. I could go on.

The fact is that Yale’s President Richard Levin has declared Yale to be a global university, and, the library is actively supporting that strategic vision. What does this mean for us? Our library, like many others, has had a long tradition of supporting individual area studies, with particular strength in seven of them and emerging activity on a smaller level with a handful of others. Our area curators and staff are terrific, and we continue to increase our investment in human resources and collections in global activities; there is never enough, of course, but still we are fortunate. The fact is also that the more traditional “area studies” way of looking at and thinking about our library is no longer sufficient. While we need to continue our area studies work, we also now recognize that much of what we do, the programs we participate in, and many of the staff we engage—not only in the humanities but also in the social sciences, medicine, law, arts, and much more—are international, global, committed to content and resources and people around the world.

In short, we are beginning to learn to think of ourselves as more than a group of area collections specialists; who we are internationally encompasses many assets and languages and nations. We are well positioned, both in collections and in human talent, to be truly global. What might this changing awareness and emphasis on the part of our library mean for the GRN project?

I believe the changing international scene in higher education strongly suggests that the GRN project might productively begin to shift from the individual linguistic and relatively narrow geographical project basis of the GRN to date. The Yale conference was, in fact, very successful, through Donald Water’s concluding talk and also the breakout sessions, in directing us to different ways of imagining a more comprehensive GRN. Various participants suggested that we might tackle not specific and regionally defined resources but, rather, enabling structures that will facilitate creation and access to these. Here is a list of only some of the possibilities:

- Create a registry of global access and digitizing projects.
- Identify and support technological practices and standards for creating such efforts and organizations defining such practices and standards.
- Work together with the Digital Library Federation through its new Aquifer project to develop a pilot, perhaps in a cross-disciplinary program, such as women’s studies or democratic traditions.
- Train library staff to provide better types of services to readers (not just services focused upon regional expertise and language skills but also ever-growing interdisciplinary, cross-cultural topics of study and research).
- Seek resources in the form of public-private partnerships, learning to understand when these are and are not effective.
- Develop resources for crafting cross-border intellectual property and borrowing/lending arrangements.

Don Waters advised that libraries must determine where we can best cooperate as well as compete. GRN could, by implementing some of the suggestions above, position libraries to continue to add value to their institutions’ global visions, at the same time supporting their competitive positions at home and abroad.

Note: The Yale Library created a Web site featuring the papers of the conference. Most of the papers are now available at http://www.library.yale.edu/mssa/globalrecord/new_web/.
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ARL Membership Convenes in Philadelphia

ARL President Ann Wolpert, Director of Libraries at Massachusetts Institute of Technology, convened the 146th Membership Meeting in Philadelphia on May 24-27. Hosted by the University of Pennsylvania and Temple University, 107 member libraries were represented in a series of meetings that included discussions shaping ARL’s Strategic Plan and program sessions. The meeting theme—“Strategic Directions for Research Libraries: Innovation and Impact in Times of Change”—appropriately embraced both the planning discussions and the program sessions.

The Transformative Nature of Large-Scale Digitization

The program sessions opened with comments from Ann Wolpert on the important role of research libraries in teaching, learning, and research. To illustrate, she introduced a panel on the “Transformative Nature of Large-Scale Digitization Projects.” Carole Moore, Chief Librarian at University of Toronto; John Price Wilkin, Associate University Librarian, Library Information Technology and Technical and Access Services at University of Michigan; and Clifford Lynch, Executive Director of the Coalition for Networked Information (CNI), opened the panel with brief remarks followed by an extensive dialogue with the audience. The panelists sparked commentary on issues such as: the importance of a mix of private and public investment in digitization; the need to move collectively to more strategic and shared storage arrangements for both digital and print resources; the value of international competition to be “the first” to digitize national cultural heritage and make it available on the Internet; and the implications of expanding the public domain for scholars and scientists even as other information resources remain available to them only from “silos” that are governed by copyright restrictions.

Expanding the Public Domain

The panel was followed with lively remarks by James Boyle, William Neal Reynolds Professor of Law, Duke University Law School. Boyle built on one theme of the morning panel as he advocated for expanding the public domain and a return to evidence-based policy making.

Academic Uses of the Internet

Steve Jones, Professor of Communications at the University of Illinois at Chicago, and Senior Researcher for the Pew Internet and American Life Project, presented the findings of the project’s 2004 survey of college students and faculty. From the survey results he concludes that the academic population views the Internet as an “information-Swiss Army Knife,” i.e., one cornerstone in their academic environment that they can call upon in a variety of ways to gain access to information tools and to content. The Internet remains only one of multiple ways that students and faculty undertake their academic and social life. Jones said, citing a high prevalence of student use of cell phones while also being online. He highlighted implications of the findings for libraries. For example, he called on libraries to take responsibility for teaching critical information assessment skills, citing faculty frustration that students do not demonstrate an ability to evaluate information sources.

In addition to these program sessions, member representatives gathered in small groups to discuss: “Anticompetitive Implications of Bundling,” led by Meredith Butler, Dean and Director of Libraries at University at Albany; “Establishing the Infrastructure for Digital Publishing,” led by Ken Frazier, Director of Libraries at University of Wisconsin–Madison, and “Campus Responsibilities for Course Management Systems,” led by Suzanne Thorin, Dean of University Libraries at Indiana University Bloomington.

Membership Meeting background papers, speaker slides, and discussion summaries are posted on the ARL Membership Meeting Web site http://www.arl.org/arl/proceedings/146/.

Welcomes & Tributes

Five new ARL member representatives were introduced at this meeting: Larry Alford, University Librarian at Temple University; Jeffrey Horrell, Dean of Libraries at Dartmouth College; Deborah Jakubs, University Librarian at Duke University; Jay Schafer, Director of Libraries at University of Massachusetts, Amherst; and Janine Schmidt, Director of Libraries at McGill University. Four member representatives received tributes on the occasion of their last ARL Membership Meeting: Meredith Butler; Bill Gosling, University Librarian at University of Michigan; Graham Hill, University Librarian at McMaster University; and Frank Winter, Director of Libraries at University of Saskatchewan.

During the ARL Business Meeting, Ken Frazier introduced a resolution in honor of SPARC’s founding Executive Director Rick Johnson and his contributions to research libraries and the scholarly community. The resolution was passed by acclamation and with a standing ovation for Rick from the ARL membership.

The next Membership Meeting will be October 26–27 in Washington, DC. The meeting will be followed on October 28 by a forum on “Managing Digital Assets: Strategic Issues for Research Libraries.” This one-day program is being sponsored by ARL, Digital Library Federation, Council on Library and Information Resources, and CNI.
ARL Salary Survey Highlights
by Mark Young, ARL Research Assistant for Statistics & Measurement

The recently published ARL Annual Salary Survey reports that ARL librarians’ 2004–05 salaries are outperforming inflation again after a lag at the start of the new millennium. The combined median salary for U.S. and Canadian ARL university libraries rose to $55,250—a 4.2% gain over the past year, almost 2% higher than the 2003–04 rate of increase. This was a strong performance versus inflation both in the U.S., where the Consumer Price Index (CPI) rose 3%, and in Canada, where the CPI increased 2.3%. The median nonuniversity library salary increased to $74,022; that 5.7% increase was slightly smaller than in 2003–04, but still higher than any other year since 2000.

Median beginning salary increases have slowed after some sharp jumps in the late 1990s and early 2000s. After increasing by $1,000 in each of the last two years, the median beginning salary in ARL university libraries increased by $984 in 2004–05, to $36,984. ARL nonuniversity libraries saw their median beginning salary increase slightly to $34,764—if not for the extra $25, that figure would have remained constant for the second consecutive survey.

The Canadian dollar had rebounded slightly against the American dollar in 2003–04, but it gained considerably in strength in the current fiscal year, as the exchange rate used to convert Canadian salaries into U.S. dollars rose to its highest level in a decade, to Can$1.34328 = US$1.1. Canadian university libraries recorded a median salary in U.S. dollars of $52,707, more than 16% greater than last year, although still 5.5% less than the U.S. universities’ median of $55,600. The last time the Canadian median salary converted to U.S. dollars exceeded the U.S. median salary was in 1996–97.

The New England, Middle Atlantic, and Pacific regions had the highest average salaries in the United States. The gap between salaries in private U.S. ARL university libraries and those paid in publicly supported U.S. university libraries decreased to 5.9%, the first time in several years that gap has narrowed. Libraries with more than 110 staff have the highest average salary, $64,254, compared to $60,641 for libraries with between 75 and 110 staff. Libraries with staff of 22–49 professionals paid an average salary of $58,852 and those with staff between 50 and 74 paid $57,213. The difference in salaries between the highest paying cohort and the lowest paying cohort is $7,041, about 32% larger than last year’s gap of $5,351.

### ARL Academic Librarians, FY 2004–05*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Filled Positions</td>
<td>2,871</td>
<td>4,942</td>
<td>7,813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Salary</td>
<td>$62,005</td>
<td>$58,770</td>
<td>$59,959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Years Experience</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Minorities**</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority Average Salary**</td>
<td>$56,937</td>
<td>$55,666</td>
<td>$56,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority Average Years Experience**</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Directors</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Salary of Directors</td>
<td>$161,370</td>
<td>$157,630</td>
<td>$159,366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Years Experience of Directors (filled positions)</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Excludes law and medical libraries.

**United States only.
The gender gap in ARL university library salaries still exists, even though these libraries have remained approximately 65% female since 1980–81. The average salary for men at all ARL university libraries was $62,005, while women's salaries averaged $58,770—94.8% of the men’s average salary, compared to 94.4% in 2003–04. Average salaries for men surpass those of women in 18 of the 27 job categories that ARL tracks, compared to 19 in 2002–03. As in past years, differentials in experience do not explain this phenomenon; there are several categories in which women average more experience but lower salaries, including Director of Libraries and Functional Specialist. This pattern is also repeated for minority librarians: the average salary for minority men is higher than that for minority women in nine of the ten experience cohorts, despite the fact that women comprise 68.5% of minority staff. The average salary for male university library directors (52 men out of 112 directorships reported) surpassed that of female directors by 2.4%.

A total of 9,487 professional staff positions are reported for 113 ARL university libraries (including law and medical libraries), and 3,946 staff members for the 10 nonuniversity ARL libraries. Of the university positions reported, 8,581 are in U.S. institutions, and 906 are in Canadian institutions. In U.S. ARL university libraries, 1,098 staff members reported that they belong to one of the four non-Caucasian categories that ARL tracks. Although that amounts to 12.8% of U.S. professional staff, the percentage of minorities is lower for every managerial or administrative position: 5% of directors, 7% of associate or assistant directors, and 10% of branch librarians belong to one of the minority categories.

The ARL Annual Salary Survey 2004–05 is available for $60 to member libraries and $120 to nonmembers (plus shipping and handling), and is available on standing order. To order online, visit http://www.arl.org/pubscat/order/. For more information, contact ARL Publications at pubs@arl.org.

1 This is the monthly noon exchange rate published in the Bank of Canada Review for the period July 2003–June 2004.
2 Black, Hispanic, Asian, and American Indian/Alaskan Native.

THE FUTURE OF HUMAN RESOURCES IN CANADIAN LIBRARIES

A significant collection of data and accompanying analysis examining important facets of human resources in Canadian libraries was published in February. The Future of Human Resources in Canadian Libraries is the latest in a series of reports from a two-year study by the 8Rs Research Team. The team draws its name from the eight core issues that the literature suggests are integral to human resources management in libraries: recruitment, retention, remuneration, reaccreditation, repatriation, rejuvenation, retirement, and restructuring. While some findings are specific to the Canadian environment, much of the report will be of interest to the US library community and beyond. Data from members of the Canadian Association of Research Libraries (CARL) is presented separately in each table. For more information about the study and to download a copy of the report, see http://www.ls.ualberta.ca/8rs/.

Making Library Assessment Work

Last fall, ARL libraries were invited to participate in a new ARL program “Making Library Assessment Work: Practical Approaches for Developing and Sustaining Effective Assessment,” led by Visiting Program Officers Steve Hiller of the University of Washington and Jim Self of the University of Virginia. The goal of the program is to establish a process to help libraries develop sustainable assessment efforts to demonstrate their contributions to teaching, learning, and research. Initial interest exceeded expectations so a Phase II (September 2005–August 2006) was scheduled.

During Phase I, site visits to seven ARL libraries are being conducted. The response has been very positive, with libraries noting that more time with the Visiting Program Officers would be desirable. Based on the experience gained this year, including feedback from participating libraries, ARL is adding a number of enhancements to the program. These include: extending the site visit to one and a half days; establishing formal follow-up activities to assist in implementing the recommendations included in the project report and consulting on a specific assessment project; follow-up will also include a meeting with a representative from the library during a professional meeting; and providing additional written resources that support practical approaches to sustainable assessment.

Libraries participating in Phase I are: University of Arizona, Arizona State University, University of Connecticut, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, New York University, Notre Dame University, and University of Oregon.
**ARL Transitions**

**Albany, SUNY:** Frank D’Andraia was named Dean and Director of University Libraries, effective July 1, upon the retirement of Meredith Butler. He was previously Dean and Professor of Library Services at the University of Montana, Missoula.

**Brown:** Harriette Hemmasi was appointed Joukowsky Family University Librarian, effective this fall. She is currently Executive Associate Dean of Libraries at Indiana University Bloomington.

**Duke:** Deborah Jakubs was named University Librarian and Vice Provost for Library Affairs effective January 4. She was previously Director of Collections Services for Duke University’s Perkins System Libraries.

**McMaster:** Graham Hill retired as University Librarian effective in June. Associate University Librarian Charlotte Stewart is serving as Interim University Librarian.

**Massachusetts Amherst:** Gerald “Jay” Schafer was named Director of Libraries, effective May 24. He served as Interim Director since January 2004.

**Michigan:** James Hilton, Associate Provost for Academic Information and Instructional Technology Affairs, is serving as Interim University Librarian. Bill Gosling stepped down as University Librarian effective April 1 to take on a new set of duties, including serving as Curator of the Children’s Literature Collection in the Special Collections Library.

**Saskatchewan:** Ken Ladd, Associate Director of Libraries, was named Acting Director effective July 1. Frank Winter’s term as Director of Libraries concluded June 30. He will be on Administrative Leave from July 1, 2005, to June 30, 2006. After that time, he will return to the University of Saskatchewan Library as a Collegium.

**Syracuse:** Suzanne Thorin was named University Librarian and Dean of Libraries, effective October 1. She is currently Dean of University Libraries at Indiana University Bloomington. Denise Stephens, Acting University Librarian at Syracuse, was named Vice Provost, Information Services, University of Kansas, effective in July. William Garrison, Associate University Librarian for Information Management and Systems at Syracuse, was named Interim Librarian, June 17 through September 30.

**Utah:** Joyce Ogburn was named Director of the J. Willard Marriott Library, effective September 1. She is currently Associate Director of the University of Washington Libraries, Resources and Collection Management Services.

**ARL Staff Transitions**

**Karla Hahn** was named Director of the Office of Scholarly Communication, effective January 6. She was formerly Collection Management Team Leader for the University of Maryland Libraries.

**Rick Johnson,** SPARC’s founding Executive Director, announced his decision to resign. **Heather Joseph,** founding President and Chief Operating Officer of BioOne, was named to succeed him. The change in SPARC leadership was effective July 1.

**Karen Wetzel,** resigned her position as Program Officer for Distance Learning, effective March 25, to take a position as Associate Director of Education with the National Association of Federal Credit Unions.

**Other Transitions**

**Council on Library and Information Resources (CLIR):** Director of Programs Abby Smith left CLIR staff on July 1, to pursue work as an independent consultant. She retains her role as senior editor of the American Council on Learned Societies’ Commission on Cyberinfrastructure for Humanities and Social Sciences and continues to work with the Library of Congress NDIPP as a consultant to CLIR.

**International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions:** Peter Johan Lor, Professor Extraordinary in the Department of Information Science at University of Pretoria, South Africa, was appointed Secretary General, effective February 15.

**National Archives and Records Administration:** Allen Weinstein was sworn in as the ninth Archivist of the United States on February 16. He was formerly President of The Center for Democracy.

**National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges:** C. Peter Magrath, President, announced that he will leave his position on December 31.

**National Commission on Libraries and Information Science:** Trudi Bellardo Hahn, Interim Executive Director since November, was named Executive Director on April 30.

**National Endowment for the Humanities:** Thomas Mallon joined NEH as Director of the Division of Preservation and Access on January 10. He is a novelist and widely published critic.

**National Humanities Alliance (NHA):** Jessica Jones Irons, the former Assistant Director, was named Executive Director, effective May 4. Executive Director John Hammer retired on December 30, 2004. The NHA Board elected him Executive Director Emeritus, effective January 1.
GOVERNANCE TRANSITIONS

Canadian Association of Research Libraries (CARL): Joyce Garnett, University Librarian at University of Western Ontario, completed her term as CARL President on June 9 and John Teskey, Director of Libraries at University of New Brunswick, became CARL President for the next two years. Leslie Weir, Chief Librarian at University of Ottawa, was elected Vice President/President-Elect.

Council on Library and Information Resources (CLIR): The Board of Directors elected six new members at its semiannual meeting April 29: Charles Brown, Director of Libraries, Public Library of Charlotte and Mecklenburg County; Mark Dimunation, Assistant Director for Special Collections and Rare Book and Special Collections Division Chief, Library of Congress; Wendy Pradt Lougee, University Librarian, University of Minnesota; Claudia Lux, Director General, Central and Regional Library of Berlin; Stephen Nichols, James M. Beall Professor of French and Humanities and Chair, Department of Romance Languages, the Johns Hopkins University; and S. Georgia Nugent, President, Kenyon College. Deanna B. Marcum retired from the Board after serving CLIR as its former president and, since her appointment to the Library of Congress in 2003, as a Board member.

HONORS

Larry Alford, Vice Provost for Libraries and University Librarian, Temple University, was awarded the Distinguished Alumni Award by the University of North Carolina School of Information and Library Science Alumni Association. The association’s president noted that Alford is nationally recognized for his leadership in the field.

Meredith Butler, Dean and Director of Libraries, University at Albany, SUNY, was awarded the 2005 Academic Citizen Laureate award by the Board of Directors of the University at Albany Foundation for notable contributions to the university and to the higher education community.

Paul M. Gherman, University Librarian, Vanderbilt University, was chosen to receive the 2005 ACRL Hugh C. Atkinson Memorial Award. This award recognizes the outstanding accomplishments of an academic librarian who has worked in the areas of library automation or library management and has made contributions (including risk taking) toward the improvement of library services or to library development or research.

Rick Johnson, Executive Director of SPARC, was honored with a tribute by the directors of ARL Libraries on May 27 during the ARL Membership Meeting in Philadelphia. The directors adopted a resolution honoring Johnson’s contributions to research libraries and the scholarly community.


Clifford Lynch, Executive Director of CNI, was presented the second George V. Voinovich Award for Information Innovation by the Ohio Board of Regents for his “contributions in the use of information technology and networked information for the advancement of scholarship, librarianship, and intellectual productivity.”

Susan K. Nutter, Vice Provost and Director of Libraries, North Carolina State University, was named Library Journal’s 2005 Librarian of the Year. In the 17-year history of the award, she is only the second academic librarian to receive this honor.

Hannelore Rader, Dean of University Libraries, University of Louisville, was presented with the Distinguished Faculty Service Award from the University of Louisville on April 13. The award recognizes Rader’s national and international accomplishments in the profession as a representative of the university.


University at Albany, SUNY, Libraries were ranked first for quality of services and facilities in a SUNY-wide survey that asked students to rate their satisfaction with multiple aspects of their educational experience. The Albany Libraries also ranked first among the SUNY University Centers.

University of Virginia Library won the ACRL 2005 Excellence in Academic Libraries Award in the university category for “its broad, deep, and early innovation that has proven its effectiveness over time and is being emulated by other academic libraries as they reposition their services for the future.”
ARL CAL ENDAR 2005
http://www.arl.org/ar l/cal.html

July 25–26  ARL Board Meeting
Washington, DC

August 8–11  Library Management Skills Institute II: The Organization
Los Angeles, CA

September 8–9  The Future of Government Documents in ARL Libraries
Washington, DC

October 25–27  ARL Board and Membership Meeting
Washington, DC
( Note new dates)

October 28  Managing Digital Assets: Strategic Issues for Research Libraries
Washington, DC

November 4–5  New Ways of Listening to Library Users: Tools for Measuring Service Quality
Washington, DC

November 8–10  Library Management Skills Institute I: The Manager
Los Angeles, CA

December 5–6  CNI Fall Task Force Meeting
Phoenix, AZ

ONLINE LYCEUM
Can’t make it to our in-person events? Take a look at our Online Lyceum Web-based course offerings at http://www.arl.org/training/lyceum.html.

ARL MEMBERSHIP MEETINGS 2006–2007

May 16–19, 2006, Ottawa, Ontario
October 17–20, 2006, Washington, DC
May 22–25, 2007, St. Louis, Missouri
October 16–19, 2007, Washington, DC