

November 1998

Profiles Encouraged: Judy Webster

Editor

Follow this and additional works at: <https://docs.lib.purdue.edu/atg>



Part of the [Library and Information Science Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Editor (1998) "Profiles Encouraged: Judy Webster," *Against the Grain*: Vol. 10: Iss. 5, Article 13.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7771/2380-176X.2992>

This document has been made available through Purdue e-Pubs, a service of the Purdue University Libraries. Please contact epubs@purdue.edu for additional information.

Profiles Encouraged




Judy Webster
Head, Acquisitions
and Processing,
Univ. of Tennessee
Libraries and
Director, 1998,
Charleston Conference
<jdwebster@utk.edu>

In the beginning: I am a native Tennessean and have worked at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville Libraries for 29 years. My first job, after moving away from Knoxville for three years and starting a family, was checking out books at the circulation desk as a classified staff member.

People who influenced me: Mentors who were most influential in career decisions were **Carl Cox**, a library science professor at UTK, who convinced me to get my library degree and **Richard Boss**, Director of the UTK Library during a portion of the 1970's, who convinced me not to take a job that would put me on a career path behind the scenes in the library. Both of these individuals pushed me to accomplish more than my own self-confidence could muster at the time.

Library jobs: I have held positions as a professional librarian both in public services and technical services. Although I have been in technical services for the majority of my career now, that's not how I began. I like to think that I have retained many public service attitudes and goals and have allowed them to guide decisions that I have made in technical services. I am currently manager of a library team that includes Acquisitions, Serials, Processing, Binding, and Preservation. We have a \$4.9 million library materials budget, including endowments, and we have 25 staff who report to me, including one librarian.

Spare time: I enjoy traveling in my spare time with my husband who photographs lighthouses and maintains a famous Webpage with his own photographs and writings about our trips. I am a part-time gardener investing mainly in perennials. I have yet to grow a decent delphinium, so I'm not sure that I can claim success in this area of my life. I also am an avid reader of current literature and mysteries, especially the British ones.

Musings: My work with the **Charleston Conference** has been very rewarding and exciting over the years. I think that I have attended all of the conferences and have been actively involved in the programming process for approximately 6 years. 

Op Ed from page 24


fault method specified by OMB in Circular A-21," according to the General Accounting Office and the NSF Inspector General (OIG 91-2 Dec. 1988). They were more concerned about bookkeeping than pained reports that Stanford canceled 500 research journals in 1987 due to the devaluation of the dollar.

NSF, OSTP, and PCST are responsible under the law to assess the treatment of scientific and technical information, treatment that easily could be called miserly and ruinous. They have, instead, set a new standard for Milgramesque obedience to praetorian authority, ignoring cries of frustration expressed by researchers, librarians, the **National Enquiry on Scholarly Communication**, and publishers for twenty years. If he were writing today of "two cultures," the late **C.P. Snow** might well have explored the gulf between the "new paradigm" cabal's obsession with budgets and the community dedicated to the progress of knowledge. Former science advisor **D. Allan Bromley** made it clear in his 1994 memoir that university presidents have a clear channel to influence reforms in the allocation of resources. Doesn't the throttling of communications hinder potentially adverse assessments of their programs? Doesn't it protect "invisible colleges" from competition? The major scientific societies also wield considerable influence. Doesn't the impoverishment of libraries reel competitive publishing ventures?

Thus the priority of knowledge across the entire spectrum of academic disciplines is doomed by the "new paradigm." Full time faculty positions, tenure, and publication of research, which attract and qualify the best teachers, are under siege. Librarianship is undervalued as library schools are shut or reformed. "Distance learning" dilutes instruction as it cuts faculty payrolls. Bowing to the jealous ambition and power of campus managers, libraries cut back on collection development and hiring. Large segments of the publishing industry are reeling. University presses, trade publishers, technical publishers, and serious authors all suffer from the systemic depression in sales to academic libraries. Plummeting sales force prices up. High prices eliminate buyers. This degenerative cycle discourages developments in dissemination: electronic media, specialty journals, database coverage, monographs, reviews, and reference works. It discourages the reiterative synthesis of research findings into useful knowledge—a complex process similar to separating wheat from chaff, refining flour, combining ingredients, kneading dough, baking, and slicing bread. Each day the modern researcher is served staggering mountains of "unthreshed, unrefined, and uncooked" findings. (It's no wonder review articles, which survey lines of research, are so

heavily cited.) The impoverishment of libraries also discourages investments in the critical appreciation of art and culture.

The subversion of law undermines the academic mission at its core. Ultimately it suppresses information for researchers and students who are not email insiders and who cannot wait for photocopies from foreign sources. Reviewers are stymied when denied the full range of primary reports. The greatest flaw in peer review is the deluge of undissemated knowledge—a failing so profound that it was avoided completely by NSF's 1997 task force on merit review. Postpublication assessments in areas of physics and clinical medicine suggest that *half or more research is poorly informed and makes no contribution to knowledge*. To compound the weakness of peer review, agencies award grants without calling for intensive evaluations of prior research—evaluations that would require teams of specialists and comprehensive information resources—that might also reveal unproductive spending.

The 1976 law aimed to defend the priority of knowledge. I believe that it failed because the "new paradigm" opposes it. Government contracts have indeed become the substitute for intellectual curiosity, as President Eisenhower warned in 1961. By that time the science bureaucracy had already ditched **Vannevar Bush's** dictum that universities are responsible for the conservation of knowledge. Now even the leadership of organizations chartered to promote dissemination supports the revolution. *Et tu Brute?* If Congress serves the taxpayer—aiming to maximize progress and the cost-effectiveness of research—it must intervene. Or, the tragedy will play out. Science will drown in its own undissemated work product, taking the Arts and Humanities down with it. 

Further reading:

Communication: The Essence of Science. William D. Garvey. Oxford: Pergamon Press. 1979.

Degradation of the Academic Dogma. Robert A. Nisbet. New York: Basic Books. 1971. Reprinted 1997 with a new introduction by Gertrude Himmelfarb. New Brunswick NJ.

The Ethics of the Library Crisis and the First Amendment. Albert Henderson. *Publishing Research Quarterly*. 13,4. 1997/98. P. 31-40.

Incoherence of the New Science Policy. Albert Henderson. *Society*. Sept./Oct. 1998 p. 40-45. (In press)

Science in the Twilight Zone; Or, Are Science Libraries Part of Science? Albert Henderson. *Issues in Science and Technology Librarianship*. 1998. [Online] <http://www.library.ucsb.edu/ist/>. (In press)

U.S. Scientific and Technical Information (STI) Policies: Views and Perspectives. Edited by Charles R. McClure and Peter Herson. Ablex. 1989.