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Consent Form for Oral History Interview (2002 version)

This confirms my understanding and agreement with the Medical Library Association (MLA) concerning my participation in an oral history interview as a part of MLA’s Oral History Program.

1. I agree to be interviewed by Joan S. Zenan on April 26, 2012. I understand that my interview will be recorded and that a transcript and edited version of my interview will later be created. I understand that I will be given an opportunity to review and edit the edited transcript before its release.

2. I hereby grant and assign all right, title, and interest to any and all recordings and transcripts of my interview including copyright [and all rights subsumed thereunder] to MLA. I will be given a copy of the edited transcript for my personal use. I understand that the transfer of these rights to MLA confers no obligations on MLA to promote, market, or otherwise make publicly available copies of the interview.

3. One or more edited and/or condensed versions of the interview, approved by me, may be disseminated by MLA, as it deems appropriate.

4. I understand that the original, unedited recording of my interview and the original unedited transcript will be maintained in the MLA archives at the National Library of Medicine, or at such other place as MLA may reasonably designate, and may be made available to researchers who have demonstrated that they have appropriate qualifications. I further understand that the original unedited recording and/or the original unedited transcript will be made available with the following restrictions (Check one):

   [ ] No restrictions

   [ ] The following specified portions of the interview will not be made available to anyone until ____________________.

Wayne J. Peay
Name of Interviewee

Signature

Date 4/26/12

Joan S. Zenan
Name of MLA Interviewer(s)

Signature

Date 4/26/12

Accepted by: MLA EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Date 5/20/12
Biographical Statement

Wayne J. Peay, FMLA, is known throughout the health sciences information profession as an innovator and change agent, particularly in the early adoption and use of technology. During his career, he helped develop landmark information management systems and introduced videoconferencing and Internet communication tools long before they became widely used. In his home state of Utah, he worked with the state legislature to fund technology and library services and led planning for the governor’s office for the general technology infrastructure of the entire state. Recognizing that, as a small state, Utah would always face resource restrictions, he aggressively pursued collaboration on multiple levels and built service platforms to link communities together.

Peay received his bachelor of arts degree in history from the University of Utah in 1973 and a master of science degree with honors from the School of Library Service of Columbia University in 1977. Prior to and while attending library school, he worked on an early library automation project, the PHILSOM serials control system, at Washington University and the Medical Library Center of New York. He served as head of several departments at the Spencer S. Eccles Health Sciences Library at the University of Utah, including Media, Technical, and Computer Services. In 1984, he was named director of the library, a position he held for twenty-three years. He received numerous federal and state grants and contracts. Projects included the first computer network in the state connecting colleges and universities as well as public libraries, the installation of a telefacsimile network linking higher education libraries, implementation of integrated library systems, and the development of Pioneer: Utah’s Online Library.

He served as president of the Association of Academic Health Sciences Libraries, member of the Board of Directors of the Medical Library Association, and chair of the National Library of Medicine’s Biomedical Library Review Committee. As co-chair of the AAHSL Future Leadership Task Force, he was instrumental in launching the highly successful program to train future library directors. He presented the Janet Doe Lecture at MLA’s centennial meeting in 1998, “Strategies and Measures for Our Next Century.” In 1999 he received the Distinguished Service Award from the Utah Library Association, and in 2000 he was nominated as one of Utah’s library advocates for the twentieth century and was honored at the American Library Association meeting in Chicago. He is a Fellow of both the Medical Library Association and the American College of Medical Informatics. He received the AAHSL Cornerstone Award in 2007 and MLA’s Marcia C. Noyes Award in 2009.

Always bold in searching for ways to improve services and operations, Peay envisioned a new model for delivering Regional Medical Library services across a widely scattered geographic region. This model was approved for implementation, and, in 2001, he became director of the MidContinental Region of the National Network of Libraries of Medicine. From 2002 through 2005, he co-directed the construction of the Spencer F. and Cleone P. Eccles Health Sciences Education Building, then oversaw its initial operation as an interdisciplinary environment applying technologies in instruction.
Medical Library Association Interview with Wayne J. Peay
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Joan S. Zenan: This is an interview with Wayne Peay. We’re in Salt Lake City at the Spencer S. Eccles Health Sciences Library on the University of Utah campus. Today is April 26, 2012. To begin, tell me how you came to work at Washington University.

Wayne J. Peay: Well, it actually began at the Health Sciences Library at the University of Utah with my first job at a medical library. I had been wandering around Europe for eight or nine months and I’d come back to Salt Lake and was looking for a job. At university personnel, there was a bindery clerk position listed. I actually had worked at the law library a few years before, so I had seen the back room. But I applied for and actually got the clerk job. I had a friend at the library who mentioned to me somewhat later that she was really glad that I got it because it looked like I needed a job.

At that point in time, the medical library at the university had joined the PHILSOM [Periodical Holdings in Libraries of Schools of Medicine] serials network, which was an automated serials management system developed at Washington University. I was told some years later that the director of the library at Utah, Priscilla Mayden, had been in the back seat of a taxi with Estelle Brodman, the director of the library at Washington University. Estelle was not going to let her out of the back of that taxi until she agreed to become the first library in a new serials network, where they were going to share the operation of this serials program.

One of the features of the program was a bindery module that produced pull slips for journals as they were ready to be bound. That was my job. It was my introduction to technology, and at that point in time, it was pretty interesting. It was a technology that was using computers but was still using a lot of paper. I was a bindery clerk and did the job for the better part of a year, until the serials assistant at the library quit in a huff one afternoon. He and I went for coffee, and that was my training on the use of the serials system. I was the only one who had used it at the library, so I was it.

After several months of anxiety about whether I was going to blow up the system, I got fairly good at it and ended up going to a meeting in St. Louis and was introduced to Dr. Brodman, who had received favorable reports on our work out here. A year later, the coordinator for the network at Wash U resigned, and I got a call from Dr. Brodman wanting to know if I’d be interested in a job. I said, “Yes, I would be glad to leave Salt Lake City and earn the fabulous sum of $7,500 a year.”

Z: Ooh... Big salaries back then.

P: Yes. She said, “That would be good, but you’re going to need a bachelor’s degree first,” which actually didn’t take all that long because I’d been an undergraduate for a long time and had a lot of credits in various areas of interest and was able to put together a degree in fairly short order. I graduated from the university and went off to
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Washington University to become the PHILSOM network coordinator and serials librarian.

Z: Without a librarianship degree.

P: Without. But I had a nice, fresh degree in history.

Z: That’s right. You were eligible. How long were you at Wash U?

P: I was there for two years. It was exciting work. It was really exciting work. It was incredibly challenging. Dr. Brodman was notorious in the profession as a driven woman. She was brilliant. She was truly genius-level talent. She held herself to very high standards and she held everybody else in the world to high standards. Working for her was exciting and difficult. She would wear people out, because that’s the way she worked. But it was fun. She would meet with me every Wednesday morning at nine o’clock and we would review what I had done and not done, and what I planned to do, and what she wanted me to do, most of all. There was a high degree of responsibility, but it was fascinating because she treated her library as a laboratory, and that was a model that was very influential for me as my career developed and really one that I tried to imitate over time. It was an interesting place because at that time she was at the end of a [multiyear] NLM [National Library of Medicine] training program, when they would have people come to Washington University—new library school graduates—to do an internship.

Z: Was it a one-year internship?

P: As I remember, it was. It was fun to be around interesting research projects that all of these kids were working on and see what ideas emerged. It was just an exciting environment to be around. I got to work with lots of different libraries around the country. When I went there, I think we had five libraries, ranging from the University of Missouri to NIH [National Institutes of Health] to [the University of Texas Health Science Center at] San Antonio. We added a few more while I was there. It was an interesting introduction to technology.

Z: Which was really just getting into libraries.

P: It was just beginning to emerge. That became a central thread of my career, the use of technology. I learned a lot about innovation; I learned a lot about trying new things, and having expectations of myself and the people I was around.

Z: When you have Estelle setting expectations, there you are setting them for yourself.

P: Absolutely.

Z: That’s a wonderful path. This position has obviously influenced your later career, but in between that and coming back to Eccles, what happened there?
P: It turned out that the folks at the Medical Library Center of New York wanted to replicate the PHILSOM network for the community of libraries that they served. Now, the Medical Library Center was truly a unique organization in its time. There were so many libraries in New York City—so many medical libraries in New York City—that they were able to get together and form a cooperative. They would pay a membership fee to the Medical Library Center that supported its operations, and then the Medical Library Center would provide various services to this community of members, primarily as a storage facility. They had been able to purchase what was, in fact, a parking garage, and put stacks up in there because the floors were strong enough to support stacks. They rented out the rest of the building to other folks who needed it. Some of them were parking tenants from Mount Sinai, which is across the street, and a methadone clinic on the top floor, which always drew an interesting crowd. It was a fascinating place to work because of the community that you got to work with. I was recruited to come back to the Medical Library Center to help them put together and then manage a PHILSOM network for their members. The idea was that they would provide me with the flexibility to go to library school.

Z: That was good. Now, who recruited you to go back there?

P: Spencer Marsh was in charge of information technology at the Medical Library Center, and he turned out to be a great colleague for many years in my career. I realized that to advance in libraries you had to have at least a master’s degree, and there was [a library school] available at Columbia University across town, and so I applied to Columbia. I hadn’t had the most distinguished academic career, but I had some grades to report, and actually took the GRE [Graduate Record Examination] one day and sent in a few letters of support and subsequently got a phone call from Columbia. A young woman on the other end said, “You may not remember me, but I used to come to your parties out in Salt Lake City, and now I’m managing admissions at Columbia. Your grades aren’t all that distinguished, and the GRE was not one of your better days, but you’ve got great letters of recommendation, so we expect that you’ll be admitted to library school.”

Z: How did you know this person, or did you?

P: I did. I remembered her name. I thought, “Oh, let’s see. What should I remember here?”

Z: Was she a librarian?

P: No, she was just someone working in the library school office and happened to have a connection back to Salt Lake City—the small world effect.

Z: Works all the time.
P: Yes. [Before leaving St. Louis] I went and thanked Dr. Brodman for my letter of reference and she said, “Now, Mr. Peay, I want you to know that I expect you to do very well, because I told them that when you arrived in New York City you would be able to walk across the Hudson River, and I expect you to perform at that level.”

Z: She didn’t indicate a bridge, did she?

P: No. That’s how I ended up concluding my career at Washington University and moving on to the Medical Library Center in New York.

Z: Fantastic.
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Z: Tell us about your library education. Did you go to Columbia specifically for medical librarianship?

P: No. [Laughs] [The library school] was available, it had a big reputation, and it was a place that I thought was worth a try. I’m sure everyone who was in library school at that time [mid-'70s] was a little bit frustrated because they were teaching old librarianship when new librarianship was emerging. It was not particularly challenging and it was not particularly relevant. I enjoyed taking the cataloging class, but I did my homework by going back to the Medical Library Center and looking it all up on OCLC. Columbia didn’t teach you anything about OCLC. What they told you was how to lay out a catalog card. It was not particularly important.

But there were several good classes there. I took the audiovisual class. That was fun. There actually was a class all about microforms, which, again, was not particularly relevant, but it still was fun; it was interesting. Far and away the best part of the library school experience were my colleagues, the other students. We were in the part-time program, so we were going to school in the evenings, and they were coming in from libraries all over town. I had a friend who was at the library of the United Nations. I had a friend who was in a law library in a big firm of 400 lawyers. I couldn’t even imagine what that must be like. Another guy was a computer programmer for one of the big publishing companies. That was the fun part. I did really well in library school, but I had been in the business long enough that I didn’t need to work at it very hard.

Z: Did you take any medical librarianship classes?

P: I took one: the medical bibliography class. It was taught by Erich Meyerhoff, who was quite entertaining. Erich is a unique force of his own. The thing that was kind of interesting at that time is that I was not only taking a class for him, but I was working for him. I was moonlighting in his library doing serials for him. I got an A-minus in the class because on the final paper I think Erich wanted more gossip than I was willing to provide. [Laughs] But it was fun; he was entertaining. It wasn’t very hard because I knew what he was talking about, but it still was fun. He’s terrific. He was the founder of
the Medical Library Center, so he knew what I was all about. But he wanted to know what else was going in the Medical Library Center, and I wasn’t prepared to really tell him.

That was part of the deal about working in the Medical Library Center—you were at the nexus of all of this stuff that was going on, with great and important libraries, big names in the library field. I had the opportunity to be around Rachael Anderson, who was head at Mount Sinai and then went over to Columbia. It was fun. It was entertaining. I worked with Jean Miller, who was the director at the Medical Library Center. What I learned from Jean is that you could work hard and you could get things done, and she did. She was phenomenal.

Z: This was in 1975 that you started library school?

P: Right, 1975 at library school; 1975 at the Medical Library Center. I was there for a couple years. When I got out of library school, Jean offered me a full-time position at the Medical Library Center. Mr. Meyerhoff offered me a position at Cornell. And I got a call from Salt Lake City and they said, “Would you be interested in a position out here, which will pay you less than you’re making?” I said, “I’ll be glad to come back to Salt Lake City after two years in New York City.”

Z: It didn’t have mountains, among other things.

P: No. But it was a great experience living in New York City. It was a fun thing to do when you’re in your twenties. We lived through the US Bicentennial in New York City, and that was great fun.

Z: So you came back to Eccles. When you got here, what were the library and the institution like?

P: It was a going concern. Priscilla [Mayden] had built a new library. When I was here as a bindery clerk, I’d helped move it into the new building. We moved all of the books out of the subbasement of the hospital into the new building, and it was spectacular. Priscilla had, in her own right, figured out that Utah was never going to have a lot of resources, but if you offered high-quality service and then went out and recruited resources, you could be quite successful. I think that was one of those models I found very persuasive and incorporated in my own model for libraries.

She had a number of different grants underway that she had secured from the National Library of Medicine. I think she had two or three going at once. I came in at the end of a learning resource center grant to manage the audiovisual services for the library. Again, that was sort of a step in the technology that wound its way through my career. We had, at that time, a traditional collection of slides, 16-millimeter film, and videotape. A lot of that stuff went away. We had some very early work with computer-assisted instruction, and it was before its time. The technology just was too much of a barrier for people. Priscilla embraced technology. She didn’t really work very hard at understanding it; she
just saw that it had power. I mean, she didn’t need to know how to program, but she needed to have people who did, and that’s what she was able to find.

Z: Did you learn how to program yourself?

P: I did some of the programming here on the computer-assisted instruction system, and built a couple of programs. I did one in kinesiology that worked fairly well and was used by a lot of students in the College of Health, including the basketball team, which was always sort of interesting—to have those young men come by and hunch over these old-fashioned terminals to peck out answers in an online instructional program.

Z: All these different positions up to this point, before you became the director, must have influenced your approach, both to librarianship as a new director and leadership roles you might have taken in the Medical Library Association.

P: It was interesting, because I was able to see a lot of the back operations of a library. I was head of technical services, I was the serials librarian, I was the audiovisual librarian. Interestingly, I never was very compelled into the public services side of the business. But even so, I appreciated and certainly embraced Priscilla’s commitment to public service as a distinguishing characteristic of this particular library here at the University of Utah. She established her position in the community at the Health Sciences Center, based on the high level of service the library would provide, in stark contrast to the main university library, which was never known for the quality of its service.

Z: That is true on so many campuses.

P: Right. That was a powerful strategy. I understood you have to have these things in mind. When the opportunity came around to apply for Priscilla’s job—when she retired—I was the internal candidate, which is always a challenging position to be in. It was an interesting process because I withdrew from all of the interviews of the people coming here because I was totally—obviously—conflicted. They had a very respectable group of applicants, some of whom I knew. I was able to come out at the end as the director. I was thirty-seven. I was pretty young to the game, and didn’t know as much as I thought I did.

Z: But you were a quick learner.

P: I just figured, “Learn by doing.” I had some just world-class support in terms of people here at the library that Priscilla had brought in.

Z: Describe the evolution of the library over the years under your directorship [1984-2007].

P: I came in as the director when we had just received one of the first IAIMS [Integrated Academic Information Management Systems] contracts from the National Library of Medicine. At that point there were four IAIMS contracts in the very first round, and we
were one of them. IAIMS at that time was a model for technology that Nina Matheson developed and published in a special supplement to the *Journal of Medical Education*.

[Editor’s note: “Academic Information in the Academic Health Sciences Center: Roles for the Library in Information Management” by Matheson and John A. D. Cooper was published in October 1982; it became known as the Matheson-Cooper Report or Matheson Report.] I think I must have read that supplement ten times, and it took me ten years to understand what she really was saying.

Z: It was very meaty.

P: It was a vision that totally transformed this library, transformed my career, and I think ultimately transformed all of the health sciences libraries in the country.

Z: It was like a turning point.

P: Absolutely. It was the idea that libraries should embrace the technology, take leadership in the application of technology, look at the kinds of things that would make sure that people had equitable access to technology, and saw that you could apply the technology to major challenges like library systems, clinical information systems, and research; and that the model should be an integrated model, where you could move information across boundaries. I can say here, thirty years later, that that vision has yet to be truly and completely realized. Because I think one of the harder lessons—and I don’t know that it’s one that Nina truly appreciated at that time; again, it was hugely early in the game—is that the technology challenges were significantly less than the political challenges.

Z: The human element.

P: Right. You had to figure out strategies. They, in fact, understood some of that. There was the need for commitment at the highest levels of the institution, but this was a time when the highest levels of the institution were totally clueless about the technologies. Trying to get that kind of support and that kind of understanding was far more difficult than putting together a minicomputer and making it work.

Z: IAIMS was an opportunity to have an impact on the university, not just the library.

P: Right. What it brought to libraries was this broader vision, an institutional vision. I think part of the brilliance of that was the library was uniquely positioned to provide that. The library is the only organization that has that broad vision. A college can have a vision for its college, but it doesn’t necessarily extend across the boundary. A hospital can have a wonderful vision for the hospital, but its vision is to crank out bills. If you started talking about how the information on that hospital bill has relevance to a researcher or to an educator, first of all, it was threatening. Secondly, why would they ever want that? It was huge.

Z: You really opened a lot of their eyes to new possibilities.
P: It positioned the library to lead because you had the vision and you could bring that to the discussion.

Z: You could convince some of these higher-powered people that there was a reason to work with you.

P: Right. The library was not scaring too many people, and you were in a position to facilitate change.

Z: I think libraries are in a big position to facilitate change.

P: That’s our absolute core responsibility. I think that you have to understand your political environment and how you can build the coalitions that allow things to happen.

Z: That is number one for any director. If you don’t do that, you can be left behind, ignored, and a lot of other things. Now, while you were here, you took a leave of absence to work at the Board of Regents for the Utah System of Higher Education. How did that come about, and what was it like?

P: It was IAIMS extended. We were doing well as a medical library. Obviously, there aren’t too many in the Intermountain area. Our nearest colleague was in Reno, 500 miles away.

Z: And a very small library.

P: Or in Denver, also 500 miles away. In the state of Utah, the medical library had unique standing and unique leverage. We were beginning to work with the other college and university libraries in the state. We didn’t have big collections, we didn’t have big budgets, but we had a medical collection that everybody needed. That gave us a position of some leverage, and we took advantage of that. We began building coalitions and partnerships and collegial approaches to library services across the state.

Now, there was a foundation that we built on, the Utah Academic Library Consortium. It had been in place for twelve or fifteen years. They had done a little work with interlibrary loan and cooperative purchases, but there was not anything close to a vision for how libraries could work together across the state. We began working with them and there was an opportunity in the late ‘80s where a building program was proposed, because all of the colleges and universities had really bad facilities. We put together this political strategy of going together as a community to the state legislature and asking for multiyear funding to support a construction program.

Z: Oh, construction—not resources.

P: Not yet. This was construction only, and we did it on the basis of saying, “We understand that legislators cannot make financial commitments beyond the current year,
but there is an understanding that we will work together to secure funding for all of the colleges and university libraries.” The main university library here needed the facility; we did not. But we took the opportunity to say, “We are interested in technology.” And so there was a technology component to the program. We started introducing the idea of investing in technology in libraries. This percolated around and the funding proposal was not from a single institution—it was championed by the Board of Regents and the Board of Regents office, and they shepherded it through the legislature. That gave me my first opportunity to go to the legislature and to present before the appropriations committee and talk about technology. That was an educational challenge.

Z: How were you received by that committee?

P: I was speaking a foreign language to most of them. You have to understand, these guys were farmers, some of them were ranchers, some of them were out of little businesses around town—they were part-time legislators. We had to become very basic in our explanation of what we were trying to do with technology. We were dealing with very early technologies. What they got and what they liked and what got us money is that we were working together as a consortium, as a community. Where you invest in the community, everybody gets a benefit. Since most of these guys were on the appropriations committee because they had some relationship to a college or university, this was a sales strategy that was unique to libraries and I think still wins at the legislature. We were able to get some money for technology. We got some money for new buildings. Everybody got new buildings. By the end of the process, we had built a very special relationship with the Board of Regents office and with the legislature. They liked what we did; they liked how we did it.

Z: And you did what you said you were going to do.

P: We did. We put together a telefax network. We put together an Ariel interlibrary loan network. We put together, ultimately, the first data network to connect all of the colleges and universities in the state as a library initiative, which eventually turned into the Utah Education Network that connected all of the colleges and universities, all of the public schools, and all of the public libraries in the state. That started off this initiative of the colleges and universities. So again, we did this out of building this special relationship and then leveraging it across the state.

In about 1992 we had a new governor come in [1993-2003], Mike Leavitt—a reasonably young guy, a lot of energy. Somebody got to him—I don’t know who; it wasn’t the libraries—and sold him on technology. He came in with this big technology agenda, and the Regents were not prepared for that. They needed to respond to this guy. He was going to build, and did build, what turned out to be the Western Governors University, which was a technology-based initiative that was going to put colleges and universities out of business through the use of technology. Governor Leavitt was a little bit premature in what he thought technology could do. But the Regents office needed someone to come in and do technology for them and build a long-range plan for
technology. They called me and asked, “Would you like to come down and work with us for a while and put together this plan?”

Z: What happened to the library while you were gone?

P: We had Joan Stoddart here, who was able to keep...

Z: Keep things running.

P: I did a lot of running back and forth between the Regents office downtown and the library here up on the hill. Being at the Regents office again gave me some access that I had never had before. We worked with all of the college and university presidents, and we worked a lot with the legislature and the governor’s staff. I learned a lot about lobbying and built the relationships that are essential to work in those kinds of environments. We put together a long-range plan for higher education that was basically a $25 million investment in technology across the system. And we got it. We invested in administrative systems for the colleges and universities. Many of them had nothing, they were still purely in paper. In addition, funding was secured for the installation of integrated library systems for each college and university.

Z: It might have been easier to start if you’re still in paper.

P: Right. But we put that together. That was a huge investment. We built the Utah Education Network out of that money and we built integrated library systems for every college and university in the state. A major victory was securing ongoing funding from the legislature for electronic resources. We were also positioned to benefit from one-time funding. For several years, at the end of the legislative session, a little funding would be left over and often the analysts would send it along to the libraries since it was viewed as a statewide investment. This onetime money was used as opportunity funding for start-up or special projects. The best example of how this funding was used is the digitization initiatives, most notably the Mountain West Digital Library. The success of this statewide collaboration was truly made possible by the outstanding support of the director of the Marriott Library at the University of Utah, Sarah Michalak, and Sterling Albrecht, the director of the Lee Library at Brigham Young University.

Z: That was so big.

P: It was one of those things where we were at the right place at the right time and the money was there. That money we used to both leverage resources and provide levels of access to the students of Utah that were, at the time, far beyond what we could have ever done as individual institutions.

Z: Is it still going today?

P: Absolutely. That money is still in the pipeline. It’s been cut a little bit over time, but it’s still there. It still functions as a catalyst for collaboration, because it was appropriated
to the Board of Regents office and was to be used for the library system. We leveraged a piece of that money to build something that, for me, was one of the accomplishments that I take great pride in, and that’s what turned out to be called “Pioneer,” which was basically purchasing services from an aggregator—I think it’s currently EBSCO—for electronic journals and a few monographs that are available to every college, every public school, and every public library in the state. That was big. It still is big. Every school has at least some electronic resources. Many of the little public schools have no libraries, but they at least have Pioneer.

Z: So Pioneer is the electronic library collection for the state.

P: This is “Utah’s Online Library.” I basically directed it for eight or nine years, and when I retired, handed it off to the Utah State Library, which ruffled a few feathers, because there were various people who would have liked very much to have Pioneer and its resources and its political connections. But it came out of higher education. There wasn’t a good new home for it in higher ed that was safe.

Z: …because there’s such competition.

P: Right. And the politics are tough. The Utah Education Network wanted it, and the politics are tough there. The state library doesn’t have the clout, but it has the political neutrality, of a sort.

Z: And it has a mandate to serve the entire state.

P: Exactly. That was where it ended up. The work at the Regents office was fun and I could have stayed there. But it wasn’t that fun. [Laughs]

Z: That’s because it’s high politics. Always.

P: Right. But it was an interesting opportunity to meet a lot of interesting people—make the connections. That was good. It was fun.

Z: You came back here and eventually successfully competed for the RML [Regional Medical Library] contract. Why did you go for it, and what were the keys to your success?

P: Yes, the RML contract was out there. Early on in the game I had an experience with the Regional Medical Library Program, and it was not the most positive experience. It was, in its early years and well into the ‘90s, a very top-down driven operation from the National Library of Medicine through various Regional Medical Libraries around the country. Ours happened to be based at the University of Nebraska in Omaha [the Midcontinental Regional Medical Library Program].

Z: Not exactly next door.
P: No. Our region had a history of its own in that it was affectionately referred to as “the leftover region” because when the region was formed, it was made out of institutions in states that nobody else wanted. [Laughs]

Z: How do you like that—feeling like you’re not wanted?

P: In large part because, in those early days, we had three of the most notorious personalities in the country in Estelle Brodman, Brad Rogers, and [Bernice Hetzner]. It was kind of a peculiar region. We have this extreme reach from St. Louis to Salt Lake City, so Nebraska ran it as a top-down organization. One of the things that they’re required to do is to have the directors of the main academic libraries constitute an advisory committee. I got to know the Omaha airport by heart. We would have to go there twice a year, sit in a daylong meeting where we were told what Nebraska was doing, and then we were told to go home.

Z: They didn’t ask you what you wanted to do or how you would do it.

P: If you raised a suggestion, you were told, “NLM will never let us do this.” Now, when I first came on board as the director here, Bob Braude was the director at Nebraska.

Z: So it was after [Bernice Hetzner], the infamous lady.

P: Bob and I spent the better parts of our careers like two bucks in a pasture pounding our heads against each other, although it was reasonably congenial.

Z: But he was in charge because he had the RML contract.

P: Right. We were going to do what Bob wanted to do, and it didn’t matter what our interests were, particularly. He knew what we were going to do.

Z: Did he have that same attitude that, “NLM will never do that”?

P: He did a lot of that, so it was not particularly rewarding. We did some good things with him; we talked him into a project here and there. We did an electronic interlibrary loan service; we built a union catalog—those kinds of things. But by and large it was totally frustrating. Over the years, directors stopped going, which was not a good sign.

Z: Was this while Bob was still there, or afterwards?

P: Yes, [while he was still there.] I can remember Charles Bandy, who was the director at the University of Colorado, would just get livid at being told what to do and he stopped coming.

Z: It was one way of saying, “I don’t like this.”
P: My friend Dean Schmidt at the University of Missouri came and said, “I come because I’m the director and I’m supposed to come. It’s not that I expect anything, but they pay the bills on my travel.” And that was basically it. The RML did some things that were useful. They did DOCLINE, and in their early days they did some education programs, but those went away. So it was not entirely productive and certainly not very rewarding.

When the contract came up for renewal about 1995, we seriously thought about competing. But you have to understand that competing for an RML contract is extremely difficult because they have the staff—eight or ten full-time people—who work on writing a contract proposal.

Z: Right, so you put them out of business.

P: They have a lot of incentive to work on that contract. You are on your own. You have one person to develop a proposal that’s competitive. And then NLM has all sorts of incentives not to change. It costs them big money to move a contract because they have to close down one and open another, meaning you have this whole duplication of services for a while.

Then there are the political issues. You have institutional expectations. At Nebraska they’d had the contract for thirty years. They just expected that money to come to them. It’s significant money—it’s a million dollars a year. I don’t care which institution you’re at—whether it’s Nebraska or Utah or Illinois or the New York Academy of Medicine or Maryland—a million dollars is a lot of money. Interestingly enough, it also includes overhead, which nobody talks about, but that’s even better money because that’s money that institutions can take and then spend beyond the responsibilities of the contract.

When we saw a contract renewal coming up in 2000, there were some changes at NLM in the leadership. Lois Ann Colaianni, who was the associate director, was also in charge, basically, of the RML program, and she was pretty much top-down. When she retired, Betsy Humphreys moved up the ladder and came on board. That suggested that it might be more of an opportunity.

Z: Timing.

P: Yes. The other thing for us was that we had a technology vision for how an RML could operate that was very different. You couldn’t do all that we proposed because the technology wasn’t available, but it was clear it was coming. We put together a proposal that was basically to decentralize the operation significantly, where you put RML staff out in the resource libraries, pay for them, have them work on RML activities in their respective states or on specific areas of responsibility, and manage that using the Internet. The Internet wasn’t around—it wasn’t widely developed and available. We were talking about things that were just beginning to emerge, like videoconferencing and having people have easy communication at their desktop across the Internet. The idea was that we would have this staff of people distributed out at the University of Colorado or at
Washington University, and those people would work together every day. That was the expectation.

Now, building that proposal was hard—these contracts are huge. They have a technical proposal, where you describe what your plans are, and it’s a five-year plan. You have a business proposal that says how you’re going to manage all the finances. I got incredibly fortunate on the business side because there was a woman in the grants office here who said, “I’ll take care of it. You just tell me what the bottom line is and I will take care of it.”

Z: That was a blessing. That was a gift.

P: I couldn’t have done it [without her help.] The other part was I had no idea how to approach the technical proposal. I went to UCLA to talk to Alison Bunting and said, “Alison, show me how you do an RML.” The RML at UCLA had been quite successful; it was one of the best ones in the country. “I want to see how you do an RML and I want to see how you put together a contract proposal. I want to meet your staff.” It was an interesting time, because her RML was under transition. Beryl Glitz, who was her RML associate director, was retiring. Alison had some in-house talent that was looking to move up. So it was interesting to see what the opportunities were at UCLA. It was just unbelievable [to learn from them]. Later on in the game, I had Alison actually come to Utah, come here, to do a practice site visit. She came and critiqued our proposal and our site visit presentation. She was incredibly generous with her time and her expertise. I give her huge credit as far as our success because looking at the RML from the outside is a whole lot different than looking at it from the inside, and there wasn’t anything that she wouldn’t show me on any question that I had. The other part was that when I was preparing the contract proposal, I was able to talk Beryl Glitz into being a consultant. I took six weeks and worked on the proposal. Every morning I would write the proposal and send it to Beryl, and she would look at it in the afternoon and send me back comments that evening. We did this every day, basically, for six weeks. And so I was able to put together the proposal for this new model for an RML.

We submitted it and we had an interesting stroke of luck because this involved site visits, and they don’t do site visits very much anymore. We had a very distinguished group of people scheduled to come to Salt Lake, and that night—they had just finished the site visit at Nebraska—there was a huge storm over the Midwest and some of the site visitors couldn’t get here. We were sitting here trying to figure out, “How are we going to do this?” because I had library directors who were supposed to come in from around the region to present on behalf of the contract proposal. We had this interesting issue of what was going on [with the weather.] We ended up having the library directors participate via conference call and we did a video broadcast of the site visit to all of the library directors so they could see what was going on and get a read for what the dynamics were, and also to a couple members of the site visit team who could not get to Salt Lake. We actually showed—just in the site visit—what we could do and that was amazing good fortune.

Z: It was easier to show than to tell.
P: We just put the technology up front, and it worked. It was quite the deal. Later we got a call from Dr. Lindberg saying that we had received the contract. I made two calls following that phone call. I called Claire Hamasu at UCLA, who was on the staff at the RML and had applied for the job of the associate director but had not gotten it. So I called Claire and I asked, “What would it take to get you to come to Salt Lake City?” There was this pause at the other end of the line. We had some discussions and I was able to persuade her to come to Salt Lake.

Z: I’m sure she never regretted it. It was a fit.

P: That was my best decision. The next thing I did was call Nancy Woelfl, the director at Nebraska, who had just lost the contract, and I said, “Nancy, I need to come to Omaha and talk to you and to the folks there about this transition and how we hope to work with you in the future.” I went to Omaha and they were unhappy, and I spent about three days with some really unhappy people. But they needed to express that, and we needed to work with them. I made it clear that I expected them to be a full partner in this new model, and to their credit they stepped up and have been a good partner.

Z: Did some of those people get other jobs?

P: Most of them went to other institutions. We had one who came here for a while and then subsequently moved on. It’s not gratifying to put people out of jobs, but on the other hand, we had to move forward; we had work to do. It was fun; it was exciting. It was challenging to build that organization. We had wonderful cooperation from the resource library directors, but we also built an incentive for them. They were seeing [subcontract] money of some consequence for the first time.

Z: Instead of being told what to do, they got people who did it.

P: Right. They got salaries and they got some overhead out of the contract. Now they had an investment in the success of the program and the success of getting good people to come work for them. The program still does have some phenomenal talent that showed up to work at these institutions.

Z: Your last major project was the construction of the Health Sciences Education Building.

P: Yes, just kind of the pièce de résistance. Again, it was one of those things where you have to be at the right place at the right time. The organization here at the Health Sciences Center—and this goes back to Priscilla Mayden—Priscilla made sure that the director of the library was treated as a coequal with the deans of the colleges and the School of Medicine. Obviously, we don’t have the clout of the dean of the School of Medicine, but we sat at the table. We tried to be a constructive and cooperative partner. Since Priscilla’s time, they’ve had a deans’ council, and I’ve always been on the deans’ council. As important—and it is one of the things that makes the job at Utah so nice—is
that I didn’t report to a dean. I reported to the vice president for health sciences. That
gives the director of the library here access to the senior leadership of the institution. I
didn’t spend a lot of their time unless I needed it, which they appreciated. When I
wanted to talk to them, I could talk to them. I had vice presidents for whom I worked
who wanted to meet with me regularly. I had some who didn’t want to meet with me.
They were busy, so they said, “When you need me, let me know.” I worked for a lot of
vice presidents over twenty-three years as director.

Z: They come and go.

P: They do. They last four or five years and then they go on or get tired or...

Z: Burn out.

P: In 2001-2002 the Health Sciences Center put on the table at the legislature the issue
that they had the worst teaching facility in the country, and they did—terrible classroom
space; they had hideous labs. They couldn’t put all of the students in the labs. They had
huge classrooms—these multistory steep-floor classrooms that you can do nothing
with. The administrators went to the legislature, and fortunately, a number of legislators
had either children or grandchildren who wanted to go to medical school, and they
appropriated $33 million towards a new educational facility for the School of Medicine.
There was cheering next door in the School of Medicine, where everybody was deciding
which office space they were going to get in this new building. They still have an old,
aging facility.

To his credit, Lorris Betz, vice president for health sciences, said, “This is an opportunity
to go beyond our current model of education to an interdisciplinary model of education.
This will be an interdisciplinary facility and it will be for education. It will not be office
space. We want a state-of-the-art classroom teaching facility to support an
interdisciplinary model of education here at the Health Sciences Center.” He had an
associate vice president, who was in charge of facilities, who had been the dean of the
College of Nursing, and she and I had worked together for many, many, many years and
we had just a wonderful relationship.

We began meeting as a planning committee of the deans. At that time, there was a new
chief information officer at the hospital, and periodically there were moves to have the
library put under so-and-so and so-and-so, and this was kind of in the works again at the
time. I was thinking, “How do we keep this from happening to the library?” I decided to
go with the ‘pig-in-the-python’ strategy—that you had to be too big to swallow.

We walked into one of these deans’ meetings, and totally off the agenda when we got to
the end of the meeting, I said, “I’ve been giving some thought to how this new facility, as
an interdisciplinary facility, can be managed effectively. It occurs to me that really the
library is in the best position to manage the facility on an equitable basis and give us the
kind of interdisciplinary environment that is needed. We offer that in the library, and we
can extend that into this new building.” There was this huge pause at the table, but you
could see the wheels turning as each dean thought about having one of the other deans in charge of the building. They looked at me and said, “This is a great idea!”

At that point in time, Linda Amos, who had been dean of the College of Nursing and then was the associate vice president, and I took on the responsibility of this new facility. Prior to that, I thought ironing out the RML contract and the period of time it took to build the contract was the hardest work I had ever done. In fact, I got shingles at one point.

Z: Yes, you were under stress.

P: But focusing on the education building, over three years, was the hardest work I ever did because it was the construction issues, it was the political issues of making people feel good about the building, the technology issues—all of that complex stuff was going on for the better part of three years. Then there was fundraising. We fundraised an additional $7 million.

Z: I was thinking $33 million wasn’t enough.

P: Right. It was an incredibly successful fundraising program. We had donations from other institutions, from other hospitals, we had big foundation contributions. But as gratifying was the level of support from the community here at the Health Sciences Center; the faculty and staff—especially faculty—made very generous contributions to the building.

Z: That was nice. They really wanted it.

P: They saw it as investment. It was like going back to the old model for libraries. It was an investment in the institution, where everybody would benefit from your investment. We have faculty from every college reflected as donors to the building.

Z: That’s great.

P: That was. It was exciting, and it was interesting. We went around and visited other institutions to see what kind of buildings they had. We interviewed architects, we interviewed contractors, and all of those kinds of things. We dug a huge hole directly south of the library and built a parking terrace under the building because at any medical center parking is gold. We worked it out so that we were able to fund the parking, and the income generated by the parking comes to the library to support the operation of the building. We built facilities for students. We put in a café. We have recreation areas. We have lockers for students. We built lots of different kinds of study space. There is a full range of technology-enhanced instructional facilities, from large 150-seat classrooms to 10- or 15-seat conference rooms, small group study spaces.

Z: Out of that, you had a lot of training opportunities so that professors could learn how to use it?
P: Absolutely. In fact, we built an electronic podium that we installed in all of the larger classrooms. It was standard across every classroom. We built one in the library, so that before the building was completed, we would offer—and bribe—faculty to come and use this podium in the library so that when the building was opened, our faculty could walk in and feel like they weren’t walking up to an unknown.

Z: Right. They had a level of comfort.

P: Right. They do not want to look like dopes. It was successful; it worked. It was interesting that we had, basically, a technology-depressed instructional environment, and turned it into an incredibly rich environment. The most intense area—and I think probably the most successful area of technology application—was in the clinical skills training area, where we built ten, maybe fifteen exam rooms, fully equipped with tables and all of the toys of the trade, but each one had a microphone and a video camera in it that was managed in a central area. This was pretty much at the cutting edge at the time, and we knew what we wanted but we didn’t know how to get there. We interviewed security companies and video production companies. I ended up going to an AMIA [American Medical Informatics Association] meeting, and one of the displays was on a clinical skills monitoring system. I looked at that and I said, “This is what we have to have.”

I came back and we found the money in the budget and we bought this thing, and it has been transformative. It is truly an interdisciplinary environment. We put together an interdisciplinary educational experience that’s based entirely on bringing together nursing students, medical students, pharmacy students, guys from the College of Health to come in as a team, work with a patient, program the patient—not a real patient—and then review what they were seeing on the video and then critique it. It seemed like such a simple deal at the time, but it proved to be just this total experience for these kids who never understood what a nutritionist did, or what a pharmacist would bring to it.

Z: So they got exposed to each other.

P: Exactly. It was enormous. It’s been huge. Again it was one of those things that prior to the technology wasn’t possible; would never have been possible before that building was completed. I think the goals of interdisciplinary education are still out there to be realized, but we made progress, and the building made it possible. The library secured its position. Nobody will take over the library now.

Z: You’re too big.

P: Right. And then we built a bridge between the library and the education building.

Z: Did they dedicate it to you? [Laughs] I think it should be “Wayne’s Bridge.”
P: No. There weren’t too many things that were nonnegotiable, but in the design phase I made it very clear that they had to have the bridge. It had to be seen as this integrated facility—the library was integrated into the education building and vice versa. And we did that with the bridge.

Z: Your thirty years here kept you here because all these things kept happening.

P: The environment at the University of Utah was one of understanding that the resources are limited. It seems to me—and I’ve said this to other people—that the downside of poverty is that there’s a lot of stuff you can’t have, but the upside is when you see everybody else has it, it provides you some incentive for working together because you have to bring resources together to get stuff done. There is a culture of collaboration here. The institution has always recognized the limits of its resources, so they give you a huge amount of support if you’re out there trying to bring in resources. Like the support from the grants office on the [RML] contract—I have colleagues who would never have that kind of support.

So there was that. It was just an opportunity where you were able to do interesting work. It was encouraged and rewarded. We established a standing for the library, an expectation that innovative work was what they could find here. In many, many instances we had faculty who would come in and say, “This is really not something that I can get done at the college. Could you help us?” and we said, “Yes.”

Z: Of all the influence and contributions you’ve made, what are you most proud of?

P: We did a lot of good work. The IAIMS stuff was good, although it ended. We kind of got killed on IAIMS here at the institution because we did the planning process and we did a pilot project that was funded. Then there was the opportunity to do the big implementation, which was a five-year, multibillion dollar activity, and we had an exceptional plan. We understood early, early, early in the game that we could really realize that role of IAIMS through the development of high-speed data communications, and we put together a proposal based on that. To do it, to get funded, you have to have the support from the senior administration. We did just an outrageous site visit, and the vice president for health sciences came in and gave this wonderful speech of support. The site reviewers just had nothing but praise. They saw this vision. Two days later, the vice president walked away, and our proposal was in the tank.

Z: What happened?

P: He was planning to leave, and he wasn’t honest about what was going on.

Z: How demoralizing.

P: It was pretty devastating, but the vision remained. We ultimately built that network. It was much harder, but we could have done so much more because it was such a good model. It would have conveyed an entirely different model across the IAIMS initiative of
the country, because the rest of the IAIMS sites were driven by clinical information systems—which were important.

Z: And they were all major universities, mostly back East.

P: Yes, they were big-name places. It took many years, even for the National Library of Medicine, to recognize the potential of high-speed data networks.

Z: So they weren’t ready.

P: They weren’t ready, and if we had been successful, I think we would have driven that agenda much faster than it emerged.

Z: Over the years, you’ve sort of done what you planned; it just took longer.

P: Right. We were able to get a lot of it, so that was big. The stuff with the Board of Regents and the library consortium, and Pioneer was big.

Z: And you covered the whole state. They always loved the whole-state [concept.]

P: And then the RML, and the education building. I guess the building was the last big item.

Z: It’s bricks and mortar. It’s still here.

P: And I was done. I used it all up to get that building done.

Z: I would think so. Building buildings is a more than a full-time job. Even if you have the main say in it, it’s still a lot.

P: It was huge.

Z: How about the academic committees you served on in Utah?

P: How about we go to lunch?

Z: We could do that first. Okay, let’s stop.
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Z: All right. We’re back from lunch. This is Joan Zenan, continuing the interview of Wayne Peay. When we stopped, we were talking about the academic committees that you served on at the University of Utah, so tell us more.

P: Probably the most important committee, and I served on it for probably close to fifteen years and chaired it for a number of years, was the University Task Force on
Computing. This was largely an accidental appointment. The committee was formed and the vice president was asked to name someone as the representative for the health sciences—not for libraries, but for the health sciences. He and I had worked together on various kinds of technology things, and he just said, “Why don't you represent us?”

This turned out to be one of the most productive and one of the most important university committees by virtue of the fact that it administered a computing fee that was collected from all of the students and generated $5 to $7 million every year that was to be allocated across the university. The agenda up front was that there were some research interests on campus that wanted some support for computing, and they had persuaded one of the other vice presidents to go forward with the idea of a fee. When the original committee was formed, there were three or four people, plus the budget officer of the university, and me, to manage how the money was to be allocated. There was no one else from the other university libraries to begin with.

Z: When they found out you were on, did they have a fit?

P: Yes. The main university library was very annoyed, but they didn’t actually get it either. I don't think anybody understood the implications of what this was all about. We ended up establishing instructional computing facilities across campus. Every college got some kind of an instructional computing facility. We put large computing facilities in the libraries, not surprisingly, and they proved to be extremely popular. They were the most heavily used facilities on campus, with students working in the libraries. Big surprise!

Well, that was a surprise for everybody but us. What it did give me and did give the libraries on campus was some influence over some extremely important resources that were ongoing. They were collected every quarter. We did a lot of good things. We did the instructional computing facilities, we did the first [high-speed] campus data network [connections]. It’s fun to think back now that you had to explain what a network was and why it was important. One of the strategies to demonstrate the value of computing networks was that the first real connections on campus were between the libraries. Funny, you know why? Because the libraries were a resource that everyone wanted to get to, and so you could go to a library and it was a revelation that you could actually see what was at the other library and if it was checked out.

Z: We’ve come a long way.

P: It was such a revelation at the time, but it’s what we had to do and it’s what we wanted. We wanted to show them how stuff worked. Plus, we wanted to know if it was checked out at the other library, too. But we did that. We did it blazing fast—a 56 KB connection to the Internet when it was coming up. It wasn’t even the Internet at that point. We supported BITNET email for the campus, so people first got to see email. We built a large integrated library system for the main university library. We got a library system here at the health sciences on our IAIMS funding. We were in a position to help the university library, and I went and talked to the university librarian and told him we had gotten him half a million dollars or something—a significant amount of money.
was really pleased with myself, and he said, “You know, they can spend money on these stupid computers and they can’t buy books.”

Z: He should have lived to regret that remark.

P: And I thought...

Z: Well, that was then.

P: ...“I’m not going to work very hard for you,” because it was a struggle to get that kind of resource for the main university library, and he wanted books, so that’s where it went. Anyway, it was extremely important and very influential. We were able to really provide a very, very robust computing environment for our students.

Z: All across the university.

P: All across the campus. It was interesting because it was variable. Supporting computing in meteorology was a hell of a lot more expensive than supporting computing in art at that time. You had to do these delicate balancing activities and make sure that faculty felt good because their students were paying the fees. They wanted their share. I spent a lot of time talking to deans about computing and how it was being effectively invested in their respective colleges.

That was good. It was important, and nobody saw it coming, and it turned out that it was probably the single most important committee I served on. Now, I served on some other ones that were fun. The accreditation committees were brutal, but again you were in a position to work in the big picture. It was good, valuable time. The library—our library especially—always got good marks, which helped secure our position. But we were always doing accreditation work. Somebody was always getting accredited.

Z: You’re either finishing one or they’re coming to review what you finished two years ago.

P: Right.

Z: The one thing I found with accreditation committees is that you meet faculty on campus who then become doors to other things, and that was always helpful.

P: Mm-hmm. A lot of them got educated about what, in fact, you were doing beyond what they were familiar with. Most everybody knew a little bit about their area of the library. Those were good, if somewhat less fun.

Z: That’s all right. Fun is not bad on an academic committee.

P: Yes. I served on curriculum committees—just kind of the standard ones—but certainly the computing committee was the most important.
Z: That’s big, because that was really more the infancy and building it.

P: We did some building, we negotiated big purchase agreements with technology vendors, so you could buy equipment inexpensively and software. We negotiated software donations and all of those kinds of things.

Z: That’s good. I think you would say it’s rather important for librarians to be involved in the academic part of an institution.

P: Right. I don’t know if you remember, but I think it was a meeting in Washington, DC, where Bob Braude and I, oddly enough, got into a rather heated argument about whether libraries were academic units or service units. It was my contention then, and absolutely I’m certain of it now, that for libraries to succeed you have to secure your position as an academic unit. Otherwise you become like plant operations or janitorial services. First of all, it doesn’t serve you well, because you’re not being dealt with as an equal. Secondly, you become highly vulnerable in budget situations because services are cut quicker.

Z: Oh, yes. And money goes to academics first.

P: Right. At some institutions, you can’t pursue grants unless you’re an academic.

Z: Right. So do librarians here at Eccles have some sort of academic status?

P: Yes. The librarians here at the university have quasi-academic status, and it’s mostly full academic status, although they have a slightly different track system going on. To my mind, academic rank—and I think, absolutely a preferred position is straight, regular academic rank—is how librarians should approach their work, how they should be treated, and how they should be measured.

We had some very bitter battles on this campus with librarians at the main university library, who want academic rank, but they don’t want the academic responsibilities. They say, “We don’t publish; we don’t teach. We catalog.” Well, cataloging is good, but it’s not academic. It doesn’t meet the bar of teaching, research, and service. At the Health Sciences Library, I think teaching, research, and service has been our measure here. It has served us extremely well. I think it has made it so that librarians can feel comfortable and confident in dealing as equals with anybody on campus.

Z: Yes, because they’re doing the same things.

P: Right. They get the same kind of respect, because if you’re publishing, if you’re teaching, if you’re bringing in grants, peers say, “Okay. You’re doing what you’re supposed to do.” I think in the academic setting—I have less familiarity with the hospital library setting—but certainly in academic higher education, you need to have academic
status, but it can be a difficult sell. At UCLA, they don’t have academic status; they are staff. And I think that’s a disadvantage. It’s not just UCLA; it’s many of the institutions.

Z: Many. Part of it is a mind-set unless you’re a strong person to overcome it and somehow get in in the right niche.

P: It has served us well here, and I think in terms of any regrets I had, it’s that we weren’t able to get back to full...

Z: Faculty status.

P: But it’s quite close. If you so desire, if you want to be in the Academic Senate, you actually get that privilege. [Laughs]

Z: There are sometimes reasons to belong.

P: There are—absolutely. There can be, but also there can be some brain-numbing discussions. In any event, it’s a significant issue and has been a significant part of our success.

Z: I think it’s interesting—the mind-set of librarians who don’t think it’s necessary.

P: I think that one of the issues for hospital libraries is, they have to secure a position beyond just a service, and that’s incredibly difficult. In terms of a strategy, if they can secure that, they have a much better chance of survival these days because services are just too easy to lop off and say, “We can get by without them.”

Z: Yes, saving money, or just not realizing the importance of it. Can you think of anything else you want to mention about your academic and national career before we move on to professional organizations?

P: Yes, let’s go see what the professional organizations have to offer. [Laughs]

Z: Well, you’ve been involved in several: MLA, AMIA, AAHSL; so let’s start with MLA. More than thirty years in MLA. When did you join?

P: Not surprisingly, Dr. Brodman said, “You will be a member of MLA.”

Z: She had quite an influence on your career.

P: Yes, but she didn’t offer to pay my dues. [Laughs]

Z: Oh, boo. Did she send you to any meetings?

P: She did. My first meeting was in San Antonio, actually, in 1974 or something like that, and it was fun. I had a fun time. I have great affection for the town. I think I’ve
always had a good time in San Antonio. It was interesting in that we had a PHILSOM meeting of the network members, just an afternoon or something; it was just an update kind of thing. I don’t know what I did; I don’t remember what it was. It embarrassed Dr. Brodman and she was furious. She tore me apart right in the middle of the meeting.

Z: What did you do?

P: I could not tell you what it was. All I can tell you is what it was like, and it was one of the most humiliating, painful experiences I had ever been subjected to up to that point, but I can still remember all of that. I came out of that and Spencer Marsh, Jean Miller, and Jacqueline Felter, who were at the meeting, took me to dinner and explained that Estelle is just like that. It was a wonderful dinner. Jean took us to some fancy French restaurant. The first soufflé of my life, I think, was at that restaurant. They were so kind to me, and I had just had this terrible experience. That was my introduction to an MLA meeting.

Z: That’s when you were still working for Estelle?

P: Yes, I was working for her. I was coordinating her network for her and putting those meetings together and doing all of that stuff. I don’t know; I do not remember what it was that put her into explosion mode, but she went off and there wasn’t much left of me when she was done.

It was an expectation at Wash U that you would go to MLA and that you would be a member of the association, and you would participate, and you would be a member of the chapter and participate in the chapter meetings—which was good, because I think the value of the professional associations, to me, has always been the ability to present your projects, to listen to other projects.

I never did all that well on the committee side, and I was never elected to anything, so I guess that tells you something about my standing in the association. [Laughs] But the fact of the matter was it contributed enormously to my career to have that exposure to what was going on and to be able to spend time with colleagues from around the country. I learned how to do that. That was fun.

Z: You were never elected, but you served on the MLA Board of Directors [1992-1994].

P: I did serve on the board. I was invited onto the board by colleagues who lobbied on my behalf to replace, I think, Henry Lemkau.

Z: It was, yes.

P: Henry had gotten elected on the basis of a very fiery speech he made at some MLA meeting, some business meeting. Then I think Henry decided he really didn’t want to do the work. He lived in Miami. He didn’t like to come to Chicago in the winter. After his first year [he resigned and] I was invited to fill his vacancy. It was a nice experience.
There were some really fun people. Joan, you were on the board; that was nice. Carol Jenkins was there. Let’s see, I think when I started Jackie Bastille was president, and then June Fulton was president.

Z: Oh, right. Let’s see... also Jacque Doyle.

P: Jacque Doyle was there. Mary Ryan. Julie Sollenberger was there. Carole Gilbert was there. All these people kind of came and went, as the board does.

Z: I know, because it changes every year.

P: Right. All of them were great people. It gives you an opportunity to spend time with people who really were worth spending time with.

Z: Yes, and getting to know them.

P: They were talented. They are talented people who were making significant contributions out there in all the institutions.

Z: Many of them are still working.

P: Some of them became presidents of the association. Overall, it was a good experience. My contribution to the effort at the time was technological. MLA was looking to upgrade an in-house computer system, and the executive director at the time, who is the now late Ray Palmer, was anxious to buy another one just like what he had. At that point in time, office automation was really shifting away from the proprietary, in-house systems into personal computers, so I came in and persuaded the board not to follow Ray’s request. [Laughs]

Z: What year would that be?

P: That would be about 1993, I think. Ray was a little annoyed. In fact, I think he left shortly thereafter.

Z: I think he was encouraged to leave.

P: Okay. Yes. Anyway, I was able to persuade them to invest in personal computers. At the time, I was on the University of Utah’s instructional computing committee, so I was talking to vendors all the time and I got MLA headquarters a fairly good deal on some equipment. I got a fair amount of software donated to help them get up and running, and I felt pretty good about that.

Z: You should. It was like bringing them into the twentieth century, poised for the twenty-first.
P: Yes, right. It got them in a direction that I think ultimately gave them more capabilities and probably saved them money.

Z: Thinking in a different direction. That was good.

P: In terms of the board experience overall, I think the lesson I learned was [about decision making]. You know, the membership rotates through the board, which is good. I think it’s a nice exposure, it’s good experience. But it also means that just as you’re gaining experience on how to work on the board, you leave, which means lots of important decisions are left to the MLA staff and the executive director. And they, not surprisingly, make decisions based on what they think is important, which is usually what is important to them as opposed to the membership.

Z: At the headquarters versus for members.

P: Right. It’s totally understandable. In the larger scheme of things, it does not work best for the profession. At the very end, we had a fairly vigorous discussion about the association’s acceptance of funding from publishers and creating this very, very significant conflict of interest. It’s not unique to MLA. The other library associations do it, too. This is money that they feel that they need for operations and it keeps the dues down. We began looking at the role of publishers and the role of what are basically exploitive pricing structures. It is hugely disadvantageous to the profession and to the goals of the profession to make information accessible. But they cannot give up that money. It’s sad, because the library associations—the library profession—should be really out there leading in this battle. And they’re there, but with reluctance, it seems.

Z: It may go along with a majority of the profession who don’t feel like they can be out in front. That’s why leadership training is so helpful.

P: Yes. That was kind of where I ended up with the board and the board experience. I always considered it a very big plus. Looking at recruitment and bringing in new librarians and evaluation of them, their professional association activities are always a factor.

Z: Oh, absolutely.

P: One of the things I did that I think changed the culture of this library is when I became director, I gave every librarian a professional development budget. They all had $1,000 or $1,500 a year to spend on professional development. They didn’t have to come and ask me which meeting to go to, or if they could go to a meeting, and I didn’t want to know. I always felt I had a certain number of decisions left in me, and those were not ones I wanted to use up. I just said, “Here, you decide.” I think 90 or 95% of the time it was totally well invested. I had maybe one or two instances where I felt, “Hmm, going to Palm Springs?”

Z: [Laughs] Well, there was a meeting in Palm Springs once, but…
P: I went to a meeting in Palm Springs.

Z: Okay, so it’s not all bad.

P: Right, right. But like I say, I think it was fun, and I learned a lot and was given a lot of opportunities.

Z: Now, I, and many others, remember your great willingness to take an active role in MLA business meetings.

P: Absolutely.

Z: Tell us why you were willing to step forward to that microphone.

P: I went to business meetings even as a beginner. I can remember David Bishop, who was the director of the library at the University of California San Francisco, this very well spoken and intelligent man, would frequently stand up in the meetings and question what was going on. I thought this was cool. I really did. I just thought it was great that he was willing to do that, and do it so well. Regrettably, he died…

Z: …way too young.

P: Yes, way too soon. I decided someone else needed to stand up, because we’d go to the meetings and they would ask, “Are there any questions?”

Z: Everybody was asleep.

P: Hardly anyone was there. Those who were there weren’t willing to get up to the microphone and say anything. I can remember the first time I stood before a business meeting reporting on a committee and had to go to the microphone, I was just paralyzed with fear. They had to ask me to give my report twice, because they couldn’t hear what I said the first time.

Anyway, I thought, “Damn, I’m just going to get up there and ask a question,” and so I did. After that I felt if I have a question, I’m going to ask it. Sometimes they were questions that were important. We talked about dues a lot. One of the issues for me on dues was somebody like Bob Braude would stand up and say, “This increase would only mean you wouldn’t be able to go to dinner.” I thought that was the most inane thing I’d ever heard because I had beginning librarians for whom fifty dollars was a lot of money.

Z: That was a lot of money.

P: We would argue that or we would talk about the expenditures. I remember Frieda Weise, who was MLA treasurer at one point.
Z: I followed her.

P: Yes. I stood up and I could just see this look of fear come across poor Frieda as I walked towards the microphone, because she knew I was going to ask a question about her budget. It was always done in good faith, and I never intended it to be mean or hurt or insult anyone, but I just thought transparency was a good thing.

Z: After the first couple of years, we all expected you to stand up and ask some hard questions. That was good.

P: I just thought it was something that the members should feel like they can do—could and should do.

Z: Yes. You were a good example, evidently. You have received a variety of honors, and especially from MLA, such as the Janet Doe Lectureship and the Marcia Noyes Award. How did you pick your topic, “Strategies and Measures for Our Next Century,” for the Janet Doe lecture?

P: From the very earliest part of my career, giving a Doe lecture was one of the things that I constituted as a mark of success. I always went to the lectures, too. I never blew them off. There were some that were better than others. There were a couple that were terrible, but there were some that were just spellbinding. You walked out of there and you thought, “God, this is what it’s all about and this is such a good idea, and gosh, I’d like to give a Janet Doe lecture that was that good.”

If you go to those lectures, they always start out with the “Oh, hell” experience when you open the letter and it says you’ve been invited to give the Doe lecture for this next year. I had that experience, and it was exactly like that. I had no idea it was coming. It was especially frightening because it was for the MLA centennial year [1998].

Z: That’s right. Frieda’s and my meeting.

P: It was one of those things when you finally got to where you wanted to be and then you look around and think, “Why was I thinking this?” But it was fun. It was one of the truly fun professional experiences, because you have a year to work on something.

Z: Yes, I think that’s good.

P: And I did. I was done by February and the meeting was in May. I started working on it pretty quickly. I brought together some things that I was working on at the time. I had just been at the Utah Board of Regents, was talking about technology. We were exploring the Internet really heavily at the time. The Western Governors University emerged as this kind of competitor for traditional academia. All of the websites were exploding [along with the issue of] how were we going to find out which were the good ones. There was no shortage of things to talk about, and I talked about them quite a bit.
But for me, the thread that came together really quite easily was that it was also the bicentennial for Lewis and Clark. The book that came out on the expedition, [Lewis & Clark: The Journey of] the Corps of Discovery, was beautifully done. There’s a wonderful quote that I used in the lecture from Lewis, as they left St. Louis on the great exploration. That was what I was trying to convey: that we had gone through a hundred years and we were entering this new age of exploration and that we should seize the opportunities, but more importantly, the idea of making sure that we have ways of determining whether we succeed or not. That’s the measuring part. Because I had learned by then that you can only get by so far on your good looks, you know?

Z: You have to prove your worth, yes.

P: Right. Everybody likes librarians, and it’s a wonderful thing that they do, but it’s really important to be able to show them why they should like us and appreciate the work we do and understand that it’s important.

I had that pretty much wrapped up by February. I had that all done, and then put it away and then came back. The meeting was in Philadelphia, and I stayed in this funny old place. It was a renovated historic building. It was some kind of a manufacturing building away from the convention hotel. It had these just gigantic oak beams in the ceilings, and the floors creaked like crazy. Afterwards I felt really badly for the people who had the room below me because it had this really long hall, and I would pace back and forth in the hall practicing my lecture. Creak, creak, creak, creak. Creak, creak, creak, creak. I did that every night until I gave the lecture, and then stood up there and made the presentation. I can’t tell you what it felt like to get to the last page. [Laughs]

Z: I’m sure. It’s a great sigh of relief. “The burden is now off me.”

P: It was amazing. Anyway, it was very gratifying and very satisfying, and certainly one of my personal measures. Then the Noyes came out of the sky, the Marcia Noyes award [2009].

Z: Don’t you love it? That’s the crown on your career.

P: It was very gratifying to have your friends and colleagues feel like you’ve made a contribution worth that level of recognition. Like I say, MLA has been a very important part of my career and I feel good about it. I feel really good about what I was able to do. I feel very gratified by the recognition I received.

Z: Well, you’re continuing, because you’re a Fellow.

P: I am a Fellow.

Z: And now you’re looking at making that better.
P: Well, the Fellows are—[laughs]—the Fellows are a good crowd. These are people who, again, have received recognition that’s well deserved. I’ve been a Fellow for a while [2000]. One of my most favorite people, Lucretia McClure, kind of herded us along and kept looking for us to do something. There is talent in that room. We’re not all worn out. There ought to be something. And yet there hasn’t seemed to be a good niche yet. I’m hoping to go back to the annual meeting this year and persuade my fellow Fellows that we should constitute ourselves as the fundraising body for the association.

Z: I think that’s an excellent idea.

P: We all have experience in fundraising. We all are in a position to make some kind of contribution on our own part to the financial contribution. I found out with the education building that once I’d made a fairly significant donation to the building, I felt I could go and ask somebody else.

Z: Absolutely.

P: I think that the Fellows, on that basis, could then go out to their networks and say, “Can you make an annual donation of whatever amount?” As a profession we must invest in our profession.

Z: That’s it, with support from MLA headquarters. That’s good.

P: I felt good about being a Fellow, and it is fun to see my pals.

Z: Yes. They’re a great bunch of people. Any other honors, issues, or anything about MLA [we should discuss?] Think we’re good?

P: I think so. Like I say, one of those things that should define us as a profession is to have a true professional organization.

Z: Absolutely.

P: What’s next?

Z: The Association of Academic Health Sciences Libraries—AAHSL, by any other name.

P: [Laughs] Okay.

Z: How did you get involved?

P: Reluctantly.

Z: You’re not alone.
P: When I first became a director, I tried to figure out what AAHSL was. It seemed to me like an old boys’ club and I thought, “I really don’t have time or the interest to participate in this organization.” It was a bunch of library directors who seemed to get together and then didn’t do anything. They did the statistics, to their credit. Dick Lyders made it possible for us to have a very good statistical foundation, and that’s totally to his credit because it was not easy. It’s never been easy.

Z: Oh, no. I’m surprised that he or his library survived [hosting the annual statistics.]

P: It’s never been easy. One of the most painful AAHSL meetings you ever attend is the discussion on the statistics. It seems to bring out the worst in librarians somehow. But in any event, I just didn’t have the time and didn’t really have the interest to participate, and it took me a while before I even went to the meetings.

Z: Do you remember when you went to your first meeting?

P: You were president. I remember that distinctly. I thought, “Well, this is cool.” You did really well as president. You moved them along, we had a nice meeting, and I started attending. I had the misfortune of becoming president [1989/90], and I didn’t do very well.

Z: What do you mean?

P: I chaired the meeting, and that’s about all I can claim.

Z: Some years you can accomplish more than others.

P: That’s right. But I began to have an appreciation for it, and I think it began to mature a little bit. I think I did something that actually made a difference, and that is I put together an email listserv for the association. This, again, this was way early in the days, and this was one of the first ones that really emerged. I didn’t think it up on my own. I had seen it in operation. A guy in Houston, actually—I can’t remember his name—was running one just on kind of general issues of interest, and I thought this was a pretty good idea. I actually went to the staff at our computer center, and they had never seen a listserv. I explained it to them and they wrote the software that gave us a listserv to begin with. We ultimately moved it over to the BITNET software, if I remember, that finally came out, and it was a little more professionally done. Running an email list for six or seven years I think really helped the association coalesce as a community.

Z: Because communication between and among was probably the most important thing.

P: Right. You could ask a question, or you could send out an announcement. My favorite thing was I’d send out the weather from Salt Lake City. Not that anybody cared, but I thought there’s nothing going on, so I’d just send out and say, “God, it’s another beautiful day in Salt Lake City.” [Laughs] It just lowered the barriers and lowered the bar so that people felt comfortable about communicating and saying, “I’m really
struggling with my budget; do you have any suggestions?” Or, “We want to buy this, what do you think?” It was all sorts of stuff. I think, too, that it got the directors using technology, which many of them had not, and created that sense of community that was good.

Z: I do think that’s extremely important. As we see it evolve, it’s still really good.

P: I think it’s one of the core activities for the association and continues to be so.

Z: Yeah.

P: I did participate for AAHSL on the Joint MLA/AAHSL Legislative Task Force. That was fun. I think [you and I] did that, too.

Z: Yes—I did ten years’ worth. Maybe not as long for you.

P: Not that long, but I did it a few years with you and Mary Horres. We had fun. We had great fun. Another of the things that I did to help the association [was establishing the Matheson lecture presented at the Association of Academic Medical Colleges (AAMC) annual meeting.] Valerie Florance and I had dinner in New Orleans one night—at that time she was at Johns Hopkins. I said to Valerie, “I think we should figure out a way to do something in honor of Nina Matheson; what would you think about a lecture?” She went to Nina, and Nina was okay with it. Then I raised a little bit of money out of the membership, interestingly enough.

Z: If you ask, you will get.

P: Mm-hmm. We began an endowment for an endowed lecture in honor of Nina Matheson, and it continues to this day. Maybe the biggest challenge was that at the first lecture I was supposed to pin a corsage on Nina. This proved to be very difficult, a near-death experience.

Z: Do people still contribute to it?

P: I don’t think so, although I remember that the fact that we had an endowed lecture was something that allowed AAHSL to change its legal status to a 501(c).

Z: But I wonder if they still give.

P: I don’t know whether they do. I have never subsequently received any kind of solicitation.

Z: Me neither. I’ll have to ask.
P: The last I remember, they were working with the AMIA people in terms of funding the lecture. [Editor’s note: The lecture is now jointly sponsored by AAHSL and AAMC’s Group on Information Resources.]

Z: That would be good. There’s a lot of interaction there.

P: So I did that. Then we went the rounds a few times on scholarly communications, but that was okay. That was an education for everybody. I think that the majority of the directors are very strong in terms of open access and where we should be, though not all of them. The last thing I did was the [Future] Leadership Task Force.

Z: That is big.

P: That started around [2000], I think. Carol Jenkins was the AAHSL president. She formed two task forces, one on strategic planning and one on leadership. A survey had showed that there were directors who were beginning to march out the door [due to retirement], and we had to start looking at preparing a next generation of directors, which seemed okay. I was actually quite annoyed with Carol when she appointed me to it because I really didn’t want to do it.

Z: Didn’t give you much choice, did she?

P: I was more interested in the strategic planning one, but she didn’t give me any choice.

Z: She knows how to delegate.

P: She said, “No, I think you should do this one, and you can work with Rachael Anderson.” She, Linda Watson, and I were the three that I think started those discussions.

Z: That’s a formidable group.

P: It was really good. Rachael was just about ready to retire, and so she really gave it her full attention. We had some really fun discussions. We put together a framework that I think really worked in a number of different directions. It built a sequence of training, and it produced a core of people that were prepared to step up into positions of library director.

Z: And they’re doing it.

P: Yes, absolutely. Carol also, much to her credit, talked Carolyn Lipscomb into coming out of quasi-retirement into the position of coordinator for the program, and that was brilliant. She has done a fabulous job. She has put her own stamp on the program, and has provided the continuity this kind of a program requires. We put together a program that started with an MLA CE class called “So You Want To Be a Library Director,”
which was hilarious. It had four library directors—myself and Rick Forsman, and Judy Messerle and Jim Shedlock to start off. I think they have a new team now.

Z: Yes, I think they do, too, but this one was super.

P: It was fun because we all brought a different kind of perspective, and that’s exactly what we were trying to do: To say to people who were thinking about being a library director, “Come and hear from some what it’s like.” Then we would break up into small groups and they could ask you questions. I think they’re still teaching that class. I think Carol’s in it now.

Z: I guess Judy Consales was pretty much working with the program on the committee, the task force.

P: Yes, right. She was a graduate of the program. We did that. Carolyn and I put together a guide to hiring a library director with two goals: One, to give to institutions that were looking to hire a new director, because they don’t do it very often. They don’t know how to do it well.

Z: They don’t even know what to look for.

P: Yes. We put that together, and I think that’s been used, to a degree. But also—I don’t know if they do this anymore—we would give that out as the reading material for the CE class so the people could see what it looks like from the other side of the fence. I thought that was pretty fun. We did a scholarship program, which I think has been good. People who were trying to build their CVs and go into specialized administration programs have a little bit of money to do so. Then the best was the fellowship, which NLM funded. They support five fellows a year to work with a library director, including an on-site visit.

Z: What’s the official name of it?

P: The [NLM/AAHSL] Leadership Fellows Program, I believe. One of the other things I take some pride in is that I basically constructed the first group of library directors to function as mentors. I knew that we had to start out with a very high degree of participation, and so I called some people and gave them the hard sell. Every one of them stepped up. We had Judy Messerle at Harvard, Carol Jenkins at North Carolina. Let’s see…Michael...

Z: Homan, yes [at Mayo Clinic].

P: Yes. Who am I missing? Could be Rick Forsman. I think it was Rick. Anyway, it was terrific because we didn’t know what we were doing, but we had the best possible people stepping up and saying, “We’ll figure it out.” And it was superb. Then when Carol left the position of association president, she appointed herself as co-chair of the fellows program. [Editor’s note: Jenkins and Peay were appointed co-chairs in 2003, replacing the first chair Patricia Mickelson.]
Z: She could do that.

P: She did that, and it was wonderful. It was wonderful working with her. She brought a huge personal commitment, because she got it started, and I think was very pleased with how it developed, and had a very good experience with her fellow, Judy Consales. It was Nancy Roderer who was the other mentor. It wasn’t Rick. I think Rick was the [third] year. But Nancy—oh, Nancy was good.

Z: She’s amazing.

P: She was. She’s just terrific. She’s just one of my favorite library directors.

Z: [Whispers] See, you need to come with us at New Year’s.

P: [Laughs] Maybe. But it was and is an extremely successful activity. The National Library of Medicine keeps sending money, which means they’re happy.

Z: It’s doing what the CLR/NLM [Council on Library Resources/National Library of Medicine Health Sciences Library Management] Intern Program didn’t do as much of as they had hoped.

P: I think four out of five fellows in a cohort become directors. We have really put our own stamp on the next generation of directors, and that’s what we wanted. I consider myself an accidental librarian. There’re not many people that start out in the profession saying, from the first day, “I want to be a librarian.” And even less who say, “I want to be a director.” You go into that director’s job—you know this, and I know this—you only know parts of the job. There’s a lot of on-the-job training, and it’s not always easy.

Z: It’s not always fun, either.

P: No. But I think in this program we gave a lot of people a really good start. Then we did something, too, that I think they’re still doing. We had such a good experience with the fellows that every few years we have a follow-up for new directors [AAHSL New Directors Symposium], and have them come together and talk about what they’ve learned as new directors that they can share with other new directors. They address issues that are at a bit of a higher level than you could with the fellows.

Z: Is that like a seminar?

P: Mm-hmm. That’s like a two- or three-day seminar in Washington. It’s been done a couple of times and was fun.

Z: I think when you’re still just learning, there are a lot of things that are new to you, and when you share them around, everybody finds out they’re getting the same stuff.
P: Right. The other thing that we always had as an objective was to build a sense of community amongst a cohort. We have five fellows who become kind of bonded as a result of their shared experiences, and then you get them into new directors and they have another kind of cohort where everybody knows everybody else as peers. I think that’s worked pretty well.

Z: That’s good. It’s just like you have a building block and you keep adding to it.

P: Right. We have these interesting steps that you take in this education program that I think really builds very competent library directors, and I hope some very distinguished ones, too. I’m confident that they will be.

Z: It’s such a boon for the profession to have that happen.

P: It sure turned out lots better than I would have thought at the beginning. I thought, “Oh, hell, what has Carol done to me this time? This isn’t the one I want to be on.”

Z: But she could see that your skills were there.

P: I know. She’s pretty smart.

Z: Yes. All right, let’s move to the AMIA folks. Explain the difference between AMIA [American Medical Informatics Association] and the American College of Medical Informatics.

P: Okay. It’s been interesting working with the informatics community because one of their great founders and leaders has been here at the University of Utah in Homer Warner, who is a tremendous gentleman, a brilliant informatician. It’s always been around, and there were other members of the informatics community here that were fun to work with—Reed Gardner and Allan Pryor, and guys that really made significant contributions to the development of clinical information systems.

It was interesting going to the meetings. It became quite apparent early on that the informatics community, by and large, didn’t understand libraries and really weren’t very interested in libraries. From my perspective, it was interesting to get a better feel for that community, and clinical information systems in particular, because they are part of the infrastructure of a health sciences center. I was never very active in AMIA. I did attend meetings, but I found fairly early on you didn’t have to go every year. I did go regularly because it was important to track the development. They were colleagues. I ultimately had an adjunct appointment in the Department of [Bio]medical Informatics here and appeared in their curriculum periodically, and that was sort of fun.

But AMIA really is the larger association of people that are involved in informatics, and that generally means clinical information systems. To a lesser degree, genetics, and to a lesser degree, computer science. All of that stuff is worth knowing. Now, the American
College of Medical Informatics is an invitational organization sort of like fellows in the informatics community.

Z: You become a fellow?

P: You’re voted into the college by the members of the college. Then they have their own annual meeting where members of the college come and present. I was elected to the college I think just only a year before I retired [2006], so I never really spent very much time in it.

Z: But that was indicative of their recognizing your skills and ability.

P: I think it was pushed by the few librarians in there, and I’m sure that they would like to see more. It was gratifying that they would recognize my work and invite me to join their community. It would have been nice to have it happen a little earlier in my career when I could have had more time and wasn’t nearly as done as I was at that point, but it was nice. It was fun.

Z: Yes. You were recognized. That’s good. Okay, let’s move to NLM and the Biomedical Library Review Committee [BLRC]. Tell us all about that.

P: It’s a great experience. I don’t know that anyone I have ever known who has served on that committee considers it anything less. It’s a huge amount of work. I figured, in retrospect after my three years, that I was spending six to eight weeks a year on BLRC work, because the job of the BLRC is to review grant proposals for funding by NLM and make a recommendation on the quality of the work and whether it should be funded or not. It was a great honor to be asked, because the people at NLM have to think you have something to contribute to the discussion or an area of expertise.

The committee itself had, at that time, I think, three or maybe four librarians, and they would have some informatics guys, some clinicians, and some computer science people. One year we had a Nobel laureate, a geneticist who was on the committee. NLM has run it for all these years. Interestingly, I guess the string has been broken, but for—I’ll bet for twenty or twenty-five years somebody from the University of Utah was on the BLRC. A little known fact. Priscilla Mayden served on the BLRC. Homer Warner, Al Pryor, Reed Gardner [and Paul Clayton] were on the committee. For somebody from Utah to come on board was not that big a deal. The administrator, Roger Dahlen, was a good friend and colleague—although Roger has a bent sense of humor. When I got invited to be on the BLRC, at the very first meeting I was assigned the very first grant to present. I had no clue as to how this was supposed to be done, what I was supposed to say.

Z: You think he did it on purpose?

P: Absolutely. But that was basically how it would work. You would be assigned as a principal or secondary reviewer, present the elements of the proposal to the committee, and then lead a discussion. It’s very, very challenging. Some of the proposals… I would
get ones on statistics and just be thinking, “Oh, my god.” You can’t ask for help. This is all done in confidence. Those were pretty challenging, but you learned a lot. Just to survive you had to find out what is a meta statistical analysis and how is it done?

Anyway, it was great fun. They worked hard to make you feel comfortable and make you feel collegial, had social events following each day’s meeting. You worked all day long. NLM couldn’t buy you coffee. You had to buy your own coffee because it had to be a totally independent review, although you could put it in for reimbursement. It was crazy. It was the government.

Z: Following the government rules, yes.

P: Again, like [work for] MLA and AAHSL, you learned a lot, it was fun. Working with the people was the best part. Alison Bunting came on the BLRC when I was there. I had only known Alison as some distant director from Southern California. Having an opportunity to work with her in that kind of environment was just wonderful, and we became good colleagues, and she came to my rescue when I [wrote the contract proposal for] the RML. Sherrilynne Fuller was on there when I was there. She and I became good friends. I ultimately was the chair of the committee for one year, and talk about herding cats. You had to learn how to lead a discussion of about fifteen or eighteen very large personalities.

In retrospect, one of the things that was particularly gratifying was awarding a small group of small library grants in those days. I don’t know if they do that anymore. Fifteen thousand dollars each. For the first year, we did those separately as librarians, and later they just integrated them into the general review by the full BLRC. Everybody else on the committee gave those the same amount of attention as they would give the million dollar proposals, and gave them the same kind of respect. These were often times little proposals to buy books or improve a facility or do a little network.

The GaIN [Georgia Interactive Network for Medical Information] project, when it came up, was one that folded a bunch of those small grants together to build a network. It was an incredibly successful project that was reviewed by the BLRC and obviously considered as a very worthwhile funding opportunity. So it was fun. I learned a lot about NLM. They spent a lot of time getting you around NLM and showing you what it’s all about. It was a lot of work. I was glad when my three years were up. I’d had enough.

Z: You didn’t have to review anymore.

P: But it was good work for three years.

Z: Throughout your career you were closely associated with the application of technologies in libraries. Yet, if I remember correctly, your undergraduate degree was in history.

P: You got it.
Z: How did you end up with this technology expertise, and what was the impact of your efforts?

P: It began totally by accident as the binding clerk. I had the opportunity, and I don’t know that many people have careers during a time when their professions are being transformed. When I started, we were punching paper cards, and a Selectric typewriter was high-tech and very desirable. Those were hot, and a self-correcting Selectric typewriter was the state-of-the-art.

But computing began to really appear, be accessible, become useful, be applied. I was in the midst of places where that happened—Washington University, here at the University of Utah. One of the benefits of being at the University of Utah, one of the benefits of being in the profession, and I think most certainly one of the responsibilities, is that you as a librarian must continually redefine yourself and build your skill set. I learned about technology by doing it, talking to people, reading, working on it always throughout my career.

It was very clear to me very early on that technology would be transformative for libraries, such as working with PHILSOM. Compare it to what we were doing with punch cards and stacks of paper or with the Kardex. People reading this will not know what a Kardex is, but it was this kind of file cabinet with sheets in it where you would mark off the receipt of a journal to ensure you got everything that you paid for. If somebody wanted to know if you had this issue or that issue of a journal, they could look at the Kardex, and they might be able to tell you if somebody had marked the card…

Z: It was in, but nobody could find it.

P: Right. There was always that part, too. Just to have lists of what journals the library had that you could put around the building was a revolution.

Z: That’s true.

P: It wasn’t very hard to figure out that this technology was going to be important. It was fun and it was interesting, and you could do some amazing things. Throughout my career I was able to do that, and I enjoyed it. I remember my first Apple IIe that I had as a desktop computer. I always had computers accessible. The first computer lab at the Health Sciences Center was here in the library. We bought some Apple IIe computers with the help of the vice president’s office and tried to explain to people what a disk was, why they were using a keyboard, and what the return key would do. We had those kinds of classes.

Z: At the very beginning.

P: Yes. Then we did the network stuff, trying to explain networks. Then we began doing databases, and we began doing video. We did Slice of Life out of this library,
which was a huge advance in medical education. Building a videodisc that had high quality images that were accessible to medical schools across the country came out of this library.

Z: From what I’ve seen and learned here, you had a wonderful environment. It was nurturing and supportive, which really helped because you sort of started at the beginning, but they were going with you.

P: Mm-hmm. We built an environment here of high expectations—it went back to the Dr. Brodman model of the library as a laboratory. Everybody was expected to work in that environment. People like that stuff. They want to be in that kind of an environment. If they don’t, then they need to work someplace else. [Laughs] We had a few people who came here and weren’t comfortable with that kind of thing, and they found other places that were more comfortable. I was in technology because it was very important. I found it fit the way my brain works. I learned it by taking advantage of being in a library, where you have access to expertise, and I still follow its evolution.

Z: Anything else before we wind up? See what your notes say.

P: I would like to restate the fact that I think what I did, this ability to reinvent myself, is what we all should do as professional librarians. Being a member of a profession has wonderful benefits, but it has real responsibilities. If you view your work in libraries as a job, I’m not sure you’re really a member of the profession. It’s not eight to five. It’s not something that you do to pay the bills. It’s a personal commitment. It involves your stepping up and making sure that you can fulfill that commitment and continue to build not only yourself but your colleagues as well. I think that’s one of our great strengths as a profession—the ability to work as a community.

Z: Yes, we mentor. We mentor well.

P: Anyway, that’s one point I would probably have to stress.

Z: The last interview items have to do with some general reflections on a few topics: Who are the people who you feel most influenced your life and career, and who are the people that you feel you most influenced? We know who’s number one.

P: I would say I was fortunate to have three major mentors in the beginning: Priscilla Mayden, Estelle Brodman, and Jean Miller. They got me when I was moldable, and they did a good job molding.

Z: They had good talent to work with.

P: They taught me things that I adopted and they taught me some things that I decided not to do. That was their job, and they did it well. My colleagues in the profession had at least as important a role. Joan, you, Carol Jenkins, Alison Bunting, Roger Dahlen. These were people that I could talk to, and if they wanted to talk to me, they could. Also Rick
Forsman. When we were struggling to put the RML together, Rick stepped up and just asked, “What can I do?” He came to Salt Lake the day we had the site visit despite the weather. He flew in.

Z: Oh, did he? He’s a can-do person.

P: Yes. Also Spencer Marsh. When I was at the Utah Board of Regents, Cecelia Foxley was the commissioner for higher education. She was our champion when we did the library project. She was the associate commissioner at that point, and then she became commissioner, and she was the one who invited me to come down there and work. It was a wonderful opportunity, and she was a great supporter of libraries. [Another influence was] my last boss here at the University of Utah, Lorris Betz. Dr. Betz and I could have gotten along better. He’s quite reserved and I’m not exactly “Mr. Outgoing,” but we got along well enough, we had mutual respect, and we built that new education building.

Z: That’s a wonderful lasting memorial to both of you.

P: I think he takes great pride in that building, and that’s very gratifying. Those are the people that certainly have main importance to me. Hell, I don’t know who I’ve influenced. I’ve had a lot of people come and go through this building that have gone on to do other good things. I’ve worked with lots of people.

I’ve always felt that optimism should be central to how you proceed, because it’s always easier not to do anything. But if you have a feeling and convey a sense of optimism, then folks will take that and run with it. I always tried to do that. You don’t want to crush them right off the gun.

Z: That’s all right. Most everybody I’ve interviewed has few people they want to name [as having been influenced by them], so that’s all right. We know everyone who worked or works here was influenced by you.

P: [Laughs] It’s been good.

Z: Overall, how would you like to be remembered by the library community?

P: Well, Lois Ann Colaianni, to her credit, brought us that wonderful phrase, “the vision thing,” and I think I brought a vision to the community. I think they respected it and I think we got a lot out of it. It involved innovation and collaboration and a commitment to service.

Z: Hard work, definitely.

P: Yes, hard work is there. I think that the ability to build a vision and then to keep refining it and achieving the vision is what we have to do as a profession. We all have listened to the guys talk about how they’re going to put libraries out of business, but if we build that vision and we continue to pursue it, we will, I’m sure, succeed.
Z: You’ve mentioned a lot of important contributions over the life of this interview. Is there any one that is most outstanding?

P: I wanted to be director of this library, and I was.

Z: And you were. You did it. Where do you see librarianship and medical librarianship headed for the future?

P: I think it has a bright future if it remembers what it is. We are in a position where we facilitate new knowledge. The acquisition of new knowledge, the discovery of new knowledge. We are part of that. As long as we continue to develop the skills that make that happen, libraries will be in the midst, we will succeed. We will continue to make a great contribution. I think that that involves our changing and developing new skills and remembering that we have this contribution to make and not get satisfied, saying, “We know how to catalog and that’s all we need to know.” Well, cataloging is good. I liked cataloging, but…

Z: It’s not all there is.

P: It’s not all there is. Nor is checking in journals. Throughout my career, again and again I’ve heard, “Oh, this technology is going to put libraries out of business or this organization is going to put libraries out of business.” I’ve seen a lot of those things go out of business, and it wasn’t libraries. I think libraries are flourishing right now, and can continue to flourish if we continue to play that role in the discovery of new knowledge.

Z: Any advice to people new to the field or already there? You’ve mentioned a lot of them already.

P: I have. Yes, I’ve talked about that in detail. I just would stress the power of optimism. I think it is something that you need to make sure is in that tool kit, because it makes a huge difference.

Z: Right. Do you have any suggestions for who might be interviewed for the oral history project, or who would be good interviewers?

P: I’m actually not terribly conversant of who’s on the current list of who’s already been interviewed.

Z: That’s all right. Every suggestion gets put in. If it’s already there, that’s okay.

P: You obviously need to be interviewed.

Z: Oh, I have been.

P: All right, so that’s good. Carol Jenkins needs to be. Alison Bunting needs to be.
Z: She’s been done.

P: I think it would be fascinating if Roger Dahlen was interviewed.

Z: Okay, that’s a good one.

P: Because he was in a position where he saw a lot of the revolution, and he helped a lot of it. Also two of my favorite colleagues from this library, Valerie Florance and Karen Butter.

Z: Yes, they both should be done.

P: They need to be on the list.

Z: They may be on the list, but I really don’t know because I haven’t asked Carolyn who else is to be done. But I’ll pass these along in case they aren’t already on it. Anyone you think should be an interviewer?

P: Hmm, who would be good at that? You do well. You’ve done a good job.

Z: Thank you. I was thinking maybe Rick Forsman.

P: I think Rick could do it, absolutely.

Z: I’ll put his name in.

P: He could do that, absolutely. Michael Homan needs to be done, if he’s not done.

Z: Oh, right.

P: He would also be a good interviewer, actually. Oh, hell, there are so many good and talented people that have been in the profession while I passed through.

Z: The thing that holds us back is the limited funding. So maybe the MLA Fellows could consider…

P: I think that’s a very good idea. I think that’s very nice.

Z: Just a special fund.

P: Yes, that would be interesting. Okay.

Z: You’re going to the annual meeting next month. You can tell them.

P: I’ll do that.
Z: All right. This concludes the interview of Wayne Peay by Joan Zenan at the Eccles Health Sciences Library on April 26, 2012.

P: Okay.

Z: Thank you. Very painless.

P: Not too bad.
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Utah Academic Library Consortium, 1978 - present
Member, Media Committee, 1978 - 1979
Member, Bibliographic Access Committee, 1979 - 1980
Member, Systems Committee, 1981 - 1984
Member, Director’s Council, 1984 - present
Chair, Utah College Library Council, 1985 - 1986, 2000 - 2001

Utah Library Association, 1984 - present

University of Utah
Chair, 1985 - 1986
Department of Family and Community Medicine Curriculum Committee, 1985
School of Medicine Accreditation Self-Study Task Force, 1985 - 1986
Chair, Library Self-Study Subcommittee, 1985 - 1986
University Task Force on Computing, 1985 - present
Chair, 1992 - 1995
School of Medicine Curriculum Committee, 1986 - 1987
Presidential Task Force on Internal Relations, President’s Undergraduate Education Initiative, April-May 1989
Vice President for Health Sciences Search Committee, 1990
President’s Task Force on Libraries, 1991 - 1992
President’s Administrative Working Group on Strategic Planning for Computing, 1992 - 1993
Distance Education Directorate, 1994 - 1997
Co-Chair, Faculty Assistance/Multimedia Resources Subcommittee, 1994 - 1995
School of Medicine Accreditation Steering Committee, 1995 - 1996
University Accreditation Self Study Steering Committee, 1996
Network Planning Committee, 1996 - 1997
Information Technology Council, 1998 -
School of Medicine Curriculum Committee , 1999 - 2001
Committee for Technology Enhanced Curriculum, 2000 - 2003
Chair, 2002
Information Technology Executive Committee, 2000
Responsible Conduct of Research Task Force, 2001
School of Medicine Admissions Committee, 2002 - 2004
Health Sciences Education Building Core Steering Committee, 2002 – 2005
Community & Governmental Relations, 2003 -
Health Sciences Education Building Administration Committee, Chair. 2005 –
University Research Cyberinfrastructure Committee, 2006

Utah State Medical Association Computer Committee, 1983 - 1984

Association of Academic Health Sciences Library Directors, 1985 - present
Member, Committee on Library Information Management Technology, 1986 - 1989, Chair, 1989
Chair, Nominating Committee, 1988 - 1989
President, Association of Academic Health Sciences Library Directors, 1990
Member, MLA/AAHSDL Legislative Task Force, 1988 - 1990
Moderator, AAHSLD Electronic Discussion Group, 1989 - 1996
Representative, Association of American Medical Colleges, Council of Academic
Societies, 1990 - 1993
Chair, Matheson Lecture Committee, 1993 – 1996
Future Leadership Task Force, 2000 –
Co-Chair, 2003 -
Scholarly Communications Committee, 2003 –

Utah System of Higher of Education
Statewide Library Technology Committee, 1988 - 1991
Technology Subcommittee, 1993 - 1996

Utah Education Network
Steering Committee, 1993 - present
Chair, Library & Data Communications Committee, 1993 - 1998
Chair, Dial in Services Subcommittee, 1996 - 1997
Chair, Pioneer: Utah’s Online Library Subcommittee, 1996 - present

Office of the Governor, Western Governors University - Utah Steering Committee, 1996 - 1998
Acting Chair, 1997


Consultant:

Audiovisual Consultant, Midcontinental Regional Medical Library Program. University of

Library Operations and Administration. West Virginia University, School of Medicine. Morgantown, West


IAIMS. Rochester University Medical Center. February 28, 1995.


Planning Grant: Education and Training of Health Sciences Librarians. University of Pittsburgh. 1996

IAIMS Planning Project. City of Hope National Medical Center July 24, 1996


Selected Presentations:


Peay WJ. "Organizing the Audiovisual Collection" and "Audiovisuals and Copyright." MCRMLP/LMEF Audiovisual Workshop. March 2, 1982. Lincoln, NE.


Peay WJ. "Applications of New Technology." Advances in Medical Library and Medical Media Production Services Workshop sponsored by the Regional Learning Resources Services, Veterans Administration Medical Center. March 30, 1983. Salt Lake City, UT.
Peay, Wayne J.
Curriculum Vita


Peay WJ. "Word Processing." Preceptor Workshop sponsored by the Department of Family and Community Medicine, University of Utah. June 10, 1984. Park City, UT.

Peay WJ. "IAIMS - Planning for the Next Decade." Annual Meeting of the Utah State Medical Association. October 5, 1984. Salt Lake City, UT.


Warner HR, Detmer DE, Peay WJ. "IAIMS Implementation and Administration at the University of Utah." Medinfo 86. October 27, 1986. Washington, DC.


Peay WJ. "Development of State-Level Networking Initiatives." Office of Information Technology, Department of Computer Science and the School of Library and Information Science, University of Iowa. September 23, 1994. Iowa City, IA.


Peay WJ. "The Virtual University: Implications for Higher Education Systems." Western States Association of Faculty Governance Conference. April 29, 1996. Las Vegas, NV.
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