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Introduction and Overview

In January 2006, I joined CLIR as a visiting program director to work with staff, committee members, and other advisors to develop strategically directed scholarly communication and preservation agendas that will appeal to and create value for CLIR constituents and the broader communities of stakeholders whose existence is entwined with these two topics. This report represents my findings between mid-January and late March 2006, identifying possible directions and studies to be pursued in CLIR's scholarly communication programs over the next three years.

A number of organizations are able to conduct investigatory projects in domains of interest to libraries, but most have goals specific to their particular needs (e.g., OCLC, ARL, Ithaka, CNI, DLF, individual libraries, consultants). CLIR is seen as being able to operate in a space that crosses stakeholder communities, brings them together, and facilitates learning and understanding. CLIR can launch initiatives that later become self-sustaining. CLIR has access to presidents, provosts and to high-ranking officials in related organizations (ACLS, LC, OCLC, and so on), i.e., a broad audience. While supporting goals that the library community holds dear, such as wide access to (affordable) information and quality services to information seekers, CLIR respects the interests of other parties in the information chain, such as authors, publishers, and business partners; it strives to optimize relationships for the benefit of all. CLIR aims to balance, to listen, to learn, and to share what is being learned. Given this perception, CLIR is indeed in a unique and fortunate position for a small organization.

This flexibility and aptitude for broad boundary-crossing partnerships can stand CLIR well in another important domain as well. Over the years, CLIR has touched on many areas that fall under the heading of scholarly communication (e.g., usage, digital technologies, and intellectual property), but not in a way that added up to a strategic competence for the organization. CLIR has made from time to time valuable contributions, in other words, but is not primarily or widely known for contributions in this area. This report imagines, therefore, a more significant investment in scholarly communication expertise and policy over the next few years, positioning CLIR for leadership in a new dimension vital to the future of great libraries. This report scouts the terrain on which those ambitions would play out and makes some recommendations for some reconnaissance missions and some projects that go beyond reconnaissance and make first substantial forays.

During the exploratory process, briefly described below, I heard about many scholarly communication topics that merit investigation and study; the more people I contacted, the more
ideas were floated – good ideas are never in short supply. Working on the CLIR scholarly communication agenda presents a very different scope and dynamic from the other group I have supported (preservation). The preservation committee "sang with one voice" (i.e., understood preservation needs in similar or complementary ways) from the moment they entered the meeting room, and their main question was how to exercise that voice nationally. CLIR has a decades-old interest and history in this area. The scholarly communication agenda, on the other hand, is newer to CLIR and the new committee appropriately represents very diverse stakeholders in the chain (even then it does not begin to represent the many players in this space). The SCC, eager to advance good work in this area, sometimes represents complementary interests and at other times viewpoints and interests that may be in disagreement. Thus, identifying and choosing common agendas is much more complicated.

Process

The ideas presented herein come from several directions, as well as my own thoughts:

(1) The Scholarly Communication Committee (SCC membership list appears in Appendix A) was established by Nancy Davenport and the CLIR Board. This group met in person on 11 January in the CLIR offices to engage in free-ranging discussions and brainstorming exercises aimed at eliciting ideas and priorities (Appendix B contains minutes of that meeting plus appendices).

After I wrote and distributed the minutes, various members responded with additional insights and suggestions (Henry, Tibbitts, Skinner, Gasaway, English). Martha Brogan sent numerous helpful suggestions and citations. I followed several of these committee contacts with phone conversations (English, Harper, Henry, Schonfeld, Tibbitts, Skinner and Walker).

(2) Additional consultations were conducted with the following individuals, who deepened, enriched, and suggested new directions. These individuals are skilled in diverse aspects of scholarly communication, well grounded in reality, articulate, and helpful.

Consultations (apart from the Committee):

  Phil Davis, Cornell Library
  Susanna Easton, Department of Education
  Joe Esposito, Consultant, Portable CEO
  Peter Givler, AAUP
  Kevin Guthrie, Ithaka
  Karen Hunter, Elsevier Science
  Sami Kassab, Analyst, Paribus, London
  Rick Luce, Los Alamos Labs
  Sally Morris, ALPSP
  Kimberly Parker, Yale Library, and other Yale staff
  Susan Perry, CLIR/Mellon/NITLE
  John Price-Wilkin, University of Michigan
  Joyce Ray, ILMS
  Peter Shepherd, COUNTER
  Members of ICOLC (the International Coalition of Library Consortia, including directors of consortia outside the United States)
(3) I have used the suggestions coming from the SCC to begin explorations outward and then used those explorations to focus back in on ideas to present to the CLIR leadership.

Observations

A number of diverse, specific ideas that arose out of the above consultations are attached (Appendices C.1-9) as possibilities for further pursuit and development by CLIR. Each has one or more committee champions. In most cases, I have identified individuals (not named) and/or potential organizational collaborators in the effort. The ideas have not yet been costed. A few additional comments:

A. **Partnerships.** Several proposed projects lend themselves to partnerships and in some cases are impossible without these partners. For example, in addition to past relationships CLIR has enjoyed in its work, new and desirable partners might include groups such as the Association of American University Presses (AAUP) in developing a better understanding of scholarly monographic publication; the Association of Learned and Professional Society Publishers (ALPSP), which has a recently organized a US branch convened by the current editor of *Choice Magazine* and ACRL; the UK's COUNTER (Counting Online Usage of Networked Electronic Resources), with a keen interest in standardizing and studying electronic resources usage statistics; the Ithaka research group, with its growing expertise in defining and conducting important economic and user analyses; the National Association of College and University Attorneys (NACUA) for a better understanding of the legal issues facing academic librarians and their attorneys; and various publisher groups (individual societies and several trade associations) to understand better the "end of print."

B. **Mix.** The proposed ideas are a mix of activity types. Some are partnered "expert committee" studies of the sort that CLIR led with its "artifact" group: facilitated meetings between diverse stakeholders over time, to develop understandings and key recommendations about current issues. The scholarly monograph, the "future of print journals," and the "lawyer" proposals are such projects. Others are quantitative studies that begin to test frequently made assertions, such as "scholarly monograph publishing opportunities for junior faculty in specialized disciplines are shrinking." A third, less ambitious type of activity (but useful and very much educational) can be done in-house or sourced to a contractor.

C. **Quantitative Studies.** A perusal of CLIR's burgundy book publications suggests that CLIR has conducted relatively few data-driven studies. A need for these types of studies, impartially and carefully conducted, was frequently expressed. Branching into this area poses an important challenge for CLIR, not only with respect to selecting topics but also in managing such studies. An individual with the relevant expertise could be hired, or CLIR staff could manage a small number of outside consultants. CLIR could start with the latter but might move towards some in-house capability if interest, demand, and success warrant.

---

1 Nancy Davenport and I met on 22 March in the CLIR offices with Sally Morris, Executive Director of ALPSP, and Irv Rockwood, ACRL. We agreed that a forum for discussion between the group represented by CLIR sponsors and the ALPSP's societies could be very helpful. We also agreed not to pursue broad-based discussions of the sort previously conducted with AAP, but rather to focus on important and timely topics, of which the first would be measuring usage of e-resources. We will assemble a well-chosen group of society publishers, librarians, and users, to develop a modest and share-able research agenda, and then make a realistic plan to accomplish it together.
Recommendations

A. Cyberinfrastructure. As in scientific, technical, and medical fields, the humanities and social sciences are developing large collaborative projects for which a combination of appropriate infrastructure plus supportive technological and human services must be developed. Many such remarkable humanistic projects have won wide acclaim and become important tools and objects of study in their own right. The Institute for Advanced Technology in the Humanities at the University of Virginia is justly famous for pioneering efforts and has now a track record stretching back more than a decade, but less institutionally-supported efforts such as the Perseus Project have scarcely less enviable records of sustained success. For the last five years, the National Humanities Center has recognized achievement in this domain with the Richard Lyman Award, named after a former president of Stanford and of the Rockefeller Foundation, while the American Council of Learned Societies this year is awarding a first tranche of digital innovation fellowships to support leading-edge research that depends on the integration of information technology with traditional methods and subjects of inquiry in the humanities. The ACLS is also taking the lead in provoking humanists to learn to use the word "cyberinfrastructure," with a major report due this spring outlining the needs of these disciplines in the years to come. Numerous universities are, partly in consequence, assessing their readiness to support scholars in the new, collaborative activities. What actions are they taking? What does the landscape look like?

Action Items:

1. CLIR must quickly connect with these initiatives (Dan Atkins at the NSF; the humanities report and its authors and advocates; exemplary individual efforts), understand them, and help, wherever possible, to advance them in appropriate ways. How to make these connections has yet to be determined, but it should be done soon. It is my understanding that a CLIR contribution in the near future will be a paper by Paul Courant; this should be just the beginning. The library community can and should be an important contributor to these burgeoning activities.

2. We propose a focused and limited effort to "take the temperature" in a handful of emerging interdisciplinary fields, chosen to help assess how well libraries today are serving the actual needs of these working scholars. The effort will look beyond self-reported ideas about the library to determine actual practices – to avoid the problem that arises when scholars swear their love for and fealty to libraries, while Googling their way to Wikipedia and other new information sources. (See Appendix C.1 for description.)

B. Library Operations in Support of an E-Environment. The library "back room" is an area where traditional infrastructure and cyberinfrastructure begin to merge. How can the functions of traditional librarianship that support acquisition, cataloging, and tracking of materials be made more productive and less costly by the innovative adaptation of information technology? A number of research libraries are struggling with organizational changes and reallocations that must be made as a result of moving content functions very quickly and substantially into the electronic environment. Yale is typical here: e-expenditures are now $5M (some 25-30%) of general library budgets. The central staff to manage and support identification, activation, licensing, ERM, budgeting, and so on, to say nothing of identifying and providing access to many new types of e-resources, have numbered less than three for several years, even as the e-resource uptake for traditional and new-type content has increased by an order of magnitude. Few in our "traditional" technical services areas are committed to re-allocation of resources to meet the new needs. How can ARL-sized libraries make the same transition to electronic in their "back room"
operations that readers have made in their reading and study practices? Is there a way to eliminate some redundancies across libraries?

**Action Item:**

Susan Perry's CLIR program has facilitated studies on this topic in three small college consortia (these have led to interesting outcomes such as work consolidations among institutions), and CLIR should now expand that work by examining the operations of larger libraries. Some interested library staff willing to work on this topic have been identified. In addition to improving and assuring user support, the exploration will be committed to the goal of identifying economically and efficiently run organizational structures.

C. **Expert Committee Studies.** From the broad-ranging conversations described above, three large studies of wide interest have been identified. CLIR has previously created several such study groups, reminiscent of National Academy of Sciences expert studies (though without the price tag!). Each will require staff facilitation and writing support.

**Action Items:**

1. Examine the issues related to scholarly monographic publication: trends, impacts on scholars and libraries. Report findings to the wider academic community. Work with organizations who are doing or have done work on related topics (research team at UC Center for Studies in Higher Education, MLA, AAUP). There is a widespread assumption that the scholarly monograph is "in crisis": can this assumption be quantified, verified, or nuanced? (See Appendix C.2 for description)

2. Study, with appropriate publishers and scholars, today's move towards an e-only environment, particularly for scholarly journals. What issues are raised? How and when will they be resolved? Is it possible to develop experiments to test this shift and help it to happen in a more rather than less orderly way? (See Appendix C.3 for description.)

3. Legal relationships are increasingly important, particularly for libraries, venturing into many new areas as contractors, digitizers, out-sourcers, publishers, and much more. Librarians need to build close relationships with campus attorneys, and yet the sense is that the two groups often inhabit worlds in collision. Exploring the landscape, identifying vexing issues, and finding ways to resolve these will enable CLIR to make an important contribution, while partnering with a key segment of the academic community. (See Appendix C.4 for description.)

D. **Quantitative Studies.** A basket of modest but important quantitative studies has been proposed, along with another, more ambitious project that aims to measure value delivered by scholarly journals.

**Action Items:**

1. Work with CLIR board and sponsors, as well as an ALPSP group, to identify useful, data-driven studies and plan to carry out and disseminate at least one per year. (Leave the very large user-studies to other groups better positioned to carry them out at this time.) Continue to publish the results of significant studies done by legitimate
organizations such as UC Berkeley's Center for Studies in Higher Education, Ithaka). (See Appendix C.5 for ideas that have been proposed.)

(2) Conduct a study of the perception of money flow vs. value received in the scholarly publishing economy. There is significant disagreement on the part of publishers, scholars, and librarians about how much value is added during the publishing process. This proposal (by an SCC member who publishes hundreds of society journals) aims to explore perceptions about value-adding, to learn what each stakeholder thinks about the others' contributions; to establish the resources necessary to procure the value-added, and to generate a framework for further studies about the cost-benefits of published journal scholarship. (See Appendix C.6 for description.)

E. In-house or single-source projects.

Action Items:

(1) Pursue, probably via outsourcing, a significant revision and expansion to the original CLIR/DLF-funded LIBLICENSE project, including not only updating of licensing software and bibliographies, but also an extensive new section about "licensing out" of library content with the commercial (for-profit and not-for-profit) sectors. (See Appendix C.7 for description.)

(2) Contract and fund the assessment and upgrade and determine the future of the long-lived NewJour alerting project and service. (See Appendix C.8 for description)

(3) Consider establishing a "CLIRinghouse" project and Web site to document current initiatives of professional groups, societies, academic institutions, and others, in the area of scholarly communication. Document, in particular, success stories that could help scholars to consider new ways of working and learned societies to move from print to electronic publishing. (See Appendix C.9 for description.)

Additional Ideas Suggested by SCC Members and Advisors (no specific projects recommended at this time)

A. Institute. The SCC has also suggested that CLIR might track models of scholarly publishing that fall somewhere between the extremes of "fully OA" and "fully closed and costly," or, alternatively, convene a high-level, inter-institutional meeting similar to the earlier Scholarly Communication Institute (SCI), this time involving progressive types at high administrative levels (vice provosts or provosts), and including the press, library, and IT worlds. It has been suggested that convening the right type and level of individuals could increase understanding of deep-rooted SC issues and shift some of the ownership of the problem from libraries to their institutions. Such an institute might also allow for brainstorming about new communication models and how to employ them systematically and to support them – again, thinking cross-institutionally. The aim: to awaken more interest concerning growing problems in our scholarly communication and publication apparatuses, considering the problems as institutional ones and making some attempt to solve them through cross-institutional efforts. This idea could be further explored within the SCC; if it is to proceed, let alone succeed, the concept needs much more development.

B. More about user behaviors and needs. Rick Luce, director of the Los Alamos National Laboratory Library, described to me his library's initiatives in usage analysis. He noted that few organizations are analyzing their logs and usage data in sophisticated significant ways, and that
this is a lost opportunity. The work done at Los Alamos combines user surveys, log and usage analysis (as a surrogate for behaviors vs. what users say they want or like) with bibliometrics to understand areas of high interest, better describe "social networks" of users, develop tools, focus services more directly, and inform decision-making. If it were possible for the LANL staff to document their approach and perhaps provide a set of tools for other libraries to do similar analysis, it would be an invaluable service. This group is planning a conference in September about the convergence between bibliometrics and user dimensions and they are already in some stage of developing a proposal to the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, once LANL bureaucratic issues are worked out. CLIR might be helpful in supporting this event and in pursuing the "tool set" idea.

******

Comments on any part of the contents of this memo and attached brief proposals are most welcome. Thank you.
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APPENDIX B

CLIR Scholarly Communications Committee
Meeting of 11 January 2006
Washington, DC
10 a.m. – 3 p.m.

Present: Martha Brogan, Consultant; Nancy Davenport, CLIR; Laura DeBonis, Google; Lolly Gasaway, UNC; Georgia Harper, University of Texas; Ann Okerson, CLIR; Roger Schonfeld, Ithaka; Katherine Skinner, Emory; Gordon Tibbitts, Blackwell's; Diane Parr Walker, UVa.

By Conference Call: Ray English, Oberlin College; Eugene Wiemers, Bates College.

Regrets: Chuck Henry, Rice; Steven Nichols, Johns Hopkins; Will Thomas, Nebraska.

I. Introductions all around.

II. Nancy Davenport opened the meeting, thanking all for coming. This group is important to future of CLIR. CLIR's Board has established a strategic plan with four thematic areas, which blend together well. She described briefly each of the four:

A. Place as Library (follows on from early priority of Library as Place).
B. Preservation: the whole range of activities including shared print repositories.
C. Training Future Leaders: she is still thinking about ways to conceptualize this program.
D. Scholarly Communications: the CLIR board represents all elements of the community; SC issues are paramount.

The role of this group for the next couple of years is to help CLIR think about SC issues and how CLIR can work with others to commission the kind of research, publishing, or other appropriate programs that will help the community. CLIR wants to be a catalyst as well. CLIR sits between several intersecting interest groups, a unique position to have. CLIR will use the work of this and the other committees to develop future grant proposals to Mellon and other organizations, particularly a 3-year grant proposal due to the AWMF this summer.

At this time, Nancy is taking on the topics of "Place as Library" and "Leadership." Ann is taking on "Scholarly Communications" and "Preservation." Susan Perry will be retiring this June. She has been working with liberal arts colleges and CLIR members' CIOs. Her replacement may take on some of the portfolios above.

The SC and other committees are accountable to Nancy, who in turn delivers reports to the Executive Committee. This group meets six-weekly by phone and twice a year as part of the CLIR Board.

III. Brainstorming. Ann led the Committee through several rounds of brainstorming on the following topics to get a sense of key issues and convergence:

A. Hot Topics in SC [See Appendix A for detailed listing].
B. Projects, Organizations, People I most admire, which I had nothing to do with [See Appendix B for details].

C. “If I won the Powerball” [See below].

IV. Hot Topics. The categories of hot topics that were named include: Access, Economics, Education, Intellectual Property, Stakeholder Futures, Technology, and Users/Usage. In a later exercise, each member was asked to assign 3 votes to his or her most important topic areas. The votes, in order of priority from lowest to highest, were:

1. Future of print (paperlessness)
   Creating Centers of Excellence, i.e., centralized services to eliminate redundancy, particularly in libraries
   Developing "success stories" (about positive effects of technology)

2 – Access to scholarship
   Long term permanence and sustainability
   Google effects

3 – Usage (and all its ramifications)
   Organizational leadership to carry out ambitious agendas
   Preservation of scholarly works in all media

4 – Educating faculty about SC issues

5 – Economy of Scholarly publishing

V. Admired Projects, People, Organizations. The group did not spend much time looking for common themes across these groupings, except to say that nearly all involved elements of personal risk, surprise, and vision. A high proportion were launched because of the dream of an individual or individuals, rather than any “group think.” Spotting a new issue and potential trend, deciding to act on it, and taking the right action is tricky. Could an organization such as CLIR have paved the way, through any of its meetings or activities, for any of these initiatives?

VI. “If I won the Powerball” – and could spend the time and money making a strategic difference to an aspect of scholarly communications – what would I do?

Laura Gasaway would change copyright law to make it clearer; specifically mentioned were orphaned works, the De Bono copyright extension, digital copying, a broader public domain. How would one make such a change? Through targeted political donations; far more extensive lobbying on Capitol Hill – we do not have the budgets that industry does. Has Google opened a congressional lobbying effort and can we participate?

Georgia Harper spoke of the “MacArthur model,” i.e., buying out the time of energetic people. She would use a year of funds to live in France and study copyright issues: what has copyright law done in other countries? The US law is becoming more like European copyright law; we need to understand why. Globalization was discussed; the law is becoming more and homogeneous or interoperable. Why France? It is the model for all of European copyright law; much more author and natural rights oriented.

Ray English noted that SC issues are very intertwined and very complicated. $9M from Gordon Moore launched PLoS. How could CLIR organize a high profile conference of parties from
different constituencies to think about and develop strategies? Martha Brogan observed that many important problems do not require more money to be solved, but rather a coordination of agendas among top stakeholders, funders.

Gordon Tibbetts opined that we have to “put some relief into the system” with its many commercial entities, interests, governments. To pull back the tide, we need to have a free space with good ideas and good thinking and agree on principles. A think tank is a place to talk and share. In the software industry, there is a lot more collaboration than one might think. In a non-profit library space, everyone is coming out with different standards and approaches. There should be incentives to follow standards.

Roger Schonfeld would buy out Elsevier Science. Are there equivalent actions that could be taken? What would we do if we bought such a large publisher? Would one lose the existing relationships, i.e., would its authors and editors move elsewhere? Or, Roger might partner with mass digitization projects to be sure that there are sustainable copies in perpetuity. The history of book survivability in the last 150 years is a challenging topic: why have some survived and others not?

Ann Okerson would consolidate the management of many smaller libraries into larger, more efficient organizations. Currently there is a lot of redundancy in library back room operations. Martha asked what would that new organization look like? She referred to the concept of “Centers of excellence to mitigate against redundancy. Some suggested that there is little reward for being efficient. Ann disagreed and said that the reward for efficiency is to be able to take on the many new digital opportunities and meet the new needs of library users.

Martha Brogan added that few librarians and scholars understand business models very well and we need that additional training. How about starting a Web site dedicated to tracking business models, collaborative plans, contracts, charting what is available? She suggested that CLIR could form institutes, create learning centers people can go to, and provide fellowships for time off to take courses.

Diane Parr Walker would digitize many of the items that aren't being done by Google. We in libraries are chugging away very slowly at the digital realm. Studies show that only 2% of current college students begin their research in the library.

VII. Roger Schonfeld gave a brief report about the research initiatives being undertaken at Ithaka, which include:

A. A systemwide view of library collections was undertaken with OCLC. Of 32M published books in WorldCat, 82% were published since 1923. Overlap is not as great as expected.

B. Roger, with collaborators, conducted an extensive study of the non-subscription costs of periodicals, including operating costs, capital costs. The group was trying to understand whether transition from print to electronic would be cost-neutral. Study found significant cost reductions in moving to electronic. There is a loss of economies of scale in such a conversion: i.e., as an institution reduces print, unit costs go up. At what point doesn't it make sense to keep print?
C. Ithaka commissioned a study of publishers’ incentives to move away from print or to continue print. Will small publishers be left behind? This is a real worry, as they don’t have the resources to invest in technology and conversion.

D. Another emphasis is users and faculty and the huge differences between disciplines. Libraries could serve users better by considering carefully what users most need and differentiate services.

E. Roger has visited 7 liberal arts college to analyze success factors in the use of digital images. Cooperation between libraries and IT is critical; there are implications for organizational structures. Needs can be very different among different schools.

F. Ongoing are explorations of issues related to transitions away from print, such as preservation, ownership.

G. What will be the impacts of mass digitization?

H. Big studies planned or underway:

* Fall – another big survey of faculty – 45K mailing.

* A lot of similar questions as before; some of the same ones.

* Also a survey of academic libraries – directors of collections – at that level.

* A study of how rates of citation might be changing as a result of online availability. Likely to study only subscription based titles so as to weed out the OA factor. Will study disciplinary differences – digitization more impact in some disciplines than others. This will be an expensive study – will control for self-archiving so as to take out the noise.

* Paper repository study of UC. How do such repositories work, what kind of collaboration is necessary?

* History of book survivability over time; what is it that informs the values of materials over time.

VIII. What might CLIR contribute to any of the areas discussed today?

A. Find ways to share information better than has been done so far, the lessons we have learned from Ithaka, Portico, Aluka, Nitle. Inform the community.

B. ARL & ACRL will be conducting a scholarly communications institute this summer: the idea is to have participants work on campus plans for addressing scholarly communications issues. Could CLIR do something like this? Diane observed that CLIR did something very much along these lines, and U of Virginia will be continuing the activity this summer and onward. The event will bring together teams of faculty, university librarians, administrators, scholars (junior?) to influence institutional priorities and funding. There will be different themes for different institutes.
C. CLIR can emphasize working with faculty on editorial boards, pushing change, encouraging self-archiving, control of copyright. (Is this the SPARC agenda?)

D. Work with ACRL. It wished to foster research on some SC issues but couldn't do it due to funding constraints. Developed some possible research agenda topics such as documenting in a much better way what has been happening to access to scholarly resources across a broad range of institutions; purchase rates, etc. This research agenda is on the ACRL web site. The broad theme is a better handle on access to scholarly resources across range of institutions.

E. What about a study of the effects of self-archiving? Might CLIR commission an independent study about how academic libraries would approach canceling decisions if author self-archiving moves forward more broadly? (There is currently such an ALPSP study underway; could this be different?)

F. Could CLIR study the copyright issue with respect to authors ceasing to give their copyrights to societies so societies can sustain themselves. If authors take away that right, they could be shooting themselves in the foot. How about the downstream effects on publishing of the CURES bill (one provision is that all HHS reports could be made accessible). This is an emerging issue. Develop a research methodology.

G. Can we avoid extremes? Advocates suggest that we must move to OA or legislated solutions; others that we should stay with the current journal publishing models. What kind of attention could we pay to alternative models? What types of things could we be exploring? Probably there are about a dozen business models that haven't been tried and might be able to work. The author pays models out there are currently heavily subsidized, so they are not truly author-pays.

H. How are libraries exercising leadership in scholarly communication? Positioning themselves? Re-structuring? Societies are going thru the same thing. How much conversation there is there between publishers and libraries? What and where?

I. Can we get a better understanding of what's going on with tenure; what's going on with university press lists, to what extent have they been cut back, changed, etc. Can we get a better handle on this? More data are needed. Is there a research study in this topic? Is there a Mellon study on the endangered monograph?

J. Different models were proposed for CLIR’s work:

* Develop a project and hand it off or outsource it
* National Academy type study
* Commission a quantitative study of some sort

K. How to proceed?

* Gordon – will send Ann a diagram related to business models.
* MLA just came out with something – huge survey about tenure; send Ann a copy.
* Endangered monograph: look at Mellon study and consider next steps. Should we actively support university presses, do they phase out? Have we passed the
tipping point so the new issue is: what is the new way in which we will disseminate this kind of publication?

Ann will distribute the minutes; seek further advice through phone calls. Will report back to the group. Meeting adjourned at 3 p.m.
APPENDIX A: Domains

★★ on the following slides show the number of votes SC members assigned to a given topic during the "dot" exercise. An absence of stars indicates the item received no votes i.e., dots.
ACCESS

- ★★Access to scholarship
- Access to non-specialists, a lot of inner circles; huge amount of info
- Author self-archiving
- Open Access
- Federal policy for federally funded research
- Distribution of federal research dollars to institutions – not even handed

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY

- Intellectual property – using and protecting the rights of those who are doing it (restrictions on use, author control, etc.)
- Licensing and restrictive licensing terms affect access & all kinds of things
USERS

☐ Respecting differences in the disciplines
☐ How do we present different experiences to different users, levels of knowledge
☐ Which disciplines need print (which disciplines need which media)?
☐ ★★★ Usage, with all its ramifications: data, who/what/how
☐ Multimedia and scholarship – how do we conduct and integrate it?
☐ What is the place in scholarly communications of new forms such as blogs, wikipedias
☐ Courseware and course products, e-learning
☐ Centers for digital scholarships; bridges between arts & sciences – interdisciplinarity

ECONOMICS (1)

☐ ★★★★★ Economy of scholarly publishing, money flow – how to fund "stuff"
☐ of e-publishing
☐ ★★Long-term permanence for scholarly projects ; sustaining digital scholarship
☐ University press publishing needs support; humanities monographs (is the monograph really endangered?)
☐ Fate of small journals – no migration path to electronic, e.g.
☐ Fate of small projects
☐ ★Future of print, paperlesness
Economics (2)

- Pricing (as opposed to cost) - can pricing be sustained? - the demand side.
- Little brand new (disciplinary, interdisciplinary) society wants to bring new discipline into the market - but not well resourced
- ✨Creating Centers of Excellence and how that might address other problems; centralized services are offered so that one doesn't need to replicate
- Which disciplines have not received or developed e-resources at the same level as others and do we have responsibilities for those.

EDUCATION

- ✨✨✨✨How many faculty don't understand the issues in this area; role that a library plays re. keeping them in the dark; shielding them from making better choices
- Make sure that we empower local campuses to educate faculty; we can't just talk to each other
- ✨★★University as a whole not interested in SC, which is not a library problem (scholarly publishing, models of payment, etc.)
STAKEHOLDER FUTURES

- Developing success stories; system of peer advocacy for benefit of taking department run print journal into the online world
- Marketing of projects
- Organizational structure of the library community – partnerships & collaborations
- What has worked, what hasn't, how to do entrepreneurship
- ★★★ Organizational leadership to carry all this out

TECHNOLOGY

- ★Google, Google Print
- Cyberinfrastructure – architecture & infrastructure for how to manage all this digital information and its integration with non-digital
- Search and discovery systems for federated searching
- Metadata
- Standards; very confusing when trying to do searching
- ★★★ Preservation of scholarly works, analog, digital, multimedia
APPENDIX B:  Admirations

ADMIRED ORGANIZATIONS

- Granting agencies spending money on thinking about these issues; lots of zealots.
- University of Nebraska - money & effort behind SC
- University of Virginia, atmosphere of innovation
- UK, for parliamentary inquiry, coming to terms as a nation with issues of scholarly publishing, moving towards a national policy
- MIT - launching Dspace, Open Courseware
- CRL - developing a low-use, cooperative mission
- Gates Foundation work - small rural public libraries and schools
- LC in dealing with orphaned works issue
ADMIRED PEOPLE

- HighWire at Stanford for building a cooperative journals community (Michael Keller et al)
- arXiv for e-prints (Paul Ginsparg)
- Michael Grossberg, ed. American Historical Review, brainstormed the history cooperative
- eIFL (George Soros et al)
- Brewster Kahle: Internet Archive & Open Content Alliance
- OAI, Open URL protocols for enabling access & interoperability (Carl Lagoze, Herbert von de Sompel)

ADMIRED PROJECTS

- Google developments
- JSTOR, in its notion that you can pull together a field
- Open WorldCat, leveraging the work of the library community
- PubMed and NIH
- HINARI, AGORA, OARE – delivery of quality information to developing countries
- SPARC for advocacy
- PloS for marketing a new kind of journal financial support model
- Public Knowledge Project (based at UBC), open source and process model developers
- LOCKSS and Portico for e-preservation emergent solutions to preservation
APPENDIX C. 1

CLIR 1 – Are You Being Served?

The "old" service model for libraries is clear. Scholars and scientists need books and journals, so the library buys them and helps the students and academics use them. But the emergence of new technologies and of new disciplines (to say nothing of interdisciplinary combinations) suggests that it is timely to ask a fresh question about the value libraries offer.

This project would select a small, representative set of emerging disciplines and well-defined interdisciplinary areas of research and explore how libraries do and might better serve the needs of scholars in those fields well. One part of this would be a relatively empirical study of current patterns of acquisitions, holdings, and services, as far as possible identifying specific resources and services libraries have been able to provide in these areas.

A second part would engage focus groups with both researchers and librarians in the room at the same time under well-informed (about the subject matter) facilitation. The goal would be to explore and identify ways in which library functions (acquiring, organizing, and facilitating access) can be adapted and adopted to new disciplines and new kinds and formats of materials. We would particularly be looking for new non-traditional materials and discussing with researchers the right form of housing and management with a university. What is the audience for information in a new discipline? When does the library see its emergence? When does it make sense for a researcher to buy her own access to a database, and when does it become more appropriate for the University library to do so? Perhaps more urgent than those questions is the question how the library knows when there are resources being acquired in specialty labs and local offices that could and should be of wider interest and use in the institution and could effectively be provided and supplied centrally. Budgetary reality may help here – researchers may or may not be inclined to ask the library to buy things for them – but getting a clear objective picture of what actually goes on in a representative set of fields could inform practice for libraries generally and lead to other area-by-area studies.

A way of making this study manageable would be to choose 2-3 emerging fields in perhaps the social sciences, which are sometimes neglected in library examinations.

Who: The key to this study will be to identify an experienced, inquisitive, analytical librarian-researcher with strong scholarly interests and faculty connections and gain the support of his or her institution. (Yes, we do have someone in mind who would be perfect and would relish this challenge!)

Duration: Approximately 12 months, start to finish.

Dissemination: Depending on length of report: journal articles, conference presentations, CLIR monograph.

Cost: TBD; Some release, research time and 1-2 small on-site meetings.
APPENDIX C. 2

CLIR 2 - The Scholarly Monograph, University Presses

There is a broad general awareness, reinforced by frequent specific assertions by well-known people, that the scholarly monograph, and in particular the scholarly monograph published by the American university press, is in "crisis." But there is no serious quantitative information to corroborate or confute this claim. Indeed, some numbers (aggregate numbers of titles published by university presses) seem to be on the rise, while there is also a strong sense that sales-per-title are off and a corroborating line of anxiety that holds that the 'specialized monograph' is having trouble getting published and junior scholars risk loss of tenure thereby, while books of more general interest are being sought out eagerly and almost exclusively by even the most academic publishers. Hypotheses, in short, abound.

We propose a project comprising a series of linked studies designed to create a more objective basis for discussion of policy issues among academics, publishers, and librarians by studying the output of AAUP members. Peter Givler, Executive Director of the AAUP, has described an AAUP project funded by the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation perhaps five years ago, wherein the AAUP, working with a consultant team, intended to develop the kind of study we propose below. He reported that the effort failed and part of the money was returned to the Foundation. He has explained the methodology that was pursued at the time (using data from Yankee Book Peddler) and believes that the study encountered several problems that might be avoidable in a next round. Should CLIR want to work on such a study this time around, the AAUP would be pleased to offer its prior experience and advice to develop a better way and to achieve success. We discussed briefly whether vendor or OCLC data would be the better avenue.

Questions to explore rigorously include:

1. How many scholarly books are being published, in which disciplines, by which presses? Track the product of specific presses by subject over time. 10 years? 15 years?

2. What is the universe of publishers that academics use for the publications that other academics respect and where do the university presses fit in? (One diagnostic approach could be to assemble lists of books awarded major prizes by learned societies over the last 25 years, then track the names and distribution of publishers.)

3. How many presses to study? Attention might focus on the top quartile of presses, though it might be possible to study the entire group's output – to be determined.

4. Have the characteristics of published monographs changed? (This may require soft, qualitative study at the outset, but could lead then to more analytical measurement of a subset.)

5. Are there different fact patterns for different disciplines? (A series of litmus test studies across a broad selection of disciplines, to be followed by closer study of a few chosen then as representative.)
6. Are junior scholars having trouble getting monographs published in a way that has changed over time? (This would presumably require us to identify objective trends first and narrow down to disciplines in which there is reason to believe that constraint has operated, perhaps controlled by study in one or two fields in which the publisher/library data suggest that there is either no new constraint or even outright growth.)

7. At this point, it might make sense to turn to a study of library monograph budgets and purchases. Traditional numbers (the famous ARL graph) depend on undifferentiated aggregation. Could we identify a set of publishers and a definition of monograph (even to the title level?) and track holdings/acquisition over a period of years?

Who: CLIR, partnership with AAUP and data provider such as OCLC or a major vendor. Engage a consultant for numerical analysis. Convene a small steering group to analyze results.

Duration: 1 – 2 years.

Cautions: Given the problems with the AAUP study, it is critical that the right partner(s) be identified and qualified. Several individuals have suggested that this topic is more complicated than it appears on the surface. AWMF is currently funding two studies in this area (one examining several disciplines within UC system and another much more focused study in Art History. CLIR will want to learn about these studies and what work may have been done in other fields. Further "homework" is required before proceeding with this topic.

Dissemination: CLIR monograph, conference presentations for AAUP and others; articles in appropriately placed outlets.

Cost: TBD
APPENDIX C. 3

CLIR 3 - The future of print journals

Everyone knows that many if not all learned journals will cease printing and distributing paper copies of their product at some date in our lifetimes. The stars are lined up for exactly this to happen. Research libraries are canceling print, particularly – though not exclusively – in STM fields, because studies show that, given the choice, readers prefer the e-version, at times by a factor of 100 to 1, and because libraries wish to reap the considerable labor savings of not handling print journals from selection to shelf. Elsevier's just-released annual report noted that already 40% of its contracts are e-only. Publishers are now stating that the landslide to e-only is happening more rapidly than they expected. Indeed, one of the resolutions from the Cornell Janus Conference of October 2006 was that libraries should stop buying in print any Western-published titles that are available electronically.

When will the day come on which publishers will stop producing print journals? This is unclear and ambiguous. In spite of strong evidence of what users read, every stakeholder in the chain is afraid of taking the steps that lead to such a future. Publishers fear they will disaffect their library customers or their academic contributors. Libraries fear that they will disaffect their faculty and that a crisis in preservation and price will ensue. Academics fear that the reliable markers of academic success and the reliable tools of academic inquiry will be broken by techno-zealotry. What will happen, when, and how to move forward with more certainty for libraries, publishers, and their readers?

We propose a sequence of inquiries and discussions designed to support more rational and less fearful discussion and to encourage responsible cost-effective behavior.

First, we imagine a small working group that gathers information and identifies critical issues.

1. What is actually happening? What libraries are canceling paper? What publishers are offering paperless? What effects are being seen? There are presumably disciplinary differences: what are those?

2. Can one measure in advance the cost benefits of canceling print cross disciplines? (Humanities journals, for example, are still heavily paper-dependent: could one leave them be at minimal cost? Should one focus in other areas? Which ones? Do we confine ourselves to STM publications? Western publishers? Learned societies?)

3. What are the real preservation issues? How far advanced are we in fact in assuring survival of and access to electronic journals? What progress can be anticipated in what time frame?

4. Can we model a sequence of steps by which progress could happen? Who moves first? Publishers to assure preservation? Libraries to measure usage carefully and discontinue discreetly those paper issues that are going untouched? Some subset of libraries taking a leadership position? A flagship learned society getting support to do a large-scale experiment? A report of this kind could suggest two or three such models. Are there practical experiments that could be proposed and conducted?
With an advance working group flagging issues and providing a draft report and body of data, we then propose assembling a working group of scholars and librarians on the model of the "fate of the artifact" commission chaired by now CLIR board member Steve Nichols some years ago. This group will assess the gathered information and facilitate discussions with a wider group of stakeholders. It will produce a report, based on both the data and the stakeholder conversations, that models a more rational and progressive form of discussion of these issues.

It must be emphasized that the goal is both to advance knowledge and to dispel fear, or rather to replace undifferentiated fear with rational anticipation of negative consequences and a plan for addressing those. This cannot be only an expert study, but needs stakeholder participation, buy-in, and consequent publicity for a short report meant to be widely read and discussed.

Who: CLIR, partnership with publisher groups (perhaps AAP, ALPSP, ACLS?). Staffer or consultant to solicit data from publisher groups and libraries regarding cancellation of print. Study group to discuss and interpret, develop findings and recommendations.

Duration: 18 months; six months for data gathering; one year for convening meetings. Needs strong staff work at CLIR.

Dissemination: CLIR monograph, conference presentations for partner groups and others; articles in appropriately placed outlets.

Cost: TBD
APPENDIX C. 4

CLIR 4 – Legal Relationships

What general counsel needs to know about the library and what the library needs to know about general counsel

"The first thing we do, let's kill all the lawyers" (2 Henry VI 4.2)

Whatever one may think of the Shakespearean strategic plan for dealing with the contentious relationship between leaders in society and their men of law, one has to admit that it has so far been an abject and complete failure: there are more lawyers per capita by several orders of magnitude than ever there were in Shakespeare's time. Assuming that selective violence is not the solution to a library's challenges in addressing legal questions, how might a library organization best support librarians who work in myriad institutions, often smaller and less well resourced, in dealing effectively with legal questions that arise? It is impracticable to offer a national contract for legal counsel, and even impracticable to think of a legal aid clinic for librarians (though such a thing might be an interesting part of a project such as this), but it is surely possible to advance the discussion in a way that makes librarians better and more helpful customers for the legal staff on their campus by providing good quality information about critical issues. A few larger libraries are hiring their own attorneys: that is an important development and worth of examination, but it only emphasizes the need for a clearer definition of what libraries need and especially what can be done for those libraries who can't afford their own attorneys.

The risks we now regularly incur include: (1) delays because the lawyers are busy; (2) incomplete or misinformation because the lawyers are not specialists in our emerging and complex issues; (3) timidity and failure to exercise legal prerogatives because in the absence of authoritative and timely information, excessive caution is the natural order of the day.

We propose therefore a project in three or four discrete stages: (1) development of a base of issues and information about them, (2) facilitated stakeholder discussion, (3) refinement of (1) in light of (2) and, if necessary, and then (4) final stakeholder discussion and ratification of a report.

A first stage would be to identify the key open and emerging issues and surround them with high quality information. For that stage, we imagine a small team of librarians and lawyers, supplemented by some "worker bees" doing the information gathering. Issues more or less certain to arise would include:

1. Library as customer: Contracts with publishers for electronic anything need to be vetted by legal and possibly by the purchasing department.
   a. of what? journals? other e-products? if traditional e-products are becoming more stable, are there emerging products we don't yet know how to buy?

2. Library as user/producer:
   a. e-reserves
   b. digitization projects
   c. mounting things on web – librarian as publisher
d. institutional repository
e. selling/licensing your own IP to others

3. Library as partner:
   a. e.g., digitization projects with individuals, small NFP organizations, large NFP organizations, and commercial entities (from Cambodia Genocide to Shoah to Time/Life Books)

4. Issues of our time:
   a. OFAC issues – when do we run the risk of running afoul of the law in international partnerships?
   b. Patriot Act issues: granted the difficulty in finding out what is going on, is there a value to best practice guidelines?
   c. DMCA – how to handle
   d. Orphan works – what now?

5. Explore with university lawyers what their concerns are about libraries and what could be done to improve their comfort.

Who: CLIR, partnership with association of university attorneys. Brief survey to solicit issues of mutual vexation (I've just posted a question about this on the liblicense-l list and the replies are pouring in; need a comparable venue for the attorneys.) Study group to discuss and interpret, develop findings and recommendations.

Duration: 9 months? Needs strong staff work at CLIR.

Dissemination: CLIR monograph, conference presentations for AUTM (?) and others; articles in appropriately placed outlets.

Cost: TBD

NOTE: Seek counsel and support from Georgia Harper, member of CLIR SCC and Copyright Counsel for the University of Texas system.
APPENDIX C. 5

CLIR 5 – Counting Noses, Counting Uses

The Scholarly Communications Committee determined that understanding users and usage is a key priority for the interested community. There is a substantial body of experience in user studies and usage studies already. This is an important but difficult area, with lots of room for useful work, along with a great need for thoughtful definition in order to achieve useful, applicable results.

1. The meaningful user studies, studies of user behavior and interests, often need to be (in order to be meaningful) quite large, with decent-sized samplings. Some of the successful studies that have been done of this sort have been by the CIBER group in the UK, the eJUSt study managed by Stanford (of science users' behaviors -- partnered with the Institute for Future), and also a large JSTOR user study. These big studies are, if well-done, expensive and it becomes difficult to translate them into meaningful information for a specific local user environment. A large, effective, really high quality user study is probably not within CLIR's scope of feasibility.

2. Usage studies, on the other hand, come from the data logs that an institution keeps or from publishers' statistics about their product. They can produce very large quantities of data, enough to be daunting. Accordingly, not many people are doing usage studies across institutions (exception are groups like OhioLink, which control their own content), because what emerges from an institution's own data, from its publishers, and from its own log sites is complicated to interpret. Worse yet, the data sets are often incompatible across different publishers (although the COUNTER project in the UK is helping us to standardize some usage data from participating publishers). For an institution like CLIR, moreover, that is not itself a subscriber and has no "native" usage data, any study would require significant partnerships with other institutions in order to obtain basic data.

Thus, a significant usage study is probably also beyond CLIR's scope, but we here identify some ideas which have been presented enthusiastically and can offer meaningful analysis and information.

I. Economics of Information – author fees.

What it is possible to do and realistic for CLIR to take on is to look at the economics of information, commissioning some modest studies in the domain of usage that answer some interesting questions. For example, what can we learn about charges to authors who publish in Open Access journals? There is a fair amount of debate and discussion on the topic and various opinions expressed about whether authors will pay $500 or $1000 or more – much disagreement and few hard data points. Oxford University Press is charging $1500/article for publication in Nucleic Acids Research (but library subscriptions subsidize the payment), while Springer Open Choice is charging authors $3000 for an open access article; here the takers are few.

Phil Davis of Cornell (with whom we would work on such a project) has intriguingly described the current development of BioMed Central as an evolving natural experiment waiting for its observer. BMC now publishes over 150 journals and has moved from a flat membership fee this
year to a tiered structure of pricing. BMC used to charge to a big library about $4500-5000/year, and the libraries constituent authors could then publish as many articles as they wanted to for that price. BMC found that model unsustainable and so has moved to this set of choices:

1. Library or institution pays all: BMC estimates how many authors are going to publish how much in a year from a given institution, as well as the mix of journals (some more and some less expensive) and sets a price for the year, then allowing unlimited publishing access, effectively free to the authors, but far from free to the institution (and with some adjustment in the next year if the estimate proves to be far off in any direction).

2. Mix of payment: Member institution makes a fee payment at a lower level, and its authors can publish at a consequent discount.

3. Authors pay all: no institutional payment; price to authors covers all costs.

The proposal is to explore the three categories and find out how this type of differential pricing affects incentives for authorship, in order to develop a price-demand curve which will answer an overall question: an estimate of what authors are willing to pay to publish. It would then be possible to look at differentiation by impact factor, prestige of journal, and possibly calculate a model to predict what a "traditional" STM journal publisher going to OA can charge authors for their existing journals in different tiers of importance.

Further studies could look at the question of citation impact and economic impact for OA and IR-published articles. Does making articles freely available affect citations? Does it affect publishers' downloads and revenues? The most anecdotal evidence to date paradoxically says that citations do in fact go up but revenues and hits to the publisher sites do not go down. Is this true? Will this pattern sustain itself over larger data sets?

II. Partnered Studies. Both COUNTER and ALPSP have expressed great interest in partnering with CLIR to extend and expand studies done recently in the UK.

JISC in the UK funded a project in which COUNTER usage data from 17 institutions who take the NESLi2 Big Deal were analyzed, along with prices, etc. The results were very interesting, and JISC were able to derive some useful metrics, such as Cost per Use and Cost per FTE, as well as to identify the most used, least used, etc. titles. (JISC have subsequently funded a new project to determine the feasibility of creating a central repository for usage statistics as a service to UK academic libraries.) A proposal is to conduct the first survey of usage in the USA using COUNTER-compliant statistics. This could build on the methodology developed by the JISC project. Different categories of academic library, and later perhaps non-academic libraries, could be included. Patterns of usage, cost per use, and the like could be measured. The SUSHI project might help for data gathering. This brand new protocol, supported by NISO, might facilitate the automated collection and consolidation of COUNTER usage data. The protocol is now ready; I know too little about it.

Another hot topic is the management and analysis of usage statistics and their development as a routine management tool for librarians, is a major challenge for all libraries, who would like help with this new type of activity. An approach would be to find out how various libraries now manage and take it from there.
Who: This is a small basket of projects. Phil Davis, who is an excellent data analyst and thinker, should be contracted for the author cost study. The possibility of a partnership with COUNTER and ALPSP deserves exploration, as well as potentially a cost-sharing project.

Duration: Various projects to be accomplished over a 2-3 year period.
APPENDIX C. 6

CLIR 6 - Adding Value in E-Journal Publishing

Following the Money – Notes for the CLIR team
Gordon Tibbetts - March 26, 2006

Discussions of the economics of scholarly publishing too often remain at an impressionistic level, in which information is often used as a weapon rather than as a tool. High prices are a self-evident problem, though there is no agreement on the identity of the problem revealed. A more sophisticated understanding of the value propositions for stakeholders in the process would lead to better analytical discussion of specific choices for all concerned.

We assume that the publisher as manufacturer/vendor stands at one end of a process and society as a whole at the other. In between are the key stakeholders identified by their role in producing content for the publishers (authors deriving benefit from doing so) and in acquiring content (libraries, with a different value proposition). Complicating the scenario is the double role of institutions that produce and consume journal information (and the institutional budgeting that separates the producing arm of the institution from the consuming arm in all financial analyses), and the double nature of the institutional customers for the information (not for profits with more abstract assessment of the value received and for profits with very clear ability to measure areas of benefit).

We should be trying to explore where stakeholders have misperceived the contributions by stakeholders to the scholarly publishing process (for example, improving the field, helping scholarship, helping learning, in-kind and monetary support, etc.).

An initial exercise would be to explore and develop for each stakeholder (Library, Author, Publisher, the Public, and Industry) the specific contributions each makes according to each other and allowing for a scaled response (including allowing for answers of "I don’t know" and "I don’t agree").

This foundational work would lead to a relatively easy to conceive (though perhaps difficult to implement) study of the actual money involved in the procurement of these “values.” Notice that I did not say that we needed to know the cost (both direct, indirect and opportunity) of the development of these contributions. This is because we could get widely disparate information around costs and there is already quite a bit of research concluded and underway ferreting out the costs of e and p publishing. Blinding this study might derive better results. For instance, surveyors could ask publishers to classify societies’ by gross revenue (ex. > 100K, 101-200K, 201-500K, > 500K). Surveyors could ask libraries to classify publisher contracts for subscriptions by average subscription price (ex. 0-50$, 51-100, 101-200, 201-500, > 500). Matching up the amounts transacted between stakeholders will require careful survey design. In addition to this work, stakeholders should identify what contributions they "consume."
Next a report can be created outlining the critical misperceptions. Further work can be undertaken to create a framework that describes transaction types (who receives what from whom) which can facilitate the research in this area. As a grounding principle, this framework would need to describe the transaction types regardless of who might provide these services. Too often I hear debate about eliminated one stakeholder or another only to hear that the solution is to have the very same service contributed by another (or even a new) stakeholder. Regardless of the fact or fiction of the misbehavior of stakeholders in their respective roles, I think it is unlikely that any contributions today will be eliminate in the future even with the available power of the internet.

Summary

Survey and deliver a report on the following:

Establish the various contributions by stakeholders
Learn what stakeholders think their own contributions are
Learn what stakeholders think of each others contributions
Stakeholder should identify which contributions they “consume”
Establish the amount of money spent to procure these contributions
Present the results of this analysis outlining the critical misperceptions. This analysis also can generate a framework that further studies of this economy can refer when talking about the costs and benefits of the scholarly life-cycle.
APPENDIX C. 7

CLIR 7 – Liblicense: the Next Generation

Yale's LIBLICENSE project "went live" in January 1997 with the launch of the Liblicense-l discussion list, followed shortly thereafter by the website, <http://www.library.yale.edu/~llicense>. At that moment, the importance of libraries' developing expertise in business of licensing e-resources was evident, even if the scale of the enterprise was still small. (For reference, at that point, our Yale budget for such resources was about $300K/year. Now it has grown to about $5M/year.) The moment was clearly right for providing high quality information to members of the scholarly communication community both nationally and internationally and then for bringing together a community of interested professionals to continue to explore together in the informal environment of an e-mail list the things that preoccupy us.

In the near decade since, the site and the list have flourished. The list remains a place where, despite some preoccupation with Open Access issues that tends to irritate or bore a number of readers, very smart and highly placed professionals in the library, academic, and publishing communities meet to read, think, and write about issues of importance to the present and future of scholarly communication.

The project was funded by small grants from CLIR and from the DLF and has been ambitious in scope. It provides a collection of annotated links to high-quality licensing information, an extensive annotated licensing bibliography of materials not linked, subsets of information on specific topics (most recently and interestingly, a page gathering "developing nations initiatives" – e-publishing projects that take into account the needs and financial challenges of readers in less developed countries and emerging markets). In the early years, it was particularly important that the project created a standard model license for the not for profit community (it was endorsed by the DLF and widely adapted as a standard license by many libraries and groups) and even developed basic software downloadable from the site, enabling users to craft their own license language in guided ways. Gradually, librarians were no longer simply recipients of long contracts from publishers, written to publishers' advantage, which they had either to accept or riddle with niggling queries. The sense of control has become palpable and welcome, giving to library readers a sense that they could be equal players in the discussions with publishers. The consequent reduction of anxiety and enhancement of professionalism was welcome on all sides.

The site has had wide praise, as from a DC lawyer who practices and teaches intellectual property law: "Liblicense is the leading and most widely used online resource on e-content licensing, particularly for librarians. In many ways it is the complete destination for this discipline, including a model license, glossary, bibliography, and resource lists. I use resources from this site extensively during my licensing class." Comments like this continue to arrive regularly.

The site has been relatively stable, with modest updates to a few of its branches, and the list discussion continues at a remarkably high level, with leading figures from the publishing and library worlds regularly writing for it, with many more reading it devotedly. The success and value of the site and list encourage us to propose that this project be refreshed and enhanced for users facing the next generation of issues.

We propose three parts to the upgrade:
1. In October 2005, Cornell University hosted the Janus conference, one of whose resolutions was that libraries need to be much more assertive with publishers, especially in securing certain clauses with regard to (non)confidentiality, archiving, ILL, and institutional repository permissions. CLIR has offered to the Janus group a space on the Liblicense Web site where librarians can share their most successful publisher contracts. The home page graphic needs to be redesigned in order to permit this modification.

2. On the site itself, some links need updating; the ILL project on the site, which has never realized its potential, needs to be either rethought or disappear; the bibliographies and links should be updated from 2004; and the license software, which was developed in 2000, needs to be revised and perhaps rewritten to assure its portability and usefulness forward as operating systems continue to upgrade.

3. If in 1997, the critical issue was how libraries would acquire licenses for material published by others, we see now emerging a reciprocal need, guidance for writing license contracts whereby others may have the use of library materials and property: contracts for libraries to use when publishers and others come to digitize their materials. A recent study of the business relationships between libraries and publishers in the digital environment was written for Ithaka by Peter Kaufman of Intelligent Television, in which he demonstrated that libraries and their information resources are now hot properties. Google wants to digitize, Gale, Readex and ProQuest are making deals left right and center, as are a number of smaller organizations. This is the 1970s reprint era on steroids.

We imagine a Web site resource for librarians entering into such relationships which can again guide them to make the best and most mutually beneficial arrangements for their communities, for the materials they are committed to protecting, and for the possibilities of wider access that publishers and others who come to us provide. The idea here would be also to seek licensing examples, perhaps to develop a generic framework license, and to work with an attorney in realizing that dream (and we have made preliminary contact with an attorney who may very well be the partner needed in this regard). Whether this becomes part of the existing Liblicense web site or takes on a life and site of its own remains to be determined.

Who: Ann Okerson as Project Manager; contract attorney for license development; graduate student for bibliography and link updates; programmer to revise the software.

Duration: Approximately 12 months, start to finish.

Dissemination: Updated Web site.

Cost: TBD
APPENDIX C. 8

CLIR 8 – NewJour: Documenting the Rise and Development of Electronic Journals

In 1993, in partnership with the American Mathematical Society, the Association of Research Libraries developed a current awareness listserv called NewJour for notices of new electronic journals. In those days, the total number of existing journals in electronic form was tiny, as tracked by the print directory that ARL did in those days (1991 – 1996). The e-mail list, indeed, emerged as a service between issues of the directory at the point when activity began to pick up. In late 1995, the list management followed the originator (Ann Okerson) to Yale, and a partnership with the University of Pennsylvania IT and the University of California at San Diego began. There has been low level funding, first from Penn and now from Georgetown, for "worker bee” service in maintaining this daily alerting service (newjour@ccat.sas.upenn.edu). The ARL Directory stopped publication after 1996, because it became impossible to produce a printed book, given the rapid growth of journals, and the ARL project went away.

The NewJour Web archive (http://gort.ucsd.edu/newjour) now contains 17,000 entries and the accesses to this little-sung site number in the hundreds of thousands per quarter. A modest effort is expended on updating, but there is also some concern with maintaining the historical record of the early days of e-journal publication that is contained therein. The list has been on largely autopilot for some time, but a good librarian part-time employee is maintaining that effort with intelligence and attention, and our host library at UCSD for the Website continues as well to contribute the modest services needed to keep the resource useful, including migration of data and servers as needed.

We propose a retrospective and prospective effort to assess NewJour and determine its future. A small staff project would explore the archive now in hand to construct a profile of the journals and put some analytical work into what can be learned from what is admittedly a free-form and incomplete – but large and long-lived dataset. With that in hand, we would then assemble a small advisory team to discuss the results, review the present state of the work, and make recommendations for future development. Possibilities include reinforcing or reshaping the alerting service, and also further exploration of the historical archive that has been gathered. The part-time staffer at Georgetown who now handles the data collection and management would be well-qualified to serve part-time in a supporting role on such a project for limited duration.

Who: Kurt Beske, Georgetown, guided and advised by CLIR staff.

Duration: Approximately 6 months

Dissemination: Report of findings to outlets such as D-LIB. There may be follow-on recommendations for further work.

Cost: Beske's ½ time salary?
APPENDIX C. 9

CLIR 9 – CLIR-inghouse

For more than a decade, stakeholders in the scholarly communication landscape have been undertaking initiatives designed to improve our knowledge and refine our ambitions. These efforts take place at many levels: national and international associations and professional groups, learned societies large and small, libraries, and research and academic institutions. A member of the SCC took a few moments to search out scholarly communications initiatives and discovered, for example, efforts on the part of the American Society for Engineering Education, the American Anthropological Association, and several library groups. There is often little information sharing among such projects and inevitably some considerable discrepancies in level of sophistication and awareness. Often participants in a campus or society discussion have the sense that they are present at the re-invention of the wheel.

We can imagine a project to establish a national clearinghouse to inventory, document, and track these efforts, with periodic extraction of best practices and success stories from their work. We believe that this would benefit even the best of such enterprises, but we particularly believe that it would benefit the smaller enterprises more, and the nascent but not-yet-fledged enterprises most of all. That is to say, if a small learned society is worried about its publications and about the fate of its junior scholars, it may at present be hostage to the knowledge of its officers and directors and/or the hobbyhorses of participants.

The international dimension of this benchmarking will have us look at what organizations lead and coordinate such efforts in the U.S. especially in light of more centralized systems (closer alignment of governmental and academic funding) evident in the UK, continental Europe, and Australia? LC, NARA, CNI, ACLS, NIH, AAU, AAUP as well as major funding agencies (NEH, NSF, Mellon) may have something to contribute to this discussion.

A clearinghouse effort would include initial in-house documentation of the landscape with, inevitably, some retrospective capture; and then an evaluative and organizing stage with a larger group of stakeholders participating over a brief time with a view to reviewing the direction and organization of the effort and extracting a set of success stories and best practices from what has been learned; and eventually an ongoing monitoring activity conducted by mainly by staff working at a support level, with periodic direction and supervision from a CLIR program officer.

Caveat: The CLIRinghouse idea is a perennial one and tends to emerge in brainstorming sessions such as the SCCs. It can be difficult to define the scope of such an inventory and to organize and sustain the data gathering effort. Can we find examples of successful sites of this kind in other areas of inquiry and identify characteristics for success?

Who: CLIR staff, in partnership with one or two organizational partners (think about ACLS? ARL? SSP?)? (NOTE: Is this project better for ARL's Scholarly Communication Program?)

Duration: 6 months.

Dissemination: Annotated Web site; presentations to various groups.

Cost: TBD