**Chief Collection Development Officers of Large Research Libraries**

**Minutes of the Meeting**

**Midwinter, ALA, 2010 -- 16 January 2010**

**Rose Kennedy Ballroom, III - Intercontinental Hotel**

**8:15-noon**

Thirty-two of the 40 CCDO institutions were represented at the meeting. In addition to institutional representatives, about 60 visitors attended the meeting.

CCDO Chair Ann Okerson (Yale) opened the meeting and invited the members to introduce themselves.

1. **Mandates & Compacts.** Ed Shreeves (Iowa) was first on the agenda. He invited discussion on the topic of mandates for deposit and compacts in support of OA journal initiatives. Dan Hazen (Harvard), John Saylor (Cornell), Carol Hunter (Vrginia), Bryan Skib (University of Michigan), John Ingram (Florida), Barbara List (Columbia), and Shreeves also provided brief updates on activities at their institutions. At Harvard, three particular steps are being undertaken with leadership from Stuart Shieber: (1) OA language in publishing contracts; (2) funding from Provost for fees for publishing in purely OA journals; (3) internal papers on how to "crack" the current publishing models. Harvard's efforts have been the most focused thus far. Progress is short of aspirations at all institutions. Most efforts are still very preliminary. Some institutions have attempted to implement a publishing compact for librarians, as a symbol of commitment and effort to lead others. Ann Okerson reported on the activities of the Scholarly Publishing Roundtable, which was convened under the auspices of the U.S. House Committee on Science and Technology, in collaboration with the White House Office of Science and Technology. There is obvious interest in sharing results of federally funded research more widely, but also concerns about overturning the current system of publishing too abruptly. Also the Roundtable seeks to tamp down some of the more extreme rhetoric on both sides of the issue. There is recognition that NIH efforts have been worthwhile. Other agencies should consult with their constituencies in setting and developing access standards and appropriate embargoes. More detailed information is available in Ann's email of January 12, which is pasted below as Item A.
2. **arXiv Update.** John Saylor (Cornell) reported on efforts to develop a sustainable business model for arXiv. He reviewed the background and history of arXiv and its funding sources. arXiv is currently supported by the Cornell library at approximately 400k per year. It operates on the principles of free access and submission, fairness and honesty, and community focus. The proposal is conceived of as an interim, three-year business plan, while a longer-term support system is developed. The top 200 users are asked to make voluntary annual contributions at modest levels. More detailed information is available in John's email of January 11, which is pasted below as item B. There were questions regarding the longer term plan for sustainability. An advisory group is being formed, and endowments are part of the longer term business plan. Are the societies being considered as potential funding sources? Yes. Some concern was expressed from pubic institutions about paying for resources that others get for free. There have already been examples of such things with other archives/digital projects. These concerns are not shared by all state institutions.
3. **Shared Print & TRAC Assessments.** Bernie Riley (CRL President) reported on the Shared Print Archive and on assessments (certification) of Portico and HathiTrust.

(1) Shared Print Archive: Lizanne Payne coordinated the overview of the print to digital process; explored domain based print archiving, particularly in law and agriculture; looked at data; felt there is a need for more granular data; talked to funding agencies such as Mellon, IMLS, etc; and convened a small group of provosts. Some concern was expressed about faculty opposition. Another group will be convened to develop consensus on what is doable in a three year time horizon, factoring in not only storage but also preservation.

(2) Parallel to the shared print effort, CRL conducted a preservation audit of Portico. The audit showed that Portico is a trustworthy enterprise. Some issues were raised: scope of the archive needs to expand to get to "critical mass" of journal content, although no precise definition of "critical mass" has been established; the functionality and services interface for public could be more robust; there is a need for more planning regarding future costs and risks—what happens if Portico ever goes away? And, better plans and more thought are needed for how to deal with increasingly complex e-content—not just journals and books, but other emerging forms and formats as well.

(3) CRL is also in the process of reviewing the HathiTrust, looking at adequacy of surrogates and the business model, in addition to other aspects. There will be more information on both efforts at the CRL membership meeting on April 23rd. Questions included: What other products are being reviewed? Portico was first, Hathi in the works, and CRL is also looking at Scholars Portal (Ontario). The checklist (TRAC) has been developed for the review process and for work on a larger set of analyses. Are there efforts outside the US to certify and review digital content? Yes, and they are important partners. All commented that this process has been extremely valuable for the community.

1. **The Cloud Library Project.** Dennis Massie (OCLC Research) stood in for Michael Stoller (NYU) to report briefly on the Cloud Library project with Hathi, OCLC, and ReCAP. This project is funded by the Mellon Foundation. The question being asked is something like, "How might NYU (and other institutions) make use of ReCAP and Cloud to better manage collections?" HathiTrust has digitized five million volumes in the last 15 months. There are over 70 million volumes in physical storage nationwide. Of the 2.8% of those books which are digitized and located in Hathi, only 12% are in the public domain. Seventy percent are held in a print archive, and 48% are held by fewer than 25 libraries. There are 600,000 NYU titles in Hathi, representing 38,000 linear shelves. Only 6% are in the public domain. 106,000 volumes are found in RECAP, Hathi, and NYU. A typical ARL member library might find that 20 to 40% of its print public domain collection is in Hathi. WorldCat does not identify what volumes are in storage, so there could be much more overlap.

Dennis offered some takeaways from these numbers:

(1) The Hathi Trust and ReCAP collections will continue to grow at a much faster rate than any single library's collections, so all the overlap numbers are going to get "better and better."

(2) Michael and his colleagues are doing some very important work, trying to model a service agreement and business plan that would make sense, given the current and evolving states of overlap of the collections; we will hear more about this from Michael.

(3) Early indications are that an institution like NYU might need to forge agreements with multiple storage facilities to get the degree of coverage they require.

(4) Finding the threshold of overlap that would make a service agreement worthwhile, is a tricky process.

1. **Hathi Update.** Bryan Skib (University of Michigan) informally presented a HathiTrust update. Hathi currently holds 5.3 million volumes. More than half a million have been added since December 2009. 760,000 are in the public domain, i.e., 14 to 16%. By 2012, there will be 14 million volumes in Hathi. University of Michigan Press backlist titles are now in Hathi and available in Print on Demand. Hathi has an NSF grant to look at OA and a Mellon grant to measure the quality of the files. Searching across the repository has been available since November. Columbia is now a partner. There are 26 partners overall. UC has also added to Hathi materials from the Internet Archive. The preliminary report from the CRL (TRAC) audit will be available next month. A great deal of Shibboleth worth is happening. Staff are working on an expanded interface for public discovery and evaluating the need for a third storage instance. Negotiations with other institutional partners are ongoing. Institutions that join before the end of 2009 will have a voice in governance issues. For more information, visit Hathi's Web site. Institutions can partner whether or not they have content or contribute content immediately. For information about costs, see Bryan's e-mail message of January 18, pasted (minus attachment) below as Item C. Hathi staff are also developing a copyright program aimed at identifying, definitively, which items are in the public domain and seeking other partners to join them in this work.
2. **Questions from the CCDO Institutional Reports.** There was a general discussion of "2CUL," the Mellon-funded project to support the development of shared services between Cornell and Columbia Libraries. In collection development, an early focus will be in area studies; working out timelines and ideas of how to proceed. This is not a merger, but an effort to create a "third entity" to foster shared services and programs where they make sense. 2CUL could involve other institutions in the future. On another topic, there was a question about pulling out of aggregated packages. Taylor and Francis and the academic package from Nature have been dropped by several institutions. Some libraries are refusing to sign Non-Disclosure Agreements. There was also a question regarding Borrow Direct—whether this and other such services have encouraged cooperative collection development. Answer—not so much yet, but hope springs eternal.
3. **Ithaka Report.** Roger Schonfeld of Ithaka discussed the "What to Withdraw" report recently released by Ithaka Research. The goal of the report is to facilitate responsible collection decisions; to help build a community framework once things have been digitized and digitized well; and to develop a tool to make the framework actionable. The tool considers the percentage of copies in a print archive; the number of verified surrogates; and the quality of digital images in a given title. The tool is not intended to generate a "pick" list, but rather to serve as another set of criteria to consider if a library is considering withdrawing print items from its collections. This is a preservation initiative and not an access initiative. More information is available in the Ithaka report at: <http://www.ithaka.org/ithaka-s-r/research/what-to-withdraw>

The meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted

Steven (Steve) Escar Smith

Associate Dean, Collections and Services

Texas A&M University Libraries

College Station, TX 77843-5000

stevensmith@tamu.edu

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Item A:** Ann Okerson's e-mail message about the work of the Scholarly Publishing Roundtable

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

January 12, 2010

EXPERT PANEL CALLS ON U.S. RESEARCH AGENCIES TO DEVELOP POLICIES FOR PROVIDING FREE PUBLIC ACCESS TO FEDERALLY SPONSORED RESEARCH RESULTS

Policies Should Protect Peer-Reviewed Publications While Ensuring Rapid Access

An expert panel of librarians, library scientists, publishers, and university academic leaders today called on federal agencies that fund research to develop and implement policies that ensure free public access to the results of the research they fund 'as soon as possible after those results have been published in a peer-reviewed journal.'

The Scholarly Publishing Roundtable was convened last summer by the U.S. House Committee on Science and Technology, in collaboration with the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP). Policymakers asked the group to examine the current state of scholarly publishing and seek consensus recommendations for expanding public access to scholarly journal articles.

The various communities represented in the Roundtable have been working to develop recommendations that would improve public access without curtailing the ability of the scientific publishing industry to publish peer-reviewed scientific articles.

The Roundtable’s recommendations, endorsed in full by the overwhelming majority of the panel (12 out of 14 members), 'seek to balance the need for and potential of increased access to scholarly articles with the need to preserve the essential functions of the scholarly publishing enterprise,' according to the report.

'I want to commend the members of the Roundtable for reaching broad agreement on some very difficult issues,' said John Vaughn, executive vice president of the Association of American Universities, who chaired the group. 'Our system of scientific publishing is an indispensible part of the scientific enterprise here and internationally. These recommendations ensure that we can maintain that system as it evolves and also ensure full and free public access to the results of research paid for by the American taxpayer.'

The Roundtable identified a set of principles viewed as essential to a robust scholarly publishing system, including the need to preserve peer review, the necessity of adaptable publishing business models, the benefits of broader public access, the importance of archiving, and the interoperability of online content.

In addition, the group affirmed the high value of the 'version of record' for published articles and of all stakeholders' contributions to sustaining the best possible system of scholarly publishing during a time of tremendous change and innovation.

To implement its core recommendation for public access, the Roundtable recommended the following: \* Agencies should work in full and open consultation with all stakeholders, as well as with OSTP, to develop their public access policies.

\*Agencies should establish specific embargo periods between publication and public access.

\*Policies should be guided by the need to foster interoperability.

\*Every effort should be made to have the Version of Record as the version to which free access is provided.

\*Government agencies should extend the reach of their public access policies through voluntary collaborations with non-governmental stakeholders.

\*Policies should foster innovation in the research and educational use of scholarly publications.

\*Government public access policies should address the need to resolve the challenges of long-term digital preservation.

\*OSTP should establish a public access advisory committee to facilitate communication among government and nongovernment stakeholders.

In issuing its report, the Roundtable urged all interested parties to move forward, beyond 'the too-often acrimonious' past debate over access issues towards a collaborative framework wherein federal funding agencies can build 'an interdependent system of scholarly publishing that expands public access and enhances the broad, intelligent use of the results of federally funded research.'

The report, as well as a list of Roundtable members, member biographies, and the House Science and Technology Committee’s charge to the group, can be found at

http://www.aau.edu/policy/scholarly\_publishing\_roundtable.aspx?id=6894

For more information, contact:

John Vaughn (Chair)

Executive Vice President

Association of American Universities

202-408-7500

john\_vaughn@aau.edu

Paul N. Courant

University Librarian and Dean of Libraries

University of Michigan

(734) 764-9356

pnc@umich.edu

Fred Dylla

Executive Director and CEO

American Institute of Physics

(301) 209-3131

dylla@aip.org

James J. O'Donnell

Professor of Classics

Provost

Georgetown University

202-687-2015

provost@georgetown.edu

Ann Okerson

Associate University Librarian

Yale University

203-432-1764

ann.okerson@yale.edu

Crispin Taylor

Executive Director

American Society of Plant Biologists

301-296-0900

ctaylor@aspb.org

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Item B:** John Saylor's e-mail message about arXiv

Colleagues- In advance of our discussion on Saturday I thought I would send you Anne Kenney's email to the Cornell library staff this morning about our plans to support arXiv and a link to the FAQ at http://arxiv.org/help/support/faq

If you have any questions that you think I need to prepare for please send in advance. Thank. Cheers-

John M. Saylor

Associate University Librarian for Scholarly Resources and Special Collections

Cornell University Library

301 Uris Library

Ithaca, NY 14853

607-301-0261

http://vivo.cornell.edu/individual/vivo/individual22600

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Anne R. Kenney" <ark3@cornell.edu<mailto:ark3@cornell.edu>>

Date: January 11, 2010 8:29:45 AM EST

To: "cu-lib@cornell.edu<mailto:cu-lib@cornell.edu>" <cu-lib@cornell.edu<mailto:cu-lib@cornell.edu>>

Cc: "CULAC-L@cornell.edu<mailto:CULAC-L@cornell.edu>" <CULAC-L@cornell.edu<mailto:CULAC-L@cornell.edu>>

Subject: Take One: January 11, 2010 (on supporting arXiv)

Reply-To: "Anne R. Kenney" <ark3@cornell.edu<mailto:ark3@cornell.edu>>

Take One: January 11, 2010 (on supporting arXiv)

In the next week or so we will be launching a campaign to expand support for the ongoing operation of arXiv.org<http://arXiv.org> by asking for voluntary contributions from the top 200 institutions that use arXiv the most heavily. This group of worldwide institutions account for more than 75 percent of institutional downloads. I’m pleased to note that in the “silent phase” of planning for this, most of the top 25 institutions have already committed to supporting arXiv and have lent their names to the announcement of this campaign. The proposed funding model is viewed as a short-term strategy, and the Library is actively seeking input on a long-term solution. Currently, Cornell University Library supports the annual operating costs of arXiv (approximately $400k, which are comparable to the costs of the university’s collection budget for Physics and Astronomy).

Nearly 600,000 e-prints — research articles published online in physics, mathematics, statistics, computer science and quantitative biology — now reside in arXiv, which is an open information source for hundreds of thousands of scientific researchers around the globe. arXiv will remain free for readers and submitters, and this voluntary collaborative business model could be viewed as analogous to support for public radio—but targeting specifically those institutions that benefit most from arXiv.

Over the last six months, we have held extensive discussions with key stakeholders and considered a range of alternatives. I want to acknowledge the very good work that Oya Rieger, Simeon Warner, Terry Ehling, Steve Rockey, and Leah Solla, among others, have done in preparing for this campaign. Today, Simeon and Oya will offer a presentation on the business planning methodology at 2 pm at 703 Olin Library. You can also read more of the details about the operating principles of the new structure by visiting the FAQ at http://arxiv.org/help/support/faq.

Have a healthy and productive week. Anne

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Item C:** Bryan Skib's follow up e-mail message about HathiTrust.

To follow up on two questions raised at our meeting at ALA:

1. Cost of participation in HathiTrust --

You may find some details at:

http://www.hathitrust.org/cost

There is a cost calculator, which shows that the cost per GB of new files stored by a partner will trend downwards. If you are interested in considering participation, of course, direct contact via hathitrust-info@umich.edu will provide the most complete details on the costs, benefits and expectations of participants. I would probably see Hathi less as an additional insurance policy, and more as a storage and access solution that is building something far greater than any of us could achieve on our own.

2. Copyright Review Management System (CRMS)

Staff from Indiana, Minnesota and Wisconsin are expected to join the effort in the future. I have attached the update shared with the TS Big Heads. I can share a copy of the presentation given at Yale, but the file is large so please contact me directly if you are interested.

Yours,

Bryan Skib

Collection Development Officer

818 Hatcher Library

University of Michigan

(734) 936-2366

\*\*\*\*