Chief Collection Development Officers of Large Research Libraries | Minutes

ALA Annual 2013, Chicago
June 29, 2013, 9:00 am to 11:30 am

Attendees: Sharon Marshall (Alberta), Stephen Bosch (Arizona), Jeanne Richardson (Arizona State), Jean McKenzie (Berkeley), Ivy Anderson (California Digital Library), James Mouw (Chicago), Bob Wolven (Columbia), James Simon (CRL), John Saylor (Cornell), Robert Byrd (Duke), Dan Hazen (Harvard), Tom Teper (Illinois), Julie Bobay (Indiana), Michael Wright (Iowa), Joseph Puccio (Library of Congress), Jennifer Marill (National Library of Medicine), Charles Spetland (Minnesota), Denise Hibay (New York Public Library), Carol Hunter (North Carolina), Greg Raschke (North Carolina State), Roxanne Sellberg (Northwestern), Karla Strieb (Ohio State), Martha Brogan (Pennsylvania), Lisa German (Penn State), Fern Brody (Pittsburgh), Tom Izbicki (Rutgers), Mary Thomas (Smithsonian), Zachary Baker (Stanford University), Carmelita Pickett (Texas A&M), Caitlin Tillman (Toronto), Sharon Farb (UCLA), Carla Lee (Virginia), Tim Jewell (Washington), William Wibbing (Washington—St. Louis), Irene Zimmerman (Wisconsin), Daniel Dollar (Yale), and 35 additional attendees representing academic libraries, publishers and other organizations.

Welcome and introductions. Carmelita Pickett (Director of Collection Development and Acquisitions Services, Texas A&M) convened the meeting at 9:00am.

Listserv. Carmelita asked for a volunteer to take over as moderator of the CCDO listserv. Carla Lee, from the University of Virginia, expressed interest.

Posting bi-annual updates. Discussed posting CCDO updates on the group's ALA Connect site. We decided to make these reports publically available. A recommendation was made for members to continue to send their updates to the CCDO listserv as it's easier to access them in the run-up to meetings. Carmelita proposed the Chair take responsibility for posting the updates from the listserv to ALA Connect.

Minutes: The minutes from the ALA 2013 Midwinter meeting were approved by acclamation.

Compact for Open-Access Publishing Equity

Sue Kriegsman (Program Manager, Office for Scholarly Communication, Harvard Library) gave a presentation on COPE (Compact for Open Access Publishing Equity) and efforts underway at Harvard to fund Open Access. For more information on the presentation, please see Sue's the PPT slides which have been sent to the CCDO listserv and will be posted on the group's ALA Connect site. Additional information can be found at http://oacompact.org.

Discussion:

Q: What are the staffing requirements to manage an OA fund.
A: Staffing requirements are low. The status of the requester (faculty, staff or student) must be determined as that impacts the amount of funding provided. Overall, the process is highly automated through a submission form process. There is low overhead with one person handling the process, and they receive few questions. Cornell noted their experience, in terms of staffing, was similar to Harvard.

Q: What is the breakdown of funding by discipline—it does seem to favor the Sciences.
A: Most requests currently do come from the Sciences, however, it is early days for Harvard and there is an expectation of more requests coming from the Humanities. There are also plans for greater promotion of the effort across campus.

Q: How do you prevent accepting articles where grant funding is available?
A: The requestor must first submit the article which is reviewed for references to grant support. In those cases, the requestor is asked to use their grant funding to publish OA. However, the default position is to accept the article; Sue cited conversations with authors who noted their grant funding had run out and that was sufficient justification to provide funding.

Q: Have you done any cost modeling? What happens if large numbers of faculty start asking for financial support?
A: No modeling has been done, but this is a problem to be welcomed. It will force a healthy conversation that might lead to alternate funding sources and models.

Q: Are there any efforts to incorporate discounts for article processing fees into journal subscriptions and package agreements?
A: The issue is coming up increasingly in discussions with publishers. CRL is incorporating that position into their license negotiations, for example.

Q: Any consideration of PeerJ and their annual payment model?
A: No, the issue has not yet come up, but will need to look at its potential implications.

Q: Can you discussion further the position of not funding requests involving publication in hybrid journals (subscription/OA).
A: Opening the fund to hybrid journals creates many more requests and additional costs, without really helping the institution or library change the publishing marketplace—although it would be good for individual authors. Someone noted their school does support hybrid journal submission, but covers only half the cost.

Global Dimensions of Scholarship and Research Libraries: A Forum on the Future

Dan Hazen (Associate Librarian of Harvard College for Collection Development, Harvard University) provided an overview of recommendations from the December 2012 Global Forum co-hosted by Duke University Libraries and the Center of Research Libraries. The recommendations can found on the CRL website
at http://www.crl.edu/sites/default/files/attachments/events/Global%20Forum%20Recommendations.pdf

Dan noted it seemed to be a regular occurrence every ten years for a crisis to be declared in the acquisition of area studies materials. However, a number of factors suggest the sky might actually be falling this time with decreasing federal funding and shifting university interests, plus more students relying just on online sources. So while analog is still the dominate format in various parts of the world, we must work toward digital—in both traditional and new area studies fields.

The report makes three sets of recommendations: aggressively pursue broad digital access to international information resources; internationalize research library services and perspectives; and, broaden and internationalize library collaborations. Within these recommendation areas, there are ongoing technology issues related to library search tools being unable to handle non-Roman languages—thus making the material unfindable. Cooperative efforts, while laudable, have a North American (actually U.S.) focus. We need global partners to address these issues.

Dan expressed his hope that we could move past some of the details found in the recommendations and look for ways to implement meaningful efforts to address these challenges. He noted, for example, some recoil over the report by area collections librarians, feeling the recommendations implied they are not doing a good job. They are doing well; we just have to find ways to do more.

To begin the discussion, Dan asked if there were assumptions made in the report that needed to be questioned.

Discussion:

The recommendations did not mention Canadian institutions where there are research-intensive institutions actively building area studies collections.

Collection analysis appears to be insufficiently discussed in the context of area collections and the report's recommendations.

In terms of collaborative collection development efforts, it appears that we are for allowing the blooming of "a thousand collaborative flowers." While positive in many ways, it diffuses resources for focused collective efforts.

There appears to be no strong focal point for leadership with a strong North American championing agency. Do we look to the Mellon Foundation which provided funding for the Forum, and/or other grant funding support?

Report seems to be calling for an international version for what is now being developed with the Digital Public Library of America (http://dp.la/) with a focus to integrate collecting, technology and technical services.

How, and to what extent, do we try to shape funders' actions? Funders are interested in issues, such as tool development and digitization—we need to try wrapping area collections into all those conversations. Can research libraries employ the expertise of our international collections specialists to expand beyond just meeting local needs?

Q: How do we prioritize efforts in area collections? For example, a number of publishers and vendors are creating area studies-related and/or foreign language digital products for purchase by libraries. The recommendations appear not to consider that reality.
A: We do need to work with a variety of groups and build from the grassroots. We need, for example, to tie into African institutions to determine the possibilities for collaboration and help set priorities. It is an open question if commercially-produced digital products for primary source materials are sufficient. We need to work with vendors and publishers to acquire digital rights to the materials they are acquiring or publishing, and help identify potentially unique materials to ensure its retention for use by scholars.

Q: How to capture interest? What actions should CCDO members take in light of these recommendations? Should we be thinking of ways to cluster work, for example, around web archiving efforts related to area studies collections.
A: We have to figure out the landscape, but hopefully not get blogged down in such an effort. Success will require the building up from a mosaic of efforts.

Dan concluded the discussion by noting Digital Public Library of America is an interesting model which could serve to move the effort forward. He also wanted all CCDO members to know that Global Forum steering committee members are willing to participate in meetings to discuss these issues at your institution.

Science, Technology & Engineering Historical Collections

Stephen Bosch (Materials Budget, Procurement, & Licensing Librarian, University of Arizona) spoke of the five-year partnership, announced last year, between the Center for Research Libraries (CRL) and the Linda Hall Library (LHL) to provide access to historical Science, Technology and Engineering (STE) materials in the U.S. and Canada.

Stephen noted the impetuous for this effort stemmed from the big growth in R&D research in Eastern Europe and East Asia, while U.S. and Canadian research libraries are not adding new serials and significantly cutting back on foreign language scientific materials—including publications from Eastern Europe and East Asia. In noting the problem, Stephen mentioned that a "bad hammer pounds more nails than a good banana." And with that thought in mind, he outlined how the partnership is

attempting to fill a critical need in our STE collections. For more information on the presentation, please see Stephen's the PPT slides which have been sent to the CCDO listserv and will be posted on the group's ALA Connect site. Additional information can be found at: http://www.crl.edu/collections/global-resources-partnership/grp-science-technology-engineering.

Discussion:

Q: Describe LHL's holdings of Chinese language material.

A: LHL has not collected heavily in Chinese. Their strength is in Japanese language materials.

Q: Can you elaborate on the partnership's collection development plans.

A: These plans are under development and will be made transparent in order for research libraries to use them to help shape their own collection development policies.

Print archives. The partnership is working with the California Digital Library (CDL) initiative Print Archives Preservation Registry (PAPR) to add their holdings to this broader print archiving effort. The expectation is to add approximately 50,000 records to PAPR. More information on PAPR can be found at, http://www.cdlib.org/services/d2d/papr.html.

Digitization. The partnership is using RapidILL for article and book delivery. Books are being digitized and kept behind a firewall. The expectation is such efforts are not of concern to publishers, since the materials are fairly esoteric. To date, approximately 14,000 to 15,000 ILL transactions have been recorded.

Stephen concluded the shortcomings of research libraries current collecting practices are becoming apparent as funding goes into "big deal" journal packages, other scientific literature—especially foreign language material—is getting missed. We need new approaches to close this gap. Stephen believes we need to recognize the large amount of non-English language being published in STE—particularly in Chinese. Scientific literature is not, nor will it be, all in English.

Collection Development at Scale

Elliott Shore (Executive Director of the Association of Research Libraries) was invited for a conversation. Elliott began by mentioning his membership on the Committee on Cohesion at Scale in Higher Education. The committee is charged with looking for trends and developments, which at scale could change higher education. While we in higher education are focused on things we need to do, there also needs to be space to step back and see the bigger picture. In libraries, we are great with detail—the challenge is for us to raise our vision.

Elliott discussed the listening tour he has been on at ARL institutions around the U.S. and Canada; he has also spoken with funders and other stakeholders. For example, funders are concerned about the sustainability of collaborative collection development efforts—because they can fall apart with changing

institutional commitments and personnel. Maybe a role for ARL is to serve as a backstop for those efforts.

Elliot announced that ARL would be undertaking a "strategic design effort" to better understand where libraries and universities are going, and how ARL should respond. The goal is to think outside traditional thought patterns. The tour has exposed a variety of views regarding what is an academic research library. The strategic design effort needs to bring clarity to the definition of the research library, and how it connects with today's research enterprise.

> Discussion:
>
> Funding was a major topic of discussion. It was noted that there seems to be no shortage of efforts asking for "20 thousand." How do we keep the "20K" requests from eating us alive? Can ARL be an umbrella for analysis and priority setting to help guide our local decisions? Similarly, can ARL provide "venture capital" for promising initiatives? We need to experiment and be willing to fail. However, we don't want to create new platforms, instead we must build on existing investments.
>
> Elliott noted ARL is working to justify additional investments in libraries. The SHared Access Research Ecosystem (SHARE) is an opportunity to attract those investments, http://www.arl.org/news/arl-news/2773-shared-access-research-ecosystem-proposed-by-aau-aplu-arl
>
> Can we strike a balance between innovation and focus which does not stifle the former, but provides space to address key issues, such as: digital preservation and endangered digital materials; open access and scholarly communication; and commercial publishers' ability to pick apart libraries/institutions. One possible pathway is to determine what research libraries are all doing locally which could be addressed more efficiently and cost effectively at a national level.
>
> We circled back to the need for setting priorities. While Harvard has recently started an Open Access fund, the University of North Carolina created a similar fund in 1995. What can we learn from these efforts and their impact, for it to inform and benefit all ARL members?
>
> The discussion of priorities reminded Elliot of a quote from Chuck Henry (President of CLIR) that we all need to worship at the "Church of Cohesion and Scale." Carrying that thought further, Elliot noted we needed constructive, reversible actions where we get commitment to secure action without overly binding ourselves.
>
> It was suggested ARL could help the membership develop different business models. It was noted that significant effort went into work at Cornell to develop a funding model to sustain Archve.org.
>
> There appears to be a clear role for ARL in fostering international collaboration. Elliot was surprised that an organization looking to encompass North America does not have any Mexican member institutions. There was general agreement for ARL to explore international

memberships. We need ARL taking the broader, global view of the challenges and opportunities faced by academic research libraries and higher education in general.

Carmelita Pickett concluded the meeting at 11:30 am. Daniel and all present joined in thanking Carmelita with a round of applause for her outstanding leadership as Chair.

Minutes submitted by Daniel Dollar.