

ALA Annual 2012, Anaheim, CA

Chief Collection Development Officers of Large Research Libraries Minutes

Saturday, June 23, 9:00 am to noon

Grand Ballroom A

Hyatt Regency Orange County

11999 Harbor Blvd.

Attendees: Stephen Bosh (University of Arizona), Jeanne Richardson (Arizona State), Julia Blixrud (ARL), Thomas Leonard (delegate for UC-Berkeley), James Simon (CRL), James R. Mouw (University of Chicago), Robert Wolven (Columbia University), Maureen Morris (delegate for Cornell University), Nancy Gibbs (delegate for Duke University), Dan Hazen (Harvard University), Thomas Teper (University of Illinois at Urbana –Champaign), Julie Bobay (Indiana University Libraries), Michael Wright (University of Iowa), Joseph Puccio (Library of Congress), Bryan Skib (University of Michigan), Kelvin Watson (National Agricultural Library), Jennifer L. Marrill (National Library of Medicine), Victoria Steele (New York Public Library), Rita W. Moss (delegate for UNC-Chapel Hill), Harriet Lightman (delegate for Northwestern), Karla Strieb (Ohio State University), David Magier (Princeton University), Thomas Izbicki (Rutgers University Libraries), Mary Augusta Thomas (Smithsonian), Zachary Baker (Stanford University), Carmelita Pickett (Texas A&M University), Catlin Tillman (University of Toronto), Sharon E. Farb (UCLA), Jane Penner (delegate for University of Virginia), Tim Jewell (University of Washington), William Wibbing (Washington University in St. Louis), and Mary Radar (University of Wisconsin-Madison)

9:00 Welcome and introductions; review of minutes; other business

Committee members approved minutes from ALA Midwinter meeting. David mentioned that the committee's meeting time may change. Steven Bosch reported that it is likely the committee's time slot will be preserved.

9:15 *University Accessibility Policies: E-Resources and Compliance with Federal Law*

Carmelita Pickett (Head, Collection Development Operations & Acq Services, Texas A&M)
- - Discussion: the Penn State settlement (<http://accessibility.psu.edu/nfbpsusettlement>)

Penn State entered into a voluntary resolution agreement with the National Federation of the Blind (NFB) to address accessibility complaint filed against the University. The National Federation of the Blind has filed several complaints across the country. This is documented in the organization's leading publication Braille Monitor. Daniel Goldstein, a civil rights attorney, chronicles the organization's actions to secure equal access in "Equal Access to Information: The Urgency and the Law." This article provides context to the complaints filed by NFB against universities, Google, Amazon, Apple, etc...

Carmelita asked the group if their institutions worked with their campus Chief Information Technology Officers to craft guidelines covering compliance with current accessibility law. How do libraries articulate/express this in collection development practices?

- Group response varied. UCLA includes a value statement addressing ADA compliance specifically and stated that we should include statements in licensing agreements.

- ARL has Services for Users with Disabilities working group, with a charge to help craft guidelines. Staff plans to meet with directors in the fall. See also Services for Users with Disabilities, SPEC Kit 321.
- University of Chicago is working to upgrade their accessibility following a compliance review.
- ALA Digital Working Group subgroup Licensing & Business Models will be developing guidelines and talking points.
- University of Illinois at Urbana- Champaign mentioned that Elsevier has organized an Accessibility Interest group with researchers on campus.
- Ohio State is working to select appropriate formats to comply.
- NLM has a mandate to reformat historical materials to comply with accessibility law.

Relevant websites:

- <http://www.nfb.org/>
- <http://www.ada.gov/>
- <http://cita.disability.uiuc.edu/collaborate/elsevier/person.php>
- http://www.ala.org/aboutala/sites/ala.org.aboutala/files/content/governance/officers/eb_documents/2011_2012ebdocuments/ebd_12_9_digital_con.pdf

9:30 *E-books and Cooperative Collection Development: Is there any way to SHARE so that we can COORDINATE collection development?*

Adriana Popescu (Engineering Librarian, Princeton)

- - *Case study of the BorrowDirect Patron-Driven Shared Engineering E-book project*

*** Note please review attached presentation for a more detailed description.**

Adriana Popescu summarized the Borrow Direct (BD) Engineering E-book Project collaboration with the following participants: Brown, Columbia, Cornell, Dartmouth, MIT, Princeton, University of Pennsylvania and Yale. The project was organized by BD Engineering Librarians who wanted to strengthen existing collaboration within BD. The collection focus for the BD pilot e-book collaboration was nanotechnology.

Project goals

- Develop a method for building shared research engineering collections for BD libraries.
- Demonstrate that a cooperative acquisitions model can build a comprehensive research collection in engineering areas.

Challenges

- Budgets
- Satisfying institutional needs
- Publishers
- Pre-existing agreements
- Each libraries use of different e-book vendors and platforms

Next Steps

- Launch project in 2013

- Assessment
- Expand model to other subject areas
- Recommendations: E-book value statements for institution and consortia, national standards and best practices, publisher willing to experiment.

Group Discussion (Q&A)

Q: How did each member decide funding for this project?

A: Each member contributed an equal amount.

Q: Will members participating in the project purchase print?

A: Each institution will decide to purchase print. If an electronic version of a title is not available, then the title will be acquired in print.

Q: For e-books with single user access, how will members provide access?

A: Each individual school will have to purchase a copy.

Q: Who owns the content?

A: Member institutions will presumably own the content.

Q: How amicable are the publishers to BD sharing?

A: Will wait to see which publishers sign up.

9:50 *The Internet Archive's Wayback Machine: to link or to copy/harvest?*

Jennifer Marill (Chief Technical Services Division, National Library of Medicine)

Internet Archive Wayback Machine was developed in 1996, and currently includes over 100 billion archived web pages. Jennifer Marill asked members to share their current practices for archived content available in the Internet Archive. Are libraries linking to the archive for content that's no longer accessible? Members commented that libraries need to do more to capture web content. The Wayback Machine has value and some content can only be accessed through the Internet Archive. James Simon remarked that the Wayback Machine would not qualify as a trusted repository as the organizational and technical structure is not transparent.

10:05 *arXiv Update*

Fiona Patrick (Project Coordinator, Digital Consulting & Production Services, Cornell)

Cornell University Library (CUL) has finalized a new membership model and operating principles. The former model secured contributions from 200 libraries and research laboratories that represented arXiv's heaviest institutional users. The tiered structured contributions ranged from \$2,300 to \$4,000 per year based on use. CUL covered 15% of direct annual costs for running arXiv and all indirect costs.

The Simmons Foundation awarded Cornell a \$60,000 planning grant. The foundation has shown interest in supporting the arXiv. Funding support up to \$300,000 could be awarded per year based on other institutions commitment to maintain and enhance arXiv. The foundation support would begin in 2013-2017.

Operating Principles

<https://confluence.cornell.edu/display/culpublic/arXiv+Sustainability+Initiative>

- arXiv provides an open-access repository of scientific research to authors and researchers worldwide.
- arXiv is a scholarly communication forum informed and guided by scientists and the scientific cultures being served.
- Access to arXiv content via arXiv.org is free to individual end users.
- Individual researchers can deposit their own content in arXiv for free.
- Criteria and standards for depositing content in arXiv are maintained by the Scientific Advisory Board, and deposit is governed by transparent and publicly posted policies and procedures.
- arXiv serves the needs of researchers in physics, mathematics, computer science, quantitative biology, quantitative finance and statistics. Any expansion into other subjects or disciplines must include scholarly community support, satisfy arXiv's quality standards, and take into consideration its operational capacity.
- Whenever possible arXiv adopts open-source software and relevant standards and best practices.
- Additional updates and information available:
http://arxiv.org/new#apr24_2012

10:25 Break

10:40 *Financial support models for open-access initiatives: discussion of unglue.it and others (arXiv, the Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, BioMed Central, SCOAP3, etc.)*

Bob Wolven (Associate University Librarian for Bibliographic Services and Collection Development, Columbia)

Based on the website description Unglue.it works with authors and publishers to choose a fair licensing fee. Funds are raised from participants contributing so the rights holder is paid. Once the rights holder is paid, they issue a free e-version under a Creative Commons license. Unglue.it is a service provided by Gluejar, Inc., the parent company. Gluejar, Inc. is a for-profit company that works with non-profit and commercial partners.

Group Discussion

- Members remarked that it is cumbersome and time consuming to determine rights. The overall consensus was that enough is not known about Unglue.it but the model is intriguing.
General questions from the group:
- If libraries participate what are the risks?
- Should libraries support unglue.it?
- Who owns it? URL: <https://unglue.it/about/>.
- How does it scale?

11:00 *The Uncertain World of Videos: Preservation Issues and Collection Development for Research Libraries*

- - discussion facilitator: **Janet Gertz** (Director of Preservation & Digital Conservation, Columbia)

Gertz summarized the preservation challenges for video collections.

Challenges

- Obsolescence of equipment.
- Formats: Determining when to migrate between formats? Digital formats and file size. Obsolete formats and support needed to reformat. User expectations for streaming capabilities.
- Metadata: Cataloging records do not always exist.
- Permissions and rights.
- Collection development: Who's using the collection? What types of videos are collected (documentaries, special collections, faculty lectures, etc.)?

Group general comments:

- UCLA has received a grant and hired a Video Preservation Specialist to help assess what services can be provided by the library.
- University of Chicago mentioned their permissions process for campus events.

11:20 *Distance Education, MOOCs (Massive Open Online Courses), Content, and Online Course Support: the Role of the Library?*

Michael Keller (University Librarian and Director of Academic Information Resources, Stanford)

- - Discussion: online courses at your university? Library tasks?

Over the last several years MOOCs or open teaching has garnered support from universities and professors across the country. Michael Keller described a recent example of an MOOC course taught by a Stanford faculty member; 180,000 people registered for the class. How do libraries support MOOCs? Is there an expectation that libraries will support MOOCs? In this example the course received no support from the library since the course was not officially recognized by the university. Keller mentioned that Stanford University Libraries does support distance education programs organized by the Stanford Center for Professional Development. Keller described the challenges in educating teaching faculty and teaching assistants to use licensed content. Faculty members are not often aware of the proprietary resources that the library acquires on their behalf.

Keller then introduced the presenter who discussed Stanford Intellectual Property Exchange (SIPX). SIPX is an online rights management tool that works within learning management systems; designed to navigate the complex copyright/permission maze. Presenter stated that if a simple system is available, faculty are less likely to pirate content.

Benefits for libraries, faculty, & students

- Make licensing process transparent
- Legal certainty and less liability for libraries
- Make the process cost efficient for libraries
- Lower cost of course material
- Give authors and research community the ability to share

Publishers Benefits

- Set pricing
- Retain control
- Control content
- Collect fees

For more information about SIPX:

Email: Sipxinfo@ gmail.com

URL: [http:// www.nmc.org/news/stanford-university-cloud-based-copyright-clearance-win-win-content-creators-and -users](http://www.nmc.org/news/stanford-university-cloud-based-copyright-clearance-win-win-content-creators-and-users)

Noon: adjourn