Library Management Team
Notes from October 6, 2004 Meeting

Attending: Karen Calhoun, Claire Germain, Tom Hickerson, Anne Kenney, Janet McCue, Jean Poland, Sarah Thomas and guest Terry Ehling.

1. Presentation of the Report of the CUL Task Force on Open Access Publishing.

Terry Ehling, Director of Electronic Publishing, represented the Task Force on Open Access Publishing for this LMT presentation. Other members of the Task Force are Phil Davis, Oliver Habicht, Sarah How, John Saylor (chair) and Kizer Walker. The Task Force was convened by Ross Atkinson in January 2004 and met weekly through June 2004. The group was charged to provide a report to LMT that addressed the following questions:
--What is Open Access publishing? Are there different versions of or perspectives on how it should operate and be funded?
--What are the factors that will affect the adoption of Open Access by the academic community?
--Should the library community in general and CUL in particular take action to increase those prospects and, if so, what should those actions be?
--If Open Access publishing becomes a significant component of scholarly publishing, how will it affect CUL services, and what operational changes might CUL need to undertake as a result?

In discussing the group's conclusions Terry stated that
a. Open Access is really about economics and democratization. Open Access publishing holds the "promise of a more affordable system for academic institutions and their libraries and a more democratic one for readers and authors."
b. Full Open Access is not economically feasible for Cornell.
c. Open Access is not the ultimate solution to the current serials pricing crisis.
d. In order to succeed, proposals for implementation of Open Access scholarly publishing must be sensitive to the needs of the scholars and their disciplines.

As stated in its August 9, 2004 report, the Task Force recommends that CUL:
a. Foster and support viable Open Access publishing initiatives that respond to or resonate with real needs of specific scholarly communities.
b. Apply the following selection criteria in considering any Open Access publishing strategy or project:
--It appears, based on informed projection, to offer an approach that over time will be more cost effective for CUL than the current publishing model;
--It responds to and meets the needs of CUL's user communities and improves scholarly communication; and
--It minimizes detrimental financial, political, and cultural effects on scholarly networks.
c. Engage in ongoing environmental scanning to identify a broad range of local

stakeholders and pursue outreach in order to raise awareness of OA issues among scholars at Cornell and to discern and respond to needs and interests of various local scholarly communities. Outreach efforts should include:
--Public outreach (e.g., external speakers; publicity around activities of CUL's Electronic Publishing Program)
--Outreach targeted at specific communities (e.g., November 2003 Cornell Editor's Forum.)
d. Establish a standing committee under CD Exec to monitor developments in OA publishing for the purposes of informing policies and decisions of the Library Management Team and raising awareness among CUL's constituencies. The committee's charge should include the creation and maintenance of a public website on OA publishing issues.

In reviewing the report and its recommendations LMT agreed that:
a. The report was very well written and very readable. Members felt it could be reworked into an article for publication.
b. There needs to be more examination of the projected expense estimates used in the report.
ACTION:
--Hire an economist as a consultant to analyze the economic model utilized in the report.
--Factor into the economic model the possibility of a consortium of institutions being the basis for the model rather than Cornell standing alone, which is the basis for the current report's economic conclusions.
c. Before attempting to begin outreach to stakeholders on campus, the Library needs a clear message to give editors and authors that is fine-tuned for different disciplines - the approach for scientists will be different from the approach for humanists. Faculty questions about copyright and other such issues need to be anticipated with answers spelled out.
ACTION:
--Compose a standard message for outreach
--Hold another Editors' Forum
--Update the Scholarly Communications Web page so Open Access issues and information are included for outreach purposes.

2. The Library and Institutional Repositories

Sarah asked LMT to consider how the Library can play the most effective role with regard to institutional repositories. Currently the library is involved with several repositories, including DSpace, DPubS, and arXiv, and ILR also has plans to create its own digital repository. The time has come to analyze the pluses and minuses of each and to determine if we are too dispersed and if there is redundancy. How much time is needed to know if a repository is a success? So far the notion of an institutional repository like DSpace has not been compelling to users. If Cornell got behind just one of the options, would it be

more successful?

The notion of institutional repositories does not appear to be compelling to the faculty. They appear to be more drawn to discipline-based repositories. For example, Claire said that Law School faculty submit their publications to NELLCO (New England Law Library Consortium), a non-profit corporation dedicated to resource sharing among law libraries, for posting on the NELLCO server. This voluntary initiative has proven very popular with a significant number of law faculty.

Faculty need to be engaged in the notion of submitting their publications. In the Open Access environment, should CUL adjust the license to say if we pay the author's fee the article may be harvested for the repository?
Before adjourning Sarah stated that the Library should:
a. Evaluate the existing repositories, define the purpose of each, and determine the viability of each effort.
b. Continue weighing the value of Cornell gathering all publications produced by its faculty under one repository.
c. Charge a scholarly communication work group to monitor developments and review the issues.

Andrea Barnett