

Report on the CNI Spring 2010 Membership Meeting

Jody DeRidder, 19 April 2010

The Spring 2010 Membership Meeting of the Coalition for Networked Information was held in Baltimore, Maryland on April 12th and 13th. The format included five breakout sessions, each offering several presentations from which to choose. The opening plenary session, moderated by Clifford Lynch, included several panelists focusing on open access implementation strategies, and the closing plenary by Liz Lyon challenged us to consider the support of open science. Generous breaks provided time for networking, as did a reception the first evening, and breakfast and lunch on the second day.

Opening Plenary: by Cliff Lynch

In the opening plenary, Cliff Lynch sought to provide us with a variety of methods by which institutions are currently supporting open access to faculty scholarship. The panelists included Ann Wolpert (Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT)), Deborah Ludwig (University of Kansas), Mary Marlino (National Center for Atmospheric Research (NCAR)), and Sue Kriegsman (Harvard University).

Sue Kriegsman of Harvard stated that their faculty had voted the open access policy into effect, and their policy has three parts: rights to the content are granted to the university and library, a waiver of these rights is available, and a copy of the faculty research goes to the library. The library also accepts non-open access content for preservation. Their focus is more on making the open access content available via Google Scholar than through their own front end software (DASH). There are 5 Harvard schools, each with different methods of implementation. At first, the library hired 61 students to knock on faculty doors, to get compliance, but that was not effective. Now they are down to 8 good students, 10 hours each per week, 2 hours of which is spent in the library. These students are given guidelines, and they use an email approach. They let the faculty drive how the contribution is made: by email, CD, web, etc.

Ann Wolpert (MIT) says their faculty adopted open access in March 2009, providing an automatic grant of non-exclusive rights over the research to the institution, with an automatic review after 5 years. Their library was charged to develop an easy submission procedure; their faculty need only “make the content available” to them. The library personnel locate the content and pick it up. There is no submission process.

MIT has had DSpace for 10 years now; Hewlett Packard helped install it. Theirs is arguably the largest repository of its sort. MIT gets 1/3 of its funding from grants, and they have the support of an excellent press, to which they credit much of their success.

Mary Marlino (NCAR) states that their institution is small, and has no students. Of the 1600 staff, 350-375 produce approximately 650 peer-reviewed articles per year. Of these, approximately 80% of them are published in two journals. Thus their efforts at open access support had to be developed in concert with the needs of these two publishers, and it was an intensely political maneuver, spearheaded by their library. They started out by pointing out what the publishers had lost over the last several years because open access had not been supported, and the materials had not been preserved. As yet, NCAR does not have a repository; they are developing policies now.

Deb Ludwig said that the University of Kansas has 2500 faculty, 90% of whom have PhDs, and who spend 40% of their time on research, which is open access by mandate. They have a 3-year review cycle for the policy. Their E-Scholarship librarian Ada Emmett and her co-leader, a professor in

evolutionary biology, are “a force on campus.” They have many meetings with faculty and work tirelessly to clear up the many misunderstandings about what open access means. Their staffing is bare-bones: .5 FTE support beyond Emmett, with the IT staff managing upgrades of DSpace. They would like to develop a simpler submission process, integrate the waiver/request with the submission, and need better embargo support.

Cliff closed by stating that to be successful, the open access mandate must be connected to faculty and researcher profiles, and tied to promotion and tenure.

From the Researcher’s Point of View: Support for Research Workflows

The first breakout session I attended was presented by Jennifer Schaffner, Program Officer for OCLC Research and the RLG Partnership. She reported on a collaborative research project seeking to examine what information-related tools and services researchers use during the course of their research workflow. This study of faculty, deans, and provosts at 8 research-intensive institutions, undertaken by OCLC Research and the Research Information Network (RIN) in the UK, hoped to identify significant gaps that perhaps libraries could fill.

The positive possibilities that emerged were that researchers want:

- tools that scan lab documents and create metadata for retrieval;
- a “Pandora”-type for articles, that will sift the available content out there and offer up a selection that is custom-sorted to meet the needs of the researcher
- a tool such as “Zombie” that sorts email by pre-set preferences, and prioritizes them so the researcher can simply delete those at the bottom of the list without reading them
- easy-to-use software that effectively manages their personal documents and data sets, including support of collaborative management (for content developed in concert with other researchers) and analysis of data
- storage, preservation, and curation of data sets

Though the research assessment is not yet complete (the report is due out in late spring, early summer), Schaffner’s preliminary synthesis includes the following negatives:

- E-Journals and Google dominate the landscape
- Researchers want efficient, easy-to-use services
- Researchers choose collaborators from their friends, not according to expertise, and they don’t want help locating collaborators
- Researchers do not use libraries (apart from the E-Journals)
- Researchers do not want help managing citations, nor do they want citation analyses
- Researchers already have grant alerts, and institutional services which identify research of potential commercial value and start the process to commercialize it

Faculty Attitudes 2009: Findings from the Latest Ithaka S+R Survey

Continuing this theme of seeking how we can best meet the needs of researchers, I next attended the presentation by Roger C. Schonfeld, Manager of Research for Ithaka Strategy and Research (S+R). Ithaka is a non-profit organization which also provides JSTORE and Portico services. Now that a third

survey has been completed, it is possible to determine trends that are taking place.

Of the original three roles of the library (gateway, archive, and buyer), 90% consider the buyer role as the most important; 72% consider its archiving role as important. While the use of the library as a gateway to information has dropped remarkably, two new roles have emerged that scientists (not humanists) consider important: teaching and research support. To the humanists, the gateway and archiving roles are more important. All five roles are still important to more than 50% of faculty.

There is a broad acceptance of the cancellation of print journal subscriptions in favor of electronic journal acquisitions. However, there are some reservations about ceasing print journal publications entirely; faculty want to know that copies of the print journals do exist somewhere, particularly for certain fields such as mathematics. However, the print copies increasingly need not reside at the local library.

Of the faculty surveyed, only 28% deposit their research into institutional repositories (IRs). However, if you broaden the definition of IRs to include posting copies to web pages, that percentage expands to 38%.

The full report for the fall 2009 faculty survey is available here: <http://www.ithaka.org/ithaka-s-r/research/faculty-surveys-2000-2009/faculty-survey-2009>.

ROI: Measuring the Library's Contribution to the Academic Enterprise

Mary Ellen K. Davis, Executive Director for the Association of College & Research Libraries (ACRL) and Lori A. Goetsch, Dean of Libraries at Kansas State University, and ACRL president, provided this ACRL project briefing. ACRL had contracted with Megan Oakleaf, assistant professor in the iSchool at Syracuse University, to develop and deliver a comprehensive review of the quantitative and qualitative literature, methodologies and best practices currently in place for demonstrating the value of academic libraries. They are hoping to supplement the IMLS grant project led by Carol Tenopir of the University of Tennessee and ARL at the University of Illinois (Urbana-Champaign) on Return on Investment. While the IMLS project focuses on collections, grants, and such, this project seeks to focus on student success to develop measures for library success.

The ACRL study seeks to define value in terms of the institutional goals, and to identify measureable surrogates that demonstrate the library's impact on those goals. Then they hope to provide best practices on measuring these surrogates, and to explain how the findings should inform data collection decisions going forward. Thus the value should be derived from the institutional mission.

Serious questions must be answered. How do we define success? Is it graduation rates? Is it the learning of salable skills? Should they look at SAT rankings? How do collection dollars weigh against the grant dollars brought in, in terms of the impact on students?

Already they have discovered that the number one determinant of which institution a student selects is based on the field of study; the second determinant is the library of the institution. Thus we should indeed be involved in recruitment of prospective students.

The presenters referred to a new effort called the "Voluntary System of Accountability" (<http://www.voluntarysystem.org/>); the library needs data in order to be included and involved. Public libraries need to be able to measure how they impact people's lives. Academic libraries may be able to look at test scores or GPAs and the students' relationship to the library.

Next, the ACRL program need to set a research strategy that will look beyond the role of gateway for the library. They've been presenting at non-library conferences to reach out to faculty about the need to substantiate the library's worth. Many faculty members still don't know that librarians will work

closely with faculty in support of research and teaching, despite all our previous outreach. We need to focus on embedding librarians in departments and reduce or eliminate reference librarians. Even IT departments now need to demonstrate their value, as there is less dependence on enterprise software and more on Google and cloud computing. We need to reward innovation and experimentation, and we need to coordinate our efforts, developing more collaboration both internally and externally.

A participant in the audience stated that their deans had found a relationship between the availability of group study space and the amount of time to graduation. Another suggested seeking a correlation between the number of connections to an embedded librarian or the amount of time spent using library resources during a course, with the grade obtained in that course. Another audience member suggested that special libraries may be able to help us determine how to measure an ROI, as they've had to do this for years.

A CLIR-funded study done about 5-6 years ago on who people ask for help, found that students without declared majors asked their friends or their parents for help, whereas students with declared majors were more likely to behave like graduate students and faculty, seeking help from authoritative sources. Thus, those students on campus who have not yet declared majors are like lost sheep, which offers a real opportunity to librarians for intervention and assistance. We need to develop relationships with these students and help them realize we are a good resource.

We also need to determine how to reach out to distance education students. One suggestion is that we build virtual collections for highly specific domains.

The presenters closed by saying that in the U.S. we need leadership from provosts and presidents to support collaboration and interdependence between institutions. Many of the needs developing will require multi-institution effort to address. European collaborations are already systemically supported, and thus are far beyond us in this area. But once we do develop such collaborative solutions, how do we then measure the ROI for collaborative efforts?

More information will be available this fall or next spring.

Interoperable Annotation: A Reference Implementation for the Open Annotation Collaboration

This presentation on the Mellon-funded Open Annotation Collaboration¹ (OAC) was made by Trevor Owens, Community lead for George Mason University, and Doug Reside and Dave Lester, both Associate Directors for the Maryland Institute for Technology in the Humanities. Some of the existing tagging projects out there include eComma² (commentary machine), CATT³ (collaborative tagging), and AXE⁴ (AJAX encoder). Unfortunately, these efforts have had little cross-pollination, are not interoperable, and do not integrate well with the researchers' workflow.

The current effort is developing web centric annotation, based on an integration of Zotero⁵ (an open-source annotation plug-in for Firefox) and AXE. Assumptions made are that the content of an annotation is an expression of the relationship of two URIs, the annotation URI and the target URI. Zotero notes provide a stable URI, so Zotero was selected as the platform. By integrating AXE into

¹ <http://www.openannotation.org/>

² <http://ecomma.cwrl.utexas.edu/blog/>

³ http://text.etl.luc.edu/HRIT_CaTT/

⁴ <http://www.mith.info/research/?project=19>

⁵ <http://www.zotero.org/>

Zotero, the presenters were able to insert the OAC data model⁶ into hundreds of thousands of researchers' workflows. The interface they presented (<http://mith.umd.edu/AXE/>) was initially blank; any URI content can be dragged and dropped into it. The annotator uses the polygon selection tool provided to identify which portion of the document or image is being tagged.

One of their findings is that researchers are not happy with storing their annotations in a web service; they want to keep a copy themselves.

Codes, Clouds and Constellations: Open Science in the Data Decade

Liz Lyon, Director of UKOLN at the University of Bath (UK), presented the closing plenary. The point of departure for this talk was the Open Science at Web-Scale Report published in November 2009⁷. One of the things they've discovered is that every place has different workflows, different software, hardware, and different specifications. The Infrastructure for Integration in Structural Sciences⁸ (I2S2 Project) seeks to bridge the chasm in data integration across the web and institutional boundaries. Additionally, they will be performing a cost-benefit analysis.

One area where this sort of effort can have a huge impact is on genome sequencing. The goal is to sequence a genome for less than \$1,000 by 2013. In the face of the data deluge, we need methods that are cost-effective, secure, provide ease of use, and potentially move the content into the cloud for storage. The SAGE (Security and Globalization Effects Global Public Policy Academic Group⁹) initiative, among others, is seeking methods for people to share data which can be used for preventative and predictive treatment. An example of such sharing is the Personal Genome Project.¹⁰ Unfortunately, some researchers don't want to share their data.

In nature cell biology, scientists are looking for new metrics to enable them to cite datasets and share information about them. One issue is attribution granularity; the complexity challenges are considerable.

SAGE has developed an Open Science Institution Readiness Checklist¹¹ to help us determine if our institution is ready for citizen participation in the expansion and development of scientific efforts. Dr. Lyon urged us all to consider the questions and address the issues at our own institutions. As an example, she held up Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute¹² (RPI in New York) as facilitating team science. How do our own institution's faculty support open science? We need to be embedding data informatics, providing education for faculty and LIS students.

Data sharing requires pragmatic solutions and embedded workflows, attribution granularity, research assessment. We need to be able to harness the crowd, and to do so, will require tools, interfaces, guidance and assistance. For open science to succeed, institutional strategies must embrace informatics. The prospects are transformational.

⁶ http://www.openannotation.org/documents/OAC-Model_UseCases-alpha.pdf

⁷ <http://www.jisc.ac.uk/media/documents/publications/research/2009/open-science-report-6nov09-final-sentojisc.pdf>

⁸ <http://www.ukoln.ac.uk/projects/I2S2/>

⁹ <http://www.sagecenter.net/>

¹⁰ <http://www.personalgenomes.org/>

¹¹ <http://www.jisc.ac.uk/publications/reports/2009/opensciencerppt.aspx>

¹² <http://www.rpi.edu/>

In parting, Dr. Lyon recommended us to the Digital Curation Conference to be held in Chicago this December.

Summary

Clearly, from the opening and closing plenary, the CNI staff is urging us to implement institutional changes that will better support open access and the development of open science. Faculty research should be deposited into an institutional repository with non-exclusive rights, and its inclusion there needs to be part of the tenure and promotion process. Support for scientific data-sharing and the involvement of the public in providing the data needed for scientific enquiry creates multiple challenges for us in the coming years.

The presentations attended focused rather heavily on assessing the current landscape and seeking strategic roles for libraries, including how best to assess our impact in order to secure more funds. The mood of the conference was, to me, quite anxious and somewhat fearful. What if we cannot change our institutions or our foci quickly enough? It seems we are being called upon to change our culture and practices very quickly, constantly scanning to determine the direction for the next iteration of change. If indeed we are to have much impact at the institutional level, if we are to be involved in the decisions surrounding management of informatics across campus, we need to have multiple strong leaders connecting with researchers and departments. By keeping our fingers on the pulse of the needs of our faculty, we will be able to leverage our knowledge of information science to assist in the development of solutions. If the table where these problems and solutions are discussed does not yet exist, perhaps we should set it, and invite OIT to join us.