

**ESIG Meeting at EPSCoR - September 7, 2003
Las Vegas, Nevada**

The Group first held a discussion on *Campus Research Politics*, particularly on successful ways to make a case for STM information:

Montana State has strong support with their VP of Research and have recently been able to double access through electronic. Has been helpful in attracting faculty and graduate students. In addition, they are receiving a larger portion of F&A for the library to cover the cost of inflation. They are making creative use of statistics, e.g., one Web of Science search occurs every twelve minutes (24/7).

Have discussed set-aside funding for STM journal access. Montana doing this! They get some "off- the- top" funding. Part of research infrastructure funding.

How do we replicate what is done in Montana? Have to look at campus culture. At MSU, they were in a severe decline 4 years ago. They had to change their attitude; now see access to information as fixed cost like lights. So increases to library automatically given e.g. health care, libraries, ? management.

New Mexico did this at state legislative level!! One of only 2 that get increases!

We need to recognize that we are competing against other goods:

- grad assistants
- lab space
- expensive equipment

How do we make a case for STM information? In Montana, faculty have bought into this view. Have made commitment, so comes in higher than 3-4 graduate students. This is presented as a RESEARCH problem and not as a "library problem."

Crux is commitment. If committed to research as a significant part of the mission, then we have to make parallel a commitment to information resources.

EPSCoR to reduce barriers to research competitiveness. As research program grows, the library as barrier grows. Have to show is a barrier to growth.

At Montana, 2.5% goes to library

NM State has 5%. She gave them a choice: undergrad library or research library.

ESIG members surveyed (unscientifically) by B. Winters, WV:

33% - of respondents get no indirect costs from their institution.

33% - get a percentage (which varies from institution to institution).

33% - receive a flat amount of grant dollars.

From researcher POV, this is information issue, not library issue!

New model for most schools to get for STM access. Get out of local politics, local arena.

Some countries (Canada, UK) setting up national solution for access. Compromise? National Commitment? "No research library left behind."

Pilot program most likely to be funded.

This is "our" problem. Need to work in concert.

Publishers - cost still going up even if electronic. Consider ESIG as third world country? Canadian licenses vary by institution. No different than CIC getting. Also, publishers now know how to price consortia.

Cost per ? Has gone down (of course, use easier, get more use!).

Can (how can) NSF help? Carolyn Fuller, Washington lobbyist with Van Scoyoc Associates, made clarification about support from NSF: EPSCoR Foundation may not be a good source for central funding, as it works on policy. E. Coalition is a possibility for central funding. EPSCoR infrastructure awards are handled through state agencies. In Montana, they are not clashing but are participating in shared infrastructure improvement award for the state. This differs from state to state.

Look at other areas of NSF?

Is it time for alternative model? Match basis?

Coalition (hill, lobbying) and Foundation agencies joined at the hip.

Four years ago, NSF changed EPSCoR program, aimed at major research centers. So changes would not go very far. But reasonable to look at other NSF groups.

SIGHS? SIZE? Computer Information Science and Engineering CISE! Deals with computers, networking, etc. She's been working with NASULGC.

In general, EPSCoR senators are sensitive to networking needs; not as clear on journal needs.

Action item:

Put together short paper on delivering information, STM? To Congress, NSF, OSTP. (The outcome of this was a white paper drafted by Bruce Morton, copy attached. This paper was delivered to MSU's EPSCoR director and was a part of the agenda of the October 29, 2003, EPSCoR Coalition Board meeting. Following that meeting, the ESIG Board was invited to present a proposal for funding to the EPSCoR Foundation. Copy of that proposal is attached. The Foundation voted not to fund the proposal at their meeting on July 13, 2004.)

ESIG Partnership with EBSCO (for the Kluwer Deal)

(EBSCO rep Stan Terry present.)

Many of us are EBSCO customers. They also provide services for publishers. Publishers beginning to see more value in their services.

EBSCO role evolving. Value in administrative details.

Kluwer - their point of view. Some details (first they have attached in detail).

- Control on escalators
- 280 titles retail does not match up.
- No relation at Kluwer between print fulfillment and electronic fulfillment. Want to move all consortial fulfillment out of regular fulfillment process. More of a spreadsheet system. But no print fulfillment through that system.

So EBSCO tries to understand and create procedures so works for all. But how fulfill and remit to publishers is different. EBSCO has been working with Kluwer for 3 weeks to try to understand, find how Kluwer will work with them. Will put out a set of instructions to libraries on how to handle renewals. They can facilitate invoicing, ordering at this point.

Where library paying for dual access, do we need to do both through EBSCO or just electronic? They will give us information on our choices, and we can elect to pay print through another vendor. May mean more work for library staff. No control over what other vendor will do.

Keep in mind: Consortial retail is different from publisher retail!

Each office will fill in a spread sheet for fall renewal so be sure consortial rates correct. Kluwer has different rates for each consortium! Admin side very complicated!

Dual access offerings result of libraries not ready to give up print. So print prices vary. They have spent a lot of time straightening out this chaos!

Getting right data at right time is key!

Not ready to distribute definitive process (changed again 9/5/03!). But will put together sheet covering all variations in ordering. Will do same for Wiley package.

EBSCO can also help identify packages, terms, collections (vendors want to know amount of business), etc. They will NOT negotiate on our behalf, but will support negotiation. They have folks who deal with electronic journals, delivery, etc. ONLY! Can get turned on in 24 - 48 hours. Have a lot of experience now.

We do not order at same time. No real problem.

Have multiple year pricing in title file.

Have to identify to Kluwer:

- Who is in consortium, who is not.
- Journals with what vendors.

ESIG is \$2.5 M worth of business to Kluwer.

What if have access to another consortium? Could we transfer credit? Has to be determined individually.

Dekker deal? Non-ESIG? Publisher does not care who is in the consortium.

EBSCO supports administration, does NOT do negotiation. Dekker is one reason we have to say this. Say, "Communication conduit for offers." Publishers do not like to see EBSCO negotiating.

EBSCO involved in communicating the licensing concerns, terms. Consultative.

There haven't been any lawsuits dealing with licensing data products.

Our order processed at local office. Only invoice at consortial level will be new journals (new content). This will have 7% tacked on.

New content is new content over last 3 years! Things came online during 3 years. So may pay retroactively for something no one used.

We are in many different consortia! Some have 6 choices for same item. Timing may not line up with publisher calendar, budgets. Publishers always on calendar year.

Easy to decide if want to participate as a group, but institution factors affect whether individual institutions can buy in. Some publishers can deal with opt in. Others price based on number of participants.

Smaller institutions reap benefit of the larger institutions' participation.

Alabama suggests that we ask Solinet to handle billing.

Affiliated campuses - central usually bills to sub campuses. If central doesn't want to handle, could send bills to affiliate. EBSCO could do this. Take one consortial piece and subdivide.

Line of credit? Would depend on regional, local office.

Can do as one big package in administration so publisher sees ESIG.

Customer service? They have beefed up their publisher service side. Time and turn around on electronic issue different from print issue. They are working on this.

What does EBSCO need from ESIG?

- Who's in on Kluwer deal? IN / OUT
- What other agent used (if relevant).
- Agreement on how to distribute newly published journal fees.

Expect / could get out definitive plan this week. We need to compare with other offers.

We get access to Kluwer because of list but also duplicates!

What if have to cancel? There is 1% cancellation clause in contract. Some schools having to cancel, could change things.

Be clear on what is electronic order and which is print and electronic. EBSCO does not want to handle consortia thru regular channels.

Should we note if "non cancelable?" Kluwer will assume responsibility if in violation of license. Publishers will inform us! Value of title matching certain percent is unlikely.

EBSCO did pilot project between Elsevier and Texas A&M. They're calling EBSCO's involvement as an "experiment." Successful from EBSCO, customer point of view. Have discussed with Elsevier, have limited expansion to 30 accounts. EBSCO's compensation? They were compensated fairly by Elsevier, did not have to charge clients. Elsevier now waffling, limiting to 30 clients.

REPOSITORY: Greg Tananbaum, Berkeley E-Press:

ESIG: Case for systemwide repository. Overview of development of idea. Scholarly publishing landscape:

Strengths - peer review, hierarchy of outlets, transition to print and electronic widens availability.

Weaknesses - delays in publishing, substantial subscription costs, lack of viable outlets for non-standard materials (reports, working papers, etc.). Monographs could have short print run.

Subscription costs: ARL stats and graph: expenditures up 226%, but bought 7% less. 1998-2002: increases of 39-50% depending on area, discipline.

University point of view: source of human capital, source of revenue for human capital, then buy the journals.

University as publisher, distributor of information:

- halve the double dip
- outlets of non-stud stuff
- ? perpetual access
- better representation of scholarship created within the institution.
- Stake, or further leadership claim in specific subject area. (Show we are a leader).

Examples of university as publisher:

- SPARC - sponsored, peer reviewed (AZ: Journal of Insect Science).
- Subject-based portals (e.g. Cornell's Project)
- Institution - based portals - U. California E Scholarship Repository. D Space is another example. E-prints.

California Digital Library - has an e-scholarship group exploring a lot of areas, has lots of projects.

So, use CA as case study. Berkeley Electronic Press founded by professors several years ago. Have 20 journals now. Created a peer review system, publishing behind this to support, keep cheap.

Approached by CDL, confluence of interests.

- be press - flexible, willingness to adapt, knowledge of professoriate.
- CDL - large user community, desire to be more than buying club.

Key decisions made:

- give participating units unique spaces that feed into larger collection. Material discoverable from multiple points.
- Uploading as easy as possible, new and legacy.
- Non-static resources should be included
- alerting component as new materials published.
- OAI compliance - way for data to be "crawled," way to be aggregated in future.

Feature set:

- auto conversion to PDF
- ability to publish non-states resources (sound, video, etc.)
- accept wide variety of publisher types
- publish HTML
- peer review module
- full-text searching
- save searches
- browsing by date, author
- access/subscribe control

- HTML - base template
- customized controlled - vocabulary pick list for data entry.
- Branded publishing sites
- customized doc. cover page
- automated email interface between author and pub. administration
- usage stats
- ? email
- auto email on new materials
- flexible doc. hierarchy

e Scholarship Repository Rollout

BENEFITS:

- increased visibility of research
- OA1 and 'googling' of research
- increased profile for unit (95% of use ? U.C.)
- usage stats - how frequently used
- alternative to self-publishing or commercial options
- software easy to use, save time and resources
- no need to rely on local IT or technology
- permanence of materials

People want viable alternatives for current scholarship publishing.

How works:

- paper uploaded by author or administrator
- paper converted to PDF
- paper approved by admin. or sent back for edits
- one-click publishing on approval (peer review different)
- associated files published at same time
- pages immediately updated
- may be discovered immediately thru unique paths (Google in about 2 days)
- interested parties notified (daily, weekly, monthly, as chosen)

Results to date (launched 4/02):

- 12 units in first wave
- now 125 units (9/03)
- 30 more in queue to join
- 200k full text downloads registered, weekly average 4k. 95% not UC!

Ex. Anderson School of Management

2220 papers as of midnight 9/7/03

Discoverable in many ways.

Why so successful?

co development provided software system that was easy to adopt

motivated partners

advantages make adoption "no-brainer"

network effect, viral marketing, between/among campuses and disciplines. UCLA linguistics triggered UC-SF

linguistics and UCLA Romance Languages

addressed current frustration among faculty

What should ESIG do?

- provide platform collectively that cannot do individually
- demonstrate depth, breath of research of member institutions
- create "subject bands" that transcend institutional borders
- escape buying club model
- fulfill EPSCoR's charter
 - bring lasting improvements to states research infrastructure
- historical & prospective archive
 - increase members' national R&D competitiveness
- at what does school excel?
 - accelerate movement of institutions into mainstream of federal and private R&D

Tenure:

Historically, bias against giving equal value to electronic publications. Falling away, less of an issue.

Peer-reviewed still treated with respect, even if electronic. Have a lot of work in progress, preprints. Even in biosciences, where don't do preprints, are publishing the parallel materials, backup materials that would otherwise not be there.

They have tech. For peer-review. So the consortia has to decide if they want to provide peer review. Can pull out to side to show have gone thru more.

Cost? Flat rate for all you can eat. Some few thousand for certain numbers.

If grant money involved, we would take over at end. Out going costs!

Federating different instances of repositories. OAI STER. COM at the University of Michigan, searches across OAI compliant repositories. OAI linkup has not been developed. Mostly developing internal, get running internally before work to link.

Work with federating vendors? Have not done much yet. CDL owns project, and not on their front burner. Should not be harder.

CDL has approached some A&I services, but not enough. The bias to peer review is changing. Great piece.

PERL system runs on Apache servers. Have poured a lot of money into. Contact him is want more information. Built his own database.

Florida State University library central for this? Otherwise, at UC, each research unit has an administrator.

Dspace vs. BPE? Dspace free, can be customized. But on your own for development, support. Have to build own infrastructure. BPE commercial entity and are motivated to meet needs. Technology continually improving. Can be implemented quickly. Open source - free.

Data, including metadata, transportable? Fully exportable, but have to negotiate format. Data owned by university.

Greg will send the PowerPoint for distribution!

www.repositories.cdlib.org

ORGANIZATION ISSUES:

ESIG Organization (Bruce): starting point for discussion.

- model of organization and leadership
- move beyond volunteers for 'deals'
- funding

ASERL found projects moved forward once had a coordinator.

Motion to approve model given.

Incorporation model? 501(c)(3)?

MSU legal counsel said don't.

AISTI just incorporated.

Why not? Financial obligations? How much business will we do? Legal obligations for contracts? Institutions concede contracting authority to organization? Would really be done by institution, through Mole? 24 institutions represented here. There are 41 on list on web site (those who said would be members).

What are benefits of organization?

- right to sit at table
- participate in ESIG deals
- potential of new deals within EPSCoR community
- collective voice promoting libraries in EPSCoR
- grant development

Subnet in EPSCoR family, or are we pulling out? Creating separate group? Other groups funded through EPSCoR, we're thinking of funding from library budget.

Already EPSCoR dollars on campus in Montana, but EPSCoR different in each state.

State EPSCoR programs should be supporting, not the libraries. If does not happen, library has to decide if they should participate.

Lots of work involved in managing "deals."

Renewable for group this size took a lot of time! He did not have time to explore other publisher options!

Number of hours a week varied by part of the cycle. Average of whole year five years/week. Other times could be half his time. If count assistant, 10 hours/week.

How affected by EBSCO? Invoicing the highest time consuming item, so will save that. But EBSCO will not negotiate for us.

Learning curve involved, gets easier as go along. But turnover creates need for more learning, etc.

Group could shift beyond 3 licenses to other projects, so more time involved.

"Big 10" went from 8 to 30 members. Also have to support grant efforts. Nebraska has 1 FTE equivalent dedicated to consortial activities.

Let anyone be around table at an EPSCoR meeting. Motion still on table. Can we stay tied to EPSCoR?

Too many ebbs and flows in who comes and goes. Have had 2 drop out of Kluwer and Blackwell. 43 in one or both licenses. Eligible? Not sure. 48 on web page who said want to be considered part of the group. Develop directory? 5 ARLs.

Cost of \$1000 can be expensive for smaller schools. Stay away from incorporation to keep close to EPSCoR.

Still need dollars in hand.

Organization passed with one abstention.

Money to operate next year? Need someone to do the stuff. What will it cost us? Pledge \$1000 for one year? EBSCO will add their charge to invoices. Ex. UNLV pays 3.2%.

ELECTIONS:

Election of board by end of month. Call for nominations other listserv. Consider representation patters—not all Montana, not all west, etc. Let the election take care of this.

Be sure institution allows treasurer to be a fiscal agent. Be sure \$1000 is enough. ASERL is now \$2500. They also have charge for various projects. Dues fund fixed cost.

Need to find institution to carry forward the renewals we have until can do transition. Continue discussion on how much staff involved.

Need to capture folks that are not around the table. Indicate strong consensus. If we know folks at sister institutions, be sure on ESIG listserv. That is how we will notify folks.

Name decided at first meeting.

List of things that we need to do when we are board elected. One is how to position ourselves with EPSCoR. Board participating in March meeting! How do we get in their governance structure?

Functionality of group is fuzzy until get board. Also, \$1000 temporary until board can cost out. Also question of hosting mechanism of employee to do work. Labor market a consideration. Should individual handle finances? Model of EPSCoR offices in institutions. Can also call on regional networks (again, to board).

Be sure fiscally audit proof.

Criteria for elections, nominations? CEO of library will cast vote. Nominees have commitment of institution for travel money.

Attachment 1:
White Paper Presented to EPSCoR by Bruce Morton, Montana State University, at Request of Carolyn Fuller

What is ESIG?

It is the **EPSCoR Science Information Group**. ESIG was founded in June 2001 at a meeting of librarians from 16 EPSCoR states. To date, 48 libraries from 20 EPSCoR states, plus Puerto Rico, have identified themselves as members of the ESIG initiative. ESIG is in the process of electing a board of directors comprised of a President, immediate past-president, president-elect, a secretary/treasurer, and three at-large directors.

Why ESIG?

EPSCoR focuses on those states that have historically received lesser amounts of Federal R&D funding and have demonstrated a commitment to develop their research bases and to improve the quality of science and engineering research conducted at their universities and colleges. The assumption is the creation or improvement of sustainable S&T infrastructure at the state and institutional levels will significantly increase the ability of EPSCoR researchers and institutions to compete successfully for Federal and private sector R&D support.

However, from the perspective of librarians at research institutions in EPSCoR states, EPSCoR has heretofore neglected a critical part of the research equation--the information infrastructure (i.e., info structure). Researchers in EPSCoR institutions have complained bitterly about the dearth of the journals and databases to which their counterparts (competitors) at more affluent institutions have access. Not having 24 x 7 desktop access to the STM information they need simply makes them less competitive than they might otherwise be, in effect devaluing --to a degree-- the investment of EPSCoR research dollars.

What ESIG Has Accomplished and What Can Be Accomplished:

ESIG can provide a vehicle through which EPSCoR libraries can negotiate deals at excellent prices for electronic STM journal suites and/or STM databases. Since its inception ESIG has brought the 670 e-journals Blackwell Science (Synergy) suite to 21 EPSCoR libraries (in 14 states) and the Kluwer e-journal suite to 22 EPSCoR libraries (12 states). Most recently 14 EPSCoR libraries (in 8 states) have subscribe to the Marcel Dekker 78 e-journal package at extremely attractive pricing. Opportunities abound for additional deals. ESIG also has the potential to be a catalyst for education and visioning relating to the future of STM information and scholarly communication.

What ESIG Needs:

ESIG librarians met in Las Vegas concurrent with the September 2003 EPSCoR meeting. Based on experience with the aforementioned deals, it was recognized and decided that ESIG needs to put in place at one of its member libraries a person to handle ESIG business, which would include coordinating communication among ESIG libraries, scout and negotiate deals, manage license renewals, track the disbursement of funds from member libraries; it is expected that ESIG funds will be managed through the G&C office of one of its member institutions.

The is, therefore, proposed that ESIG will need approximately \$100K annually to establish such an office and provide benefits and travel support for the ESIG staff coordinator; \$4,500 per EPSCoR state.

**Attachment 2:
Copy of Proposal for Funding, Submitted to EPSCoR Foundation, July 2004**

June 22, 2004

Ms. Dina Katsev
Program Associate
EPSCoR/IDeA Foundation

Dear Ms. Katsev:

Thank you for the opportunity to continue the discussion of the EPSCoR Science Information Group (ESIG) proposal to fund collaborative library activities in support of EPSCoR research programs. ESIG is committed to increasing the effectiveness of EPSCoR researchers by delivering online scholarly journals and databases, and the ESIG proposal is the next logical step to improve access to scholarly research information needed by faculty and staff located in EPSCoR states.

Three years ago, 30 research libraries from EPSCoR states mutually agreed to negotiate group subscriptions for collections of electronic journals and databases, leveraging their combined purchasing power to achieve lower unit costs. Staff within individual ESIG libraries took responsibility for researching terms and negotiating contracts for these joint subscriptions. Several contracts were successfully negotiated and participating libraries thereby added significant new content to support their institutional research programs – titles they could not otherwise have afforded.

The following are a few examples of the research packages negotiated through the ESIG initiative:

Kluwer Online – provides access to 650 online journals in physical sciences, behavioral sciences, biosciences, environmental and plant sciences, biosciences, engineering and computer sciences, and humanities and social sciences.

Blackwell Synergy – 739 online journals in agricultural and animal sciences, engineering, computing and technology, health sciences, life and physical sciences, medicine, humanities, social and behavioral sciences, business, economics, finance, accounting, math and stats. T

Marcel Dekker Publishing – 78 online journals in agricultural, chemistry, biology, earth and geosciences, engineering, environment, medicine, physics, food science and technology.

Wiley E-journals – provides shared online access to any of the 186 journals held among the participating ESIG libraries. This subscription not only offers access to materials owned by each institution's library, but also allows access to information purchased by other ESIG libraries.

Joint subscription by ESIG libraries has therefore created access to over 1,400 online scholarly research journals for those libraries that chose to participate. The result of the ESIG initiative was the opportunity to add significant research content at a cost below what an individual library could negotiate, thereby directly benefiting the institutions' and states' EPSCoR agenda. As an example of spending a modicum of additional money to purchase significantly broader access to the journal literature, prior to the ESIG deal Boise State had subscribed to 150 Kluwer journals; with the ESIG deal, they were able to add access to 400 additional journal titles for a total

additional expenditure of \$1,040. In general, the average ESIG library participating in both the Kluwer and Blackwell Synergy deals gained access to an average of 1,300 additional electronic journals at an average cost per institution of \$8,000 beyond what they were already spending with Kluwer and Blackwell.

Researchers in EPSCoR institutions are calling on their libraries to provide access to a growing number of journals and databases, and consortial subscription is a powerful tool for reducing costs and adding new content. Maintaining the current licenses for ESIG is a time consuming annual process of price negotiation, subscription reconciliation, and invoicing – compounded as license period expire and new agreements have to be negotiated. This is challenging for the ESIG institutions that have volunteered to shoulder the work, and this volunteer process is not sustainable into the future. For this reason, we have not yet been able to approach a number of the largest science and technology publishers, for example Elsevier (1,800 titles) and Taylor & Francis (1,200 titles). ESIG has therefore proposed that the EPSCoR/IDeA Foundation Board support an experienced agent (the Alliance for Innovation in Science and Technology Information – AISTI) to work on behalf of the ESIG group in negotiating and managing favorable agreements with publishers.

We have proposed funding for one year, after which we will evaluate the effectiveness of the program by the number of new titles made available to participating institutions and the cost-savings achieved for any existing subscriptions. At the end of the first year we will report our recommendations for the future. We anticipate that we will recommend an annual allocation to support an agent in the acquisition of new titles and renewal of titles that continue to be valued by EPSCoR researchers.

The Alliance for Innovation in Science and Technology Information (AISTI) is a partnership of university and federal research libraries and organizations with the same goals as ESIG. AISTI and ESIG are an excellent match. Both groups seek to provide access to scholarly information predominantly in the fields of science and technology. There is no conflict of interest between the two groups and there will be opportunities to join together in future negotiations for publishers' packages. This proposal will allow ESIG and AISTI to form a more powerful purchasing "cartel" than either would be alone. The Executive Director is experienced in negotiating with publishers, and she understands the fine points of licensing information. She has experience working with libraries and will be ready to represent ESIG immediately. She also understands the kind of "serials control" information that must be maintained for individual institutions and then transmitted to publishers – work that must be updated with each renewal cycle. An opportunity to employ such a knowledgeable person is rare and ESIG believes the match is a good one. (We attach a letter of interest from the AISTI executive director.)

Scholarly information is a critical component of the expanding research programs in EPSCoR states. As EPSCoR programs develop and expand, researchers are asking for more current scholarly information, and libraries have responded to increasing demands for information through the ESIG initiative. It is a deliberate effort by libraries in EPSCoR states to strengthen the research infrastructure through efficient and effective negotiations with publishers. The EPSCoR/IDeA Foundation can make a significant contribution to sustaining and expanding the success of the national EPSCoR program by supporting ESIG's request for funding. The return on investment will be seen through the success of state research programs, their ability to compete for national research grants, and the further economic development within EPSCoR states.

Again, thank you for the opportunity to provide more information about the ESIG request for funding from the EPSCoR/IDeA Foundation. Please contact me if you have additional questions.

Sincerely,

ESIG Board of Directors
Barbara Winters, President