

The project team, led by James Madison University Libraries Data Services Coordinator Yasmeen Shorish and Open Educational Resources Librarian Liz Thompson, and in collaboration with the Association for Research Libraries, is seeking a 13 month National Forum Grant to convene experts and stakeholders to address key opportunities and challenges in developing an open access collection development system. Academic collection development and acquisitions librarians use subscription agents, book aggregators, and approval plans to maximize efficiency by reducing the number of relationships and transactions necessary to purchase and license collections. Library consortia leverage these networked tools to make smart, collaborative collections decisions aligned with local and regional priorities, resource sharing relationships, and shared print agreements. For open access (OA) content, particularly from new content creators, there are no such tools and arrangements.

This National Forum proposal is the first step in surfacing community requirements and principles towards a collective OA collection development system. The Forum will ask participants to envision a collective funding environment for libraries to contribute provisioning or sustaining funds to OA content providers. Through a series of successive focus groups, the Forum will ask a non-random but diverse sample of the academic library community about the conditions under which they could and would participate in openly and collectively funding OA content that is wholly or partially a public good. These forums will be held at three national conferences and travel scholarships will be available to encourage inclusive participation.

The anticipated outcome of this Forum—a white paper based on observations from six focus groups— will benefit a diverse array of stakeholders, including library professionals from a variety of roles and institutions, consortia entities, and OA content providers and advocates. Through participation in the forums and/or reading the final white paper, community members will contribute their needs, values, and priorities to the discussion, elucidating the areas of opportunity and friction and leading to a common vocabulary and framework to discuss collective funding of public goods content. The team anticipates that the community will derive additional research questions from the white paper, such as a large-scale data collection instrument to determine the community's state of readiness for this kind of collective action, and/or product development projects responsive to insights reported in the paper. The outcome of the Forum grant is also well aligned with current efforts advocating for community-controlled OA infrastructure, complementing that ongoing work and providing the community with an accessible foundation on which to build.

Most current initiatives in the open scholarly content arena are focused on what institutions can do, as well as what individual content providers can do, to achieve sustainability. This National Forum further explores the critically important role of individual collection development and acquisitions librarians in collecting open content, and the environment, norms, and systems they would need to have in place to make informed, locally beneficial decisions. A final dissemination meeting to discuss and interrogate the white paper's observations will further expand the community building ethos of the forums and help enfranchise a larger segment of the profession in this effort. While important to further the national movement towards collective action, the white paper will also be an important tool for individual institutions and for consortia to apply or adapt the takeaways to their local or regional environments.

Supporting OA collections in the open: community requirements and principles

1. Statement of National Need

Academic collection development and acquisitions librarians use subscription agents, book aggregators, and approval plans to maximize efficiency by reducing the number of relationships and transactions necessary to purchase and license collections. Library consortia leverage these networked tools to make smart, collaborative collections decisions aligned with local and regional priorities, resource sharing relationships, and shared print agreements. For open access (OA) content, particularly from new content creators, there are no such tools and arrangements. This National Forum proposal is the first step in surfacing community requirements and principles towards a collective OA collection development system. The Forum will ask participants to envision a collective funding environment for libraries to contribute provisioning or sustaining funds to OA content providers. Through a series of successive focus groups, the Forum will ask a non-random but diverse sample of the academic library community about the conditions under which they could and would participate in openly and collectively funding OA content that is wholly or partially a public good.

Currently, in the absence of such a system, OA content providers most often receive provisioning or start-up funds from grants, and then devise memberships¹ in order to collect sustaining fees. This Forum will engage participants in creative thinking around how a collective funding model could be designed in order to 1) minimize the creation of new membership organizations, which come with attendant governance responsibilities that do not scale; 2) create and maintain a dynamic catalog of OA content providers; and 3) be a source of systemwide data on library investment in open content where currently none exists.

While David Lewis's "2.5% Commitment"², the associated Invest in Open Initiative³, and the European coalition SCOSS⁴ all address vetting and collectively funding *infrastructure*, this project is a complementary effort focusing on funding OA *content*.⁵ The project team is requesting \$89,333 for a National Forum Grant through the National Digital Platform to convene experts and stakeholders to address key opportunities and challenges in building an OA collection development system. Through a series of small, moderated forums, the project team will explore librarians' individual and institutional attitudes and behaviors toward funding public goods content and produce a white paper of observations and recommendations. The team anticipates that the academic library community will derive additional research questions from the white paper, such as a large-scale data collection instrument to determine the state of

¹ See, for example, ArXiv

(<https://confluence.cornell.edu/display/arxivpub/Business+and+Governance+Information>), BioMed Central (<https://www.biomedcentral.com/about/institutional-support/membership>), Cogent OA (<https://www.cogentoa.com/article-publishing-charges/membership-schemes>).

² Lewis, David W. "The 2.5% Commitment," September 11, 2017. <http://doi.org/10.7912/C2JD29>

³ "Toward a Scholarly Commons: Moving to Open since 2017," <https://scholarlycommons.net/>

⁴ The Global Sustainability Coalition for Open Science Services (SCOSS) <http://scoss.org/>

⁵ The Open Access Network (OAN) (<http://openaccessnetwork.org/>) is also designed primarily to encourage institutional support of the infrastructure for scholarly communication as well as the content enabled by that infrastructure. See Rebecca Kennison and Lisa Norberg, "A Scalable and Sustainable Approach to Open Access Publishing and Archiving for Humanities and Social Sciences: A White Paper," April 11, 2014 <http://knconsultants.org/toward-a-sustainable-approach-to-open-access-publishing-and-archiving/>

the community's readiness for this kind of collective action, and/or product development projects responsive to insights reported in the paper.

The white paper will benefit a diverse array of stakeholders, including library professionals from a variety of roles and institutions, consortia entities, and OA content providers and advocates. Through participation in the forums and/or reading the final white paper, community members will contribute their needs, values, and priorities to the discussion, elucidating the areas of opportunity and friction and leading to a common vocabulary and framework to discuss collective funding of public goods content. The project team will draw from literature on voluntary public goods provisioning and coalition-building,⁶ constructing questions designed to elicit opinions and expectations about reciprocity and parity among members of a particular coalition. With the clear objective of the National Forum Grant to produce a report with action items related to a challenge, the project team is well positioned to engage participants in fruitful conversation and dialog, minimizing the potential for tangential divergence.

1.2 Background

When David Lewis published "The 2.5% Commitment" arguing that "academic libraries should commit 2.5% of their total budgets to organizations and projects that contribute to the common digital infrastructure needed to support the open scholarly commons," the reaction in the academic library community was largely "how?" and not "why?"⁷ Our own project will focus on content, not infrastructure, but will maintain close communication with Lewis and the Invest in Open project team as the efforts share this basic question: how can and will academic libraries (of all sizes, both private and public) use local collections money to contribute to open public goods? How will individual librarians make choices about where to invest, and what information do they need from providers and from their peers in order to commit sustaining funds?

Since the 2002 Budapest Open Access Initiative, the global scholarly and library communities have issued dozens of statements and manifestos in support of open scholarship and open data.⁸ There is widespread and growing interest in the library community in helping to fund and accelerate the development of open educational resources (OER).⁹ Since 2016, more than 15 scholarly communities have launched open preprint services on the Open Science Framework (OSF) alone, and many of those communities have librarians on their steering committees.¹⁰ While academic librarians and their professional associations are largely supportive of open scholarship in theory, how to fund it remains a nascent if lively conversation, primarily at the institutional level.¹¹ This National Forum project focuses on how individual acquisitions or collections librarians would function in an environment where contributing to open content was a mainstream activity tied to advancing local mission and collecting priorities.

⁶ Burger, Nicholas E. and Charles D. Kolstad (2009) "Voluntary Public Goods Provision, Coalition Formation, and Uncertainty," NBER Working Paper #15543. DOI: 10.3386/w15543

⁷ ACRL/SPARC: "The 2.5% Commitment Initiative: What You Need to Know," ACRL Forum, ALA Midwinter Meeting, February 2018.

⁸ Kramer, Bianca and Jeroen Bosman (2017) "Scholarly Communications Charters" <http://tinyurl.com/scholcomm-charters>

⁹ SPARC, "List of North American OER Policies & Projects," <https://sparcopen.org/our-work/list-of-oer-policies-projects/>

¹⁰ OSF Preprints, <https://osf.io/preprints/>

¹¹ Conversations/initiatives include OA2020, SPARC Investment Fund, UC Pathways to Open Access, 2.5%

In 2016, Ellen Finnie, Director of Scholarly Communications and Collections Strategy at the MIT Libraries, explained her institution's new and novel strategy: "to use our collections dollars—in a more systematic and strategic way—to transform the scholarly communications landscape towards more openness, and toward expanded, democratized access."¹² In 2017, the University of California (UC) Council of University Librarians charged a group to analyze pathways and strategies for its campuses to effect large-scale transition to OA content.¹³ In Finnie's blog post at "In The Open," she acknowledged that because MIT Libraries is well-resourced (as is the University of California System), it may have more flexibility than other libraries to employ a values-based approach to OA collecting.

This Forum will endeavor to include representatives from academic libraries of all sizes and types (i.e., research, comprehensive, liberal arts, community college) in order to understand the opportunities and constraints in the community as a whole in sustaining OA public goods. James Madison University, as a public university with graduate programs and very high undergraduate enrollment, is a good representative institution for whom the envisioned system would need to work. In collaboration with the Association of Research Libraries and others, the project team leverages a wide array of experience and perspectives, which will help mitigate institutional blind spots and assumptions in the Forum design.

Literature Review

Beyond the library community or even the knowledge economy broadly,¹⁴ there is a body of theoretical and experimental literature on public goods contributions, particularly around coalition-building, coordination, and institutionalized reciprocity. This literature can help the project team understand the broad conditions under which institutions or individuals will contribute to public goods. This literature also addresses the problems cast as "free-riding," or more generally "the problem of collective action."¹⁵ In "The 2.5% Commitment," Lewis suggests that the commitment to open infrastructure will only happen if it becomes both normative and institutionalized—through library membership organizations, academic institutions, or accrediting bodies. This Forum, focusing on open content, is meant to explore how individual library decision-makers and influencers might behave in such a normative environment, and what information they would need from providers and peers, as well as what commitments and coordination they would need, in order to participate as contributors to support particular content providers.

The project team is also familiar with fundamental financial and regulatory constraints, on public institutions in particular, with respect to procurement processes and limitations on charitable giving.¹⁶ This project is unlikely to change any regulatory environment, but it can

¹² Finnie, Ellen (2016) "What Organic Food Shopping can tell us about Transforming the Scholarly Communications System," In the Open. <http://intheopen.net/2016/03/what-organic-food-shopping-can-tell-us-about-transforming-the-scholarly-communications-system/>

¹³ University of California Libraries (2018). "Pathways to Open Access," <https://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/groups/files/about/docs/UC-Libraries-Pathways%20to%20OA-Report.pdf>

¹⁴ "Knowledge Ecology International (KEI) Proposal: A WTO Agreement on the Supply of Knowledge as a Public Good" (2008) https://www.keionline.org/wp-content/uploads/kei_wto_agreement_on_public_goods.pdf

¹⁵ Burger and Kolstad, (2009); Ozono, Kimijo and Kazumi Shimizu (2016) "Institutionalize Reciprocity to Overcome the Public Goods Provision Problem," PLOS One, 11(6). Wenzler, John (2017) "Scholarly Communication and the Dilemma of Collective Action: Why Academic Journals Cost Too Much," College and Research Libraries, 78(2).

¹⁶ American Association of State Colleges and Universities and National Association of Education Procurement, (2010) "Public College and University Procurement: A Survey of the State Regulatory Environment, Institutional Procurement Practices, and Efforts Toward Cost Containment,"

engage focus group participants in creative thinking around what existing mechanisms might be adapted or leveraged in order for their institutions to participate in public goods contributions within library budgets. For example, cooperative collection development among regional libraries for print materials creates a kind of public good as materials retained in such arrangements are typically lendable to libraries outside of the region. Together with focus group participants, the project team will explore how decades of experience and literature regarding cooperative collection development of books can provide insight into the motivations and expectations for participating in such mutual arrangements.

2. Project Design

2.1 Goals

A significant goal of this proposal is to bring together groups of interested and invested individuals, who may have different priorities and perspectives, and begin to build a community of engagement and dialog. Through thoughtful moderation that will leverage the insights and interactions of focus group participants, the project team will develop a white paper that clearly articulates the challenges, opportunities, and potential mechanisms for building an OA collection development system and culture and that motivates the community toward collective action.

A criticism occasionally levied at OA development work is that it is either purely theoretical—relying on arguments of altruism and public good to produce change—or results in “solutions” that are hastily implemented by OA advocates in ways that either do not scale to other institutions or do not consider how the changes affect existing collection development practices and culture. The project team is designing these forums as foundational conversations, to serve as a bridge between the theoretical and the specialized solution. Before the profession can consider how to encourage a culture of collective action and community building, there must be clarity around the barriers to and concerns about such a cultural shift. These forums are a critical information-gathering activity designed to build meaningful future research and development. While those future research questions and developments are out of scope for this proposal, these forums may help motivate participants and readers of the white paper to continue the work.

The project team includes scholarly communication experts and representatives from national organizations whose work will inform the structure of and participation in the proposed Forum, including the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL), the Association of Research Libraries (ARL), and the Open Access Network (OAN). The team has secured letters of support from the 2.5% Commitment/Invest in Open Initiative, ACRL, the Association for Library Collections & Technical Services (ALCTS), and the Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition (SPARC). A National Forum, opportunistically convened at ALA Midwinter 2019, Electronic Resources and Libraries (ER&L) 2019, and ACRL 2019 in a progressive fashion, will aim to bring as many representative voices into the conversation as possible. Four travel scholarships per conference will be made available to encourage participation from those for whom conference attendance is a financial hardship (discussed further in the Diversity Plan). The team is positioned to invoke a wide network to solicit participants to collectively envisage and address key challenges and opportunities of a collective funding

system. Finally, the team will convene a workshop at the DLF Forum in fall 2019 to present the Forum work to the community.

2.2 Methods and Timeline

The project team selected a conference-adjacent focus group approach to the National Forum in order to draw from the community of key professional meetings, supplemented by travel scholarships. Small groups of 8–12 per session (two sessions at each conference) will enable the PIs, acting as moderators, to draw out “rich experiential information” from individual participants and at the same time to leverage the interaction among them to understand community dynamics.¹⁷ With exposure to nearly 75 focus group participants in the course of the project, the project team will derive both individual and interactive data.

The project team will recruit library professionals for the Forum from a variety of institution types across a range of job responsibilities and decision-making authority. The team is especially interested in participants who work within collections and acquisitions—including responsibility and participation in consortia entities—as well as those who work within scholarly communications and those who provide service to diverse constituents. The team will promote the focus groups through professional and membership association listservs and will use a web-based registration form on the project website, limiting the size to 12 per session for effective moderation and equitable participation. Additional information about the recruitment and selection process can be found in the Audience and Input section. Each session will be 90 minutes long.

The project leads are experienced moderators with considerable domain expertise in OA publishing and scholarly communication, and will structure the meetings to solicit individual, group, and interactive input on key areas of importance, including values, incentives, and practical considerations. Conducting the meetings over time allows for the opportunity to iterate the structure somewhat, allowing for new directions that the project team did not anticipate. At the conclusion of the Forum meetings, the data gathered by the facilitators will be shared with Rebecca Kennison of K|N Consultants, who will transcribe, code, analyze, and compile the findings. Kennison will also serve as the primary author of the white paper that will be widely and publicly distributed via the open LIS Scholarship Archive (LISSA) and promoted on the project website and on listservs and social media channels.

The National Forum will engage participants in issues vital to the success of the envisioned collective funding environment, including:

- Attitudes and behavior toward collective funding of open resources, including motivations and inducements to participate in such actions (exploring, for example, the limits of altruism and expectations for local benefit)
- Differences in collective behavior and expectations by institution type, size, and budget
- Definition of workflow needs across a variety of potential library units, including acquisitions, collections, liaison, and scholarly communication
- Operational elements (e.g., transparency in operating costs, adherence to Fair OA Principles) that OA content providers need to display to garner sustained investment by a library without (necessarily) a role in governance
- Exploration of what organization or entity, or what criteria for such, is best positioned to administer an OA collection development system

¹⁷ Cyr, Jennifer (2015), “The Pitfalls and Promises of Focus Groups as a Data Collection Method,” *Sociological Methods and Research* 45(2), 231-259.

To ensure a successful experience for participants, the project team will retain Raym Crow, Managing Partner at Chain Bridge Group and expert consultant in non-profit scholarly publishing and sustainability, to develop the questions and discussion guide and work with the moderators throughout the project on any necessary iterations. The design of the focus group questions (see Supporting Documentation for preliminary design) is informed by previous work, such as existing data on open content collections behaviors and desires collected by the Open Access Network,¹⁸ collective funding models under development at SPARC,¹⁹ and library-researcher/scholar partner endeavors.²⁰ With ACRL, ARL, and SPARC supporting this proposal, we can anticipate that influential audiences for the white paper will take up the challenge of continuing these investigations, perhaps culminating in the issuing of an RFP for development of a platform or system responsive to expressed community desires and concerns.

This project will begin October 1, 2018. The availability of the travel scholarships will be advertised in October, to give people ample time to make plans for ALA Midwinter in January 2019. Promotion of the scholarships for the subsequent conferences will begin approximately three months prior to the conference. ER&L 2019 will take place in March, which will give the project team time to evaluate the initial focus group dynamics and feedback, allowing the team to adjust the delivery as necessary to promote the most fruitful and positive experience. ACRL 2019 occurs one month after ER&L, allowing for a shorter window to iterate, although one would expect minimal adjustments at that point. There is enough time between each conference that the project team can determine if alternative communication and outreach methods should be used to adequately populate and diversify the focus groups at each subsequent conference.

Audio and written feedback from each session will be compiled by the project team, as per a submitted IRB protocol. After each conference, the audio data will be transcribed. In May, the transcriptions will be analyzed. In June, the project team will meet at the ARL offices in Washington DC to review the analysis and frame out the white paper. The June meeting will also serve as the dissemination strategy meeting. In August, forum participants will have the opportunity to review the report and provide feedback. By September 30, the final version of the white paper will be available in LISSA. In October 2019, the project team will hold a final workshop at the Digital Library Federation (DLF) Forum to further the dissemination of the white paper findings and build community around the next step toward developing an OA collection development system.

2.3 Audience and Input

In order for the forums to capture a wide range of views from all those who would benefit from an OA collection development system, we require a diverse group of participants. Acknowledging the risks noted below, the project team will produce targeted outreach to communities to help motivate participation across constituents. The web-based registration form will encourage participation from those who:

- Have administrative or resource-allocation authority at their institution for collections
- Have scholarly communication responsibilities at their institution

¹⁸ Kennison, Rebecca, "Unpublished Survey Data," Open Access Network

¹⁹ 2018 SPARC Program Plan, <https://sparcopen.org/who-we-are/program-plan/>

²⁰ Sutton, Shan et al (2017), "Accelerating Academy-Owned Publishing," In the Open, <http://intheopen.net/2017/11/accelerating-academy-owned-publishing/>

- Have collection development or acquisitions responsibilities at their institution
- Work in library publishing
- Rely heavily on consortial collecting at their institution
- Serve or represent under-resourced communities

The project team will apply some screening and selection criteria to the focus groups in order to limit multiple individuals from one institution and to populate each group with as diverse a selection of roles and institutions as possible.

As the project team wishes to draw into conversation a variety of stakeholders — library professionals in a variety of roles and who work in a variety of institutions — various outreach methods will be used. Utilizing listservs, such as the ACRL ScholComm list; the CRL LibLicense list, which is targeted to acquisitions and collections librarians; the Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HCBU) Library Alliance list; the ACRL Community and Junior College Libraries Section (CJCLS) list; and the ARL Diversity Fellows list will help reach a broad group of people. Coordinating the meetings with conference organizers means that the sessions will be listed in the conference schedules, where the link to the project website where people can register will be included. Using inclusive language on the registration page and in recruitment emails will help signal that these forums should be as cross-cutting as possible.

As mentioned in the Project Design, the focus groups will solicit input via moderated discussion. Feedback from participants will be captured via audio recording and written notes. A link to an anonymous comment form on the project website will be shared with participants who wish to add to their thoughts after the event. Participants will also have an opportunity to review a late draft of the white paper. We recognize that the purpose of this Forum will surely be of interest to those beyond the participants noted above, specifically consortia, publishers, subscriptions agents, and the end user community, but for the purpose stated in the Goals section and for maximum efficacy of the focus group approach, these communities are considered out of scope for participation in this Forum grant.

2.4 Risks and Assumptions

The unpredictability of participation is a risk of meeting forums. Assuming maximum attendance at each session (12 people per session), the total participant pool would be 72 people. As stated above, the team recognizes the importance of a diverse pool, but does not wish to hand-select participants. Keeping the participation call open (with consideration of the criteria noted in the Audience section) helps cover the project team's potential ignorance of knowledgeable stakeholders whom we would not know to invite. Conversely, without pre-selecting participants we risk not drawing knowledgeable stakeholders into the conversation, or—equally problematic—having too many similar voices in the room. It is the intention that the twelve travel scholarships will help diversify participation, drawing engaged individuals who may not have the professional development support for travel to participate in the meetings. While there is some risk that people who self-select to participate in the focus groups will have a predisposition towards OA, it is also possible that those skeptical of an OA collection development platform will want to participate to voice their—and their institution's—concerns.

2.5 Key Personnel

The PIs will act as the project managers and administrative liaisons on this grant, ensuring all timelines and deliverables are met and that the focus groups are well attended and run

smoothly. The project team will have monthly check-in teleconference meetings, to ensure that the registration, travel scholarship, and white paper processes are running as they should.

Yasmeen Shorish, Co-PI; James Madison University (JMU).

Yasmeen Shorish is an Associate Professor and the Data Services Coordinator at the JMU Libraries. She has published and presented on issues related to data management, scholarly communication, and representation in libraries. She served as a guest editor for a special issue of the *Journal of Librarianship and Scholarly Communication* (in press), and is the incoming Chair (2018-19) of ACRL's Research and Scholarly Environment Committee (ReSEC).

Liz Thompson, Co-PI; James Madison University (JMU).

Liz Thompson is an Assistant Professor and the Instruction and Educational Resources Coordinator at JMU Libraries. She is the Open Textbook Network (OTN) campus leader at JMU. Liz also serves on JMU Libraries' Scholarly Communication Steering Committee and is the outgoing committee Chair (2016-2018). She is currently completing an OER Research Fellowship, which is administered by the Open Education Group and funded by the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation to support continued research into the use, perceptions, and outcomes associated with open educational resources.

Judy Ruttenberg, key collaborator; Association of Research Libraries (ARL)

Judy Ruttenberg is the Program Director for Strategic Initiatives at ARL. As a member of the senior program staff, she supports the Association's strategic agenda on scholarly communication and open scholarship, including serving as the co-lead of the SHARE initiative. Prior to joining ARL in 2011, Judy was a program officer at the Triangle Research Libraries Network (TRLN) where she coordinated the work of TRLN's collections groups, focusing on issues such as collections analysis, shared collections, and large-scale digitization.

Rebecca Kennison, consultant; K|N Consultants

Rebecca Kennison is the executive director at the non-profit K|N Consultants, which has developed the Open Access Network (OAN), a collective of organizations and individuals devoted to enabling and ensuring public access to scholarly content. Her current consulting projects include work for the Association of College and Research Libraries, Fairfield University, and Michigan State University, among others. Prior to working full time at K|N, Rebecca was the founding director of the Center for Digital Research and Scholarship, a division of the Columbia University Libraries.

Raym Crow, consultant; Chain Bridge Group

Raym Crow is managing partner of Chain Bridge Group, an independent consultancy to scholarly and professional societies, university presses, academic libraries, philanthropic foundations, and other nonprofit publishers. Raym has over 30 years' experience in academic and scholarly publishing, specializing in strategic business planning and practical sustainability models for open access journals, monographs, digital humanities projects, and infrastructure services. For over a decade, he has focused on collective models to support the provision of open access services. Since 2002, he has been Senior Consultant of the SPARC Consulting Group.

2.6 Needed Resources

In addition to the information detailed in the budget justification, this proposal requires meeting space at three national conferences, web infrastructure for the registration and travel scholarship application, and meeting space at a fourth conference to debrief and disseminate the findings of the white paper. The project team has spoken with conference organizers and

has secured complimentary space at each of the four conferences (see Supporting Documents for data collection permission at the three sites). James Madison University will host the WordPress site that will facilitate registration, and ARL will facilitate the travel scholarship application portal. The co-PIs and the ARL collaborator will conduct the work of this grant as part of their regular job duties and do not require salary funding.

2.7 Dissemination Plan

The audience for the report for this study is anyone working in scholarly communications. The white paper will be deposited in LISSA, an Open Science Framework (OSF)-hosted preprint service, along with associated files, such as the grant narrative and the aggregated and themed data. The JMU-hosted WordPress project site will direct users to the LISSA record. The project team will advertise the availability of the white paper through the listservs identified for forum participation, and ACRL, ARL, and SPARC will commit to further dissemination and discussion of the report as appropriate within their memberships.

3. Diversity Plan

In an effort to minimize the time and expense that multiple forums could incur, it is proposed that the meetings be held in colocation with professional conferences. While this may help some individuals participate, given the support they receive to attend conferences, many academic librarians do not receive institutional support to travel. Some of those most impacted are those working in community colleges, minority-serving institutions (MSIs), and historically black colleges and universities (HBCUs). To help encourage participation from individuals from those institutions, we will provide four travel scholarships to each conference.

Recognizing that institutional diversity represents only one facet of the larger scholarly communication landscape, we propose using the criteria of the DLF/ARL travel scholarships as a model. We will provide a total of twelve scholarships at \$2000 each to help create an inclusive forum experience. The application criteria includes: those who identify as members of a group (or groups) underrepresented among library practitioners. These include—but are not limited to—people of Hispanic or Latino, Black or African-American, Asian, Middle Eastern, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, First Nations, American Indian, or Alaskan Native descent. Moreover, applications from people who work at community colleges, MSIs, and HBCUs or who could contribute to the diversity of the Forum in other ways are also welcome to apply. The application form and selection criteria will follow a similar structure to the ARL Fellowship for Digital and Inclusive Excellence, a program with which Yasmeen Shorish and Judy Ruttenberg have experience and expertise.

Institutions with limited funding for travel may also face limited funding for collections resources. These institutions, and their constituents, would benefit directly from an OA collection development system. Given the systemic structural and funding challenges that these institutions (and people of color in librarianship²¹) face, it is a priority of the project team to provide a clear, equitable way for these perspectives to be heard and individuals' perspectives to be shared.

²¹ Hankins, Rebecca and Miguel Juarez (2015) *Where Are All The Librarians Of Color? The Experiences Of People Of Color In Academia*. Library Juice Press. Sacramento, CA.
<https://libraryjuicepress.com/librariansofcolor-front.pdf>

4. National Impact

Most current initiatives in the open scholarly content arena are focused on what institutions can do,²² as well as what individual content providers can do,²³ to achieve sustainability. This National Forum further explores the critically important role of individual collection development and acquisitions librarians in collecting open content, and the environment, norms, and systems they would need to have in place to make informed, locally beneficial decisions. The anticipated outcome of this Forum—a white paper based on observations from six focus groups—provides the necessary exploration with the community to help shape library practice in a world transitioning to more open, networked scholarship.

Co-PI Yasmeeen Shorish will be chair of the Research and Scholarly Environment Committee (ReSEC) of ACRL during this project year. ReSEC is developing a national research agenda on the research environment and scholarly communication system.²⁴ The final research agenda will provide an overview of trends, identify effective and promising practices, and delineate important questions where deeper inquiry is needed to accelerate the transition to more open, inclusive, and equitable systems of scholarship.

In addition to the work coming out of ACRL, the work of the Lewis-led Invest in Open Initiative, SPARC's strategic priority of advocating for community-controlled infrastructure, and the upcoming University of California Choosing Pathways to OA meeting demonstrate that the community is looking for systemic change in scholarly communication and collections. The outcome of the Forum grant is well aligned with these efforts, increasing the likelihood that this white paper will complement existing and ongoing work, providing the community with a strong and accessible foundation on which to build.

Following the release of the white paper in September 2019, the project team will convene a workshop at the DLF Forum in October. The DLF conference comprises a critical constituency in academic libraries focused on openness and equity in the future of scholarly communications, information, and higher education. Designing a participatory workshop to elicit responses to the white paper will expand the community building ethos of the forums and help enfranchise a larger segment of the profession in this effort. The workshop will solicit engagement among attendees to encourage use of this Forum's white paper in their work building the future of digital libraries.

As national membership organizations, ACRL, ARL, and SPARC are well-positioned to socialize the idea of a collective funding approach to open content in academic libraries. The project white paper will provide insights into the community's thinking, the language librarians use to discuss collections, and the perceived constraints and barriers to participation that need to be further researched, understood, and addressed to set up a successful collective funding environment. While important to further the national movement towards collective action, the white paper will also be an important tool for individual institutions and for consortia to apply or adapt the takeaways to their local or regional environments.

²² See, for example OA2020.us, focused on journal offsetting agreements at the institutional level.

²³ Maron, Nancy L. (2014) "A Guide to the Best Revenue Models and Funding Sources for your Digital Resources" <http://sr.ithaka.org/?p=22805>

²⁴ Nevius, Erin (2018) "ACRL Selects Consultants for New Research Environment and Scholarly Communication System Project" <https://www.acrl.ala.org/acrlinsider/archives/15595>

	October 2018	November	December	January 2019	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September
ALA Midwinter scholarship initiated	█	█	█									
ALA Midwinter scholarship awarded			█									
ALA Midwinter 2019: data collection				█								
Iterate focus group questions				█	█							
ER&L scholarship initiated			█	█								
ER&L scholarship awarded				█	█							
ER&L 2019: data collection						█						
Iterate focus group questions						█						
ACRL scholarship initiated				█	█							
ACRL scholarship awarded					█							
ACRL 2019: data collection							█					
Analyze Transcription								█				
Key personnel wrap-up, Washington DC									█	█		
White paper writing											█	█
Forum participant review of draft											█	█
White paper virtual dissemination												█

	October 2019
DLF 2019: white paper dissemination	

DIGITAL PRODUCT FORM

Introduction

The Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS) is committed to expanding public access to federally funded digital products (i.e., digital content, resources, assets, software, and datasets). The products you create with IMLS funding require careful stewardship to protect and enhance their value, and they should be freely and readily available for use and re-use by libraries, archives, museums, and the public. However, applying these principles to the development and management of digital products can be challenging. Because technology is dynamic and because we do not want to inhibit innovation, we do not want to prescribe set standards and practices that could become quickly outdated. Instead, we ask that you answer questions that address specific aspects of creating and managing digital products. Like all components of your IMLS application, your answers will be used by IMLS staff and by expert peer reviewers to evaluate your application, and they will be important in determining whether your project will be funded.

Instructions

- Please check here if you have reviewed Parts I, II, III, and IV below and you have determined that your proposal does NOT involve the creation of digital products (i.e., digital content, resources, assets, software, or datasets). You must still submit this Digital Product Form with your proposal even if you check this box, because this Digital Product Form is a Required Document.

If you ARE creating digital products, you must provide answers to the questions in Part I. In addition, you must also complete at least one of the subsequent sections. If you intend to create or collect digital content, resources, or assets, complete Part II. If you intend to develop software, complete Part III. If you intend to create a dataset, complete Part IV.

Part I: Intellectual Property Rights and Permissions

A.1 What will be the intellectual property status of the digital products (content, resources, assets, software, or datasets) you intend to create? Who will hold the copyright(s)? How will you explain property rights and permissions to potential users (for example, by assigning a non-restrictive license such as BSD, GNU, MIT, or Creative Commons to the product)? Explain and justify your licensing selections.

The white paper that will be produced will have a CC-BY license applied to it. The audio files and their transcription created in the course of the research will be destroyed upon completion of the project. A file identifying any themes or trends from the forums (the "analysis") will have a CC-BY license applied to it.

A.2 What ownership rights will your organization assert over the new digital products and what conditions will you impose on access and use? Explain and justify any terms of access and conditions of use and detail how you will notify potential users about relevant terms or conditions.

The themed, "analysis" file and the white paper will be freely accessible from an Open Science Framework (OSF) project space and the LIS scholarship archive (LISSA).

A.3 If you will create any products that may involve privacy concerns, require obtaining permissions or rights, or raise any cultural sensitivities, describe the issues and how you plan to address them.

The PIs have submitted an IRB protocol to obtain informed consent for the audio recordings that will be made in the course of the research. Names will not be used in the transcription and analysis and any identifying details will be redacted.

Part II: Projects Creating or Collecting Digital Content, Resources, or Assets

A. Creating or Collecting New Digital Content, Resources, or Assets

A.1 Describe the digital content, resources, or assets you will create or collect, the quantities of each type, and format you will use.

All documents will be generated in Word format and converted to PDF files for dissemination. One white paper file and one "analysis" file will be created. Six audio files and three intermediate transcription files will also be created in the course of the work (see Part IV for dataset information).

A.2 List the equipment, software, and supplies that you will use to create the content, resources, or assets, or the name of the service provider that will perform the work.

Microsoft Word and Adobe Acrobat will be used for the textual information. Dragon Professional for transcription. An Olympus Linear Recorder will capture the audio.

A.3 List all the digital file formats (e.g., XML, TIFF, MPEG) you plan to use, along with the relevant information about the appropriate quality standards (e.g., resolution, sampling rate, or pixel dimensions).
DOCX and PDF for textual information. MP3 will be used for the audio files at a sampling rate of 44.1 kHz.

B.Workflow and Asset Maintenance/Preservation

B.1 Describe your quality control plan (i.e., how you will monitor and evaluate your workflow and products).

Project team will meet regularly to review the process and assess efficiency and quality.

B.2 Describe your plan for preserving and maintaining digital assets during and after the award period of performance. Your plan may address storage systems, shared repositories, technical documentation, migration planning, and commitment of organizational funding for these purposes. Please note: You may charge the federal award before closeout for the costs of publication or sharing of research results if the costs are not incurred during the period of performance of the federal award (see 2 C.F.R. § 200.461).

The working documents will be stored on JMU's OnPrem Microsoft Sharepoint cloud service. The access materials will be on an OSF project space and preprint archive. OSF maintains a preservation strategy.

C.Metadata

C.1 Describe how you will produce any and all technical, descriptive, administrative, or preservation metadata. Specify which standards you will use for the metadata structure (e.g., MARC, Dublin Core, Encoded Archival Description, PBCore, PREMIS) and metadata content (e.g., thesauri).

N/A.

C.2 Explain your strategy for preserving and maintaining metadata created or collected during and after the award period of performance.

N/A.

C.3 Explain what metadata sharing and/or other strategies you will use to facilitate widespread discovery and use of the digital content, resources, or assets created during your project (e.g., an API [Application Programming Interface], contributions to a digital platform, or other ways you might enable batch queries and retrieval of metadata).

N/A.

D.Access and Use

D.1 Describe how you will make the digital content, resources, or assets available to the public. Include details such as the delivery strategy (e.g., openly available online, available to specified audiences) and underlying hardware/software platforms and infrastructure (e.g., specific digital repository software or leased services, accessibility via standard web browsers, requirements for special software tools in order to use the content).

The themed analysis files and the white paper will be freely accessible from an Open Science Framework (OSF) project space and the LIS scholarship archive (LISSA) with a CC-BY license.

D.2 Provide the name(s) and URL(s) (Uniform Resource Locator) for any examples of previous digital content, resources, or assets your organization has created.

N/A.

Part III. Projects Developing Software

A. General Information

OMB Control #: 3137-0092, Expiration Date: 7/31/2018

IMLS-CLR-F-0032

A.1 Describe the software you intend to create, including a summary of the major functions it will perform and the intended primary audience(s) it will serve.

N/A.

A.2 List other existing software that wholly or partially performs the same functions, and explain how the software you intend to create is different, and justify why those differences are significant and necessary.

N/A.

B. Technical Information

B.1 List the programming languages, platforms, software, or other applications you will use to create your software and explain why you chose them.

N/A.

B.2 Describe how the software you intend to create will extend or interoperate with relevant existing software.

N/A.

B.3 Describe any underlying additional software or system dependencies necessary to run the software you intend to create.

N/A.

B.4 Describe the processes you will use for development, documentation, and for maintaining and updating documentation for users of the software.

N/A.

B.5 Provide the name(s) and URL(s) for examples of any previous software your organization has created.

N/A.

C. Access and Use

C.1 We expect applicants seeking federal funds for software to develop and release these products under open-source licenses to maximize access and promote reuse. What ownership rights will your organization assert over the software you intend to create, and what conditions will you impose on its access and use? Identify and explain the license under which you will release source code for the software you develop (e.g., BSD, GNU, or MIT software licenses). Explain and justify any prohibitive terms or conditions of use or access and detail how you will notify potential users about relevant terms and conditions. N/A.

C.2 Describe how you will make the software and source code available to the public and/or its intended users. N/A.

C.3 Identify where you will deposit the source code for the software you intend to develop: N/A.

Name of publicly accessible source code repository: N/A.

URL: N/A.

Part IV: Projects Creating Datasets

A.1 Identify the type of data you plan to collect or generate, and the purpose or intended use to which you expect it to be put. Describe the method(s) you will use and the approximate dates or intervals at which you will collect or generate it.

Approximately 540 minutes of audio content will be captured in the course of the research. This audio will be transcribed and anonymized. These will be the data used for qualitative analysis, which will be used to generate the white paper. The audio will be captured at conferences in January, March, and April 2019. Transcription will occur directly after the meetings occur.

A.2 Does the proposed data collection or research activity require approval by any internal review panel or institutional review board (IRB)? If so, has the proposed research activity been approved? If not, what is your plan for securing approval?

The PIs have submitted an IRB protocol to obtain informed consent for the audio recordings that will be made in the course of the research. We expect approval upon review, and are prepared to respond to any comments the Board may have on the protocol.

A.3 Will you collect any personally identifiable information (PII), confidential information (e.g., trade secrets), or proprietary information? If so, detail the specific steps you will take to protect such information while you prepare the data files for public release (e.g., data anonymization, data suppression PII, or synthetic data).

Voices will be captured during the focus groups. Names will not be used in the transcription and any identifying details will be redacted. The audio files will be stored on an access-controlled JMU maintained server and will be destroyed upon completion of the project (as per IRB requirements).

A.4 If you will collect additional documentation, such as consent agreements, along with the data, describe plans for preserving the documentation and ensuring that its relationship to the collected data is maintained.

The consent forms will be destroyed with the audio files upon completion of the project.

A.5 What methods will you use to collect or generate the data? Provide details about any technical requirements or dependencies that would be necessary for understanding, retrieving, displaying, or processing the dataset(s).

The audio files will be generated via the Olympus Linear Recorder, as MP3 files which can be played back on any audio playback software, such as iTunes or Windows Media. The transcription files will be generated via Dragon Professional software.

A.6 What documentation (e.g., data documentation, codebooks) will you capture or create along with the dataset(s)? Where will the documentation be stored and in what format(s)? How will you permanently associate and manage the documentation with the dataset(s) it describes?

The audio files will be named in ISO date format: YYYYMMDD. No additional documentation will be created, as these files are not for re-use. The Word transcriptions will follow the same naming protocol and are also not for re-use.

A.7 What is your plan for archiving, managing, and disseminating data after the completion of the award-funded project?

The audio files and transcription files will never be shared. The themed "analysis" files will be shared as noted in Part II.

A.8 Identify where you will deposit the dataset(s):

Name of repository: N/A

URL: N/A

A.9 When and how frequently will you review this data management plan? How will the implementation be monitored?

This plan will be reviewed prior to each instance of data collection and at the conclusion of transcription, and again at the conclusion of the project. Yasmeen Shorish (PI) will be responsible for monitoring implementation.