

Hyde Park Corner

Melody Burton

University of British Columbia, melody.burton@ubc.ca

Kimberly Douglas

California Institute of Technology, kdouglas@library.caltech.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/charleston>

An indexed, print copy of the Proceedings is also available for purchase at: <http://www.thepress.purdue.edu/series/charleston>.

You may also be interested in the new series, Charleston Insights in Library, Archival, and Information Sciences. Find out more at: <http://www.thepress.purdue.edu/series/charleston-insights-library-archival-and-information-sciences>.

Melody Burton and Kimberly Douglas, "Hyde Park Corner" (2011). *Proceedings of the Charleston Library Conference*.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.5703/1288284314880>

This document has been made available through Purdue e-Pubs, a service of the Purdue University Libraries. Please contact epubs@purdue.edu for additional information.

Hyde Park Corner

Melody Burton, Chief Librarian, Okanagan Library, University of British Columbia

Kimberly Douglas, University Librarian, California Institute of Technology

Kim Douglas: Good morning, and I guess you are the committed ones; doing what it takes, not just what's convenient. Thumbs up!

Melody and I have been talking about this interaction opportunity for the last few months, and the concept we had in mind was London's Hyde Park soap box idea, where you get up and spout off in terms of uncomfortable or risky ideas; take a little risk and go out on a limb. So, that's the qualifying statement about what I hope starts to go through your mind as Melody and I go back and forth. It's not necessarily really a debate, but a dialog and we want you also to be in that dialog. We're provocateurs. And with that, I hand it over to Melody.

Melody Burton: Okay, so this is debate-ish. "Something's Gotta Give" is the perfect title for this conference and it sums up exactly where libraries and librarians are today: What will give? And I think you heard some possible answers today or this week, but will it be budgets? Will it be jobs? Will it be salaries? Will it be some traditional model of service, traditional models of collection development? Will it be print? Will it be the stuff we hate? Or will it be the stuff we love?

And I wish I could say that this title has implicit in it "something's gotta give"—that it can't go on. But the weird thing about academic libraries is that it can go on for a very long time. And in fact, it has been going on for a long time and I'm sure many of you in the audience have been thinking that something's been gonna-gotta-give for a very long time. Many of us, and some of you in the audience I'm sure, are quite committed to transformational change. But I'm doubtful that many of us will see this change dramatically in our lifetimes. I hope I'm wrong, and in fact this whole talk today could be called "I Hope I'm Wrong." It's a bit of a rant, and it's Hyde Park-ish.

This session was originally titled "The Future of Libraries," and that was eventually abandoned as a

title for some combination of the following reasons: it's been done before; it's been done to death. Think about that, the future's been done; it's too bleak, that's how smart we are. We know what the future is and we know we don't like it. It's too boring. It's too boring to say the book is dead, the journal is dead, the reference desk is dead. In the last session we heard A&I is dead, the library is dead, the librarian is dead. And of course, it's not true, right? They're not dead, they're just dying. At any rate, death is in your future in some form. But anyhow, we can't leave the conference on this very dire note. We wanted to have a little heart, especially at the end of the conference, and end on a high note. So Kim and I are going to find some high notes.

Kim Douglas: Well, I think we have to give up the concept of reader services and we have to start thinking about authoring services. Take a hint from our colleagues over in Special Libraries and think in terms of what do our institutions need? What are they doing? What is their productivity? How can we tie in what we do to what they actually turn out, which is scholarship, and then also the graduating students? We heard themes along this line during this conference. Corey Seeman used the term "outcomes" in terms of designing his annual reports—outcomes versus output, and there's a difference. He talked about that, and that was very insightful. Also, Rachel Fleming-May talked about the University of Tennessee now designing their budgeting process around the outcome of graduating students as opposed to the data of student enrollment. That also is a very interesting and significant piece of information to take in, as to what are we doing? We need to tie ourselves to the productivity. And not just the inputs for the productivity, we need to tie ourselves to the actual outcomes.

And so, with that, think also in terms of author services; think of linked data. What were Michael Keller and MacKenzie Smith talking about in regard to linked data? How does that relate to authoring? How does that relate to author identities? Are we

doing what we need to be doing? Jack Bernard, in his comments about copyright, and recasting that as a public learning focus. Are the outcomes of our universities, our institutions of higher learning, in terms of positioning; positioning the output, the papers, for example, of the faculty so that there's public learning? Are we doing that? And then Eric Hellman's "Unglue It," I thought that was fascinating, a fascinating model. It gives us, as information service providers, authoring services providers, another tool to use with our faculty to make their papers, their work, their scholarship, be more accessible. I think there's great opportunity there, but it's going to take the mind change of not so much reader services, but author services. How do we help our authors?

Melody Burton: Well, I thought I'd find a high note: the economy. You're supposed to laugh there. In case you didn't hear it this week, unemployment fell in this country. Not a lot, but a little bit and we'll take it. Maybe the direction has changed. Many of your libraries have taken cuts. Show of hands: How many libraries have taken a cut? How many are facing a cut this year? Not many, not quite as many. How many of you think the cuts are over? Nobody. But I'm sure that in some ways, there is some optimism that 2008 was the big bump, right? And I know that some vendors must feel, too, that they have weathered a storm, a very difficult turbulent time. It's been lean, but okay; many are still standing. The worst is over, and things surely will start to turn around. And God love the vendors. Earlier this week one of them said to me, "Are you contemplating any big," and he paused. In my mind, I'm going "Cuts. Are you contemplating any big cuts?" But he says, "Are you planning any big purchases this year?" You see, this is the kind of optimism that's out there, and it's emerged since 2008.

I think that Brad Eden set the stage quite well this morning in a kind of "tough love" way. He's a very direct, straight talking guy. But seriously, it's budget time on my campus. Bottom line, we have to rein in spending and freeze vacancies. We have to defend the budget, and the only question is do we defend it like Xena, Warrior Princess, with sword and shield, or do we defend it like Kathy Bates, and slay the Provost with clever phrases and a cold hard stare?

But here's another kind of high note. How many of you were at the Shared Print Repository preconference? One, okay. I attended this and I really needed to go to this workshop. I enjoyed it, and I needed to go. In full disclosure, my institution will be involved in a shared print repository in the future, whether it's regionally, provincially, or on our own, which I guess wouldn't be shared, but we're doing it. And I needed a lot of help with this concept because, quite frankly, I'm still struggling with it. The idea scares me. I wrestled with this, and I asked what is it about this that I don't like? To me, it sounds like a version of N.I.M.B.Y.—not in my backyard, meets Hoarders, librarian-style. It goes like this: okay, we take all the books, all the bad books, the books that no one wants, the books that no one's ever wanted, and we hide them. And we hide them somewhere out in the wilderness where the land is cheap. And if we hide them together, it won't seem so bad or cost so much. You see, we need to preserve the books, the bad books; not because they're bad, but because they're unique. They're uniquely bad books! And I have to make this argument to my Provost. And I need to tell him I need \$9 million to do this. I hope Bill Maher never gets a hold of this story, because it reinforces every stereotype imaginable about libraries.

I don't want to ignore the space element in the shared print repository, because it is a key element. There is a hidden cost of collections, and it costs a lot of money to keep them in our buildings. But the problem is, we've been lying about this cost for so long, that it's embarrassing to bring it up and I don't know how we're going to get past it. I bet Brad has an idea about how to say this, but we're going to have to figure out a way to sell this so that we don't look like complete idiots. That's a high note.

Kim Douglas: The costs as we've been managing the infrastructure for scholarship and higher-ed learning are simply overwhelming in the total. In other words, there is so much that needs to be done and I think you go back to what Clifford Lynch said. He laid out our problems: the scale, the volume of material that needs to be dealt with, and also adding not just the fact that there are all these papers that get published, didn't he say one per minute or two per minute, but also now the data sets. So the issue really is rationalizing resources for the nation,

across the nation. And one would hope that there would be a few Presidents and Provosts who would understand that we can't afford, *they* can't afford, the duplication anymore. We cannot have the scholarship tools that are needed, we cannot maintain the long tail, that infinite long tail of content, the uniquely bad titles, without the cooperation and the collaboration to share the infrastructure burden. We have to share the infrastructure burden to do what needs to be done. And that's what Brad Eden was talking about in terms of the technical services and the cataloging issues, and also what Cliff Lynch brought up. We can have expertise in one place that can be shared across the nation. But how are going to do this? We have to do it from the grassroots up. Some of the issues that are unique to the United States, and these are hard to wrap our brains around, is that we are a mix of private and public universities and colleges. This makes the United States a very difficult place to do anything related to the public good for the nation. We learned from the SCOAP3 initiative that many public universities did not feel that they could make certain decisions in order to participate in an international centralized or consortium endeavor. So there are some real problems here that we need to work on from the grassroots up. We're not going to get the leadership from the top to do these things, the way they do in other countries, and that has to do simply with how we're organized. We have to come to terms with that and that's why we have to find our solutions from the grassroots up. It's going to be a little chaotic, but I think through cooperation and collaboration we can do it.

Related to that is what Mark Dimunation, from the Library of Congress, talked about too, is that we have to change how we use and design our operational infrastructure to do what is needed not only from a legacy environment but also to move into what needs to be done for the future. And we have to get off the project-based one ups and into a completely different approach to scholarly infrastructure design.

Anthony Watkinson: I want to say something, because you've said something just now, Kim, that is not comprehensible totally. You have to define what "from the grassroots up" means.

Kim Douglas: Well, I think it means in many ways what Brad Eden was also talking about, and that is the staff, the staff in the various libraries recognizing the problems that have to be solved. It's up to the management to articulate the problem, and begin to work within the organization to make decisions that lead to regional cooperation and collaboration. It's very hard in this country; we don't do it very well actually.

Anthony Watkinson: How do you do it in your library?

Kim Douglas: Well, at Caltech we were one of the initiators of WEST Shared Print. And in analyzing my community, it was pretty clear that Caltech wasn't going to be a print repository. That's not their goal, that's not their mission, and that's not something they would invest in. And so, in working with the staff in terms of analyzing the collections, and then going out to the other libraries in the region and saying, "What are we going to do about this?" However, we know we need access to the legacy collections over time. At Caltech, we have the Einstein Project, and the Einstein Project requires access to international newspapers and documents that we would never have in the collection, but we do have the services to bring them in and those remote collections are very important and they need to be retained. So that's essentially the model. Analyzing, and this goes back to what I said earlier, really being clear on the outcomes of your institution, the values. Then reflecting how to change operations, at the same time giving the staff leadership and direction as to where we want to go; how their jobs and their tasks are going to change, and what their future holds for them. And this ties in very much to what Brad was saying.

Melody Burton: And a number of people have been asking all week: "How do you turn a big organization around?" I think since 2008, that question has been a clear focus for a lot of people. And there's this fear, of course, and a reality, that what can emerge is a culture of defeatism. That nothing can be done. It'll only get worse. Do what you can, which is a positive spin, and we heard a little bit of that from Brad too. It's worse somewhere else, maybe Greece. Go home and get some sleep. You need to be rested for the morning when you come

in. But maybe what is emerging, and Kim brought this up, is a culture of collaboration. And I know so many people say we've been doing that forever, that isn't new. But maybe we have hit another realm. We have lots in common, we have the same problems, and maybe we need the same solutions. And maybe we can solve our problems together. This is so wonderful-sounding, like Kumbaya, and Pilates, and hot chocolate, but it is positive and I think people need some sort of positive notion to hang onto in this difficult time. Maybe we can solve our collections problems together.

Anthony Watkinson: But Melody, all this means losing jobs doesn't it? Collaboration always means that someone has got to lose their job.

Melody Burton: I don't know, because those shared print repositories. We're going to spend more time; we're going to build buildings. So somebody's going to get jobs out of it, but they'll be different jobs. If we're talking about real change, and to me, the real change that I've been waiting for since 2008, is a change to the publishing model. If ever there was an opportunity for a new era to begin, it was 2008. And who was it that said "Never let a good crisis go to waste." Many universities were hit with big cuts; some put the brakes on in a major way to collections spending. Some of us got mad. You heard that from Brad. Think Albert Finney in *Network*: "We're mad as hell; we're not gonna take it anymore." We're not going to pay \$17,000 for *Science*. We're not going to continue in this way. The recession was a whole-scale, real life reality check. Wouldn't a new model for pricing emerge? Wouldn't it have to? Wouldn't it break it if there was going to be this much money coming out of the marketplace? Wouldn't the Big Deal crumble? Aggregators, which I call the crack cocaine of undergraduates, and yesterday was called the nickel bag, would see their pricing drop dramatically? Change would be necessary in this environment, and we'd make it a principle. Libraries would say: we'll never pay twice again! We're not going to pay twice for stuff! We would just say no. I believed that new rules would have to emerge to reflect this new reality, but I think I'm wrong. I don't think we're seeing new rules. And the scary part about that is it makes it seem that maybe the recession wasn't so bad. Maybe we didn't hit the reset button? We weath-

ered the storm. And here we are today saying "Something's Gotta Give." What's gonna give? It's gotta be Greece.

Anthony Watkinson: Is there anybody with views on what's got to give?

Melody Burton: Is there anybody from Greece in the audience?

Audience Member 1: I just read in this morning's Wall Street Journal that MF Global, which went bankrupt, found the missing \$657 million, and it was part with JP Morgan, and I think that money should come to libraries to help solve some of our problems.

Audience Member 2: I'm Bob Holley, Wayne State University. My research area is the out-of-print book market. And I think we're forgetting that just-in-time may really work. And while we've got the Google Book project, we've also got millions and millions and millions of titles in private hands that go back a long time. So we've got a faculty member that suddenly needs romance novels from the 50's and 60's, we don't need to worry about the libraries holding them, we can just go to the out-of-print book market and they will be able to find them. I also sell stuff, and I had an urgent call from a researcher at the University of Utah where I used to work for a 30 year-old science book that she was willing to pay \$35 to deliver overnight. There will be private people who have lots and lots of materials. If we need to get it, we can buy it.

Kim Douglas: Crowd-storing. Right? I think you're right. I mean, who would've thought that the Internet would give used books a new business model? That was an absolutely unintended consequence of the Internet, and it's something to keep in mind that we are going to be continually surprised by what's possible.

Bob Holley: And they're so cheap you might get them for a penny.

Audience Member 3: I'm Mitchell Brown from the University of California Irvine. I think one thing that we're looking at, in terms of what's gotta give at the UC, is the shared bibliographer model. Soon you

won't have enough people on campuses, through attrition and retirement. The expertise level is out of balance between different campuses. What's gotta give for my workload is the idea that not only am I responsible for one campus, but I've got to be responsible for parts of other campuses' work. That's a big shift for individual bibliographers. But I think it's a challenge for the UL's to think of "How do I do staffing models if that person doesn't belong to me?" What is that sense of belonging, or what is that sense of location. And if I'm responsible for a different campus, how do I explain that to my boss in terms of my pay? That the work that I do impacts my fellow campuses? The things that I buy are also meant for them? Are my faculty thinking "You're taking too much of my time?" They want me, but I'm tethered. Do I belong to a campus or do I belong to a system? I think that's something that I have to think about. What are my responsibilities? Where are my loyalties?

Kim Douglas: Right, one way to think about the duplicative work that we do across the system is that our universities are duplicative. They compete with each other across the same fields. Whereas, in other countries they actually rationalize where their expertise lies geographically so that those allied services, like the bibliography services are co-located. That makes sense. So there are some issues that reflect the competitive nature of the scholarly environment, particularly in the United States. Where the schools compete for faculty, they compete for students, they compete for money. And they compete in the same disciplines. I don't have the solution for that. All we can do is articulate that as an issue. We in the library world can actually rationalize the infrastructure services to serve the country as a whole, but the institutions are going to have to start thinking that way too. I haven't actually seen that come through yet, but perhaps with some of the publicly-funded university consortia we'll start to see that. I wanted to go back to say that one of the things that's gotta give is that librarians have got to start recognizing their own behavior as part of the problem in the sense of continuing to buy what we really don't want to buy. We've been behaving like our own worst enemies. I think we have to start thinking like economists, and we have to start using economists' terminology. If we can't do that, then we can't have a constructive

conversation with the publishers. How many of you have read Ted Bergstrom's papers and his presentations? He's certainly been in the library circuit for awhile. Preston McAfee, same thing, and Mark McCabe. These are three economists that we should be very familiar with their work. They have made it very clear that there are three economic principles at work in the scholarly publishing environment that are the source of our problem. And we have to understand those issues so that when we talk to publishers, we can change the model. We cannot change the model by complaining. And we cannot change the model by just saying "Charge us less." That's not going to work.

What are those three issues? It's understanding that we are operating in an environment of inelastic demand, and the inelastic demand is *our* inelastic demand. We continue to pay! I heard a Nature Publishing Group rep a few years ago stand up in front of a library community and say "Pricing is not my problem. It's not my problem to charge you less. It is your problem." And he is right, because we control the demand. So we have to stop buying this stuff, essentially, and that's what's going to happen. Publishers, I think, have got to understand it that we are going to start buying less.

Of course there are consequences to that. Anne Kenney pointed out that our collections will likely be very homogeneous. We'll all subscribe to *Nature* and nothing else, or we'll all subscribe to *Science* and nothing else. Not quite, but close. But we have alumni who want access. We know Carol Tenopir's data showing that for every article cited, faculty or authors are looking at 40 other papers. So we need the access, we know that. However, we are in a capitalist economic system, so competition is important. I think Kevin Guthrie was the one who said that the reader-author construct has to be deconstructed. We have to take it apart. So how do we look at this?

So, I said inelastic demand. There are two more, two more economic principles to really get our heads around. The second one is that it's a two-sided market. How many of you understand it's a two-sided market? Ted Bergstrom has written about this. Publishers sit in the middle. They get the content from one side, so they're operating a jour-

nal, they're operating an authoring services business when they're communicating with the authors. Then on the other side, we, representing the readers, the consumers, are paying for the access and for the piece. So the publisher sits in the middle and controls capital on both sides. In a two-sided market, one side will generally subsidize the other. And we see this all the time in the communications world that we operate in. So what has happened in the print model, because it was commodity based, is that the reader side subsidized the authoring side. This is particularly true in biology and chemistry. In the physical sciences they still have page charges so it's a little mediated. Now another aspect of this two-sided market, and this is very key to working on a new model, and that is that on the authoring services side, it's a market of substitutes. A market of substitutes is generally a more healthy market; in other words, there's elasticity in the demand. If the page charges are too high, or the services are too high, or it's not good enough, or whatever, they have different venues they can go to. On the reader side, particularly in scholarship side, it's a market of compliments. That's why it's inelastic in demand. If you're doing research, you need it all. So that's an unhealthy market, and I have to say that this has been known for at least a decade. One of the first research papers that came out about the scholarly publishing environment was not a healthy market actually came out of the Netherlands. The Netherlands Bureau of Economics published a white paper in 2000 on the serials crisis. And they laid it out very clearly. It's a paper that not many people seem to know about, but it was one of the first by economists pointing out that this is not working. So what do we do? What did we just learn? We have learned that there actually is a healthy market of substitute services in scholarly publishing. So my thinking is, that's how we've got to shift it. We have to shift to the authoring side subsidizing the reader side so that we get the access we need.

There's another way to think about this, too. There were a lot of papers at this conference on usage data. Now, I'm a library director and I have to sit back and think about where's my staff time going? And there are some very smart people doing some very bright things, some very sophisticated things with usage data. But what's it really telling me? Now go back to what I said earlier about focusing

on the author. If my staff is spending an inordinate amount of time trying to figure out what the usage data means, they're not dealing with the outcomes of the university. I've yet to come across an administrator who's excited to learn from me how many papers we downloaded on campus that day. Have you? Have you ever run into anybody who cares? Some may find it anecdotal, "Oh yeah, we downloaded a million last year. We think, we're not sure, but that's the number we can come up with..." But they don't really care! But what they do care about is publications! That, they're excited about. How many papers in peer reviewed journals? Now if my staff time was spent on studying the authoring behavior: Where are they publishing? Are they changing their publishing patterns? Are they interested in a new journal? That would be much more productive for our operations, because we can more intelligently go back to the institute and say "Here's your outcome. Here's what we published last year. Here's where it was published. Here's data that is meaningful to what we do."

So, somehow we have to work together with the publishers to make changes in how the publishing model works. And I think that if our journals/serials budgets start to get pinned to the outcomes of the universities, if we can figure out how to make that happen, there will be equity across disciplines, potentially. In other words, the university would actually be investing where the authors publish in a manner that could be tracked across disciplines in a way that we can't really do now. So that's an idea.

Katina Strauch: Is Scott Plutchak here? Well, Scott said something that I think has gotta give. Everything that y'all have been talking about is libraries, how libraries are doing things. Scott says that we have to shift from just thinking about the library, which is basically physical materials. We have a lot of virtual things obviously, but we spend a lot of time talking about our physical materials. We need to talk about librarians, and how librarians themselves can work with the data to enhance our position and not just be looking at each other and saying "we need to do this, we need to do that." I think that Scott has got a clue, and I wish he were here to express his opinion himself because he's much more eloquent about it than I am. But I do think that we focus too much on particular library issues

rather than librarians and what we can bring to the table as a group.

Anthony Watkinson: Can I just add to that something that you, Kim, mentioned. Authoring services, author services. We've heard a lot of stuff about data at this meeting, and it has to be crucial and it has to be some help to the authors and the searchers to get their data in a form that can substantively be reused. The only information professionals that can really know all this are the librarians. And that's a huge change. Think about how our subject librarians have been destroyed at some universities, at least they have in the U.K., we've gotten rid of all the subject librarians, and we've got fewer and fewer people who are really in touch with the faculty. How can they help? It's not just a technical thing, it's an empathy thing.

Kim Douglas: This is why I focus on authoring services. I include in that the data issue, and they do need help, and they want it. The way we've positioned our work with the faculty to respond to the data management plan requirements of the NSF grants is with guidance in terms of how to respond to the mandate. We have an institutional repository. We give them content that they can plug into their grant proposal, that's number one, it's all about saving their time. In other words, you have to be entrepreneurial. There's no magic thing here that you can say "this is how to do it, go march off and do it." It's entrepreneurial, it's about relationships, it's about knowing the subject area and the individuals, it's also about knowing how they do their work. And the subject librarians have to go and figure this out, and it will vary from university to university. So we're not leaving the data out—I don't think—we haven't really specified it, but it's all part of the package. And one of the aspects, particularly with the data management issue, is "What is worth saving?"

Audience Member: Hi, I'm Antje Mays of Winthrop University. One thing that we haven't discussed in this conversation is the tyranny of accreditation agencies and external reporting requirements that shackle libraries to quantifying the inputs. You know, what journals do you have, and these types of metrics that philosophical trends tell us to get

away from. What solutions do you see to that problem?

Melody Burton: Okay, perfect setup for me. What Kim has really been talking about is return on investment, right? ROI. You can talk about the dollars, but people also want to talk about the value. And when dollars get scarce, we like to talk about value more. It's important to be relevant. A lot of these agencies, as you just mentioned, measure books and journals in miles and yards, and all kinds of quantitative measurements associated with them, but not really many qualitative measures. And the biggest call right now, especially in ARL libraries, but everywhere basically, is that we need a new metric. We need a metric that will demonstrate our ROI to both our shareholders and stakeholders. Now this scares me, because it needs to calculate the impact of our collections on scholarship and learning, basically, right? Either of those would be good, both would be perfect. But we're going to get a number. The impact is going to be a number. It's going to be a relative number and it's going to be relative to other universities. And it's going to have two digits and a decimal point and then you're going to sit down with a number and your Provost. And my Provost asks me the hardest questions, all the time, he says "What does it mean?" What are we going to do with this other factor? I think Brad got into this issue, and Anthony just mentioned it too. The real answer is in relationships. At the end of the day, you have to look somebody in the eye, and you have to answer the questions: "Is this worth doing? Can I trust you? Does this have value associated with it? Because I know you don't know everything, like the future and how this is going to play out, but is this worth doing? And can I trust you? What do we really need to do here in this situation?" And I think we've got two different conversations going on in the room about data. Kim, you were talking about usage data, the evidence, versus the raw material of our faculty. So two different kinds of data. Okay, next high note.

Kim Douglas: One of the issues that I think we need to talk about more is the infrastructure needed for learning, and the infrastructure needed for scholarship. How that's changing, and how that relationship is changing in the digital age. In the print environment, with everyone coming to the library to get

access to the resources, we actually amortized the high cost of the scholarly tools over the broad base of general use. And that is gone in the digital age. The broad base of general use has gone to the general search engines. It's gone to Google, it's gone to Wikipedia. In listening to some of the people talk about working with students or whatever, we've actually changed what we're teaching to be less about the scholarly tools and more about how to use the general information services effectively and responsibly. That's a very interesting switch, and it has dramatic impact on how we're going to afford scholarship and the scholarship tools. So I think somehow we're going to have to figure out different metrics for the outcome assessment of learning and the outcome assessment of scholarship, and present different ones for those two efforts. We're all going to be a lot more different from each other than we have been in the past. Generally, in the past, in the legacy environment, there was a standard. The top academic research libraries set a standard, more or less, and then we all did the same, more or less. But now, as we reinvent ourselves in our institutions to be more responsive to the outcomes and to tie what we measure and what we do to the actual outcomes of the universities, we're going to be more different. Because *they* are going to be more different from each other. We're not quite sure how, and maybe they aren't either, but there is going to have to be a certain differentiation that takes place because the resources are simply different. So that's how I'm, at least, thinking about this issue of accreditation that was brought up, or data metrics that measure what we do. Because it used to be the number of books in your library was a quantitative measure of how well you were serving the students and how well you were serving the faculty. They were conflated. That doesn't fly anymore. We have to do things differently because those are two very different environments now.

Melody Burton: Okay, so we're getting close to the end here. Here's something positive. Let's jump on board the Occupy movement. So what does that look like? You've seen some of this already, right, the Occupy movement? Occupy Libraries, Occupy Librarians, Occupy Knowledge, Occupy Yourself? You've already heard those. We could Occupy Charleston, we could Occupy Collections (Kim: We

did occupy Charleston!), we could Occupy Books. We said at the beginning that we would allow ourselves in this room to kind of drift into that secret place of our imagination, a fantasy even. I'd like to perform some very clever act of civil disobedience, get arrested, found guilty, and sentenced to house arrest. And occupy my house. Because I work too much. Despite Brad, and his "It's just a job," at the end of the day I'd like to stay home more and maybe just hang out. So that's my positive, secret fantasy, that I'll get arrested doing some act of very, very clever civil disobedience.

Kim Douglas: And yours? You have ideas on civil disobedience?

Anthony Watkinson: What is some really radical movement? What would some librarian who has been inspired by Brad Eden would like to do now? Would you like to cancel the whole of ScienceDirect, or would you like to see universities have a real mandate to stop their faculty from publishing in naughty journals? Because they could in theory, hold the copyright, actually, usually, in practice they don't, but in theory they have total control over the output of their staff. They do at many universities. The big ones do, Oxford University for example. That's just one radical thought, but does anyone have anything really radical? What about you?

Audience Member: Define occupying.

Kim Douglas: Well, I'm a library director. I look at the budget, and I know there are things we want to invest in. We want to invest in re-training staff. We've got to do more in the digital environment. We have to get more of our Special Collections out. We've got tens of thousands of photos to scan that would be used internally by our own media operations, not by the library, but by the institute. But I know, and all library directors know, that there's no new money. So you look at your budget, and you say "Where is the money going?" Well, I'm at a scientific research institute and I can assure you that an extremely high percentage goes to journal subscriptions. I remember being at a CNI conference in 2005 and listening to Paul Courant talk about what was needed for data management. I mean, it goes back that far, I can assure you, and I realized, they're going to take the journal budget and use it

for data management. That's what they're going to do. It was very clear in my mind. We've got to figure out how we're going to do this differently. Because ultimately, if we don't internally convert how we're using those funds to be a more competitive, price-constraining model, then we're not going to free up anything to re-use, and it's just going to be taken away at some point once the next generation of authors is posting everything on Facebook, perhaps, or whatever technology comes next. I do talk to undergraduates about scholarly communication and one of my first questions, because all of them are involved in research, is "So, are you going to post your paper on Facebook?" And they look at me quite puzzled. So far, they say no, but the day's going to come where they might say yes. And one thing's for sure, they already know their peer community. Every university, every library has to look at its own situation and make its own choices as to what's critical in terms of moving forward.

Melody Burton: I think what would be really radical for me, would be to see more university librarians just say, "It's over. The cat is out of the bag, it is not sustainable." Gather round the staff, and say, "This can't go on, something's gotta give, we can't continue." And Kim is exactly right—there is no new money. Brad said it pretty bluntly this morning. This is what we've got to work with and this is what there is. I wish I could turn it back around to publishers and say, "This is how much money we have. You guys come to me with the best proposal, and the one with the lousy proposal is falling off. Something's gotta give, so sharpen those pencils. This is the whole amount of money. You guys get all of this money, but how it's divided depends on who's giving me the best numbers here. Cause it's not going to grow. It's the vendors who are going to lose here because there's this fixed amount of money.

Anthony Watkinson: They all know that, and they know the budgets are getting smaller and they want to get the biggest "their part" that they can.

Kim Douglas: Well, going back to your question, Anthony, about what is grassroots, and why I spent

so much time talking about the economic models that we're currently operating in, and that is, publishers and academic research libraries have really got to come together at the grassroots level, which is me, my staff, and their sales/marketing, maybe even their VP, come together and say, "Okay, we've both got to change and we understand the principles that we're working with." So it's not personality, it's not "You're evil," it's none of that. We've got to change the model together so that we can both continue to do what we do best to serve scholarship. That's what it's about. And I do believe the publishers ultimately, certainly the staff, want to serve scholarship. It's just changing the system in a way so that it can function more productively for both. So, where are we?

Anthony Watkinson: I do agree, and this is one of the discussions from the Round Table and Scott Plutchak's initiative, the Chicago Collaborative, which started right here in Charleston, actually. But it hasn't gotten very far yet.

Kim Douglas: Yes, a very famous person once said insanity can be defined as doing the same thing over and over again, expecting different results. And I'm afraid that's where libraries are. Particularly in this issue, we keep doing the same things over and over and expect different results, and it's just not going to happen. That's why we have to take on and really learn how the economists view this market and have substantial, informed discussions with the publishers about this. I think all of you have been in one training session or another having to do with relationships, whether it's manager, supervisor, employee, spouse, parent relationship in terms of making things be different, you know, change. What do they tell you? What's the message? Start with yourself. So if you're not getting the change you want, what has to happen? Only you can initiate the change. It rests on you. So be empowered. Be the change you want to see.

Melody Burton: That's the happy note.