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I Hear the Train A Comin’

Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy

Column Editor: Greg Tananbaum (President, The Berkeley Electronic Press, 2809 Telegraph Avenue, Suite 202, Berkeley, CA 94705; Phone: 510-665-1200 x.117; Fax: 510-665-1201) <greg@bepress.com> www.bepress.com

Several years ago, our company (The Berkeley Electronic Press) began publishing peer-reviewed, born digital journals. As an experiment, we offered all of our articles under what we deemed a “quasi-open access” policy. The idea was that, although we are a commercial publisher that hopes to make money, we nonetheless would be best served by having as wide a readership as possible. We thus allowed nonsubscribers to access our content by completing a short guest registration form. The form allows us to inform their library of their interest in reading our journals. When libraries were convinced of sufficient interest in the journal, we reckoned, they would subscribe, and afterwards access for all faculty, staff, and students at that institution would be immediate, with no more forms to fill out.

This model has proven to be a great success for us. Since that experiment began five years ago, we have begun deploying our technology in other areas of the academy as well, notably institutional repositories. Dozens of schools now use our repository technology — Digital Commons, co-marketed with ProQuest. These repositories house a wealth of interesting and valuable scholarly information. It seemed like a logical extension to us to capture and display this open access content alongside the 30 quasi-open access commercial journals we publish under our own imprint. When we announced plans for this co-mingling — called ResearchNow — at ICOLC this past spring, it met with intense discussion. Some felt strongly that there are open access materials, and there are commercial journals, and conscious or unconscious attempts to blur the line were problematic.

This ICOLC debate over ResearchNow set me to thinking. Are there other projects that rethink traditional divisions between “free” and “subscription” materials? Who is charting new business models for scholarly communication, in nuance, rather than the broad brushstrokes of open access and commercial content? How did their models emerge, where do they break from the traditional norms of scholarly publishing, what have they learned to date from their efforts, and what do these lessons portend for the future?

Katina Strauch was kind enough to provide an excellent forum to examine these matters at the 2005 Charleston Conference. I had the honor of moderating a session entitled, “The Confluence of Open Access and Licensed Content.” The session examined a number of emerging models that rethink traditional divisions between “free” and “subscription” materials. Presentations were given on the specific efforts of the American Political Science Association’s Political Research Online service (http://www.politicalscience.org), Cornell’s Industrial and Labor Relations Review’s new home within the School of Industrial and Labor Relations’ institutional repository (http://digitalcommons.irl.cornell.edu/irlreview), Alexander Street Press’s “free to the world” databases (http://www.alexandersstreetpress.com), and the Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy’s endowed content (http://plato.stanford.edu). In this month’s column, I will look at the latter as a fascinating case study of a new way to fund the dissemination of scholarly information.

The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (SEP) — located at http://plato.stanford.edu — was launched in 1995 to serve as a “dynamic reference work” covering all areas of philosophy. The goal of a dynamic reference work is not just to grow in word count or number of entries. Rather, entries are meant to be evolving rather than static, and can be changed as new developments emerge in the field. Each entry is maintained by an expert or group of experts in the field. Currently, an editorial board of 100 distinguished philosophers oversee information across 45 topics (e.g., aesthetics, metaphysics). These board members solicit contributions from authors around the world (a small number of submissions are unsolicited), vet the drafts, oversee postings to the site, and work with authors to keep their contributions current as the scholarship in their topic evolves. In this latter regard, readers, too, play an important role. They are encouraged to contact the thousand or so contributing authors directly with comments, corrections, and other suggestions for improvements. As of late 2005, some 750 entries have been posted to the SEP, typically in the 10,000 word range. For a complete list, see http://plato.stanford.edu/published.html.

While the content maintained within the Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy and the dynamic reference work approach are exemplary (indeed, the project recently received the Best Content Award from the Charleston Advisor in its Fifth Annual Readers’ Choice Awards), it is the unique business model that I wish to examine in greater detail. The SEP is maintained on an annual budget of approximately $200,000. This includes 1.7 FTE, servers and other technology, as well as a small overhead allocation from Stanford. While the project managers committed to long-term unrestricted access for all, several funding options were discussed. Eventually, the SEP crafted a most unusual model. It convinced Stanford University, its host, to partner with a number of libraries and library consortia for the purpose of building a protected operating fund. In other words, they set out to raise an endowment. After some negotiation, they enlisted the Southeastern Library Network (SOLINET), the International Coalition of Library Consortia (ICOLC), the Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition (SPARC), and Indiana University Libraries to raise $3 million over the course of 3 years. At the same time, Stanford agreed to raise $1.125 million from private individuals and corporations. The intention is for the SEP to then live off the interest on that $4.125 million fund.

The Stanford fundraising tentacles are legend, but from what sources would the libraries raise their share? Working with the Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, they drew up a target list of libraries at academic institutions offering degrees in philosophy. Beyond the warm feeling one gets from contributing to the greater good, the libraries were provided some concrete incentives and assurances. The SEP also proposed to be accessed by participating universities’ readers are to be stamped with a customized banner acknowledging the support of the local library. Contributing libraries have access to the Encyclopedia’s quarterly archives as a single compressed file, providing a local archive option should the project ever terminate. Importantly, contributors are ensured governing input over the project.

Another intriguing aspect of the Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy fundraising model is this: Stanford University has agreed to return all library contributions (together with any interest and appreciation in excess of the annual payout) should the SEP project ever terminate. This is a unique element in the business plan: the libraries will see that their contribution appreciates through endowment management as it is put to work, yet is protected so they can invest in some other worthy open access project should this project ever cease.

So, is that warm feeling combined with these practical benefits enough to secure mass
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ians may be happening just when the need for them is lessening.

To return to my fiddling metaphor, Campbell suggests "Librarians must widen the discussion and raise the questions concerning the future of academic libraries" instead of making beautiful music while our libraries/profession are being consumed by the flames of newer technology (page 28). He doesn’t try to answer the question but emphasizes that each campus must confront this question.

I think he is right but I find it difficult to come up with some possible answers that I could advance on my own campus to get the discussion going. I guess I would like to return to the ideas [a bit updated] advanced last year in my tongue in cheek short story in ATG of what the librarian whose library was destroyed by a tsunami should do (March 2005):

· Buy as many eBooks and e-journals as possible and get the faculty to use them for teaching purposes instead of our legacy printed collections that cost people and space.

· Tell the faculty to rely upon Google Print for old books and give them an account with which they can buy new books from Amazon.com.

· Build new space, or convert the old space generated by selling off all the books that can be found in Google, for enormous information commons complex for student study needs. Provide most services 18 hours a day but keep it open the other six hours.

· If our newly emptied old buildings still have surplus space — turn them into gyms, theatres, etc., for all the people who are spending too much time in front of their computers.

· Replace paper and books conservators/ hindery staff with more systems librarians able to deal with the new problems that come with digital forms of information.

· Look at the work that needs to be done and hire accordingly. Hire more subject specialists and make sure help desks are manned with people who know what they are doing. When a professional librarian is needed, hire him or her but don’t start with a near religious belief in the need to find clones for ourselves. Cut the rest of the staff to the point that only those needed to do the above are left.

Do I really believe the above? I think I may be "just kidding." Or am I? I suggest that you find Campbell’s article and spend some time thinking about these questions.

PS. I would like to thank Mark Miller of Montgomery College in Takoma Park, Maryland who kindly pointed out that in my September 2005 Backtalk article I referred to myself as an ex-patriot when I should have said that I was an "expatriate." Thanks so much for correcting me. All my patriotic relatives back home in Idaho will be much relieved. — AF

Endnotes

Innovations Affecting Us
from page 79

emerging issues that include archiving and copyright concerns. How libraries will use this technology remains to be seen in many cases, but it may become more important if coursecasting proves to be a positive supplement to the university or college student’s learning experience.

According to the most recent Pew Internet & American Life Project Report on Podcasting (April 2005), over 22 million American Adults own an iPod or other MP3 player and of those 22 million, 29% have downloaded a podcast. More specifically, almost 50% of the people who own an iPod or other MP3 player and have downloaded podcasts are between the ages of 18-28. The report is available from http://www.pewinternet.org/PPF/r/154/report_display.asp. Accessed 20 January 2006.

I Hear the Train A Comin’
from page 84

participation? If the price is right, yes. In the United States, the requested amount is $5,000 a year for three years for Ph.D. institutions, $2,000 a year for schools offering Master’s degrees, and $1,000 for institutions with undergraduate programs. More than 400 libraries worldwide have committed to the Endowment for the Humanities challenge grant, the library fundraising arms secured commitments of $1.3 million in its first year.

To be sure, there is a free rider problem that the Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy has not fully overcome. Some schools have not contributed (and may not be aware of the importance of their contribution), but nonetheless benefit from the contributions of others. The SEP has an outreach plan that targets institutions meeting criteria such as size, location, the kind of degree in philosophy it awards, and so forth. When a reader

Rumors
from page 43

He also held various sales and marketing positions in Addison Wesley and Simon and Schuster. Beale holds a bachelor’s degree from Loughborough University, UK, has studied extensively in the United States, and is an active member of the UK Publishers Association. He and his family will be relocating to the Ann Arbor, Michigan area in the coming months, and he will be

based out of the ProQuest global headquarters there. www.il.proquest.com/

Do you have ARTstor? We do in our library and are learning more about its functionality and content every day. Was talking to Bruce Heterick <Bruce.Heterick@jstor.org> about it. (He has been home recuperating from double-hip replacement surgery. Ouch!) Anyway, Bruce says that Max Marmor and Kathryn Wayne will be doing an article on ARTstor for ATG. Stay tuned.

A fascinating article to read — “Vatican ‘cares in’ by putting price on the Pope’s

copyright” by Richard Owen in The Times, January 23, 2006. Seems that the Vatican has decided to impose strict copyright on all papal pronouncements. www.timesonline.co.uk/article/0,6124,113549-20050615%e2%80%99s,00.html.

And, finally, be sure and read Bob Nardini’s Issues in Vendor/Library Relations, this issue, p.75. It reminded me of my father, a research economist. When I was in high school, he gave me a small book called How To Lie With Statistics. It taught me a lot, just like Bob’s column on numbers... very... umm... factual.

Signing off. See you in April.
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