The Devil Is in the Details: Challenges of Collaborative Collecting

Judith Russell
University of Florida

Follow this and additional works at: <https://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>.

Judith Russell, "The Devil Is in the Details: Challenges of Collaborative Collecting" (2016). *Proceedings of the Charleston Library Conference*.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.5703/1288284316500>

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.

The Devil Is in the Details: Challenges of Collaborative Collecting

Judith Russell, Dean of University Libraries, University of Florida

The following is a transcription of a live presentation at the 2016 Charleston Conference.

Judith Russell: Thank you for having me here to talk with you this afternoon about the challenges of collaborative collaboration and also the rewards because there are significant rewards, and I hope you will see that as we go forward. There is an old African saying right here on this slide: “If you want to go fast, go alone. If you want to go far, go together!” This saying is mounted on the front of my computer monitor thanks to a fortune cookie that I ate many years ago, and it is there for a reason. It reminds me of the benefits of collaboration and also that I need to be patient with the process. Those of you who know me or know of me will recognize that patience is not the first characteristic that comes to mind when my name is mentioned. My instinct is to want to get things done quickly, and I do need a reminder that patience is a virtue.

The libraries at the University of Florida are very active participants in a number of collaborative collection development initiatives, and they do provide significant benefits to us, to our partners, and to others who can benefit from the information that we gather. I’m only going to touch on a few of them today, but I’ve tried to pick ones that represent kind of a range of things. I think it’s really important, though, to start out by recognizing that each of them is requiring this effort to establish and sustain trust and to maintain the value for the other collaborators, not to drift away, not to lose sight of the fact that everyone has to be benefiting, and also that it will take longer. It always takes longer than I want it to and always longer than I think it should, but that is because we do have to consult a number of people, and we have to maintain our awareness and concern of their preferences. But that has not stopped us from actively seeking to identify and participate in these initiatives, but again, we have to remember that everybody has to benefit, so there is a need to constantly revisit and think about that.

This summarizes our library mission and vision, and I wanted to speak about just the top two bullets. One of them is the second bullet that says, “We initiate and participate in collaboration and community

building.” This is in our DNA. I think it is in the DNA of most libraries and most librarians, but it is very much in our DNA, and it does drive our openness to these collaborations, and I think helps to make those collaborations successful. And then the second one is this issue of offering key services at the point of need, and increasingly, that means dealing with digital content so that we can have the content available for access anywhere and anytime. So, we do favor electronic content. We dedicate a huge percentage of our materials budget to electronic resources. We have our own digital platform, the UF Digital Collections, which already has over 12 million pages of content and is adding about a million pages a year. So, we do take this seriously as the digital content being an important part of who we are and what we do and how we contribute.

We do a lot of collaborative acquisition, as again I’m sure many of you do. Over 50% of our material’s budget is used for collaborative acquisitions. We’re doing a lot of patron-driven acquisitions in bilateral and multilateral arrangements. That does mean we’re focusing less on the future needs of our researchers and more on the needs of current users, sort of the nature of the beast. We do also have a shared service viewer that runs our integrated library system and provides other resources, so it facilitates sharing of particularly print resources among the academic libraries in Florida. And we do have other consortial relationships like HATHI Trust. So, we do look at collaborative acquisitions in a lot of different ways.

But, today I really want to talk about other types of collection development initiatives, and I picked six of them, well six-ish; some of them go a little broader than the first bullet. These are examples of several major collection development initiatives, each of which contributes to meeting our institutional needs and those of our partners. They do benefit all the participants; the benefits may not be equal to each participant, but there still has to be a benefit to each of them to engage them and keep them in the project. The first and third, the digital library of the Caribbean and the ASERL Collaborative Federal Depository Program, had already begun when I arrived at UF in May of 2007, but both have

expanded considerably since that time, and as often happens with good collaborations, dLOC has expanded to additional and important projects that can be reviewed independently and cross searched within dLOC, as you'll see as we go forward.

dLOC is now 11 years old. It's a long-standing collaboration of libraries, archives, and research institutions in the U.S. and the Caribbean and even a few in Europe. It reflects the diversity of the Caribbean, and it supports a wide range of content in many languages. One of the major challenges to dLOC, other than those identified in the bullets, was the abrupt transition from grant funding to self-funding when the final two years of the grant were canceled in the recession. We made that transition successfully in part because of the willingness of the partners with greater financial resources to establish a tiered due structure, but that needed to be done with great care to respect the feelings of all the partners and avoid any implication of lower dues indicating less importance or status, keeping the board as inclusive as possible, and having the leadership include well-respected Caribbean partners was, and continues to be, essential. This is the homepage for dLOC (<http://www.dloc.com/>). I would encourage you to go and visit it. It shows here some of the sample of collections, two that I would call particular attention to are the one at the bottom of the page, the "Voodoo Archive," which is a very interesting digital scholarship project that was developed by a faculty member at the University of Florida, and another that doesn't show on the screen but which is called "Haiti and Island Luminous." It has received numerous awards and is quite interesting and diverse and really worth looking at.

So, this, dLOC, is a perfect example, looking now at the Haitian law and legal materials, of the serendipity that occurs often in collection development in identifying opportunities for collaboration. Several years ago, I was having lunch with Jerry DuPont, who is the founder of LLMC, and he was late for lunch because he was at a planning meeting for the Haitian Law Initiative. I asked why he hadn't contacted UF, and he said it was because our law library did not collect heavily Caribbean law, and, of course, LLMC was a consortia of law libraries. I responded that the Latin American and Caribbean collection in my libraries did collect legal materials. LLMC was also looking for a public access platform so the people of Haiti could access the materials that

were being digitized for their benefit. Their platform at that time at LLMC was only open to members. dLOC became the public access site, and LACC, our collection, became the third largest source of content for this Haitian law project.

Out of that project grew another project modeled on that which is on Cuban law, and that one began with my collection, so we were the first collection that they mined, and we are now expanding it to other partners. So, again, an example of how one collaboration leads to another. And in turn those collaborations related to other things we were doing and have resulted recently in the establishment of the Cuban Heritage Digitization Project. Over three years ago, on his first visit to the Smathers Libraries, Eduardo Torres Cuevas, who is the director of the Biblioteca Nacional Jose Marti, the national library of Cuba, signed an agreement to join dLOC, and we began to exchange digital files and host his digital files and to plan for collaborative digital initiatives. We already had digitized a number of Cuban newspapers that he didn't have and gladly provided him with digital copies. He has a collection of Cuban American newspapers from 1890 to 1930. There are only five or six issues of those newspapers held anywhere in Florida, and he has a very good collection of them, so he is digitizing those to give to us, so it is sort of ironic that we're giving him Cuban newspapers and he's giving us Cuban American ones, but it works. Right? So, out of several years of collaboration and exchange visits came a recent Convenio Contract to create the Cuban Heritage Digital Collection. BNJM has digitized 89,000 cataloging records from 1900 and earlier, and 58% of those records, according to their analysis, are for materials uniquely held in their library. He has committed to digitizing his unique holdings and providing them for public access through dLOC. He will also host them locally, but Internet access in Cuba is extremely limited still, so he doesn't feel that he can be the platform for worldwide access and not even always for the best access for Cubans. We've agreed to collaborate with other libraries to digitize as much of the remaining 42% as we can, adding them to the collections of dLOC and giving him digital copies for local use.

I want to switch now to another collaborative initiative that was underway when I came to Florida, the ASERL Collaborative Federal Depository Program. I immediately joined the committee that was

managing the initiative under an IMLS grant. It was a demonstration project to consider ways to improve collaboration among documents librarians in the region. I was particularly well-suited to participate and then to provide leadership for this project, as my immediate prior position had been as the superintendent of documents at GPO. These three bullets are key elements of the program: Stay within the law but not necessarily be constrained by tradition or GPO policy that was not legally mandated; seek to build retrospective collections only for what we called “centers of excellence.” There had been a value system in the depository program that said that regionals should try to build comprehensive retrospective collections so that all of us who are regionals should have every document we could possibly get, and that was just overly burdensome, duplicative, and inappropriate. We also wanted to simplify and harmonize disposition rules to reduce the burdens and facilitate the transfer of needed titles among libraries throughout the regions. The tradition had been that each regional set the rules for the libraries that were selectives within their space, and so I think there were 49 regionals at the time, which meant that there were 49 different sets of rules. So, for us, there were 12 regionals in our 10 states, which meant 12 sets of rules. We had some struggles with GPO to get the program approved, but it has been very successful.

We started on this initiative, and then following the release of an ITHACA report on the FDLP in October of 2009, there was a discussion among the ASERL Deans that lead to a decision to build on the IMLS funded project and develop a regional initiative that pushed the boundaries of the FDLP enabling a legislative but remain compliant with the law. So, we wanted to go to the edge of the cliff, but we did not want to jump off or push anyone off. It certainly helped that I was very knowledgeable about Title 44 and the Depository Program and had been working for many years on ways to improve the program without the necessity of statutory changes. We expanded the governance to include documents librarians from all 12 of our regionals, even though two of them were not ASERL members, and also we included other government documents librarians from selective depositories because we needed to understand and meet their needs, and we set up a steering committee of deans from both regional and selective depositories. This insured commitment both in terms of resources and permission, in fact encouragement, to act boldly and it also provided a

means to settle questions that the documents librarians could not resolve among themselves. The principal way that this worked was to set up Centers of Excellence, and the idea of a Center of Excellence was that we would take out parts of the collection that were relevant to the university and to our constituents, and we would build out those collections. We would invest our time and energy in cataloging and digitization and developing reference skills and so forth around those collections. So, I’ll give you two examples: Ole Miss has a major archive for the Institute of Certified Public Accountants. They chose the IRS. They felt that focusing on documents published by the IRS would enrich and complement the ICPA collection and vice versa, so it marched with the needs of their university and the interests already there. Florida International University was already operating the Everglades Digital Library, and they decided that they would take a subject focus, and they would look for any document by any federal agency that dealt with the Everglades. So, they weren’t focusing on an agency. They were focusing on a topic.

An important part of the project is the commitment to fill identified gaps in the CLE collections. That is the one place where we were committed to retrospective digitization, and one of the biggest burdens on depository libraries is that legislative mandate to first offer publications to other depositories before you can weed or discard it from your collection. So, to address both of these requirements, UF developed and continues to host the ASERL Disposition Database. Because there are common rules for disposition, the process is automated, and it matches offers of materials from libraries that are planning to discard with needs from libraries that are trying to build collections, whether they are CLEs or not, but preferential access to those discards is given to filling gaps in CLE collections. In 2015, 312,000 documents, or groups of documents in some cases, were offered. 21,000 were claimed, of which about 15,000 were claimed by Centers of Excellence. So, that may seem like a small amount that we only saved 21,000 documents from being discarded, but that is way more than had been saved under the old manual process, and they were going places where there was a high need, and there is a lot of duplication in those collections, so it is not surprising that there would be a lot of discards as well. Many more items have been adopted under this program than the old methods, and there is still a very heavy volume of discards.

So, also to fulfill the IMLS Grant, we shared the cost with ASERL to develop another piece of software tool called the "Gap Analysis Software," and it lets us compare records from various libraries to identify unique holdings. This does facilitate identifying gaps because if we see that another library has a publication from one of our Centers of Excellence collections, and we hadn't already identified it as missing, we can add it to our needs list, and we can consider, if they are not able or willing to give it to us, at least settling for a print or digital surrogate so that we have a copy in our collection until we can get an original.

So, we are, as I said earlier, a regional depository. We serve Florida, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, which crosses back over into our Caribbean interests. We are considered a multistate regional because we are serving institutions from more than one geographic area. We are very active in the Collaborative Federal Depository Program. We have 35 Centers of Excellence, which you can see listed here. We are a land-grant institution, so not surprising, a lot of interest in USDA agencies. I worked at one time in my career at NCLIS and OTA, so we've adopted them. Our biggest commitment has been to congressional hearings, and we are still working to get those catalogued. That is an enormous collection, but the Panama Canal was particularly interesting. We have a very significant collection on the Panama Canal, and we merged into our collection a collection from a small museum on the Panama Canal, and so we are taking care of the Panama Canal Commission and its predecessor agencies but also, not unlike the Everglades example, all other federal documents and maps about Panama and the canal regardless of the agency. It could be the Corps of Engineers. It could be a treaty from the State Department. It could be hearings. It could be the GAL report. If it is about Panama, we want to have in our collection.

We are actively cataloging and digitizing and making these things available for public access. We, in fact, have submitted to GPO the digital copies of all of our Panama Canal documents, and they are now appearing in FDSys (govinfo) depending which name you know it by. We do harvest digital or digitize content for our Centers of Excellence, but we don't otherwise harvest or host digital content locally, and that is really true across our collections. If we send 100 brittle books out to be digitized, and 10 of them were from our preeminent collections, we would

bring those back and host them locally, but we would be perfectly happy if we've used Internet Archive, for example, for digitizing, to just leave the others at Internet Archive and link to them. We don't feel compelled to host something locally unless it is part of one of our important collections, and we follow that same policy with the documents.

So, one of the commitments that I made as a Dean, which I some mornings wake up and wonder why, but we had 300,000 government documents uncatalogued in storage when I came, and we started cataloging them, and then in 2014, to make space for student services, we moved the remainder of the documents collection to off-site storage and committed to cataloging the entire collection. We have catalogued over 560,000 volumes, and we have created almost 14,000 original cataloging records which we have put in OCLC, so they are available to other people who are doing cataloging. Most of these records have been copy cataloguing. There is a lot of cataloged documents out there; it is just people have not applied those records to their catalogued materials. Based on the large number of original cataloging, people often comment that we have a high number of unique documents, and I remind them that I don't necessarily have unique documents; I have uniquely catalogued documents because so many of us still have a large volume of pre-1976 documents that are uncatalogued. It is difficult to estimate how far along we are because the pre-1976 publications are interfiled with later ones, but we think we are about at the halfway point, so we still have a lot of cataloging to do. I did realize, though, that this was one of the best things I could do for my selectors and for the FDLP as a whole. By cataloging my collection, each of them can make informed decisions about their own collections. There was and is a large volume of weeding going on based mostly on the assumption that the regional has everything, or at least some other depository will have a copy of everything that is being discarded, and it's an assumption without facts to base it.

Last year GPO started discussing the option to allow digital substitution for regional collections. Right now, regionals are required to keep everything tangible all print or microfilm forever. We stepped up and offered to serve as a preservation collection for print versions of digital or digitized documents in govinfo. When at least four preservation copies have been identified, other regional depositories will be

able to request authorization to discard the print and rely on the electronic. The reason we stepped up so quickly is that this requires minimal changes to our standard procedures. The biggest change is that the preservation copy in our system will become a noncirculating copy so that we will rely on the digital copies, and that is feasible because there will be digital copies. I think that is another important factor about collaboration. The more minimal the disruption is, the easier it is to get the collaboration to work and to get people motivated to participate in it.

We also created a “Last Copy” policy specific to federal documents. As far as I know, it is the only one in the country, but we are hoping that other people with either shared storage programs that include documents or other regionals will adopt this policy. We feel that if one of our selectives or any of the academic libraries in Florida feels that they have a document that they can no longer retain but that it’s important that they still have access they should be able to send it to us, even if it is not within the framework of our Center of Excellence collections, and we should receive it and host it as a service because we are meant to serve our community. Because it is not fully catalogued, it is not easy for them to know if we have it, so they can’t determine whether we have it. They can send us a list, we will walk our shelves, we’ll verify what we have, and we’ll let them know what we don’t have, and they can send it to us. That has worked very well. We’ve gotten not a large number of documents, but we’ve gotten some, and it does build a lot of goodwill for the overall collaboration.

So, I think you can begin to see how these things begin to link together. Participation in the ASERL Collaborative Federal Depository Program led to the transfer of our regional collections to what we call FLARE, the Florida Academic Repository, and the existence of FLARE gave us a logical home for the regional collection. So, we’re now managing government documents like we manage other shared monographs and journals. We plan from the beginning on the assumption that the collection would eventually service the private universities and the public and private colleges in Florida, not just the university system, and we wanted to make sure that our policies and procedures anticipated those future participants. So again, an important part of collaboration is a broad engagement and participation of future partners. We didn’t want to

get all the rules developed so that we are perfectly happy and then say, “Hey, guys. Now we’re ready for you to join,” and have them say “Oh, but we can’t do it because this rule or that rule.” It is much better to have representatives at the table with us as we plan the basic rules and just put the right rules in place from the beginning. The FLARE collection is eventually supposed to be housed in a high-density storage facility in Gainesville. The planned facility will eventually initially have two modules with a capacity of 5.2 million volumes. The land adjacent to the current facility has certainly enough space there to build multiple additional modules with a capacity of over 20 million volumes as they are needed. I actually proposed building this facility to the Provost when I interviewed for the job at Florida, whether or not she chose to hire me. I had my first meeting with my new colleagues, the library deans in the state university system, in June and proposed it to them. We submitted a proposal to the Board of Governors in August, and it was approved enthusiastically in October of 2007. The land speed record for getting anything approved through the Florida Board of Governors, I might say. However, although we were given planning money in 2009, and then we had a recession, so this is perhaps one of the greatest tests of my patience because we are still waiting for funding. But, we have continued to build the FLARE collection using the two off-site storage facilities, and I’m optimistic that this might finally be the year when we actually get funded.

As noted here, the FLARE repository already has over 2.2 million volumes, and 1.2 million have already been trade and inventory. They’re already identified in OCLC and are available for interlibrary loan. Our policy is that we loan from this collection the way that we would loan from any collection in our academic libraries, so it is not a closed collection just to serve the participants. It is an open collection to serve the broader community.

Simultaneously with our development of FLARE, ASERL was developing its own print journal archiving, and we aligned the policies for that so that FLARE could be an active participant in ASERL. So, every journal that is in FLARE is also in the ASERL Collaborative Print Journal Archive. And then in 2013, the ASERL project merged with the WRLC Collection to create something that we call “Scholars Trust.” Out of self-interest, but also interest in my community and to avoid duplicative entry into databases for two journal archiving programs, I

offered to develop software that would serve both originally ASERL then into Scholars Trust and FLARE, and it is called JRNL, Journal Retention and Needs Listing. The lessons learned from the dispositions database applied here that we were going to have journal collections with missing volumes, and we should be able to communicate with our partners so that if they were weeding, they can identify that they had a volume that we were missing, or that we had a volume that they were missing, and we could fill in the gaps in our collections. As of June, there were over 17,000 unique ISSN's recorded in JRNL, of which over half were from FLARE, so FLARE is a major contributor to this larger collaborative program.

We have another special project that I initiated, which is sort of nested into this print journal archiving. There are 40 ASERL libraries and nine WRLC's, so 49 libraries in this partnership. Only 10 of us are land-grant institutions, so we identified 1,000 journals in agriculture and related fields. We went to the 10 land-grant universities in ASERL and to the National Agricultural Library, and we are collaborating to establish archiving commitments for those agricultural journals. We're excepting commitments from others, but it seems so much easier, again scale is an issue, so it is a lot easier to start this project with 10 libraries than it would've been to start it with 49, so once the 10 got it well under way, we are accepting commitments for titles from others, but the starting point was the smaller group. We already have 762 journals that have been entered into the database for retention commitments, so it is working well.

We do expect to grow the journal program by subject. We've already got another small group, I think its nine libraries, who are working on architectural collections. There really is an advantage to finding a scale. There is a lot more self-interest in having architectural librarians from nine of our universities collaborate than there is to go out to 40 of them and just say, "Tell me any journal you want to keep," regardless of the subject. It's almost too big to get engaged in, so that's been very helpful to look at it that way.

The final example that I wanted to share with you is a very different type of collaboration, and it is between the Smathers Libraries and commercial publishers, making it a little bit more controversial, maybe a lot more controversial to some. It began with a collaboration with Elsevier, which has

expanded to include other publishers through CHORUS, and there is a fairly detailed article about the Elsevier project in Collaborative Librarianship in Volume 8 published in early summer of 2016, so you might want to look at that if you want more details about this project, but kind of here is the who, what, why, when, where. So, it was a bilateral project with UF and Elsevier. We were looking at each of us having goals which were at least not incompatible. They were sometimes different but not incompatible, and the ultimate way that we did this was to link articles and download metadata into our institutional repository using a free API, application programming interface, from Elsevier. So, we did have some common goals. The way this came about was in conversations with my Provost, my Vice President for Research and the Faculty Center Research Council over several years. I was asked several times why the universities couldn't solve this problem, the problem being identifying UF faculty research publications with minimal burdens on the faculty. Don't ask the faculty to tell me what they published. Don't ask them to send a copy of the article or the manuscript to me; find a better way. There are many more academic faculty than library faculty. I assume that happens to you as well, and they are very productive. Our faculty produce over 8,000 journal articles a year, so we also need a solution that place minimal burdens on the library faculty and staff.

Since the UF authors published between 1,100 and 1,300 articles a year in Elsevier journals, I first approached Elsevier to see if I could obtain author manuscripts directly from them. Think of it. They have the manuscripts, right? I don't have to go to all these different authors. They know what permissions were or weren't granted, and it seemed very logical. I've quickly learned that Elsevier has recently developed APIs to facilitate identification and downloading of metadata into local institutional repositories and was looking for a partner to test them. My staff quickly decided to use the APIs rather than to seek copies of the manuscripts, and I have to say UF did not have a culture of deposit. At the time that we started this, there were only seven Elsevier articles in the institutional repository, so out of an average of 1,100 to 1,300 a year that were being produced, our goals in phase 1 were to increase the comprehensiveness of our coverage of Elsevier published content in the IR, to provide subscribers with access to what we termed the best available, that is the published version of the article. Our faculty definitely preferred that we take

people to the published version of the article with all the links and other things that were embedded in it. We wanted to integrate the published articles into the IR at UF so that people could find other content that was already in the IR, whether it was a conference paper or something else, and use all of the content that we had on that topic, not just the content that wasn't published in commercial journals or just the commercial journal content. So, in phase 2, which we just started recently, we're now providing an access option for users who do not have a subscription to Elsevier. We're providing an option for nonsubscribing users to see a manuscript version of the article, and we are also doing full text indexing, wherein the first phase was indexing just with metadata and abstracts. And we've been doing usability testing of the first phase, and so we're looking to that to help us change and improve the interface, and we've been doing research on open access publishing by UF authors and using Elsevier metadata for other university purposes, including compliance.

Right now, we have over 30,000 articles by UF authors from 1949 forward that we were able to download from Elsevier. Again, metadata and abstracts, linking to Science Direct, full text access, full access for users with subscriptions, and we are working on phase 2 of alternative access for other users. Ninety-five percent of the attempts to use Science Direct come from subscribers. There is only a 5% rejection rate, so there really was a sense that this historical number of denials for nonsubscribers was relatively small, and, therefore, we didn't really deal with that in phase 1. Often that denial is corrected by logging into a VPN server. People are sitting at their desks, getting right through. They go home, they sit at the desk, and they don't get in, and when they get rejected actually says, "You might consider signing on through VPN." Often when they do, they then get in, but we are now focused on serving those nonsubscribers.

The benefits of collaboration were a little different for each of us but one that both of us were very interested in was how this might ultimately facilitate oversight of and participation and compliance with the new public access mandates that were coming up. We also recognized that the university was going to need help with this compliance, and so we were testing how having this metadata might help us at least inform them of what articles UF authors have published so they would note it and try to see if there's been compliance with those articles.

Our phase 1 goals were, as I say, focused on metadata and indexing of metadata. The most difficult problem we encountered was identification of UF authors. I've always been a good strong believer in ORCID. I've become a good strong believer in Ringgold. You know, we're not at Clemson or Emory or Stanford or someplace that has a unique name. There is a number of universities that have the word "University" and "Florida" in their titles, so it's a big effort on our part and Elsevier's to get rid of the ones that were University of Central Florida or Florida State University or the false traps. We think we've pretty well overcome that, but obviously, better metadata that identify both the authors uniquely and the institutions uniquely would be enormously helpful. The surprising discovery in all this was the high number of open access articles published by UF authors in Elsevier journals. We're doing further analysis on the open access publishing, and we expect to survey these authors to determine more about their motivation and their source of funds. We hope some of them will become champions for our campus-wide open access policy that we've been trying to get through for several years. Interestingly, out of these 601 articles by 1,443 unique UF authors, so that is not counting their collaborators from other institutions, which are in some cases also participants, 8 to 10 of these had more than 20 open access articles in Elsevier journals in the years between 2009 and the early first quarter of 2016. That seemed amazing to me. One of them had over 30, so I really want to meet these people. I'm very curious about what they're doing. Obviously somebody has got a real strong commitment.

So, I wanted to show you this because one of the issues was how would we display this content, and the Elsevier people wanted to be sure that people knew when they had access. Actually, if you do a Google Scholar search, it does not tell you if you have access. If you click through, it will stop you, but it doesn't tell you before, but Elsevier felt, and we agreed, that it will be helpful if somebody knew. It could be very frustrating if you click through a lot of things but kept getting told, "No, no, no." So, we came up with this symbol that you see at the upper part of the screen. It says "Publisher version. You have access." And then we also wanted to let people know when they might not have access, but because it is sometimes issues like VPN, we didn't want to say, "You don't have access," and maybe stop them from even looking, so we came up with a publisher version

check access as shown at the one at the bottom, and you may not be able to read it from the back, but that article was published in 1990. UF does not own the back file for that journal. Consequently, the Elsevier API identifies correctly the user accessing the article from the UF IP range may not be entitled to access. The user from another institution that does have access to that back file would've seen the message "You have access," so the API presents the results that are specific to the status of the individual user, which we all thought was really very beneficial, but it wasn't kind of a guess. It was a very real and targeted response. And although, as I just mentioned, we have a lot of open access articles, we didn't think it was enough to just say "You have access." We really wanted to call attention to the open access articles, and so there is a specific and different label for articles that have open access, which obviously everybody can have access. We're now working with Elsevier on the tagging in phase 2 for how we're going to inform the users without subscriptions that they have access to the manuscripts, so that is kind of one of our phase 2 activities.

So, moving kind of the transition from Elsevier to CHORUS, when I first saw this slide, the word compliance was as it is now in the center, but there was one less figure on the slide, and I went up to Howard Ratner, who had used this in a presentation about CHORUS at an SSP meeting, and told him that the person on my campus who was losing sleep over compliance wasn't on his slide, the Vice President of Research. I acknowledged the need to initially focus the development of CHORUS on publishers and funding agencies but pointed out that this was, in fact, a three-legged stool, and that there were three figures from academic institutions who represented one leg of that stool, the librarian, the VP research, wants a place there and the researcher, and they were not participating in the design of CHORUS. So, I suggested that when they were ready, UF and other academic institutions should participate in the development of CHORUS to ensure that it met our needs as well as those of publishers and funders. A few months ago, Howard called me and said they were ready to expand the partnership and asked if UF could participate, and I quickly agreed.

This is another example where the Elsevier project led to the CHORUS project. Elsevier is a CHORUS board member, and their member of the board kept them informed about our pilot, and, as the other publishers learned about how the Elsevier pilot was

working, they became more and more confident about doing something similar with the universities through CHORUS. So, we now have a whole group of seven CHORUS members who are participating in the pilot, and we expect that more will participate before the pilot is concluded. There are others who are actively considering.

We have a variety of aims for the project, but from my point of view, the most important goal here is the goal of facilitating compliance. So, the way this is going to work is that we will be using tools to identify UF authored articles. Then CHORUS will in an automated way check the metadata for the funding source. Once the funding source is identified, they will verify that there is deposit in an appropriate funder repository or not, and they report the data to UF through this dashboard, and we will then turn that information over to the Compliance Office and the Office of Research. So, for example, Dr. Smith has published an article that was funded by DOE. They find that article, and they confirm that the grant was a DOE grant, and they look in the DOE repository, and they say, "Oh, yes. That is there." So, the report that we get is, "Here's the article, here's the funding agency, and it has been deposited." Dr. Jones published in USDA, but the USDA grant is not yet in the repository. The Office of Compliance knows at least at some point they will need to follow up with Dr. Jones to say, "Remember you need to deposit that article." But, it may be that in the next month's report. We haven't decided whether these reports are weekly or monthly, but in the next report, it may then say now Dr. Jones has deposited, so this will be really important. My Vice President of Research is enormously happy about this because he sees this as being a very efficient way to help his office of compliance manage the fact that we have these 8,000 journal articles being written, many of which will have to be deposited in one or more repositories under these agency mandates.

The most frequent question I get asked about these projects is the one on this slide. Why Elsevier? Why CHORUS? And I think this slide answers that question. Eight of the 10 publishers most selected by UF authors are CHORUS members. Elsevier has the largest volume of any publisher, so naturally I started with them. Also, they were ready and willing to test it. But, there's also Springer Nature, who has a large volume. Wiley has a large volume. Automated solutions for identification of access to

articles by UF authors from multiple publishers reduces the burden on the academic faculty. It reduces the burden on the library faculty and staff, and by sharing the data on compliance, it reduces the burden on the staff in the Office of Compliance within the VP of Research. So, I think you can see here that it's logical for us to think about how do we get automated tools that allow us to do this efficiently? This is going to be something that every one of our campuses is going to be having to deal with, and so testing these things and trying to perfect them and make them into standard tools that we can all use I feel is very important. And I think it is very important that we were in it at the beginning of the process so that they aren't developing these tools in a vacuum. They are developing them, and we're already giving them feedback about what do we need on the academic side, which is going to be very different than what the agencies need to be reported and what the publishers need for their own information. So, we're looking at all of the users and what their needs are and trying to address them collaboratively. It's just in the early days. We've only been at it for a couple of weeks, but it already holds great promise, and we're really excited about it.

I want to go back and wrap up by my African saying: "If you want to go fast, go alone. If you want to go far, go together!" I hope these projects give you some good examples of the benefits of collaborative collection development as well as to specifics about some of the initiatives in our libraries and with our partners. We share expertise, we share costs, we challenge one another, and we stimulate creativity and innovation, and we do not only go farther, we go better by going together. It is not without cost, sometimes in dollars, more often in commitment from our library faculty, but it is absolutely essential. We could not do most of these things effectively on our own. They have to be done with collaborators to really benefit from them.

I'm back again to the other slide about libraries, and I here emphasize the bullets, whereas on the first one I was emphasizing the lead statement, but these initiatives do require effort. They're not without pain. We have to sustain trust. But I'd like to talk for a minute about what makes a successful collaboration and get back to the title. The devil really is in the details. Ultimately, every collaboration is a risk. They're not going to all work well. They won't all be sustainable. But we have to

be open to the potential and able to identify the ones that are likely to pay off and willing to recognize the value of the lessons learned from the ones that don't. Sometimes we learn more from a failure than we learn from a success, and we have to be able to take that and learn from that and go back to the well and try again in a new way and see if we can go forward.

Each project requires leadership, vision, and commitment. We need to be able to see the potential, to identify the benefits in our own institution and to the others who seek to join us. We need to be able to convince others, both internal and external, to participate, and we need the patience to persevere even though it is likely to take longer than expected. As leaders, we need to provide the necessary resources and empower and encourage, and I'm guilty sometimes of badgering the participating staff. I will say that most of the time when I question the staff, I'm asking "What do you need from me in order to move forward faster? What do you need from me?" But it is still badgering, so I acknowledge that. I'm more patient than I was but maybe not patient enough yet. We do need dedicated believers and implementers to understand the vision and work out the details and strengthen the collaborations. They're the ones who make it happen. I can have the vision. I can go to Howard Ratner and say, "Let me in." He can say, "Come in." But, it is only when his staff, and my staff, and the staff of these publishers sit down at the table and really talk it over and start working on it that it will actually happen.

We often face uneven resources, skills and commitment among our partners, and we need to accept that and adjust to it. International partnerships, and sometimes even domestic ones, can have language and cultural barriers. Working with the publishers certainly identify different vocabulary and different perspectives, but these were not barriers, and we both learned from exploring the differences and gaining greater understanding, and in the end, it helped us to move forward. Successful collaborations build on each other. dLOC into the Haitian law and to the Cuban law and to the Cuban heritage, FLARE into ASERL, print journal archiving and the Scholars Trust, Elsevier into CHORUS; so if you look at these things not just in their isolation of this project but where does this project take us? Also, a successful collaboration builds trust and makes the next collaboration with that partner or perhaps with observers easier. They

surprise and delight. I cannot tell you how enthusiastic my staff are about some of these projects. I mean, they just feel so good about what they're getting done, and so even though it is hard work, the rewards both personal and professional are great. They meet new people. They form new friendships and relationships, so I can only say you should try it. You're going to like it, and it is much

more fun to travel with others than to travel alone, even though it will slow you down a little bit. And I will say to you also that if you have a great idea and you need a strong collaborator, I hope you'll consider sharing your idea with us. We all have limited resources, so we can't join everyone that interests us, but we do help and participate where we can. So, I hope we left little time for questions. Thank you.