[Remarks presented during Elsevier's Digital Libraries Symposium in January 2010]

Daviess Menefee, Moderator: Table 20. I see Table 20 raising their hands over here. Yes. It's Table 20.

Table 20: Well, I want you to know the Elsevier person waved her hand around, but the rest of us came up with a question. We're wondering about how or can one use the ROI model for areas of benefit, that is, when we're looking at benefits that the university has, areas of benefit that can't be quantified. That is, if we can look at research productivity and grant income, that's one thing.

But what if we want to define a benefit? So, are you already thinking about how to quantify a benefit, for example, related to say student success? And then, sort of a parallel question to that, are there other entire parts of the university besides the library that you know of that are trying to use these kinds of ROI models?

Daviess Menefee: I think that's for Carol. Yeah.

Carol Tenopir: Yeah. And clearly, the grants didn't come the easiest, because you have money coming in. So, to quantify or to give a dollar amount to other kinds of services, you have to go a bit downstream. And so, for example, for student success, you need to think about what, how does student success, what kinds of dollar amounts can you attach to student success?

So, you can look at retention rates, and then you look at tuition. And you look at after they graduate, you look at donation and then the impact on the community in terms of their careers. So, you're going further downstream. And anytime you go further downstream, you know you have to put in little caveats. But there are dollar amounts that you can do.

This has been a lot in public library ROI, where you look at the total value of the library to the community in terms of a more informed populace, in terms of increase in people in jobs, paying taxes, you know, donating to the overall economic welfare of the area, and, in this case, of the university. So, those are the kinds of dollars that you look at. Again, they're kind of downstream.

So, the metrics for that, and by the way, if anybody has ideas, we're still in the stage of putting together what metrics are we going to be testing, so, if anybody has ideas for metrics for that

that would be good. But some of those things I mentioned are the metrics we're looking at which is retention, income in terms of tuition and other kinds of income to the university, and community kinds of income.

And you had another part of the question …

Table 20: *[Inaudible]*

Carol Tenopir: Yeah. It's interesting. Research units often do this too, and so partnering with a research office was an important part of the return on investment studies here. Because they want to see how does a university's investment in people who help you write grant proposals and all of those kinds of things in the research, how does that impact?

So, they're, those are the ones that I'm most familiar with, and I suspect there are others, but I know that they're doing that. And so, we did these studies in conjunction usually with a research office so we could look at return on investment of both kinds of services.

Interviewer: Okay. We have two tables fighting to be next over here. So, we're going to go with Table 18. Yes. Microphone …

Table 18: Betsy Wilson, University of Washington. Carol, we're really, interested in the timeframe for Phase 3. Could you talk a little bit about that? Yeah. Like, could you have it done next *[Crosstalk]*, yeah …

Carol Tenopir: Well, let me get home first, and okay. Here's the bad news guys. It's a three-year timeframe, but we're not going to wait till three years to release something. First of all, the Phase 2 is done. It's just that we are quintuple checking every single number. And the people that we're involved, we let them check everything.

So, that's what – when, we want it out. We know it's going to be controversial, but we don't want it to be wrong. So, at least we're going to show you everything we did, and if people want to quibble that's fine, but we want to make sure it's accurate. So, the Phase 2 will be out momentarily. Well, certainly, in February.

Phase 3, we're starting. We just started at the ARL Statistic Assessment meeting yesterday. We got a lot of good feedback on the kinds of things, measures that people want, as well as the kind of research questions they need answered in the functional areas

and things. So, again, if anybody has anything to give me, that'd be great.

We're dividing and conquering kind of, so each part of the team has a different focus that we're looking at, return of investment for information commons, institutional repositories, because there's some of those that really are interested in that, teaching/learning, all of those. And again, there's no reason why we won't release things in bits and pieces both, through the ARL website, and then presentations and publications. So, the final thing is done in three years.

Daviess Menefee: Okay, Table 17.

Table 17: Hi. This question is for Wendy, and also, if Winston can chime in on this as well. We spoke about a few things at the table, but the most important thing that came up was change. There's a few parts of this question, but everyone at the table wanted to know who in the institution was involved in this change. What helped in the change? And what else were the critical factors that got most people to adapt and to accept the change at the library? Also, what did you have to give up to get these changes to be implemented?

Wendy Lougee: I think one thing I would say about those three studies that I mentioned is that they had a secondary benefit in that, we had to be out working with the community in order to get the data. So, you know there was that sort of penetration of the community, and dialogue that was necessitated.

I guess the other thing that we found as a kind of unexpected result, kind of to get into Winston's phrase, in coming up with that analytic framework of primitive behaviors and talking about the process. When we took that back out to faculty, it was kind of an "aha" moment for them, to realize that there were sort of stages where there were pressure points and those sorts of things.

So, by definition, all of the activities that I described engaged the campus pretty broadly. Programs like Ethics Share was absolutely critical. And again, this echoes what Winston said that the faculty led it, so we have three co-PIs on it, one from computer science, one from bioethics and myself, a governance board, all the faculty from institutions across the globe. And so they were very much engaged in designing that.

Your second or third question, really though was about what is given up. And I would turn that slightly, and to say, how do you

begin to incorporate those roles in, as part of the normal portfolio? So, what I didn't talk about were processes that we engaged in that first of all looked to streamline some of the backroom functions of the library, and to free up time of the discipline liaison librarians so that they could engage more with the campus. So, there was a sort of second set of processes that were very much directed at developing capacity to engage more in these behaviors. Now, in this economic environment, the kind of letting go is probably going to be accelerated in ways that we all, I'm sure are deeply engaged in. Winston …

Winston Tabb: Well, at least a partially facetious answer is that part of what helps change is the constant churning of people within the academy. Again, in a way, I was not really accustomed to at Library of Congress, where people tend to come and stay forever. So, I have actually found that sometimes these rapid changes of people at the dean level, the provost level, and the provost, actually can be very helpful if you know what you want to do. And you just go ahead and get it done.

That's maybe a negative way of – more positively, I think, the key area really is for us to have champions. In every one of the areas that I spoke of, there's one key person who was so focused on this effort that there's so simply no way it's not going to happen. Many of you know some of these people, like [Sair] Sayed, in a couple of cases, but I actually have other people who are very similar to that.

Also, the fact that the Mellon Foundation has been so generous to support initiatives like this, means that at this point, between the Mellon Foundation and as if we haven't had to face the "give up" yet that's likely to come at some point, but not something we've really had to worry about at this point. But, really, I think the single most important thing, in addition to the champions, has been and is the very strong tradition in my library is that library staff want to do as much as they can to help faculty.

So, the will is there. I haven't always known how to do it, or always been as engaged on the frontiers of change as possible, but that's so much a part of the ethos of the library that I haven't really had to deal with some of the kind of "why are we doing this" as opposed to the kinds of issues that might be true at some other places.

Daviess Menefee: Okay, Table 13 is next, and then we'll go over here to Table – question's been asked and answered. Okay, judges rule. Then we're going over here to Table 7.

Table 13: Hi. On behalf of the librarians here, how do we immerse ourselves in the research at our institutions? How do we cultivate a more intimate partnership between researcher and librarian?

Daviess Menefee: That's a good one. Yeah.

Wendy Lougee: I think it can be almost anything from take-a-faculty-member-to-lunch kind of an approach, to thinking about you know where they live. You know not, I mean, I think a fundamental activity is having out-of-library experiences and you know getting out there, but having a repertoire, having you know the right arrows in your quiver, so to speak.

So, for example in the scholarly communication environmental scan that I talked about, each of the librarians went through sort of a series of workshops. We put together toolkits for them, PowerPoints that they could go out and talk to faculty, tools that they could use, templates that they could help faculty with, with respect to publishing and authors' rights, those sorts of things.

So, I think we need to not just push people out, but give them, not just the skill set, but the tools they need to emulate the kind of behavior that we're looking for in the new workforce.

Winston Tabb: I agree with that, but I think it's also of course, faculty speak with each other. So, the problem that we confront I think more and more is how to deal with the success that we're actually having. So, I've been more focused on about how to contain expectation, which is slightly the other side of the kind of issue that you're raising with us. And not yet understanding how we're going to cope with that in every case. But, this is a very good problem to have.

And I think that as we have more success, we'll be having to figure out better ways of dealing with that. Part of it's going to be dealing with having more partners outside the institution. What are, faculty learn that library staff can help, they will be coming for more, that's clearly the situation. And how we cope with that, is going to be a challenge in this economic climate for sure.

Daviess Menefee: Okay, over here, Table 6. Is that what is – 9, sorry, Table 9.

Table 9: Doug Jones, University of Arizona. We were getting back to the theme of the symposium about the role and image of the library and thinking. I think everyone at this table is either a consortia person or we are all members of a consortia. We were wondering, how can we apply some of the concepts that Carol was talking about, to the idea of the library as a larger network organization, which I think Winston and others were referring to as well.

Wendy Lougee: I'll let you guys jump in too, but this came up yesterday too. It's interesting, because here we talk about return on investment of collaboration. And we've talked about collaboration within the university with the faculty and collaboration with the research enterprise. But, collaborate – of course, libraries are experts at collaborating with each other and saving – the savings are easy or easier to demonstrate. And so, this idea of by a small investment in collaboration, how do we say it?

So, a lot of it has to do with quantifying, and that's actually an area that can be quantified, because what are we saving in terms of effort and in terms of collection? And so, this is something that I appreciated the input yesterday, and today, that we need to make sure that we have a group that focuses on collaboration. So, that's a way of saying that, yes, I think it could be demonstrated. And yes, we can look at it, but I don't have an answer right now. The others may have.

Carol Tenopir: I'll just add, this doesn't get at the value part, but I do think we've seen a fundamental shift in what constitutes collaboration. So that in the past it was much more likely to be based on sharing, the interlibrary loan model. Now we're much more likely to see, you know, lining up the assets of various parties in a consortium, if you will, and figuring out who is best positioned to undertake something, and then investing in it.

So, I'll use as an example, the CIC, the Committee on Institutional Cooperation, a big-time investment we made early on in the HathiTrust. Deciding that it should be based at Michigan and Indiana, each of us contributing because we knew on our own we couldn't do digital preservation. Similarly, projects such as the digitizing we've been doing of government documents or that we've looked to see who is best positioned to do it, and then, we've been willing to invest in it.

So, it involves much more trust and less kind of bilateral sharing, and having governance structures in place, I think is absolutely critical. So, I don't know how you'd get at the value, except I

could imagine that there are some variables where you could look collectively at the 13 institutions and see the overall benefit by that collective activity.

Daviess Menefee: Way over here, 3, 2 – Number 2.

Table 2: I'm Tobey Birch from Loyola Marymount University. And our question is, many of these initiatives seem to be funded through grants. Our question is, how do they become sustainable when the grants go away?

Winston Tabb: Well, this of course is one of the most important aspects of the current data net project. Why I mention that, among the four key research elements as part of that is specifically sustainability. So, we don't have the answer yet, but I think putting up front that that's one of the most important questions and having it be part of the thinking from the beginning is extremely important. That's why we included Ithaca for example, as one of our partners to really help with that part of the thinking.

One of the good things about being able to jumpstart activities like the Heritage Conservation Science, I think is that while it may not have appeared so obvious to some of the staff as why it was important, and how it useful it will be. That I think having the funding for a few years to sustain it, while people understand the importance and it takes root in a way that it cannot go away gives us opportunities to think about how we will cease doing certain things that may not have the same kind of value. Or may not be positioned to be a center of excellence, and moving more and more resources toward those places where we have something unique to contribute.

Carol Tenopir: This question goes back to the collaboration question as well, because the sustainability is absolutely dependent on collaboration in many cases. Sometimes it's a matter of setting priorities and changing the way you do things.

Other times, it's putting together a strong team that includes not only other universities or libraries, but also public/private partnerships. We're doing a lot with government lab partnerships where there is really a strong motivation to get something developed and then, others that will help with the sustainability.

Wendy Lougee: One other dimension to that, and if you think about the history of libraries, we've each and every one of us, generally our institutions thought there's something we have strength in. So, if you take for

example the Ethics Share model, the tools and capacities for doing that are all done with Drupal code. So they can be shared, so other people can use them.

We feel we have some strength in bioethics, but you know Johns Hopkins may say, well, we have strength in, and fill in the blank here. So, if the model is a valid and viable one, and if the capacities are shareable, you could imagine a universe where you begin to populate this notion of domain-based virtual organizations based on institutional strength. And each of us then begins to see it as a commitment that we're making, just as we made commitments in the past to sustain certain parts of our collections.

So, there are some dotted-line relationships with the way that we've funded the things in the past, where we thought we had a responsibility to sustain certain things. Partly why I shared that case study is that you know, it strikes me, it has legs to begin to populate how we divide up the discoverability and work environment for different disciplinary domains.

Daviess Menefee: Okay. We have time for maybe one more question, and then we're going to do a wrap-up, 31.

A shout-out question, okay. Here comes the mic.

Audience Member: This is for Carol. Carol, I'm just wondering if in your study on grant funding in ROI, especially for the STM-heavy research institutions, did you take into account somehow the researchers that may not have been getting their citations from the library, like the physicists that get theirs from the preprint servers, etc?

Carol Tenopir: Yeah. What we did in that case, we took – to calculate ROI it got the data of the – financial data, but we also used data from the surveys. So, from the faculty surveys we asked them what percent, on average what percent of their citations in their proposals came from the library e-collection.

And it was phrased, each one was phrased differently, so they'd recognize it. Because, you know, because just saying, they may not know it's the library, but we used the name of the service. So, then we divided that. So, we reduced the ROI by that. So if they said only 50 percent, then the contribution of the library, we also asked how important they felt it. We reduced it again by that.

So, this is a very conservative estimate of ROI, because we did reduce it by the people that did not get their things from the library.

And from our other studies, we know, of course, it varies tremendously, the percent of readings that come from sources other than the library. So, yes, it was reduced by that.

Daviess Menefee: Okay. What we'd like to do now is spend a few minutes wrapping up, and Karen Hunter is here, who many of you probably know, and …

[End of Audio]