

## **Chicago Collaborative Minutes**

**November 9, 2011**

**Hyatt Regency Denver at the Colorado Convention Center, Granite A Room**

**8:00 am-3:00 pm**

**Co-Conveners:** Michael Homan and Gail Yokote

**Attendees:** Martin Frank, Norman Frankel, Tony Mazzaschi, T Scott Plutchak, Margaret Reich, Tom Richardson, Irving Rockwood, Mary Ryan, Rita Scheman, Jean Shipman, John Tagler, Pat Thibodeau, Paul Weislogel, Kristen Overstreet (guest)

**Regrets:** Helen Atkins, Karen Butter, Christine Laine, Diane Lang, Michael Mabe, Jayne Marks, Paul Schoening

**Recorders:** Margaret Reich and Jean Shipman

### **Introductions and Announcements**

Michael Homan welcomed all attendees.

### **Update on Current Initiatives**

**Education Initiatives.** Jean Shipman reported on past and planned presentations of Biomed 101. It was presented as a webinar by John Tagler and Jean Shipman to the South Central, MidContinental, and Pacific Southwest regions of the National Network of Libraries of Medicine. It will be presented similarly in Seattle and Baltimore for the rest of the regions. Norman Frankel presented it to the Sapporo Medical University in Japan. They will translate his presentation into Japanese, and we will link back to this from the CC website.

The corresponding education initiative, Libraries 101, is being worked on by Scott Plutchak, Jean Shipman, and Norman Frankel. The question was raised as to whether and how to make the content more international. The International Congress of Medical Librarianship (ICML) will be in Boston in 2013, and the CC has a slot in an Open Forum of this meeting.

Developing a webinar specifically for post docs was discussed, and it was agreed that outreach to authors was part of the CC mission.

**Meetings.** A lot of positive interest was shown at the CC's booth at SSP, and the Librarian Roundtable there was very well received. A presentation was given at NASIG in 2010, and it was decided to try to get on their program every 3 years. There was nothing formal done at Charleston this year, but there was a lot of interest and discussion among people attending the meeting. Brochures were available at the STM booth at the Frankfurt Book Fair. Irv Rockwood,

Scott Plutchak, and Tom Richardson had a great session at the MLA Midcontinental Chapter meeting. Based on that success, a proposal is in to present to a 4-chapter MLA meeting in Baltimore next year. Because the MLA and CSE annual meetings will be overlapping in time and in the same city in 2012, Jean Shipman and Margaret Reich are working on some joint activities, including a panel about new roles of librarians at the CSE meeting. An MLA CE course will be given at the 2012 Seattle meeting. Rita will be speaking on a panel in Mexico (UNAM) during the XIII Meeting on Scholarly and Academic Journals, sponsored by EBSCO. CC members were reminded to send photos from the CC related meetings for posting on the website.

*Other.* It was suggested that we write an article for the *Journal of Librarianship and Scholarly Communication*. Volunteer authors should let Jean know of their interest.

### **CC Future Directions**

Gail and Michael opened the discussion by explaining that as Co-Conveners they report to the AAHSL membership, and that AAHSL members are very interested in the publishers' issues and opinions. There is a need to develop a communications feedback loop so that each association sending representation to the CC has a chance to react and let the CC know which issues resonate with those associations.

It was decided that a product from each meeting would be a document that summarizes a topic or topics discussed. This document would be agreed upon by the representatives to the CC, and then brought back to each association by its representative(s) for feedback, in the way that the founding documents of the CC were created. The feedback from the associations might be neutral, negative, or enthusiastic to the point that an association takes some action to address it. Responses from these associations would be aggregated and not attributed, to engender more frank and direct responses. Issues that resonate broadly among participating CC associations could become themes of future in-depth discussions that may bring in other parties with specific expertise to the discussions.

Until now, the CC has taken the long view when choosing topics to discuss, and has purposely avoided contentious issues in its early days in an effort to look for common ground. The sense of the group is that there is enough trust built now to discuss more difficult issues that will show to all associations that we are making a difference on some important topic. By sharing information and perspectives on these issues, each constituent in his or her respective fields comes away more informed and intelligent about making decisions, and therefore better at building useful products and negotiating with each other in our daily jobs.

However, it was pointed out that if the CC were to discuss more contentious issues, there will be points of discussion on which those around the table will not agree. So the goal for the documents that come out of the discussions would give readers a perspective on the topic from a group that came at the topic from perhaps very different points of view. There would not be

pressure to write opinion statements that everyone can agree on, but to lay out the issues for comment, consideration, and perhaps, action.

Some issues for future discussion might be:

- Open access
- Business models
- Non-disclosure agreements
- Diminution of value of peer review, or the state of peer review

Other future activities discussed included a method of sharing “tidbits,” or “news bites,” (e.g., the Neuroscience Peer Review Consortium, the use of COPE flow charts for ethical issues) that we learn from each other with a wider audience. A resource page could be created on the CC website. A long discussion was had about whether the CC should get involved with social media (i.e., LinkedIn Group, Facebook, Twitter), to share information to a broader audience than just CC representatives. Although a LinkedIn Group was considered the venue of choice, the question was raised as to whether the CC needed to contract with a social media expert. A draft of a job description for this volunteer position will be distributed. This person would not provide the content—the CC members would—but would advise the group on the appropriate use of social media. The immediacy of social media will also help the CC to see what others are interested in hearing more about.

### **CC Representative Roles**

The roles of the CC representatives were discussed in relation to the future directions, namely that CC representatives will act as communications conduits to their member associations and other appropriate associations they are involved with (e.g., the new Library Relations Committee of the STM, the Scholarly Communications Committee of AAHSL, and the CLOCKSS board) and act as ambassadors for the principles of the CC. CC representatives will be given homework assignments to author these communication or perspective documents from time to time, and will be asked to collect feedback from their associations. CC representatives will also be asked to submit news items to share through social media or other venues.

### **Sustainability**

The future structure, makeup, and sustainability of the CC were discussed. Questions raised included whether other associations should be invited to join. Should the CC be considered biomedical only? What about other library associations, including international ones, like the European Association of Health Information Libraries (EAHIL)? The group decided that growth should be done in evolutionary steps, perhaps by inviting representatives from other groups as appropriate to themed discussions in future meetings. Concerns about the group becoming too large for comfortable discussion were heard from all sides. However, all agreed that all would

benefit if the Editor representatives were able to attend more frequently. As an action item, the CSE and the ICMJE will be asked to find a new Editor representative (perhaps a senior Editor rather than an Editor in Chief would be more available for meetings). Appropriately, a Board member of the International Society of Managing and Technical Editors, Kristen Overstreet, had been invited as a guest and joined the meeting at lunch to find out more about the CC in order to see if their society was interested in participating in the CC.

The group also discussed its future governance structure. Gail and Michael reminded the group that they would be rotating off as Co-Conveners and as AAHSL representatives to the CC, and that Jean Shipman would be stepping up to the role of the AAHSL Convener. The group expressed sincere appreciation for the skillful way that Gail and Michael had facilitated discussion among such a diverse group. In order to give Jean the assistance of a co-convener, Irv Rockwood stepped forward as a publisher co-convener for the coming year.

The group discussed whether AAHSL would be able or willing to continue to support its work administratively, or whether this support should be shared among the various associations. Various models were discussed, but in order to make a more informed decision, a list of administrative activities and their costs was requested from AAHSL, which Jean agreed to obtain. It was decided that after such information was made available, a conference call before the spring meeting might be scheduled to discuss this further.

### **Environmental Scan**

Because the discussions of the future direction and sustainability of the CC constituted most of the meeting, the CC's discussion of topics of common interest was briefer than usual. However, the following topics were discussed:

### **Data Curation**

Reports from those who attended the AAMC/AAHSL/NLM Digital Research Summit in early May raised the following points about data curation.

- Definitions of data?
- Need tools to use
  - Structured data, mining
  - Visualization
  - MedEd Portal for research tools—there is a possible new tool
- Organization?
- Archiving/presentation

- Clinical, research, quality improvements
- Regulatory environment for data
- Metadata schemes (description, content)
- Life cycle for research
  - How data fits?
  - How formal publication fits?
- Stakeholders?
- Standards for collecting, discovery, use, re-use?
- How will publishing change?
- Tools that are used for “use” data; shared or not?
- How to reproduce results if viewing tools not present?
- What to keep for use (or archive) for future?
- What is scholarly content?
- Ethics for data use, re-use—what kind of criteria to use to avoid misuse and misrepresentation?
- “Use” rights?
- Residual use: extra data sets, that is proprietary

Could the CC map out the life cycle of data, as a useful document for others?

### **Research Assessment Methodologies**

- Bibliometrics techniques; STAR metrics
- Scholarly assessments
- Impactfulness
- COUNTER usefulness factor; COUNTER will distinguish between content that is open access or not.

Clinical research and environmental sciences are judged by quality measures that are different than the traditional ones judging basic scientists. Google is driving its hits to the free sites, not

the publishers' sites. HathiTrust is scanning print books. Hits on these will now be factored in to quality assessments.

**New British Library Article Delivery Initiative** removes international ILL component and charges for document delivery with publishers' agreement. This initiative was developed with the STM.

**NLM's National Cooperative Print Retention.** NLM is looking at 250 high-use clinical journals (from the prior Abridged Index Medicus) to be preserved in print at 12 volunteer universities and NLM libraries.

### **Choose Next Meeting Date**

May 3 (afternoon) and 4 (morning), 2012, were discussed as the next meeting dates, with the meeting to be held in Washington, DC, at the end of the STM meeting. This would allow the CC to have a themed discussion of the recent RFI from the OSTP. The CC is considering inviting Michael Stebbins to discuss the responses received. Fred Dylla and John Vaughn from the OSTP Roundtable could also be invited.

### **Transition**

Jean Shipman formally thanked Michael Homan and Gail Yokote for their service as inaugural Co-Conveners of the Chicago Collaborative.

### **ACTION**

A team will be put together to develop the first document to go to represented associations. The document will ask the following questions: What is your short list of issues of the future of scholarly communication that the CC should discuss? What do your associations expect to get out of the Collaborative? Which of these do you perceive to be the top two or three issues?

--archiving and preservation

--open access/ public access

--data management

--the state of peer review

--publications ethics/scientific misconduct

The document would ask for swift feedback (speedback) in order to inform the spring meeting's discussions.