

Reveal Digital Funders Round Table -June 2016

Meeting Summary

Attendees

Sarah Beaubien, Grand Valley State University; Becky Culbertson, CDL; Jeff Daniels, Grand Valley State University; Kay Downey, Kent State University; Celeste Feather, LYRASIS; Lisa Fish, University of Miami; Marion Frank-Wilson, Indiana University; Jill Grogg, LYRASIS; Jan Maxwell, Ohio State University; Steve Sowards, Michigan State University; Doug Way, University of Wisconsin; Liza Weisbrod, Auburn University

Reveal Digital: Jeff Moyer, Peggy Glahn, Tim Fusco

Financial Update

Jeff and Peggy provided a financial update for the Independent Voices project

Funding Commitments by Year

	2013	2014	2015	2016 YTD	TOTAL
New	565,633	280,864	117,502	191,393	1,155,392
Supplemental	0	0	0	273,000	273,000
TOTAL	565,633	280,864	117,502	464,393	1,428,392

Reveal Digital started fundraising effort in 2013. There was early buy in from CDL and CIC who used central funds to prime the pump. 2014 was a steady year, followed by a significant downturn in new funding commitments in 2015.

The picture brightened considerably in first 6 months of 2016. We have received strong funding support via new commitments and supplemental funding. Year-to-date funding is \$464,393, bringing the total funds raised to \$1.4M. We are now at 78% of our cost recovery goal. We need \$366,061 to complete the project as originally conceived.

CRL Campaign

CRL and Reveal Digital began working more closely together this year, as recommended and facilitated by our Executive Committee. CRL undertook a significant outreach effort to its members this spring on behalf of Reveal Digital. The results have been very encouraging.

2016 Fundraising Summary

CRL Commitments 2016	
New Commitments	\$ 141,983
Supplemental Commitments	\$ 239,800
Total	\$ 381,783

Non CRL commitments in 2016	
New Commitments	\$ 49,410
Supplemental Commitments	\$ 33,200
Total	\$ 82,610

All Commitments 2016	
New Commitments	\$ 191,393
Supplemental Commitments	\$ 273,000
Total	\$ 464,393

Content Update

Spending on digitization outran new commitments in the fall of 2015. After accumulating a deficit of \$300,000, we suspended digitization and rights clearance activities. The suspension remained in place until this spring when funding picked up dramatically. As new and supplemental commitments began coming in, a portion of the commitments were directed to covering the debt and another portion to restarting digitization.

Independent Voices: Content Summary

Series	Live Titles	Live Pages	In Production	Live & In Production	Target	Balance
GI Press	460	37,275	0	37,275	37,275	0
Little Magazines	133	159,139	10,899	170,038	170,038	0
Feminist	72	70,903	3,904	74,807	100,000	25,193
Campus/Community	69	76,664	14,892	91,556	125,000	33,444
LGBT	9	27,162	2,604	29,766	100,000	70,234
Black	5	1,612	5,783	7,395	50,000	42,605
Latino	0	0	742	742	50,000	49,258
Native American	1	554	1,241	1,795	50,000	48,205
Right Wing	0	0	0	0	75,000	75,000
	749	373,309	40,065	413,374	757,313	343,939

Items to note from the table above include:

- The GI Press Series is complete.
- The Little Magazines series is nearing completion. This series is the largest collection of literary press materials ever assembled. Wisconsin and University of Buffalo are the main source libraries. This series alone is worth the investment libraries have made in Independent Voices. It is a wonderful collection for anyone looking at avant-garde literature, particularly poetry. A lot of the magazines made creative use of illustrations and graphics, so having full page images of this material makes the collection that much more interesting and stronger.
- Campus Community Papers and LGBT. We have enough rights to complete those collections. MSU has been a major contributor, also Duke and Northwestern, University of Connecticut.

- We will be focusing our rights-clearance and digitization resources on the minority presses through the rest of this year. The last series to be completed will be the right-wing press, where rights clearance activity is just beginning. University of Kansas will be the major source library for this material.

Question: If there is content that can't leave the source library, may that library scan the material and send it to Reveal Digital?

Answer: Yes. For example, The University of Texas has a complete run of The Rag. The Rag cannot leave the library but UT has an active digitization program. They are creating scanned images (and have done a great job) and sending the images to us for further processing.

Ancillary Benefits

MARC records

Because we ceased scanning new content, there has been little activity on MARC records since last fall.

Becky Culbertson and various assistants at CDL have restarted their efforts as we have begun to add new content to the collection. Becky is also liaising with Regina Reynolds at the ISSN Center to get ISSN numbers assigned to titles that have never had one. Doug Way mentioned that the cataloguers at Wisconsin are very particular about quality of MARC records and they said the records Becky and team are creating are excellent. Thank you Becky!

Another batch of MARC records will be ready by Labor Day. Funders will be notified when ready.

We have also been working with Summon and EBSCO discovery services. We have not been able to make a connection with Ex Libris for PRIMO and SFX (contact was established shortly after ALA!).

COUNTER Statistics

Veridian, the platform provider for Independent Voices, has never developed COUNTER statistics functionality until now. We continue to work with them to develop this capability. In the mean time, we have been able to extract title-level usage statistics from the log files. Based on the group discussion, there was general agreement that the title-level usage statistics we can provide now will be helpful to receive twice per year. Reveal Digital will work on a mechanism to provide this information to funding libraries.

New Projects

NYU received grant money to digitize the Sylvester Manor collection outside the Reveal Digital project, so that project has been removed from Reveal Digital's list. The other three, SNCC, Liberation News Service and Highlander School are still on the list of projects we think there is value in doing. These projects will be first up for consideration under the new investment fund model Reveal Digital is contemplating.

Up until now, Reveal Digital's open access model has been project-focused. The resulting paradigm has led to librarians evaluating Reveal Digital projects as they would a new product from a commercial provider. This project focus requires significant outreach resources, making the model unsustainable in the long run. We intend to continue to pursue our mission to find cultural heritage materials in the humanities and make them open access, but under a modified, more sustainable model.

Transition to investment fund model

Challenges of existing project-based model

- Projects perceived and evaluated like commercially available products
- Libraries would make commitments to a project, but the project would not reach its funding threshold. They may have earmarked dollars, but then need to put that money somewhere else by year-end and their commitments are still sitting there.
- Unfunded projects lead to gaps in our funding base

Investment Fund Approach

- Reveal Digital engaged a consulting group to interview library directors and heads of collections. We received strong positive feedback on our new proposed approach.
- We'd like libraries to make 3, 5 or 7-year commitments. Ongoing commitments would provide a steady stream of funding that would cover the fixed cost associated with managing the organization while providing funding to invest in projects immediately.
- If we maintain our current tiering structure, we expect commitments for ARL libraries to be under \$10,000 per year. Liberal arts college commitments would be in the \$3,000 to \$4,000 range.
- There will be an editorial board composed of funding libraries that will direct which projects are funded through a formal vetting and ranking process.
- There will be a defined process for nominating projects.
- There will also be a library-driven board that will determine how **all** funds are invested.
- We'd like to finish the funding for Independent Voices so there is no uncertainty about where funds are going. We'd like to do that by the end of 2016.
- We anticipate spending the first half of 2017 presenting the prospectus for the fund to our existing funding libraries and the library community in general.
- The fund will have a thematic structure. There is power in aggregation, pulling content together that can be cross-searched. We are looking at 20th Century social change as a theme that would build on what we started with Independent Voices, and where there seems to be a need for content.
- There could be multiple funds if there is a strong need identified in other areas.

Comments from the group

This is the right direction to be going in.

It is important to give people an option to either give the full amount one-time vs. making payments every year.

It is Important to present the model as an open access project. As a "product" the content is too narrow.

Emphasize sweet spot we operate in where the collections are focused on in-copyright material that libraries wouldn't digitize on their own.

One librarian talked about how a single Article Processing Fee from Wiley or Taylor & Francis can be \$3,000. That's just for one article. The funding amounts we are talking about for an investment fund are fantastic from an open access point of view because there is so much more content that comes from a single payment.

There is a shift happening, at least with ARL's, into expanding open access beyond journal publishing. An investment fund approach is just another way we support open access.

There is no need for an embargo period for content digitized under this model. The libraries that will be supporting Reveal Digital will expect the content to be open access.

There was a recommendation to make funding levels "suggested" levels of commitment to allow libraries that would like to support the effort but aren't able to make the tier to join the fund.

There was discussion around how to construct the tiering system for funding. We can stick with current system of tiering by ARL and highest degree awarded in history. Also discussed were bronze/silver/gold tiering where an institution contributes at one of those levels regardless of size, or we could tie funding levels to the materials or acquisitions budget, or full-time enrollment numbers.

One librarian commented the funding structure may be the single most important thing to get right.

It can be easier for some libraries to come up with one-time payments. Money can be found somewhere, whether from endowments, gifts, year-end budget. This can be easier than a serials-type commitment into the future.

There will need to be flexibility with wording and dates on invoices so that invoices can show a particular date and contain specific wording that will work in each institution's setting.

We should consider providing contribution ranges which would give libraries the ability to pay more than may be suggested.

For some libraries the membership approach is easier to pay and for others more difficult. One librarian commented that he has to justify every membership they belong to. Another uses memberships for things he can't justify in other ways. Be flexible on this!

Some states are putting all invoices, contracts, every expenditure online where anyone can see them.

The group agreed that not-for-profit is the best way to go. It will open up other funding options from foundations and the like.

Funding Libraries Through June 2016

Below is an alphabetical list of Independent Voices funding libraries for Independent Voices. Institutions listed in red text have provided a second round of funding in addition to their original contribution.

California Digital Library (CDL) for:

[University of California, Berkeley](#)
 University of California, Davis
 University of California, Irvine
 University of California, Los Angeles
 University of California, Merced
 University of California, Riverside
[University of California, San Diego](#)
 University of California, San Francisco
 University of California, Santa Barbara
 University of California, Santa Cruz

[Dartmouth College](#)
 Davidson College
 Denison University
 Dickinson College
 Duke University
 Emory University
 Florida International University
 George Mason University
 Harvard University
 Hollins University
 In Memory of John H. Muir
[Johns Hopkins University](#)

Committee on Institutional Cooperation (CIC) for:

[University of Illinois](#)
[Indiana University](#)
 University of Iowa
 University of Michigan
[Michigan State University](#)
[University of Minnesota](#)
 University of Nebraska-Lincoln
[Northwestern University](#)
 Ohio State University
 Pennsylvania State University
[Purdue University](#)
[University of Wisconsin-Madison](#)

Juniata College
 Kalamazoo College
 Kent State University
 Kenyon College
 Luther College
 Macalester College
 Mount Holyoke College
 Muhlenberg College
 New York Public Library
[New York University](#)
 Oakland University
 Oberlin College
[Princeton University](#)
 Reed College
 Simon Fraser University
 Smith College
 Temple University
 Tufts University
 University of Alberta
 University of Arkansas, Fayetteville
 University of British Columbia
 University of Colorado at Boulder
 University of Connecticut
 University of Denver
 University of Kansas
 University of Miami
 University of North Carolina (Charlotte)

Allegheny College
 Auburn University
 Bowling Green State University
 Brandeis University
 California State University – East Bay
 California State University – Northridge
 Calvin College
 Case Western Reserve University
 Colgate University
 College of Wooster
 Colorado State University
 Columbia University
 Cornell University

University of North Texas
University of Notre Dame
University of Ottawa
University of Pennsylvania
University of Rhode Island
University of Rochester
University of Sussex
University of Texas, Austin
University of Toronto
University of Victoria (BC)
Vanderbilt University
Vassar College
Virginia Commonwealth University
Wellesley College
Wesleyan University
Western Michigan University
Winthrop University
Wofford College
Wright State University
Yale University