

**SCHOLARS, LIBRARIES, AND THE AAU/ARL GLOBAL RESOURCES PROGRAM:
CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK AND OPTIONS FOR ACTION**

Prepared for discussion at the May 2003 ARL Membership Meeting
Dan Hazen
Director, AAU/ ARL Global Resources Program
April 14, 2003

CONTENTS

Executive Summary	3
Part I: The Global Resources Framework	5
The Global Resources Program and Its Six Current Projects	5
Understanding GRP: A Conceptual Framework	5
The GRP Matrix, GRP Projects, and Agendas for the Future	8
Do the Projects Need a Program?	9
Part II: Modeling a Program. A Discussion Vehicle	12
Program Scenarios	12
<i>Scenario One: An Activist Central Agency</i>	12
<i>Scenario Two: Focused Coordination and Promotion of Global Initiatives</i>	14
<i>Scenario Three: A Collaboration of Concerned Libraries with Distributed Responsibilities</i>	15
<i>Scenario Four: A Clearinghouse to Share Information about International Projects</i>	16
Hybrid(s)	17
Changing the Paradigm: A “Global Resources Network”	17
Part III: From Model to Materiality	19
Questions for Reflection and Discussion	19
Appendices	20
1. GRP Outcomes and Evaluation	20
2. GRP Roles and Responsibilities	21
3. GRP Financial Requirements for AAU and ARL	23
4. GRP Project Membership by ARL Institution	26

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The AAU/ARL Global Resources Program aspires to provide students and scholars with seamless access to international information. Two complementary impulses are particularly critical in achieving this end. Systematic applications of technology can expand scholars' access to foreign research resources; collaborative initiatives can maximize the overall benefits of local investments while also serving the community as a whole. The Global Resources Program has thus taken tangible form through targeted, cooperative projects that energize specific clusters of information resources for scholarly use. Six such projects, each associated with a particular world area, have emerged thus far.

The first part of this paper identifies some of the conditions for project success, and also outlines a matrix that can be used to site and assess any international initiative. This matrix encompasses three overlapping realms:

- The community's most elemental concern is to facilitate interactions between scholars and specific sets of international information. A first level of analysis thus explores where existing arrangements fall short, the concrete activities that can produce tangible improvements, and the criteria through which priorities can be assigned.
- Organized groups of librarians and scholars have responded to these and similar questions through projects that then have their own requirements for success and sustainability.
- The Global Resources Program itself provides a structure that helps AAU and ARL to identify scholarly information needs, especially where well-defined feedback channels are not now in place; to develop and nurture new projects; to encourage coordination and communications among existing initiatives; to publicize needs, possibilities, and results; and to promulgate best practices in order to maximize the benefits of collaborative activity. The Program, like the individual projects, requires certain conditions for success.

The paper's second section sketches several alternative scenarios for the Program's future: (1) "An Activist Central Agency," (2) "Focused Coordination and Promotion of Global Initiatives," (3) "A Collaboration of Concerned Libraries with Distributed Responsibilities," and (4) "A Clearinghouse to Share Information About International Projects." Each pursues different goals, offers different means to develop and support international projects, and carries its own requirements for staff and sustenance. Various hybrid combinations are possible as well. This section also introduces "A Global Resources Network" as an entirely different Program approach that focuses on systemic shifts in library operations in conjunction with project development.

The third and closing section, finally, frames the following discussion questions to help clarify priorities and preferences within both AAU and ARL:

1. How do you perceive the impact and value of the Global Resources Program and the associated projects?
2. How would each alternative scenario's success, or failure, affect the community's overall access to international information resources? Which scenario(s) would best allow you to reallocate local funds to acquire access to *new* international content?
3. How do the different scenarios position the research community for the future?
4. How does each scenario address long- as well as short-term Program goals and possibilities?
5. Which option(s) would attract AAU/ARL membership and financial support?

PART I: THE GLOBAL RESOURCES FRAMEWORK

The Global Resources Program and Its Six Current Projects

The Global Resources Program's active projects correspond to Africa, Germany, Japan, Latin America, South Asia, and Southeast Asia. Current project descriptions, including the documents distributed for review at the GRP Advisory Committee's meeting on February 21, are available through the Global Resources Program Web page (see <<http://www.arl.org/collect/grp/>>). These materials depict a diverse group of projects of varying scale, which enjoy different levels of energy and support. While some primarily reflect a regional or "area studies" perspective, others—notably those concerned with Germany and Japan—encompass all subjects and disciplines. The projects, whether examined individually or together, are engaged in a dazzling (or perhaps merely incomprehensible?) array of activities.

For all their variations, these projects, and all others concerned with international information, also share several common features. They rely on one or several "champions," individuals with the energy and vision to galvanize group action and to sustain participants' interest and commitments. These champions must in turn be based in supportive institutions that allow and reward their efforts. Most successful projects build from pre-existing organizations or working groups that have already identified some common concerns and achieved some degree of mutual trust. Most projects require seed money for start-up meetings and other initial expenses, and to ensure tangible early results. Almost all also require ongoing resources for long-term sustainability. As we shall see, all these considerations come into play as we look toward the future.

Understanding GRP: A Conceptual Framework

The Global Resources projects now in place are at first blush notable for their substantial and apparently incommensurable diversity. Does the Program amount to anything more than a hodgepodge of activities? Are GRP projects in any meaningful way different from independent international initiatives? How do we detect duplicative efforts, or identify priorities and gaps? We need to find some solid basis for analysis and assessment before delving further into project formation and Program futures.

Projects concerned with international information, or any other information resources, encompass three broad dimensions: the resources themselves, the actions and interventions applied to these resources, and the institutions that perform the activities. These elements can be very briefly summarized as follows:

- **Source Materials:** Interactions between scholars and information are central to academic life. Information resources address particular subjects or concerns; variously consist of raw data, the direct record of human expression, or the more "processed" record of scholarship; are produced and disseminated in a variety of formats, both analog and digital; are constrained by specific structures for intellectual property; and originate among particular linguistic and cultural groups and in different parts of the world. The intensity and nature of scholars'

need for specific sets of material, of course, vary widely: concrete demand and useful outcomes are critical in determining priorities for action.

- **Primary Project Activity/Library Function:** Information resources become fully useful for scholarship as libraries or related agencies perform four basic functions. Libraries serve scholarship by identifying and/or collecting information resources, describing them for discovery by users (through cataloging and instructional programs), ensuring that they're accessible (within the library, via delivery, or on the Web), and preserving them.
- **Institutional Context:** Libraries carry out these functions singly or in concert with other libraries and agencies. The arrangements may be either formal or implicit, and either domestic or international in scope. They may likewise draw upon entire institutions or only selected individuals. A range of more specific concerns (champions and organizational structure; infrastructures of funding, technology, and expertise; etc.) further inform project structures and possibilities.

Each of these three dimensions, just on its own, subsumes many discrete possibilities, some of which can be further subdivided into a multitude of very specific categories. Taken together, the three dimensions suggest a global resources matrix that can reflect the activities and also the scholarly needs that are addressed by any set of library operations or information resources. All international or "global" resources efforts can be sited within this framework. While most activities occupy only one or a few cells, the matrix in its entirety can serve as a heuristic tool that illuminates both the dynamics of specific projects and their place within the whole. Such contextualization can then make it easier to assess the significance and the success of particular efforts. A very incomplete depiction of some of the activities now underway within only a few GRP projects may suggest how this plays out:

The **Digital South Asia Library** (DSAL <<http://dsal.uchicago.edu/>>) seeks "to create and deliver to a scholarly audience electronic reference resources of high reliability." Many specific activities are subsumed within this broad goal, which can be represented thus within the matrix:

- Scholarly objectives: Ready access to selected reference materials on South Asia
- The source materials:
 - Topic and nature: Reference resources ("secondary sources" / the scholarly record) relevant to South Asian studies
 - Place of origin: South Asia, former colonial powers, other countries
 - Format and medium: Multiple formats, mostly analog
 - Intellectual property status: Generally subject to copyright
- Primary project activity/Library function:
 - Access and delivery
- Institutional context:
 - Principal players: Project participants (the North American lead institutions, the University of Chicago and Columbia University, work in league with other university libraries from the U.S., South Asia, Australia, and Europe); the Center for Research Libraries (CRL)

- Additional actors: Center for South Asia Libraries, Association for Asian Studies, Council of American Overseas Research Centers, South Asia Language Resource Center, various foundations

This project activity in the first instance focuses on improved access to a fairly broad range of heavily used research resources. Additional materials will be added over time.

The **Latin Americanist Research Resources Project (LARRP)** <<http://lanic.utexas.edu/project/arl/>> includes a “distributed resources” component through which a voluntary subset of participating institutions have agreed to reallocate seven percent of their Latin American monographs budgets for targeted acquisitions in areas that they themselves select. The aggregate amount redirected each year, achieved by reducing duplicative purchases of little-used materials, is roughly equivalent to the materials budget of a typical Latin Americanist research collection.

- Scholarly objectives: Broader coverage of little-used research materials
- The source materials:
 - Topic and nature: Latin American monographs in self-selected areas of institutional interest
 - Place of origin: Latin America
 - Format and medium: Monographs (analog format)
 - Intellectual property status: Generally subject to copyright
- Primary project activity/Library function:
 - Access and delivery
- Institutional context:
 - Principal players: Project participants (27 North American research libraries, drawn from more than fifty LARRP participants)
 - Additional actors: Latin American Studies Association; Seminar on the Acquisition of Latin American Library Materials (SALALM)

The distributed resources effort is voluntary and only loosely coordinated. Expansion to additional institutions and to encompass larger shares of participant budgets, while theoretically possible, is bounded by the realities of local funding often sufficient only to provide the high-use “core” materials that remain essential to on-site users.

The **German Resources Project** <<http://grp.lib.msu.edu/>> seeks “to provide the students and scholars served by North American and German research libraries with better and quicker access to collections across the ocean by continuing to promote binational library cooperation in the areas of bibliographic control, collection development, digital library development, and document delivery.” The improved access to which this project aspires encompasses resources in all disciplines and fields, not just Germanic language or culture.

- Scholarly objectives: Immediate, transparent access to library holdings within both North America and Germany for students and scholars from both countries
- The source materials:
 - Topic and nature: Both the record of scholarship and the direct human record, in all topics and all fields

- Place of origin: All countries, regions, groups
- Format and medium: All available formats and media (both analog and digital)
- Intellectual property status: Materials fall both within and outside the public domain
- Primary project activity/Library function:
 - Description
 - Access and delivery
- Institutional context:
 - Principal players: Project participants (more than sixty research libraries in Germany and North America)

The German Resources Project focuses on the institutional compatibilities that will permit ever closer cooperation. Thus, for example, fully harmonized cataloging rules and streamlined standards for international document delivery will facilitate scholars' access to the immense range of library holdings in both Germany and North America.

These selected examples in the first instance illustrate how some Global projects focus on particular categories of source materials in order to meet any or all of the goals of improved description and discovery, enhanced access and delivery, and preservation. The Cooperative African Newspapers Project similarly seeks an "online union list of African newspaper holdings regardless of language or format." (See <<http://www.crl.uchicago.edu/info/camp/afrinul.htm>>.) Other efforts, including the German project, instead emphasize new institutional alliances that will in turn permit standardized operations that apply across the board. Somewhat similar impulses are at work in some of the vernacular language indexing and descriptive activities of DSAL and of the Southeast Asia project's Thai indexing effort <<http://content.lib.washington.edu/Thai/>>, both of which seek to implement Unicode-based systems as a basis for broader interoperability; or the Japan Journal Access Project's use of the international standard for interlibrary loan to facilitate access and delivery <<http://pears.lib.ohio-state.edu/NCC/jpnproj.html>>.

The GRP Matrix, GRP Projects, and Agendas for the Future

These few examples illustrate how the matrix can help site GRP project activities, and also other international initiatives, within a broader picture. This exercise then makes it easier to discern whether and how specific activities address scholarly needs, where parallel endeavors might benefit from shared experiences, and what we've overlooked. It can likewise suggest how existing activities might be refined, where "best practices" may be emerging, and how these might more generally apply. Matrix-based analysis, in other words, can suggest new lines of action as well as synergies within and among different projects. This approach can in the process highlight some of the requisites for project sustainability and also foster increased coordination and communication among projects.

This conceptual framework for GRP, as mediated by the practical dynamics of project formation and growth, provides a basis for planning and assessment. The current Global Resources projects emerged out of pre-existing area studies constituencies, and in the first instance focused on needs that were already familiar.

New projects may likewise build from organized groups of librarians, for example for the Middle East or Scandinavia.

Projects associated with the developed world may incline toward the German and Japanese models of deeper institutional interdependencies among institutions that are in every sense peers. Efforts that focus on the developing world, by contrast, seem more likely to emphasize specific categories of resources that are scarce, inaccessible, or at risk. While international partnerships may be activated at different times and pursue different ends, they are in all cases essential.

Another set of Global Resources projects might be constructed around the international resources required by professional programs, or themes and topics (for instance the environment or human rights) with general international dimensions. However, our library staffs and workflows are seldom configured in terms of these programs and phenomena: neither the impulse for action nor the prerequisite staff specialists and professional organizations may be in place. “Top-down” interventions may thus be required in order to identify champions and potential key players, construct interest groups and organizations, establish action agendas, launch concrete activities, and sustain the efforts over time. Some such projects may most effectively begin with a compact group and gradually build more inclusive memberships. The first “top down” interventions might focus on fields like international business, where special programs (in this case the CIBERs, “Centers for International Business Education and Research”) or other pieces are already in place.

New Global Resources activities, like existing initiatives, can be sited within the matrix described above. Project participants can thereby relate their approaches to those of other initiatives, benefit from existing experience and “best practices,” and avoid goals that are either too ambitious or unnecessarily constrained. As new projects are nurtured, potential constituencies can be steered toward objectives that make sense in terms of both specific scholarly priorities and the “Global” knowledge base.

Do the Projects Need a Program?

Freestanding initiatives that focus on international resources arose before GRP existed and continue to emerge. Do we really need a Global Resources Program, in addition to the projects themselves? Both matrix-based analyses and the conditions for project development and sustainability suggest the values of a programmatic superstructure.

International projects benefit from full understandings of the context in which they will function, an understanding that the Global matrix can help to provide. This exercise, when conducted within a framework that encompasses many initiatives, will draw from a rich range of activities, methodologies, best practices, and synergies. A contextualized approach may likewise inform choices concerning a project’s scope, sequencing, membership, governance, and scale. Projects that tap into a broad Global knowledge base by means of this process may also strengthen their credibility, and thus their chances for support from both institutional sponsors and external agencies. The matrix, as presented here, plods rather gracelessly through the elements of an activity. The underlying concepts, however, could be readily accommodated within more

discursive descriptions. An overall inventory or directory of such descriptions could then serve as a central resource for the community as a whole.

Projects that emerge via emulation or spontaneous generation, through a “bottom-up” dynamic, are like all others in requiring champions, agendas, constituencies, and start-up resources. The process can be entirely independent, though the necessary elements are most readily mobilized through efforts that enjoy external validation and support. For their part, “top down” initiatives by definition require a “top.” An outside agency must in these cases identify the appropriate concerns, develop the constituencies, and sponsor the champions. External resources are crucial in enabling the players to convene and in promoting tangible early results.

Project development works best within the richest possible context of information, engagement, and support. Continuity and sustainability require the same, particularly as ongoing initiatives reach certain predictable milestones. Project leaders come and go, and succession is always an issue. Isolated initiatives, particularly those based within a single institution, may simply disappear. Even more substantial efforts may lose energy, focus, or financial support. External linkages and larger frameworks for support may minimize both the dangers of priorities that drift away from scholarly needs and the disruptions of leadership shifts. Ongoing projects, when they reach a certain mass, also require regular infusions of new resources for maintenance and growth. Freestanding, informal initiatives are at a disadvantage when it comes to collecting dues or securing external support: legal and organizational realities pretty much force enduring efforts either to incorporate (with the associated consequences for staff and infrastructure) or to affiliate with someone else. Formal affiliations with established organizations are often the best solution.

Individual projects, therefore, may be most successful when they affiliate within a framework through which a central agency or agencies can provide coordination, guidance, and logistical support. A body that serves as an umbrella for more than one project can also facilitate communication and some administrative economies of scale. Such an agency, for its part, would then be in a position to publicize the activities of several projects, mobilize moral and material support for the whole as well as the parts, and exploit synergies to promote both creativity and continuity. This kind of entity, on the other hand, would itself require ongoing support and a stable funding base.

A central agency might also promote activities and analyses that would otherwise not arise. Our discussion of “top down” project development has already suggested one such area. Efforts to tie together activities and threads from otherwise discrete projects, and thereby create unified initiatives on a larger scale, comprise another. Experiments may at times be in order as well. While each project would retain its integrity and agenda, a Program might pursue separate and complementary outcomes of its own.

A final, ambitious, and incipient Program area encompasses technologically informed efforts to minimize unnecessary duplication and thereby maximize our collective return on international library investments. This sort of initiative is already apparent in several projects, for instance the obvious case of LARRP’s “distributed resources” component—but also, less blatantly, through the eight hundred previously

unindexed and underutilized Latin American journals whose tables of contents (and articles themselves) have become generally accessible through the "LAPTOC" database. The Program might analyze, publicize, and expand upon these and similar model efforts, thereby shifting our understandings of how we can most effectively provide access to international resources. The eventual consequences could include new conceptual approaches for developing and managing all types of research collections.

PART II: MODELING A PROGRAM. A DISCUSSION VEHICLE

Program Scenarios

Targeted projects comprise our most promising means for improving scholarly access to international information. Nesting these projects within a program may in turn allow even greater benefits. Such a programmatic structure could take any of several forms. The models here described vary in terms of their aspirations and goals, their organizational underpinning, the support they can provide for projects, and their financial requirements. Three variants reflect different levels of control and coordination, while the fourth option describes a clearinghouse to collect information and facilitate communications. Hybrids and combinations are possible as well. Finally, impulses for systemic changes in library operations may suggest a model that entails a very different and seemingly more direct approach.

Scenario One: An Activist Central Agency

Aspirations and Goals

A new central agency undertakes focused efforts to rapidly expand access to international resources by identifying, mobilizing, and helping to sustain a range of high-priority projects. Seed money and central services provide incentives for new initiatives. Some established efforts may be supported as well. Activities could include:

- Supporting new projects, and also—perhaps—initiatives that are already in place
- Engaging scholars in designing projects and assessing their results
- Strengthening relationships with libraries and scholarly organizations in other countries
- Promoting tools, practices, and policies that expand access to international resources at minimal incremental cost by means of cooperative action and targeted applications of technology
- Maintaining a clearinghouse for information on Program projects and complementary initiatives
- Publicizing Program goals and achievements among potential users, participants, and contributors

Organizational Underpinnings

A new agency (the “Coalition for Global Resources”?) draws support from the Association of American Universities, the Association of Research Libraries, and other organizations that formally represent scholarly interests—for instance the American Council of Learned Societies or the National Resource Center Directors. This agency’s policies and priorities are determined by a body that is broadly representative of its constituents. The new Program agency also fosters ongoing partnerships among its projects (and, perhaps, the Program itself) and other organizations, such as the Center for Research Libraries or the Latin American Network Information Center, in order to ensure the projects’ continuing access to critical services.¹

¹ The African and South Asian projects now operate through the Center for Research Libraries; the Latin American project relies on the technology infrastructure at LANIC. These kinds of relationships

Nature of Support for Projects

The central agency deploys seed money to stimulate new projects that respond to Program priorities. It also offers advice on proven strategies; serves as a resource in areas of legal uncertainty or technical doubt; and provides administrative services such as grant management, meeting planning, and financial accounting. Certain central technical capabilities may be available as well. Projects thus take shape within a structured environment that ensures ongoing access to shared services, coordination, and guidance.

Financial Base

The Program draws upon multiple revenue streams that could include some or all of the following:

- Endowment income, with the endowment itself partially generated through commitments from ARL's reserve fund
- AAU funding
- ARL dues (new and/or reallocated)
- Program fees from participating libraries
- Grants from foundations or federal agencies

The projects receive seed money from the program and, in some special cases, limited continuing support. Projects also generate their own revenues on the basis of participant fees, subscription and use charges, and grants; and of time and travel expenses that are contributed by participating libraries.

Example

The Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition (SPARC) is an ARL initiative whose administration and governance are managed by the Association and whose programmatic priorities are determined by an oversight committee. Like SPARC, the new body would serve as a catalyst by applying new strategies to longstanding concerns.

might in the future be formalized through agreements between the Program and appropriate external agencies.

Scenario Two: Focused Coordination and Promotion of Global Initiatives Aspirations and Goals

This model shares many of the first scenario's aspirations and goals, while also anticipating more modest financial and staff resources. Its approach therefore emphasizes international projects that surface on their own, with but a limited role for initiatives launched from above. This model likewise relies only occasionally on seed money to stimulate new projects. The Program does advocate for international information, and it also seeks out additional sponsors and funds.

Organizational Underpinnings

The Global Resources Program continues as an AAU and ARL initiative. GRP also fosters a series of ongoing partnerships between its projects (and also, perhaps, the Program itself) and other organizations such as the Center for Research Libraries or the Latin American Network Information Center in order to ensure the projects' access to critical services. Program governance is based upon advisory committees, plus oversight from the associated organizations.

Nature of Support for Projects

The Program provides its affiliated projects with administrative services such as fee or grant management, meeting arrangements, and financial administration. Limited financial support, administrative services, and technical capabilities may be available as well, though the projects as a rule rely on their own strategic alliances for technical advice and infrastructure support. The projects likewise manage themselves and their agendas. New projects should incorporate scholarly perspectives as they establish their goals and their governance structures. The Program facilitates communications within and among projects, and also with external communities. It monitors projects in order to publicize best practices and lessons learned, and also serves as a resource in areas of legal doubt or technical uncertainty.

Financial Base

The core Global Resources Program is funded by ARL dues and/or by payments from those libraries that elect to provide support. The projects for the most part generate their own funds through participant fees, subscription and use charges, grants, and time and travel expenses that are contributed by participating libraries. Limited funds to launch or support projects might also become available as a result of fundraising by the Program itself.

Example

The Global Resources Program in its current transition phase incorporates many elements of this model.

Scenario Three: A Collaboration of Concerned Libraries with Distributed Responsibilities

Aspirations and Goals

This approach highlights enhanced access to international information resources as a priority that local institutions then address through new cooperative efforts.

Organizational Underpinnings

Self-selected collaborations of libraries and other players pursue improved access to international resources. Each group coordinates communications and actions among its participants, determines its own goals and priorities, and arranges its own governance. Efforts to create new projects, or to support ongoing initiatives, are ad hoc and extraordinary. Project publicity and advocacy, while important, are generated at the local level. Requirements for staff, structure, and financial resources are addressed within each collaborative group, though shared services and coordination are always a possibility.

Nature of Support for Projects

Specific initiatives take shape within and among libraries and consortia. This model therefore offers a dispersed, laissez-faire approach to international projects.

Financial Base

International information initiatives are funded locally and/or on a project basis.

Example

This model, which presumes institutional rather than individual participation, is similar to that for some state and regional library consortia.

Scenario Four: A Clearinghouse to Share Information about International Projects

Aspirations and Goals

The clearinghouse gathers and disseminates information about the wide array of international capabilities already in place, as well as new initiatives. Such an agency could conduct surveys, publish reports, and—perhaps—institute a Web-based current awareness service.

Organizational Underpinnings

The clearinghouse could function within an organization such as ARL, in which case it might initially be staffed by a visiting program officer who would compile information submitted by ARL member libraries and solicited from other agencies both within and beyond North America. The host organization, in this example ARL, exercises oversight and control.

Nature of Support for Projects

The clearinghouse, while offering no direct support for projects, facilitates cross-project awareness and learning. Heightened awareness of the universe of international initiatives should encourage efforts to replicate examples that reveal effective technological innovation and/or cooperative action.

Financial Base

A clearinghouse based at ARL would be funded by a combination of dues income and cost-recovery services.

Example

The ARL Office of Leadership and Management Services (OLMS) SPEC Survey and Kit program.

Hybrid(s)

The universe of international projects and activities is highly diverse. Any real-life Program scenario will therefore combine elements from more than one model. The following combinations might prove particularly fruitful:

- Funds and capabilities to promote new projects are an explicit component of only the “central agency” model. This capacity could be incorporated within any of the other models as well, at levels ranging from modest to substantial. The Program’s ability to guide change would thereby increase.
- Joining an “information clearinghouse” capacity to other models could likewise carry practical benefits. A “clearinghouse” component would significantly strengthen the otherwise diffuse and decentralized “collaboration” model, and similarly buttress the only implicit information-gathering aspects of the “focused coordination” scenario. The “central agency” model, by contrast, builds information gathering and dissemination into its initial mandate.

Changing the Paradigm: A “Global Resources Network”

The original vision for the Global Resources Program imagined “a distributed program for access to foreign acquisitions” based on shared collecting responsibilities, innovative technologies, and rapid document delivery. The targeted projects that would have proved this initial concept, however, have instead emphasized newly created resources and capabilities that address specific scholarly needs. Coordinated acquisitions have pretty much gone by the boards.²

GRP’s initial vision might now be revisited. Many remain dissatisfied with a research library system that appears to exalt redundancy and inefficiency. In the international realm, as most others, these libraries are often perceived as building heavily duplicative collections of materials that are too often never used. A Program that focused on changing this system could produce the economies and efficiencies that would ultimately allow improved access to information across the board.

Visions of cooperative collecting and delivery arrangements that maximize coverage and minimize unnecessary costs, both for individual institutions and for the research library community as a whole, are nothing new. Constantly improving technologies to describe research resources and then to deliver them or otherwise provide access, however, suggest that what once were pipe dreams may again deserve a fresh look. A concerted initiative, focused on “global” resources, might allow substantial progress in demonstrating benefits, drawbacks, and areas requiring additional work.

A different model for the Global Resources Program therefore proposes a “Global Resources Network,” which could take shape in conjunction with continuing project-based efforts to address concrete scholarly concerns. The “Network” scenario would seize upon international information resources as a vehicle for imaginative experiments to reconstruct our structures for collection development and access. In very broad

² GRP’s founding Director, Deborah Jakubs, analyzes this shift in “The AAU/ARL Global Resources Program: The View from a Crossroads” (see <[http://www.crl.edu/info/awcc2002/Jakubs Paper.pdf](http://www.crl.edu/info/awcc2002/Jakubs%20Paper.pdf)>.)

outline, this “Network” would ensure that distributed holdings are easily identified by students and scholars through single searches across multiple and immediately accessible databases. Materials of interest could then be requested through one-step sequences that trigger electronic document delivery or, for bulky hardcopy materials (still predominant in many foreign areas), interlibrary loan. The model would extend internationally as well as within North America. System-level efficiencies and savings, expected as a primary outcome, could in turn free up resources for specialized efforts to ensure access to particularly fragile, obscure, or endangered resources.

A “Global Resources Network” would in the first instance function as a testbed for applying this kind of approach to a particular subset of international information resources. A strong central agency would recruit participants, devise strategies, and deploy technologies to implement the model and then evaluate the results. The Network would require start-up support from AAU and ARL, and also external funds from foundations and the government. If and as the model proved successful, it could then be extended to other realms of both international and domestic information.

PART III: FROM MODEL TO MATERIALITY

The preceding section serves up several theoretical scenarios for a Global Resources Program. GRP, however, is also a functioning initiative to which AAU and ARL have for the better part of a decade lent financial, moral, and logistical support. Grant funds have further underwritten most Program activities and allowed its projects to take shape.

GRP has spent out its grant funds. The Program's core operations at present rely upon ad hoc contributions from nine research libraries. New subsidies for either existing projects or project development are on hold pending membership decisions concerning goals and models. The existing projects likewise face an uncertain future until their options for ongoing programmatic support—generated internally or provided from without—are more fully defined. The current ambiguities also inhibit the development of new projects. As AAU and ARL look to the Program's future, matters of finances and organizational capacity—as well as vision and goals—will come to the fore.

GRP's financial prospects are in many ways encouraging. All research libraries make significant and sustained investments in international resources; about eighty ARL libraries participate in at least one Global Resources project; almost thirty contribute to more than one. Nonetheless, straitened budgets and competing priorities may in the future erode these commitments. Local investments in a common international endeavor may sustain and also extend our ability to serve scholarly needs.

An active Global Resources Program likewise entails organizational requirements and operational capabilities. These might be provided through a central agency. They could, alternatively, be facilitated through strategic partnerships designed to maximize efficiencies and economies of scale. Or they could simply be left for each project to work out on its own. The success of both projects and Program requires conscious consideration of all the options.

Thus the following questions for reflection and discussion:

1. How do you perceive the impact and value of the Global Resources Program and the associated projects?
2. How would each alternative scenario's success, or failure, affect the community's overall access to international information resources? Which scenario(s) would best allow you to reallocate local funds to acquire access to new international content?
3. How do the different scenarios position the research community for the future?
4. How does each scenario address long- as well as short-term Program goals and possibilities?
5. Which option(s) would attract AAU/ARL membership and financial support?

APPENDIX 1: GRP OUTCOMES AND EVALUATION

The AAU/ARL Global Resources Program will be assessed in terms of the following criteria (some of which will vary depending on the GRP scenario eventually selected):

- Its overall and strategic impact on North American access to international and foreign-language information resources.
- Its ability to heighten awareness, mobilize constituencies, and build coalitions to address global resource needs.
- Its success in stimulating projects and pursuing complementary activities that scholars, administrators, and librarians perceive as substantively improving access to international resources in support of learning and research. Constituent perceptions of success will be supplemented with tangible indicators of material usage, interlibrary loan/delivery transactions, acquisition levels, and leveraging of Program investments.
- Its ability to collect and share information on projects, standards, and best practices related to international information resources.

Excerpted from "The AAU/ARL Global Resources Program—Phase II: Discussion Document on Goals, Priorities, and Desired Outcomes," September 17, 2002—revised February 11, 2003; April 11, 2003.

APPENDIX 2: GRP ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

ARL Member Libraries

- About 80 ARL members (plus many other libraries and organizations from beyond the membership, international as well as domestic) are active members of at least one of the projects affiliated with the GRP. About 45 of these participate in two or more of the projects.
- Nine ARL member libraries have contributed a total of \$80,000 to sustain the program through a year of transition. These libraries are the University of California, Berkeley; the Center for Research Libraries; Duke University; Indiana University; New York University; University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; University of Pennsylvania; University of Washington; and Yale University.

Association of American Universities and Association of Research Libraries

- Sponsor the overall program and provide leadership and support for the AAU/ARL GRP advisory committee
- Define mission and secure support
- Monitor progress and assess success

ARL Board

- Establishes strategic direction with advice from the AAU Executive Officer and the ARL Executive Director
- Provides oversight and assessment of the GRP budget as part of its ongoing review of ARL's financial condition
- Reviews program progress and proposed priorities as part of the annual ARL program review

Collections and Access Committee (comprised of library directors)

- Provides programmatic advice and guidance
- Contributes to ongoing program assessment in reports to the ARL Board, particularly with regard to GRP's impact on local strategies for collection development and management

AAU/ARL GRP Advisory Committee (comprised of faculty members, university leaders, library directors, and collection specialists)

- Identifies desired outcomes, possibilities, and priorities for GRP, as well as funding options and opportunities for strategic alliances
- Serves as a channel to ensure that scholars' requirements and concerns are addressed
- Reviews GRP support for specific projects
- Contributes to ongoing program assessment in reports to the ARL Board, particularly with regard to GRP's impact as a strategic initiative to strengthen North American scholars' access to international and foreign language resources.

GRP Program Director (appointed by ARL's Executive Director)

- Advances the Program by means of discussions, promotional activities, communications, and other initiatives
- Manages the GRP budget, leveraging internal funds to extend support
- Explores and pursues opportunities for external funds

ARL Executive Director and AAU Executive Vice President

- Sustain communications between the two associations
- Review GRP outcomes, financial strategy, and Program status

ARL Executive Director

- Appoints and evaluates the GRP Program Director

APPENDIX 3: GRP FINANCIAL REQUIREMENTS FOR AAU AND ARL

Section II of the Global Resources Program “framework” document includes four scenarios built around a project-centered approach, plus an option for hybrid arrangements. Each of these scenarios entails a different level of financial support, above and beyond the amounts that participating libraries will continue to spend as they collect or otherwise acquire access to international information resources. (The “Global Resources Network,” also outlined in Section II of the “framework” document, will require a separate discussion paper of its own—including budget projections—if initial AAU and ARL reactions so warrant.)

GRP’s basic activities require staff support; provisions for reports, meetings, and representation within ARL; staff participation in outside meetings and conferences; and, in some scenarios, the capacity to sponsor and support specific projects. Core funding for this basic infrastructure (provided through library pledges totaling \$80,000 for the 2002-03 transition year) could be generated through AAU and ARL membership support. GRP, through ARL, can apply for and/or participate in grants and other funding programs in order to supplement its core income and to support additional activities. Alliances with other organizations and agencies may likewise be invoked. Projects relying on GRP or ARL for logistical or other support services will be charged accordingly, though “seed funds” available through GRP may in some cases cover these costs. GRP does not charge the projects it sponsors or supports as a means to fund its own activities.

Regarding sponsorship for new projects: The three most solidly established GRP projects—Latin America, South Asia, German Resources—respectively required \$156,000, \$62,700, and \$35,000 in start-up costs over their first three years. These funds were raised through buy-in fees of \$3,000 per institution plus \$60,000 of targeted foundation support (LARRP), foundation support (German Resources Project), and direct GRP support (DSAL). All three projects subsequently raised money on their own. The “new projects” line therefore assumes overall support of circa \$70,000 for a “typical” project (if such exists) to become rooted, spread over three years (Year One, \$40,000; Year Two, \$20,000; Year Three, \$10,000). Sources for start-up funding are not necessarily limited to AAU and ARL.

Regarding support for ongoing projects: Provision for occasional, targeted extraordinary support for specific initiatives within particular projects that would otherwise not be feasible.

Ongoing budgetary requirements are difficult to anticipate in advance of more precise AAU and ARL consensus concerning GRP’s activities and goals. (The amounts budgeted for staff and travel assume 2% annual inflation.) The following hypothetical budget categories and amounts are therefore only suggestive.

GRP Financial Requirements for AAU and ARL

<i>Scenario One: An Activist Central Agency</i>			
	Year One	Year Two	Year Three
Central staff support (75% FTE Program Director, plus substantial logistical and staff support)	\$130,000	\$132,600	\$135,250
Reports, meetings, and representation within ARL and AAU (Includes support for Advisory Committee)	\$10,000	\$10,200	\$10,400
Convening and participating in outside meetings and conferences	\$20,000	\$20,400	\$20,800
Sponsorship for new projects (Two new projects in Year One, one in Year Two, one in Year Three)	\$80,000	\$80,000	\$80,000
Support for ongoing projects	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000
Total	\$260,000	\$263,200	\$266,450

<i>Scenario Two: Focused Coordination and Promotion of Global Initiatives</i>			
	Year One	Year Two	Year Three
Central staff support (40% FTE Program Director, plus logistical and staff support)	\$60,000	\$61,200	\$64,425
Reports, meetings, and representation within ARL and AAU (Includes support for Advisory Committee)	\$10,000	\$10,200	\$10,400
Convening and participating in outside meetings and conferences	\$15,000	\$15,300	\$15,600
Sponsorship for new projects (One new project each year)	\$40,000	\$60,000	\$70,000
Support for ongoing projects	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000
Total	\$145,000	\$166,700	\$180,425

GRP Financial Requirements for AAU and ARL

Scenario Three: A Collaboration of Concerned Libraries with Distributed Responsibilities

Any inter-institutional efforts are funded through ad-hoc, “distributed” arrangements among participants.

	Year One	Year Two	Year Three
Central staff support	(0)	(0)	(0)
Reports, meetings, and representation within ARL and AAU (Includes support for Advisory Committee)	(0)	(0)	(0)
Convening and participating in outside meetings and conferences	(0)	(0)	(0)
Sponsorship for new projects	(0)	(0)	(0)
Support for ongoing projects	(0)	(0)	(0)
Total	(0)	(0)	(0)

Scenario Four: A Clearinghouse to Share Information about International Projects

	Year One	Year Two	Year Three
Central staff support (25% FTE Coordinator, plus logistical and staff support)	\$37,500	\$38,250	\$39,000
Reports, meetings, and representation within ARL and AAU (Includes support for Advisory Committee)	\$10,000	\$10,200	\$10,400
Convening and participating in outside meetings and conferences	\$10,000	\$10,200	\$10,400
Sponsorship for new projects	(0)	(0)	(0)
Support for ongoing projects	(0)	(0)	(0)
Total	\$57,500	\$58,650	\$59,800

APPENDIX 4: GRP PROJECT MEMBERSHIP BY ARL INSTITUTION

This compilation reflects membership lists as represented on Project Web sites in April 2003. See also the additional notes at the end concerning Digital South Asia Library (DSAL) and the Southeast Asia Indexing Project. LARRP stands for the Latin Americanist Research Resources Project.

University of Alabama
German Resources Project

University at Albany, SUNY
German Resources Project

University of Arizona
German Resources Project
Japan Journal Access Project
LARRP

Boston College
LARRP

Boston University
Cooperative African Newspapers Proj.

Brigham Young University
German Resources Project
Japan Journal Access Project
LARRP

Brown University
German Resources Project

University of California, Berkeley
Cooperative African Newspapers Proj.
German Resources Project
Japan Journal Access Project
LARRP

University of California, Los Angeles
Cooperative African Newspapers Proj.
German Resources Project
Japan Journal Access Project
LARRP

University of California, Riverside
German Resources Project

University of California, San Diego
German Resources Project
Japan Journal Access Project
LARRP

University of California, Santa Barbara
German Resources Project
Japan Journal Access Project
LARRP

Center for Research Libraries
Cooperative African Newspapers Proj.
DSAL
Japan Journal Access Project
LARRP
Southeast Asia Indexing Project

University of Chicago
DSAL
German Resources Project
Japan Journal Access Project

University of Cincinnati
German Resources Project

University of Colorado at Boulder
German Resources Project
Japan Journal Access Project

Columbia University
Cooperative African Newspapers Proj.
DSAL
Japan Journal Access Project
LARRP

University of Connecticut
LARRP

Cornell University
German Resources Project
Japan Journal Access Project
LARRP
Southeast Asia Indexing Project

Dartmouth College
German Resources Project
LARRP

University of Delaware
German Resources Project
Japan Journal Access Project

Duke University
German Resources Project
Japan Journal Access Project
LARRP

University of Florida
Japan Journal Access Project
LARRP

Georgetown University
German Resources Project

University of Georgia
German Resources Project
LARRP

Harvard University
German Resources Project
Japan Journal Access Project
LARRP

University of Hawaii at Manoa
Japan Journal Access Project

Univ. of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Cooperative African Newspapers Proj.
German Resources Project
Japan Journal Access Project
LARRP

Indiana University
Cooperative African Newspapers Proj.
German Resources Project
Japan Journal Access Project
LARRP

University of Iowa
Japan Journal Access Project

Johns Hopkins University
German Resources Project

University of Kansas
Cooperative African Newspapers Proj.
German Resources Project
Japan Journal Access Project
LARRP

University of Kentucky
German Resources Project

Library of Congress
Cooperative African Newspapers Proj.
DSAL
German Resources Project
Japan Journal Access Project
LARRP

University of Maryland
German Resources Project

University of Massachusetts, Amherst
Japan Journal Access Project
LARRP

Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Japan Journal Access Project

University of Miami
LARRP

University of Michigan
German Resources Project
Japan Journal Access Project

Michigan State University
Cooperative African Newspapers Proj.
German Resources Project
LARRP

University of Minnesota
DSAL
German Resources Project
LARRP

University of Missouri
Japan Journal Access Project

National Agricultural Library
LARRP

University of New Mexico
LARRP

New York Public Library
Cooperative African Newspapers Proj.
German Resources Project
Japan Journal Access Project
LARRP

New York University
German Resources Project
Japan Journal Access Project
LARRP

Univ. of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
German Resources Project
Japan Journal Access Project
LARRP

North Carolina State University
German Resources Project
Japan Journal Access Project

Northwestern University
Cooperative African Newspapers Proj.
German Resources Project

University of Notre Dame
LARRP

Ohio State University
Cooperative African Newspapers Proj.
German Resources Project
Japan Journal Access Project
LARRP

Ohio University
Cooperative African Newspapers Proj.
LARRP

University of Oregon
Japan Journal Access Project

University of Pennsylvania
German Resources Project
Japan Journal Access Project
LARRP

Pennsylvania State University
German Resources Project
Japan Journal Access Project

University of Pittsburgh
Japan Journal Access Project
LARRP

Princeton University
LARRP

Rice University
LARRP

Rutgers University
German Resources Project

University of Southern California
LARRP

Southern Illinois Univ. Carbondale
German Resources Project

Stanford University
Hoover Institution
Cooperative African Newspapers Proj.
Japan Journal Access Project
LARRP (Stanford)

Syracuse University
LARRP

University of Texas at Austin
Japan Journal Access Project
LARRP

Texas Tech University
German Resources Project

University of Toronto
German Resources Project
Japan Journal Access Project
LARRP

Tulane University
LARRP

University of Utah
German Resources Project

Vanderbilt University
German Resources Project
LARRP

University of Virginia
German Resources Project
Japan Journal Access Project

University of Washington
DSAL
German Resources Project
Japan Journal Access Project
Southeast Asia Indexing Project

Washington State University
Japan Journal Access Project

Washington University in St. Louis
German Resources Project
Japan Journal Access Project

University of Waterloo
German Resources Project

University of Wisconsin–Madison
German Resources Project
Japan Journal Access Project
LARRP
Southeast Asia Indexing Project

Yale University
German Resources Project
Japan Journal Access Project
LARRP

Notes

DSAL membership includes several consortia, among them the Triangle South Asia Consortium and the Urdu Research Consortium. At least 23 ARL libraries, by participating in these consortia, are also involved with DSAL. Three libraries could be added to the list above if all these participants were separately identified.

The Southeast Asia Indexing Project likewise has indirect associations with 7 ARL libraries not separately listed, including 1 not now represented in this tally.

The six projects together include as participants another 17 North American libraries that are not ARL members. At least 15 libraries in Asia, 2 in Australia, 17 in Europe, and 8 in Latin America, plus 2 international organizations and 3 non-library organizations, are also engaged in project activities.