

CARLETON UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

Minutes

LIBRARY COMMITTEE OF SENATE

Date: Wednesday, April 7, 2004
Time: 10:30 a.m. – 12:00 noon
Location: Room 360k, Library

Present: Leslie Pal (Chair), Martin Foss (University Librarian), Aleksandra Bennett (Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences), Jonathan Malloy (Faculty of Public Affairs and Management), Michael Weiss (Science) Xin Wang (Faculty of Engineering and Design) Pamela Armstrong (Library) Abeer Reza (Graduate Student member)

Guest Speaker: Isla Jordan

Observers: Heather Berringer, Laurie Campbell, Ingrid Draayer, Leslie Firth, Meg Houghton, Elizabeth Knight, Madalena Macedo, Bruce Moreland, Laura Newton, Trish O'Flaherty, Nancy Peden, Flavia Renon, Janice Scammell, Judy Senecal, Susan Tudin, Vivian Cummins

Absent: Anita Hui (Library), Carl Neumann (Undergraduate Student member)

1. Adoption of the Agenda

Motion to accept the agenda as circulated: moved by A. Bennett, seconded by P. Armstrong.

Carried.

2. Approval of the Minutes of the Meeting of November 19, 2003

Motion to accept the Minutes as circulated: moved by A. Bennett, seconded by P. Armstrong.

Carried.

3. Business Arising

3.1 Membership – Carleton University Library Circle of Friends (L. Pal) Item 3.2, November 19, 2003

[Minutes of two previous meetings and a letter were sent to Janice Menchetti, Manager, Page Break, on November 20, 2003, inviting Ms. Menchetti to become a member of the Carleton University Library Circle of Friends through a financial contribution to that organization.] L. Pal informed Members that Ms. Menchetti forwarded this information to her supervisors at ARAMARK. They did not respond to the letter. On April 1, 2004 Ann Newton sent a copy of the original letter to Ms. Menchetti, which was, in turn, forwarded to her superiors at ARAMARK. As of April 7, 2004, Ms. Menchetti and the Chair had not received a response to the original or

follow-up letter. The Chair expects that a response to our invitation will be received shortly.

3.2 Budget (M. Foss)
Item 4.1, November 19, 2003

2004/2005 Budget

M. Foss reported that the 2004/2005 budget proposal was submitted during the latter part of February. As of April 7, 2004, the funding that the Library will receive is unknown. M. Foss informed Members that more details on the 2004/2005 budget would be provided in item 5.1 of the agenda, the proposed Information Commons.

2003/2004 Budget

F. Foss reported that because of the rise in the Canadian dollar, year over year at important times of the year (late fall and early January) the value of the Canadian versus U.S. dollar improved by 20.5% from the critical period in 2002/03 to 2003/04. As approximately 80% of the Materials Budget is in U.S. dollars, the Library has an additional 350,000 to 400,000 one-time dollars to spend this year. There are a number of items listed in what is called the “hopper” – products, items (digital or print) that are desirable for the Library collection. Anita Hui, the Collections Development Librarian, has been working to update these lists. During the next few weeks a series of financial snap shots will be taken to bring the materials spending to a satisfactory year-end condition. M. Foss reminded Members that as the Library is now its own RPC, surplus dollars may be carried into the next fiscal year. M. Foss commented on the complexity of managing the materials budget, which has been further complicated by learning about the new Banner Fast System, the use of Visa cards for the first time, etc.

L. Pal asked why the management of the Materials budget was more complicated. Was it because the Library was dealing with digital items? M. Foss agreed with the Chair. As an example, M. Foss provided the following scenario. The Library contracts for a suite of electronic journals and agrees to subscribe to the suite, cancel the print equivalents in the collection, and rebates for the print journal cancellations are received. The Library’s cost for the suite of electronic journals is based on formulae that have been developed by the cost-share group across the province. Sometimes these formulae simply won’t work. Things keep changing. Costs are based on a variety of factors, including full-time equivalent student numbers, the total budget of the University, and the number of research dollars expended – the latter being part of the formula for CNSLP products. M. Foss stated that in the past journal vendors could provide libraries with a reasonably accurate estimate of the increase in subscription costs year over year. That degree of accuracy is no longer possible, due to the factors previously identified.

3.3 Research Data Centre (M. Foss)
Item 5.1, November 19, 2003

M. Foss informed the Committee that the Library expected to receive a draft memorandum of understanding from the University of Ottawa about a month ago. The draft was received shortly before the April 7, 2004 SLC meeting, and it was forwarded by M. Foss to the interested parties at Carleton. M. Foss reported that the Research Data Centre would be located at the University of Ottawa, and that it would be jointly funded and managed by Carleton University and that institution. It was the Chair's recollection that the Data Centre was to be established at Carleton University. L. Pal questioned why there was a change in venue. M. Foss stated that the University of Ottawa had had a strong preference in having the Research Centre on site, and Carleton University did not object since these facilities are collaborative and will be jointly managed.

L. Campbell (Library, observer) asked the University Librarian to explain the difference between the Research Data Centre (RDC) that will be established at the University of Ottawa and the Date Centre that is currently housed in the Library and managed by Wendy Watkins. M. Foss stated that the RDC is a secure facility that affords researchers access to the micro- and longitudinal data, i.e. data that Statistics Canada produces that may identify individuals. An individual is tracked over years and sometimes decades. It is highly confidential, sensitive data. The material in the Library's Data Centre is public information that has been released under the Data Liberation Initiative and does not contain data about individuals that would identify them.

A. Reza requested additional details on the matter of confidentiality. M. Foss informed Mr. Reza that researchers must offer proof of their status. Material cannot be removed from the Centre, and waivers must be signed in which the users guarantee that they will respect confidentiality.

3.4 Library Regulations (Draft) – Status (L. Pal)
Item 6.3.1, November 19, 2003

L. Pal announced that the revised library regulations were successfully passed at the Senate meeting of Friday December 5, 2003.

3.5 Faculty Loan Period (L. Pal)
Item 6.3.2, November 19, 2003

L. Pal reviewed details about the November 12, 2003 letter from Professor Sheryl Hamilton (Mass Communication Program, School of Journalism) requesting an extension of the faculty loan period and special borrowing arrangements for graduate students. A letter was sent by L. Pal, on behalf of the Committee, stating that current regulations were appropriate. A copy of this letter was circulated to all members. As no response was received, the Chair presumed that Professor Hamilton was satisfied with the Committee's decision on this issue.

3.6 Limitation on Number of Titles Borrowed (L. Pal) **Item 6.3.3, November 19, 2003**

L. Pal informed Members that the motion on limiting the number of titles borrowed was passed, as part of the revised library regulations, at the December 5, 2003 meeting of Senate. The final wording of this motion, originally moved by A. Bennett, and seconded by A. Hui, was “The total number of items Carleton University students, faculty and staff may borrow is normally limited to 100.”

4. Institutional Repository Pilot Project (Isla Jordan)

L. Pal welcomed guest speaker, Isla Jordan (Library). Isla briefed the Committee on the Library’s Institutional Repository Pilot Project. Details are provided in Appendix A.

Following Ms. Jordan’s presentation, Members engaged in a question/answer session.

L. Pal asked whether the submission of information would be on a voluntary basis, or would the Committee actively seek material. For example, if the School of Public Policy and Administration (SPPA) decided to pull together material on the voluntary sector (bits and pieces that aren’t in the public realm) could they send it to the Library for the repository? I. Jordan said yes; material must be created by individuals on campus and submissions are voluntary. To further clarify the process, L. Pal referred to the example previously given, i.e. material on the voluntary sector. The School of Public Policy and Administration would send images, lecture notes, learning objects on this topic to the Library for repository, and the material would then be organized for SPPA under some “community” called Voluntary Sector. I. Jordan stated that basically the “community” manages its collections. Administrative people or Web Masters, or faculty decide on policy decisions – who can deposit what, whether there is a review process. The “community” deals with policy decisions, etc. and the Library provides the software, assistance with organizing the material, and forms (with pull-down menus) to simplify the process for submitting information.

L. Campbell (Library, observer) asked about the difference between the Institutional Repository and the University Archives. In reply, I. Jordan stated that the University Archives is selective in terms of the material that it accepts. Corporate memory items and collected papers from a famous researcher may be accepted. L. Campbell asked if there would be a joint-interface or sharing which would allow people to figure out what goes where - repository or University Archives. I. Jordan stated that pulling everything together from the user’s point of view is problematic. The University of Winnipeg has an e-commons, a centralized scholar’s space where everything is pulled together on one front Web page.

As an editorial comment, L. Pal stated that the repository is a different model of knowledge generation. What we normally work with is to some degree centralized and operates on the basis of certain standards - “you’re famous, you get in, you’re not famous, you don’t get in”. The repository is much more decentralized, percolating up from the bottom. The electronic medium permits that format or model. It is one of these issues, again, where the Library is caught betwixt and between a kind of technological revolution that leads to informed knowledge gathering generation and dissemination.

M. Foss stated that the repository would only have a good, solid future if there was some value added for scholars to contribute items to it. Presently, if a prestigious journal in your field accepts your article for publication, you would be inclined to put it there rather than into an institutional repository. M. Foss also discussed access, in particular the meta-data harvesting software. It should be possible in the future to conduct a search, simultaneously, across all institutional repositories that observe the same standards. That is the vision. Simon Fraser University is the pioneer in this initiative.

Abeer Reza asked whether Economic Working Papers, course materials, and theses would be appropriate materials for the repository. I. Jordan replied in the affirmative, and then proceeded to discuss various copyright issues. Many publishers will allow researchers to self-archive articles at the pre-print or post-print stages. During the initial development of the repository we are not actively seeking these items.

M. Foss reiterated I. Jordan's response, noting that many journals will allow a pre-print to go into an institutional repository prior to publication in the journal. One of the most important aspects of the repository is its preservation and archival function. There is so much that is transitory on hard drives and elsewhere that is potentially of value, and that should be preserved. The University Archives has previously focused on the print and paper, but now recognizes that much of the University's business is now conducted electronically and also worthy of preservation. Ohio State has gone beyond the concept of institutionally repository. They are envisioning a digital entity that includes scholarly output and institutional administrative information.

X. Wang questioned whether access was limited to the University. I. Jordan said that the idea was to have the information accessible to everyone. The Communities decide who will have access. At some institutions, access may be allowed to everyone, but denied in certain areas, i.e. the University of Toronto will not allow access to exams.

L. Pal asked if users would require access to the meta-data harvester, or would the information be accessible through GOOGLE or a web interface particular to the software previously mentioned. I. Jordan informed Members that GOOGLE had approached the University of Toronto on a number of occasions, as they are very interested in the meta data.

M. Weiss commented on the need for repositories to be active, i.e. allow users to make comments and to create their own objects. Mechanisms should be in place for users to receive notifications about new items that have been added. In this way, you create added value that enhances the Community. Many of these systems have faltered because they are highly passive. I. Jordan views the repository as an interim measure to preserve information, and down the road it will become more unified.

5. Other Business

5.1 Proposed Information Commons (M. Foss)

M. Foss reported that the establishment of an Information Commons was embedded in the Library's Budget Proposal for 2004/2005. What is an Information Commons? In its simplest form, it is a CCS help desk and a Library reference information desk combined, and a suite of full-service computer terminals like those on the fourth floor and at other labs on campus. Ideally, it should be located in an attractive

area, with some associated facilities and services, like group study rooms. Many universities, like the University of Toronto, the University of Calgary, and Dalhousie University have an Information Commons in their libraries. The use of these facilities is phenomenal. There is enough evidence to indicate that Carleton Library should establish a similar facility. Where would it be located? M. Foss stated that there was currently no space for an Information Commons. To proceed, we need to build new space or generate space that is currently in the building. The new space would be the extra floors on the extension. That is not happening. What has been decided is to reduce the physical space occupied by the science journals by a combination of strategies:

- add more compact shelving;
- acquire digital equivalents of science back files.

Our best guess is that by employing the above strategies, the space required for the science journals could be reduced by a half. At the same time, we are looking at off-site storage. For purposes of next year's budget, the Library requested fiscal dollars to finance the purchase of digital equivalent back files and compact shelving, as well as a team to manage various aspects of the project. Assuming that we can generate 6000 or 7000 feet there would be a series of consequential moves to free up the space required for the Information Commons. It is generally agreed that it should be located on the main level of the Library – for purposes of security, accessibility and a host of other things. That might mean moving the Reference collection, and some of the staff offices. In aid of this, funding was obtained for a library building development plan. The deadline for architects/designers to make their proposals for this project is April 23, 2004. Staff from the Physical Plant will evaluate responses. The mandate will be to design a plan that incorporates an Information Commons. Construction may not begin until next summer, but the downsizing to generate the necessary space will be done this summer. The budget for 2004/2005 did not include how much it would cost to buy the computers, refurbish the space, furniture, etc. It focused on dollars required to prepare for the journal downsizing, etc. M. Foss sent information about this initiative to the Deans of Science and Engineering. Yesterday the University Librarian attended a meeting of the Science Faculty Chairs and Directors and briefed them about this project. The response was generally positive. To ensure that our numbers for Maclean's are not negatively affected by this initiative, the print volumes that are replaced by digital equivalents will not be discarded. They will, instead, be placed in Storage.

X. Wang stated that e-journals start at 1995 (Elsevier) and recommended that the Library not discard print journals that are not available in electronic format. M. Foss advised X. Wang that most of the Elsevier journals are available from volume 1 on in digital format. The Library will, where possible, purchase back files in digital format. Journals that are not available in this format will be kept in Storage.

M. Foss emphasized that the plan for an Information Commons hinged on the University's willingness to fund the facility.

Abeer Reza commented on the value of print versus electronic copy. With print copy, you may check through a few volumes in a reasonably short time. With electronic copy, you may have to spend hours at your computer screen to locate the same information.

J. Malloy asked what makes the Information Commons different and valuable for a Library. M. Foss stated that it was the combining of support services – the information side and the computing side. The boundaries between are becoming

blurred. The Information Commons is an effort to provide more centralized support for students faced with various problems, be they hardware, software, research, writing, etc. The best information available is that no two Information Commons are identically configured, but they all share that fundamental service point. The Information Commons that have been most successful are those in which staff have been cross-trained, and are thus able to respond to any/all questions. The investment in training for the latter is enormous. Usually, Library Reference staff work on one side of the desk with computing staff on the other side.

Professor Bennett prefaced her remarks by indicating that they were made in a “friendly” spirit. She noted that M. Foss had begun by saying: “We don’t have the space. We know we don’t have the space. We have two options. We either have to get new space or generate new space. We know that we aren’t going to get new space, so we have to generate space.” A. Bennett observed that there was clearly money within the university, because the past couple of years had seen the field house completed and the ground broken for a new gymnasium. With respect to the Library, what was lacking was will and commitment. She expressed the belief that given the vital position of the library within the university, a strong argument could be made for it to have resources commensurate with its importance and that this argument should be being made in the right quarters. Professor Bennett stated that a new library is needed and that if one is not to be built, the extension should be completed by the addition of two floors. A. Bennett noted that Dalhousie’s Information Commons was instituted in 2002 and she juxtaposed this with Leslie Pal’s remarks on the areas of the Library that are now wireless. Given that the essence of wireless is mobility, Professor Bennett expressed the view that the Library could not be considered leading edge by setting up stationary, fixed areas. A. Bennett also expressed concern at the prospect of cutting back the collection and of increased compact shelving. As FASS representative, she requested a commitment from the library that she would be notified of any prospective cuts. To facilitate the consultation process, she undertook to be available during the summer or to supply a deputy. In view of the substantial changes being proposed. Professor Bennett wanted to know the reaction of Library staff, since they would be the people most concerned with implementation. As an example of consultation, Professor Bennett described the formation of the History Department’s Young Turks Committee which was instituted to consider issues such as the rationalization of course offerings, the use of electronic materials and various other issues. The point was to secure the involvement of recent graduates with electronic skills. A. Bennett wondered what discussions had been held within the Library Forum on the proposed ‘information commons’. In view of the project’s importance and the amount of money involved, she emphasized the need to involve staff, particularly those likely to be around in the long term and those on the front lines. In Professor Bennett’s opinion, Library staff is best placed to advise on what will or will not work and what the long-term consequences will be. Professor Bennett emphasized the importance of the Library’s space issue. She recounted her experience of entering the Library for the meeting and being struck by its “grotty” appearance, the hazardous stairs and the duct-taped carpet. This is what parents of prospective students see.

In Professor Bennett’s view, the Library has a strong claim on the University’s resources but this claim is not being made vigorously enough. A. Bennett wondered whether it might be useful for the Senate Library Committee to help the University Librarian in making the case to the administration since the Committee represents the different units of the University. Were the proposed ‘information commons’ to go ahead, Professor Bennett expressed the fear that the investment is not going to be well made, because of all the physical and other strictures imposed. She pointed out that the writing tutorial service would require even more space and one that must

be sound proofed. There would need to be space for both group and individual study. Professor Bennett welcomed the acknowledgment that the 'information commons' concept as proposed would demand constant, intensive training on the grounds that to do otherwise would be unfair to staff and result in client dissatisfaction. On a lighter note, A. Bennett recommended that if the university had money for athletics, it should remember that the Library had its own athletes, namely, users who sprint up to the fourth and fifth floors.

M. Foss stated that we had done everything that we could during the past six or seven years to get some university focus on the Library building. It simply hasn't happened. Two major studies of Library space have been undertaken: one by Bozena Clarke (retired librarian) that compared our situation to the provincial standards. B. Clarke prepared an extensive report that identified deficiencies in student study space and shelving. Another study was undertaken a few years ago by a consultant. M. Foss suggested that the Information Commons will compel yet another review of space. An architect/designer will look at the two previous studies.

L. Campbell (Library, observer) commented on the Information Commons at the University of Toronto, and recommended that we not emulate their facility in terms of design, lighting, etc. Ms. Campbell discussed the need for planning, vision and an examination of different models in existence before we commit ourselves to a model that is effective and that works. A. Bennett commented on the need to look forward, and not just at existing models.

M. Foss stated that the Vice-President (Academic) would create a working group, composed of personnel from the Library, CCS, Faculty and students to determine what design should be adopted by our Library – based on best practices, input from the designer and an examination of other models.

M. Foss reported on a meeting that would take place later that day with a senior person from the Development Office about the Information Commons and about what the Development Office could do in the way of a campaign to attract donor funding for the Information Commons.

Professor Bennett questioned whether the Circle of Friends would be involved in this initiative. M. Foss replied in the affirmative.

J. Senecal echoed comments made by A. Bennett and L. Campbell about how the Information Commons should be structured, and also discussed the staffing issue. J. Senecal expressed concern that there would be a dilution of service, if the Library adopted a mixed staff approach. M. Foss stated that the Library would not take this approach unless there was the conviction that it "could be done right".

P. Armstrong stated that M. Foss recently sent an email to staff about other universities' comments on service at our Reference Desk, as compared to McGill and Queen's University. Students prefer our service because we are dedicated, and we follow-through on all queries, regardless of the time required and the status of the requester.

P. Armstrong commented on concerns about having only digitized copies of Biology and Chemistry journals. When Scholar's Portal is down, assisting students with research can be difficult. Science Direct is an option with Elsevier journals. We can go directly to Kluwer. Some science journals, though, are only accessible through Scholar's Portal. P. Armstrong addressed the issue of storage for print journals, stating a preference for easy access to these materials, as opposed to the two-week

retrieval process that is in practice in some storage facilities. Ms. Armstrong also favoured retention of the print copy of some journals, in particular Science and Nature.

Professor Bennett reiterated what Pamela Armstrong and Judy Senecal had said about the professionalism of the staff and praised staff for the assistance and research afforded to the student body and faculty.

Abeer Reza stated that the Graduate Students' Association (G.S.A.) was in complete agreement with A. Bennett's comments regarding the priority needs of the Library. If vocal and other support was required, G.S.A. would assist the Library.

L. Pal stated that one vehicle for generating more visibility for some of the issues that the Library was facing would be to circulate the Committee's Annual Report to members of the Committee who represent the various constituencies. They could, in turn, undertake to bring this information to the attention of interested parties on campus, who would subsequently be able to support us. The Chair was prepared to make a strong statement about the importance of both the Library, the staff, the Physical Plant, and about how we are currently constrained from undertaking even routine initiatives. The Library appears to be visibly constrained in doing any of these relatively pedestrian things because we lack the physical space in which to undertake them.

In closing, L. Pal expressed appreciation

- to Abeer Reza for his past participation and his strong expression of support on behalf of students for the Library
 - to Members of the Committee for their work over the last year
 - to the University Librarian for his guidance in our discussions
 - to Ann Newton who keeps us all on track and takes care of the logistics of the Committee
- and
- to our patient audience who have been with us over the last year.

A. Bennett graciously thanked the Chair for his service to the Committee.

6. Adjournment

At 11:55 a.m. A. Bennett, seconded by P. Armstrong, moved that the meeting be adjourned.

APPENDIX A

Institutional Repository Pilot Project

Isla Jordan, Carleton Senate Library Committee meeting, April 7/04

What is an institutional repository?

A university "institutional repository" is an **electronic collection of the university's scholarly and creative output**. Many items produced by researchers exist outside of the traditional scholarly publishing system, and can be found on departmental websites and personal computers. Examples are images, research reports, field notes, audio and video files, learning objects and instructional tools.

Because this digital content is dispersed, it is neither easily accessible, nor is it being systematically preserved. As a result, much of the unique and valuable digital content created on campus is being lost.

A repository is a tool to capture, preserve and make available the intellectual products of a university. In essence, it provides free, long-term managed storage and a Web-based search interface for digital materials submitted by faculty.

Institutional repositories grew out of the movement to make scholarly information more freely available to all. In the shorter term, these repositories would operate as a complement to the existing scholarly publishing model. Institutional repositories follow a set of standards that allow scholars to search several repositories at once (via a metadata harvester <http://www.openarchives.org/OAI/openarchivesprotocol.htm>).

What is its structure?

Repository content is organized around Communities which correspond to schools, departments, labs and research centres. Within each community there can be an unlimited number of collections; within each collection there can be an unlimited number of items. For example:

- University of Calgary's community called "The Alberta Gaming Research Institute" (gambling, lotteries) has a collection "Gambling Literature". Within the Gambling Literature collection is an item called "The impact of gaming on community non-profits." <https://dspace.ucalgary.ca/handle/1880/314>
- U of T has the "Knowledge Media Design Institute" community <https://tspace.library.utoronto.ca/handle/1807/120>

Each Community has a home page with information, news and links. Communities:

- **decide on policies** such as:
 - who contributes content, and
 - whether there will be a review process
- **determine workflow** – reviewing, editing, adding metadata
- **manage collections**

There are several **software** packages available to repositories. One that is gaining popularity is DSpace, which was developed by MIT and Hewlett Packard. Believe it or not, DSpace is open source – i.e. freely available to use and customize. U of T has offered us test space on their server. If the project goes ahead we'll get our own server.

What Kinds of Content Does it Accept?

Repositories accept various kinds of digital materials, such as:

- Pre-press journal articles or pre-prints
- Technical reports
- Working papers
- Conference papers
- E-theses
- Images
- Audio files
- Video files
- Learning objects

Examples at Other Universities

- **Laval** - electronic dissertations, theses and research reports
<http://www.theses.ulaval.ca/index.html>
- **University of Montreal's** contains eprints <http://papyrus.bib.umontreal.ca/>
- **Winnipeg** is just starting. The chief librarian's research articles from his previous career <http://scholar.uwinnipeg.ca/research/ir.html> (server could be down)
- **York** organizes the content in the various repositories across campus, e.g. digitized historical psych texts at <http://htpprints.yorku.ca/>

Some of the Issues

1. **Technical capacity and support** - For now, have U of T test space. Staffing.
2. **Getting content** is a big challenge. Aim for a few early adopters to populate a demo that we can use to attract others. Make it easy for people to contribute. Identify people who it's 80% of their job to do this. Also, people who realize they need this.
3. **Copyright and Ownership** – As this is a test, we're starting out with the grey literature. Later we can add pre-prints and post-prints where permitted.
4. **Standardization** - Metadata (basic Dublin Core 16 tags, e.g. Title, Author/Creator, Format). Decide whether to use controlled **Vocabulary**, e.g. LC.
5. **Policies**, e.g. Rights, Distribution, Withdrawal of items
6. **Naming it** - T-Space, Knowledge repository, Superarchive, Super digital archive, Scholarly digital archive, Scholar's depot, Scholar's warehouse. Or Waterloo's "Digital Junkyard" (a different kind of repository).

Carleton: Potential Adopters / Similar Projects

- Scott Polar Research Institute / Geography Dept. (Peter Williams)
- Computer Science Technical Reports – have permission to use them
- Systems & Computer Engineering - Research reports, conference proceedings
- Student papers (Manu Sharma, Foundry project)
- SLALS Learning Object Repository (Mike Barker)
- facdev LOR (Tim Pychyl) - will let us use some material
- Earth Sciences photos (20,000; can use a few for testing)
- Carleton Economics Working Papers (waiting for reply to emails)
<http://www.carleton.ca/economics/papers.html>
- CBC Newsworld tapes (have digitized one for testing)
- Mathematics & Statistics - Lal is archiving their Web pages
- Journalism dept. – working papers

Next steps

- Determine policies, e.g. copyright (with Communities)
- Decide metadata and whether using a controlled vocabulary
- Populate the test space with a few early adopters
- Advertise to get more adopters
- Evaluate the pilot project before going further