Thank you to Celia Bakke and San Jose State for organizing this forum.

I’ve chosen this topic because, as I’ve become more acquainted with the Digital Commons community, I’ve grown increasingly excited about the fact that the emerging direction of IRs—across the 180 or so DC institutions—is so decidedly toward publishing of original work. For UC, the decision to launch a hosted repository/publishing platform was based on a unique set of circumstances and on some very local research. Those findings have stood the test of time and, in my mind, continue to describe and guide the development of the Institutional Repository.

For those of you familiar with UC’s eScholarship (Repository) you will know that it looks and acts differently than most DC instances. Indeed a great deal of work has been done on its front end since I directed the program. But at its core, eScholarship is the same beast it always was: a very effective platform for the publication and dissemination of UC’s research output.

Why is this important? Because increasingly libraries are stepping up to this core task: to provide their institutions with a platform for the publication and management of the unique and original scholarly output that each of our academic institutions seems destined and uniquely suited to publish.
In 1997 CDL was mandated to provide a “comprehensive system for the management of scholarly information” by a joint faculty, library and administration task force.

Began as a *buyer’s club* to find efficiencies in purchase of serials across the then 9 UC campuses

The CDL, in the form of the eScholarship program, embraced the responsibility for publishing & dissemination services from the start, by design and by request.

The specific mandate was to “support research & teaching where it is happening” that is, to “bring the library closer to the classroom and laboratory.”
eScholarship became the vehicle for UC’s efforts to support faculty innovation in research and publishing.

The program was inspired by the emerging possibilities of digital publishing in a networked environment—particularly the success of arXiv—and the chance to challenge the hegemony of the commercial publishers bankrupting the universities. But it was ultimately founded on research.

The new service led to a profound shift in the role of libraries v.a.v. university’s core missions of research & teaching.
UC faculty were surveyed and consulted, especially editors of the top 2000 journals. They told us, in hundreds of unique ways, of their concerns. But they essentially boiled down to this: Peer Review and Permanence. (and PDF. Who knew?)

CONTEXT: In 2000 there was deep suspicion of online publication; it was considered to be fraudulent until proven otherwise, and it was seen as transient.
EVERYONE thought they were unique. No one thought they were at all like the physicists, so there was no obvious common solution for their needs.

In fact they were unique. The scholarly communications of each discipline were as uniquely structured as their creators; they way they adopted technologies to facilitate the communications was equally unique.

But we couldn’t sustain our effort to support 12 idiosyncratic publishing experiments. We needed to find a platform and a common approach.
Note: the decision to distribute administrative and editorial control to UC departments, institutes & research units grew out of the library’s practical concern with supporting 16,000 UC faculty distributed across the state and the world. Given the general concern with validation—and the appearance of vanity publishing—it was a good solution.
*We launched the eScholarship Repository in 2003 with a fairly broad array of content, including working papers in economics, reports from agricultural stations and marine preserves, professional papers from tobacco research (all selected by faculty) and one lone journal, in dermatology

*Faculty were central to the selection and approval of submissions, all of which were branded w/ department and institute logos

*n.b., The dermatology journal was not migrated to the eScholarship site. It had been home-built and supported multiple languages (and some stunning visuals) but the editors wanted to be associated with eScholarship.

Very soon after launch, Stan Glantz—a high-profile researcher in tobacco related disease and industry goings-on—called to say he wanted to put his book up on the site, open access. We pounced on the opportunity to publish in XML. We thought the insistence on PDF was insufferable.
We considered publishing journals as a way to encourage author/editor migration from the commercial publishers that were bankrupting libraries.

We met with and interviewed people at all levels of University of Chicago Press, especially those involved in publication of ApJ. It was extremely sobering. After only a couple of days of consultation we decided to steer clear of journals and focus on pre-publication objects like WP & TR.
Jumping ahead 6 years…
In 2003 we thought Scholarly Communication SHOULD change.

Scholarly communication has truly, dramatically changed in the recent decade. More than anything, this is shaping the role of the IR and the librarians who provide it.
The university has always been a publisher, acc to the original meeting of “publish” as defined by the OED. To “publicate” is to share with the community the new knowledge that is created in our institutions of higher learning and elsewhere.

TODAY, This requires the full arsenal of creation, validation, management, and dissemination tools.
Libraries have a good track record as

- Keepers of knowledge
- Providers of service in a constantly changing environment;
- Consistently early adopters of networked technologies to improve information access
Yes, in the broadest sense of the word. Libraries can structure and provide the process that is at the heart of publishing—review of content by the appropriate experts, dissemination in the most effective medium, and preservation for the integrity of the scholarly record.

Peer review is not threatened; it has been enhanced beyond the binary notion of the past 50 years. In fact, peer review is the most essential activity to have been reclaimed by the university, and the validation process has been vastly expanded and streamlined by its automation in tools such as the IR-P*

*IR-P = IR with full publishing capabilities.
In fact, libraries are doing a great deal more than “managing stuff.” The trend everywhere is toward management of unique and original items rather than copies, and toward a broader array of publishing services to meet the hyper-acceleration of text and data creation in academe. Eight years on, there is a proliferation of new journals coming out of UC and everywhere.

At UC—as everywhere—it is clear this is not the preponderance of scholarly output. In fact it’s a small percentage. And it is clear that commercial publishing of scholarly output has not disappeared. Colleges and universities have not banished the commercial publishers and are not stealing away their business; they are publishing the increasingly unique content being expressed by their faculty and students that have no other outlet. Libraries, once again, are in the right place at the right time.
We have come a full circle, and our universities are more engaged (appropriately) with direct support to publishing. Our faculties were right: Validation (peer review) and persistence (permanence) are the sine qua non of the university’s core activity and are critical to the advancement of knowledge and society.

And, sigh, .pdf
Thank you for your time. I would love to hear your questions and discussion.