



## arXiv Member Advisory Board Meeting Synopsis October 7, 2014

### Key Action Items

- Create a project scope and an implementation plan for adding a “Give” button, which was approved by the MAB members (and will be reviewed by them + SAB)
- Develop library guides (or other lightweight communication) to describe the basic submission and moderation process for new arXiv users (especially graduate students)
- Convene a new MAB subgroup to discuss interoperability between arXiv and institutional repositories
- Convene a MAB nominating subcommittee to make a decision about the current 2-year appointments (subcommittee will be formed according to the arXiv SAB bylaws)
- Review stock messages & Help pages to ensure that they are useful and courteous

### Introduction and arXiv Overview

Update slides for the arXiv program, membership, moderation, and IT are available at:  
<https://confluence.cornell.edu/display/culpublic/October+7%2C+2014+Meeting+Agenda>

#### *Questions:*

We never use the term OA when describing arXiv. Why?

- It’s been part of the model since the beginning, and most of the people who know about arXiv understand this important point.
- When open access was first introduced, it was a great term but since has been co-opted by predatory publishers.
- We should focus more on the moderation aspects of arXiv’s repository than its OA

What would it cost arXiv to include new subjects?

- Costs would be incurred in scaling up programming, infrastructure, but in particular in interaction with moderators. Subject area expansion means we increased subject moderators, and while the subject moderator is usually an un-paid role, it means increased traffic for our paid admin’s role.

Is arXiv concerned about plagiarism? Do we have tools to do large-scale quality control?

- Not tools per say (like Turnitin), but one verification measure arXiv has is that 90-95% of all submissions are received as original LaTeX files, as opposed to something like PDF. This means that most likely the submitting author is the creator because it is very difficult to create something in LaTeX that isn’t original. For the few materials that are submitted as PDFs, there are additional verification measures put in place.

Have you considered any journal workflow systems? Are there any external technologies you can use?

- We are not aware of any systems that will fulfil arXiv's unique needs without significant tailoring.

*SAB update by Dave Morrison/Steven Gottlieb:*

- Chris Myers has been a welcome addition to the SAB/overall arXiv team, and his role, while being defined as he is going along, has provided continuity and authority of the scientific governance of arXiv. The SAB meeting was a more positive meeting this year because there were useful reports written by Chris and Simeon. Also having Martin play the lead developer role is effective. There is now more trust in the arXiv team's understanding of the challenges.
- SAB election just took place, and the SAB thanks the MAB for their help in the nominating process. 29 names were received for three new members. We'll add two new members, new: Jennifer Ross from University of Massachusetts & Shude Mao from the Chinese Academy of Science.

*MAB report on the SAB (Catriona Cannon/Jim Mullins):*

- There was a bit of discussion about ORCID, and this is an example to see real benefit of the overlapping membership between MAB/SAB. For librarians it is a great tool, but the SAB asked if this is a reliable tool and process for author disambiguation. There was a suggestion to build our own author disambiguation tool but this is not feasible given the scope of the task. [Per the IT Roadmap, arXiv hopes to implement ORCID as a metadata field by the end of the year.]

## **Business Model Overview**

*'Give button' pilot as a fund raising strategy*

- Give button interface will need to be thoughtfully designed so that it is not lost on arXiv's current text-heavy interface.
- Give button should only reside as an option on the search interface, and not on the submission or moderation pages
- How do we define success, and balance our benchmark to any impact that a give button may have on arXiv's reputation and goodwill?
- Revenue from the give-button is not a reliable source of income, and therefore if the give button is present on arXiv it will be tied special project. The give button is also a promotional opportunity to remind users of the contributions already provided by their institutions. Using it in this way will also demonstrate that arXiv not in financial trouble.
- We will acknowledge the contributors. Recommendations were for an alphabetical list or for something like "circles" of contributors who donated specific amounts, but no logos, links, or special branding.

*Strategies for reaching out to research councils for contributions*

- Australian and Canadian councils will not fund these kind of larger endeavors
- Administrative oversight is high in these relationships

*Beyond 2013-2017 business plan - preliminary ideas and strategies for increasing funding sources*

- Current recommendation is not to add a 5<sup>th</sup> tier in the current model (for users 200 and below), but revisit this strategy in 2017.
- Increasing the fee of the top users of arXiv members to generate additional revenue is a plausible idea that needs to be incorporated in the next 5-year model.

**arXiv Users and Current/Emerging Needs**

Informal & brief presentations by MAB members about what they are hearing from their local users about arXiv. Overall, the users love arXiv and there were several positive comments. There were also several suggestions to improve the search interface, add functionality for depositing larger auxiliary files such as AV or data, implement consistent policies (e.g., trackbacks), improve the TeX support, expand document types to include other content such as lecture notes, review help pages and stock messages, offer user guides for new users, support IR harvesting. Some expressed concerns about adding new social media features to arXiv (arXiv needs to stick to its core functionality) whereas some suggested to add new functionality to support comments and blogs for discussion.

**arXiv & Scholarly Communication + Future Strategies**

- Interoperability of arXiv and Institutional Repositories - SWORD feed/compliant export? IR's can technically use SWORD API to pull from us to their IR's, but we don't have 1) an easily identifiable way for institutions to identify authors and 2) arXiv doesn't have a process in place to allow for the rights to do this (unless there is a CC license attached to the article).
- Emerging open access mandates from funders & compliance issues (e.g., plans for integration of standardized metadata by use of ID like ORCID, Grant-IDs, or Institutional IDs; SHARE & CHORUS). arXiv team will continue to develop these initiatives and add information to the arXiv FAQ as needed. For instance, we recently updated the FAQ about arXiv and SCOAP3 to clarify each service's goals and collaboration plans.

## Agenda for October 7, 2014

Time	Topic
8:15-8:30 am	Arrivals & continental breakfast (muffins, bagels, cut fruit, orange juice, and coffee/tea)
8:30-10 am	<p>Introductions and arXiv overview (10 minute each topic and Q&amp;A)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meeting goals - review of last year's meeting outcomes (Oya Y. Rieger)</li> <li>• arXiv Program at CUL (Oya Y. Rieger &amp; Chris Myers)</li> <li>• Membership Update (Jaron Porciello)</li> <li>• Moderation (David Ruddy)</li> <li>• IT Update (Chris Myers)</li> <li>• SAB update (Dave Morrison/Steven Gottlieb)</li> </ul>
10am-11:15am	<p>Business model overview</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Budget review and projections (CY14 &amp; CY15)</li> <li>• 'Give button' pilot as a fund raising strategy</li> <li>• Strategies for reaching out to research councils for contributions</li> <li>• Beyond 2013-2017 business plan - preliminary ideas and strategies for increasing funding sources</li> </ul>
11:15am-noon	<p>arXiv users and current/emerging needs</p> <p><i>Informal &amp; brief presentations by MAB members about what they are hearing from their local users about arXiv:</i></p> <p>--Is arXiv meeting scientists' needs? Both as readers and submitters of papers. Any features that arXiv is not providing and needed by scientists (research data support, social networking tools, better interoperability with other related system, etc.)? Are there any other online databases or repositories that scientists prefer to arXiv?</p> <p>--What do you see as graduate students' up-and-coming needs? How do they differ from the current generation of scientists? What do we need to do to continue to meet current and emerging needs?</p> <p>--Opinions on arXiv's quality parameters. Our goal is to ensure that articles are of interest, relevance, and value to the disciplines in which they are listed. Submissions are reviewed by expert moderators to verify that they are topical and refereeable scientific contributions that follow accepted standards of scholarly communication. Submissions may be rejected or reclassified based on moderator input. Does arXiv strike the right balance between quality and openness? Are article classifications appropriate and useful?</p> <p>--Any 'stories' you hear about how arXiv is affecting their research or communication.</p>

Time	Topic
LUNCH	Working lunch - arXiv users and current/emerging needs discussion continues <i>(includes a 15-minute break)</i>
1-2pm	<p>arXiv and scholarly communication: arXiv operates on limited resources therefore it is critical for us to identify priorities. We'll discuss the importance of several initiatives vis-à-vis arXiv to review arXiv's plans and get your input on identifying what should be a priority for us.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interoperability of arXiv and Institutional Repositories</li> <li>• Emerging open access mandates from funders &amp; compliance issues (e.g., plans for integration of standardized metadata by use of ID like ORCID, Grant-IDs, or Institutional IDs; SHARE &amp; CHORUS)</li> <li>• Linking to research data</li> </ul>
2-3pm	<p>Future strategies and directions: We invite your questions &amp; recommendations. Here are the questions we've received so far from the MAB members to be addressed at this meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are there any new subjects and fields on arXiv responding to different disciplines' publishing habits?</li> <li>• What is the desirability and feasibility of outsourcing arXiv's technical development and support?</li> <li>• Are there any new developments in regard to your collaboration with ADS, Inspire, Epi Science, etc.?</li> <li>• What are the new developments with SCOAP3 &amp; arXiv collaboration?,</li> </ul>
3-3:30pm	<p>Conclusions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MAB 2-year terms</li> <li>• Review of the meeting outcomes</li> <li>• Communication strategies -- with MAB and other key stakeholders</li> <li>• Any feedback, questions, recommendations for arXiv team</li> </ul>

**Participants:**

- Margareta Fathli, representing Tommy Ohlsson, Professor , KTH Royal Institute of Technology, Department of Theoretical Physics, Sweden
- Carol Hoover, Digital Information Resources Manager, Los Alamos National Laboratory, US
- Tracy Gabridge, Associate Director for Research & Instructional Services, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, US,
- Zhixiong Zhang, Assistant Director of National Science Library, National Science Library, Chinese Academy of Sciences, China (was not able to participate)
- Philip G. Kent, University Librarian, University of Melbourne, Australia
- Molly White, Director, Math, Physics, Astronomy Library, University of Texas, Austin, US

- Tim Klassen, Head, Science and Technology Library, University of Alberta, Canada
- Eva Isaksson, Physics Librarian, University of Helsinki, Finland,
- James (Jim) L. Mullins, Dean of Libraries and Esther Ellis Norton Professor, Purdue University, Representing Committee on Institutional Cooperation (CIC), US
- Esther Tobschall, German National Library of Science and Technology Germany, Representing Consortium arXiv-DH and HGF: Coordinated by the German National Library of Science and Technology (TIB) and Deutsches Elektronen-Synchrotron DESY, Germany
- Catriona Cannon, Associate Director, Collection Support, Bodleian Libraries, Representing Jisc, UK
- Laine Farley, representing MacKenzie Smith, University Librarian at UC Davis, Representing University of California, US
- Yuri Tschinkel, Professor of Mathematics, Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences, New York University, Director of Mathematics and the Physical Sciences, Representing Simons Foundation, US (was not able to participate)

### **Ex Officio Members**

#### Cornell University Library

- Chris Myers, Interim Scientific Director
- Jaron Porciello, Digital Scholarship Initiatives Coordinator, arXiv Membership Program Lead
- Oya Y. Rieger, Associate University Librarian, Digital Scholarship & Preservation Services; arXiv Program Director (MAB Chair)
- David Ruddy, Director, Scholarly Communication Services, arXiv User Support Manager
- Simeon Warner, Director, Software Development & Repository Architecture, arXiv IT Manager

#### Scientific Advisory Board

- Steven Gottlieb, Distinguished Professor of Physics, Indiana University, US
- David Morrison, Professor of Mathematics and Physics, University of California, Santa Barbara, US