Purdue University

Purdue e-Pubs

Charleston Library Conference

Needle-Moving Collaboration: From Act to Impact

Katherine Skinner
Educopia Institute

Follow this and additional works at: https://docs.lib.purdue.edu/charleston

An indexed, print copy of the Proceedings is also available for purchase at:
http://www.thepress.purdue.edu/series/charleston.

You may also be interested in the new series, Charleston Insights in Library, Archival, and Information Sciences. Find out more at: http://www.thepress.purdue.edu/series/charleston-insights-library-archival-and-information-sciences.

Needle-Moving Collaboration: From Act to Impact

Katherine Skinner, Executive Director, Educopia Institute

The following is a transcript of a live presentation at the 2015 Charleston Library Conference.

Katherine Skinner: Thank you so much, Anthony, and thank you to all of you for being here so bright and early in the morning. I'm going to move fast so if you didn't get coffee, you're probably going to regret it in a couple of minutes, but you're going to be awake. So, today what I'm going to be doing is I'm going to be challenging all of us in this room to think about the roles that we need to play, all of us, to move the needle in scholarly publishing. Nobody here is exempt, and I will say that again: Nobody here is exempt. Every single one of us has a role to play. Every single one of us is needed as we are moving into the next generation of scholarly communications, all of us.

In order to kind of illustrate action and the need for action, I'm going to start with my favorite tigress. This is Mohini. So, this tigress and her story appeared first in *The New Scientist* back in 1984. It was a story told by David Challinor, who was a long-beloved representative of the Smithsonian National Zoo. And so Mohini was a gift to President Eisenhower. She was the first white tigress to arrive in the United States. Beautiful, fantastic, totally exotic for the 1950s America and she was placed in a 12 × 12 cage in the lions' area, which is what you did with animals back then. So, in that lion's den on concrete she paced back and forth, back and forth in her 12 × 12 pen for years. But the Smithsonian Zoo was one of the first zoos in the United States to really pursue natural habitats, and so in the early 1970s they started to build Mohini a new area to live in. Acres and acres of grass, and they were really, really excited to let their tiger out and see what she was going to do. So, when they released Mohini, she was a little set in her ways. And so everybody's watching—there's great anticipation—and what does she do? She claims a 12 × 12 area and starts pacing it, and she wore out the grass underneath her feet. She paced back and forth, back and forth, back and forth for

months. And the story illustrates what happens if we don't act and if we don't recognize the kinds of opportunities that are in front of us. In the academic publishing landscape, I think it is a story that we need to hear and that we need to think about because we've had an established way of doing our business that has worked really well for centuries. Maybe not quite so well in more recent years, but it has worked pretty well for centuries, and now we have got this opportunity to do so much more and I'm not sure that we're there yet.

Sociologists and naturalists would call Mohini's plight *isomorphism,* which is a fancy word for habit. She was hindered from experiencing what she could have, and in taking advantage of what she could have, because she was stuck in her habits, and we can see this all around us. So all of our partners on this journey—and you see kind of an illustration here, a lot of the ones that come to mind when we think about scholarly publishing— we have arguably been wearing pretty serious tracks in our own 12 × 12 confines. Most of publishing today is still adhering to rules that were established a generation ago. And I'm going to argue today that all of that is changing, whether we want it to or not, whether we participate or not, actively; that we are in a critical moment now; and this critical moment is every bit as dramatic as Mohini's shift from the concrete cage to the grassy acres. We've all got a choice to make in this moment.

And this is a critical moment. So what do I mean by critical moment? This starts to illustrate it. And I will let this sink in for just a second. So, what I want you to note in this image is all of the loss. Right? There's the loss of the pipe, the loss of the glasses, the loss of the hat and the toupee, which is my personal favorite part, and the loss of the oar, the loss of control. I mean, he has completely lost control, and so have the two very helpless women who are not doing a whole lot to assist the man. But I do want to take issue, and the name of this painting is *A Critical Moment,* and I

do want to take issue with that name because I'm not sure that this is the critical moment. When I think about the critical moment, I think about that moment that preceded this. What happened that allowed this moment to take place?

The moment of opportunity is what I like to focus on when I'm thinking about critical moments, not the moment of loss. Hopefully we don't get the moment of loss, because we take advantage of the moment of opportunity. And not every era gives us the opportunity to experience critical moments, especially not like this day and age. Every generation thinks it is living in unique times, but we really do live in pretty intensively changing times. Not every era brings that, so we're creatures of habit, by and large, as humans; change of the field-wide or system-wide level is usually restrained by the boundaries that are around the field. So, if you think about the way that gears reinforce each other and encourage stasis, they don't like to let go. That's what the systems that we embed ourselves in—including the business systems like academic publishing—that's what they do. And for the most part that is a good thing. We need predictability; that's why we function this way. But those things can get in the way when we're ready to change. And in particular, when we're thinking about change, one of the things that is hard to realize when you're in the middle of something is that one organization, or one institution, or one small cluster, or one stakeholder group has a really hard time bending these gears enough to actually get them to go out of alignment so they go somewhere new. One of the things that I think we expect to happen, and that we fund to happen, and that we try to invest in is innovation in small spaces. That doesn't work unless it incentivizes all the players in the system. You can't incentivize one stakeholder group and expect everything to change, and I'm going to illustrate that in just a couple of minutes.

When we think about this critical moment, and some of the markers of it, and some of the ways that we know that we really do have a lot of things aligning that open up a moment of opportunity—a moment where we can make great changes that aren't necessarily permissible in the human system under regular

circumstances—some of those changes are here. Technological change: I don't even have to tell y'all how fast it's going because all of us are experiencing it on a daily basis. New competitors: We've got a lot of them in this field. Some of them are driven by commercial interest; others are driven by more academic interests. There are clashes of values that are happening on a regular basis, and it's something that has increased dramatically over the last generation of scholarship. We also have huge political shifts, and this is going on in the broader environment. So, looking at the way that the kind of shifting priority has happened from the public good, which used to be more or less an accepted part of the American life, to more privatized interest and the concentration of wealth in very, very few hands, so the political shifts kind of merge in with this economic concentration, though they are distinct, and when you put all of those factors together and then add to it the information deluge, we've got huge opportunities. It's not comfortable times we're living in. We really do have huge opportunities for change, and change is coming. If we're in a critical moment, if by this definition we're in a critical moment, then what do we do? We've got two main choices: We can continue to walk in our 12 x 12 confine and do what we're used to, or we can try to game the system for good and create some transformation ourselves. I like that latter option for opportunity, and sociology gives us some really great tools towards that end.

How do we game the system? We start with research. Research from disciplines like sociology and economics and business can tell us a whole lot about field transformations, which is what we are really experiencing right now. Lots of fields are changing; it's not just the academic publishing field, but we feel it here, and those disciplines—sociology, etc.—have demonstrated repeatedly that fields do tend toward stasis. So, think about the gears again. But, major change does become possible occasionally, and when those moments come up we can change or we can be changed. You can witness the Catholic Church in the age of Gutenberg just as an example. I won't go into a deep illustration of that, but the printing press transformed one of the most powerful

institutional forces on the planet at the time, and certainly in the Western world. When fields become unsettled, the process of change usually unfolds from innovations, but not innovations that take place at the center. They usually take place on the fringes of the field, which is not where we expect to see them. This is due to the habituated behaviors, so the Mohini kind of mindset, and the way that we treat our vested interest. If we are at the center, there is really nothing incentivizing us to have the kind of breakthroughs that tend to happen more on the fringes. So we really have to watch the fringes in order to anticipate where change can really come from.

And then, third, and I think most overlooked within our respective fields, researchers have also shown that it is not lone geniuses that produce change. Innovation is not something that happens because a lightbulb goes off over somebody's head and they come up with this brilliant idea and that idea is what changes everything. That is what we tell ourselves, and I think the American mythos in particular—with the focus on frontier mentality and those kinds of things—I think the US is extremely prone to this kind of lone genius fallacy. But it is a fallacy, and it has been pretty well debunked in sociological circles. Instead, those innovators are always a key part; if they are successful they are always a key part of a larger cultural system that includes the production, the distribution, and especially the reception. And that system always depends upon networks of people. You cannot do this—you cannot have change happen without networks of people driving it. To say that a different way, change doesn't arise because one amazing individual somehow displays his or her extraordinary genius, devising some magical new innovation that completely changes the world. Instead, it happens through the activities of networks of people. I can think of no better illustration for this than the Castellers in Barcelona, who literally build human castles, and do so by strengthening the base with arms that stretch to shoulders and basically make a proportional infrastructure to support the people that they are elevating.

Now what do we do with that information? So, if you buy what I've said so far, then we can play a little game of "if-then." If a field is a somewhat stable enterprise, and if innovation tends to happen on the fringes, and if networks are what's needed to move those innovations from the fringes to the center, then we all need to work deliberately field-wide, which is not something that we would comfortably do, in order to manage our efforts using networks to ensure that we align and not compete. We need to work toward a common goal that's at the field level. We need to stop thinking only about the here and now and start thinking about where we want to go and how to get there.

What might that look like? Let's shift gears for just a minute, and in order to really position where we are right now I want to make sure that we are all on the same page. I'll recognize and own that my perspective on this is my own perspective on this. It is as grounded as it can be from history and sociology, but I will recognize that there may be some things in the following slides that others would paint a little differently. I want to put us in the historical context that we are operating in today. This image is of the first research journal. This is *The Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society,* and this was published 350 years ago. I had the great pleasure of seeing this, which is actually Christopher Wren's personal copy, when I was in Oxford, England, for FORCE 2015 earlier this year. This was an incredibly important innovation and it exemplifies impact. Three hundred fifty years ago, basically what happened is this got published and it laid the groundwork for everything that's come since. But there are some reasons that that happened. The innovation itself was good, and one reason is that this encapsulated research. It gave an easy way for scholars and researchers to get information back and forth to each other. It was a good mechanism for registering, for disseminating, and for recording and archiving one's research, so I don't want to take away from that. But that in and of itself did not make this successful. What made this successful is it had a ready society that adopted it and adapted it and quickly started using it. The Royal Society played an incredibly strong role here, and it was something that had already been there. This was not a new society: It was a ready network of influential players and, as we'll discuss

a little bit more in a few minutes, that is the kind of linchpin in these environments.

Then the third factor that played into its favor is that this came into being right at a moment when scientific discoveries were on the rise and when a lot of people actually had the means to both do research and to appreciate this kind of recording of it. Building on this first journal publication from roughly the late 1600s, all the way up until the 1970s, 1960s, we had a pretty well established way of doing things. It relied on our publication of journals and of monographs, and publishers served as the gatekeepers, the editors, the producers, and disseminators of scholarship. The academic libraries purchased them and cataloged them and preserved them. Everybody had a role and the system functioned really, really well for a long time. And then things happened. The unsettling of this relatively healthy system and the resulting articulation of crisis can be traced back all the way to at least the 1970s, and I suspect the 1960s, though I haven't found that proof yet. And notably this was a really volatile moment for Western markets, and we can't take this out of that context. Now conventional wisdom today, and the wisdom that I was taught, is that this all happened for two reasons—that the scholarly communications crisis happened for two reasons—(1) the shift from print to digital, and (2) the consolidation, the now infamous bundling practices. Right? But that explanation is not right. It is way too simple and reality is way more complicated than that. So, where did the destabilization come from? One of the causes was the Xerox machine. The Xerox machine, as it says, makes copies of anything on ordinary paper, including books. In the late 1960s this became a technology that was being used by scholars, and it cut into journal subscriptions. Very quickly, scholars were able to take a piece of what they wanted and actually take it back to their offices. This really changed some of the subscription behaviors of individual scholars. Now, that alone didn't do it. We also had the diversification, very quick diversification, of fields. Disciplinary specialization started to be on the rise in the 1960s, 1970s. For example, you had anthropology splinter off into subdisciplines, and those subdisciplines splintered off into subdisciplines,

and each of them had to have their own society and their own journal. Suddenly there was a lot more competition for society memberships, and so again, subscriptions dropped. Also, libraries couldn't keep up with the sheer volume of content that was coming out, so that too led to a drop in subscriptions from the library side.

Now that matched up with another phenomenon, which was the emergence and attention that was given to publishing and higher education rankings. For both disciplinary departments and across the university, the value of publishing included what it was doing for the ranking system. Again, there was an increase in the supply of journals and journal articles, so libraries' acquisitions budgets continued to suffer and subscriptions continued to drop. And the net effect of all of this—and I will give a shout out to Sarah Glassmeyer, who produced this graphic, and there are some more updated versions of this out there as well—but the drop in revenues from subscriptions weakened the societies. There was an open door for consolidation, and again this was all taking place in Western markets, where consolidation was already happening across other industries like music; you name the industry, it was consolidating. As I say, commercial publishers bought out a lot of the weakened societies, and you can see here how that played out in one particular area. But the commercial publishers were feeling the burden too. It's not like they were these protected creatures that were hugely successful. Instead, they knew that they were in a subscriptions spiral, the same as everyone else. The libraries would drop subscriptions, or people started dropping subscriptions, and then the prices had to rise to accommodate that, and then they'd drop more subscriptions, and so the spiral went forward and it spiraled really out of control, and it was hurting the commercial publishers as well as the noncommercial publishers. But, the commercial publishers were the ones that decided that they had to do something, and they found an opportunity to move strategically towards an electronic future at the same time as they were addressing this problem.

Now it is really important to recognize that the innovation which was the Big Deal, the bundled

subscriptions, was really an accident coupled with serendipity, right? This was not a deliberate scripted takeover of the scholarly journal space. It was a really, really good guess in the right direction that just happened to snowball. But why did it snowball? It was a good innovation in some ways, but why did it snowball? It's because all of the players in the system embraced it. Not a single player, not a single sector, stepped back from this and said, "We're not going to play this way." And that is what enabled its success. So, Academic Press was the one that initiated the idea over in the UK. They spotted a source of funding and saw that the UK's higher education funding council had a grant program that was available, and they pitched a project at it, and that project led to the funding of a multiple journal, or multi-journal, and multi-year license that provided all of the UK's higher ed establishments with free use access to all of AP's titles. This seemed like a win for everybody, right? Academic Press had a dependable revenue stream, which was nice, and the way to actually start exploring the digital without it being quite as much of an investment as it might've been. UK's higher education funding council was really happy because they had a strong project that filled an established and notable gap, and libraries and researchers were happy because they had huge vastly increased access to content, especially through some of the early consortial relationships. Everybody got something out of this, and it was a bold move in a critical moment, much like the critical moment that we're living through today, and it was well played, more by luck than by aim, and that is really, really important to recognize.

The sense of crisis that permeated the scholarly communications landscape left the Big Deal largely under analyzed, even by AP itself, which later admitted that they were going on gut and really had not analyzed thoroughly the model that became the new base model for academic publishing. There were a few people in the field, mostly librarians, who did point out from the beginning, and I do want to say that the Big Deal was a short-term win for individual institutions and potentially a long-term loss for the whole

field. But because it appealed to so many local interests, most institutions bought in. We are really bad about doing this, folks. We think local, we do not think at the field level, and that gets us into a lot of trouble. I think where we are today we can tie directly to that, and where we go tomorrow, we need to be thinking about that so that we avoid hitting the same calamity. Once they bought in, their campuses had huge access to content and they don't want to give that up. So, the deal with the devil. I don't think any of the players here are devils, and I also think that the biggest problem here is that the problems that the Big Deal sought to address weren't actually addressed by the Big Deal. It just postponed the inevitable. The subscription crises continued to go where it was going; the shrinking budgets of libraries, that hasn't changed. If anything it has gotten dramatically worse. Library budgets have continued to decrease, journal prices have continued to increase, and now libraries have been trapped for long enough and have kind of occluded what was happening—not intentionally, but by design—because they were trying to protect their campuses. What we have at this point is a weakened system. It's not just a troubled system, which is where we were in the 1970s—now it's a really weakened system. Part of what weakened over this was the relationships between the different sectors. Because it became the libraries against the presses, especially the commercial presses. Or it became the libraries and the university presses not working together, but actually working at odds with one another and having a lot of resentment because, of course, monograph purchases dropped radically and so the university presses were doubly impacted. Groups that should've been great supporters of each other, and great supporters of the academic promise, and supporters of knowledge dissemination have gotten focused on these other things. These other things have really split us apart and are very divisive; most of the outfits that have tried to resist the Big Deal just continued that same sensation of divisive action instead of trying to find some grounds on which we can all unite. This is a systemic problem, and I do mean a systemic problem. Note that there are

no new purchasers arising in this space so themarket share, the amount of money that is there to spend, has decreased at the same time as the content has dramatically increased, both in price and amount.

Scholarly communications is not the sole burden of libraries. It is not the sole burden of publishers. There are a lot of stakeholders and a lot of interests in the landscape, including the authors who we often don't have in, for example, this room. But until this moment, the crisis was absorbed a lot by the libraries, and now the libraries can't absorb it anymore. The range of approaches that have been attempted to resolve the crisis or to change it, again, most of those have actually inadvertently reinforced the main problem, which is that the different sectors aren't talking to each other, and certainly aren't talking to each other straight. I'm going to say that one of the things that is a problem right now is that we haven't found a way to incentivize a sufficient percentage of the stakeholder groups that have interest in the landscape. In order for any entity to have an impact on the system that lasts, we've got to have the players from across the system actually unite around something. Whether that is done purposefully or accidentally, it doesn't matter. But we've got to be in that crucial sociological phenomenon where a network really takes the innovation back into the system.

How do we align? We're in a new critical moment—one where change is imminent. We know change is coming and we know that we've got a lot of factors aligning again, much as we did in the 1970s, and we've been talking around the big thing that's changing for decades. More recently we've gotten closer and closer and closer to what the crux point is, and the word that resonates here is a big one, and it's one that means a lot of different things: *data.* This is what's coming and we know it. It's already here. But today I am not wanting to talk about the typical data conversations that we've had over the last five years: how to publish it, or how to cite it, or how to preserve it. Those are all important things, but there is something much bigger looming. What's important about data in academic

publishing today is how it's starting to be collected and how it's being used in predictive analytics, and the implications of what that could mean, not just for academic publishing but for the whole academic system.

How many people here remember *Money Ball*? *Money Ball*, both the book and the movie, do a really good job of exemplifying what happened with the Oakland Athletics back in the late 1990s/early 2000s with super metrics. They were one of the first really popularized ideas of what data can do. In essence what they did at the Oakland Athletics, where they didn't have much money, is they constructed their team one year not by the collective wisdom of the players, and the coaches, or the scouts, and the front desk, and all the people who usually got involved in that kind of baseball selection, but instead from analytical gauges of player performance. What Oakland did was it demonstrated, as it started winning games, that the effective use of data could move a team from the bottom of the heap close to the top. The value in this case was placed on things that lead to wins in baseball games. So, on-base percentage and slugging percentage, which, as it turned out, once they did the math, those things mattered a lot more than the things that were driving the decisions of most coaches and scouts and others, like batting average. Again, let me emphasize the value here was placed on wins. So, as we move from the field of dreams to the field of publishing we need to ask the question, "Where will the value be placed?"

It's a really, really, really important question because digital technology is making it possible for publishers and libraries to gather data on the dissemination and use of digital scholarly publications in absolutely unprecedented detail and on an unprecedented scale. Data arising from the digital distribution of content provides us with all sorts of new opportunities. There are lots of good things here to help us understand what is going on in the scholarly communications ecosystem, but it also raises a huge range of questions—ethical questions and ones that we really haven't begun to grapple with. The high

cost of providing data and providing data-related services, those are reinforcing the inequities that are already there within the academic publishing landscape so that those who have enough money

to actually understand what's going on also have increased ability to act. Those practical challenges associated with gathering and assessing and disseminating or interpreting usage data are really, really important to who is going to be able to play in the next generation. Even those libraries and publishers who do have sophisticated data management systems lack the crucial contextual data to basically mark their own performance by. They may be able to analyze their own, but can they tell what's going on in the aggregate? If you're not able to measure your impact then, again, you've got some problems here. Data about the published works you're using is playing a growing role in the assessment of research performance. For scholars this is huge, and it's going to be informing how decisions about scarce resources are allocated—what gets published and what we do with those publications—and it's going to be a determining factor in things like permission and tenure. It's something that has those scholars who are paying attention, which is a tiny minority, but has them very, very concerned right now, and we need to be listening to those concerns and amplifying them with concerns of our own. The increasing availability and value that is placed on data—usage data—creates important ethical challenges for organizations that are gathering this information. So, in particular, where is the transparency around the data algorithms and about data accuracy? What are they measuring? We don't know right now for most of the things that are happening within the system, and we are sufficiently not asking and we are sufficiently not controlling it, and that is a problem. And the "we" here is all of the different players in this system, not any one player. Even if data is accurate and we understand the algorithms that are used to analyze it, the data still raises really urgent questions. How will personally identifiable information be tied to a scholar? How will measures of the attention given to a scholar's work impact that research career, the trajectory, and what we value? What is it that we're going to value—what sells? Or is it going to

be that we value what transforms? And what transforms doesn't tend to transform in the moment that you put it out there. We all know this. We are in academic publishing, and some of the most important texts that have been published were underappreciated in their own time. As we're using usage data to shape the new forms of scholarly inquiry, we've got to recognize that's actually what we are doing. It's not just that usage data is going to help us to somehow better market, better understand, better anticipate. It's that it fundamentally could change what we are publishing in ways that could privilege the commercial interest over the actual intellectual interest. I think this is already happening, and I think it is terrible, and I think it is dangerous.

What do we do about this? We have a system that's changing. The implications are just very, very severe. I can't make that point strongly enough in this talk. We can choose to sit by and let a few dictate what that aggregated data look like, who holds them, how they control them, how they dole them out, etc., or we can work together to determine that as a community. I'm going to encourage us to choose the latter, and I want us to think about what that might look like and what could make it possible for us to align.

Basically the question here is, how do we move from act to impact? In the social sector, initiatives that are geared towards system-level transformation have been increasingly turning to methodologies that cultivate multi-stakeholder licenses in order to create and sustain transformative change: environmental improvement, or reduction in homelessness, or reduction in teen pregnancy rates—all of these types of things. We've got some really, really well-proven methods that do a lot to make those changes happen. And in these approaches the system-wide changes encouraged through the work of cross-stakeholder networks—that comes right back to the sociological principles that we were talking about. And what they share in common is a number of very specific pieces. So, they share a common agenda where cross-stakeholder groups come together and say, "You know what? We may disagree on a lot of things, we may be competitors, but we agree on this one

central thing." It can't be a platitude. It's got to be something that is measurable. You've got to have shared measurement systems that allow each one of those stakeholder groups to map back progress, both of the whole group towards the whole and then of side projects and initiatives towards the whole. This is about alignment. Mutually reinforcing activities have to be there, and have to be constantly recalibrated, to make sure that all of the players in the system continue to get enough out of the pathway that is moving forward to stay involved and to keep moving those gears in a new way. Continuous communication—absolutely mandatory, and it's got to take place from a neutral space, and that neutral space has got to be funded well enough to actually do that work. It is one of the most underfunded things that we do, and we need glue to hold a group together. We rarely provide it in the academic publishing community, and it is one of the reasons why multi-sector stakeholder initiatives often splinter. I know that that works because I put it into practice in a lot of different ways through Educopia projects, and also because I've studied this extensively so when I ask you guys to trust me on it, I'm also going to say that if anybody wants to talk to me about how this has worked and how lightweight this can be, I'd be happy to.

But I'm going to turn in the last 2 minutes—and Anthony I promise it will be 2 minutes—towards a project that we are lovingly calling "Project Meerkat" that grew out of the Scholarly Communications Institute a month ago. This is a proposal that we are just starting to vet. A few of you in this room have probably already seen it, and hopefully many of you will see it in the coming weeks. What we did at the Mellon Fund Scholarly Communications Institute under the leadership of Kevin Hawkins, who was the head of my group from the University of North Texas, is we looked at usage data in one very specific area: monographs. And what we became quickly obsessed with are the challenges in the ethical implications of that data, and who holds that data, and how that data is used. What we've done now is we've put together a proposal. We got pretty juiced up about this, and we've put together a proposal that would do a seed-funded project that

would have the following aims. In essence the important parts are the three bullets:

- *Usage data modeling:* How do we collect and share information about monograph usage? How do we share it? With each other and with others that are not necessarily part of gathering it?

- *Usage data ethics:* What are the principles that we all need to adhere to in order to protect the academic integrity of what we're publishing?

And then, finally:

- *Cooperative infrastructure:* How do we incentivize all of the groups to be there because they all own and govern it?

We've got a number of deliverables that we have outlined again with this now very drafty proposal that we are just vetting. This is not an active initiative yet, but it would have three sets of deliverables, and I think that the crux piece here is that data ethics piece. It would map with and include, it would have to include a lot of other relevant efforts. There are a lot of other things going on in the area of data analytics. What we're talking about here is not doing something different from that. It is approaching it in a different way. So the outcomes here would be knitting together a different type of scholarly communications infrastructure. Not one that is utopian, where all of us suddenly love each other, and it is all equal and somehow that works for everybody. No. There are going to be more successful and less successful players commercially. There are going to be more successful and less successful players in terms of what their ratings are, etc. But ultimately all of us will be moving in a more unified direction, and one that protects the thing that I think all of us are most motivated by, which is academic integrity and which is, I think, under fire right now if we are not very, very careful with what usage analytics does for us in the future.

So on that very positive end note, I'm going to go ahead and transition and say that these are the people that have been working on this proposal with me, and again I'm going to say that it is still in

the vetting stages right now. Don't be afraid—if you'd like to see it—to reach out to any one of us and ask. Over the course of the next couple of weeks we will be rolling it out further and really testing this to see if it is something that we can make fly. So, I am truly grateful for your attention.

I had to rush through so many things. This is so painful. I would have loved to talk to you guys for an hour, but I don't think that that was what the conference organizers meant. So, I will stop talking now and hear from you.