# Governing Structure models for a digital repositories system

## I. Purpose of Digital Repositories Steering Committee:

* *Assumption I: Steering committee goal is to establish necessary guidelines and priorities for creating a sustainable repository system and suite of services; implement these services, and then manage and enhance them.*

 *Creating a sustainable repository requires*

1. *Identifying and establishing consistent and ongoing funding/revenue sources and models*
2. *Adherence to international standards / best practices*
3. *Development and management of user-needed platforms*
4. *Development and management of user-needed services*
5. *Development of policies to mitigate risk (structural, physical, legal, information, etc.)*
* *Assumption II: Steering committee will focus on both developing and implementing platforms and services for institutional repositories and digital collections, with immediate focus on IR and digital collections next;*
* *Assumption III: Steering committee will report to COLD Executive Committee, while including representatives from across the CSU, and members of the Community of Practice. Overall size and composition TBD.*
* *[Other assumptions ??]*

## II. Selected membership model types:

* Washington Research Library Consortium (WRLC): non-profit organization; equal-partners membership model;
* Texas Digital Library (TDL): tiered pay-in membership model controlled centrally with 7 person governing board and 22-member member board;
* California Digital Library (CDL): free membership model to UC campuses; central funding independent of library budgets; grant funded;
* Mountain Scholar: Pay two-state membership model controlled by libraries

### a. Washington Research Library Consortium (WRLC)

**Model Type:**

A non-profit corporation with director; an equal-partners model with shared/distributed costs;

**Overall Structure:**

Repository steering committee consisting of advisory committees, task forces, and interest groups reporting to Library directors.

***Potential CSU model:***

A three-tiered structure that comprises COLD, the steering committee, and the existing communities of practice in ScholarWorks (including IGs, and ScholarWorks Advisory group). *See appendix for a more detailed model.*

**CSU Steering committee make-up:**

* Option 1: Every participating campus has a member on the board. Equal members. Equal say.
* Option 2: a few campuses have representation that rotates each year; representative of campus sizes by FTE;

*Steering committee goal: establish necessary guidelines and priorities for creating a sustainable repository system and suite of services.*

**Other groups:**

* Advisory groups: (STIM / ScholComm) provide input at the request of the Steering Committee – especially related to CSU policy and specific expertise (i.e. copyright; handles; OA policy making; etc.);
* Task forces: meet specific short-term goals: i.e. code sprint; draft a repository mission statement; etc.
* Interest groups provide specific findings and investigate goals specified by steering committee; work in coordination with task forces; longer-term and ongoing issues;

### b. Texas Digital Library (TDL)

**Model type:**

Tiered membership model; member-funded

**Overall structure:**

The TDL membership is represented by a Member Board, which includes the administrative head of each Regular Member (plus a representative administrative head for each Consortia Member). The Member Board meets yearly in the fall to discuss issues of concern to the membership and to elect at-large members of the Governing Board. The TDL Governing Board provides strategic direction for the Texas Digital Library and is comprised of library deans and directors from seven TDL institutions. The founding ARL members of TDL serve as ex officio members of the Governing Board. The remaining three members are elected at-large from within the regular membership. In addition, two members of the TDL staff sit on the Governing Board as ex officio, non-voting members.

Each institution involved with the TDL pays for services based on the Carnegie designation of its campus. The tiered model is as follows:

***Potential CSU model:***

Consortial members could pay-in certain amounts to support specific projects and services – based on FTE or Library budget; money is used to fund certain ongoing projects/support for projects/etc. Steering committee would oversee memberships and implement tiered pricing;

**CSU Steering committee make up:**

* Option 1: every paying member has equal representation on the Member board; vote to elect at-large members of governing board;
* Option 2: a few campuses have representation that rotates each year; representative of campus sizes by FTE; vote to elect at-large members of governing board;

*Steering committee goal: establish necessary guidelines and priorities for creating a sustainable repository system and suite of services.*

**Other groups:**

* Advisory groups: (STIM / ScholComm) provide input at the request of the Steering Committee – especially related to CSU policy and specific expertise (i.e. copyright; handles; OA policy making; etc.);
* Task forces: meet specific short-term goals: i.e. code sprint; draft a repository mission statement; etc.
* Interest groups provide specific findings and investigate goals specified by steering committee; work in coordination with task forces; longer-term and ongoing issues;

### c. California Digital Library (CDL)

**Model Type:**

Central and grant-funded; free to mandated members service model

 **Overall structure:**

*[NOTE: Includes a much wider group of stakeholders than currently exists for CSU repositories.]*

The CDL's primary advisory body is the *Systemwide Library and Scholarly Information Advisory Committee (SLASIAC)*. It was established to advise the University on issues such as system-wide library policies and priorities, long term planning for the UC libraries, and strategies for enhancing the discovery, use and preservation of research and scholarship.  SLASIAC's members represent ***the faculty senate, information and educational technology, university libraries, and scholarly publishing.***

The CDL coordinates with the Vice Provost of Academic Planning, Programs, and Coordination and the University Librarians on system-wide library planning activities. Representative groups for the UC libraries also advise the CDL on system-wide initiatives.

25 UC representative groups directly advise the CDL and university system libraries in specific domains. In addition, most CDL programs and services have liaison groups that assist with system-wide communication and operations. More details here: [CDL Committees and Groups](https://www.cdlib.org/groups/).

CDL has *“saved the University millions of dollars by facilitating the co-investment and sharing of materials and services used by libraries across the UC system. We work in partnership with campuses to bring the treasures of our libraries, museums, and cultural heritage organizations to the world. And we continue to explore how services such as digital curation, scholarly publishing, archiving and preservation support research throughout the information lifecycle.”*

***Potential CSU model:***

Independent board and direct funding from both CSU system and grant funds. The advisory body/steering committee, would be wider in membership than library faculty, staff or administrators. It would include those in the CSU Statewide Faculty Senate, information and educational technology, libraries, and those related to scholarly publishing (i.e. journal and press editors, etc.).

**CSU Steering committee make up:**

* Option 1: every participating member campus has equal representation on the advisory/steering committee; vote to elect at-large members of governing board, among all CSU Faculty Senate members as well as IT and ET, libraries, and scholarly publishing.
* Option 2: a few campuses have representation that rotates each year; representative of campus sizes by FTE; vote to elect at-large members of governing board, among all CSU Faculty senate members as well as IT/ET, libraries, and scholarly publishing.

**Other groups:**

* CSU Statewide faculty senate standing committees
* CSU campus Provosts and upper administrators
* Advisory groups: (STIM / ScholComm) provide input at the request of the Steering Committee – especially related to CSU policy and specific expertise (i.e. copyright; handles; OA policy making; etc.);
* Task forces: meet specific short-term goals: i.e. code sprint; draft a repository mission statement; etc.
* Interest groups provide specific findings and investigate goals specified by steering committee; work in coordination with task forces; longer-term and ongoing issues;

### d. Mountain Scholar

**Model Type:**

Paid membership model. The repository is also supported by each participating institution **paying $8,000** annually, which would amount to approximately **$72,000/year**. Also, includes a limited-time, NSF funded grant.

 **Overall structure:**

Mountain Scholar includes **nine** public colleges and universities located in both Colorado and Wyoming. All are employees of Colorado State University, which is also the holder of NSF grant for the Rocky Mountain Advanced Computing Consortium. CSU is currently covering much of the infrastructure and has taken the primary lead in terms of providing the base service for the consortium.

***Potential CSU model:***

Model would include all campuses, but each pay an equal yearly fee to support the repository. Instead of one campus, the CO would take the primary lead in providing the base service for the consortium. (It should be pointed out that it is likely not feasible for one campus to take the lead in the CSU system to provide base repository service). However, the takeaway may be that equal yearly fees per campus can help support the repository.

**CSU Steering committee make up:**

* Option 1: every paying member has equal representation on the Member board; vote to elect at-large members of governing board;
* Option 2: a few campuses have representation that rotates each year; representative of campus sizes by FTE; vote to elect at-large members of governing board;

*Steering committee goal: establish necessary guidelines and priorities for creating a sustainable repository system and suite of services.*

**Other groups:**

* Advisory groups: (STIM / ScholComm) provide input at the request of the Steering Committee – especially related to CSU policy and specific expertise (i.e. copyright; handles; OA policy making; etc.);
* Task forces: meet specific short-term goals: i.e. code sprint; draft a repository mission statement; etc.
* Interest groups provide specific findings and investigate goals specified by steering committee; work in coordination with task forces; longer-term and ongoing issues;

## III. Takeaways:

The various models don’t have to be taken on “as-is”. Each can be adjusted or even mixed together to meet the CSU system’s current needs. For example, Mountain Scholar has a single instance of DSpace used for 9 institutions, with one university taking the lead and securing grant funding. Their pay-in membership model could be emulated by the CSU system if the CO takes on that central role instead of a campus. Each member campus would pay in with an equal but reasonable amount. The TDL model has a slightly different approach that may provide a clearer reality for the CSU. Since every campus in the system is of different size, budget and orientation, a pricing model based on FTE might be a more realistic way to have campuses directly support the repository and its services. CDL’s approach would require a much larger governing body, including not only librarians and library administrators but also educators, statewide faculty senate members, publishers and press. This may be more difficult or less desirable to emulate, despite the clear success the model provides. Finally the WRLC model allows the CSU campuses to keep participating as equal members, but does not require membership buy-in. It may be the most feasible to implement in the short-to-medium-term, but does not solve the main intertwined issues of funding and staffing.

# Appendix: WRLC-based model for CSU:

ScholarWorks Governance Structure

Draft, March 26, 2019

1. Three-tiered Structure
	1. COLD Executive Committee
	2. ScholarWorks Steering Committee; *STIM & ScholCom (Advisory)*
	3. ScholarWorks Working Groups
2. Membership
	1. ScholarWorks Steering Committee
		1. Chair (COLD member)
		2. Vice-Chair (COLD member)
		3. Chairs of SW Working Groups (communities of practice and interest groups)
		4. ScholCom and STIM representatives
		5. At-large members from CSU libraries
		6. Director, Systemwide Digital Library Services (CO) – ex-officio
		7. Project manager (CO) – ex-officio
	2. ScholarWorks Working Groups (drawn from existing communities of practice and interest groups)
		1. Publishing
		2. Metadata
		3. Faculty Profiles
		4. Digital Archives
		5. Best Practices/Trusted Repository