

Looking Back to the Future

Models for a Coalition for Library and Information Science Research

Prepared by: Barbara Buckley Owen

For: The British Library

18 June 2007

1. Executive Summary

- 1.1 A workshop was held in November 2006 at the British Library to commemorate Brian Perry and to establish priorities for library and information science research. The outcome of the workshop suggested that there was a need for a real or virtual structure to enable the organisation, co-ordination and implementation of strategic LIS research and a coalition approach was strongly favoured.
- 1.2 This study was commissioned to develop at least three models for a potential coalition, drawing on current schemes both in the UK and overseas. Seven models were analysed in some detail and four others were also considered for any useful lessons.
- 1.3 Issues to consider when developing a coalition: the key members; the need for champions within member organisations; a wide membership base; sustainability over the long-term; centralisation *versus* decentralisation; openness in sharing benefits; funding; and what success should look like.
- 1.4 Using the results of the analysis, three models have been drawn up and two others were rejected. The preferred model, Model 1, has a core membership of key members but with associate members to draw in the wider profession. It is a mixture of a real and a virtual organisation. Model 2 limits the membership to the key players but with an onus on them to share results. Model 3 is a compromise with a central champion to make things happen but also a membership.
- 1.5 It is recommended that a business plan be developed aimed at the Arts and Humanities Research Council to try to secure pump-priming funding for the necessary consultation on, and setting up of, an embryonic coalition.

2. Background

- 2.1 The workshop *Looking Back to the Future: Research Agendas for Library and Information Science* was held on 27 November 2006 at the British Library to commemorate the work of Brian Perry, former Director of the British Library Research and Development Department (BLR&DD), as well as the research stimulated by the BLR&DD and the Library and Information Commission (LIC).
- 2.2 As well as looking back, the workshop was designed to establish priorities for library and information science (LIS) research. The outcome of the workshop suggested that there was a need for a real or virtual structure to enable the organisation, co-ordination and implementation of strategic LIS research. A coalition approach was strongly favoured by the workshop participants, rather than setting up a new organisation. This coalition would be of relevant partners and stakeholders and authority would come from its membership.
- 2.3 The **aim** of such a coalition would be to ensure that the library and information sector had the evidence, tools and skills it needed by maximising the potential value obtained from research.

2.4 The **strategy** for achieving this has been identified as:

- articulating a strategic and planned approach to LIS research
- identifying appropriate research content
- encouraging the development of research capacity
- promoting practitioner research and the translation of research into practice
- ensuring the maximum return from the research funding available and leveraging more funding for research
- encouraging synergy between funders at the planning stage
- ensuring the inclusion of each sector of LIS activity.

2.5 Potential **activities** would include:

- consulting on and finalising the national research agenda
- recognising and valuing different types of research
- horizon scanning
- bringing together cognate research
- information exchange
- acting as an ideas forum
- promotion of best practice
- setting of quality guidelines
- developing mechanisms such as observatories, town meetings, networks of excellence to improve dissemination, enhance quality and ensure good co-ordination
- establishing processes for continuity and sustainability
- being a partner finding/dating agency
- promotion of the development of skills and competencies
- influencing employers
- supporting professional doctorates by professional practice.

2.6 **Key outputs** would include:

- a Manifesto setting out aspirations, objectives which should demonstrate links between existing strategic research and government agendas but also set out its own agenda
- a roadmap to show how it would achieve its objectives
- the 'Cream of Information Science' showcase of best practice and the facilitation of existing research information exchange.

3. The Brief

3.1 The British Library, on behalf of the organising committee, has commissioned this small study to develop three or more potential models for a coalition and make recommendations on the most suitable structure in the current UK climate. The models would be drawn from an analysis of current schemes in the UK and overseas.

4. Methodology

4.1 The workshop participants and the organising committee identified various existing organisations, both from within the UK and overseas, which might offer blueprints for a new research coalition. Internet searches provided significant information on the purpose, structure, activities and funding of these organisations. This was analysed

in terms of suitability, strengths and weaknesses in relation to the aims of the new coalition. In addition, further searches were undertaken, including on the LISA database, to identify any other organisations, not necessarily in the LIS arena. These were analysed in as far as they also threw up useful ideas.

- 4.2 Elements considered in the analysis were: purpose of the scheme; membership; the geographic area covered; funding; governance and staffing; dissemination; support for the research agenda; events and other activities; measures of success; and lessons for the research coalition. The results were also informed by personal experience of working for and with co-operative organisations in the library and statistics environments.
- 4.3 The analysis suggested three different models, although Model 2 might lead to Model 1 as the coalition became established and funding more secure. Two other models were rejected as being too far from the workshop's preferences or impractical with the large potential membership.

5. Analysis of existing schemes

- 5.1 Seven schemes were analysed in detail to assess what could be adopted by a coalition for research in the UK. Information that could be gleaned from their websites in the time available is given below. Further organisations were also considered for any other useful lessons.

5.2 Key schemes

5.2.1 Digital Preservation Coalition (DPC)

<http://www.dpconline.org/graphics/index.html>

Purpose: to foster joint action to address the urgent challenges of securing the preservation of digital resources in the UK and to work with others internationally to secure our global digital memory and knowledge base.

Membership: open to all sectors including commercial, cultural heritage, educational, central and local government, and research. Members must be collective or not for profit organisations which can subscribe to the public mission, goals and principles of the DPC but other organisations can participate in alliances and sponsorship. Membership is also open to other 'membership organisations' with UK members but rights and benefits of membership only extend to the staff and officers of those organisations, and do not flow through to their own members. There are two main tiers of membership, full and associate. Full members (half the membership) must be able to make a major strategic contribution to the DPC and have an international and/or national role in digital preservation.

Area covered: UK/Irish membership but Library of Congress programme and National Library of Australia affiliated.

Funding: member subscriptions plus support from JISC for the secretariat.

Governance and staffing: a not for profit company limited by guarantee. The business of the DPC is managed by a Board of Directors made up of full members.

An Advisory Council acts as a forum for circulation and sharing of information, supporting the activities of the DPC, and advising the Board and Secretariat on programme development in key areas. The Council is comprised of experts and representatives from the staff and officers of full and associate members and, by invitation of the Board, of other external individuals and representatives. It exists primarily as an email list/listserv. Executive and administrative support to establish the DPC and its Secretariat has been provided by JISC.

Dissemination: website has public and member-only sections; email list/listserv; membership involvement in working groups and projects.

Research support: research community not specifically targeted but would benefit from preservation of digital materials for research; details of members' preservation projects on the website.

Events: forums and meetings.

Other activities: commissioning reports; digital preservation training; making recommendations for action and responsibility; advocacy campaign to raise awareness of the issues in the media; digital newsletter quarterly with a summary of digital preservation activity.

Measures of success: increased membership; increased media coverage of the issues; increase in digital preservation projects; take-up of training courses and events; progress with recommendations of the *Mind the Gap* report; results of surveys show an improvement in the preservation of digital materials.

Lessons for the research coalition: significant buy-in and commitment from the key players but also flexible enough to accommodate a wide range of other stakeholders across the sectors, including from overseas. Whilst the number of full members remains fairly small, the running of the Board of Directors should be efficient. Communicating with the wider membership by email list/listserv should work well as long as the secretariat have sufficient resources to maintain and manage it. The number of regular reports and level of information available through the public website provides a valuable resource for the membership and the wider community. Having a members only section to the website facilitates internal communication without the need to meet, so less bureaucratic.

5.2.2 JISC Strategic e-Content Alliance

http://www.jisc.ac.uk/aboutus/committees/working_groups/strategic_econtent_alliance.aspx

Purpose: to build a common information environment where users of publicly funded e-content can gain best value from the investment that has been made by reducing the barriers that currently inhibit access, use and re-use of e-content.

Membership: 7 sponsors: The British Library, BBC, British Education Communications and Technologies Agency (Becta), UK e-Science Core programme, JISC, Museums, Libraries and Archives Council (MLA), NHS National Electronic Library for Health (NeLH).

Area covered: UK but mindful of international stakeholders.

Funding: JISC Capitol Programme funding until 2009.

Governance and staffing: Working Group reporting to JISC Content Services Committee. Chair (from MLA) plus 11 members from sponsors. No dedicated staff (assumed).

Dissemination: website; reports published by JISC.

Research support: research community not specifically targeted but would benefit from development of a common information environment.

Events: not specified.

Other activities: commissions research to support development of a common information environment.

Measures of success: e-Content Framework producing benefits in strategic statement.

Lessons for the research coalition: Key players involved, with some central funding, but (assumed) no dedicated staff, for whom it would be their top priority. May be suitable model in the short term to get things moving but would benefit from dedicated support. Would need wider buy-in across practitioners, researchers and policy-makers in the long term.

5.2.3 Coalition for Networked Information (CNI)

<http://www.cni.org/organization.html>

Purpose: supporting the transformative promise of networked information technology for the advancement of scholarly communication and the enrichment of intellectual productivity.

Membership: 225 members from: higher education, publishing, network and telecommunications, information technology, libraries and library organisations. Most library members are in the public sector, predominately universities.

Area covered: USA-based, with some overseas membership, including the British Library.

Funding: annual membership fee of \$6,400 plus, (assumed) funding from the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) and EDUCAUSE.

Governance and staffing: sponsored by ARL and EDUCAUSE who appear to drive the coalition. The Steering Committee is made up of representatives from these two bodies plus their nominees from the membership. 6 employees.

Dissemination: website; electronic forums and RSS feed to which anyone can subscribe.

Research support: own programme of initiatives in line with its strategic plan which benefits the research community.

Events: task force meetings for members twice a year; co-sponsors workshops and conferences.

Other activities: works collaboratively with US and foreign organisations in advocacy and standards; advice to members.

Measures of success: number of members; events held/sponsored, publications, projects undertaken.

Lessons for the research coalition: The two sponsors are driving the work forward and they have managed to attract a good range of members, including from abroad. It is not clear from initial research to what extent the wider membership has a say in the direction of the organisation, although dissemination seems to be good and regular events are held for the members to bring them up to date on results. Too centralised for the UK although much good work done – we need a greater sense of shared ownership to achieve the goals set out in the workshop.

5.2.4 **Research Information Network (RIN)**

<http://www.rin.ac.uk/>

Purpose: to lead and co-ordinate the provision of research information in the UK. Its ambition is to serve the research community by helping to cut paths through the ever-growing and increasingly-complex mass of information that underpins the work of all researchers.

Membership: 14 sponsors: 4 higher education funding bodies, 7 research councils & 3 national libraries.

Area covered: UK

Funding: £3m for 3 years from sponsors.

Governance and staffing: Funders' Group provides accountability to sponsors; Advisory Board, appointed by the Funders' Group, provides the strategic direction within the overall framework of objectives and budgets set by the Funders' Group – 16 members from various sectors. 5 executive staff based at the British Library.

Dissemination: website; RSS feed; consultative groups.

Research support: created to develop, prioritise and lead a UK-wide strategy for provision of research information.

Events: workshops.

Other activities: projects to take forward the strategic objectives.

Measures of success: from Strategic Plan: first, to deliver – in partnership with key stakeholders – a programme of work that will make a visible difference to the research and the information communities; second, to secure a recognised place in those communities as a leader and co-ordinator of strategy and activity; and third, to gain acceptance as an authoritative voice in speaking to and on behalf of those communities.

Lessons for the research coalition: significant buy-in and funding from policy-makers in the short-term which should enable significant improvement in the provision of support to researchers. However, centrally driven and higher education only – the

envisaged range of interested parties for the research coalition is far more complex and the structure will need to reflect this. Members of the Advisory Board are individuals appointed by the funders; they do not appear to be bringing their own organisations to the table as participants in the work of the Network.

5.2.5 German Library Development Agency (BEA)

http://www.bertelsmann-stiftung.de/bst/en/media/xcms_bst_dms_15629_15630_2.pdf

Purpose: organisation proposed in 2004 in Germany to give central direction to innovation and quality assurance for countrywide library development.

Membership: no 'membership' as such but would work in collaboration with partners in LIS.

Area covered: Germany.

Funding: proposed independent not for profit foundation.

Governance and staffing: not yet clear.

Dissemination: envisaged that results would be cascaded through partner organisations.

Research support: would invite tenders for projects from small (ie libraries) as well as large organisations; would disseminate results and good practice.

Other activities: policy, planning and advocacy for German libraries.

Measures of success: increase in spend per head on German library materials – the low level was one of the spurs for the proposals.

Lessons for the research coalition: if developed, probably akin to the Library and Information Commission; the organisation would have considerable support from central government and a role to foster planning and co-operation across the country. With central funding it may be able to achieve a certain amount but it wouldn't be 'owned' by a wider membership – a key requirement emerging from the workshop.

5.2.6 Royal School of Library and Information Science, Denmark

<http://www.db.dk/english/>

Purpose: there doesn't seem to be a specific scheme but since the 2000 Danish Library Act the Library School has been encouraged to take a lead in co-operative activities and especially training.

Membership: no membership as such but works collaboratively with libraries around Denmark.

Area covered: Denmark but participates in international discussions on research.

Funding: assumed from core government funding as part of the library school's work.

Governance and staffing: co-operative activity run by library school staff.

Dissemination: through discussion forums and training courses.

Research support: develops the quality of, and co-ordinates, researcher education from a Nordic and international perspective. Commitment to improve communication of research results.

Events: first international conference held 2006.

Other activities: staff of the library school provide training courses, research and consultancy.

Measures of success: increase in take-up of courses, range of collaborative activities with partner libraries, increase in research and consultancy commissioned.

Lessons for the research coalition: again, a central body would be making the running. It is not clear from the website what the role is in relation to co-ordinating research across the country. The concept of the library school both providing short courses for practicing librarians and integrating courses provided by other organisations into its students' training might be worth pursuing with library schools in the UK to bridge the gap between academics and practitioners.

5.2.7 Library and Information Co-operation Council (LINC)

Purpose: no longer in operation, but set up to facilitate and encourage co-operation between library and information services at a time when competition rather than co-operation was the norm.

Membership: founder members were the regional library services; affiliate members were themselves membership bodies with an interest in library co-operation.

Area covered: UK

Funding: significant financial support from the British Library in addition to subscriptions from members. Founder members paid considerably more, enabling small organisations to be able to afford affiliate status.

Governance and staffing: Council of member representatives, founder members having more places. Management committee of 5 including a part-time executive secretary managed the day-to-day business.

Dissemination: LINC newsletter and cascading down through membership.

Research support: encouraged practitioner research in support of its aims, obtaining British Library funding.

Events: conferences.

Other activities: commissioned research, both practical and strategic.

Measures of success: library co-operatives increased in number and scope of operation. Many ideas for co-operation were ahead of their time and are now more acceptable with the change in climate from competition to co-operation.

Lessons for the research coalition: very much owned and run by its members, it was able to be quite influential, for example in promoting the need of a body which became the Library and Information Commission. Accommodated a wide range of members. The very small secretariat kept things on track but the members of the Management Committee, in particular, put in considerable effort – a good balance was struck. British Library funding proved invaluable as members were mostly small, poorly funded organisations which didn't have the capacity for providing significant funding or other support.

5.3 Other schemes considered

5.3.1 Corporation for National Research Initiatives (CNRI)

http://www.cnri.reston.va.us/about_cnri.html

Purpose: a not for profit organisation formed in 1986 to foster research and development for the National Information Infrastructure. Among CNRI's major goals is a programme of research to identify and nurture infrastructural technologies and services that will unlock the potential of information and knowledge along with technology itself.

Area covered: USA

Governance and staffing: 4 officers and 6 other directors. Staffing unclear.

Research support: [D-Lib](#) is a forum for researchers and developers of advanced digital libraries. [D-Lib Magazine](#) provides monthly stories, commentary, and briefings, together with a collection of resources for digital library research.

Lessons for the research coalition: has managed to achieve much through partnerships with other organisations but too centralised an approach for the coalition.

5.3.2 London Libraries Development Agency

<http://www.llda.org.uk/cms/contentpage/home>

Purpose: to develop and implement a co-ordinated strategic vision for library and information services across London.

Membership: a membership organisation working towards joint venture status. Membership includes the 33 London Boroughs and the City of London, the M25 Consortium of Academic Libraries, the British Library and London Health Libraries.

Area covered: London

Funding: Subscriptions from members

Governance and staffing: executive committee is made up of representatives from the key stakeholder groups that the LLDA serves. The committee's role is to guide and define the strategy of the agency, overseeing production of our work plan and the realisation of our commitments. 4 staff.

Lessons for the research coalition: whilst starting with a local authority focus, it has managed to build partnerships with academic and health libraries, amongst others. Executive committee includes councillors from London boroughs – the funders and policy-makers. Has succeeded in bringing in considerable extra funding for the sector in London. Many activities are similar to proposed functions for the coalition.

5.3.3 Centre for Voluntary Sector Research & Development (CVSRD)

<http://www.cvsrd.org/eng/index.html>

Purpose: promotes and undertakes collaborative research and learning on governance, management, policy, and emerging issues in the voluntary sector in Canada. Acting as a catalyst and convener, and linking research to practice, the Centre seeks to enhance understanding knowledge of the distinctive contributions of the voluntary sector; promote a broader knowledge of, and response to, the priorities and issues of the sector; strengthen the capacity of voluntary organizations and the sector as a whole; and encourage closer co-operation between the research community and the sector.

Membership: has a Council drawn from Carleton and Ottawa Universities as well as representatives from the voluntary sector

Lessons for the research coalition: undertakes many of the same types of activity envisaged for the coalition but in the voluntary sector. Does not seem to be a membership body as such but works in partnership with many organisations and is particularly concerned to bring together researchers and practitioners.

5.3.4 Consortium of Research Libraries in the British Isles (CURL)

<http://www.curl.ac.uk/>

Purpose: to increase the ability of research libraries to share resources for the benefit of the local, national and international research community.

Membership: Major academic research libraries in the UK.

Lessons for the research coalition: many projects undertaken and completed to improve support for researchers, showing what can be done with strong commitment and support from the member organisations. A clear common focus with a narrow membership must make it easier to make progress – the research coalition will be much more diverse and fragmented.

6. Proposals for a new Coalition for Library and Information Science Research

6.1 Principles underlying the proposals

6.1.1 **Membership:** Membership would be for institutions not individuals. All involved in the library and information sector should want to have a stake in developing the research base and identifying its own needs for research. In practice, however, there will be a small number of key organisations that will need to drive the initiatives forward.

Aspects of the work of the coalition would be central to their own goals and they each have valuable expertise, resources and contacts to bring to the coalition:

- *British Library*: expertise in co-operative library and information programmes; holds the library and information science national collection of materials (formerly the Library Association Library); expertise in developing databases of resources; already a partner in key relevant organisations and projects in UK and internationally eg: Research Information Network, Coalition for Networked Information, Digital Preservation Coalition, JISC Strategic e-Content Alliance, Digital Repository Infrastructure Vision for European Research (DRIVER).
- *CILIP*: represents a wide membership across the sector; already has dissemination mechanisms in place with its online community, web search services and printed journals *Gazette* and */Update*; expertise in professional development, including provision of its own training courses and accreditation of university courses, so in a good position to encourage the research skills of practitioners; international contacts through IFLA and EBLIDA.
- Within *CILIP*, the *Library and Information Research Group (LIRG)* aims to raise awareness of information research by: increasing its profile and influencing its direction; promoting the dissemination of sound research methodology and results; assisting in the development of emerging researchers; and enabling networking between researchers. It encourages practitioner-based research by creating opportunities for research activity and dissemination through presentation, awards and publications.
- *MLA Partnership*: already has role in identifying sources of funding and encouraging their take-up; role in workforce development and setting standards; primarily public sector focus but with useful links to government and other policy-makers; with regional structure, has good links to organisations across England; expertise in EU research initiatives and JISC e-Content Strategic Alliance.
- *Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC)*: its strategic aims are closely aligned with the aims of the proposed coalition. These include:
 - to support and promote the pursuit of high-quality and innovative research
 - to enhance the research infrastructure, and leadership, management and key skills for arts and humanities research
 - to promote, support and enhance high-quality postgraduate research and training
 - to encourage researchers in engaging with the creative, cultural, heritage, and other sectors of society and the economy
 - to represent and promote the interests of arts and humanities research so that its contribution to social, economic, and cultural life is enhanced and more widely appreciated.
- *JISC* is centrally involved in many research initiatives and whilst it primarily supports the academic sector, it does spread its net more widely and would be a valuable partner.

- *BAILER* ought to have the expertise in undertaking research and training researchers but does not appear to be very active at present. Individual departments of information studies may wish to make a contribution but it may be for the coalition to bring them together rather than *BAILER*. On the other hand, the coalition may be a spur to *BAILER* becoming more active.
- 6.1.2 **Champions:** Buy-in at the top level is vital and each core member will need at least one champion to ensure their organisation's commitment to fulfilling its responsibilities, encouraging and enabling staff to participate. They may or may not be the organisation's representative on a governing board but they must have the clout to make things happen. Experience has shown that without this top-level support it is hard for staff to achieve real change and get the necessary activities built into their own organisation's planning.
- 6.1.3 **Wide base of membership:** whatever membership model is adopted, it must be hospitable to organisations at all levels from local to national or even international, and from all sectors. Ideally at least some of the members would have an international focus to enable the consortium to benefit from, and contribute to, international initiatives which could be cascaded down.
- 6.1.4 **Timescale:** the nature of the role envisaged for the consortium suggests an organisation that should work towards long-term sustainability. There will be some activities that are time-limited but there will be an on-going demand for much of the work.
- 6.1.5 **Centralisation/decentralisation:** Whilst member involvement is essential, it can be hard to make significant progress without some level of central support, for example to co-ordinate activities, organise events, manage consultations, and provide administration. Until any funding is secured it may be necessary for one partner, for instance the British Library, to take on this role but it should be the servant, not the master, of the membership. If one partner, or a core secretariat, becomes too dominant, there is a danger that the rest of the membership will leave the work to them. Getting a suitable balance will be important.
- 6.1.6 **Openness:** Results should be for all policy-makers, researchers, practitioners and users of LIS services, not just members. Being involved means members get to have their say about what they want to get out of the coalition but the outcomes should benefit everyone.
- 6.1.7 **Funding:** Some direct or indirect government money for pump-priming should be a goal, with some significant finance from major partners as an earnest of commitment. In order to undertake a wide consultation, for example along the lines of the JISC town meetings, and development of a business plan, considerable staff time will be involved which will need to be paid for. In the longer term, funding from a wider membership will only follow if the benefits of such membership to the individual organisations are clear.
- 6.1.8 **What would success look like:** In drawing up the 'manifesto' for the coalition, it would be helpful to have in mind what success would look like. What is the current situation and what would be different if the coalition achieved its aims? How do you get from here to there?

6.2 Models for a coalition

6.2.1 Model 1: Membership organisation – big players plus

This is the preferred model, drawn largely from the Digital Preservation Coalition (DPC) which seemed to have the most appropriate mix of financial and practical commitment from the key players, together with a wide spectrum of membership and mechanisms for consultation and dissemination.

Funding: it is recommended that initial funding to be sought from AHRC and other key players until a business case is developed for full membership subscription funding. It is envisaged that at least £100,000 would be needed.

Membership: key players to be full members – probably the British Library, CILIP, MLA Partnership, AHRC, plus any others that have promotion of the research agenda as a major element of their activities or strategies. Subscriptions would be at a higher level for full members than for the other, associate, members.

Governing Board: manages the business of the organisation, with representatives from full member organisations. If the coalition becomes a company limited by guarantee in time, this could become a Board of Directors. Having all members represented here would make it too unwieldy.

Advisory Council: to act as a forum for circulation and sharing of information, supporting the activities of the coalition, and advising the board and secretariat on programme development in key areas. All members would have a place on the Advisory Council. The Council would be virtual through email list/listserve but events could be held for the whole membership as occasion demanded.

Secretariat: to provide administration and co-ordinate the work of the coalition, ensuring that everything is done and on time. It would manage: consultations, both face to face and electronic; dissemination, including email list/listserve, a website. Events, and, in time, a database or portal to research resources. Ideally the staff would not just be administrators but would have the expertise and experience to act on behalf of the coalition. Unless or until the organisation had corporate status, the secretariat may need to be on the payroll of one of the full members (perhaps the British Library) for the payment of salary and overheads or be seconded from elsewhere.

Communication: would primarily be through the email list/listserve, RSS feed and website but members would be encouraged to cascade throughout their own organisations. Regular events to bring the membership face to face would keep the profile high, help members to feel involved and stimulate further action and partnerships. A database of or portal to research activity in the longer term would be invaluable but considerable time and cost would be involved.

6.2.2 Model 2: Partnership of big players

This model is similar to Model1 but would concentrate on the big players and disseminate results for general benefit. The JISC Strategic e-Content Alliance and the Research Information Network have the most in common with this model. The model has the benefit of concentrating on a tight group of key players that could focus to achieve results; the governance structure would be straightforward and relatively

unbureaucratic. However there wouldn't be the same sense of ownership by the profession and getting roll-out to practitioners may be more difficult to achieve.

Funding: it is recommended that initial funding to be sought from AHRC as well as the other key players as the work of the coalition would be core to its strategic aims. It is envisaged that at least £100,000 would be needed.

Membership: the British Library, CILIP, MLA Partnership, AHRC, National Library of Scotland and National Library of Wales, SLIC, CYMAL. LISC NI and possibly JISC.

Governing Board: representatives from the membership.

Secretariat: as for Model 1. It is recommended that there is significant secretariat input as representatives from the member institutions will still have day jobs that will limit the time they can devote to the coalition.

Communication: as for Model 1 but the members and secretariat will have to put in considerable extra effort to communicate the work of the coalition to, and consult with, non-members.

6.2.3 Model 3: Champion plus

This model is a compromise of Models 1 and 2. It concentrates management of the coalition in the hands of a champion but other organisations would be invited to become members. This is the least favoured model and most closely aligned with the Coalition for Network Information in the USA plus elements of the JISC Strategic e-Content Alliance. There would be a clear focus for the work as well as a strong commitment from the champion to make things happen. This would be the least bureaucratic option and might be a positive move in the short term if the British Library, say, was willing to take on this role. However if the organisation was perceived as being too much the baby of the champion, involvement across the sector might be limited, especially amongst practitioners. There is a danger that the secretariat could become too dominant. The membership needs to 'own' the organisation, not a champion.

Funding: would seek central government funding to supplement the champion's own funding – possibly given in kind through the provision of a secretariat. Subscriptions from the membership would provide financial support in time as this was built up.

Membership: membership would be widely drawn, as per Model 1, but they wouldn't have a seat on a governing board. They would be recipients of services rather than the drivers.

Governing Board: representatives from the champion and possibly and other core funders such as AHRC.

Secretariat: functions much as Model 1. Would probably be on the payroll of the champion, perhaps seconded from other posts.

Communication: as for Model 1.

6.2.4 Other models

Two other models were rejected:

- A membership body where all members have representation on the governing council with elected officers, akin to the Library and Information Co-operation Council. Too many players ought to want to be involved, which would make this unwieldy, if democratic. However, if it was decided to go for a smaller membership, this could be considered as being similar to Model 1 but with a single Council.
- A central government funded body along the lines of the Library and Information Commission. The will of the workshop seemed to be for a coalition of existing organisations and the government would be unlikely to fund a separate organisation when it is already funding the MLA.

7. Next steps

7.1 Name: Suggestion for a name to help develop a 'brand': **CLAISR – Coalition for Library And Information Science Research** – to avoid confusion with the various short acronyms with LIS or LIR eg LIRG/LIRN/LISC/LISU. Another, frivolous but more memorable, suggestion: **ReCLIS – Research Coalition for Library and Information Science**.

7.2 Business plan: As suggested at the workshop, the key players need to develop a clearer statement of the aims and objectives for the coalition, the benefits that will accrue to the various stakeholders – policy-makers, researchers and practitioners, as well as the possible models for such a body. It is recommended that this should be developed into a business plan aimed at the Arts and Humanities Research Council to try to secure pump-priming funding for the necessary consultation on, and setting up of, an embryonic coalition. There is precedence for this: the Economic and Social Research Council provided £70,000 over two years to the Royal Statistical Society to set up a Statistics Users Forum. This provides a mechanism for user groups to share their experience and develop a consensus on what needs to be improved, influencing producers of statistics and policy-makers. This would be akin to providing a forum to bring together LIS practitioners, researchers and policy-makers for mutual benefit.

7.3 Potential members and other stakeholders:

- The British Library
- CILIP (including LIRG)
- MLA + the 9 regional partners
- AHRC
- ESRC
- other research councils
- National Library of Scotland
- National Library of Wales
- SLIC
- CYMAL
- LISCNI
- JISC
- BAILER
- departments of information studies
- research centres
- Research Information Network

- CURL
- Society of Chief Librarians
- SOLACE
- SOCITIM
- London Libraries Development Agency
- M25 Consortium
- Department for Culture Media and Sport
- Department for Education and Skills
- Department of Trade and Industry
- National Health Service
- National Electronic Library for Health
- National Archives
- SCONUL
- BIALL
- AIOPI
- CoLRIC
- Special Libraries Association
- School Libraries Association
- IAML
- ARLIS
- City Information Group
- Employer organisations eg CBI
- Lifelong Learning UK
- Hatrics and other local library co-operatives
- TFPL
- Consultancies eg Tribal and Information Management Associates