



OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

April 11, 2017

Board of Trustees
c/o The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation
Scholarly Communications Program
140 East 62nd Street
New York, NY 10065

Dear Board of Trustees Members:

As President of West Virginia University, I am delighted to endorse Dr. Cheryl Ball's submission of *Many Voices: Building a Consortium of Small Scholarly Societies in the Humanities* to the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation's Scholarly Communications Program. I understand that the proposed project, if funded, will be a collaboration led by and housed at West Virginia University.

West Virginia University is proud to be a 21st century land-grant institution. We are deeply committed to providing the highest caliber teaching, research and engagement, both in our state and in the global community. We are also the flagship research university of West Virginia, classified by the Carnegie Foundation as an R1 (highest research activity) institution. We currently attract more than \$174 million in externally funded projects annually.

Dr. Cheryl Ball exemplifies the kind of extraordinary faculty whom West Virginia University is proud to support. She is a leading figure in digital media and digital publishing both nationally and internationally. Dr. Ball has presented her research all across the United States and across Europe. In addition to a \$1 million grant from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, awarded in 2015, she has been awarded a Fulbright grant (2013) and several grants from the National Endowment for the Humanities, including one for \$220,000 in 2016.

The project that Dr. Ball proposes clearly fits with West Virginia University's land grant mission of outreach, as it has the potential to impact scholarly societies across the country. This leadership of the project, which I am confident that Dr. Ball can undertake, will fit with her ongoing roles in both the Department of English and the West Virginia University Libraries' Digital Publishing Institute. *Many Voices* is a natural extension of Dr. Ball's current work and of her external role as Executive Director of the Council of Editors of Learned Journals.

I endorse Dr. Ball's submission of *Many Voices: Building a Consortium of Small Scholarly Societies in the Humanities* to the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation's Scholarly Communications Program with my highest recommendation and I look forward to your favorable review of the project.

Sincerely,

E. Gordon Gee



April 11, 2017

Dear Patricia Hswe:

I am writing as principal investigator to present you the final planning proposal for "Many Voices: Building a Consortium of Small Scholarly Societies in the Humanities," for which we are requesting \$59,500 in funding from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation's Scholarly Communications program.

This project would last one year, starting May 1, 2017. The expected outcome for this planning grant is a report based on survey data of small, scholarly societies to determine whether there is interest in creating a consortium that would consolidate some administrative, financial, technical, and related society tasks so that societies can more solely focus on their scholarly knowledge-making and communicative goals.

West Virginia University understands and will comply with the Mellon Foundation's grant-making policies, as outlined on its website, and the project team understands and will comply as well.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Cheryl Ball".

Cheryl E. Ball
Associate Professor of Digital Publishing Studies

PROPOSAL INFORMATION SHEET
The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation

Organization Information	
Date of Submission:	April 11, 2017
Organization Legal Name <i>(as it appears on your IRS determination letter):</i>	West Virginia University
Also Known As, or Doing Business As <i>(if applicable):</i>	
Organization Legal Address:	West Virginia University 886 Chestnut Ridge Road PO Box 6845 Morgantown, WV 26506-6845 Telephone: 304-293-3998 Fax: 304-293-7435
Secondary Mailing Address <i>(if applicable):</i>	
Fiscal Year End Date:	2018

Proposal Information			
Title or Description:	Many Voices: Building a Consortium of Small, Scholarly Societies in the Humanities		
Requested Amount, USD:	\$59,500		
Requested Amount, local currency <i>(if applicable):</i>			
Requested Amount, exchange rate information <i>(if applicable):</i>	Exchange rate	Date of exchange rate	Source of exchange rate
Grant Start Date:	May 1, 2017		
Grant End Date:	April 30, 2018		

Contact Information				
	Chief Executive Officer/President	Principal Investigator(s)*	Financial Officer*	Grant Management Contact**
Name:	E. Gordon Gee	Cheryl E. Ball	Cynthia L. Roth	James A. Watson
Professional Title:	President	Associate Professor	President – WVU Foundation	Director of Foundation Giving
Email:	Gordon.gee@mail.wvu.edu	chball@mail.wvu.edu	croth@wvuf.org	jwatson@wvuf.org
Phone:	304-293-5531	304-293-9714	304-284-4040	304-284-4093
Fax:	304-293-5883	304-293-5380	304-284-4001	304-284-4001
Mailing Address <i>(if different from above):</i>	PO Box 6201 1500 University Ave. Morgantown, WV 26506-6201	1503 University Ave. West Virginia University Morgantown, WV 26506-6296	One Waterfront Place, 7 th Fl. Morgantown, WV 26507	One Waterfront Place, 7 th Fl. Morgantown, WV 26507

*if different from Chief Executive Officer or President. For grants to Liberal Arts Colleges, the principal investigator is the president or

As of November 1, 2016

Assistant Name <i>(if applicable):</i>				
Assistant Email:				
Assistant Phone:				

*if different from Chief Executive Officer or President. For grants to Liberal Arts Colleges, the principal investigator is the president or

Many Voices:

Building a Consortium of Small Scholarly Societies in the Humanities

Submitted April 11, 2017 to the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation Scholarly Communications Program

Executive Summary

As a collaborative group of faculty, scholarly publishers, and digital scholarship professionals, our 2016 Triangle SCI project team is collectively seeking a 12-month planning grant from the Mellon Foundation in the amount of \$59,500 to explore the possibility of establishing a consortium of small scholarly societies (those with fewer than 1,000 members) in the humanities. The purpose of such a consortium would be to consolidate the recurrent and often time-consuming administrative functions that all scholarly societies face, but that are especially burdensome for small societies with limited or no professional staff. The ultimate aim of such an administrative consortium would be to allow these societies to focus their efforts on core activities and membership benefits—such as publishing a scholarly journal—rather than on the more mundane “business of the business.”

The planning grant will cover 12 months of research and analysis, which will include an in-person meeting involving the project team and stakeholders from a range of small scholarly societies to explore the consortium idea and an online survey of small-society officers based on the in-person discussion to further vet the idea. While the planning grant is meant to move us toward consortium-building, the centralization envisioned would be in service of several larger goals: to help small societies achieve financial stability through greater efficiencies; to support small societies’ efforts to develop scholars and academic leaders in their respective disciplines; and to provide a forum in which small societies can collectively consider potential alternative approaches to traditional publication, including open access.

Project Description

Small scholarly societies—defined for our purposes as those societies with fewer than 1,000 individual members—are places where humanistic inquiry occurs through community building around and research on enduring questions and topics of particular interest to specialists in a subdiscipline or to practitioners of a shared approach. Three such societies are represented by members of our team. The Edith Wharton Society is an example of small societies in the study of literature and of societies that promote the close analysis of the works of individual authors, their impact on literary traditions, and their importance to classroom teaching. The Society for Values in Higher Education fosters the reflection on and study of the moral and political values implicit and explicit in the research and teaching of scholars, particularly those in the humanities. The Council of Editors of Learned Journals (CELJ) explores, among other topics, how in the coming decade the combined publishing efforts of scholarly journal editors might work toward increasing access to research for readers of all of their journals.

Members of all societies seek out scholarly organizations to build networks or to benefit from reduced or free registration at conferences and reduced or free society journal or newsletter subscriptions. What makes a *small* society unique, however, is its tight focus on common issues, disciplinary values, and shared goals designed to create and sustain a community of inquiry and practice. As havens for small groups of scholars, these organizations are the fora in which members of our Triangle SCI group—and many others—entered the profession and in which many of us receive valuable advice and develop professional contacts. Sustained as labors of love, these communities of practice are merely one of the many member benefits small scholarly societies have to offer. Yet inseparable from these tangible and intangible benefits are the associated burdens assumed by small scholarly societies. These burdens are substantial.

The major difficulty that many small scholarly societies face in delivering benefits is tautological: Small societies are small. They generally rely exclusively (or nearly so) on volunteer labor and cannot by themselves afford the kind of expert services (legal, financial, technological) to which larger societies have access. Their smallness can make it difficult to successfully, consistently, and sustainably deliver member benefits—benefits that members typically pay for and have come to expect from any society of which they are members. Large societies—such as the Modern Language Association, the National Council of Teachers of English, or the Society for the History of Technology—accrue enough income through membership dues and financial investments to pay for services that include administrative, legal, financial, marketing, technical, fundraising, and publishing support, either by hiring within the organization itself (or through its host institution) or through payment of services to external organizations, such as commercial publishers. The problem for small societies is this: They are often too small by themselves to accrue enough through membership dues

to pay someone (on staff or at a third-party organization) to provide these services, so they rely for the most part on volunteer labor, asking in turn that these volunteers spend the majority of their time and effort on infrastructural tasks rather than on ensuring the scholarly health of the organization. Membership dues, frequently priced low so as not to be off-putting, often go directly and almost entirely to offsetting the deliverables of journals and conferences, leaving these societies with very real financial struggles.

On its own, for instance, a small scholarly society may be able to pay a portion of its membership fees to a local or third-party administrator, but that price does not cover the actual expense and workload necessary to administer the society's website, discussion forums, accounting, membership roster, and so on. This is the case for CELJ, which contributes 30% of its annual income (approximately \$3,000, a luxurious amount for some societies) to the West Virginia University (WVU) Libraries to offset the costs of some administrative tasks—and yet in actuality that work costs the university the equivalent of 100 hours a month spread across six faculty, staff members, and graduate students, totaling well over \$7,000 a year (calculating an average salary of those workers, not including the salaried faculty member). Working in consortium with other small scholarly societies to pool their resources to cover these administrative tasks would mean that each society does not have to recreate the administrative wheel, and the overall costs (and upstart labor) would be significantly less. \$3,000 goes a much longer way when it is part of a larger pool of funds.

Beyond the financial realities they face, what is even more worrying for small societies is that their reliance on faculty volunteers can create a precarious and sometimes unstable organization. When members step down suddenly, real crises of succession can occur, bringing basic administrative functions to a halt. For example, two of the three societies represented on this planning grant suffered severe financial challenges when the designated treasurer, who was the sole bank-account holder, became seriously ill and the society's leadership could not access their funds for months or years. This problem may seem on the surface to be more a question of governance than a challenge of volunteerism, but the two go hand in hand. Most small societies are led by scholars who are passionate about their discipline or subject, but who are less keen on running a business. We suspect that such problems are hardly unique to our own societies and believe that a larger organization could provide support for governance best practices—whether in terms of developing procedures, by-law review, or succession plans—that is very much needed. Uncovering the administrative and organizational tasks that could be managed by a centralized service, exploring stakeholder interest in (and qualms about) such a service, and analyzing its costs and benefits are the research agenda this planning grant will support.

During this planning period, we will test the idea that multiple societies diverting a modest portion of membership dues to an umbrella organization might allow such an organization to provide professional infrastructural support and expertise to small societies that would in turn allow the leadership of these societies to focus their

volunteer efforts where they are best suited, on the academic pursuits of the society. It is not unusual, for instance, for small-society board members, such as secretaries/treasurers (often a combined job done by a single person), to spend as much as 15 hours a week handling membership inquiries, updating rosters and listservs, providing banking and accounting services, and, if they are lucky enough to have a working website, revising its content. That work lasts for the few years of a faculty member's election, and then it transitions to a new faculty member, a move that frequently includes the transference of bank accounts and re-establishment of non-profit status now based in that faculty member's home jurisdiction. This administrative work detracts from the intellectual purposes of such societies, exists beyond the expertise of many of its members, keeps the "usual suspects" in governance roles, often limits the substantial involvement of non-US members (who lack access to US postage or bank accounts), and curtails both membership and governance growth as well as the intellectual outreach that these societies could be performing.

The challenges of small scholarly societies are very much the case for those represented in our Triangle SCI working group by the Edith Wharton Society, the Society for Values in Higher Education, and the CELJ. We are aware of several other small scholarly societies that also struggle with these same issues, particularly consistency in governance. We need to address the common challenges most small societies face: a lack of expertise in matters legal, financial, and technological/digital, in publishing, and in other areas essential for operating any membership organization and its publications. Small societies need solutions that will relieve them from perpetually reinventing the administrative wheel within their own organizations with every incoming president and treasurer. Not least among these solutions, small societies need relief from mundane duplicative tasks that would be better handled at scale by those with proper expertise.

There appears to be no umbrella organizations that provide a full range of services specifically for small scholarly societies. If such an organization existed—and this planning grant project looks to move us toward answering that call in the affirmative—it could relieve many small scholarly organizations from having to cobble together time, often taken from faculty members' research and editorial/publishing efforts, to run the business of the society. Such an organization could allow its members to buy from a centralized bureau a number of services, including administrative/personnel, technical, communications/outreach, legal/governance, publishing, and grants administration support. Such an organization could facilitate discussions of best practices, particularly as societies and their editors navigate a changing culture of scholarly publishing, including the shift to open access, which is considered by many societies—large and small alike—to be the top challenge they face in the coming decade. In addition, such an organization would allow for small scholarly societies to develop policies, to lobby, and to collaborate on larger community projects that would advance knowledge relevant to all humanistic disciplines. We also aim to reach out to

small social-science societies that are humanistically oriented, exemplified by the American Society for Environmental History, American Dialect Society, and the International Association for Feminist Economics, as their societal and scholarly goals are similar to those in the humanities.

We believe creating a consortium to provide shared services to small scholarly societies in the humanities and humanistically oriented social sciences could alleviate a substantive amount of the administrative burden for scholars whose time should be spent working on the humanistic intellectual endeavors for which they joined the society in the first place, including scholarly communication and the dissemination of scholarship and ideas to the widest possible audiences. We will explore through data gathering and analysis during the course of this planning grant period what particular services are most needed and whether a centralized service could provide efficiencies that would make such outsourcing cost effective.

We are seeking this Mellon planning grant to continue the project team's initial collaboration, begun at Triangle SCI 2016, in exploring the feasibility of such a consortium. The project team is comprised of those with leadership experience in small societies as well as experts in a range of scholarly business activities. The co-PIs (Eric Bain-Selbo, Cheryl E. Ball, Meredith Goldsmith) all share the experience of managing and directing small societies and their publishing programs. Cheryl Ball will serve as lead PI and primary research coordinator, and her institution (WVU) will serve as the grant host and fiscal agent. Ball's recent experience in creating an institutional home for the CELJ at WVU provides her with special insight into the specific administrative tasks that are needed to consider when providing small scholarly societies with an institutional or (even better) consortial home. (One year into that project, there are numerous lessons learned that will be explored to the benefit of this planning grant.) Eric Bain-Selbo and Meredith Goldsmith will serve as co-PIs, supplying expertise drawn from their experience as board members of their respective small scholarly societies. The rest of the project team (Patrick Alexander, Rebecca Kennison, John McLeod, and Helen Szigeti) has considerable experience supporting society publishing needs at the intersection of traditional scholarly publishing, open access initiatives, and academic librarianship. Each project team member's individual tasks during the course of the grant period are outlined in the Personnel section below.

In addition, the team plans to bring in one outside consultant—Steven Wheatley from the American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS)—who has experience in coordinating and leading a federation of scholarly organizations in the humanities and social sciences. As Vice President of the ACLS, Wheatley is uniquely positioned to provide much-needed input and perspective in our in-person meeting to help ensure a solid foundation for the team's work.

The team members' expertise in serving on small scholarly societies and in running small-to-medium or independent publishing venues and small businesses provides us with a basis for asking and answering tough questions throughout the grant period, in conversation with six members of small scholarly societies we invite to the meeting.

During the grant period, we will determine the desirability of the consortial approach and whether existing or potential fee structures would make it possible to create an umbrella organization that would then be responsible for the management of some of the administrative elements suggested above, including conference planning, membership management, website updates, and business support. The core of the planning grant period will be a survey of society executives to gather information on what benefits they would imagine stemming from such an organization, what their concerns about outsourcing such tasks might be, what their current costs are now, and what level of interest they have in the consortium idea. Part of our process will be to do a cost-benefit analysis of the consortial arrangement for small societies. We hypothesize that a consortium of small societies, through their collective power, could make each society individually more sustainable, we need to answer many fundamental questions to test this theory. For example, how many societies at what price point would be needed for the consortium to be feasible? What might be the maximum level of contribution that any given society would be willing to pay? What non-monetary costs (e.g., loss of autonomy) might be involved and what are their implications for the feasibility of the consortium? Assuming these basic questions can be satisfactorily addressed, could such a consortium then advance the efforts of such societies in the creation of new knowledge and its dissemination? Indeed, could participation in such a consortium lead to circumstances where smaller, more diverse, and underrepresented scholarly societies thrive and new and powerful forms of scholarly communication, including open-access publishing, become more feasible? These are the research questions with which we approach this planning grant.

The academic landscape is filled with hundreds of small scholarly societies in the humanities and humanistic social sciences. Such societies have been critical in the production of new knowledge. The academic world is enriched by the many voices that contribute to the vast array of intellectual conversations. By developing a plan to preserve, sustain, and enhance the work of small scholarly societies in the humanities, we aim to make an important contribution to scholarly communication that will help these disciplines continue the advance towards more open scholarship, open research, and open publishing.

Personnel

Responsibilities of each member of the project are specified below, starting with the project team in order of proposed effort. Biographies are listed in Appendix A.

Project Team

Cheryl E. Ball is Associate Professor of Digital Publishing Studies and Director of the Digital Publishing Institute at West Virginia University. As lead PI, she will provide coordination within WVU (the grant's fiscal agent) with primary responsibility for communication with Mellon, will participate in the in-person meeting and all project

calls, will serve as the point person for survey development and analysis (with a graduate student, see below), and will lead authorship of the final report.

Graduate Assistant (to be hired) will work under the direction of Ball and will be assigned to the Digital Publishing Institute (DPI) that Ball directs at WVU. (The DPI is a campus unit in WVU Libraries that, in part, supports Ball's in-progress Mellon grant for the Vega academic publishing platform.) Under this planning grant, the GA will work with administrative staff at WVU and John McLeod (listed below) at UNC Press to coordinate travel arrangements to Chapel Hill for the attendees of the in-person meeting. The GA will also attend that meeting to learn more about small scholarly societies in a highly engaged setting and serve as back-up note-taker for Helen Szigeti (listed below as primary note taker). After the meeting, this person will conduct additional research for the survey including compiling a contact list for boards of small scholarly societies, preparing the survey based on directions that arise from the project team's meetings, marketing the survey through digital and analog means, and helping to create initial drafts of reports based on meeting minutes and the team's analysis of the survey results.

This GA will be a new line for the Department of English at the Ph.D. level. With the support of department administration and the graduate director for English, Ball has already identified potential candidates from the current and incoming pool of GAs for the 2017–18 academic year. (Please see the draft job description in Appendix B.)

Rebecca Kennison is the Executive Director and Principal of K|N Consultants. As primary instigator of the Triangle SCI proposal that prompted this follow-up application and an experienced workshop facilitator, Kennison has the knowledge and expertise to facilitate the in-person meeting in Chapel Hill that will bring together the project team, six small scholarly society representatives, and Steven Wheatley from ACLS. She will draft the meeting agenda, lead the discussion with the society representatives, and moderate Wheatley's participation for the benefit of the small societies and our research goals. In addition to facilitating the meeting, she will co-lead all project team conference calls with Ball and be collaboratively responsible, along with Ball and Szigeti, for authoring the final survey questions, analyzing the results, and writing the final report.

Helen Szigeti is Program Director for the Society for Scholarly Publishing and an independent consultant in scholarly communications. Szigeti will function as lead note-taker during the in-person meeting and will assist Kennison and Ball in authoring the final survey questions, analyzing the results, writing the report, and editing the final report for distribution to Mellon. She will additionally participate in all project team calls, providing a record of our discussions and follow-up action items (essentially serving as a project manager).

Meredith Goldsmith (co-PI) is Professor of English and Assistant to the President for Strategic Initiatives at Ursinus College. Goldsmith will serve as an expert in small scholarly societies based on her longstanding experience on the board of the Edith

Wharton Society, in particular with her role as editor of the *Edith Wharton Review*. She will assist with contacting other small society boards, help to facilitate discussion at the in-person meeting, assist with creating the survey questions, promote the survey among her small scholarly society contacts, provide some analysis of the survey results, and ensure that the final report reflects the survey results and our in-person discussions.

Eric Bain-Selbo (co-PI) currently is Department Head of Philosophy and Religion at Western Kentucky University, but in May will take up new duties as Dean of the School of Humanities and Social Sciences at Indiana University–Kokomo. He will serve as an expert in small scholarly societies based on his longstanding experience with the Society for Values in Higher Education. He will assist with contacting other small society boards, help to facilitate discussion at the in-person meeting, assist with creating the survey questions, promote the survey among his small scholarly society contacts, provide some analysis of the survey results, and ensure that the final report reflects the survey results and our in-person discussions.

John McLeod is Director of the Office of Scholarly Publishing Services at the University of North Carolina Press. Through his experience at university presses in the areas of business and rights/permissions, most recently with UNC Press and its nonprofit subsidiary Longleaf Services, McLeod brings front-line knowledge of the services needed by university departments and individual faculty and staff to lower the cost of producing and disseminating quality educational and scholarly publications. McLeod will participate in the in-person meeting and all project calls, coordinate (with the graduate assistant) the logistics for the in-person meeting at UNC Press, and review the final report.

Patrick Alexander is Director of the Penn State University Press, overseeing a press that focuses its efforts on advancing scholarly communication in the humanities and social sciences by working with nearly two dozen small societies, including the American Association of Teachers of Korean, the Association for the Study of the Worldwide African Diaspora, the Edith Wharton Society, the Moravian Historical Society, the Pacific Ancient and Modern Language Association, the Society of Jewish Ethics, and the Society for Values in Higher Education. He will take the lead in doing the cost-benefit analysis of a consortial arrangement for small societies, will engage the societies with which PSU Press works to have them complete the survey, will participate in all in-person meetings and project calls, and will review the final report.

Consultant

Steven Wheatley will participate in the team's in-person meeting. Prior to the meeting, he will review the team's proposal, meeting outline, initial discussion questions, anticipated meeting goals, and selection of society stakeholders. After the meeting, he will be available to review the team's deliverables throughout the process, including the survey instrument and final survey report.

Schedule of Activities

Our activities will include consultation with additional experts and stakeholders and a survey of small scholarly societies to vet our assumptions and approach, leading to a survey report with findings and recommendations for next steps. In addition to virtual communication via Slack and e-mail and working meetings via telephone and Skype, we will convene one in-person meeting.

The in-person meeting (anticipated for October/November 2017) will convene the project team and up to six stakeholders from small scholarly societies, along with Steven Wheatley of ACLS, who has agreed to serve as the outside consultant on scholarly societies for this project. The University of North Carolina Press has agreed to act as host in Chapel Hill, NC.

During our Triangle SCI 2016 meeting, we identified the following small scholarly societies as possible stakeholders because (1) they have enough members and current activities to contribute to our initial discussions; (2) they represent a range of humanities and humanistic social science disciplines, including popular (i.e., non-academically leaning) societies with scholarly interests; (3) they represent a diversity of participants; and (4) many of them have small journal distributions that could benefit from adopting an open access approach:

- The Alliance for the Study of Adoption and Culture and *Adoption & Culture*:
<http://www.adoptionandculture.org>
- Asociacion de Licenciados y Doctores Espanoles en los Estados Unidos:
<http://web.aldeeu.org/>
- Frank Norris Society: <https://franknorrisociety.org/>
- Historical Society of Pennsylvania: <https://hsp.org/staff>
- Langston Hughes Society and *Langston Hughes Review*:
<http://www.langstonhughessociety.org>
- Mennonite Historical Society and *Mennonite Quarterly Review*:
<https://www.goshen.edu/mqr/>
- Pauline Hopkins Society: <http://www.paulinehopkinssociety.org/>
- Society of Early Americanists (with editor of *Tulsa Studies in Women's Literature*): <http://www.societyofearlyamericanists.org/>
- South Asian Studies Association: <http://sasaonline.net/>
- Southern Historical Association and the *Journal of Southern History*:
<http://thesha.org/>
- Stephen Crane Society: <https://stephencranesociety.wordpress.com/>

These societies are only representative. We will conduct further research after the start of the grant to finalize our list of societies to invite to the in-person meeting, and that research will also serve to create a list for contacting societies for our survey later on.

In the meeting we will begin to address our research questions on the feasibility of such a consortium, leading to the production of a survey to be taken by officers of small scholarly societies to gather more comprehensive information about societies' needs and financial situations. Our preliminary research questions are listed here and are elaborated in Appendix C:

- What is the value of a consortium?
- How do we define the "feasibility" of the consortium?
- What *service areas* could be supported efficiently through a centralized business bureau?
- In each identified service area, what *specific tasks* could be supported efficiently through a centralized business bureau? What tasks in which areas would need to be kept by the society? Does the answer change depending on the size of the society?
- Which tasks/service areas would be supported directly by consortium personnel, and which tasks/services would be made available through shared external service options?
- What partnership opportunities are available? Which external parties would serve as a pool for shared services options?
- What business model and funding strategies should the consortium adopt? What governance structure?

By asking our co-PIs and their colleagues to reflect thoroughly on the service work they have done in these roles, we will be able to generate specific questions, modeled on our research questions, for the survey.

The survey will include qualitative and quantitative questions and will be submitted as an Exempt proposal to the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at WVU, both to ensure our ethical and legal obligations are met and to enable us to obtain permission from participants to publish the anonymized and aggregated results of the survey for the purposes of scholarship, reference, and re-use. This IRB proposal will be drafted over the summer of 2017 by PI Ball, with the help of the project team, and submitted with the final survey questions in November. Over the last decade Ball has conducted multiple IRB Exempt and Expedited pedagogical and editorial-workflow studies involving survey methodologies with confidential or anonymized data. She served as an IRB representative at her previous academic institution, and has a strong working relationship with the IRB office at WVU, who can process expedited proposals (as we expect this one to be) within a month. We therefore foresee no issue with the proposed clarity and methodology in creation of the survey instrument.

Potential survey questions are included as research questions in Appendix C, but will generally include assessing which routine tasks society executives undertake, how much time they spend attending to these tasks, what kind of administrative support is already in place, and the costs involved with both the executive and the administrative

work. We will learn more about the kind of work society executives do in coordination of conferences; the editing and production of journals; membership management and other financial tasks; website updates; and society communication. Through analysis of the survey results, we will develop a nuanced account of the nature of small-society leadership, which, we theorize, might well run counter to the goals these society executives have for their organizations. Qualitative questions will focus on precisely that—what society executives hope to achieve for their organization, what motivates them to continue a high level of involvement, and what kind of challenges they face.

We plan to identify survey participants by including small societies that are already members of the ACLS, those whose journals are already published by PSU Press and UNC Press, and those that are affiliated with or related to larger organizations such as the Modern Language Association (MLA), American Historical Association (AHA), the College Art Association (CAA), and the American Academy of Religion (AAR). (For instance, we plan to contact a representative sampling of small, scholarly societies listed on the MLA's Allied Organization list, which currently includes over 100.) In addition to reaching out to leaders of small societies directly, we will leverage social media to solicit responses from officers of small societies globally. Our target response sample will be 100 such societies. We believe assertive outreach will allow us to reach this goal. Our survey will be built using either the professional-level version of SurveyMonkey or Qualtrics, either of which provide robust tools for analyzing and visualizing the results, and both of which would be free for the project team to use through K|N Consultants or WVU respectively.

Over the winter, we will draft and distribute the survey (after IRB approval), collaboratively analyze the survey results through an online document-sharing system (i.e., GoogleDrive or DropBox). Through scheduled bi-weekly conference calls, the team will discuss the results and analysis and determine whether the survey results are in favor of a consortium or not. Based on that determination, Ball, Kennison, and Szigeti will draft an initial version of the recommendation report to the Mellon Foundation (via Google Drive) and circulate it to the team for collaborative feedback and revision.

Timeline

Date	Activity
May 1, 2017	Grant period begins. Initial call to formalize project processes and confirm team roles and responsibilities.
May – September 2017	Bi-weekly conference calls among team members to plan for the in-person meeting, with activities that include but are not limited to: developing the agenda for that meeting; reading widely on the topic of small societies; creating/gathering background

	documents for review; drafting an outline and initial discussion questions; drafting IRB; outreach to gather six small but representative society stakeholders; setting meeting goals and desired outcomes.
August 1, 2017	Date set for in-person meeting. Invite small-society stakeholders to meeting; WVU (Ball/GA) begins arranging travel and accommodations with McLeod.
October or November 2017	In-person meeting in Chapel Hill, NC. Specific dates to be determined, but will be 1.5–2 days. See description above.
November – December 2017	Bi-weekly conference calls among team members. Activities include but are not limited to: creating the survey; confirming the survey distribution list; submitting the IRB; follow-up on action items arising from in-person meeting.
January – February 2018	Administration of survey to small scholarly societies in the humanities and humanistically oriented social sciences. Bi-weekly email communication and monthly conference calls among team members to assess progress of survey.
February – March 2018	Analysis of survey results. Bi-weekly coordination calls culminating in an extended project team conference call to review the final analysis and discuss potential report recommendations. Completion of cost–benefit analysis based on survey interest.
March – April 2018	Drafting of report for Mellon including recommendations for next steps. Bi-weekly calls to coordinate the work of the writing team, culminating in an extended project team conference call to finalize report. Possible research article on survey results, if time permits.
May 2018	Submission of final report and financial statement to Mellon. (Submission will be the responsibility of the lead PI).

Expected Outcomes

Our primary goal for this planning grant is straightforward. We will, by the end of the grant period, have a clear understanding of the services currently performed by small-society officers and volunteers that would be best handled by a centralized consortium that could do this work more efficiently and effectively, thus freeing up those individuals to provide leadership and strategic guidance for their societies. We will have developed and executed a survey instrument that will elucidate the common tasks undertaken by officers and volunteers, the current costs associated with those tasks, the needs and desires of these societies to offload these tasks, and their interest in collectively pooling money or expertise to outsource these tasks. This information will be analyzed and the results will form the basis for the final deliverable: a report to Mellon that summarizes the research results and offers recommendations for next steps, including those needed to initiate a consortium and potential stakeholders to be involved.

Diversity and Inclusion

Although this proposal targets all small, scholarly societies in the humanities and humanistic social sciences, our team is particularly concerned with ensuring the sustainability of small scholarly societies whose work focuses on underrepresented areas of humanities and scholarship, including cultural productions by women, LGBTQI people, and people of color; non-western religious traditions and histories; and lesser-taught languages and cultures, to name a few. Experience has shown us that such groups often lack the economic means to produce journals or the security of a long-term institutional home that would facilitate the operations of the society. As editors and publishers, many of us have seen how apparently eclectic work can fall through the cracks of a journal that must speak to the interests of its subscribers, and we acknowledge that underrepresented colleagues are often stretched too thin in their service requirements to support the load of administrative tasks that running a small scholarly society typically entails. It is for this reason that we want to ensure that at least half of our stakeholders in attendance at the in-person meeting represent these societies' interests.

What is seen by some both inside and outside the profession as a narrow or eclectic area is often times simply an underappreciated field or author from a marginalized tradition awaiting recovery or an area requiring linguistic or regional expertise that might be atypical in the profession. We thus also view diversity of society size as a relevant topic for our discussion: our group of target societies includes those below 1,000 members, but even those with 25 members are viable micro-societies in fringe or nascent disciplines that could benefit from such a consortium. Our goal is to strengthen the societies where scholars with diverse perspectives and backgrounds work as authors, editors, and reviewers, in turn laying the groundwork for a greater range of scholarly products, including print and multimodal works, with the aim to

sustain the societies themselves and to support societies' efforts to engage with the wider public. By contributing to the health of these small organizations, then, we look to support a more diverse and inclusive academic landscape.

Concretely, the society executives and editors chosen for this project will be selected with the specific aim of inclusivity. Every effort will be made to ensure a breadth of perspectives and an inclusive spectrum of participants. Prospective societies include those that publish journals with Penn State University Press, such as the American Association of Teachers of Korean; the Association for the Study of the Worldwide African Diaspora; the Pacific Ancient and Modern Language Association; the Popular Culture Association of Australia, Asia, and New Zealand; and the Society of Jewish Ethics. Of particular interest to us are two societies who self-publish, the Langston Hughes Society and the Alliance for the Study of Adoption and Culture. Our choice of these two groups reflects the fact that representatives from both of these societies approached members of our group seeking support for their publications. One group wished to find a home for its journal, and the other was no longer in a financial position to publish scholarship as it had once done. That both groups were seeking venues for ensuring access to their scholarship, and that one could not afford to produce a journal any longer, but that neither knew where to turn, is symptomatic of the problem this planning grant will address by exploring the feasibility of a consortial approach.

We intend to reach out to affiliate organizations associated with several larger societies—the Modern Language Association, the American Historical Association, the College Art Association, and the American Academy of Religion—as well as to those societies that may be not be affiliated with any larger group. Inclusivity, then, will not only entail our seeking societies focused on marginalized academic topics, but will require reaching beyond the usual suspects in our research process.

Risks and Mitigations

At this early stage, the practical risks we may encounter have to do with determining the appropriate participants and collecting an appropriate amount of data. We have already ensured the space for our in-person planning meeting, to be held at the offices of University of North Carolina Press. Our IRB proposal with WVU, in early stages of drafting at the time of this grant proposal, will ensure that we abide by the ethical conduct of researchers in our disciplines and by the Belmont Report to mitigate any research risks to survey participants and stakeholders. Through that process, we will ensure that participants benefit from this research project by gaining explicit knowledge of their (and others') anonymized practices and engagements with small, scholarly societies.

We do need to ensure we have an appropriate level of stakeholder participation in the in-person meeting and in the survey to provide us with the data we need to satisfy our main objectives of uncovering the administrative and organizational tasks that could

be managed by a centralized service, exploring stakeholder interest in (and qualms about) such a service, and analyzing its costs and benefits, but we are confident that by leveraging our connections, by reaching out directly to small-society officers, and by utilizing social media, we will be able to attract suitable participation to enable us to fulfill our aims.

Sustainability

We have identified sustainability for small societies as a fundamental and critical challenge both for the organizations themselves and for their scholarly journals. Our activities will serve to investigate and assess the viability of creating a consortium to allow these societies, through a collective approach, not only to be more sustainable but to have the opportunity to thrive as centers of specialized knowledge, to see new possibilities for transitioning to open-access publishing, and to embrace new forms of scholarly communication for their constituencies. It is from this motive of sustainability that we propose this funding request for a planning grant.

Because we are currently applying for a planning grant, sustainability will be more accurately reflected in our ability to move on to the next phase. Our regular communications among the project team members will help ensure that we maintain our connection between meeting times, and we will regularly document our efforts. The participation of Steven Wheatley, given his long experience with societies of various sizes and complexities, will also inform the sustainability of the project going forward.

Reporting

All reporting will originate from WVU, with Cheryl E. Ball as lead PI. Working from Mellon's Grant Reporting Guidelines, the lead PI will provide a final report after conclusion of the fourth quarter for this one-year grant. Assessments for progress reports, as needed, will be made in accordance with completion of the Schedule of Activities as listed above. Financial reporting will be conducted on the same time schedule and submitted by the WVU Foundation, which will act as the fiduciary agent on this project.

Many Voices:

Budget Narrative (\$59,500)

Salaries (\$23,121.17)

Personnel for this project are listed under the *Personnel* section in the proposal narrative.

Cheryl Ball: \$5,721.17

The funding request includes a half-month summer salary for Cheryl Ball, who is the lead PI, and salary for a nine-month graduate research assistant (GA) at WVU, working full-time at 20 hours per week. Ball is on a 9-month contract, and a half-month summer salary is calculated as follows: \$102,981.00 base salary / 9 x 0.5 = \$5,721.00.

Graduate student: \$17,400

The GA will work a full-time graduate stipend over a 9-month academic period (August 2017–May 2018). Graduate research assistants are on 9-month contracts, paid across 18 pay periods. The job ad for this position is appended as Appendix B. The salary for a full-time graduate research assistant for a 9-month period is \$17,400.

Fringe Benefits (\$2,562.47)

Ball: \$1,344.47

The fringe rate at WVU is 23.5% of the base salary. Calculations here are completed based on the university rate and calculated salary: $\$5,721.17 \times .235 = \$1,344.47$

Graduate Assistant: \$1,218.00

The fringe rate for graduate research assistants at WVU is 7.0%. Using the salary calculated above, the fringe is as follows: $\$17,400 \times .07 = \$1,218.00$

For all other project team personnel, coverage of fringe benefits are not requested.

Personnel Subawards (\$15,000.00)

Subawards are designated as flat-rate payments to cover the effort made by project team personnel not affiliated with the PI institution (WVU).

Rebecca Kennison: \$6,000

Kennison will be paid \$100/hour x 60 hours = \$6,000. Her travel to the meeting is also covered and is incorporated under the Travel section below.

Helen Szigeti: \$5,000

Szigeti will be paid \$100/hour x 50 hours = \$5,000. Her travel to the meeting is also

covered and is incorporated under the Travel section below.

Eric Bain-Selbo: \$2,000

Bain-Selbo will be paid a stipend of \$2,000 for his participation over the year of the project. His travel to the meeting will also be covered, as outlined in the Travel section below.

Meredith Goldsmith: \$2,000

Goldsmit will be paid a stipend of \$2,000 for her participation over the year of the project. Her travel to the meeting will also be covered, as outlined in the Travel section below.

Patrick Alexander: \$0 (in-kind participation)

Alexander will contribute his time without financial compensation, but will have his travel expenses covered to attend the in-person meeting, as outlined in the Travel section below.

John McLeod: \$0 (in-kind participation)

McLeod will contribute his time without financial compensation, but will receive a per diem only (since he is hosting) for his participation in the in-person meeting, as outlined in the Travel section below.

Consultants (\$2,000.00)

Steven Wheatley, Vice President of the American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS), has agreed to serve as a consultant at our in-person meeting in October/November 2017 and will advise at various points in the project. Dr. Wheatley has extensive experience in the oversight of member societies in ACLS and knows the landscape of societies and the challenges—even to large societies—to their successful functioning and growth. The success of ACLS as a consortial model encouraged the project team to ask Dr. Wheatley to participate, and he will receive \$2,000 (plus travel expenses, outlined in the Travel section) for his participation. He will devote a total of 20 hours to the project over 12 months and he will be paid \$100 per hour for a total cost of \$2,000.

Travel (\$16,817.00)

The project team requests funding for one meeting during the course of the project. All eight of the project team members, one outside consultant, and six small society representatives (15 people total) will meet at the University of North Carolina—Chapel Hill in Fall 2017 for 2 days. Space is donated by the University of North Carolina Press (see Appendix D for a letter of support). Lodging is required for 14 attendees, since one project team member is local.

Travel: All participants, except the local host (John McLeod) are expected to fly to the Raleigh-Durham airport. Flight estimates were arrived at based on the current residence city (or closest airport) for all project team members, Wheatley (located in

New York), as well as estimates for 3 East Coast and 3 West Coast society participants. These estimates averaged approximately \$500.00 per flight for the 14 persons traveling to RDU airport, for a total flight cost of \$7,000.00.

Travel also includes costs for transportation to/from participants' local airports as well as any airport parking expenses they might incur. These figures were derived by calculating the typical type of transportation (cab, public transit, personal vehicle) likely to be used depending on the size of the city (e.g., those in New York are likely to take public transportation or a cab while those in more rural locations are likely to drive their personal vehicles and park at the airport). Travel to/from the airport is estimated to be \$977.00 and parking is estimated to be \$135.00, for a total ground transportation expense of \$1,112.00.

Lodging: Hotel expenses are based on hotel website searches for a two-night weekday (Mon.–Wed.) stay in Chapel Hill, NC, at a reasonably priced hotel within walking distance (< 1 mi) from the Press building, such as the Franklin Inn (~\$200/night) in October. 14 persons will need lodging for 2 nights, totaling \$5,600.00

Per diem: Per diem for three days (including a travel day) is based on 2017 government per diem (\$69/day) for Chapel Hill, NC. This totals \$207 per 15 persons for the meeting, for a total of \$3,105.00

Total for Meeting = \$16,817.00

- Flights = 7,000.00
- Ground transportation = 1,112.00
- Lodging = \$5,600.00
- Per diem = \$3,105.00

Investment Income

The WVU Foundation, Inc., a 501(c) 3 foundation (FEIN 55-6017181), will serve as the fiduciary agent for a grant awarded to West Virginia University by the Andrew Mellon Foundation. The granted funds are placed in a designated fund for the awarded project. Interest earned on that grant amount will be deposited into the fund monthly designated for the project. The WVU Foundation will provide all financial reports required by the donor agency.

Appendix A: PIs and Supporting Team

Principal Investigators

Cheryl E. Ball (lead PI) is associate professor of digital publishing studies at West Virginia University (Department of English) and director of the Digital Publishing Institute at WVU Libraries. She is also executive director of a small scholarly society, the Council of Editors of Learned Journals (CELJ), and recently, owing to this role, migrated the CELJ to a permanent institutional home at WVU. She is PI of a \$1-million Andrew W. Mellon Foundation grant to build a new academic publishing platform called Vega. Her qualifications include 25 years of experience in scholarly, literary, and trade publishing and editing across print and digital domains. For the past 16 years, Ball has been an editor of the longest-running scholarly multimedia journal, *Kairos: Rhetoric, Technology, and Pedagogy* (<http://kairos.technorhetoric.net>), considered the premier journal in its field. Her research on digital publishing and multimodal communication has translated into her receiving several federally funded grants and a Fulbright award in digital and open-access publishing. Owing to her extensive experience in these areas, she has been invited to lecture and lead workshops across North America, South America, and Europe.

Eric Bain-Selbo (co-PI) is department head of philosophy and religion at Western Kentucky University and co-founder of the WKU Institute for Citizenship and Social Responsibility. In May 2017 he transitions to a new position as Dean of the School of Humanities and Social Sciences at Indiana University–Kokomo. He also is the executive director of the Society for Values in Higher Education and co-editor of *Soundings: An Interdisciplinary Journal*. His research spans the disciplines of philosophy and religious studies, focusing primarily on social ethics, political philosophy, comparative religion, cultural criticism, and issues in higher education. He has been a frequent presenter at conferences such as the American Academy of Religion, the Association of American Colleges and Universities, and the American Democracy Project of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities. He has authored numerous articles and five books: *Mediating the Culture Wars: Dialogical Virtues in Multicultural Education* (2003), *Judge and Be Judged: Moral Reflection in an Age of Relativism and Fundamentalism* (2006), *Game Day and God: Football, Faith, and Politics in the American South* (2009), *Violence in Southern Sport and Culture: Sacred Battles on the Gridiron* (2016), and *Understanding Sport as a Religious Phenomenon: An Introduction* (2016), co-authored with D. Gregory Sapp.

Meredith Goldsmith (co-PI) is professor of English and assistant to the president for strategic initiatives at Ursinus College. She is editor of the *Edith Wharton Review* and past-president of the Edith Wharton Society, has served on the editorial board of *Legacy: A Journal of American Women Writers*, and has been affiliated with a number of other journals. As a society executive and journal editor, she is particularly sensitive to the economic and structural pressures facing small scholarly societies. She began

researching open-access models in response to those pressures and headed the Triangle SCI 2016 working group (“Does One Size Fit All?”) that led to this proposal. Her participation in the Duke Humanities Writ Large Fellowship was also supported by Mellon, and she served as co-PI in 2010–2014 for a Mellon Faculty Career Enhancement grant at Ursinus.

Supporting Team

Patrick Alexander joined The Pennsylvania State University Press in 2007 and was named director in 2009. Alexander has been involved in academic publishing for more than thirty years, during which he oversaw the North American offices of Brill Publishers (2000–2005; Leiden, The Netherlands) and De Gruyter (2005–2007; Berlin, Germany). Alexander serves on the executive board of the Association of American University Presses (AAUP) and has been a member of the advisory board for Project Muse since 2009. He is the institutional representative and AAUP representative on the AAU/ARL/AAUP Digital Monograph Task Force. Developing business models for arts and humanities publishing that promote both access and sustainability and integrate new forms of technology figure prominently in his professional objectives.

Rebecca Kennison is the Executive Director and Principal of K|N Consultants, a 501(c)(3) organization that provides strategic and operational guidance to academic institutions and organizations, academic, national and public libraries, learned and scholarly societies, scholarly publishers and university presses, government agencies, private foundations, and other mission-driven organizations struggling to adjust to the rapid change in higher education. Prior to working full time at K|N, Kennison was the founding director of the Center for Digital Research and Scholarship, a division of the Columbia University Libraries, where she was responsible for developing programs to facilitate scholarly research and the communication of that research through technology solutions. Kennison has worked primarily in the scholarly publishing industry, including project management and production leadership roles at Cell Press (now owned by Elsevier), Blackwell Publishing (now owned by Wiley), and the open-access publisher Public Library of Science (PLOS).

John McLeod is director of the Office of Scholarly Publishing Services (OSPS) at the University of North Carolina Press. The OSPS serves all seventeen schools in the UNC system by providing access to a range of sustainable, mission-driven publishing models and solutions. McLeod was previously assistant director and rights manager at the University of Texas Press, where he focused on intellectual property and oversaw the digital publishing program. He started his career in marketing, working on all aspects of book sales and promotion in previous positions at the University of Georgia Press, and at two trade publishers, Counterpoint Press and Algonquin Books.

Helen Szigeti is an independent consultant in scholarly communication who focuses on open-access initiatives, and she also serves as program director for the Society for Scholarly Publishing. Szigeti has over 20 years of experience within scholarly publishing

across a wide range of roles, including business development and digital strategy, product development, editorial development, publisher relations, library literacy instruction, and specialty research services. Starting as an academic librarian at the University of Pennsylvania, Szigeti went on to hold key strategic positions at ISI/Thomson Reuters (now Clarivate Analytics) and Stanford University/HighWire Press.

Appendix B: Graduate Research Assistant Job Description

This position is funded through an Andrew Mellon Foundation one-year planning grant for a project called “Many Voices: Building a Consortium of Small, Scholarly Societies in the Humanities.” The purpose of this project, on which Dr. Cheryl Ball is PI, is to conduct research with a project team across the U.S. to survey boards of directors and members for small scholarly societies to see whether creating a consortium that would allow societies to pool their resources and streamline administrative tasks would be desirable.

This position is affiliated with the West Virginia University Libraries’ Digital Publishing Institute (<http://dpi.lib.wvu.edu>) and the English Department and is funded full-time (20 hours per week) during the academic year 2017–18. The research assistant in this position will report to Dr. Ball, director of the DPI, on several humanities-related publishing projects and their affiliated organizations, including the Council of Editors of Learned Journals, which is hosted through the DPI, and working specifically on the grant project outlined above. Some work over Thanksgiving and Winter and Spring breaks may be required. Travel for several days to Chapel Hill, NC, to attend a grant project meeting is required in February or March 2018 (days TBD; paid for by the grant). Travel to New York for the January 4–8, 2018 MLA convention may also be required (either paid for by the grant or by CELJ).

Responsibilities

- Conduct research for the grant survey, including compiling a contact list for boards of small scholarly societies.
- Prepare the survey based on directions that arise from the project team’s meetings.
- Market the survey through digital and analog means.
- Take meeting minutes at the Feb/March project team meeting in North Carolina.
- Help write initial drafts of the final grant report based on meeting minutes and the team’s analysis of the survey results.
- Collaborate with grant report writers (Cheryl Ball, Rebecca Kennison, and Helen Szigeti) to complete the report.
- Assist the project team (especially Ball, Kennison, and Szigeti) in drafting any additional written outcomes from the research (to possibly include a proposed business plan for the consortium, a follow-up proposal for a funding agency, and/or a research article for publication).
- Provide additional administrative services to the project team, including coordinating travel bookings.
- Work with external consultants (including K|N Consultants, among potential others) to explore the possibilities of funding models for open-access publishing for small scholarly societies.

- Provide primary membership support for the Council of Editors of Learned Journals (as an example of a small scholarly society) through
 - Regular communication with the CELJ membership
 - Coordinating with the library billing department to handle member fees, including payments and invoicing
 - Updating the CELJ website with news, events, and new members
 - Creating promotional materials for CELJ
 - Coordinating and staffing (possibly with another RA) the CELJ exhibit booth at the MLA and other conferences, as funding allows

Qualifications

- An interest in scholarly organizations/societies, community-building, professional networking, and academic publishing, particularly as it relates to open-access venues.
- PhD candidate preferred due to the academic nature of the job responsibilities; master's degree (MA, MS, MFA) applicants will be considered, particularly if they have previous relevant experience. Disciplinary area of study is relatively unimportant, but candidates who can combine this work with their research interests will find this RAship most rewarding.
- An understanding of, or initiative to learn, digital technologies that impact scholarly communications workflows.
- An ability to take initiative with a modicum of direction; anticipating questions before something gets wonky is a great skill.
- A willingness to do the often mundane work that is the life of an editor/administrator, without complaint. You will be professionalized into this work, praised for jobs well done, mentored, and given second chances when the learning curve requires it.
- An ability to notice details and complete assignments on time.
- Proficiency and professionalism with online communication (email, Slack, Skype, etc.) and a quick response rate, including some evenings and weekends, as project deadlines dictate.

Benefits

These duties work in coordination to help the RA learn more about the varied roles of faculty and library stakeholders in the lifecycle of scholarly communications, which will better prepare the student for an academic position of their own. The networking opportunities for students interested in scholarly communications will be vast in this position. Successful completion of this RAship will result in an excellent letter of recommendation from Dr. Ball and potentially other team members, depending on level of outreach conducted. The pay rate and benefits are standard for a PhD (or Masters-level student) in the English department at WVU.

To Apply

Write a one-page letter outlining your interest and qualifications for the position, including naming one professor at WVU whom Dr. Ball can contact as a reference. Attach a CV, if relevant to your experience. Submit your application materials in a single PDF file to Dr. Ball as an email attachment. Qualified candidates may be asked to complete a follow-up interview with Dr. Ball. If you have questions, please contact her at s2ceball@gmail.com. Deadline for applying is XXXXXX.

Appendix C: Project Team Research Questions

During this planning grant period, our goal is to assess the value and feasibility of our idea; it is not to test already-held assumptions. A preliminary (representative) set of research questions is provided here, and we expect to discover additional questions throughout the project.

What is the value of a consortium?

- What is the value for a society in general? For example, would it remove current limitations in membership? In governance growth? In cultivating intellectual output? In expanding intellectual outreach?
- What is the value for a society with respect to its scholarly publishing program? For example, would it remove current limitations on editorial development? On publication output? On exploring Open Access business models and dissemination practices?
- What is the value for society leadership? For example, would it allow an Executive Director more time to stay abreast of new developments and understand their implications (such as Open Access mandates and data management plans)? To identify and develop new member services, particularly in support of early career researchers? To establish/maintain a strong brand that helps to demonstrate the place of the society within the larger Academy?
- Is the potential value of the consortium the same for different size societies? If not, to what size society does the consortium offer the most value?
- What is the minimum expectation in terms of outcomes (intellectual as well as financial) to determine the success of the consortium?

How do we define “feasibility” of the consortium?

- What is the minimum viable product/service? (core services offered, clientele base required, human resources required)
- Would a consortium be any more viable than these small societies individually?
- Does the potential for consortium failure increase the risk of these societies failing?
- What does long-term sustainability require?

What *service areas* could be supported efficiently through a centralized business bureau?

These could be: Administration (general); Administration (grants); Legal; Finance; Technical infrastructure/website; Marketing, communications, and outreach; Membership; Conferences; Professional Development/training; Publishing.

- What is missing in the above list?
- What are societies spending now (in terms of support hours) in each of these areas? How many hours could be reclaimed and put towards the intellectual endeavors of the society, including author/editorial development within the publications program?
- What are societies spending now (in terms of financial outlay) in each of these areas? Who is paying for them? How much is taken from membership fees? How much is supported by publications (either publishing fees or publication price/subscription)? How much is supported via other avenues?

What *specific tasks* could be supported efficiently through a centralized business bureau?

- What tasks in which areas would need to be kept by the society?
- Does the answer change depending on the size of the society?

Which tasks/service areas would be supported directly by consortium personnel, and which tasks/services would be made available through shared external service options?

- What partnership opportunities are available?
- Which external parties would serve as a pool for shared services options?

What business model and funding strategies should the consortium adopt? (Tied to governance)

- How do those strategies change from the creation (start-up period) through business establishment (initial years) to long-term maintenance and growth (sustainability)?
- What would an exit strategy look like?

What governance structure should the consortium adopt? (Tied to business model)

- Does a new organization need to be created to support the consortium, or are there existing organizations that have the capacity (and flexibility of governance structure) to take this on?
- If the former, what are the legal, financial, and timeline implications?
- If the latter, which existing organizations are potential candidates (have capacity and interest)?
- Who are the stakeholders that need to be included in governance, such as via an advisory board?

Appendix D: UNC Press Letter of Support



THE UNIVERSITY *of* NORTH CAROLINA PRESS

116 South Boundary Street, Chapel Hill NC 27514-3808

TEL 919.966.3561 • FAX 919.966.3829 • www.uncpress.org

February 15, 2017

Dear Donald Waters:

I write to express the support of the University of North Carolina Press for the project entitled “Many Voices: Building a Consortium of Small Scholarly Societies in the Humanities.” Specifically, the Press would freely and gladly provide the space and facilities to host an initial meeting of the working group in the Fall of 2017.

The Press has recently completed a renovation of its boardroom that can now accommodate up to 35 people, has remote conferencing, and features state-of-the-art AV equipment. We can provide free parking in our guest spaces for those that need it and help attendees with travel and accommodation recommendations (as well as UNC discounts for the latter). The assistant to the director can help coordinate working meals and suggest restaurants for off meeting times.

In addition to helping with hosting and basic logistics, UNC Press and Longleaf Services staff would be happy to be on call to answer questions that may come up during the meeting.

Sincerely,

Two handwritten signatures are shown side-by-side. The signature on the left appears to be "John Sherer" and the signature on the right appears to be "Anna".

John Sherer

Spangler Family Director

BUDGET AND FINANCIAL REPORT

The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation

Hover over red numbered items for additional guidance (also located in “Instructions” tab).*

GRANT INFORMATION

Organization Name (1): West Virginia University

Grant Title (2): Many Voices: Building a Consortium of Small, Scholarly Societies in the Humanities

Grant Start Date (3): 5/1/17

Grant End Date (4): 4/30/18

Requested Amount (5):

Awarded Amount (6):

Reference Number (7):

Cells shaded gray contain formulas that cannot be edited.

Description	Reporting Period I (8)	
	Budgeted	Actual
Opening Balance:	59,500.00	0.00
Investment Income (9):		
Total Expenses:	59,500.64	0.00
Closing Balance:	(0.64)	0.00

This budget and financial report has been reviewed and approved by the following individual who has institutional responsibility for financial reporting (11):

Name: Dr. James A. Watson

Title: Diretor of Foundation Giving

Email: jwatson@wvuf.org

Date: 10-Apr-17

Total Grant Period		
Budgeted	Actual	
59,500.00	0.00	
	0.00	
59,500.64	0.00	
(0.64)	0.00	

BUDGET AND FINANCIAL REPORT

The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation

Reporting Period I (8)			Total Grant Period	
Description	Budgeted	Actual	Budgeted	Actual
Total Expenses:	59,500.64	0.00	59,500.64	0.00
Variance:		(59,500.64)		(59,500.64)

*This worksheet should be used both for **proposal budgets** (budgets submitted with the grant proposal) and for interim and final **financial reports** on approved grants. Grantees should save the budget worksheet submitted with the grant proposal and update the "Actual" columns in the same worksheet for each Reporting Period. After the proposal budget is approved, categories of expenses and funding sources and amounts in the "Budgeted" columns cannot be changed absent the prior written approval of the Foundation. Non-US institutions should enter all amounts in local currency.