

**Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (SEP)**  
**A Call for ICOLC Initiated Global Community Action**  
**Instructions and Background Information R2 01/25/05**  
**FOR general distribution**

Authored on behalf of ICOLC by Tom Sanville (tom@ohiolink.edu)

FOREWORD

This Call to Action is extensive and contains a great deal of information. But there are still inherent uncertainties; some cannot be resolved except by responding to the call, while others have not yet been fully defined. Though this is a global call to action, its success depends on how well the consortia, library, and philosophy leaders in each geographic area mold its ideas to fit their locality or region.

It is the intent of the author, Solinet, and the SEP to respond to any questions raised by creating supplements to this document on a periodic basis. Please email any questions to the contacts noted below.

The Call to Action is described in Sections I. and II. For more extensive background on the SEP please read Sections III. through IV.

Table of Contents

Page 2: Section I. Problem Statement and Opportunity – Why the SEP?

Page 4: Section II. A Call to Action - ICOLC Global Funding Initiative For Stanford Encyclopedia Of Philosophy

- The General Approach – p4
- The Nature of Funding – p4
- Funding Guidelines – p4
- What About the Philosophy Departments? – p5
- What Exactly Does the Community Get? – p6
- What is the SEP Funding Request Based On? – p6
- What is the Nature of the 3-year Contribution? – p7 **Major revisions**
- What are the Administrative Processes? – p8

Page 10: Section III. What is the SEP

Page 11: Section IV. Why Should Academic and Library Communities Care

Page 12: Section V. The SEP's Current Financial Situation and How this will Change

Page 13: Section VI. Three Models to Fund the SEP and Keep It Open Access

Page 16: Appendix- Annual Contribution/Membership Dues Guidelines

## I. Problem Statement and Opportunity – Why the SEP?

The global community of academic philosophers has uniquely collaborated to create, maintain, and expand the SEP - a work of high quality that serves a broad constituency. It has become a critical resource and is being widely used in courses and to support research around the world, as will be documented below. It has survived to date with the volunteer effort of that community, institutional support, and a series of grants. This combined formula will no longer prove viable by the end of 2005.

Unless this community, in concert with a broader community of libraries and Philosophy departments, looks creatively at how it can invest in the SEP's future we all risk several possible unattractive outcomes: (1) The SEP ceases to exist. (2) It continues to exist but at a compromised level and fails to achieve its full potential. (3) It survives but access becomes greatly restricted to subscribing institutions. (4) It survives with subscription-based access and becomes a unit of a commercial publisher subject to the operations and economics of the acquiring firm. *The SEP has already been contacted by several commercial publishers willing to assume all its costs in return for becoming its publisher.* Before any of these unattractive alternatives take shape we, as library and Philosophy communities, must consider what will be in our best long-term interests with respect to: (a) content richness, (b) affordability, and (c) maximum access by users world-wide.

We have an opportunity to use the SEP as a pilot, an experiment, to see if the global community can act together to create a new approach to taking ownership of scholarly publishing. Can we forge an approach which expands accessibility to scholarly information and do so in a way which compares with other initiatives such as SPARC, BioOne, Highwire Press, and the growing number of open access journals? We are in a time of rapid change. We have an opportunity to demonstrate leadership in creating a new global solution. The SEP was brought to the ICOLC's attention by SPARC and by JISC from the UK. After hearing an impressive presentation at the spring 2003 ICOLC meeting, the members present agreed to form a small group to begin working with the SEP to see what creative funding approaches might be considered.

Could we select some project other than the SEP? Possibly, but SEP's survival clock is ticking. It is a unique and valuable resource to the world. The creators of the SEP have already demonstrated their ability to marshal the resources of the global community of philosophers with a unique workflow system (see Section III.). This is an important ingredient. The philosophy community is demonstrating an innovative and significant degree of self-help. With the aid of the global library and philosophy communities, the SEP has a viable and supportable financial plan for the future. We should therefore take this opportunity to see if we can succeed in helping the SEP and thus ourselves. If successful we may create a global model to be used again in similar circumstances.

In Sections III through VI, we will detail the background necessary to understand what the SEP is, how it was created through a unique community approach, what its value is to us, and how it presents us with a unique collaborative opportunity to make this resource fully accessible. There are several alternative ways to prevent the SEP from ceasing to exist or becoming the property of a commercial or non-commercial publisher. These alternative publishing models are generically described below in Section VI. The critical point is to contrast these models with the traditional publishing and subscription model, on which the SEP's annual costs likely would go from \$190,000/year (see Section II) to \$300,000-\$400,000/year. The annual subscription price would reflect the increased costs of the traditional publishing model. The authors/editors would require payment (as is standard with reference works by commercial and academic presses), mirror sites that now provide their services

free would need to be reimbursed, and SEP would incur its share of publisher marketing and administrative costs.

In Section II, we are recommending a specific course of action, namely, that ICOLC members and other consortia mobilize the global library and academic community to create a long-term solution for a freely available SEP through the creation of an endowment. This effort will be a test of the ability of our consortia to take a leadership role in mustering the resources of the global library and academic community. No doubt, the success or failure of this effort will be based on the collective initiative of consortia throughout the world. But, we should expect others to rally around this effort. SPARC, for one, has reviewed and endorsed this call for action and has agreed to promote the initiative.

Unquestionably, for this to succeed, the philosophy community must stand up and strongly support this effort. They will be made fully aware of the economic crossroads the SEP is approaching. Our global effort will be directed at them as well, so as to support, energize, and empower consortia efforts.

For all those who are asked to participate in this effort, the most uncomfortable aspect will be the inherent uncertainty. There is no neat road map for this effort. On a global level, there are not always simple or consistent answers that apply to everyone, nor should there be. Taken as a whole, the response must be adequate to reach the financial goal. How that is achieved is left to the creativity of the community at the local and regional level. To offer a neat global prescription would be convenient. But that is unrealistic and undesirable. We are not trying to duplicate the unsuccessful global pricing efforts of vendors. We are attempting a wholly new approach, but it requires the local initiative and flexibility of our global community.

Addendum, January 23, 2005:

SOLINET, ICOLC and SPARC were awarded a \$500,000 Challenge Grant in December 2004 for the support of the SEP according to the plan described below. For a discussion as to how this has affected our fund-raising plan, see the final subsection ("What is the Nature of the 3-year Contribution?") in Section II below.

## Section II. – A Call to Action - ICOLC GLOBAL FUNDING INITIATIVE FOR STANFORD ENCYCLOPEDIA OF PHILOSOPHY

### The General Approach

The SEP has proposed a formula for combining contributions from the NEH, Stanford University, and the academic/library community so as to generate the necessary endowment to make the SEP independent and sustainable into the future. The academic/library community needs to contribute \$3,000,000 of the \$4,000,000 to be raised. (Stanford University will raise the other \$1,000,000.) To make this practical, we are creating a special membership organization for the support of the SEP and will be seeking three years of annual contributions in the form of donations or membership dues to this organization. The totals would yield \$1,000,000 over each of the years ending mid-2005, mid-2006, and mid-2007. After 2007 no more payments would be required; instead, the SEP will have established an operating fund which achieves free and open access for the future. Accumulation would be a global effort. World-wide there are over 2000 philosophy departments and institutes, with most offering degrees at the bachelors, masters, or Ph.D. levels. These departments, and their parent institutions in general, will benefit from the continued development of the SEP.

### The Nature of Funding

How does the global academic/library community generate \$1 million per year for 3 years? Our approach asks for three consecutive annual contributions or membership dues from institutions and consortia in as many states, provinces and countries as possible. We look to the consortium or consortia in each area act to coordinate, develop and orchestrate an appropriate local strategy for raising its fair share.

At a global level there is no single satisfactory approach that will provide a precise formula to generate the necessary \$3 million. This is not a pricing-based approach but rather an aggregate contribution-based approach. The critical singular objective is to reach the overall financial goal. In reality, given the huge diversity of local politics, organizational structures, and financial and administrative landscapes, much must be left to local initiative and discretion. For example, one area might rely heavily on libraries, another area might be able to more directly call upon the philosophy departments or parent institutions. The key to success is the willingness of consortia, worldwide, to take the lead in “thinking globally, and acting locally”. If consortia will take the initiative success can be achieved. The strategy is to achieve our objective efficiently through global group action. This will also simplify the administrative process.

### Funding Guidelines

To show how we can achieve this global effort we have chosen to provide an example of one simple method to establish geographical guidelines. To reiterate, the critical singular objective is to reach the overall financial goal. As a global voluntary effort we cannot call any guideline or goal a strict obligation, regardless of how it is derived. What is critical is that each contribution is important regardless of its relationship to any guideline or goal. There is no perfect approach and frankly, we are guessing as to the likely and hoped for outcome. We considered suggesting more elaborate models but given the great diversity of our global community we recognize the inadequacy of any single approach. Plus, as a voluntary effort, the main objective is to illustrate a scenario of relative guidelines that can result in the successful accumulation of the aggregate goal. Neither too little nor too much should be made of the guidelines.

We also recognize the wide variations in the size, nature and overlap among library consortia world-wide. There is no simple way for libraries and consortia to eliminate local ambiguities that result from

overlap and differences among consortia. We can only ask that those who know best, the local administrators, seek to minimize the confusion this might cause.

Three factors were combined to generate the guidelines offered here. First, our objective is to generate at least \$1 million per year, if not more, for 3 years. Second, we have considered the number of philosophy departments across the globe as a good general measure of relative interest. *(The lists of philosophy departments have been graciously donated to us by the Philosophy Documentation Center, the express purpose of which was to support this effort on behalf of the SEP.)* Third, the general parameters we considered, namely, English versus non-English speaking country, developing versus non-developing status, and the likely ability and willingness to contribute, were all factors which allow us to suggest amounts that could be contributed by each institution with a philosophy department. In the end, this creates a rough set of relative guidelines across the global community. Though we may have under- or over-estimated individual guidelines, what really matters is the total combined actual annual three-year commitment that is made by the global community. If every institution were to make a commitment to contribute the amount suggested by the guidelines, we would generate close to \$2 million per year. Should that happen, there are several possibilities. (1) Some of the money would be used to reduce the amounts to be requested from the NEH and to be raised from private donors. Some of the money would be used to improve the product above and beyond the normal operational costs and maintenance. (3) Finally, institutions might not have to pay the full amount indicated by their commitments (see below).

The number of Philosophy departments and annual guidelines per country during the 3 years of fundraising are summarized in the table at the end of this document. From this table a general sense of average per institution annual contribution can be calculated. Detailed institutional lists of Philosophy departments by country are found at <http://silver.ohiolink.edu/ioclc/>. The US and Canada lists are by state and province with guidelines indicated for Bachelors, Masters, and PhD level programs. On a per department or institution basis, the guidelines begin at a very modest level. It is hoped that the amount suggested by the guideline, or some amount close to it, can be committed through either a central funding approach, a reasonable division among institutions, or a combination of funding approaches to be determined locally.

#### What About the Philosophy Departments?

It is important to ask if the philosophy departments are supportive of this effort. The present effort will be merited only if they are. We would not go forward with this effort unless we fully expected the answer to be yes. In concert with the release of this document, the SEP:

- has posted a web page for its constituents that has very useful information, including an Open Letter to Professional Philosophers, the flyer it is using, an outline of why the SEP is important (see section III of this document as well) and letters of support. See <http://plato.stanford.edu/fundraising/>.
- has distributed flyers at the upcoming meetings of the Pacific Division (late March) and Central Division (late April) of the American Philosophical Association (see copy at <http://silver.ohiolink.edu/ioclc> ).
- has sent email to its 800+ authors and 90+ subject editors about our funding drive and include a copy of this Global Call to Action, asking everyone to organize their departments and endorse the proposal for their libraries
- will advertise at the SEP main web pages starting September 1, 2004

- has coordinated press with SPARC, JISC, the Australian e-Humanities network, PRT-LIBN Philosophy, Religion, Theology Librarians List, and the Centre for Computing in the Humanities at King's College London, and others

The SEP is an academic project within Stanford University's Center for the Study of Language and information. The Center's Director reports to the Dean of Research. The SEP relies on the Stanford Philosophy Department as its Advisory Board. This Advisory Board chooses the members of the Editorial Board and helps the SEP to set policy. There are 95 members currently on the Editorial Board. Their names and institutional affiliations can be found at:

<http://plato.stanford.edu/board.html>

The list of 950+ contributors (with links to their homepages when available) can be found at:

<http://plato.stanford.edu/authors.html>

### What Exactly Does the Community Get?

As previously noted, we are seeking three years of annual donations or membership dues to reach a total of at least \$1,000,000 in each of the years ending mid-2005, mid-2006, and mid-2007. After 2007 no more payments would be required. Free and completely open access to the SEP would then continue into the future indefinitely. Is there is a risk that once the required endowment is established Stanford might shut down the project and divert the money to other institutional purposes? Actually, no. The payment contract will be written so as to address this (see below). As long as the project continues to demonstrate its commitment to academic excellence (and this seems highly likely given that Stanford as an institution is so committed), Stanford would have no motivation to shut down a project that is benefiting an entire profession and the public alike. Further, Stanford would become more committed to the project as a result of a successful global effort to fund it, and so would the worldwide philosophical community. Even in a worst case scenario, the money contributed by the libraries to the endowment and the project itself are functionally portable and could be moved to a new home, though it seems unlikely that this would be necessary. (The Stanford Provost has approved the institutional arrangements discussed here and below.) The SEP project is a small operation whose key asset is its web content management software system. But we may wish to have the SEP address the ability of its community to continue operations in extreme circumstances.

Libraries which participate in our fund-raising plan would receive a perk in addition to those guarantees described below, namely, they would be allowed to download and store the 4 quarterly archives SEP makes each year. They would be able to use those archives if the SEP main server and 3 mirror sites ever go down all at once, or if the project ever folds.

The SEP has offered to provide an annual report to the community summarizing (a) its progress in building the encyclopedia entries, (b) its readership and usage statistics, and (c) its financial picture relative to the expectations expressed here. Such an annual report would be needed for at least 5 years, starting with the 05-06 academic year. The SEP is committed to an ongoing open dialogue with the community as needed.

### What is the SEP Funding Request of \$3 million Based On?

The SEP has an established operation that builds and maintains a significant content base. Currently, an NEH grant supports the operation; this grant expires at the end of the 04-05 academic

year. On the basis of its current operating budget, total projected costs for the 05-06 academic year is \$192,000, with a projected annual growth rate of 3.6%. Major costs categories are:

(\$ in 000's)

\$154.3	Staff salaries and benefits– 75% primary editor 50% professional administrative assistant 25% part-time student assistant 10% student programmer
\$ 18.0	Contract programming
\$ 11.7	Endowment-based overhead rate
\$ 5.3	Travel & misc. administrative
\$ 2.5	Computer ( \$5,0 every two years)
<u>\$191.8</u>	

An endowment of approximately \$4 million is necessary to fund this level of annual expense. The endowment will be raised from three sources, detailed in the table below:

(a) The library/academic community will raise \$1 million during each of the years ending mid-2005, mid-2006, and mid-2007, providing the bulk of the endowment. This growing principal will begin providing income to the SEP in 05-06. Thus, the total library goal is \$3 million.

(b) The SEP staff will work with its faculty sponsor and Stanford's Development Office to raise the final \$1 million dollars over 3 years from public and private sources. This growing principal also will begin providing income to SEP in 05-06. The Stanford Provost has authorized the SEP to work with the Director of Principal Gifts to generate this funding support.

(c) Before the endowment reaches sufficient self-supporting size, one more NEH grant is needed, to provide operating costs during the fund-raising period. The SEP has asked the NEH to provide \$100,000 (05-06) and \$50,000 (06-07), in a kind of weaning process. NEH has indicated receptivity to another grant if we can document the commitment and efforts on the part of the libraries and Stanford University. There is a good chance of success.

	(04-05)	(05-06)	(06-07)	(07-08)	08-09)	(09-10)	(10-11)
<b>ENDOWMENT SOURCES</b>							
Community raised funds	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
reinvested interest		\$37,000	\$75,369	\$115,158	\$119,418	\$123,837	\$128,419
Total community endowment	\$1,000,000	\$2,037,000	\$3,112,369	\$3,227,527	\$3,346,945	\$3,470,782	\$3,599,201
Stanford Fund Raise (SFR)	\$375,000	\$375,000	\$375,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
SFR reinvested interest		\$13,875	\$28,263	\$43,184	\$44,782	\$46,439	\$48,157
Total SFR Endowment	\$375,000	\$763,875	\$1,167,138	\$1,210,322	\$1,255,104	\$1,301,543	\$1,349,700
<b>TOTAL ENDOWMENT</b>	<b>\$1,375,000</b>	<b>\$2,800,875</b>	<b>\$4,279,507</b>	<b>\$4,437,849</b>	<b>\$4,602,050</b>	<b>\$4,772,325</b>	<b>\$4,948,901</b>
<b>ENDOWMENT ANNUAL INCOME to SEP</b>							
Community raised funds		\$48,000	\$97,776	\$149,394	\$154,921	\$160,653	\$166,598
SFR raised funds		\$18,000	\$36,666	\$56,023	\$58,095	\$60,245	\$62,474
<b>TOTAL to SEP from ENDOWMENT</b>		<b>\$66,000</b>	<b>\$134,442</b>	<b>\$205,416</b>	<b>\$213,017</b>	<b>\$220,898</b>	<b>\$229,072</b>
<b>OTHER INCOME</b>							
NEH	NEH	\$100,000	\$50,000				
Internal Stanford funding sources		\$25,790	\$14,347	\$529	\$343	\$142	\$0
<b>TOTAL OTHER FUNDING</b>		<b>\$125,790</b>	<b>\$64,347</b>	<b>\$529</b>	<b>\$343</b>	<b>\$142</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>TOTAL FUNDING</b>		<b>\$191,790</b>	<b>\$198,789</b>	<b>\$205,945</b>	<b>\$213,359</b>	<b>\$221,040</b>	<b>\$229,072</b>
Budget Needs	NEH	\$191,790	\$198,789	\$205,945	\$213,359	\$221,040	\$228,998

### What is the Nature of the 3-year Contribution?

We recognize that in some cases, libraries cannot contribute to an endowment. In previous releases of this document, we indicated that libraries which cannot position their contribution as a donation could exercise the option of positioning their contribution as a "subscription". We noted that donated money would receive greater protections than subscription money, namely, if the SEP project were to terminate, donated money *would be returned in full with interest*, while subscription money would be returned on a pro-rated basis. However, as of December 2004, things have changed.

SOLINET, ICOLC and SPARC were awarded a \$500,000 Challenge Grant in December 2004! This means that if we can raise half of our fund-raising goal (i.e., raise \$1.5 million), the NEH will give us \$500,000, bringing us to 2/3 of our fund-raising goal of \$3 million. Since money contributed in the form of a subscription does not count towards matching funds for our NEH Challenge Grant, we are now replacing the subscription option with the option of paying membership dues to a new membership organization that will be formed for the support of the SEP.

Consequently, payment can be positioned in one of two ways, at the discretion of the consortium or library.

Option #1: Three 1-year membership dues to a special organization formed for the support of the SEP.

Option #2: Three annual contributions to a "restricted endowment".

The money paid under either option will be protected should the SEP, all intentions to the contrary, not continue operations into the extended future. Under both options, Stanford would be contractually bound to protect the community's financial commitment by the following condition: should the SEP project ever terminate, libraries contributing money in either form would divide up the SEP's endowment in proportion to the amount that was originally paid in.

#### What are the Administrative Processes for Compiling and Collecting the Contributions?

The process of collecting 3-year *commitments* commenced in Spring 2004, with commitment intentions through the consortia due later in 2004. The ICOLC email list is being used to advise ICOLC members of this opportunity. In turn, each consortium must take the initiative and make subsequent personal contacts with other local groups and decision makers as needed. We realize we are leaving the issues of consortia overlap, even possible competition, for local resolution. With this approach and at this scale there is no simple solution other than to ask for leadership by all in coordinating local efforts.

Payments can be made annually as early as possible, or paid up-front in a lump sum. The official annual payment due dates will be March 1 of 2005, 2006, and 2007.

ICOLC members OhioLINK and SOLINET have agreed to act as the central points of information concerning this initiative and SOLINET will record financial commitments and, if our financial goals are met, will act as the collection agent. SOLINET has agreed to do this at no charge. Primary contacts are:

Timothy Cherubini  
Manager, Library Products & Services  
SOLINET  
1438 West Peachtree St. NW - Suite 200  
Atlanta, Georgia 30309-2955

Telephone: 404 892 0943 x4992; 800 999 8558 x4992  
Fax: 404 892 7879  
tcherubini@solinet.net

Tom Sanville  
Executive Director  
OhioLINK  
2455 North Star Rd. Suite 300  
Columbus, OH 43221  
Telephone 614-728-3600 x322  
Fax 614-728-3610  
tom@ohiolink.edu

Consortia should inform Tim or Tom of their plans or contact them if they have questions about the process. Please provide: (1) the group's name, (2) a list of institutions covered by this response, (3) contact information for the formal contracting and payment process, and (4) an indication of whether the consortium intends to pursue payment Option #1 or #2.

Specific questions about the SEP beyond the information covered in Sections III – VI can be directed to:

Edward N. Zalta      <http://mally.stanford.edu/zalta.html>  
Senior Research Scholar  
CSLI/Cordura Hall      zalta@stanford.edu  
Stanford University      ph. 650-723-0488  
Stanford, CA 94305-4115      fx. 650-725-2166

## SEP Background

### III. What is the SEP?

In existence for 8 years with a viable web-based service, the Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (SEP) <<http://plato.stanford.edu/>> is the first scholarly project to have organized an entire profession to collaboratively write and maintain a "dynamic reference work". The authors of the entries are scholars at universities around the world who have been chosen on the basis of their expertise to write and maintain an entry on a philosophical topic. These authors upload new entries and maintain/update their entries as new research becomes available. All new entries and updates to entries are rigorously refereed by a distinguished Board of Editors. With funding from the NEH and NSF's Digital Libraries Initiative 2, the SEP has built a software workflow system that enables the efforts of authors and subject editors to be administered by a single principal editor with a minimal support staff.

The goal of the SEP is to build a dynamic reference work that is authoritative, comprehensive, responsive to research, and useful to scholars (of all levels) and the general public, but which can be run efficiently on a small staff. This is an academic project in which the publishing house and most of the personnel involved in the publishing process have been eliminated. Now 850+ authors and 90+ subject editors are contributing to the project and all are working for free. The paid, central administrative staff consists of 1.75 FTE positions.

This workflow system consists of:

(1) web interfaces for the authors, subject editors, and the principal editor, with menu-driven functions that allow the relevant parties to

- (a) suggest new entries and prospective authors,
- (b) issue and accept invitations,
- (c) download templates and upload entries,
- (d) view and edit entries for the purpose of refereeing them,
- (e) remotely update/revise entries in a private part of the server,
- (f) display original and revised entries side-by-side with the differences highlighted (for refereeing updates to entries), and
- (g) accept, reject or publish entries;

(2) a master workflow tracking system that provides back-end data processing for the actions taken at the web-interfaces and supplies the principal editor's web interfaces with greater access to information, so that he/she can have 'at-a-glance' administrative control over the various parts of the workflow; and

(3) an automaton that, on a nightly basis, checks the state of every entry, determines who owes work by what date, compares the date with the current date, and, if necessary, sends out email reminders on an appropriate schedule.

SEP's publishing model is unique and differs from that of electronic journals and preprint exchanges in the following ways. Electronic journals: (1) typically do not update the articles they publish, (2) do not aim to publish articles on a comprehensive set of topics, but rather, for the most part, publish articles that are randomly submitted by the members of the profession (with the exception of special journal issues that are narrowly focused on a single topic) (3) typically serve a narrow audience of specialists, and (4) do not have to deal with the asynchronous activity of updating, refereeing, and

tracking separate deadlines for entries, since they are published on a synchronized schedule. Preprint exchanges not only exhibit features (1), (2), and (3), but also do not referee their publications and so need not incorporate a work-flow system that handles the asynchronous refereeing process that occurs between upload and publication in a dynamic reference work. None of this is to say that electronic journals and preprint exchanges have a faulty design, but rather that the SEP dynamic reference work is a distinctive new kind of publication that represents a new information structure, a new digital libraries concept, and thus a new test bed for research in information technology.

The SEP prepares fixed editions, on a quarterly basis, of the entire Encyclopedia and makes them available on the web. Since the entries in the active portion of the SEP are often revised and updated, they are unsuitable for the purposes of scholarly citation. But the fixed version of these entries, in the Fall, Winter, Spring, and Summer Editions of the SEP, can be properly cited (ISSN 1095-5054).

The SEP is of broad interest. It straddles both the sciences and the humanities. There are entries in 35 subject areas, including philosophy of science, aesthetics, history of ideas, feminism, ethics (theoretical and applied), social and political philosophy, logic, etc.

There currently are 1501 projected entries in the SEP, of which 971 have been commissioned and 566 written (as of July 30, 2004). The 566 entries average 9,500 words/entry, and though there are not as many entries as found in the commercial Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy Online, many of the Routledge entries are less than 1,000 words, and their average entry length is somewhere between 2,000 and 3,000 words. SEP expects to have another 250 entries online by the end of the 2005 academic year, and possibly another 250 new commissions. The primary focus will be on entries that are the most important subjects of current research, so that the SEP will be as "complete" as possible with regard to active areas of research. But as a dynamic reference work, it will grow, evolve, and adapt as research and knowledge advances.

#### IV. Why Should the Academic and Library Communities Care? How Important is the SEP to All of Us?

The SEP is currently a free web service and has one principal website (at Stanford University) and three mirror sites (at universities in Sydney, Amsterdam, Leeds). It has combined statistics in excess of 300,000 accesses/week. This level of activity indicates that SEP has become the premier source of authoritative information about philosophy on the World Wide Web. The statistics and studies described below tend to support this claim.

Consortia and libraries can determine SEP usage from their own institutions. Go to

<http://leibniz.stanford.edu/cgi-bin/library/usage.cgi>

and type in domain name such as "stanford.edu" or "kcl.ac.uk". This engine will present usage statistics for the current academic year (from Sept 2003 to date) and for the previous academic year. Information is presented about the number of (non-unique) entries downloaded and the machine host-names on campus. Please keep in mind that if you have multiple or variant domain names not all searches will be reflected under one lookup. Note the wide variety of academic departments on campus other than philosophy having computers that access the SEP.

- Google analysis

The SEP staff conducted a Google search on the titles/topics of the first 100 SEP entries:

- 75% of the time, the SEP entry on the title/topic was at the top of the list of sites returned. (Google ranks sites on the basis of the number of links to those sites.)
- 94% of the time, the SEP entry was in the top 10 sites returned.
- According to an April 2002 user survey:
  - students are 52% of all SEP users, researchers are 9%, instructors are 14%, others are 25%
  - Universities represent 89% of student users, 54% of researcher users, and 87% of instructor users
  - 24% of users are at US News & WR Top 20 National Universities, 21% of users are Top Grad Depts in Philosophy
  - Use is broad-based by discipline. Specialization of SEP users listed by Students-Researchers-Instructors, Philosophy (29%-42%-54%), Math, computer or nat. sciences (22%-38%-17%), History, English, other humanities (13%-4%-10%), Social sciences (11%-2%-6%), All other (26%-14%-13%)

The closest competitor to the SEP is the commercial Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy. Its cost per year varies depending on the level of use desired. There is no residual access to the electronic version should a subscription be cancelled. The 2003 prices were:

**1-YEAR SUBSCRIPTION**

Limited simultaneous users

Max # Users	US \$	Can \$
1	\$ 700	\$1,050
2-4	\$1,100	\$1,650
5-9	\$1,500	\$2,250
Each addl user	\$ 125	\$ 188

FTE-Based: Unlimited simultaneous users

Full-Time Enrollment	US \$	Can. \$
0-5000	\$ 880	\$1,320
5-10,000	\$1,500	\$2,250
10-30,000	\$2,100	\$3,150
30-50,000	\$2,520	\$3,780
50,000+	Negotiation	Negotiation

**3-YEAR SUBSCRIPTION (10% discount off 1-Year Rates)**

V. The SEP's Current Financial Situation and How This Will Change

The SEP was funded from 1995-1997 by the Center for the Study of Language and Information, at Stanford University, where the project was conceived, designed, and implemented. Its history of federal grant support is:

- 1998-2000, NEH (Preservation & Access) Grant #PA-23167-98, \$131,400
- 2000-2003, NSF (Digital Libraries Initiative 2) Grant #IIS-9981549, \$528,900
- 2003-2005, NEH (Preservation & Access) Grant #PA-50133-03, \$300,828

The current NEH grant will expire in September 2005. SEP needs to be on the road to self-sufficiency thereafter.

Funding under the NSF grant was \$180,000/year, and it is \$150,000/year under the current NEH grant. However, by 2005, the Principal Editor will move to 75% time and SEP will replace some student assistance with lower-turnover, professional editorial assistance. Thus, SEP anticipates the annual budget in October 2005 to be \$191,000/year. At \$250,000/year, SEP could do a lot more – such as additional processing, both at the "front end" (i.e., to enhance quality-control, uniformity, informativeness, cross-linking, etc., of the entries themselves) and at the "back end" (in terms of workflow, search capabilities, etc.).

SEP is committed to seeking grants to underwrite the technical improvements and advances beyond routine operations and maintenance.

## VI. Three Models By Which the Libraries Fund the SEP and Keep it Open Access.

In principle, the SEP would prefer to continue to offer completely free and open access to its content over the WWW, so that a wide variety of people, with different levels of education and from different parts of the world, may continue to use it. Alternatively, the SEP could disappear behind the all too familiar subscription wall. Only those who pay would get access. In this latter case, the SEP might be able to maintain its independence but it also may be required to sell out to a commercial or non-profit publisher, which would take over the all operations. If sold, the concepts of the community effort, open access, and cost recovery economics would be lost.

There are several ways to prevent SEP from becoming the property of a commercial/non-profit publisher. These are generically described below. As noted in Section II, we are suggesting that the global library and academic community create a long-term solution for a freely available SEP through the specific execution of Option A as generically described below. This will be a test of the ability of consortia to take a leadership role in mustering the resources of the global library and academic community.

### A. Complete Open Access Underwritten by Endowment

On this model, the SEP would partner with libraries and consortia worldwide to build a \$4 million endowment. The libraries would contribute to this endowment by paying a charter membership, to be made with 3 annual payments. Thus, for example, instead of paying a recurring charge of \$500/year - \$2000/year for access to the SEP (and which might go up in successive years), a large institution would make a \$7,500 - \$15,000 contribution (spread over several years) and then never have to pay for access again. This payment could be positioned as buying a lifetime membership (perpetual access) rather than a contribution to an endowment. If enough libraries and consortia contribute (at a rate proportional to size/ability to pay), Stanford would invest all library monies in its endowment (keeping subscribed and donated monies in separate accounts). The SEP would then live on the 5% interest that the University would return to the project each year (reinvesting any excess interest).

Under Models A and B (below), the SEP will naturally look to those libraries which are associated with, and serve, professional philosophy departments. Financial cooperation between library and philosophy departments may be in order. But the usage and survey data make clear that the SEP is also filling needs in many other fields of specialization, in particular, science, other humanities, medicine and business.

## B. Complete Open Access Underwritten by Annual Contributions

On this model, the SEP would partner with libraries and consortia worldwide to generate the required \$200,000 plus needed each year. Libraries with a legitimate primary interest in and ability to contribute would need to contribute (subscribe) at \$500/year - \$3000/year, depending on size, for access to the SEP. But SEP would not restrict access to just these institutions. Access would remain open to all. One can liken this model to the NPR (National Public Radio) approach of some pay, all benefit. Obviously this model only works if the community as a whole can generate the required \$200,000 plus each year and if those libraries that "should" contribute mostly do. If enough libraries and consortia contribute (at a rate proportional to size/ability to pay), this model might work, although with less stability than Model A.

This revenue-generation plan would be more complex, and involve expenses to keep track of who has paid and who has not, and require part-time personnel to keep up with contracts and to market each year the annual contributions. Money could be collected through the non-profit Philosophy Documentation Center, however, there would still be marketing costs. However, on this model, authors and editors could legitimately ask for payment for services rendered, given that it is a traditional income generation plan. If that were to happen, the SEP costs would increase significantly and so would the subscription rate.

## C. Limited Access Underwritten by Yearly Subscriptions – Open Access to a Portion of the SEP

On this model, the active portion of the SEP's content, i.e., its dynamic entries (which are always changing) might still be freely available to everyone. However, the SEP's archives would become available only to users at those institutions which pay a yearly subscription fee. Since proper academic citation and citation-lookup can take place only to fixed, archived versions of the entries, this program would be attractive to scholars and those librarians who would like to foster good web citation habits among their students and faculty.

This revenue-generation plan would be more complex than Model A, and involve expenses to configure the SEP servers to keep track of who has paid and who has not, and require part-time personnel to keep up with contracts and to market. Money could be collected through the non-profit Philosophy Documentation Center, however, there would still be marketing costs.

Model C will not work if the SEP discovers that the archive is not a sufficient draw and that there are significant numbers of accesses to the free dynamic portion from institutions which have not paid for subscription to the archives. Then SEP would have to consider having no free access or limiting the number of visits to the \*dynamic\* portion of the Encyclopedia, after which point users wouldn't be able to reach \*any\* portion of the SEP. This would involve more administration.

This model disenfranchises those academics and students in poorer institutions/countries from properly citing the SEP and, at worst, may preclude archive access entirely, since these institutions/countries won't even be able to afford the costs of subscription to the archives. This model has the most extra costs associated with it -- automating authentication, costs for marketing and maintaining contracts, and costs charged by the Philosophy Documentation Center for collecting money.

Under this model it is unclear how the mirror sites would be incorporated. At present, these mirror sites; (a) speed up service to other parts of the world, (b) provide service when the Stanford server is

down and (c) provide a level of digital preservation. Would they charge for mirroring? There would be extra IT costs of configuring their servers to respect subscription restrictions, etc.

**ANNUAL CONTRIBUTION/SUBSCRIPTION GUIDELINES FOR ICOLC FUNDING INITIATIVE FOR STANFORD ENCYCLOPEDIA OF PHILOSOPHY**

Europe			Asia			Africa			North America		
	Phil	Annual G		Phil	Annual G		Phil	Annual G		Phil	Annual G
	Depts			Depts			Depts			Depts	
ARMENIA	3	\$600	AZERBAIJAN	1	\$200	ALGERIA	2	\$200	CANADA	68	\$172,000
AUSTRIA	12	\$6,000	BANGLADESH	5	\$1,000	ANGOLA	1	\$100	MEXICO	26	\$5,200
BELARUS	2	\$400	CHINA	39	\$7,800	BENIN	1	\$200	UNITED STATES	865	\$1,393,000
BELGIUM	15	\$7,500	CYPRUS	1	\$200	CENT AFR REP	1	\$100			<b>\$1,570,200</b>
BOSNIA & HERZ	1	\$200	INDIA	107	\$21,400	CHAD	1	\$100	<b>Australia</b>		
BULGARIA	4	\$800	INDONESIA	10	\$2,000	EGYPT	3	\$300	AUSTRALIA	50	\$50,000
CROATIA	2	\$400	IRAN	3	\$600	ERITREA	1	\$200	NEW ZEALAND	11	\$11,000
CZECH REPUBLIC	7	\$1,400	IRAQ	3	\$600	ETHIOPIA	2	\$200			<b>\$61,000</b>
DENMARK	9	\$4,500	ISRAEL	7	\$3,500	GABON	1	\$100	<b>Latin America/Caribbean</b>		
ESTONIA	4	\$800	JAPAN	52	\$10,400	GHANA	2	\$200	ARGENTINA	21	\$4,200
FINLAND	8	\$4,000	JORDAN	1	\$200	GUINEA	2	\$400	BERMUDA	1	\$1,000
FRANCE	40	\$20,000	KAZAKHSTAN	1	\$200	KENYA	8	\$800	BOLIVIA	1	\$200
GEORGIA	2	\$400	KUWAIT	1	\$200	LESOTHO	2	\$200	BRAZIL	36	\$7,200
GERMANY	81	\$40,500	LAOS	1	\$200	LIBERIA	1	\$100	CHILE	17	\$3,400
GREECE	8	\$4,000	LEBANON	4	\$800	LIBYA	3	\$300	COLOMBIA	16	\$3,200
HUNGARY	16	\$3,200	MALAYSIA	4	\$800	MADAGASCAR	2	\$200	COSTA RICA	3	\$600
ICELAND	2	\$1,000	MONGOLIA	1	\$200	MALAWI	1	\$200	CUBA	1	\$200
IRELAND	9	\$9,000	MYANMAR	1	\$200	MOROCCO	1	\$100	DOMINICAN REP	1	\$200
ITALY	37	\$18,500	OMAN	1	\$200	NAMIBIA	1	\$100	ECUADOR	4	\$800
LATVIA	2	\$400	PAKISTAN	6	\$1,200	NIGERIA	10	\$1,000	EL SALVADOR	1	\$200
LIECHTENSTEIN	1	\$500	PHILIPPINES	26	\$5,200	RWANDA	1	\$100	GUATEMALA	3	\$600
LITHUANIA	2	\$400	QATAR	1	\$200	SOUTH AFRICA	18	\$1,800	HONDURAS	1	\$200
LUXEMBOURG	1	\$500	SINGAPORE	1	\$200	SUDAN	1	\$100	JAMAICA	2	\$400
MACEDONIA	1	\$200	SOUTH KOREA	40	\$8,000	TOGO	1	\$100	NICARAGUA	3	\$600
MALTA	1	\$500	SRI LANKA	3	\$600	TUNISIA	1	\$100	PANAMA	1	\$200
MOLDOVA	1	\$200	SYRIA	1	\$200	UGANDA	1	\$100	PERU	6	\$1,200
NETHERLANDS	13	\$6,500	TAIWAN	9	\$1,800	ZAMBIA	1	\$100	URUGUAY	5	\$1,000
NORWAY	8	\$4,000	THAILAND	11	\$2,200	ZIMBABWE	2	\$200	VENEZUELA	4	\$800
POLAND	25	\$5,000	TURKEY	13	\$2,600			<b>\$7,700</b>			<b>\$26,200</b>
PORTUGAL	7	\$3,500	UNITED ARAB EMIR	1	\$200						
ROMANIA	16	\$3,200	VIET NAM	2	\$400						
RUSSIA	29	\$5,800	YEMEN	2	\$400						
SLOVAKIA	4	\$800			<b>\$73,900</b>						
SLOVENIA	2	\$400									
SPAIN	38	\$19,000									
SWEDEN	7	\$3,500									
SWITZERLAND	13	\$6,500									
UKRAINE	4	\$800									
UNITED KINGDOM	108	\$108,000									
VATICAN C STATE	2	\$1,000									
YUGOSLAVIA	3	\$600									
		<b>\$294,500</b>									