

# APA/AIA Task Force on Electronic Publications: Final Report

## A. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Task Force was charged the analysis of particular issues associated with the burgeoning area of electronic publishing, including peer refereeing, freedom of information, intellectual property protection, storage and retrieval of data and whatever other concerns it may identify. Having prepared a policy statement in summer 2006, the Task Force turned to the final report of the American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS) released in 2006 (see sections D “Key Principles” and E “General Desiderata”). After discussion (see section F “Discussion”) and comments, the Task Force has formulated the following recommendations:

R1. Continue with the efforts, supported by the Capital Campaign and Board of Directors, to plan, design, and sustain a portal to digital content.

R2: Form a group dedicated to assessing classical websites with significant instructional or research tools and content through a peer-review process. Consider creating a more extensive optional peer-review process for sites that request it. Provide access to websites via portal, either directly or through linking.

R3. Explore the cost of providing portal access to important by-subscription collections to all members through the societies, or alternatively try to arrange for reasonable individual rates to be offered to members.

R4. Appoint two or three editors and institute a section for postprints (and perhaps other material) in the CDL's eScholarship Repository, or like platform.

R5. Explore a new digitally-distributed series of APA monographs. Appoint a small "development" editorial board of senior scholars to formulate precise guidelines for the series. Present proposal to OUP-USA so that it may exercise its contract right to collaborate in this venture or decline; if OUP-USA declines, the board will evaluate other potential partners. Study funding models, and apply for a startup grant.

R6. Appoint a small group to explore the feasibility of digitizing the APA microfiches to make them freely available in an open-access archive.

R7. Issue a statement encouraging development of a high-quality non-commercial digital library of Latin texts.

## B. BACKGROUND AND CHARGE

In 2005, in response to discussions in standing APA [American Philological Association] committees about the possibility of a digital monograph series and about policy on recognition and evaluation of digital scholarship, the APA Board of Directors formed a Task Force to consider these and related issues. The Task Force met for the first time in Montreal in January 2006, and shortly thereafter the group was expanded to include representation from the AIA [Archaeological Institute of America]. The Task Force operated through email exchanges during 2006, met again in San Diego in January 2007, and finalized this report in February and March 2007.

The charge of the Task Force is as follows:

The Task Force will have as its charge the analysis of particular issues associated with the burgeoning area of electronic publishing, including peer refereeing, freedom of information, intellectual property protection, storage and retrieval of data and whatever other concerns it may identify. Our precedent is the Association's Committee on Computer operations which, during its active life, made many valuable contributions, some of which have had lasting influence upon techniques utilized in our research.

The membership of the Task Force is as follows:

- Adam Blistein (APA Executive Director, ex officio)
- Laura Cerruti (Acquisitions Editor, U California Press)
- Cynthia Damon (Journal Editor Rep., former editor of TAPA)
- Sebastian Heath (AIA and American Numismatic Society)
- Jeffrey Henderson (APA VP Research)
- David Konstan (APA VP Professional Matters)
- Eleanor Leach (APA ex-President. ex officio)
- Michael Lundell (Director, Indiana University Press)
- Catherine Mardikes (U Chicago Library)
- Donald Mastronarde (former APA Monographs Editor), Chair
- Robin Mitchell-Boyask (APA Website Editor, ex officio)
- Marilyn Skinner (APA VP Publications)
- Barbara Tsakirgis (AIA Rep.)

### C. INTERIM ACTIONS

By the end of summer 2006, the Task Force produced a policy statement on electronic publications and scholarly work in digital formats to recommend to the Board of Directors of the APA and the Executive Committee of the AIA. Both bodies officially approved this statement, and thereafter it was printed in the October 2006 APA Newsletter (p. 19) and in the AIA Newsletter (Winter 2007). It is now displayed online at:

<http://www.apaclassics.org/Publications/e-publishing.html>  
and can also be downloaded from:  
<http://www.archaeological.org/pdfs/estatement.pdf>

In October 2006 the Task Force made available a draft report on issues and possible recommendations and invited comments from the membership. We thank those who submitted comments, all of which were useful to our deliberations. The Task Force hopes to sponsor a panel at the Chicago meeting in 2008 at which developments and issues related to digital library resources and initiatives will be discussed.

### D. KEY PRINCIPLES

In preparing this final report, we have benefited from the appearance of the final report of the American Council of Learned Societies Commission on Cyberinfrastructure for the Humanities and Social Sciences, available at:

<http://www.acls.org/cyberinfrastructure/index.htm>

The Executive Summary has been extracted from the ACLS report and is appended to this report, but officers and members of the APA are encouraged to download and read the entire document. The ACLS Commission report provides an excellent overview of challenges, opportunities, and possibilities, and it is therefore unnecessary to include a preamble here about the overall climate of ongoing change in which classicists and archaeologists are now carrying out their research and teaching. It will be useful, however, to summarize the recommendations of that report and note how they are related to current or future endeavors of the APA and AIA. It should be noted that these recommendations are addressed to various constituencies, ranging from the federal government and private foundations to universities and colleges and individual scholars.

**1. Invest in cyberinfrastructure for the humanities and social sciences, as a matter of strategic priority.**

The APA Capital Campaign represents an important investment in the future of bibliographic access and a possible portal. See F.1 below.

**2. Develop public and institutional policies that foster openness and access.**

Facilitating access for independent scholars and individuals to licensed collections, the proposed digitization of microfiches from the Classical Microfiches project, and the proposed postprint collection would all contribute to improving access and setting an example of openness. See E.4, F.3, F.4, and F.6 below.

**3. Promote cooperation between the public and private sectors.**

**4. Cultivate leadership in support of cyberinfrastructure from within the**

**humanities and social sciences.**

**5. Encourage digital scholarship.**

Peer review of websites, a repository for working papers and preprints, and a digital monograph series would all foster digital scholarship. See E.6, F.2, F.5, and F.6 below.

**6. Establish national centers to support scholarship that contributes to and exploits cyberinfrastructure.**

**7. Develop and maintain open standards and robust tools.**

See E.2 below.

**8. Create extensive and reusable digital collections.**

The associations' role is one of encouragement and advice rather than that of creator. See E.2, E.3, and F. 7 below.

The present report is intended to identify areas in which the two organizations may have a useful role to play. Because APA and AIA have limited staffs and funding and are heavily dependent on the efforts of ever-changing volunteers in offices and on committees, their role may often consist of informing, exhorting, and facilitating, but there are also some particular projects that one or the other organization can consider undertaking.

E. GENERAL DESIDERATA

Based on our own deliberations, comments received, and the content of the ACLS report, we wish to highlight the following desiderata as goals that the associations and their members should keep in mind and encourage as digital resources are planned, created, and used:

E.1. *efficiency of access*: truly extraordinary resources may be made available by individual scholars, libraries, and other projects, but they will not have full impact unless scholars, students, and others know of their existence or find them easily when they research a specific relevant question. The need for efficient access can be met by advanced cataloguing of resources, submission to databases (for instance, the new self-submission function now available for L'Année Philologique), and reliable portals. (See Recommendation F.1 below.) Many libraries already interconnect their online catalogues with the resources, and we recommend that more libraries make efforts to do so. Libraries could also take responsibility to submit records to the national union catalogues (WorldCat, RLG) for all important digital projects at their home institutions.

E.2. *interoperability*: data providers need to seek to conform to standards, especially open standards, to provide for readiness for future changes in digital technologies and for cooperative efforts, such as data sharing, program sharing, or linkage with library catalogues. (See Recommendation F.7 below.)

E.3. *sustainability and preservation*: projects that aim to serve content that is more than ephemeral need to plan from the beginning for sustainability of the product and preservation of valuable data. Sustainability can be difficult in a climate in which funding organizations are interested in seeding new projects with temporary grants, but long-term

financing is rarely easy to identify. With the constant evolution of hardware and software and storage media, preservation of digital material is a challenging and potentially repetitive chore.<sup>1</sup> (See Recommendation F.5, F.7 below.)

E.4. *open access and open content*: humanities scholars believe in the transformative power of human communication and artistic expression, and it is natural that they should want original documents and a great deal of the secondary literature that explains and interprets them to be available to as wide an audience as possible with as little constraint as possible, in continuation of the ideals of the public library. Open-access archives are a valuable alternative to commercialized media and the unfortunate expansion of copyright restrictions brought on by the Digital Millennium Copyright Act. It is appropriate for the societies and their members to encourage and participate in open-access, open-content endeavors. (See Recommendations F.4 and F.6 below.)

E.5. *openness to change*: as digital resources become more abundant and everyone grows more familiar and comfortable with their use, the profession must be open-minded about replacing old ways of doing things with new ways. Self-submission of items to L'Année Philologique already points the way toward a less centralized mode of data collection that may save time and money. At what point will we no longer need printed editions of L'Année Philologique? How much longer will revised and modernized inscriptional corpora be issued at a snail's pace in expensive printed volumes?

E.6. *peer review*: the peer review process has been essential in publishing and academic personnel hiring and review, and a major factor that has inhibited digital scholarship is the worry or the belief that the standards for digital scholarship are lower than for print scholarship. Professional societies and their members have a responsibility to extend the principles and practices of peer review, as far as is appropriate, to ensure that quality is correctly recognized regardless of the format, and that our students and the general public have access to accurate information and well-thought-out and documented arguments and interpretations. (See Recommendations F.2, F.5 below.)

## F. DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### F.1. Bibliographic accessibility of electronic resources

Some classical material can be found by doing a Google search, but many searches produce a confusing plethora of mostly irrelevant hits and lead to sites for which quality

---

<sup>1</sup> Both interoperability and sustainability are primary goals being sought for humanities digital projects in an ambitious initiative of the Mellon Foundation currently in progress. This project aims to provide a Software Environment for the Advancement of Scholarly Research (SEASR), building on architecture and tools from Data to Knowledge (D2K), developed by NCSA at UIUC, and Unstructured Information Management Architecture (UIMA), from IBM's Watson Lab. See <http://reqfd.wordpress.com/2007/02/06/mackie-mellon/>.

assurance is lacking. Authors of online materials can help searchers by using the HTML meta-tags with the names “description” and “keywords” and appropriate content.

Officially published scholarly material above a certain threshold of quality of scholarship, whether in paper format or digital-only, is supposed to be covered by l'Année Philologique. For bibliography on material culture, DYABOLA, the database of the German Archaeological Institute, is of comparable or greater importance. The American Office of APH reports that electronic journals are included, but that it sometimes takes a while for APH to learn of them. Sometimes editors of a new electronic journal bring it to the attention of APH (a policy to be recommended), and sometimes APH discovers its existence somehow after the fact. Our own study indicates that much remains to be done to provide consistent and reliable reference to electronic resources (see Appendix, section III).

We have mentioned above (E.1) the need for library catalogues to integrate links to online resources present in JStor or the like or in open-access archives. Although we all appreciate the accomplishments of the major bibliographic projects in Classics, it must be said that the level of functionality of our indexes now lags behind what is to be found in other fields. Classics indexes exist in a closed environment; the only links in place lead to their own data. Ideally, records should be updated to include a field for an electronic resource's URL, which can dynamically be wrapped in an href for immediate access (in MARC records the 856 field serves this function, but any designated field will do). Furthermore, non-Classics indexes have adopted the OpenURL protocol or in some cases the Z39.50 standard, and because of compliance with those standards citation linkers can take users directly to the full-text of an article from the citation in the index. Records of online materials would most helpfully be included in WorldCat and in many cases also in each university's online catalogue.<sup>2</sup>

As for digital content, there are various compilations of classical internet resources on departmental and library web sites, but the larger the list, the more difficult it is to maintain over the long haul, and the job has become too large for any individual. We considered whether this is a function that should be organized by or sustained by the APA or AIA. Although members of the Task Force expressed strong concerns about the level of long-term participation and commitment an APA portal would entail, they also recognized the desirability of there being an excellent portal. During our deliberations, the APA announced a capital campaign (coupled with an NEH Challenge Grant), one of whose stated goals is to provide such a portal. Should the capital campaign succeed, careful planning and design will be needed to make such a portal sustainable. Ideally, such a portal would not only compile and maintain a collection of classical links, but also inform users briefly about the scope and level of information on linked sites, and regularly verify the continued existence of linked sites.

*RECOMMENDATION 1: Continue with the efforts, supported by the Capital Campaign and APA Board of Directors, to plan, design, and sustain a portal to digital content.*

---

<sup>2</sup> Correction (April 3, 2007): we have learned that APH is OpenURL-compliant, although it appears that many subscribing institutions and classics librarians are unaware of this.

## F.2. Peer Review and Online Content

As scholars devote more time and effort to more elaborate websites, they are inviting an unlimited international audience. Peer review of websites (say, done at the request of the author/manager, and done by qualified reviewers) would have two benefits. (1) For users of a portal, peer-reviewed sites could be highlighted as having received certification or recommendation, so the users have some help in deciding which links to pursue. (2) For authors and managers, peer review should contribute to appropriate credit being given in academic personnel processes, and the more it is perceived that such credit is available, the more scholars will make their expertise available online. These two benefits have somewhat different audiences. The first is aimed at helping students and the general public locate sound information, and this goal serves the outreach and public service functions of a professional society. The second is aimed at encouraging excellence in teaching and scholarship in the field, which is also an important function of such societies.

Peer review of scholarly websites of this sort is in its infancy (see merlot.org for one general effort in this direction). Members of the Task Force had differing notions of where and how to apply peer review and how to present links on a portal. Clearly, a portal would provide links to some resources that already incorporate peer review (such as online journals), and there would be no need to assess such a site. The need is rather to extend peer review to areas where it is not currently present but would be useful. The gatekeepers of a portal could publish guidelines for inclusion, and site authors/managers who wish to have their sites listed could submit them to the gatekeepers, or the gatekeepers would seek out potential sites and invite the authors to consider requesting inclusion. Upon submission, the gatekeepers would decide whether to list or not. The very fact of being accepted on the portal would represent a level of basic validation. Any link would be accompanied by a brief description identifying what the aim of the site is, who is responsible for the content, and to what level of expertise it is directed. Some members of the group, however, would like to see in addition a higher level of validation or recommendation also available for sites that request more extensive peer review. This could involve, for example, an actual review posted somewhere online, and a special icon next to the portal link that would link to that review.

*RECOMMENDATION 2: Form a group dedicated to assessing classical websites with significant instructional or research tools and content through a peer-review process. Consider creating a more extensive optional peer-review process for sites that request it. Provide access to websites via portal, either directly or through linking.*

## F.3. Online Accessibility: free vs. subscriptions, and privileged vs. unprivileged users

While there are good reasons to support open access and open content for the public good, as stated above, there are of course good reasons for journals, presses, and learned societies to want some income from their publications to offset costs; hence, for-pay

publications and subscription services exist and will continue to exist.<sup>3</sup> While in the sciences grant funding can absorb some publication costs and the short “shelf-life” of new scholarship makes it less problematic to make articles freely available within months after publication, humanities disciplines in general lack generous funding sources, and the period of time a press may need to recover its cost through sales of an item will often be measured in years rather than months.

Sometimes, however, the subscription model creates an issue that should be a concern to the professional societies: namely, the level of access to materials available to independent scholars and to members of smaller and less wealthy departments. Of course, libraries at home institutions have always ranged from poor to good to better to great, but scholars have been able to overcome some local deficiencies by visiting large libraries in person or using InterLibrary Borrowing (ILL itself is becoming in some cases more difficult because of licenses to digital collections). The situation with licensed subscriptions to digital collections is different: in many cases, a scholar may not only lack access at her own institution, but also be blocked from access online when visiting a larger institution, unless the visitor has an official status with ID number and password, as this is a basic mechanism for control of licensed online access at many campuses. Such authentication is often integrated with institutional software for employment and enrollment, and these software systems may be quite inflexible, lacking any easy provision for a short-term informal visitor. Moreover, some of the large resources have so far offered licenses only for institutions and not for individuals. It is a good sign that the Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies recently negotiated a member’s price for individual JStor access.

Comments received in response to the draft report indicate that this is a real problem for some members.

*RECOMMENDATION 3: explore the cost of providing portal access to important by-subscription collections to all members through the societies, or alternatively try to arrange for reasonable individual rates to be offered to members.*

#### F.4. Online accessibility: inclusiveness of the historical material

Many journals are covered for their entire run by JStor or Project Muse or similar subscription services. Therefore, many articles are available online to those with access to a subscription. Others journals are not covered, or not for their entire run, and there is also much article-like scholarship of equivalent value in Festschriften and in volumes of conference proceedings that is not covered by such services. In general, all journal publishers and journal editors should be encouraged to provide some form of electronic access (by subscription or free) for new issues as soon as possible, and to make historical material under their control available as well.

---

<sup>3</sup> The Association of American University Presses has issued a statement dated February 2007 about the concerns that an open-access future may pose to the university presses. See <http://www.aaupnet.org/aboutup/issues/oa/statement.pdf>.



Open-access digital repositories of postprints are a logical location for scholars to deposit the kind of published work that is being neglected by the standard digitized collections. The California Digital Library operates an open-access eScholarship Repository that hosts some national disciplinary collections on the basis of participation of University of California departments or faculty. The CDL manager has already agreed that if, for instance, the Classics Department at Berkeley sponsored the inclusion of a APA/AIA postprint collection, such a section could be set up, controlled by editors appointed by the APA. The function of editors would be to review submissions for suitability of content and quality of appearance. The eScholarship Repository is already equipped with the mechanisms for submission and editorial review.

There may be copyright issues involved when an author wants to make a postprint available, but there are documents giving straightforward advice and steps to take, and authors can usually obtain permission for creating and posting a postprint PDF without much difficulty, especially if a Festschrift is out of print or a journal has no plans to digitize its older issues.

If such an eScholarship site is initiated, it might be used for more than postprints: preprints, working papers, and conference abstracts are other possibilities. If the following recommendation is approved, then preliminary steps would include appointing two or three editors; reviewing the information about how to determine whether permission is needed and how to get it and about how to prepare the postprint PDF for submission (adding more specific advice for classicists, as needed); seeding the site with a few dozen submissions by APA officers and committee members before announcing its availability to the membership at large.

*RECOMMENDATION 4: appoint two or three editors and institute a section for postprints (and perhaps other material) in the CDL's eScholarship Repository, or like platform.*

#### F.5. Digital monograph series

The National Academies Press has been quite successful in publishing science monographs that are immediately available for free download as well as for print on demand. Some experiments by university presses show that making some books available in toto in free PDFs appears not to harm sales of the hard copies and perhaps increases sales. Most people believe that eventually born-digital editions of scholarly books will be common and will receive the same recognition as printed books have traditionally received, and the ACLS Commission has encouraged scholars to embrace this change sooner rather than later.

But the transition to that future is not easy, especially in the humanities. First, there are economic obstacles: there are unavoidable costs for peer review and competent copyediting, and even digital works require a kind of warehousing (storage on servers and in secure backups) and marketing (systems for cataloguing, advertising, and possibly sales), but humanities publishers do not have the economic muscle of the science foundations. Foundation funding may be available for startup of a digital series, but a sustainable model has to be developed. Second, there is a great deal of skepticism about

and resistance to evaluating digital monographs as on a par with print. A recent study<sup>4</sup> in fact predicts that digital monographs are likely to fail in the foreseeable future because of ingrained perceptions among scholars in many disciplines. Third, the problems are even more severe in publications that are replete with drawing, maps, photos, and the like, as many archaeological publications are. Editing and book design in such cases are much more complex and expensive, and cannot easily be devolved to the author, as many aspects of production might be in a completely textual monograph. Finally, there is a particular problem for the APA, since it has a print monograph series and would need to define carefully how a digital series would be distinct, and since its contract with OUP-USA gives that press first refusal of any new initiative.

The current APA print monograph series has restrictions on length and content and some volumes with small expected sales are printed by OUP-USA but priced very high, and in general the press would prefer to see monographs of fairly wide interest. In the print series, extensive use of Greek has also sometimes proved to be problematic both for copy editing and for typesetting. We believe that a new digital monograph series might be distinguished from the existing series more or less in the way European scholarly series (like *Mnemosyne Supplements*, *Hypomnemata*, *Hermes Einzelschriften*) or discontinued American university monograph series are mostly distinct in character from monographs published by North American university presses. A digital series might also offer a venue where works containing substantial amounts of Greek could be produced with more control by the author and editors and better preservation of the careful text-entry that the author should already have done. This series would allow the APA to invite a wider range of works (e.g.,—always subject to peer review—revised dissertations, collective volumes, *Festschriften*, short monographs, highly technical works with limited expert audience). It would also provide a venue for works that would be improved through the digital medium: anything accompanied by a database or other interactive component, offering long but useful appendices, or having an anticipated need for frequent revision or augmentation. To maintain a distinction from the existing print series, the new series should have its own editorial board, but operate under the oversight of the Committee on Publications. The new series should not be a second choice for a work rejected by the existing series: scholars should decide in advance to submit to either one or the other. Since a good deal of the final formatting may have to be done by the authors or editors to reduce costs, detailed guidelines for final manuscript preparation will have to be formulated so that authors know in advance what is involved. The new series should have peer review processes similar to those of the print series (a minimum of two referees' reports, plus the judgment of the editorial board). The new series should try to begin with works by tenured scholars, in order to set an example and gain wider acceptance of the practice, so that eventually untenured scholars would also feel comfortable submitting to such a series. At time of publication there would also be a limited production of print-on-demand paper copies for review and academic personnel cases.

---

<sup>4</sup> *Scholarly Communication: Academic Values and Sustainable Models*. C. Judson King, Diane Harley, Sarah Earl-Novell, Jennifer Arter, Shannon Lawrence, and Irene Perciali. Center for Studies in Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley. (July 27, 2006); <http://cshe.berkeley.edu/publications/publications.php?id=23>

We believe this is an area in which change is certain to come eventually, and that such change will come more smoothly and swiftly with the leadership and backing of a professional organization. While the economic challenges of digital production may not be easily solved for the kinds of books many members of AIA produce, we feel that it is still advisable for the APA to proceed with an experiment.

*RECOMMENDATION E.5: Explore a new digitally-distributed series of APA monographs. Appoint a small "development" editorial board of senior scholars to formulate precise guidelines for the series. Present proposal to OUP-USA so that it may exercise its contract right to collaborate in this venture or decline; if OUP-USA declines, the board will evaluate other potential partners. Study funding models, and apply for a startup grant.*

#### F.6. Digital collection of classical research resources

A growing number of books from major library collections are becoming available through GoogleBook and competing projects. Works of classical scholarship have begun to appear in such collections. This is all to the good, but we do not have assurance of the quality of the available materials (for instance, there are reports of missing pages, and availability of only some volumes of a multi-volume work), nor is the free accessibility of more recent works in any way certain. Therefore, it is fully appropriate for classicists and archaeologists to consider projects to place professionally selected specimens of our historical scholarly resources in open-access collections. Such projects already exist: ETANA, Project Gutenberg, and the Internet Archive are good examples.

The APA in fact has an opportunity in this regard. With the support of an NEH grant, the APA co-sponsored Classical Micropublishing Inc. two decades ago. This project produced microfiches of a large number of scholarly works whose paper copies were threatened by the deterioration of their acidic paper. There were more than 750 titles, many of them multivolume works, amounting to over 5600 fiches. This preservation project was separate from a related project to microfiche basic works in epigraphy and papyrology. In the case of the preservation project, the vast majority of the items were published before 1923 and are in the public domain. These microfiches were prepared with great care and accuracy (to a higher quality than the rapid mass-scanning done for Google), and the books selected are just the sort of fragile books that should be and apparently are held back from Google by the cooperating libraries, so they are titles that Google may not take care of.

Since these works have already been carefully photographed, it is a relatively simple step to digitize the microfiches. Each microfiche contains 40 images, with 80 pages of a book, and each fiche can be digitized for a reasonable cost (probably under \$3, about 7¢ per image). We have copies of some microfiches from a past president who was on the editorial committee of the project, and these are good enough to digitize. It may be possible to obtain more from other scholars. A larger collection owned by Columbia University is in cold storage at OCLC [Online Computer Library Center], which could

serve as a contractor for digitizing the stored copies (this would save the expense of ordering microfiche prints to be made that could be sent to an outside vendor).

We believe that if these works are digitized, then the proper disposition of them would be in an open-access archive, perhaps with the provision that print-on-demand copies could be ordered.

If the recommendation below is approved, then some of the tasks to be done are: (1) determine for how many works we can obtain microfiches by donation from scholars who received them in the 1980s and are willing to donate them; (2) cross-check the 1980s catalogue entries (now in a spreadsheet for easier manipulation) with the holdings of Columbia University Library, which has stored master copies at OCLC; (3) clarify rights and permissions for any items published after 1923 (or confine the project to the undoubtedly public domain material); (4) verify whether any titles have already been digitized, and if so, whether the existing version is reliable and accessible; (5) decide on an open-access partner (both California Digital Library and the Internet Archive have expressed willingness to host the digital files); (6) once the number of works involved is clear, determine the costs of digitization more precisely and report to the APA Board of Directors; (7) if the Board approves, seek a grant for this expense.

*RECOMMENDATION 6: Appoint a small group to explore the feasibility of digitizing the APA microfiches to make them freely available in an open-access archive.*

#### F.7. A Latin Database

It is well known that so far the profession and the public are not sufficiently served by existing libraries of Latin texts. They are variously incomplete, based on poor choices of edition, searchable with poor software, or limited to subscribers. A well-designed online library of Latin texts is clearly one of the most pressing desiderata in the field of classics for both research and teaching. A large project of this kind should be developed with wide consultation and peer review and should follow the best practices with regard to open standards, interoperability, and sustainability.

Proposals have come and gone in the past and proposals are currently being discussed. We recommend that the APA go on record encouraging that a high-quality product be developed.

*RECOMMENDATION 7: Issue a statement encouraging development of a high-quality non-commercial digital library of Latin texts.*