SPEC KITS

Supporting Effective Library Management for Nearly 40 Years

Committed to assisting research and academic libraries in the continuous improvement of management systems, ARL has worked since 1970 to gather and disseminate the best practices for library needs. As part of its commitment, ARL maintains an active publications program best known for its SPEC Kits. Through the Collaborative Research/Writing Program, librarians work with ARL staff to design SPEC surveys and write publications. Originally established as an information source for ARL member libraries, the SPEC Kit series has grown to serve the needs of the library community worldwide.

What are SPEC Kits?

Published six times per year, SPEC Kits contain the most valuable, up-to-date information on the latest issues of concern to libraries and librarians today. They are the result of a systematic survey of ARL member libraries on a particular topic related to current practice in the field. Each SPEC Kit contains an executive summary of the survey results; survey questions with tallies and selected comments; the best representative documents from survey participants, such as policies, procedures, handbooks, guidelines, Web sites, records, brochures, and statements; and a selected reading list—both print and online sources—containing the most current literature available on the topic for further study.

Subscribe to SPEC Kits

Subscribers tell us that the information contained in SPEC Kits is valuable to a variety of users, both inside and outside the library. SPEC Kit purchasers use the documentation found in SPEC Kits as a point of departure for research and problem solving because they lend immediate authority to proposals and set standards for designing programs or writing procedure statements. SPEC Kits also function as an important reference tool for library administrators, staff, students, and professionals in allied disciplines who may not have access to this kind of information.

SPEC Kits are available in print and online. For more information visit: **http://www.arl.org/resources/pubs/**. The executive summary for each kit after December 1993 can be accessed free of charge at **http://www.arl.org/resources/pubs/spec/complete.shtml**.

SPEC Kit 332

Organization of Scholarly Communication Services
November 2012

Rachel Radom

Instructional Services Librarian for Undergraduate Programs

University of Tennessee

Melanie Feltner-Reichert

Interim Head of Scholarly Communication

University of Tennessee

kynita stringer-stanback

2010–2012 Diversity Resident Librarian

University of Tennessee

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

Series Editor: Lee Anne George

Copyright © 2012

∞   The paper used in this publication meets the requirements of ANSI/NISO Z39.48-1992 (R1997) Permanence of Paper for Publications and Documents in Libraries and Archives.

SPEC
Kit 332

Organization of Scholarly Communication Services

November 2012

SURVEY RESULTS

REPRESENTATIVE DOCUMENTS

Committee/Unit Charge

Organization Charts

Scholarly Communication Services

Scholarly Communication Resolutions

SELECTED RESOURCES

SURVEY RESULTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

Borrowing from the Washington University in St. Louis Scholarly Communications Group's statement of purpose, this survey defined scholarly communication (SC) as the creation, transformation, dissemination, and preservation of knowledge related to teaching, research, and scholarly endeavors. The survey explored how research institutions are currently organizing staff to support scholarly communication services, and whether their organizational structures have changed since 2007. It asked respondents about the SC services offered at their institutions, how those services are supported and assessed, and the impacts that SC leadership and services may have had on the institution or larger community. Sixty of the 126 ARL member institutions responded to the survey between May 14 and June 12 for a response rate of 48%. Of these respondents, 56 (93%) affirmed that their library or institution was involved in SC services.

Scholarly Communication Leadership

All but three of these 56 respondents reported that an individual or group in the library had primary responsibility for leading organized SC efforts at their institutions. When asked whether the library's SC leadership is considered to be the institution's main SC leader, 37 of the 49 respondents (76%) answered yes, but several of their comments reveal a hesitation in staking a definitive leadership claim. For example, one respondent stated that leadership roles are, "Perhaps not clear…. it's hard to say who the 'main leaders' are." Another offered that their library has "the only dedicated office on campus, but additional units in the library…. and outside the library….also contribute." Some of the 12 respondents (24%) who answered that they are

not the main institutional leader had similar comments. One wrote that their team "is as far as I know the only game on campus, but not necessarily recognized by the institution at large." Another respondent explained, "I'm not sure the institution is completely aware of scholarly communication 'services'."

These comments reflect a tension between responsibility and leadership that is perhaps felt by many libraries. They also illustrate how difficult it can be to understand institutional perceptions of SC leadership. The nature of scholarly communication itself may be one cause of the difficulty. SC encompasses such a wide variety of activities, individuals, and groups that identifying one leader may be impossible or irrelevant. In fact, every library identified as involved in providing SC services also collaborates with institutional partners to support those services. Perhaps seeking clarity about definitive leaders is the wrong approach; the best answer to the SC leadership question may simply be that 95% of the respondents identified their libraries as responsible for SC leadership efforts, and are, therefore, SC leaders at the institutional level.

Leadership Structure, Staffing, and Time

The survey asked respondents to select one of six options that best described their SC leadership structure. Seventeen respondents (30%) selected a single individual in the library as the primary leader. Fourteen (25%) reported leadership by a library office, department, or unit. Thirteen (23%) indicated that SC leadership was distributed among two or more individuals in the library (other than a unit or team). Nine (16%) reported that leadership was the responsibility of a library team, committee, or task force. The remaining

three reported that SC leadership was not associated with any single individual or group.

An analysis of respondents' comments indicates this forced choice does not accurately describe the actual distribution of responsibility. Organizational changes are one reason. One library recently transferred SC leadership from a committee to a single position. In at least three instances, SC leadership had been, or was soon to be, transformed by the creation of a new office or unit. Another reason is that multiple leadership structures exist within many of the libraries. As one respondent explained, "We actually have a combination of the three instances above: we have an individual who tends to lead the scholarly communication efforts, a scholarly communications committee, and a (new) unit where these activities rest…."

Individual Leader
The 17 individuals who lead SC efforts are mostly assistant/associate directors, department or program heads, and scholarly communications librarians. All but two report to the library director or assistant/associate director. Their titles indicate their responsibilities range across collections and technical services, research and instruction, digital services, copyright and licensing, and publishing. Eight have special training or degrees related to their SC responsibilities. These include law degrees, publishing experience, copyright and licensing training, and attendance at the ARL/ACRL Institute on Scholarly Communication. Nine have direct reports ranging from .75 to 6 FTE (on average, 1.19 FTE librarians and .76 FTE staff). Four have at least one FTE librarian reporting to them. Four have at least one FTE staff. While the other eight have no direct reports, several have support from SC steering committees and other librarians. These individuals devote between 1% and 100% of their time to SC efforts, with an average of 53%. The table below indicates how much time 16 of these individuals spend leading SC efforts at their institutions.

% Time	N	%
< 25%	3	19
25-50%	6	38
> 75%	7	44

Library Office, Department, or Unit
The names of all but a few of the 14 offices that lead SC efforts include the phrase "scholarly communication." The names indicate that other responsibilities include collections, digital services, copyright, and publishing. The number of staff in these offices ranges from one to 20, with an average of seven. Most of these are full-time staff (average 6.1 FTE) and the office names suggest that SC efforts make up a significant aspect of each position's responsibilities. In half of the offices at least one person has special training in copyright or licensing or has a law degree. Most of the heads of these offices report to the library director. The table below shows the range of staff across these 14 offices.

Total Staff	N	%
1	1	7
3–4	6	43
5–9	3	21
≥10	4	29

Two or More Individuals in the Library
Of the 13 libraries where multiple individuals have primary responsibility for SC leadership, four (31%) report that two individuals share leadership roles and six (46%) report three individuals share leadership roles. Three respondents did not specify the number of individuals. The respondents reported on 34 positions ranging from a library dean and assistant directors to department and program heads to various other librarians. The responsibilities reflected by the position titles are as wide-ranging as reported above.

Eighteen positions (54%) report to the library director. Three libraries have a direct chain of command leading to the dean (e.g., position 2 is overseen by position 1, and position 1 is overseen by the dean). Four libraries have two or more positions reporting to the same individual (e.g., there are three separate positions, and each reports to the same dean). Five are set up in a distributed way, with positions reporting to different deans, associate deans, or heads. One institution uses a combination of these latter two arrangements.

Nineteen of these SC leaders have direct reports; 12 have between .25 and 1 FTE, four have 2 to 5 FTE, and

two have 10 to 25 full-time liaison librarians. Thirteen individuals have copyright, licensing, or publishing training or a law degree. The amount of time that 30 of these individuals devote to leading SC efforts ranges from 5% to 100%, with an average of 43%. The dean spent the smallest amount of time on SC leadership. The table below shows the distribution of time across these positions.

% Time	N	%
< 25%	11	37
25–50%	10	33
75–100%	9	30

Library Team, Committee, or Task Force
The nine teams that lead SC efforts are made up of representatives from a variety of departments including collections/technical services, research/instruction (six teams each), branch/regional libraries, digital initiatives (four teams each), library administration, special collections/archives (two teams each), and library IT. The number of members ranges from three to 12, with an average of eight. Five teams report they have full-time members. Most of the teams report to the library director or a management group. The table below shows the number of members across the nine teams.

Members	N	%
3	3	33
9–10	4	44
≥10	2	22

No Single Individual or Group
One respondent described their institution as a decentralized organization, and while there is a library-led Scholarly Communications Group, "other [institutional] libraries, academic units, and support units can offer their own SC services."

Scholarly Communication Services in the Library

The survey asked whether four broad categories of SC services—campus-based publishing, education and outreach activities, hosting and managing digital content, and support for research, publishing, and creative works—were offered by the library, elsewhere in the institution, or not offered. The responses show that educational activities continue to be a defining characteristic of libraries' SC roles that was first reported in SPEC Kit 299 Scholarly Communication Education Initiatives.

On average, 89% of respondents offer one or more of the seven activities in the education and outreach category. Services to "advise and educate authors about copyright, retaining rights, etc." are the only ones offered by all the responding libraries. It is notable that librarians very often serve as copyright educators even though only about a quarter of library SC leaders have law degrees or have participated in some form of copyright training. Seventy-six percent of the responding libraries offer services related to hosting and managing digital content, 71% offer campus-based publishing services, and 55% provide the services associated with supporting research, publishing, and creative works.

A deeper analysis of the responses suggests that three different categories would more accurately describe the library services currently offered: 1) liaising, outreach, and support for author rights, 2) hosting and preserving digital content, and 3) digital scholarship support. With the specific services categorized in this way, the percentages change: 75% of the libraries offer liaison, outreach, and author rights support; 75% host and preserve digital content; and 68% provide digital scholarship support.

Liaising, outreach, and support for author rights activities include consultations with researchers as authors and rights holders (advising on publications and legal matters or planning events to increase scholars' awareness of scholarly publishing issues) and managing outreach requests usually associated with liaison librarian duties, which often support authorship (e.g., fielding requests for purchases or subscriptions or assisting with literature reviews).

Hosting and preserving digital content activities relate to accessing and maintaining institutional research data and content, storing and preserving institutional data and content, and sharing or publishing institutional data and content, particularly via institutional technologies (e.g., institutional repositories).

Digital scholarship support includes the creation of the products of digital scholarship (e.g., multimedia projects), especially the use of tools and expertise to manipulate or create digital products (data mining, data visualization, GIS). These categories relate to scholars as authors and researchers, as curators hosting and preserving digital information, and as content creators using innovative technologies.

Services Provided Outside the Library

Because SC encompasses such a variety of activities, it comes as no surprise that there are many institutional stakeholders that offer SC services outside of libraries. Education and outreach services are also provided by the office of research, general counsel, instructional technology offices, and teaching and learning centers, among others. Not surprisingly, university presses offer publishing services, but so do academic departments, particularly for faculty-hosted electronic journals. Research centers, institutes, and labs host/manage digital content, as do institutional IT offices. Support for research and creative works is distributed among the office of research, academic departments, IT office, technology transfer office, and digital humanities centers. While all respondents report that at least some services are offered both by the library and the institution, the distribution of responsibility shows that the library is the primary SC service provider except in a few cases of patent research, disciplinary repositories, and multimedia production.

Support for SC Services

The survey next asked who else at the library and institution besides the "leaders" supports SC services. The resulting comments are nicely summarized in one respondent's quip: "I think a better question may be 'Who doesn't?'" The comments included below highlight groups or issues not addressed elsewhere in the survey.

Repeated most often among the comments was the importance of liaison librarians in educating their communities about SC issues, including copyright, author rights, open access (OA), and institutional repositories (IR). As one respondent stated, "According to our recently adopted subject librarian position description framework, these librarians are expected to:

educate and inform faculty, graduate students, and campus administrators about scholarly communication issues, copyright, and their rights as authors; advocate for sustainable models of scholarly communication and assist in the development and creation of tools and services to facilitate scholarly communication; and support and promote the IR by helping administrators, faculty and students understand the role of the IR in building and preserving digital collections and assisting in content recruitment." In fact, in over half of the 44 library staff-related comments respondents drew specific attention to subject librarians and/or liaison librarians. Additionally, two respondents identified a liaison-related service: the creation of web pages or web guides to describe the library's SC services or, specifically, to identify resources for compliance with the National Science Foundation's (NSF) Data Management Plan requirements.

Respondents' comments also highlight the important outreach role for library directors: to be the SC spokesperson who can communicate the variety of librarians' roles to those outside the library.

Open Journal Systems, a program that allows faculty to host their own peer-reviewed journals, is supported by both library and institution staff. While journal hosting is not a new activity, it is an SC practice that has been made increasingly easier as a growing number of software programs facilitate the process.

At one institution, where open access is a significant part of the institutional culture, a unique position outlined in the comments is the "OA System administrator: [the] librarian [who] designed and manages [the] technical infrastructure for Open Access Policy workflows." In this position, the librarian plans and handles the practical implementation of institutional SC policy, playing a central role in that institution's SC – and organizational – landscape. The leadership inherent in that role is very unusual and stands in sharp contrast to many other respondents' comments, which tend to be more similar to the respondent who wrote that, "one of the questions on our upcoming survey asks who should support open access on campus." A comment apropos to many responding institutions was that as a result of "leadership changes in the libraries and at the university as a whole, support

for scholarly communication services will continue to evolve."

Other notable roles in SC that librarians and library staff play include offering a sponsored readings course for graduate students about SC issues, collaborating with non-library faculty on grant proposals related to SC issues, convening campus special interest groups (e.g., a campus serials interest group), and participating in needs assessment activities of the libraries.

One respondent nicely summarized the library's organizing roles: "We are campus leaders in supporting media software for the creation of new types of scholarly works. We are also the primary place on campus for preservation of digital content. We are the leaders in the open access movement, but we rely heavily on faculty input. We are advisors when it comes to copyright, but leave the final decisions up to the content creators. We convene a faculty group that sets copyright policy for campus."

Several respondents acknowledged the role that individual faculty members and/or departments have in supporting SC efforts. One respondent stated, "As we have identified champions and supporters of open access and new means of scholarly communication, they have been asked to advocate library services in support of SC among their colleagues and graduate students." Another respondent wrote, "Faculty often support themselves by learning about and using technology creatively to suit their SC needs," and another offered, "…I think it's fair to say that the science, engineering, and architecture colleges all provide some SC support in their own units which are more appropriate to their own expertise and faculty." Several respondents identified an additional role related to faculty: that of participants in faculty governance, in which they discuss and vote on institutional policies, such as open access resolutions.

Respondents also singled out institutional information technology offices, the office of research, the general counsel, provosts, and graduate schools as SC service providers. Centers for teaching and learning were also identified more than once as partners, especially in referring faculty to the library for SC advice, or inviting the library to offer SC-related workshops or other programs. Many who identified outside offices or units said they play a role in developing data management strategies and data management plans.

Organizational Changes since 2007

Since 2007, when SPEC Kit 299 was published, nearly three-quarters of the institutions responding to the current survey have undergone organizational changes intended to improve library support for SC services. Of the 39 respondents who described their organization's changes, 24 created at least one new library or administrative position (either adding a new position or changing position descriptions of an existing position) with SC responsibilities. Sixteen created a new SC department or unit, or significantly rearranged the duties of an existing one. Eight libraries created at least one new working group or team to plan and support SC efforts. One institution rearranged space to provide a centralized location for SC services.

Two institutions provided specific information on a reorganization involving Special Collections departments. In both cases, after the reorganizations, Special Collections reported to the administrator, or became part of the unit, with SC leadership responsibilities in the library. Both institutions reasoned that because digitization, digital publishing, and e-records archiving are significant aspects in Special Collections services, sharing expertise and coordinating efforts would be more efficient if Special Collections were included in the same department or reporting structure as the institutional repository, digital library initiatives, and so on.

Assessment of SC Services

Only eight libraries have evaluated the success of their SC services; however, 18 others say they plan to. Five of the eight have surveyed faculty, open access fund recipients, and/or workshop participants. Seven use annual reports, individual performance reviews, and statistics on use of services (e.g., institutional repository or open access fund) in their assessment activities.

Among those who are planning to assess their SC services, three institutions are considering surveys, and four institutions will be or have been gathering statistics related to participation in or use of SC services, such as numbers of users asking rights-related questions. Two others will be undergoing an audit

for certification as a Trusted Digital Repository, a program offered in conjunction with the National Archives and Records Administration, OCLC, and the Research Libraries Group.

At those libraries that have conducted assessment, one has used the data gathered to better inform liaison work by recognizing differences in SC needs, and approaches to SC, among various disciplines. Another library, using results from their institution's SC survey, has plans to "investigate implementing new services for OA monograph publishing, print on demand, and [to] improve digital preservation." Redesigning the library's SC-related web pages was a priority for one recent assessment project. Finally, several assessment projects aim to survey local trends in SC issues, such as faculty awareness of open access policies, interest in particular SC educational programs, and research data needs, to better plan the library's future SC outreach and technology-related support.

Impact on Authors

The survey asked respondents to identify, from a list, which demonstrable outcomes have resulted from their library's or institution's SC efforts and services. If the prompt had been to "indicate which outcomes might have resulted, at least in part, from the SC efforts and services your library or institution provides," the answers might have been different. Instead, one commenter stated, "I do not feel comfortable in answering this question as I have no way of knowing if authors have changed their practices based solely on the SC efforts we have done," and another offered, "It is my opinion that because we have not engaged in formal assessment, it's difficult or impossible to determine whether the libraries' SC efforts and services have had demonstrable outcomes."

Nevertheless, a majority of respondents provided feedback on how authors participate in SC activities and how institutions support those activities or consider new directions in SC policies. The most common outcomes reported were authors submitting work to the institutional repository (80%), seeking assistance with questions related to authorship, which have increased since 2007 (65%), and authors complying with funding mandates from agencies such as NIH and NSF (59%). Forty-three percent reported that authors at their institutions have used Creative Commons/Scholars Commons licenses for their work, and 20 institutions (41%) indicated that authors have increasingly published in open access journals. Other outcomes include authors using copyright addenda (35%), submitting work to subject or disciplinary repositories (31%), and declining to publish in or edit particular journals (27%).

The number of institutions reporting that faculty have declined to publish in or edit particular journals was supplemented in the comments by responses referring to faculty and student activism, such as signing the "recent White House petition" on open access and the "'Cost of Knowledge' [Elsevier] boycott." In these comments, more than one respondent again noted that faculty editors are founding open access journals, often using the library-hosted, Public Knowledge Project-developed Open Journal Systems platform. Also included in the comments was the fact that librarians at one institution had themselves adopted an open access resolution.

Impact on Institutions

The respondents' most commonly identified institutional impacts were an increased use of the institutional repository, a growing interest in and support for open access publishing, and growing numbers of staffing and/or physical spaces to handle SC-related responsibilities. The vast majority host an institutional repository (44, or 82%) and most of those repositories have seen an increase in holdings (39, or 70%). Related to this finding, electronic theses and dissertations are available open access at 44 institutions. Furthermore, as noted above, 20 institutions have seen an increasing number of faculty publishing in OA journals and 16 (30%) have created or maintained an open access publishing fund to support this growth.

Organizational changes also reflect the increasing importance of SC issues to institutions. Most respondents have seen the number of positions with SC responsibilities at their institutions increase since 2007 (38, or 70%), 13 (24%) have created new centers or institutes to deal solely with SC questions and support, and 11 (20%) have rearranged or gained physical spaces to better support SC services.

SC Resolutions

Faculty governance bodies have supported open access (OA) resolutions and endorsements at 11 institutions (20%), five others (9%) have endorsed or passed a resolution related to SC exclusive of OA. Most resolutions or endorsements encourage and recommend that faculty authors be aware of the costs of journals where they publish, edit, or review, and make their work available in the IR when possible. Nearly all of these statements "encourage open access when [it] doesn't conflict with [the professional] advancement of [a] faculty member," as one respondent phrased it.

Two respondents stated that there is an OA policy that, unlike a mandate or recommendation from a faculty governance body, grants the institutions license to freely share faculty members' scholarly articles. Both policies also allow authors to apply for a waiver of the license or an embargo on access when either the license or immediate access is not in an author's best interest. In three cases library faculty passed OA policies or mandates in their departments. Similar to the institutional OA policies, the library OA policies or mandates call on library faculty authors to negotiate rights to deposit their works locally and make articles openly available. A waiver is available if rights cannot be obtained.

One faculty senate resolution stands out in encouraging institutional administration "to work with departments and colleges to assure that the review process for promotion, tenure and merit takes into consideration these new trends and realities in academic publication." This statement, passed in 2009, is fairly unique in recognizing one of the biggest challenges in asking faculty to publish in OA journals—the entrenched habit of tenure review committees to consider journal impact factors when reviewing a faculty member's tenure application—and suggests that it is not enough for faculty to be aware of publishing trends in order to significantly change current publishing models and support public access to research.

Some respondents specified the addendum to publishing agreements their faculty use most often, or the copyright addenda they most often recommend to faculty authors. The majority referred to the Science Commons Copyright Addendum Engine, and several more identified the Science Commons-Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition (SPARC) addendum, or Access-Reuse addendum, in particular. Two Canadian respondents also referred to a SPARC-affiliated license, which is similar to the Access-Reuse addendum used by US institutions. Another popular addendum is the one endorsed by the Committee on Institutional Cooperation (CIC), a consortium of 13 ARL member institutions. Several institutions provide authors with recommendations in terms of "basic" and "broader" copyright addenda. In such cases, the "basic" addenda is based on the language used by the National Institutes of Health for compliance with their funding mandate, and the "broader" addenda uses the Science Commons-SPARC addenda or bases its language on a document about negotiating publishing agreements from the IUPUI Copyright Management Center.

Comparisons to 2007 Survey

There are some similarities between the findings from the 2007 SPEC Kit on *Scholarly Communication Education Initiatives* and the current survey. For one, a distributed, shared SC leadership structure within libraries is still the most common model in use. However, in 2007, only 32% of libraries had a Chief SC Librarian, and the majority of those librarians spent less than 30% of their time on SC initiatives. Now, in less than five years, SC leaders are spending closer to 50% of their time on SC efforts. Furthermore, a majority of the respondents to the current survey have carved out formal library positions—one or more individuals, or teams/units—to lead SC efforts.

There are further similarities between the two surveys' findings. For example, assessment of SC efforts is still rare. In 2007, only five respondents had assessed their SC education initiatives, compared to eight in 2012. A more positive trend that has continued is faculty hosting OA journals using online journal publishing platforms supported by libraries. Likewise positive is the continuing emphasis on educating researchers about SC issues to encourage the use publication agreement addenda, as well as the formalization of institutional support for OA in faculty governance resolutions.

In many ways, the current survey findings highlight the efficacy of the education initiatives that ARL

member libraries were leading in 2007 (at that time, 75% of responding institutions stated that they were engaged in SC education initiatives). Results from this survey point to gains in staffing and spaces for SC, indicating an institutional need and demand for these services, and successful internal educational efforts, since most respondents indicated that SC education is a significant role for liaison librarians.

Furthermore, educational initiatives have likely played a significant role in the rise of author activism. In all the faculty governance statements about OA or SC initiatives that survey respondents provided, libraries were identified as partners in publishing, rights negotiations, and education. Many of these resolutions were passed between 2007 and 2009, around the time that the National Institutes of Health (NIH) Public Access Policy was implemented and prior to the National Science Foundation's requirement for data management plans. Many libraries were involved in advising authors about NIH compliance and may have taken it as an additional opportunity to talk to faculty about open access and author rights. Author activism may now be seen in a variety of outlets: faculty signing national petitions against the high prices of subscriptions to scholarly publications, individual departments adopting open access resolutions, faculty refusing to publish or edit in particular journals, and, as stated earlier, faculty founding and editing their own journals hosted on library servers.

In part because of education and outreach efforts, especially with regard to institutional repositories, libraries have been acknowledged as relevant parties in institutional planning for preserving and hosting digital content. Past SC efforts that reached out to faculty and research groups have also prepared librarians to be included in recent SC developments, not just in the sciences, but also in the humanities. Overall, collaboration among libraries and other institutional units to support SC activities is more prominent and obvious than it was in 2007, as evidenced by the partnerships identified by member libraries in their survey responses. Additionally, with the advent of digital humanities activities, humanities researchers are more visible and vocal participants in a greater number of SC activities than was the case in 2007.

Conclusion

Overwhelmingly, libraries are leaders in organizing scholarly communication efforts at their institutions. This leadership is highly collaborative. Within libraries, leadership is often distributed among several library units, offices, or staff positions. In the larger institutional setting, libraries have many partners whose activities support and complement their SC services, even though the various centers, units, and groups involved do not use the SC label. Librarians' roles as educators, liaisons, and digital preservationists are well-established, but in the developing area of digital research, including the digital humanities and data management plans, libraries, like most in the academic community, are still finding their way. More assessment of the research community's needs could prove useful in discovering how library SC services and leadership might be better marketed, further developed, or differently arranged to address those needs. In the coming years, as access to datasets, and not just scholarly articles, becomes the norm due to funding mandates and other legislation, the need to develop and use alt-metrics to determine research impact will become more apparent, and may lead to changes in tenure review practices, such as focusing on article-level metrics rather than journal impact factors. As is still the case with open access, any new developments will require information professionals to become savvy users of these new systems, providing feedback to designers, and helping others in the research community understand and apply these features in their own projects. These are just a few of the many changes occurring in the scholarly communication landscape, where libraries seem poised to continue organizing leadership, services, and support that foster researchers' activities and increase their global reach.