



Research Library Issues

RLI 270 June 2010

A Bimonthly Report from ARL, CNI, and SPARC

**Celebrating 10 Years of ARL's Initiative
to Recruit a Diverse Workforce** 1-5

Mark A. Puente, Director of Diversity Programs, ARL

ETDs and Graduate Education: Programs and Prospects 6-15

Joan K. Lippincott, Associate Executive Director, CNI

Clifford A. Lynch, Executive Director, CNI

Urban Copyright Legends 16-20

Brandon Butler, Director of Public Policy Initiatives, ARL

**Open Access Week: Library Strategies
for Advancing Change** 21-26

Jamaica Jones, Special Projects Librarian, National Center for Atmospheric Research

Andrew Waller, Licensing and Negotiations Librarian and Open Access Librarian,
University of Calgary

with Jennifer McLennan, Director of Programs and Operations, SPARC

News and Calendar 27-33

Celebrating 10 Years of ARL's Initiative to Recruit a Diverse Workforce

Mark A. Puente, Director of Diversity Programs, ARL

In August of 2010, ARL celebrates an important milestone: the 10th anniversary of its long-standing minority recruitment program, the Initiative to Recruit a Diverse Workforce (IRDW). For the past 10 years, the IRDW has provided financial support to master of library and information science (MLIS) students from traditionally underrepresented racial and ethnic minority groups. Since 2003, with funding from member libraries and two grants from the Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS), the program has evolved to include a formal mentoring relationship, leadership development, career placement assistance, plus many other benefits. The program aims to encourage these students to pursue careers in major research libraries by providing them with an in-depth view of the operations of ARL libraries and the implications for retention and promotion in those workplace environments.

Although it is difficult to determine an exact starting date for the IRDW, conversations leading up to its creation date back at least 20 years. At the spring 1990 ARL Membership Meeting in New Orleans, one of the programs addressed the need to develop a strategy to recruit more minorities into the research library workforce. ARL began to explore the concept of cultural diversity in the workplace under the leadership of the Association's Office of Management Services (OMS, later renamed the Office of Leadership and Management Services). Three ARL OMS SPEC Kit surveys distributed in 1990 sought to scan the environment and collect data on minority recruitment and retention programs, affirmative action policies and practices, and cultural diversity programming. The year 1990 was also pivotal in that ARL received the first of two grants from the H.W. Wilson Foundation, enabling the Association to launch a project entitled Meeting the Challenges of a Culturally Diverse Work Environment. This seed funding from the Wilson Foundation allowed ARL to hire its first OMS Diversity Consultant on a part-time basis. Kriza Jennings first served in this capacity, offering presentations, seminars, and consulting services

focused primarily on workplace climate, and developing programs that promoted inclusion and fostered an awareness of and respect for human differences in the research library environment.

The demand for the OMS Diversity programs was much higher than anticipated. In 1993 the Diversity position became full-time, and the ARL Board returned in earnest to its discussions about how best to address the problem of low minority representation among the workforce in ARL libraries. These discussions were further guided by input from an outside consultant, Gloria DeSole, who served as Special Assistant to the President for Affirmative Action at SUNY, Albany. During the October 1993 ARL Business Meeting, the

By 2000, 52 ARL member libraries had committed a total of over \$500,000 to support the effort.

members unanimously approved the establishment of a dues-supported Minority Recruitment and Retention capability. On the advisement of a special working group and Ms. DeSole, the ARL Board also endorsed a five-year

plan that mandated the creation of a comprehensive minority recruitment plan and allowed for Diversity Consultant Kriza Jennings to be promoted to Program Officer for Diversity and Minority Recruitment. The enabling capability was configured in such a way that Jennings devoted 50% of her time to minority recruitment and retention projects and 50% to the OMS Diversity Programs aimed at improving workplace climate. Initially these workshops were offered to ARL member institutions, other interested academic libraries, and American Library Association (ALA)-accredited library schools. By September of 1994, Jennings had visited 28 ARL libraries offering consultation and workshops. A grant from the Gladys Kriebel Delmas Foundation was awarded to ARL in 1995 in support of programmatic activities in the recruitment arena and helped to augment the ARL dues-supported programs.

In 1996, ARL hired a new Program Officer for Diversity, DeEtta Jones, who would continue to build on her predecessor's successes, but who would also facilitate a new dialogue about how best to address the minority recruitment issue. A defining moment came in 1998 when Sheila Creth, then the University Librarian at the University of Iowa, challenged her colleagues to be more aggressive about addressing the problem of minority recruitment in ARL libraries. Her voice echoed the sentiments of other key players in this discussion, including Jim Williams, Dean of Libraries at University of

Colorado at Boulder, who has been a consistent advocate for developing a strategy that would help put more minority librarians into the hiring pipeline for research libraries. A year later, in 1999, the ARL Board was approached by Jones and Nancy Baker, University Librarian at University of Iowa and then the Chair of the ARL Diversity Committee, with a proposal to establish a minority recruitment program entitled the Initiative to Recruit a Diverse Workforce. The Board approved a motion to establish a "significant fund" to underwrite the annual award of at least 15 stipends to minority students pursuing their MLIS degrees. The momentum continued to grow during the next year, with a major catalyst being the public pledge of \$5,000 for this fund made during an ARL Membership Meeting by Carla Stoffle, Dean of Libraries at University of Arizona. Following Stoffle's lead, several other ARL library directors made pledges in support of this fund, including Nancy Cline on behalf of the Harvard College Library, Ken Frazier for the University of Wisconsin-Madison Libraries, Karin Trainer of Princeton University Library, and Scott Bennett of the Yale University Library. By 2000, 52 ARL member libraries had committed a total of over \$500,000 to support the effort. The first awards were made to four MLIS students, the inaugural Diversity Scholars of ARL's fledgling minority recruitment initiative in 2000.

The IRDW continued to gain support and recognition as time progressed. In 2003, directed by the new Program Officer for Diversity, Jerome Offord Jr., ARL received its first major grant from IMLS in support of the IRDW. Two cohorts of scholars were recruited between 2003 and 2007. The IMLS funding also provided support to host the first annual ARL Leadership Symposium (also called "Institutes") during the ALA Midwinter Meeting in Boston in January 2005. During the symposium, Diversity Scholars attended presentations on topics ranging from residency programs to job search strategies or doctoral programs in LIS education. The scholars also participated in networking events attended by ARL library directors and human resource personnel, as well as other leaders in the academic and research library community. A key strategic partnership for the IRDW was also established in 2005 with the Purdue University Libraries. James Mullins, the Dean of the Purdue Libraries, initiated talks with ARL to establish an opportunity for Diversity Scholars to visit the West Lafayette campus and experience, first hand, the operations of a major research library. These "research library visits" continue today and are a critical component of the IRDW, providing an in-

depth look at the operations at Purdue as well as the professional requirements of working for an institution where librarians maintain faculty status. Similar events have been hosted by the Harvard College Library in 2005 and 2008, the latter visit in collaboration with the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) Libraries.

ARL received another IMLS grant in support of the IRDW in 2006, this time with the emphasis on recruiting MLIS students with academic backgrounds in natural and applied sciences, computer information systems, or information technology. In 2006–07, ARL recruited only seven program participants into the IRDW so a decision was made to utilize ARL funds to expand the class of Diversity Scholars into a full cohort of 25 participants. Similar measures were employed in 2007 and 2008 due to limited numbers of applicants with appropriate academic backgrounds. With approval from IMLS, a modification to the program was made in 2009 allowing ARL to accept students into the program with academic backgrounds in the humanities, arts, and other disciplines with the stipulation that these students complete approved coursework in the targeted areas. The final class of Diversity Scholars, funded by the 2006 IMLS grant, was recruited in 2009.

The total number of students supported since the program's inception in 2000 is 126. To date ARL Diversity Scholars have graduated from a total of 34 ALA-accredited MLIS programs and have worked in almost 30 ARL libraries. A study conducted in 2009 of all past program participants indicates that over 37% of all IRDW alumni are currently employed in ARL libraries, while 61% remain employed in academic librarianship. With minority representation among professional staff in US ARL academic libraries at 14% as of 2009,¹ compared to 11% in 2000² when the IRDW was founded, it is clear that this program is making a significant impact on the research library workforce.

A new IMLS grant awarded in June of 2010 will ensure that this important minority recruitment program will continue. In the next three years, the IRDW will recruit 30 MLIS students from traditionally underrepresented minority groups into the program. In this iteration of the program, the focus of recruitment will be on undergraduate students with academic backgrounds in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics disciplines. ARL hopes that this recruitment focus will not only continue improving upon representation of ethnic and racial minorities in ARL libraries, but also will prove an appropriate response to projected needs in the research library workforce in the decades to come.

For more information about ARL's Initiative to Recruit a Diverse Workforce, please visit the program's Web site <http://www.arl.org/diversity/init/>.

¹ Martha Kyrillidou and Les Bland, comps. and eds., *ARL Annual Salary Survey 2008–2009* (Washington DC: ARL, 2009), 8, <http://www.arl.org/bm~doc/ss08.pdf>.

² Martha Kyrillidou and Michael O'Connor, comps. and eds., *ARL Annual Salary Survey 1999–2000* (Washington DC: ARL, 2000), 13, <http://www.arl.org/bm~doc/ss99.pdf>.

To cite this article: Mark A. Puente. "Celebrating 10 Years of ARL's Initiative to Recruit a Diverse Workforce." *Research Library Issues: A Bimonthly Report from ARL, CNI, and SPARC*, no. 270 (June 2010): 1–5.

<http://www.arl.org/resources/pubs/rli/archive/rli270.shtml>.

ETDs and Graduate Education: Programs and Prospects

Joan K. Lippincott, Associate Executive Director, CNI

Clifford A. Lynch, Executive Director, CNI

Higher education groups like the Council of Graduate Schools (CGS) have been examining US graduate education in an attempt to understand where improvements are needed. Many critics of graduate education would echo the sentiments of Lee S. Shulman, President Emeritus of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, who recently wrote, “Doctoral preparation remains a striking example of faith-based education... Our practices in doctoral education are a combination of longstanding traditions, replications of how we ourselves were trained, administrative convenience, and profound inertia.”¹ One of the areas where this is most striking is in the dissertation stage of doctoral education. There is growing concern both about the length of time for candidates to complete their dissertations, and completion rates, particularly in the humanities. Often advisors and members of a student’s doctoral committee, who completed their own doctoral work in a pre-Internet era, interact with and guide their advisees in the same manner that they were treated when they wrote their dissertations. Generally, graduate students are advised to produce straightforward text dissertations that do not take advantage of new technologies.

For years now, virtually every dissertation in the United States has been created in electronic form, yet students may still be required to submit their work in very precisely specified paper form and their institution may only keep bound print copies as part of the institution’s permanent record. The electronic thesis and dissertation initiative was launched in the early 1990s to change this. As part of an electronic thesis and dissertation (ETD) program, services are put in place for electronic submission of the thesis or dissertation to the graduate school or other designated academic unit, and for subsequent ingest into a repository managed by the institution’s library. Generally the

institution has articulated a set of processes (including the documentation of approvals) and standards specifically for ETDs.² At a few schools we are seeing elements of an ETD program being approached at a system or consortial, rather than institutional, level.

Brief History of ETD Development

Beginning in the early 1990s, the Coalition for Networked Information (CNI) has been active in the ETD movement. Working with Virginia Tech, University Microfilms (now Proquest/UMI Dissertation Publishing, a unit of Gale Cengage Learning), and the Council of Graduate Schools, CNI co-hosted one of the first ETD conferences in 1993 in order to explore the potential of electronic theses and dissertations as new forms of scholarly communication and as drivers for the development of digital libraries. Digital theses and dissertations offered pragmatic examples that could help advance work on the architectures, standards, access, and preservation issues in digital libraries. In addition, ETDs provided a potential opportunity for broader culture change by introducing faculty and graduate students (future faculty) to authoring, design, and reviewing issues in innovative scholarly content that employed images, sound, datasets and databases, interactive software components, and other enrichments to traditional, primarily linear text. Since that time, work has been ongoing within the ETD community at both an institutional and cross-institutional level to develop tools, standards, best practices, and instructional and support strategies.

In parallel, Proquest/UMI Dissertation Publishing, which has been in the business of distribution of microfilm and print copies of dissertations since 1938, has evolved its services to keep pace with the developments in digital libraries and access to content on the Internet. Proquest will ingest electronic theses and dissertations directly from authors or will provide a service to digitize print dissertations. They continue to make copies available, by fee or subscription, to individuals and institutions, and also provide authors an option to pay for open access publishing, which enables any user to have free access to the content. In addition, they provide preservation microfilming services and offer digital preservation; they serve as the Library of Congress's official offsite repository for digital dissertations. Many institutions use Proquest as part of their ETD digital-archiving strategy; some continue to use Proquest as the primary platform for their ETD programs.

CNI's ETD Survey

While much of the earliest discussion of ETDs was centered in the United States, the concept has gained considerable global uptake. As well as numerous institutional adoptions of ETDs worldwide, some countries have established national-level ETD policies and strategies. As a founding and active member of the Networked Digital Library of Theses and Dissertations (NDLTD) organization, CNI has been involved in these developments on a continuing basis. At NDLTD annual conferences, individuals representing universities and other groups come together to discuss developments related to ETDs. By the 2007 conference, it was apparent that some countries, for example Australia and the Netherlands, were making great strides in implementing national ETD programs.³ In the US, due at least in part to our highly decentralized system of higher education, some institutions had moved quickly and aggressively, while others continued to debate the pros and cons of such a program. At CNI, we wanted to better understand the state of progress of implementation of ETD programs in US universities and colleges and also wanted to learn what factors were facilitating or inhibiting ETD adoption. We were also eager to gain insight into whether ETD programs were being treated as a way to simply manage paper dissertations by other means (much like the situation today with scientific journal articles, which are distributed and stored digitally, but still conform very close to the historical printed articles in terms of content and organization). We developed a survey to collect data to better understand the state of ETD deployment in US universities and colleges.⁴ The survey was sent to one institutional representative from each CNI higher education member; often this was the library director or the head of digital library programs. The results of the survey may be biased due to this factor—while many ETD programs are collaborations among the library, the Graduate School, and other units, our responses came predominantly from the library community.

The US higher education members of CNI (a subset of the membership) were asked to complete the survey in spring 2008, and responses were received from 88 (62%) of the 142 institutions contacted. Of respondents, 64 (73%) reported that they had instituted an ETD program and an additional 5 institutions stated that they were planning such a program. Note that for the remainder of this article, the percentages given pertain to the institutions that have implemented ETD programs, not to the total number of survey

respondents. Most institutions reported that the library, not the faculty or academic administration, took the lead in developing electronic thesis and dissertation (ETD) programs at their institution, although in many institutions it was a collaborative initiative, often also involving the graduate school administration. This in itself suggests that grassroots demand for the greater authoring flexibility of the digital media arising from graduate students and their faculty dissertation committees has not played an overwhelming role in advancing ETD adoption. In 43% of the institutions, the ETD program was mandatory for both doctoral and masters students, an additional 10% stated that submission of an ETD was mandatory only for doctoral students, and around 14% stated that it was mandatory only for students of specific colleges or departments.

ETD Repositories

An essential library contribution to the implementation of ETD programs has been the provision of repository services that can store, provide access to, and preserve electronic theses and dissertations. This can be done through locally developed systems, through consortially developed systems, or through agreements with commercial firms. Around 89% of institutions reported that ETDs were a part of their institutional or consortial repository holdings. Many libraries consider that the institutional repository serves both as the basis of the access strategy and at least a component of the preservation strategy for theses and dissertations. In our survey, institutions could choose multiple answers for how they manage preservation of ETDs: 69% reported that they preserve them in an institutional or consortial repository, 47% replied that they relied on Proquest to preserve a digital copy, and 5% reported using LOCKSS. Clearly, some institutions are using multiple strategies for preservation.

As open access content in repositories, ETDs are indexed by major search engines and thus readily discovered via Web searches (as well as more specialized catalogs); the full text is available worldwide without fee. Some institutions implementing ETD programs have reported massive levels of use (thousands, or even tens of thousands of downloads) from around the globe. In the past, printed dissertations and theses had more restricted visibility and accessibility, via interlibrary loan (other than theses and dissertations in one's home institution) and via commercial services, notably Proquest.

Embargoes of ETDs

The broad availability of theses and dissertations in electronic form has raised concerns among a small number of sectors of the academy. Some graduate students have been warned by their advisors or threatened by publishers that if they allow open access to their work, it will preclude future publication of the content in certain journals or as a monograph. The key issue is that certain publishers consider that openly accessible theses and dissertations constitute publication. Disappointingly, the most prominent and vocal of these publishers seem to be primarily scholarly and professional societies, where one might hope for greater alignment with the broad interests of the academy. Charles B. Lowry notes that the level of concern about ETDs in repositories is often related to a fairly small number of specific disciplines, and that limited-period embargo policies, that keep the ETD from public view for a specified period of time, will often address those concerns.⁵ In our survey, 87% of the institutions had a policy allowing students to request a limited-time embargo, and 10% had a policy allowing students to request a permanent embargo.

This “prior publication” issue is one that has impacted the adoption of ETD programs in the US. In the CNI survey, we asked, “In discussions among stakeholders on campus, what is your perception of the issues that **discouraged** implementation of an ETD program at your institution?” Respondents were asked to answer this question whether or not they had already implemented an institutional ETD program. Respondents could choose more than one concern, and most of them did. It is interesting to note that institutions that have already implemented an ETD program expressed more concerns by faculty and students over the prior publication issue than institutions without an ETD program. Presumably those concerns were addressed at least in part by policies such as embargo periods, and this helps to explain the high rate of availability of this option among institutions that have implemented an ETD program. Concerns about adequate technical support and general disinterest in change received the aggregate highest total of responses (somewhat important and important) for institutions without ETD programs. The results are displayed in Table 1 below.

Table 1. Selected results from 2008 survey of US CNI higher education members

	Institutions with an ETD Program		Institutions without an ETD Program	
	Somewhat Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Important
Concerns by faculty about public access to ETDs limiting future publication opportunities	41%	30%	35%	15%
Concerns by students about public access to ETDs limiting future publication opportunities	42%	20%	30%	15%
Lack of consensus about embargo policies	35%	8%	40%	5%
Concerns about adequate technical support	26%	17%	20%	35%
Concerns about additional technical skills needed by students or staff	27%	12%	30%	15%
Concerns about potential additional costs to students or institution	25%	6%	30%	15%
Concerns about digital preservation	32%	17%	35%	10%
General disinterest in change	38%	15%	35%	20%

The embargo issue is multi-faceted. Generally, publisher demands are for limited-period embargos, which in our view are shortsighted and worthy of opposition. However, their stance is at least to some extent understandable, though it certainly attests to a low level of confidence that the publisher adds any value through its contributions and thus seems particularly surprising in the area of humanistic monographs, where there is typically a vast difference between a published monograph and the dissertation upon which the monograph is ultimately based. And there are other sensible reasons for temporary embargoes, notably to allow for patent filings.

It is interesting to briefly examine some of the justifications that are raised for very long-term (e.g., duration of copyright) or permanent embargo from public access. These primarily revolve around two concerns. The first one is the protection of exchanges between the author and a publisher (either for reputation in the case of a scholarly publication, or perhaps even for real financial gain in the case of something like a work of fiction or poetry produced for a creative writing program).

A second, less discussed concern is that, by making visible through public access on the Internet copyrighted material owned by others and reproduced in the thesis or dissertation, this will create copyright infringement liability. In essence, the hope is that if the dissertation is “locked up” no one will notice, or at least no one will care about potential copyright infringement, but if the material is easily located (say via a search engine) the author and/or the institution might have to defend an infringement lawsuit by claiming fair use. Or, the author might have to spend time (and perhaps money) clearing permissions for uses that exceed fair use as part of the thesis-writing process, creating an additional workload—if, indeed, they can clear the permissions at all. Often these kinds of questions have not been explored in traditional printed theses (though they sometimes come up as part of the process of moving from thesis to monograph), and both graduate students and the faculty advising them have little expertise in this area. Libraries are increasingly establishing services to assist faculty and student authors with understanding and addressing these types of intellectual property concerns. Note also that there are some particularly problematic issues that arise in the performing arts, where there may be issues about clearing rights of public performance of a dance work, a play, or a musical piece if open access to theses is required.

Long-term or permanent embargoes rise to the level of institutional policy: should institutions permit degrees to be awarded on the basis of work that is not made public, or that is made public only in the most limited of ways (by allowing physical inspection of a printed copy at the institution)? This is a fruitful area for community consideration both at the institutional and disciplinary level.

Non-Text Formats in ETDs

As discussed earlier, we were interested in gauging the extent to which institutions allowed various non-textual formats within ETDs. These formats could include images, sound files, videos, databases, simulations, data sets, and other items. We found that 43% of the institutions surveyed permit students to submit some types of non-text formats that are institutionally defined and enumerated, as part of an ETD. 32% allow students to submit materials in arbitrary and unconstrained formats. There is an interesting connection here between institutional preservation strategies and the digital formats that are accepted, and it parallels the situation for institutional repositories broadly:

the more extensive and diverse the set of formats accepted, the less likely that the repository will be able to offer services beyond bit-level preservation for most of the formats across time.

What we don't know (and this is a place where data would be valuable) is how many authors take advantage of these opportunities to include non-textual materials at institutions that permit this. We do know that less than a third of respondents noted that the ability to include non-text features was an important issue that encouraged implementation of an ETD program in their institution. One might speculate that this reflects the publication practices of many faculty, who continue to generate their work largely in text formats. Or, it is possible that our students need additional support, for example from the library and information technology professionals on campus, to fully exploit relevant technologies that could enhance their scholarly work. It is also possible that since librarians were the predominant group completing this survey, they may not be directly aware of the importance of the inclusion of non-text materials to various departments in their institution. At its annual conference, NDLTD gives awards to graduate students who have authored innovative ETDs, and examples of the types of materials used by these students can be seen in their work, linked from the NDLTD Web site.⁶

Needs of Graduate Students

Many university libraries are making a renewed effort to provide services and technology-rich spaces for graduate students. Institutions such as New York University, University of Minnesota, and University of Washington have studied graduate student needs for library and information services using a variety of techniques.⁷ The kinds of support that graduate students desire are likely to vary by institution and by discipline. Each institution should have mechanisms in place to gather needs-assessment data, and it would be useful to better understand what specific needs students have at the thesis or dissertation stage. Note that an institutional policy decision about the unacceptability of long-term embargoes may well play an important role in shaping these needs, particularly with regard to advice about copyrighted materials. E-research is also giving rise to new demands for help. While students often include appendices with survey instruments and tables of data, the large volume of data associated with e-research methodologies has not generally been included as part of the dissertation. One institution becoming active in this area is Oregon State

University, which is working with selected departments in the sciences on the processes and requirements for including large data sets associated with dissertations into the institution's digital repository.

A recent publication from the Council of Graduate Schools, *PhD Completion Project: Policies and Practices to Promote Student Success*, has identified a number of areas where institutions can work to enhance the graduate student experience and the completion rate of graduate degrees.⁸ For example, students' program environment can be enhanced through development of a network of support and outreach, interdisciplinary interactions (academic and social), and informal social activities. The curricular process can be enhanced by writing programs, a dissertation retreat / boot camp, and a collaborative doctoral student writing room. Unfortunately, the recent CGS report does not mention the library's role in supporting these kinds of activities (or, indeed, even to note some of the areas such as intellectual property advising where libraries are particularly well positioned to help), but clearly the library does have much to contribute.

Libraries are already developing collaborative spaces and targeting some of those for graduate students. Some information commons incorporate access to the campus writing center, and programs could be developed to specifically address the needs of thesis and dissertation writers. Libraries could play a role in hosting interdisciplinary events and could participate in dissertation retreats, focusing on the literature review, intellectual property issues, citation-management software, formatting the dissertation, and incorporating non-textual materials. Libraries can also advise students on e-research issues, providing information on best practices, development of metadata and documentation of workflows, and implications for access and preservation.

The traditional view of library participation in ETD programs has focused on their role in providing repository services. However, libraries can play a broader role in graduate education. While arranging for the institutional repository services and providing access to and preservation of ETDs is essential, there are many additional services that libraries can provide that directly assist students as they plan and write a dissertation. Such services can enhance students' dissertation experience and aid the institution by supporting students in the completion of their dissertation work.

- ¹ Lee S. Shulman, "Doctoral Education Shouldn't Be a Marathon," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, Chronicle Review, April 4, 2010, <http://chronicle.com/article/Doctoral-Education-Isnt-a-/64883/> (login required).
- ² For an overview of institutional practices and policy issues, see Joan K. Lippincott, "Institutional Strategies and Policies for Electronic Theses and Dissertations," *EDUCAUSE Center for Applied Research ECAR Research Bulletin*, 2006, no. 13 (June 20, 2006): 1–12, <http://net.educause.edu/ir/library/pdf/ERB0613.pdf>.
- ³ Presentations from the annual, international ETD conferences are available at http://www.ndltd.org/events_and_awards/conferences; an article providing a good overview of international developments is Haya Asner and Tsviya Polani, "Electronic Theses at Ben-Gurion University: Israel as Part of the Worldwide ETD Movement," *portal: Libraries and the Academy*, 8, no. 2 (April 2008): 121–139, http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/portal_libraries_and_the_academy/toc/pla8.2.html (login required).
- ⁴ The authors thank Diane Goldenberg-Hart, Communications Coordinator, CNI, for her assistance with developing, implementing, and analyzing the survey, and Sharon Adams, Administrative Assistant, CNI, for her assistance with the survey administration.
- ⁵ Charles B. Lowry, "ETDs and Digital Repositories—A Disciplinary Challenge to Open Access?" *portal: Libraries and the Academy* 6, no. 4 (October 2006): 387–393, http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/portal_libraries_and_the_academy/toc/pla6.4.html (login required). Additional resources addressing this issue are available on the NDLTD Web site at <http://www.ndltd.org/resources/intellectual-property-issues-and-etds>.
- ⁶ Networked Digital Library of Theses and Dissertations, NDLTD ETD Awards, http://www.ndltd.org/events_and_awards/awards/etd-awards.
- ⁷ Diane Goldenberg-Hart, "Enhancing Graduate Education: A Fresh Look at Library Engagement," *ARL: A Bimonthly Report*, no. 256 (Feb. 2008): 1–8; see also the presentations available for the fall 2007 ARL-CNI forum on this topic. Goldenberg-Hart's report and the forum presentations are available at <http://www.arl.org/resources/pubs/fallforumproceedings/forum07proceedings.shtml>.
- ⁸ Council of Graduate Schools, *PhD Completion and Attrition: Policies and Practices to Promote Student Success* (Washington DC: The Council, 2010), <http://www.phdcompletion.org/information/book4.asp>.

© 2010 Joan K. Lippincott and Clifford A. Lynch



This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-Share Alike 3.0 United States License. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/us/>.

To cite this article: Joan K. Lippincott and Clifford A. Lynch. "ETDs and Graduate Education: Programs and Prospects." *Research Library Issues: A Bimonthly Report from ARL, CNI, and SPARC*, no. 270 (June 2010): 6–15. <http://www.arl.org/resources/pubs/rli/archive/rli270.shtml>.

Urban Copyright Legends

Brandon Butler, Director of Public Policy Initiatives, ARL

As a copyright lawyer, I sometimes wish there were a copyright version of Snopes.com—a Web site where non-experts could check to see whether the things they read online about copyright are true or just urban legends. The recent dispute between the University of California, Los Angeles and an association of film distributors has been the occasion for earnest repetition of several copyright urban legends that are at best debatable and at worst plain false.¹ Tragically, these myths are just as likely to be repeated by librarians and educators as by advocates for rights holders. The discussion of streaming films provides an excellent opportunity to clear up some common misunderstandings about how copyright law works.

Copyright Basics: Control with Exceptions

US copyright law allows rights holders a degree of control over both reproduction and distribution of protected works. The law also includes several exceptions that allow libraries and others to make use of copyrighted materials without asking permission or paying a fee. Among those exceptions are Section 107 (fair use) and Section 110(2) (the TEACH Act).² These exceptions and limitations are just as important as copyright protection itself. They are a vital safety valve that prevents copyright from being an oppressive monopoly. In fact, the Supreme Court has said that without exceptions to facilitate access, copyright law would violate the First Amendment.³

Urban Fair Use Legends

Fair use provides the broadest, most flexible protection for unauthorized copying, performance, and display of copyrighted works. Determining whether a particular use of a copyrighted work is fair can seem intimidating, as the law has evolved from court cases and was written in an intentionally broad way to allow flexibility and continued evolution of the doctrine. Nevertheless, the situation is not nearly so dire as the following urban legends suggest.

“You cannot rely on fair use to protect a general policy because fair use determinations are made on a case-by-case basis.”

It is often suggested that because some of the factors in fair use law have to do with the nature of the work that is being used, the user is required to conduct a fresh (and presumably arduous) legal analysis for each individual work she uses. In that case, it would be impossible to rely on fair use for a general policy or class of uses going forward. But if that were true, there would be no VCR (and no DVR), no Google, no compatible-software industry, and no *Daily Show*. Each of these relies on the general applicability of fair use every day, and would be crippled if the “case-by-case” legend were true.

In reality, Google is not required to have a lawyer review each Web site its robots crawl before adding the site to its database, nor does Motorola have a full-time legal staff checking whether every program on television qualifies to be recorded on a set-top box. Software engineers rely on case law that allows them to reverse engineer platforms and make compatible programs using fair use. The *Daily Show* surely does have a legal staff, but the show would never have been conceived if it could not generally rely on fair use of clips from other shows as the core of its nightly formula.

A good faith actor can and should rely on fair use to adopt a general policy or standard of practice where it can argue with confidence that the same fair use argument will apply in every case. The “case-by-case” legend need not stymie libraries and schools that are considering a broad policy such as allowing video streaming.

“Fair use is a defense, not an exemption, and accused infringers will bear a heavy burden of proving in court that their use was fair.”

This urban copyright legend suggests fair use is a mere excuse for infringing behavior, impugning its moral status relative to other exceptions as well as implying that fair users (unlike, say, users who invoke Section 108) are presumed infringers and must do more to prove their actions are legitimate. The net effect is that librarians and administrators are made to feel like scofflaws when they rely on fair use and to perceive an inflated risk that they will be found guilty of infringement.

On the moral question, the text of Section 107 is clear: “the fair use of a copyrighted work...is not an infringement of copyright.” The fair user is not an infringer who has gotten off the hook by providing an excuse. Her actions are

just as favored by the law as the teacher who shows a film clip in class. The Supreme Court has recognized the importance of a vigorous defense of copyright exceptions, writing, “defendants who seek to advance a variety of meritorious copyright defenses should be encouraged to litigate them to the same extent that plaintiffs are encouraged to litigate meritorious claims of infringement.”⁴

On the procedural question, it is true that courts treat a claim of fair use as if it were a defense, asking accused infringers to explain why their behavior is fair. But the implication that accused infringers will bear a *heavy* burden is unfounded. The law is clear that non-profit and educational uses are at the core of what fair use protects, citing “teaching (including multiple copies for classroom use), scholarship, or research,” as examples of legitimate fair use purposes. Recent scholarship supports the idea that non-profit educational uses would have a presumption in their favor. A fairly simple showing from the educational user could shift the burden back to the rights holder, who must then prove the use is *not* fair.⁵

“If a license is available, then your use ‘harms the market’ for that work and cannot be fair.”

Rights holders often suggest that if they are willing to accept a license fee to permit a practice, then that practice cannot be fair use. It is true that “the effect of the use upon the potential market for or value of the copyrighted work” is one of the four factors in Section 107, but that factor is not decisive. Instead, the Supreme Court has required that it be weighed together with the other three factors “in light of the purposes of copyright.”⁶ In recent cases, courts have found the use of a work to be fair despite the existence of a licensing market.⁷ The DVR is again instructive, as it can record broadcast programming as well as make programs available “on demand” for a fee. Studios and programmers likely coordinate their schedules so that the same program is rarely, if ever, available through both channels, but it seems unlikely that such a coincidence would turn innocent time shifting into shameless piracy.

Section 110 Legends

While fair use has been the subject of misinformation for decades, Section 110 has also come in for some distortion in recent discussions. Here are two of the worst misstatements about Section 110.

“For digital transmissions, Section 110 trumps fair use. If a use does not qualify for 110 protection, it cannot be a fair use.”

This may be the most harmful notion that circulates in debates over educational use of films. It is also the most demonstrably false. During the drafting of the TEACH Act, which modified Section 110(2) to allow digital streaming, the Register of Copyrights prepared a report that urged Congress to include key points about fair use in the legislative history of the statute. The Conference Report on the TEACH Act did just that, quoting the Register’s conclusion that, “Fair use could apply as well to instructional transmissions not covered by the changes to section 110(2). . . .” Congress clearly had no intention of preempting fair use when it enacted 110(2). On the contrary, legislative history and subsequent analysis show Congress intended for fair use to fill in the gaps where the specific exception may not apply.⁸

“If a video is marketed for educational use, it cannot be transmitted digitally under 110(2).”

This legend expands the exception in the law far beyond its plain meaning. The TEACH Act does not allow transmission of works “produced or marketed primarily for performance or display as part of mediated instructional activities transmitted via digital networks.” Many works are produced or marketed to some extent for educational use in some contexts. Productions of Shakespeare’s plays filmed by the BBC, for example, are commonly sold to high schools and colleges for showing in literature classes. But to be excluded from the 110(2) educational provision, a work must be produced or marketed *primarily* for digital distance education. The vast majority of feature films simply do not have such a targeted audience. If the work is marketed primarily for commercial audiences, or for face-to-face educational use, repurposing it for digital distance education is precisely what 110(2) is meant to allow.

Conclusion

Copyright law can be confusing, but the proliferation of misinformation and misstatements about copyright has made rational discussion considerably more difficult, not to mention chilling beneficial behavior. Hopefully bringing some popular misconceptions to light will help clear the way for a calmer, more reasonable discussion of these issues.

- ¹ The Library Copyright Alliance (a coalition of ARL, the American Library Association, and the Association of College and Research Libraries) attempted to clear up some of the confusion when it published an Issue Brief discussing in some detail the streaming of films for educational purposes. That brief is available at http://www.arl.org/bm~doc/ibstreamingfilms_021810pdf.pdf.
- ² There are several other provisions in the law that grant special rights to libraries and educational institutions, chief among them Section 109, without which libraries would violate the law by performing one of their traditional core functions: circulating collections. Other provisions include: Section 108, Section 121, Section 504(c)(2)(i), Section 512(e), Section 602(a)(3)(C), Section 1201(d), Section 1203(c)(5)(B), and Section 1204(b). Among other things, these provisions make it possible for libraries to make books accessible to the print-disabled, to preserve deteriorating collections materials, to break digital locks for limited purposes, and to provide Internet access with the same protections as for-profit ISPs.
- ³ See *Eldred v. Ashcroft*, 537 U.S. 186, 219 (2003) (citing fair use and other exceptions).
- ⁴ See *Fogerty v. Fantasy, Inc.*, 510 U.S. 517, 527 (1994).
- ⁵ See, e.g., Deborah Gerhardt and Madelyn Wessel, "Fair Use and Fairness on Campus," *North Carolina Journal of Law & Technology* (forthcoming Spring 2010), http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1594934.
- ⁶ *Campbell v. Acuff-Rose Music, Inc.*, 510 U.S. 569, 578 (1994) (cited in Gerhardt and Wessel).
- ⁷ See, e.g., *Bill Graham Archives v. Dorling Kindersley Ltd.*, 448 F.3d 605 (2006). For a more in-depth discussion of this "Market Myth," see Gerhardt and Wessel.
- ⁸ See, e.g., Jared Huber, Brian T. Yeh, and Robin Jeweler, *Copyright Exemptions for Distance Education: 17 U.S.C. § 110(2), the Technology, Education, and Copyright Harmonization Act of 2002*, CRS Report RL33516 (Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress: 2006), 7, <http://openocrs.com/document/RL33516/>.

To cite this article: Brandon Butler. "Urban Copyright Legends." *Research Library Issues: A Bimonthly Report from ARL, CNI, and SPARC*, no. 270 (June 2010): 16-20.
<http://www.arl.org/resources/pubs/rli/archive/rli270.shtml>.

Open Access Week: Library Strategies for Advancing Change

**Jamaica Jones, Special Projects Librarian,
National Center for Atmospheric Research**

**Andrew Waller, Licensing and Negotiations Librarian
and Open Access Librarian, University of Calgary**

with Jennifer McLennan, Director of Programs and Operations, SPARC

Over the past several years, libraries have strategically brought to bear the power of a global awareness event we call “Open Access Week” to advance real, policy-driven scholarly communication change on campus. Initiated by students and marked by just a few dozen campuses in 2007, Open Access Week has evolved into a truly global phenomenon thanks to the ongoing leadership of the library community. Not simply an awareness-raising exercise, librarians have made Open Access Week a platform for advancing specific policy changes on research sharing and dissemination, including institution-wide commitments to open access. In anticipation of Open Access Week 2010 (October 18–24) and beginning to formulate local strategies, SPARC has invited two leading participants from 2009 to share in the following two articles how the event helped them to advance open access to research. For more details about plans and developments around Open Access Week 2010, visit <http://www.openaccessweek.org/> or contact Jennifer McLennan jennifer@arl.org.

—Jennifer McLennan

University Corporation for Atmospheric Research

Jamaica Jones

At the University Corporation for Atmospheric Research (UCAR), Open Access Week 2009 provided an opportunity to raise awareness about openness in scientific research. UCAR is sponsored by the National Science Foundation (NSF) to manage the National Center for Atmospheric Research (NCAR), a Federally Funded Research and

Development Center (FFRDC) that provides the facilities, tools, and models needed to advance science across the atmospheric and geoscience community. NCAR employs several hundred scientists, whose work and research are supported by the NCAR Library, a small, specialized library committed to the facilitation and stewardship of NCAR research.

Together, NCAR and UCAR share a mission of supporting research across the broad atmospheric and geoscience community. That community is comprised of over 150 UCAR Member and Affiliate institutions, each of which offers advanced degrees in related scientific disciplines. Many UCAR Members operate under budgets that render access to the top journals in the field impossible. For this reason and for several decades, Members have asked the NCAR Library to provide them with access to scholarship written by UCAR researchers. While the NCAR Library is fortunate enough to have subscriptions to most of the journals publishing this scholarship, we have been unable to provide access to UCAR scholarship outside of our own institution, owing to the terms of our subscription and publishing agreements. Motivated by these challenges, the NCAR Library began in early 2009 to advocate for the adoption of an open access mandate across UCAR. After only a few months, this policy was passed, making it the first to be adopted by any FFRDC.

Open Access Week 2009 came on the heels of that achievement. Because UCAR is a highly decentralized, busy place, we chose to celebrate "Open Access Day" rather than "Open Access Week," and opted to plan one central event. We hosted a panel discussion between George Strawn, then the Chief Information Officer of the NSF, who spoke about the role of the federal government in fostering and funding major technological innovations, and John Wilbanks, Vice President of Science at Creative Commons, who presented the merging of these innovations and communication technologies as an inevitable, necessary step in the advancement of science. Introduced by Rick Anthes, President of UCAR, and moderated by Richard Katz, Director of the EDUCAUSE Center for Applied Research (ECAR), co-sponsor of the day's events, the discussion was attended by a robust crowd of lab and department directors, UCAR governance, scientists, and administrators. Conversation following the panel discussion was lively, reflecting a high level of interest and engagement in the material presented.

In planning Open Access Day 2009, our hope for the outcome of our celebration was simply to raise awareness about the potential of open access to transform scientific communication. Judging by the diverse audience the discussion attracted,

and the thoughtful conversation it inspired, the event was quite successful. We would therefore like to offer the following recommendations to other institutions or departments planning Open Access Week activities in the future:

- **Make it relevant.** Well-structured, relevant conversations are more engaging for everyone involved.
- **Draw on your institution's mission statement.** Tying the discussion to your institution's mission will help to ensure this relevance, and will also help secure buy-in and interest from your senior management.
- **Create connections.** Prior to the 2009 panel discussion, we arranged for John Wilbanks to meet with some of our most prominent scientists, allowing him to understand the culture and concerns of UCAR, and helping the scientists to recognize how advances in open access can extend the impact of their research.
- **Meet your audience where they are,** physically as well as intellectually.
- **Plan early, schedule early.** This will be especially important if your institution is hoping to bring in a speaker. Once you know the date, ask people to hold it, and let them know to look forward to future updates.
- **Give them stuff, but also give them information.** While you are handing out buttons and T-shirts, do not miss the opportunity to educate and inform your audience about the importance of open access in scholarly publishing. This is a particularly valuable approach for institutions planning their first Open Access Week, and will help you stay within your budget.

At the time this article is being written, plans for UCAR's celebration of Open Access Week 2010 remain underway. We will certainly use the opportunity to celebrate the launch of UCAR's open access repository, OpenSky (scheduled for September 2010), and look forward to building on the momentum of last year's successes.

© 2010 Jamaica Jones



This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-Share Alike 3.0 United States License. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/us/>.

University of Calgary

Andrew Waller

Led by the Libraries and Cultural Resources (LCR) unit, Open Access (OA) Week 2009 was a successful and enjoyable experience at the University of Calgary, a large, publicly funded Canadian university with close to 30,000 students and a medical school. We used OA Week to further spread the word about open access on campus as well as increase the profile of our suite of OA-related endeavors. These endeavors include an institutional repository, an authors fund, a digitization center, OA journals in the University of Calgary Press, and an OA mandate for the academic staff in LCR to widely and openly disseminate their own scholarly activities. The positive nature of OA Week 2009 at the University of Calgary can be attributed to two elements: we planned well and we held a wide variety of activities during the week that produced noticeable results.

Planning

Led by a core team comprised of staff from a variety of LCR departments, our planning process consisted of several elements:

- **We did our research.** We did not take part in OA Week 2008 but we made sure we talked with institutions that did do something that year and we learned from them (what worked, what did not, etc.).
- **We aimed big.** As we are fairly well established in terms of OA activities, we wanted an OA Week program that complemented our progress. In addition, as we had not participated in the 2007 and 2008 OA Weeks, we had some catching up to do, so to speak. Not all of our initial plans for OA Week 2009 came to fruition but many did.
- **LCR administration was on our side.** Our director, Tom Hickerson, was very supportive, had plenty of ideas as to what we could do, and he gave us a budget of approximately \$5,000 (CAN).
- **We reached out to LCR colleagues.** A core team of LCR staff planned our OA Week program but also put the word out to everyone in LCR and drew on help from these colleagues, in both big and small ways.
- **We reached out to campus supporters outside of LCR.** Rose Goldstein,

the university's Vice-President (Research) has been supportive of our OA efforts over time and continued this support during OA Week, including her introduction of Leslie Chan, from Bioline International, who was the keynote speaker. Our Students' Union (SU) also supported OA Week by co-sponsoring Chan's presentation.

Activities

We carried out many activities during OA Week 2009. Some of the key activities included:

- **We employed the visual element.** The OA Week colors and graphics are striking and people seem to really like them. We incorporated the OA Week images wherever we placed a display or a banner or posters.
- **We had an OA Week element in every library location.** Every branch had something OA-related for the entire week, ranging from a small static display to a large, staffed desk.
- **We worked with the media.** We communicated with the media both on and off campus to promote OA and OA Week issues.
- **We gave away stuff.** People like free stuff (especially orange T-shirts). Giving away OA tchotchkes opens the door to conversations about open access and related issues.

Some Results

Anecdotally, our OA Week 2009 activities brought about more knowledge of OA and OA issues at the University of Calgary. The week's events included strong promotion of the OA projects we have at the university, all of which have continued to attract increasing interest since last October; for instance, our Open Access Authors Fund has funded over 60 articles since OA Week and our institutional repository is the second largest university repository in Canada.

Not long after OA Week 2009, the legislative assembly of the University of Calgary Students' Union passed a resolution in support of open access. They are one of the few undergraduate student bodies to have taken such a step.

Lastly, OA Week 2009 gave us good momentum for OA Week 2010.

© 2010 Andrew Waller



This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-Share Alike 3.0 United States License. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/us/>.

~ ~ ~

To cite this article: Jamaica Jones, Andrew Waller, Jennifer McLennan. "Open Access Week: Library Strategies for Advancing Change." *Research Library Issues: A Bimonthly Report from ARL, CNI, and SPARC*, no. 270 (June 2010): 21–26. <http://www.arl.org/resources/pubs/rli/archive/rli270.shtml>.

News

University of Calgary, University of Ottawa Become Newest Members of ARL

At the ARL Membership Meetings in October 2009 and April 2010, the Association membership voted to invite the University of Calgary Libraries and Cultural Resources and the University of Ottawa Library to join ARL as the 124th and 125th members, respectively. Both universities are members of the Canadian research-intensive "G-13" institutions based on sponsored research and number of PhDs.

The University of Calgary Libraries and Cultural Resources (LCR) brings together the University Library, Archives and Special Collections, the Nickle Arts Museum, and the University of Calgary Press. LCR Vice Provost and University Librarian H. Thomas Hickerson accepted the invitation to join ARL.

The University of Ottawa is a bilingual institution and the library brings together people, expertise, and knowledge resources in physical and virtual environments that foster research, teaching, and learning in English and French. University Librarian Leslie Weir accepted ARL's invitation.

For more information about these two new members, please see the ARL press releases:

<http://www.arl.org/news/pr/calgary-oct09.shtml>

<http://www.arl.org/news/pr/ottawa-may10.shtml>

ARL Transitions

Brigham Young: Randy J. Olsen resigned as University Librarian to accept the position of Director of Libraries in the Church History Department of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in Salt Lake City beginning January 4, 2010. H. Julene Butler was named University Librarian, effective January 14. She was formerly Associate University Librarian and Interim University Librarian.

Buffalo, SUNY: Stephen M. Roberts retired as Associate Vice President for University Libraries, effective June 30, 2010. H. Austin Booth, Associate Director of University Libraries and Director of Collections, was named Interim Associate Vice President for University Libraries, effective July 1.

California, Davis: Marilyn J. Sharrow retired as University Librarian, effective March 1, 2010. Helen Henry and Gail Yokote continue to serve as Acting Co-University Librarians; they have been serving in this capacity since January 2009, when Sharrow went on medical leave.

California, Irvine: Gerald Munoff retired as University Librarian at the end of the 2009–10 academic year. Gerald Lowell, Assistant Dean of the Claire Trevor School of the Arts at UC Irvine, was appointed Interim Library Director, effective June 1, 2010.

California, Santa Barbara (UCSB): Sherry DeDecker and Lucia Snowhill were named Co-Acting University Librarians, effective February 1, 2010, upon the departure of Brenda Johnson for Indiana University Libraries. Lucia Snowhill is Associate University Librarian for Collection Development and Sherry DeDecker is Associate University Librarian for User and Instructional Services. Lucia Snowhill is now UCSB's representative to ARL.

Case Western Reserve: Arnold Hirshon, Chief Strategist and Executive Consultant for LYRASIS, has been appointed University Librarian and Associate Provost, effective August 16, 2010. He succeeds Joanne Eustis, who retired in December 2009.

Colorado State: Pat Burns, Vice President for Information Technology, was also named Dean of Libraries in May 2010. He served as Interim Dean since May 2008, when Catherine Murray-Rust resigned to become Dean of Libraries at Georgia Tech.

Howard: Arthuree Wright, Associate Director of Reference, was named Interim Director of Libraries upon Mod Mekkawi's retirement in January 2010.

Indiana: Brenda Johnson was named Ruth Lilly Dean of the Indiana University Libraries, effective March 1, 2010. She was previously University Librarian at the University of California, Santa Barbara.

Kent State: James K. Bracken has been appointed Dean of University Libraries, effective August 1, 2010. He is currently Assistant Director for Collections, Instruction, and Public Services at the Ohio State University Libraries. Bracken will replace Mark Weber, who retired July 1, 2010.

Kentucky: Terry Birdwhistell, Associate Dean for Special Collections and Digital Programs at the University Libraries and Co-Director of the Wendell H. Ford

Public Policy Research Center, was named Dean of Libraries, effective July 1, 2010. He served as Interim Dean following the departure of Carol Pitts Diedrichs to become Director of Ohio State University Libraries in January 2010.

Louisville: Hannelore Rader retired as Dean of University Libraries effective December 31, 2009. Diane Nichols, Associate Dean of Library Operations and Director of the William F. Ekstrom Library, was named Interim Dean of University Libraries, effective January 1, 2010.

McGill: Janine Schmidt retired as Trenholme Director of Libraries, effective January 31, 2010. Diane Koen, Associate Director, Planning and Resources, University Libraries, was appointed Interim Director of Libraries, effective February 1, 2010.

National Agricultural Library: Simon Y. Liu was named Director, effective February 14, 2010. He was previously an Associate Director of the National Library of Medicine (NLM) and Director of NLM Computer and Communications Systems.

Notre Dame: Jennifer Younger resigned as Edward H. Arnold Director of Hesburgh Libraries, effective at the end of the 2009–10 academic year, to take on a new role with the Catholic Research Resources Alliance. Susan Ohmer, Assistant Provost and William T. and Helen Kuhn Carey Associate Professor of Modern Communication, was appointed Interim Director of Hesburgh Libraries, effective May 19, 2010.

Penn State: Barbara I. Dewey, currently Dean of Libraries at the University of Tennessee, has been appointed Dean of University Libraries and Scholarly Communications at Penn State, effective August 1. She will succeed Nancy Eaton, who will continue her ties with Penn State in retirement as Dean Emerita.

Queen's: Martha Whitehead, previously Associate University Librarian, was named University Librarian for a three-year term, effective July 1, 2010. She succeeds Paul Wiens, who stepped down June 30, 2010, to begin an administrative leave followed by retirement. Whitehead is an alumna of the 2007–08 ARL Research Library Leadership Fellows program.

Stony Brook, SUNY: Chris Filstrup resigned as Dean and Director of Libraries on November 30, 2009. Andrew White, former Director of the Health Sciences Library, is serving as Interim Dean and Director.

Tennessee (UT): Linda Phillips, Alumni Distinguished Service Professor and Head of Scholarly Communication for UT Libraries, was appointed Interim Dean of UT Libraries, effective July 1, 2010. Phillips succeeds Barbara Dewey, who is leaving to become the Dean of University Libraries and Scholarly Communications at Penn State.

Yale: Frank M. Turner, the John Hay Whitney Professor of History and Director of the Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, was named Interim University Librarian, effective January 2010, following the departure of Alice Prochaska.

ARL Staff Transitions

M. Sue Baughman was appointed Associate Deputy Executive Director, effective March 29, 2010. She was previously Assistant Dean for Organizational Development at the University of Maryland, College Park.

Les Bland resigned as Statistics Liaison, effective February 8, 2010, to accept a position as an Intelligence Analyst in the Office of Outreach, Bureau of Intelligence and Research, US State Department.

In January 2010, **Mary Jane Brooks** was promoted to Assistant Executive Director for Finance and Administration and **Kaylyn Groves** was promoted to Communications Program Officer.

Abbey Gerken was appointed as a part-time Program Assistant providing support for the Career Enhancement Program and other ARL Diversity Initiatives, effective June 9. She is a recent MSLS graduate from the Catholic University of America and holds a BA in English from the Ohio State University.

Charles B. Lowry extended his contract as ARL Executive Director through June 30, 2013. He had initially intended to return to the University of Maryland library school faculty in July 2011. However, following the ARL Board's strong endorsement of his first year as ARL Executive Director, the Executive Committee pursued an extension to his contract. He retired from the University of Maryland effective July 1, 2010, and was appointed Professor Emeritus by the President of the University.

Gary Roebuck resumed his position as Technical Operations Manager, Statistics and Measurement, effective November 23, 2009.

SPARC Transition

SPARC Europe: Astrid van Wesenbeeck was appointed Director, effective part-time on June 15, 2010, and full-time on July 12. She succeeds David Prosser, who was appointed Director of Research Libraries UK (RLUK). Van Wesenbeeck was previously Project Manager and Publishing Consultant at IGITUR, Utrecht Publishing & Archiving Services at Utrecht University in the Netherlands.

Other Transitions

American Library Association (ALA): James G. Neal (Columbia) was elected ALA Treasurer, effective in June 2010 following the ALA Annual Conference in Washington DC. He will serve as Treasurer through June 2013.

Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL): Joyce L. Ogburn (Utah) was elected ACRL Vice President/President-Elect, effective in June 2010 following the ALA Annual Conference in Washington DC. She will assume the presidency in July 2011 for a one-year term.

Association of Public and Land-grant Universities (APLU): David Shulenburger announced his intention to retire as Vice President for Academic Affairs, effective December 31, 2010.

Boston Library Consortium (BLC): Melissa Trevvett, Vice President and Director of Programs and Services for the Center for Research Libraries, has been named Executive Director of the BLC, effective September 7, 2010. Trevvett succeeds Barbara Preece, who was Executive Director of the BLC from 2000 through 2009.

Government Printing Office (GPO): President Obama announced his intent to nominate William J. Boarman as the Public Printer of the US. Boarman is President of the Printing, Publishing & Media Workers Sector of the Communications Workers of America (CWA), and the Senior Vice President of CWA. The Public Printer serves as the Chief Executive Officer of the US GPO.

Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS): Marsha Semmel, Deputy Director for Museums and Director for Strategic Partnerships, was named Acting Director, effective March 14, 2010, following the departure of IMLS Director Anne-Imelda M. Radice.

National Archives and Records Administration: David S. Ferriero, previously Andrew W. Mellon Director of the New York Public Library (NYPL), was confirmed as the 10th Archivist of the US by the Senate on November 6, 2009, and was sworn in on November 13.

National Science Foundation (NSF): President Obama announced his intent to nominate Subra Suresh, Dean of the MIT School of Engineering, to serve as the next Director of NSF. Suresh has made significant contributions to the emerging field of nanobiomechanics and is a vocal advocate for greater interdisciplinary collaboration.

OCLC Board: James G. Neal (Columbia) and Brian E. C. Schottlaender (California, San Diego) were elected to the OCLC Board of Trustees. Neal's term began in April 2010; Schottlaender's term starts in November 2010. The OCLC Global Council also elected Berndt Dugall (University of Frankfurt) Vice President/President-Elect, effective in July 2010.

Research Libraries UK (RLUK): David Prosser was appointed Executive Director, effective March 2010. He was previously Director of SPARC Europe.

ARL Calendar 2010

<http://www.arl.org/events/calendar/>

- | | |
|----------------------|--|
| July 26–27 | ARL Board Meeting
<i>Washington DC</i> |
| July 27 | Transitioning from Subscriptions to Open Access:
Article-Processing Fees & Licensing/ Author-Rights
Approaches
<i>Webinar 3B in ARL-ACRL ISC Series</i> |
| September 21 | Broader Library Involvement in Building Programs:
Organizational Strategy
<i>Webinar 4A in ARL-ACRL ISC Series</i> |
| October 12–15 | ARL Board & Membership Meetings
<i>Washington DC</i> |
| October 12–15 | XML Development: From Markup to Application
<i>Washington DC</i> |
| October 18–24 | International Open Access Week |
| October 19 | Broader Library Involvement in Building Programs:
Librarian Training and Development
<i>Webinar 4B in ARL-ACRL ISC Series</i> |
| October 25–27 | Library Assessment Conference
<i>Baltimore, Maryland</i> |
| November 8–9 | SPARC Digital Repositories Meeting
<i>Baltimore, Maryland</i> |
| December 13–14 | CNI Fall Task Force Meeting
<i>Washington DC</i> |

Research Library Issues

A Bimonthly Report from ARL, CNI, and SPARC

Research Library Issues is a freely available, online-only publication released six times per year by the Association of Research Libraries
21 Dupont Circle NW, Suite 800
Washington DC 20036
voice: 202-296-2296
fax: 202-872-0884
ISSN 1947-4911

Executive Director: Charles B. Lowry

Editor: M. Sue Baughman

Assistant Editor: Kaylyn Groves

Designer: Kevin Osborn, Research & Design Ltd., Arlington, Virginia

© 2010 Association of Research Libraries

ARL policy is to grant blanket permission to reprint from *Research Library Issues* for noncommercial use as long as full attribution is made. Exceptions to this policy may be noted for certain articles. This is in addition to the rights provided under sections 107 and 108 of the Copyright Act. For commercial use, a reprint request should be sent to ARL Publications pubs@arl.org.

Current and back issues are freely available on the ARL Web site.

The Web site is also where you may sign up for alerts of new releases of *Research Library Issues* and learn about submitting ideas for articles.

Visit <http://www.arl.org/resources/pubs/rli/>.