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SURVEY RESULTS
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Background
The survey was distributed to the 123 ARL member libraries in May 2007. Respondents were asked to provide information about the nature of library-initiated education activities about scholarly communication (SC) issues that had taken place in their institutions in the past three years or that were expected to take place soon. Seventy-three libraries (59%) responded to the survey. Of those, 55 (75%) indicated that the library has engaged in educational activities on scholarly communication (SC) issues; 13 (18%) have not but indicated that planning is underway. Only three libraries indicated that they had not engaged in this activity; another two responded that this is the responsibility of another, non-library unit of the institution.

Leadership of SC Education Initiatives
The majority of respondents indicated that the leadership for these education initiatives comes from within the library. Only 11 (17%) indicated that a group outside of the library plays a leadership role. In 25 cases (39%), leadership is shared by some combination of library SC committee, SC librarian, other library staff member, and outside group or is otherwise distributed across the organization. In most of the remaining cases there is a single leader. Twenty-one institutions reported that this is a library committee, eight that it is a chief SC librarian, three another library staff member, and two a committee outside the library.

Chief Scholarly Communication Librarian
Twenty-one respondents (32%) identified a “Chief SC Librarian” who has primary responsibility for education initiatives. About half of these are at the Assistant/Associate Librarian level. Only three of these librarians (14%) devote 100% of their time to SC initiatives. Most of the chief SC librarians have split appointments and all but a few devote less than 30% of their time to this work. Judging from their titles, they frequently also have responsibility for collections. A few have information resources, technical services, or publishing in their title. In two cases, they are a science librarian, probably due to the intense interest that science librarians have in the issue of the escalating costs of serials.

Another Library Staff Member
It was anticipated that many institutions would not have a chief SC librarian yet would have another librarian who was shouldering the primary SC responsibility. Eighteen respondents (28%) indicated this was the case and 12 identified the position. The survey results showed that, again, this responsibility most frequently is assumed by a collections or science librarian. In other cases it is combined with the role of copyright specialist, head of the institutional repository (IR), manager of the journals program, or whomever happened to be Chair of the SC task force. As anticipated, these librarians devote even less time to SC activities; none more than half
of their time and the majority devote less than 20% of their time to SC education initiatives.

Library SC Task Force

Within the library, the SC educational effort is most frequently lead by a group, committee, or task force (35 responses or 54%). The number of task force members ranges from very small (2 members) to large (18 members) with an average size of seven. The task force chairperson is most frequently a librarian whose title suggests responsibilities in science (9 of 37 responses), collections (7), or e-resources (4). In over half of the task forces described, the chair is a member of the library administration, including several cases where the University Librarian chairs the group.

All of the task forces have librarians as members but only a few have members from other parts of the institution. Five task forces (14%) have academic faculty as members, including one case where the chair is a member of the science faculty. Institutional administrators are members of four task forces (11%) and students are members of only one.

When solicited for comments about the nature of their SC task force, several respondents revealed that the task force is, at best, just a couple of librarians who are interested in SC; or is a group that gets together to plan the annual SC symposium or seminar. Other task forces appear to be focused on institutional repository or copyright concerns. Another respondent commented, “This group has a somewhat broader mandate than Scholarly Communication as defined by ARL. For instance, group members are expected to advise faculty to publish in Elsevier journals when that is in the best interest of the faculty member, the discipline, and the University.”

Outside SC Task Force

Only a few institutions (11 or 17%) indicated that their campuses have a SC task force that reports outside the library that includes library staff. About half of these groups are sponsored by and report to the Faculty Senate. Several report directly to the President or Chancellor. One reports to the University Librarian.

These committees tend to be rather large (between 8 and 21 members with the exception of one 872-member academic senate) and are usually chaired by a member of the faculty. In all cases, teaching faculty and at least one librarian are members; nearly half have student members, too. Three include institution administrators. This is in stark contrast to the library-run SC tasks forces which seldom include members of the faculty or students. From the comments it is apparent that in several instances “scholarly communication issues” are not the sole interest of these groups.

Scholarly Communication Education Activities

The survey asked respondents to indicate the SC topics the library has addressed during their education activities to the various categories of campus affiliate—faculty, non-faculty researcher, administrators, graduate students, undergraduate students, and librarians and other library staff—and whether they had targeted the topic to particular disciplines or to all regardless of discipline. [N.B. “Faculty” refers to non-library faculty as distinct from librarians with faculty status. The SC education initiatives targeted to librarians, regardless of whether they have faculty status, are covered in the section “Librarians and Other Library Staff.”] It also asked them to rank the modes of delivery they had used on a scale of 1 (least effective) to 5 (most effective).

Faculty

Fifty-eight survey respondents indicated that faculty are targeted for education about scholarly communication issues. For the most part, the faculty are treated as a whole—only five respondents (9%) indicated they only made an effort to target a particular discipline—though 18 respondents targeted specific disciplines depending on the topic. Not
surprisingly, nearly all the responding institutions addressed faculty on the topics of the economics of scholarly publishing, author rights management, contributing to digital repositories, the benefits of open access journals, and the implications for teaching of giving away copyright. Other prevalent issues include public access initiatives such as the Federal Public Access Act of 2006, the impact of the new SC models on peer review and promotion and tenure issues, and author activism (refusal to publish in expensive journals), followed by editor activism (working within scholarly societies to improve open access to articles) and concerns about the future of scholarly society publishing. Other topics respondents have addressed include copyright, fair use, and the importance of depositing into the local institutional repository.

Although none of the respondents have rigorously gathered information concerning the efficacy of their efforts with faculty, they were able to rank which methods of delivery they thought worked well with this group. The most commonly used and most effective means of delivering the SC message to faculty is one-on-one conversations; 69% of the respondents indicating that it was somewhat or most effective. The next most effective methods are informal (52%) and formal (41%) group discussions. Although nearly every responding institution now has a SC Web site, these were judged as somewhat or very effective by just 18%—slightly less effective than brochures and e-mail messages (22%). Newsletter articles were the least used and least effective means of communication. One respondent commented that their, “lunch series was highly attended by faculty. In fact, we are repeating a couple of the sessions to accommodate those who were not able to attend due to demand. Our most effective communications have come where faculty talk with knowledgeable experts (library and campus counsel) and with other faculty. The lunch series is one example of that.” So, it appears that talking to the faculty in small groups or one-on-one—and feeding them—may be the way to go.

Non-faculty Researchers
Only 14 respondents (28%) indicated that they had targeted programs toward non-faculty researchers. The SC topics discussed with this group are essentially the same as those targeted to faculty, primarily author rights management, contributing to digital repositories, the economics of scholarly publishing, and author activism. As with faculty, the best way to reach this constituency is by means of one-on-one conversations or informal group discussions. Other channels were rated only moderately effective. Due to the small sample size, it is probably unwarranted to draw other conclusions about this category.

Institutional Administrators
All but a few respondents (49 or 85%) have targeted scholarly communication education messages to institutional administrators; the majority (34 or 59%) have targeted a specific administrator such as the Provost, Chancellor, or a particular Dean. Once again, the most effective mode of communication is one-on-one conversation, followed by informal and formal group discussions. The topic most frequently discussed with administrators is the economics of scholarly publishing. Other commonly addressed topics include author rights management, contributing to digital repositories, and the implications for teaching of giving away copyright. The least frequently discussed topics are author activism and editor activism. Respondents report that they have also spoken of the “Importance to the university for retaining its intellectual property” and the “Prestige and grant-application value of IR.” Other respondents added these comments: “It’s most effective when it’s addressed in the context of something the university is trying to accomplish.” “What we are trying to do is to offer sound and practical advice and not to come off as a group who believe that they have ‘special knowledge’ about an admittedly complex situation or an idealistic ‘agenda’ like open access, etc., but to provide all options as existing and changing realities.”
Graduate Students
As the future faculty of tomorrow, graduate students have been the focus of SC education initiatives by nearly half of the respondents (26 or 47%). They are usually taught as a whole, without regard to their discipline. The primary topics of discussion include author rights management, the implication for teaching of giving away copyright, the economics of scholarly publishing, and the benefits of open access journals. Other popular topics include national public access developments, contributing to digital repositories, author activism, and the future of scholarly society publishing.

As with previous groups, the most effective means of relaying these messages is one-on-one conversations; 82% rated this delivery option as somewhat or most effective. Perhaps because graduate student audiences are often available in the classroom setting, informal and formal group presentations also work well for this group. Other methods used to reach graduate students include training sessions for teaching assistants, graduate school packets concerning electronic submission of their theses, and a “Responsible Conduct of Research” bioethics program. One library indicated that they planned to start a “Graduate Scholarly Publishing advisement service next year.” Some comments, though, indicate that libraries are not focusing their efforts on this population so much as welcoming them to campus-wide activities.

Undergraduate Students
Only seven survey respondents (13%) indicated that they had scholarly communication activities that were intended for undergraduate students. Due to the small sample size, it is difficult to draw many conclusions. However, it appears that one-on-one conversations and both formal and informal group presentations work well for reaching this group. The most popular topic to “Wow” them with is a discussion of the economics of publishing, though author rights management, the benefits of open access journals, and the future of scholarly publishing are also frequently discussed.

Librarians and Other Library Staff
Before librarians can effectively educate the rest of the academic community about the issues of scholarly communication, they must bring their colleagues and staff on board. Educational activities for librarians and staff have been held at 95% of the responding institutions. In some cases, activities have been developed specifically for subject liaisons or coordinators so they will feel more comfortable when they approach their faculty about SC issues.

Unlike the results with other audiences, the most effective means of reaching out to librarians and library staff is formal presentations; 67% of the respondents rate this as somewhat or most effective. This may be because the culture and practice within libraries tends to lean toward formal group presentations to peers. It must be noted that one-on-one conversations (64%) and informal group discussions (56%) were also perceived as effective.

Again mimicking their efforts with faculty, librarians are educating their peers about issues having to do with contributing to IRs, author rights management, the benefits of open access journals, and the implications for teaching of giving away copyright. Not surprisingly, another hot topic is the economics of scholarly publishing. Since one of the goals of educating librarians about SC issues is to enable them to engage the faculty (and others) on these issues, it is appropriate that the topics are the same as those addressed to other audiences. One institution whose librarians are members of the research faculty talk to the library faculty “about THEIR opportunities, when they publish their research. This was done to increase their comfort/knowledge of the publishing opportunities so they might speak to their clients more comfortably about it.”

Other Audience
Only nine respondents indicated that they had engaged another type of audience in the SC conversation. Other audiences that were noted in the comments include consortia to which the library belongs
and regional library groups. From the comments, it appears that in some cases libraries are banding together with others in their region to tackle SC issues. This is probably an effective tack as faculty often collaborate with other faculty at nearby institutions. Due to the small size of the sample and the diversity of the audiences that were identified, it is not advisable to draw many conclusions from the data for this group. Topics and methods of delivery to these audiences were consistent with delivery to other groups. Due to the nature of the audience, formal presentations were judged the most effective means of communicating, though one-on-one conversations were also effective.

Collaborative Activities
The majority of responding institutions have made presentations (62%) or given reports (49%) to the faculty governance body on their campus regarding scholarly communication issues. (It would be interesting to determine how many of these have been about topics other than those driven by the “serials crisis.”) Many campuses have developed and proposed SC resolutions and 38% of the campuses have passed resolutions at this point.

Most Effective Activities
The respondents were invited to describe up to three SC education activities that, in their estimation, were particularly effective. Forty-five institutions provided one or more descriptions for a total of 113 activities.

The most frequently mentioned effective means to deliver the SC message were one-on-one conversations and presentations. One-on-one interactions, in person or via personal e-mails, were good for reaching individuals such as faculty editors, department heads, or regular faculty members. Presentations were an effective means to reach groups such as graduate students, librarians, and the Faculty Senate Committee on the Library. Many also reported that symposia are effective; several reported that their campuses hold annual symposia. Several listed Web sites as effective tools, without much explanation. Other activities that were mentioned multiple times were marketing campaigns, passage of Senate SC resolutions, and newsletter items. Workshops—both library-sponsored and campus-sponsored—were also an effective means to reach the campus. A number of institutions have found it effective to work through their Faculty Senate Committee on the Library.

Challenges
Survey respondents were invited to relate significant challenges their library has faced in educating library users and staff about SC issues. They were provided three open-ended text boxes for their responses. Fifty institutions listed one or more challenges for a total of 126 challenges.

Not surprisingly, the biggest obstacle in getting the faculty to care about scholarly communication issues is concerns about promotion and tenure. Some faculty show a “reluctance … to accept that OA journals can be every bit as scholarly as non-OA journals.” Of course they also do not want to hear of any restrictions on where they should or should not publish. Some are fearful that, if they attempt to use copyright addenda, their articles will be refused by prestigious scholarly publishers such as the ACS. As one person put it, “Faculty are hesitant to do anything that will disadvantage them in the promotion and tenure process.”

Two other huge challenges to reaching the faculty are that they either show a lack of interest in the issues or are satisfied with the status quo and that they are too busy to focus on what many apparently feel is a “library problem.” Quite a few respondents said their problem was coming up with a clear message with which to reach the faculty and mobilize them into action.

Some respondents commented on challenges that involve the campus, such as lack of administrative support and the decentralized nature of the campus, which also make it difficult to reach the faculty.

The biggest challenge for librarians revolved around having adequate staff, time, and funding to
As was noted earlier, most librarians who are tasked with developing an SC education initiative have added this to an already full plate of responsibilities. Several respondents seemed to feel their SC education initiatives would fail until their library administration made SC education a real priority, providing money to fund a position that would be primarily or solely devoted to SC issues. Another major stumbling block that many mentioned is the difficulty of “educating librarians so they are equipped to engage faculty in discussions of issue.” It was acknowledged that SC is made up of many complex issues about which it is difficult to keep up-to-date.

**Assessments of Success**

Only 5 respondents (9%) indicated that they had made any evaluation of the success of their library’s SC education activities. In several instances these were just the quick “what did you learn” evaluations that are often requested after a class, workshop, or symposium. In one case, the evaluation was a part of the yearly evaluation of the SC librarian. Another mentioned that they believe slow but steady growth in the deposit and usage statistics of their IR is a measure of their success. Only one responding institution appears to have done a comprehensive evaluation, saying that their “Office of Scholarly Communication has done surveys of faculty across all the campuses on scholarly communication issues in both 2004 and 2006.” The content of these surveys was not provided.

**Demonstrable Outcomes**

The respondents were invited to relate any demonstrable outcomes (such as statements from faculty governance bodies, changes in promotion and tenure criteria, author’s switching to open access journals, etc.) related to the library’s SC education activities. Twenty-three institutions listed one or more outcomes for a total of 37 examples. The most frequently mentioned outcome (9 responses) was the passage of a Faculty Senate Resolution on SC. The focus of the resolutions varied. Several focused on bringing down the cost of journals, including one that supported “increased funding for library acquisitions.” Others encouraged their faculty to “use open access publications whenever possible;” another was endorsing the Tempe Principles to work toward transforming scholarly communication; and others were endorsing the use of copyright addenda by their researchers. Whether part of a SC Faculty Senate resolution or not, increased support for using copyright addenda to retain the rights to one’s published materials was mentioned as a significant outcome by at least 6 of the 23 respondents.

At least five institutions mentioned that their faculty are developing open access (OA ) journals using online journal publishing platforms supported by the library. The support and increased usage of local institutional repositories was also cited by at least five respondents as evidence that the SC message is reaching the faculty and administration.

One respondent is clearly frustrated with the seeming glacial speed with which real outcomes are discernible: “We have some general resolutions and statements, etc., but many of us have stacks of these stuck away in our bottom drawers. What I’d like to see is more OA journals & books based in IRs and action from funding agencies that require OA reporting of results.” But another was pleasantly surprised that, “The [local] editors and board members are genuinely pleased the library is taking an active role.”

**Final Comments from the Respondents**

In their additional comments, quite a few of the respondents indicated that they felt they were “early in the process” of scholarly communication education efforts. Several have just hired a SC librarian or are just setting up institutional repositories or digital presses. They expect to be making serious strides in their SC education efforts in the near future, though. As one explained, “We have been engaging in SC activities for some years but only in 2007 have we begun formalizing these activities in
a coherent SC program with a committee dedicated to coordinating the activities and the communications to support them.” Another commented that they would like all of their librarians to add SC components to their bibliographic instruction efforts.

None of the respondents indicated directly that they had success on the biggest challenge—alleviating faculty concerns about the effects of open access publishing on promotion and tenure. However, at least one institution has passed a resolution encouraging its faculty to publish OA when feasible and several respondents noted that there is increased support for OA publishing. Both of these outcomes suggest that there are some subtle changes going on in the long-standing scholarly communication paradigms. To be sure, the researchers are concerned about the future of their scholarly societies, but several respondents noted success in getting the editors of scholarly journals to consider going OA with their journals.

Conclusion

Clearly, scholarly communication education is a changing and growing area of activity for ARL member libraries. Ten years ago, SC education mostly focused on fair use and copyright restrictions. Now, open access, authors rights management, institutional repositories, and the economics of scholarly publishing are the topics of these education initiatives. As many survey respondents feel they are still early in the process of developing their programs, the coming years will likely see many further initiatives in this arena. However, unlike other library initiatives, the library alone does not have control over the outcomes of scholarly communication education efforts. The economic engine that is scholarly communication has many players in addition to libraries—faculty, researchers, commercial publishers, and scholarly societies—and is also influenced by government regulations. The efforts of libraries to affect change are only one of many factors at work.
Access to information, the foundation of scholarly communication, has traditionally been provided through academic journals, research collections, and other print publications. Recent advances in digital technology, however, have revolutionized scholarly communication, leading to innovations in the conduct of research as well as in the conveyance of ideas to readers. At the same time, changing copyright laws, licensing rather than owning publications, and rapidly increasing subscription costs for scholarly journals have limited access to and restricted uses of scholarly information.

ARL has been a leader in advocating the development of innovative systems that offer barrier-free access to research and educational resources. Libraries, research institutions, scholarly societies, commercial publishers, and others are experimenting with a variety of models to provide digital, online, unfettered access to scholarly information. A number of business models have emerged utilizing different approaches to handling publication costs, managing collections, and providing user access. Despite variations, however, the goal is the same: to develop more efficient, economical, and accessible models for research and scholarly communication.

Scholars face an array of options in the current environment and their actions impact the process of scholarly communication. Librarians have sought to inform their communities about scholarly communication issues such as author rights management, open access, and journal costs through activities such as teaching, Web sites, symposia, and workshops to help create change.

The purpose of this survey is to find out what kind of initiatives ARL member libraries have used or plan to use to educate faculty, researchers, administrators, students, and library staff at their institutions about scholarly communication issues.
BACKGROUND

1. Has your library initiated any education activities on scholarly communication (SC) issues for the library’s users or staff since July 2004? N=73

   Yes 55 75%
   No, but planning is underway 13 18%
   No, our institution has not undertaken such initiatives 3 4%
   No, this is the responsibility of another unit in the institution 2 3%

LEADERSHIP OF SC EDUCATION INITIATIVES

2. Which individual or group provides leadership for the library’s SC education initiative(s)? Check all that apply. N=65

   A group/committee/task force within the library 35 54%
   A chief SC librarian 21 32%
   Another library staff member 18 28%
   A group/committee/task force outside the library that includes library staff 11 17%
   Other, please specify other leadership arrangement 14 22%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Within Library</th>
<th>Chief SC Librarian</th>
<th>Other Library Staff</th>
<th>Committee Outside Library</th>
<th>Other, please specify other leadership arrangement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Scholarly Repository Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Within Library</td>
<td>Chief SC Librarian</td>
<td>Other Library Staff</td>
<td>Committee Outside Library</td>
<td>Other, please specify other leadership arrangement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Digital library steering committee and research services committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AUL for Collection Management and Scholarly Communication and Director, Digital Collections Services with Scholarly Communication Steering Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Currently hiring an SC librarian.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Within Library</td>
<td>Chief SC Librarian</td>
<td>Other Library Staff</td>
<td>Committee Outside Library</td>
<td>Other, please specify other leadership arrangement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>We have created an assistant dean for scholarly communication in charge of liaisons and collections that will foster scholarly communication discussions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Also a separate group, called the Scholarly Communications Working Group that for years has offered lunchtime programs in the library on scholarly communications and related issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AUL for Collections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Manager, Journals Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Office of Staff Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Distributed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. If your library has a chief SC librarian who has primary responsibility for these initiatives, please indicate the title of that position and the approximate percentage of the chief SC librarian’s time that is devoted to SC education–related work. N=21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position Title</th>
<th>Percent of Time Devoted to SC Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant University Librarian for Collections and Scholarly Communications</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate University Librarian for Collections and Scholarly Communications</td>
<td>Unknown, currently hiring for this position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Dean for Scholarly Communication</td>
<td>Just starting, part of many duties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Librarian for Information Resources</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUL, Sciences &amp; Scholarly Communications</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Dean and Coordinator for Scholarly Publishing</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant University Librarian, Collections</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarly Communication Officer</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Resources Librarian/Scholarly Communication Officer</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Information Resources, Collections and Scholarly Communication</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUL Tech Services and Scholarly Communication</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim Associate University Librarians for Scholarly Communication and Collections</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarly Communication Librarian</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarly Communication Officer</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Dean for Scholarly Communications</td>
<td>30% or less</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Position Title | Percent of Time Devoted to SC Education
--- | ---
Chief Officer, Collections and Scholarly Communication Office | 30% (estimate—varies)
Scholarly Communication Librarian | 50%
Scholarly Communications and Science Librarian | 50%
Endowed Chair for Scholarly Communication | 100%
Scholarly Communications Officer | 100%
Coordinator for Scholarly Communication | 100%

Percent of Time Chief SC Librarian Devotes to SC Education N=18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. If your library has a position other than a chief SC librarian that has primary responsibility for these initiatives, please indicate the title of the other library staff member’s position and the approximate percentage of that person’s time that is devoted to SC education—related work. N=12

Position Title | Percent of Time Devoted to SC Education
--- | ---
Associate University Librarian for Academic Programs | 3%
Assistant Head, Scholarly Resources | 5%
Head, Collection Development & Management | 5%
Head of Collection Development | 10%
### Position Title

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position Title</th>
<th>Percent of Time Devoted to SC Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head, Engineering Library &amp; Acting Head, Science Libraries</td>
<td>10–20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUL, Director of Collections</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Digital Resources Program</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Repository Coordinator</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarian Liaison for Chemistry &amp; Molecular Biosciences and Coordinator of Digital Content Development (2 positions)</td>
<td>25% (combined)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head, Scholarly Communications Services</td>
<td>Less than 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rights Management Coordinator</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copyright &amp; Scholarly Communications Director</td>
<td>Attorney; part-time job with main focus on copyright, with lots of individual faculty counseling. Ca. 50% FTE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Percent of Time Other Library Staff Member Devotes to SC Education N=12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. If there is a scholarly communication group/committee/task force that reports to the library, please indicate the number of members of the group, the title of the chairperson, and to whom the group reports. Please provide any explanatory comments in the box below. N=40
Number of Members N=32

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=37

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Position Title of Chairperson</th>
<th>Group Reports To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No chair</td>
<td>Dean and Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Associate Dean of Collections &amp; Technology Services</td>
<td>Dean of Libraries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Electronic Resources Librarian</td>
<td>Dean of the library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Chief Officer</td>
<td>Chief Officer, Collections and Scholarly Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Director, Institutional Repository, Director, Scholarly Publishing Office (shared)</td>
<td>University Librarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Co-Chairs: AUL for Public Services and AUL for Collections</td>
<td>University Librarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Chair, Winning Independence Team</td>
<td>Director of Public Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>AUL Sciences &amp; Scholarly Communications</td>
<td>AUL, Sciences &amp; Scholarly Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Electronic Resources Librarian/Scholarly Communications Officer</td>
<td>AUL, Director of Collections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Science Librarian</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Library Cabinet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Associate University Librarian for Sciences and Technical Services</td>
<td>Associate University Librarian for Sciences and Technical Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members</td>
<td>Position Title of Chairperson</td>
<td>Group Reports To</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Associate Chief Librarian, Information Technology</td>
<td>Chief Librarian’s Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Web Support Librarian</td>
<td>Assistant University Librarian for Library Information Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Licensing Coordinator</td>
<td>Associate Director for Research Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Director, Memorial Library</td>
<td>Director, Memorial Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Asst Head, Scholarly Resources</td>
<td>University Librarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>ad hoc committee; no official status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Assistant Dean of Libraries</td>
<td>Dean of Libraries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Liaison to the Biological Sciences; Chair of the Scholarly Communications Team</td>
<td>Leadership Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Director, Digital Collections Services</td>
<td>Director, Digital Collections Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>(2) Biology/Math Librarian &amp; Medical School Librarian</td>
<td>(2) Medical School Library Director &amp; Associate Dean, Collections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Bibliographer for the Life and Health Sciences</td>
<td>University Librarian/Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Head of Systems (Library)</td>
<td>Dean of Libraries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1. Electronic Resources Librarian; 2. Collections Coordinator for Physical Sciences &amp; Engineering</td>
<td>1. Associate University Librarian for Academic Programs; 2. Collection Development Officer; 3. Director of Health Sciences Libraries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Head, Engineering Library &amp; Acting Head, Science Libraries</td>
<td>Director, Information Resources, Collections and Scholarly Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Head of Collection Development</td>
<td>Director of Technical Services and Director of Public Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Professor, Veterinary Pathology</td>
<td>Dean of the Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>University Librarian</td>
<td>University Librarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Interim Associate University Librarian for Scholarly Communications and Collections</td>
<td>University Librarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes</td>
<td>This changes from year to year</td>
<td>This changes from year to year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cataloguing Librarian</td>
<td>University Librarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Head of Collections; Head of Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SC librarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Academic Senate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please indicate the makeup of the members. Check all that apply. N=40

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Makeup of Members</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Librarians</td>
<td>Our effort is being led by a pair of librarians; one is the assistant collection development librarian (concentrating on electronic purchases) and the other is a digital initiatives librarian. One is Tech Services the other is Public Services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Librarians</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Librarians</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Librarians</td>
<td>Future plans include faculty and administrative membership, as well as the current four librarians.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Librarians</td>
<td>We are not a formally charged group in the sense of a committee or task force. We work together on this effort as part of our central job responsibilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Librarians</td>
<td>4 members of a planning group (2 librarians plus 2 AUL Co-Chairs). This planning group works closely with 25+ Research Librarians who are responsible for reference, instruction, and collection development for various subject areas across campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Librarians, Information Technologies and Digital Development staff member,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Librarians</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members</td>
<td>Makeup of Members</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Librarians</td>
<td>1. Head of the Biosciences Library, 2. Head of the Anthropology Library, 3. Electronic Resources Librarian/Scholarly Communication Officer, 4. AUL, Director of Collections, 5. Assistant to the Director of Collections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Librarians</td>
<td>Our group is working in collaboration with another institution located 3 blocks from us, with 2–3 staff from that organization working with us to develop joint events targeted at both communities (and with each individual library having additional activities directed exclusively to their home institution).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Librarians</td>
<td>Currently the committee is composed of five librarians but in the coming months we will expand the committee to include faculty and university administration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Librarians, Faculty</td>
<td>Group is primarily focused on creation of dSpace Institutional Repository.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Librarians, Institution Administrators</td>
<td>This group has a somewhat broader mandate than Scholarly Communication as defined by ARL. For instance, group members are expected to advise faculty to publish in Elsevier journals when that is in the best interest of the faculty member, the discipline, and the University.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Librarians</td>
<td>The Office of Scholarly Communication and Publishing (OSCP) reports to the Library Services Council (i.e., directors from across the campus). The Memorial Library Director is the administrative point person for the OSCP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Librarians, Institution Administrators</td>
<td>The committee is primarily tasked with copyright and fair use issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Librarians, Faculty</td>
<td>The committee is active only during the planning stages of the biannual SC symposium. There is a work group to advise the work of the Institutional repository staff. The Assistant Dean and Coordinator of SC does most of the content recruitment work for the IR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Librarians</td>
<td>A group of librarians interested in scholarly communications issues is working together informally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Librarians</td>
<td>Ad hoc committee to conduct needs assessment for IR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Librarians, Library support &amp; professional staff</td>
<td>We established this Copyright Committee this year to update the library’s copyright Web pages, bring programming to campus, to respond to questions about intellectual property, and to develop a copyright policy for the University Libraries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Librarians</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Librarians</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members</td>
<td>Makeup of Members</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Librarians</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Librarians</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Librarians, Systems staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Librarians</td>
<td>2 group co-chairs, reporting to 3 project sponsors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Librarians</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Librarians</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Librarians, Faculty, Non-faculty Researchers, Institution Administrators, Students</td>
<td>The University Library Committee is an advisory committee that advises the dean and her administrative leadership on issues of importance to the library, including scholarly communication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Librarians, Faculty</td>
<td>Each dean appoints a member of his or her college to the Faculty Library Council. The university administration recently endorsed the idea of having the FLC assume, as one of its responsibilities, the role of being a scholarly communication committee. It will take up these duties officially at the beginning of the 2007–08 academic year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Librarians, Faculty, Non-faculty Researchers, Institution Administrators, University Press</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes</td>
<td>Librarians</td>
<td>The role of this committee is to organize an annual symposium. The membership of the committee changes from year to year as does the member of the library administration who acts as the point person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Librarians</td>
<td>Committee is in the process of being created.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Librarians</td>
<td>A small group of three or four librarians are particularly interested and active in SC issues and activities. However, SC is a growing concern of all bibliographers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Librarians</td>
<td>The library plans to form an SC committee, but it will wait until the new SC librarian is hired and in place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Librarians</td>
<td>We have worked on these issues through system-wide collections management groups; that is currently our Collection Management and Planning Group. However, we are currently considering developing an independent group with strong connections to the library’s Education and Outreach program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Librarians</td>
<td>We had a Scholarly Communication Subcommittee of the University Library Committee for many years, but it was deemed to have completed its charge with the maturation of the Scholarly Communication Center and was disbanded prior to 2004.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Librarians</td>
<td>From 2004–2005 a Working Group was created to present an action plan for reviving campus discussions on scholarly communication. This group is no longer active.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. If there is a scholarly communication group/committee/task force that reports outside the library that includes library staff, please indicate which unit sponsors the group (e.g., institution’s administration, faculty governance body, etc.), the number of members of the group, the title of the chairperson, and to whom the group reports. Please provide any explanatory comments in the box below. N=9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Group Reports To</th>
<th>Chairperson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Academic Senate</td>
<td>Academic Senate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>President</td>
<td></td>
<td>Professor of Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Provost</td>
<td>University Librarian</td>
<td>2 chairs: Assistant Professor in Information &amp; Library Science and Copyright &amp; Scholarly Communication Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Chancellor and Academic Senate</td>
<td>Advises Chancellor</td>
<td>Professor, Department of History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Office of the Chancellor</td>
<td>Office of the Chancellor</td>
<td>Associate Vice Chancellor &amp; Head of CDM in University Libraries, Co-Chairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Academic Senate</td>
<td>Academic Senate</td>
<td>Professor, Art History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Faculty Senate Committee on University Libraries</td>
<td>University Faculty Senate Chair</td>
<td>Professor of Marketing &amp; Policy Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>University Libraries Committee</td>
<td>University President and Vice President &amp; Provost</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>872</td>
<td>Academic Senate</td>
<td>Academic Senate</td>
<td>Chair, Senate Committee on Library &amp; Scholarly Communication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please indicate the makeup of the members. Check all that apply. N=9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Librarians</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution administrators</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-faculty researchers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, please specify</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

University Librarian
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Makeup of Members</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Librarians, Faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Librarians, Faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Librarians, Faculty, Institution</td>
<td>Although designated Provost’s committees, both the Scholarly Communications and the Digital Curation/Institutional Repository Committee report to a steering committee which is chaired by the University Librarian.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Faculty, Students, University</td>
<td>9 Voting Faculty, ex-officio, University Librarian and 1 graduate and 1 undergraduate student representative. Recently renamed Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Librarian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Librarians, Faculty</td>
<td>The committee was formed 3 years ago and has its second membership group. The group has held discussions about the economics of scholarly communications, the promotion &amp; tenure culture, and open access. We sponsored a scholarly publishing resolution that was adopted by the Faculty Senate in May 2006 and have spoken with visiting library directors about advancing campus awareness of scholarly communications issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Librarians, Faculty, Students</td>
<td>The Senate Committee on the Library and Scholarly Communication (LIBR) has advisory responsibility for all library and scholarly communication issues. The University Librarian and a representative from the Librarian’s Association serve as members by invitation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Librarians, Faculty, Institution</td>
<td>One of the issues this committee considers is scholarly communication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrators, Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Librarians, Faculty, Institution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrators, Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>872</td>
<td>Librarians, Faculty</td>
<td>(Two librarians)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Number of Members N=9**

![Bar chart showing the distribution of members across different roles and numbers]
7. If you specified in question 2 that another individual(s) or group(s) has responsibility for SC education initiatives, please briefly describe the role of that other individual(s) or group(s). N=13

**Specified “Other” in Question 2 N=5**

Scholarly Repository Advisor Committee: “From 2001 up through June 2006, the institution had a dedicated Assistant Dean for Scholarly Communications—oversight of general collections issues, preservation, and an emphasis on articulating and helping institution advance on scholarly communications issues.”

Digital library steering committee and research services committee: “We are relatively early in our work on SC education. We have held a library wide forum and have plans to address these initiatives in the near future. The groups providing momentum are the digital library steering committee and the research services committee. The former made up of librarians and technologists, the latter primarily of reference librarians.”

We have created an assistant dean for scholarly communication: “The assistant dean has general responsibility. The college liaisons in the division have responsibility for marketing the messages to departments and colleges; the collections librarians also have responsibility for helping develop information for campus faculty and students. We also have a marketing specialist who prepares PR, working with the librarians.”

Also a separate group: “Difficult to describe; many different initiatives. In 2005, librarians and faculty collaborated to plan and offer a symposium on scholarly communication for invited faculty (cross-disciplinary) and librarians. The Digital Curation/IR Committee, chaired by an Information/Library Science professor w/ librarians, faculty, & other membership is planning a symposium co-sponsored by the [regional] Network; our Health Sciences Library has sponsored two sessions open to the university community, and the Scholarly Communications Working Group, consisting primarily of librarians and University Press staff, plans monthly programs throughout the year on issues related to scholarly communications. These programs are co-sponsored by the Institute for Research in the Social Sciences and the University Library. Our Copyright/Scholarly Communication Director does individual copyright counseling for faculty.”

Distributed: “The work is done on a distributed, as needed basis by different librarians in the system.”

**Specified “Committee within the library” in Question 2 N=5**

“Both our Collection Development Committee and our Liaison Advisory Team have taken on these initiatives. This has primarily been in the area of open access awareness on campus.”

“The Research Exchange Task Force is primarily responsible for SC education activities related to our institutional repository, including development of the Web site, creation of handouts, etc., as related to the RE.”
"The Scholarly Communications Team oversees scholarly communication efforts for the university library system. This team is composed of representatives from other teams or groups in our library system including: Chair of the Copyright Team; Chair of the Institutional Repository Team, Leadership Council representative; Regional Libraries representative; Law School representative; and Health Center representative."

"Two individuals, the IR Coordinator and the Science Collections Librarian already have responsibility for some educational initiatives. The group (in formation) will have responsibility for creating a scholarly communications plan for the campus, including an education initiative."

"University Library Committee Purpose: This group is a committee of the university and serves to advise the Dean on library matters as indicated below. Objectives: 1. Advise the Dean of the Library regarding proposed policies; 2. Counsel the Dean of the Library in the general development and administration of the Library; 3. Express the opinions and sentiments of the faculty, staff and students relative to library policies and their administration to the Dean of the Library and his/her staff. Areas of Responsibility: The University Library Committee studies library needs in view of the instructional, research and service programs of the university and advises the Dean of the Library on matters of general library policy, the development of library resources and upon means which may best integrate the library program with other instructional, research, and service activities of the university. The committee serves as a liaison group among the faculty, staff and students and the Library. Methods of Operation: The committee seeks to hold monthly meetings. The agenda is drafted by the Chair and the Dean of the Library and is announced prior to the meeting. Policy proposals are presented and discussed; administrative matters of importance are brought to the attention of the committee by the Dean; the members of the committee communicate questions, complaints, inquiries and suggestions to the Dean and staff concerning library policies and administrative procedures. Membership Criteria: The Chair and members of the committee are appointed by the Provost of the University, with each college having at least one representative. Appointments are for a period of three years and renewable. Nominations are made to the Provost for the following appointees: Faculty Senate representative by the Senate President; Professional and Scientific Council representative by P&S Council Chair; graduate student member by Graduate Student Senate Chair; two student members by the Government of the Student Body."

Specified "Committee outside the library" in Question 2  N=3

"Aspects of scholarly communication are managed by different library directors depending upon the topic. For example, copyright concerns related to educational initiatives or interlibrary services are addressed by the AUL for Educational Initiatives. Management of content flow to the open access repository and digital rights management issues are under the leadership of the Director for Library Technology. The Director of Collections is tasked with taking a leadership role in [local] and national initiatives that are developing new models of scholarly communication with the goals of open access and sustainable pricing. Scholarly Communication Advisory Group provides advice and guidance on a wide range of issues impacting scholarly communication and collections. Recent activities include a proposal to establish an innovation fund that would support faculty, graduate students and librarians seeking to expand the realm of published [university] research open to all, and the creation of a library scholarly communication Web site."

"The Faculty Senate Committee on University Libraries has taken Scholarly Communication as a multi-year initiative to raise awareness of faculty for these issues."

"The University Library Committee advises the university administration on library related matters."
SC EDUCATION ACTIVITIES

Potential Audience: Faculty

8. Please tell us about SC education activities your library has undertaken since 2004 or plans to undertake in 2007 that are intended for faculty. N=58

For which faculty have SC education activities been intended?

If SC education activities have been intended for faculty from across the entire institution, check “All faculty.” If activities have been intended for faculty in only some departments or disciplines, check “Specific discipline(s).” If activities have not been intended for faculty at all, check “Not targeted” and continue to the next page.

All faculty 53 91%
Specific discipline(s) 5 9%
Not targeted 0 —

Which topics were addressed in SC education activities for faculty? N=56

For each topic below indicate whether it was addressed to all faculty, only to faculty in specific disciplines (check all disciplines that apply), or was not addressed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOPICS:</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>All faculty</th>
<th>Science/Engineering</th>
<th>Social Sciences</th>
<th>Humanities</th>
<th>Health Sciences</th>
<th>Law</th>
<th>Other discipline</th>
<th>Not addressed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economics of scholarly publishing</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>49 (91%)</td>
<td>6 (11%)</td>
<td>4 (7%)</td>
<td>2 (4%)</td>
<td>4 (7%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author rights management</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>50 (96%)</td>
<td>2 (4%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2 (4%)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributing to digital repositories</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>45 (87%)</td>
<td>2 (4%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>2 (4%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>5 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits and examples of open access journals</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>39 (76%)</td>
<td>6 (12%)</td>
<td>5 (10%)</td>
<td>2 (4%)</td>
<td>5 (10%)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>5 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implications for teaching of giving away copyright</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>44 (88%)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>6 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author activism (e.g., refusing to publish in expensive journals)</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>32 (65%)</td>
<td>3 (6%)</td>
<td>2 (4%)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2 (4%)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>14 (29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future of scholarly society publishing</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>30 (61%)</td>
<td>4 (8%)</td>
<td>3 (6%)</td>
<td>2 (4%)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>15 (31%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of new models on peer review, promotion and tenure, etc.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>34 (69%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>3 (6%)</td>
<td>2 (4%)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>14 (29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National/international public access developments such as Federal Research Public Access Act of 2006, NIH policy, etc.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>35 (71%)</td>
<td>3 (6%)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>5 (10%)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>9 (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor activism (e.g., working within scholarly societies to improve open access to articles)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>26 (55%)</td>
<td>7 (15%)</td>
<td>3 (6%)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3 (6%)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>14 (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future of the scholarly monograph</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>24 (52%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>4 (9%)</td>
<td>7 (15%)</td>
<td>2 (4%)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>15 (33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciplinary differences in communication practices</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>25 (54%)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>21 (46%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other topic</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4 (44%)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1 (11%)</td>
<td>4 (44%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please specify other discipline(s). N=6

“All faculty, but especially distance education faculty."

“School of Management/Business.”

“The above reflects plans, not actions as yet taken.”

“University Librarian made presentations to: Faculty Councils, 2006 Congress of the Canadian Federation for the Humanities and Social Sciences, 2006 Medical Education Conference of the Association of Faculties of Medicine of Canada (AFMC).”

“We are just getting started and have targeted our Committee on Libraries from the Faculty Council, our special VISION for a Library in 2020 task force, which is composed of representatives from the campus, and sent mailings to all faculty.”

“We have a Web site devoted to all of these issues. We hope to address these issues with all faculty, but have thus far concentrated heavily in the STM communities. Sporadic efforts have been made in areas such as Law, Social Sciences and the Humanities. The issue of rights retention has had much broader promotion and our Faculty Senate has endorsed the use of the SPARC/CIC addendum.”

Please describe other topic(s). N=11

“Workshops for Faculty on various issues related to Scholarly Communication • Issues related to copyright • Issues related to open access • Issues related to changing research environments • Promotion of open source software. • Promotion of collaborative (Web 2.0) software. • Issues related to author rights • Development of a Web site to unify and disseminate information regarding scholarly communication issues • Ongoing development of digital projects to support scholarly communication • Teach and encourage the community to contribute to the institutional repository • Teach and encourage the community to publish their Journals online via Open Journal Systems • Increased support for the dissemination of research by a number of means including: • Development and population of the institutional repository • Contributing to Synergies - a Canadian consortium of University Libraries dedicated to amassing Canadian scholarly content and distributing it globally via an online portal • Support for the development of online, collaborative research communities.”

“Advantages of contribution to library’s IR.”

“Benefits of authorial control in using alternative technologies/venues. Can be a better showplace for research.”

“Benefits of institutional repositories.”

“Copyright and fair use for teaching. Consortial responses to SC.”

“Create Change campaign, Open Access.”

“Demonstration of creating a digital press to advance emerging forms of scholarly publishing in an open access environment.”

“Fair Use in the classroom.”
“Often cover journal pricing, copyright/author rights management, open access.”

“We have engaged the faculty in many ways: Faculty Council resolutions, meetings with promotion and tenure committees, all faculty auditorium discussions, Web pages, small group education sessions with faculty, discussions with individual editors, etc., all of which might sound impressive but all of which have essentially accomplished little except to add to the general level of noise on campus. As a library we are attempting to back away from scholarly communication missionary activities as we believe this harms our credibility, but we still have librarians who are true believers, so we are providing a mixed message.”

“Where to find out about whether journals allow preprint and post print publication on personal Web sites.”

What methods of delivering this content have been most effective for faculty? Rate the following on a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 is least effective and 5 is most effective. Check “Not used” if the library has not used a particular method. N=53

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>1 (%)</th>
<th>2 (%)</th>
<th>3 (%)</th>
<th>4 (%)</th>
<th>5 (%)</th>
<th>Not used ( %)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One-on-one conversations</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2 (4%)</td>
<td>3 (6%)</td>
<td>10 (19%)</td>
<td>8 (15%)</td>
<td>28 (54%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal group presentations</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>6 (12%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>20 (39%)</td>
<td>11 (22%)</td>
<td>10 (20%)</td>
<td>3 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletter articles</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4 (8%)</td>
<td>10 (20%)</td>
<td>13 (25%)</td>
<td>5 (10%)</td>
<td>2 (4%)</td>
<td>17 (33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal group discussions</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2 (4%)</td>
<td>2 (4%)</td>
<td>13 (26%)</td>
<td>13 (26%)</td>
<td>13 (26%)</td>
<td>7 (14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web pages</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>7 (14%)</td>
<td>10 (20%)</td>
<td>17 (34%)</td>
<td>8 (16%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>7 (14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brochures and other documents</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2 (2%)</td>
<td>15 (30%)</td>
<td>13 (26%)</td>
<td>9 (18%)</td>
<td>2 (2%)</td>
<td>9 (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail messages</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>4 (8%)</td>
<td>5 (10%)</td>
<td>18 (37%)</td>
<td>8 (16%)</td>
<td>3 (6%)</td>
<td>11 (22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other method</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3 (25%)</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
<td>7 (58%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please describe other delivery method. N=9

“All faculty are invited to SC programs. We also sponsor one-on-one consultations with the library’s legal adviser.”

“All of the education initiatives related to scholarly communication were part of activities promoting our institutional repository. We have not yet planned any independent initiative on scholarly communication.”

“Articles in University newspaper.”
“Informal discussions with refreshments provided.”

“Inviting faculty to serve on the scholarly communications committee.”

“Podcasts.”

“Regular communication with faculty on scholarly communication issues through collection managers.”

“Scholarly Communication Blog, E-Publishing Symposium.”

“See above re description of lunch series that was highly attended by faculty. In fact, we are repeating a couple of the sessions to accommodate those who were not able to attend due to demand. Our most effective communications have come where faculty talk with knowledgeable experts (library and campus counsel) and with other faculty. The lunch series is one example of that.”

**Additional Comments N=10**

“Have targeted SC education presentations related to specific journal cancellations and/or rejection of consortial or institutional 'big deals'; Have made presentations to interested and/or relevant faculty groups on copyright awareness and open access/institutional repository issues.”

“Most of the efforts to date have been opportunistic: as our Dean has visited campuses and schools she has taken opportunities speak to faculty about these issues. During the past academic year our faculty senate was asked to review the CIC Provosts’ Statement on Author Rights, resulting in some visibility of these issues within the senate. Our collaboration with the university press on the Office of Digital Scholarly Publishing has provided us with opportunities for targeted outreach in the humanities, social sciences, and engineering education. During the coming year we anticipate holding a speaker/panel series on changes in scholarly communications systems and practices which we hope will garner more attention.”

“The group presentations, scheduled on a regular basis, always result in appointments with individuals for further information.”

“We are really just starting our formal push. Last year we visited a number of faculty meetings and held focus group discussions. This year we’ll be doing a much more formal campaign including printed material.”

“We are still in the early stages of planning our approaches to faculty and have not yet decided on a particular method.”

“We have concrete plans to develop Web pages and brochures in the coming months.”

“We have not formally evaluated the effectiveness of the methods.” (3 responses)

“We haven’t assessed the effectiveness of our methods of delivery so the rating above is impressionistic. We feel though that presentations to specific faculty councils or departmental committees are more effective than general articles in the university newsletter for example.”
Potential Audience: Non-faculty Researchers

9. Please tell us about SC education activities your library has undertaken since 2004 or plans to undertake in 2007 that are intended for non-faculty researchers. N=51

For which non-faculty researchers have SC education activities been intended?

If SC education activities have been intended for non-faculty researchers from across the entire institution, check “All non-faculty researchers.” If activities have been intended for non-faculty researchers in only some departments or disciplines, check “Specific discipline(s).” If activities have not been intended for non-faculty researchers at all, check “Not targeted” and continue to the next page.

- All non-faculty researchers: 11 (22%)
- Specific discipline(s): 3 (6%)
- Not targeted: 37 (72%)

Which topics were addressed in SC education activities for non-faculty researchers? N=13

For each topic below indicate whether it was addressed to all non-faculty researchers, only to non-faculty researchers in specific disciplines (check all disciplines that apply), or was not addressed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOPICS:</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>All non-faculty researchers</th>
<th>Science/Engineering</th>
<th>Social Sciences</th>
<th>Humanities</th>
<th>Health Sciences</th>
<th>Law</th>
<th>Other discipline</th>
<th>Not addressed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benefits and examples of open access journals</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8 (62%)</td>
<td>2 (15%)</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
<td>2 (15%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 (23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author rights management</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11 (85%)</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributing to digital repositories</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10 (77%)</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics of scholarly publishing</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9 (75%)</td>
<td>2 (17%)</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author activism (e.g., refusing to publish in expensive journals)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8 (67%)</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future of scholarly society publishing</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8 (67%)</td>
<td>2 (17%)</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National/international public access developments such as Federal Research Public Access Act of 2006, NIH policy, etc.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7 (58%)</td>
<td>2 (17%)</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implications for teaching of giving away copyright</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9 (82%)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1 (9%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future of the scholarly monograph</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4 (36%)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1 (9%)</td>
<td>3 (27%)</td>
<td>1 (9%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 (36%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of new models on peer review, promotion and tenure, etc.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7 (64%)</td>
<td>2 (18%)</td>
<td>1 (9%)</td>
<td>1 (9%)</td>
<td>2 (18%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor activism (e.g., working within scholarly societies to improve open access to articles)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5 (50%)</td>
<td>2 (20%)</td>
<td>1 (10%)</td>
<td>1 (10%)</td>
<td>2 (20%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciplinary differences in communication practices</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5 (50%)</td>
<td>1 (10%)</td>
<td>1 (10%)</td>
<td>1 (10%)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 (40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other topic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 (50%)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (50%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please describe other topic(s). N=1

"Benefit of institutional repositories."
What methods of delivering this content have been most effective for non-faculty researchers? Rate the following on a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 is least effective and 5 is most effective. Check “Not used” if the library has not used a particular method. N=13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>1 (8%)</th>
<th>2 (15%)</th>
<th>3 (38%)</th>
<th>4 (31%)</th>
<th>5 (38%)</th>
<th>Not used (8%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formal group presentations</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-on-one conversations</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2 (15%)</td>
<td>3 (23%)</td>
<td>8 (62%)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web pages</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2 (15%)</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
<td>6 (46%)</td>
<td>3 (23%)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brochures and other documents</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
<td>7 (54%)</td>
<td>2 (15%)</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail messages</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2 (15%)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>4 (31%)</td>
<td>3 (23%)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>4 (31%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal group discussions</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3 (25%)</td>
<td>5 (42%)</td>
<td>4 (33%)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletter articles</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
<td>4 (33%)</td>
<td>3 (25%)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other method</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1 (33%)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2 (67%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please describe other delivery method. N=2

“Podcasts.”

“Scholarly Communication Blog, E-Publishing Symposium.”

**Additional Comments N=3**

“Although we have no particular plans to approach non-faculty researchers at the moment, we may well do so in the future.”

“We have included them in programs where there is interest and we have room though our priority target has been ladder faculty.”

“We hope to discuss the entire range of issues in a systematic manner in the coming year—this would be for all researchers and scholars. We have never made a distinction between faculty and other types of researchers. Our focus does center on rights retention though we do discuss all of the above as circumstances permit.”
Potential Audience: Institution Administrators

10. Please tell us about SC education activities your library has undertaken since 2004 or plans to undertake in 2007 that are intended for institution administrators such as the provost, the vice chancellor for research, the dean of the graduate school, etc. N=58

For which institution administrators have SC education activities been intended?

If SC education activities have been intended for institution administrators from across the entire institution, check “All institution administrators.” If activities have been intended for only some institution administrators, check “Specific institution administrators.” If activities have not been intended for institution administrators at all, check “Not targeted” and continue to the next page.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All institution administrators</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific institution administrators</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not targeted</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you checked “Specific institution administrators,” please describe who these are. N=30

“Academic Administrators.”

“Associate Provost, Dean of Arts and Sciences.”

“Chancellor, Vice Provost.”

“Deans.”

“Deans, Vice Provosts.”

“Executive Vice Chancellor.”

“Executive Vice Chancellor; Provost, Chancellor, Academic Deans, Vice Chancellor for Research.”

“Faculty Senate Library Committee.”

“Faculty, Senate Committees on Library, Chancellor, Vice-Chancellor.”

“Graduate Program Services.”

“Presentation to university president and vice-rectors.”

“President, VPAA, deans, some department heads.”

“Provost, Executive Associate Provost, University Counsel.”

“Provost and Chancellor.”

“Provost level, Chancellor level, various Deans and Directors.”
“Provost, members of the university’s Budget Committee and Planning Committee.”

“Provost, President, Sr. VP for Research, CIO, Chair Faculty Senate Committee on Libraries.”

“Provost, vice chancellor for research, deans council.”

“Provost, Vice President for Research, the campus Information Technology cabinet, the Deans’ Council, the Library Advisory Committee, the Dean’s Advancement Board.”

“Provost, Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs, Undergraduate (associate) Deans.”

“Provost, Vice Provost for Research, Assistant Dean of the College, Vice President of Information Technology, Members of the Council on Libraries, General Counsel of the College.”

“The University Librarian works with the Provost, Deans, and the Research Office.”

“Those on the academic side, to whom library reports, i.e., Provost, Deputy Provost. But these haven’t been so much ‘intended activities’ focused solely on scholarly communications, but larger library discussions that have included SC issues at times. Also in this category is the Advisory Council on Library Policy, which is mostly senior faculty reporting to president & provost.”

“Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, Vice Chancellor for Research, Chair of Graduate division.”

“Vice Chancellor for Budget & Finance, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, Provost and Chancellor’s staff at budget hearings, University system-level VP for Academic Affairs.”

“Vice Provost Research, Vice Provost Faculty Affairs, University Counsel, Provost”

“Vice Provosts, Provost.”

“We created a session for the new Provost as part of her orientation to the library’s activities.”

“We have done this is more focused and smaller discussions with University Librarian or AUL for Collection Management and Scholarly Communication. We have collaborated and worked together to co-sponsor some of the outreach efforts including lunch series and larger symposium for faculty held in November 2006.”

“We have targeted College Deans and the Provost. We distributed a brochure on copyright and gave a presentation on institutional repositories at a dean’s breakfast.”

**Which topics were addressed in SC education activities for institution administrators? N=44**

For each topic below indicate whether it was addressed to all institution administrators, specific institution administrators, or was not addressed.
### TOPICS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>All institution administrators</th>
<th>Specific institution administrators</th>
<th>Not addressed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economics of scholarly publishing</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>14 (33%)</td>
<td>27 (63%)</td>
<td>2 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author rights management</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>11 (27%)</td>
<td>24 (56%)</td>
<td>6 (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributing to digital repositories</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9 (23%)</td>
<td>25 (63%)</td>
<td>6 (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National/international public access developments</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8 (20%)</td>
<td>21 (53%)</td>
<td>11 (28%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits and examples of open access journals</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>8 (23%)</td>
<td>20 (51%)</td>
<td>11 (28%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future of scholarly society publishing</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8 (21%)</td>
<td>20 (53%)</td>
<td>10 (26%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author activism (e.g., refusing to publish in expensive journals)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6 (16%)</td>
<td>14 (38%)</td>
<td>17 (46%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implications for teaching of giving away copyright</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>11 (30%)</td>
<td>20 (54%)</td>
<td>6 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future of the scholarly monograph</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7 (19%)</td>
<td>16 (44%)</td>
<td>13 (36%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor activism (e.g., working within scholarly societies to improve open access to articles)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4 (11%)</td>
<td>11 (31%)</td>
<td>20 (57%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciplinary differences in communication practices</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4 (11%)</td>
<td>20 (57%)</td>
<td>11 (31%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of new models on peer review, promotion and tenure, etc.</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6 (17%)</td>
<td>20 (57%)</td>
<td>9 (26%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other topic</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2 (22%)</td>
<td>3 (33%)</td>
<td>3 (33%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please describe other topic(s). N=7

“A topic that has occasioned some of these discussions has been in the context of approaches re. Mass Digitization (MD) projects and the library’s potential involvement in these.”

“Benefits of institutional repositories.”
“Impact and opportunities of information technology on scholarly research and dissemination.”

“Importance of campus-wide copyright policy and guidelines.”

“Importance of making it easy for faculty to determine who holds copyright to their research. Importance of university for retaining its intellectual property.”

“Prestige and grant-application value of IR.”

“University Librarian made presentations at Deans’ meetings on: Create Change Campaign, Open Access.”

What methods of delivering this content have been most effective for institution administrators? Rate the following on a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 is least effective and 5 is most effective. Check “Not used” if the library has not used a particular method. N=40

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Not used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One-on-one conversations</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>5 (13%)</td>
<td>8 (20%)</td>
<td>24 (60%)</td>
<td>2 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal group presentations</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3 (8%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>9 (23%)</td>
<td>10 (26%)</td>
<td>7 (18%)</td>
<td>9 (23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal group discussions</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>7 (18%)</td>
<td>11 (29%)</td>
<td>10 (26%)</td>
<td>8 (21%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brochures and other documents</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
<td>8 (22%)</td>
<td>7 (19%)</td>
<td>4 (11%)</td>
<td>3 (8%)</td>
<td>12 (33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletter articles</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5 (14%)</td>
<td>4 (11%)</td>
<td>4 (11%)</td>
<td>6 (17%)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>17 (47%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail messages</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
<td>9 (25%)</td>
<td>8 (22%)</td>
<td>5 (14%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>11 (31%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web pages</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6 (18%)</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
<td>7 (21%)</td>
<td>4 (12%)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>15 (44%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other method</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
<td>11 (92%)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please describe other delivery method. N=2

“Reviewing click through statements for ETD, IR, course reserves and other IP related policies. Creation of university-wide task forces on IP. Informal discussions with food.”

“Scholarly Communication Blog, E-Publishing Symposium.”
Additional Comments N=4

“I can’t assess the effectiveness of the methods used but we have used the following: formal group presentation and one-on-one conversations.”

“It’s most effective when it’s addressed in the context of something the university is trying to accomplish.”

“Our Provost is well informed about the issues and has taken opportunities to educate the faculty and has worked with the library to educate faculty by speaking at a library forum on the scholarly communication.”

“Presidents, provosts, etc., on our campus continually change and they vary in their understanding of these issues but what most of them do have in common is that they are not dumb. They understand that there are a few scholarly communication activists, a largely quiescent middle group of faculty who just want to get their research done and for whom the existing system works fine, librarians who are worried about money, and that the Web/technology is introducing some unsettledness into the process. What we are trying to do is to offer sound and practical advice and not to come off as a group who believe that they have ‘special knowledge’ about an admittedly complex situation or an idealistic ‘agenda’ like open access, etc., but to provide all options as existing and changing realities.”

Potential Audience: Graduate Students

11. Please tell us about SC education activities your library has undertaken since 2004 or plans to undertake in 2007 that are intended for graduate students. N=55

For which graduate students have SC education activities been intended?

If SC education activities have been intended for graduate students from across the entire institution, check “All graduate students.” If activities have been intended for graduate students in only some departments or disciplines, check “Specific discipline(s).” If activities have not been intended for graduate students at all, check “Not targeted” and continue to the next page.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All graduate students</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific discipline(s)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not targeted</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Which topics were addressed in SC education activities for graduate students? N=23

For each topic below indicate whether it was addressed to all graduate students, only to graduate students in specific disciplines (check all disciplines that apply), or was not addressed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOPICS:</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>All graduate students</th>
<th>Science/Engineering</th>
<th>Social Sciences</th>
<th>Humanities</th>
<th>Health Sciences</th>
<th>Law</th>
<th>Other discipline</th>
<th>Not addressed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economics of scholarly publishing</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19 (83%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>2 (9%)</td>
<td>2 (9%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits and examples of open access journals</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17 (74%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>2 (9%)</td>
<td>3 (13%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author rights management</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21 (91%)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>2 (9%)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributing to digital repositories</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15 (65%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>2 (9%)</td>
<td>6 (26%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National/international public access developments such as</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12 (52%)</td>
<td>2 (9%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>3 (13%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>5 (22%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Research Public Access Act of 2006, NIH policy, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author activism (e.g., refusing to publish in expensive journals)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14 (64%)</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td>2 (9%)</td>
<td>7 (32%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implications for teaching of giving away copyright</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19 (86%)</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td>2 (9%)</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future of scholarly society publishing</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13 (62%)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td>6 (29%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of new models on peer review, promotion and tenure, etc.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12 (57%)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td>2 (10%)</td>
<td>7 (33%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future of the scholarly monograph</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8 (40%)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td>3 (15%)</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td>7 (35%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciplinary differences in communication practices</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10 (50%)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td>2 (10%)</td>
<td>7 (35%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor activism (e.g., working within scholarly societies to</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8 (42%)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td>9 (47%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improve open access to articles)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other topic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2 (100%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please specify other discipline(s). N=2

Library and Information Science graduate students (2 responses)
Please describe other topic(s). N=2

“Benefits of institutional repositories.”

“We do provide workshops on getting published aimed at grad students. This is an opportunity to raise awareness of key SC issues. However, this has not been a targeted group per se.”

What methods of delivering this content have been most effective for graduate students? Rate the following on a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 is least effective and 5 is most effective. Check “Not used” if the library has not used a particular method. N=21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Not used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informal group discussions</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(10%)</td>
<td>(33%)</td>
<td>(29%)</td>
<td>(29%)</td>
<td>(29%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal group presentations</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(5%)</td>
<td>(30%)</td>
<td>(25%)</td>
<td>(35%)</td>
<td>(5%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-on-one conversations</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(5%)</td>
<td>(10%)</td>
<td>(25%)</td>
<td>(45%)</td>
<td>(15%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web pages</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(5%)</td>
<td>(10%)</td>
<td>(40%)</td>
<td>(20%)</td>
<td>(5%)</td>
<td>(20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brochures and other documents</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(10%)</td>
<td>(15%)</td>
<td>(30%)</td>
<td>(20%)</td>
<td>(5%)</td>
<td>(20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletter articles</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(16%)</td>
<td>(5%)</td>
<td>(11%)</td>
<td>(26%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(42%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail messages</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(6%)</td>
<td>(17%)</td>
<td>(17%)</td>
<td>(6%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(56%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other method</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(33%)</td>
<td>(67%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please describe other delivery method. N=4

“Explanatory packet created by Grad School as part of submission of theses to our ETD system.”

“Podcasts.”

“Scholarly Communication Blog, E-Publishing Symposium.”

“The library has made outreach efforts and presentations at the annual TA training sessions where we meet the new and continuing TAs.”
Additional Comments N=8

“Efforts with graduate students have not been seriously undertaken in the past three years, though some were undertaken with limited success prior to 2003. We will be evaluating how we target graduate students in the coming year, but we have no specific plans at this time.”

“Graduate students have participated in some of the above but have not been specifically targeted.”

“In general, graduate students have been reached through sessions that are open to all, or in the context of other more general group or one-on-one discussions about the library. We have over 10,000 graduate students and some are informed and knowledgeable and others are not.”

“Responsible Conduct of Research program has been extremely important vehicle for access to and attention from graduate students.”

“The sessions are now being planned for Fall of 07, so I can not yet comment on their effectiveness.”

“This doesn’t fit into any category above (it’s not ‘all graduate students’ nor a specific discipline): we have integrated some information on economics of scholarly publishing, institutional repositories, author rights issues in a non-compulsory 1 credit seminar on information literacy offered to graduate students.”

“We hope to include information for graduate students and get them involved in electronic theses and dissertations, and introduce them to rights management.”

“We will start a Graduate Scholarly Publishing advisement service in the next year.”

Potential Audience: Undergraduate Students

12. Please tell us about SC education activities your library has undertaken since 2004 or plans to undertake in 2007 that are intended for undergraduate students. N=55

For which undergraduate students have SC education activities been intended?

If SC education activities have been intended for undergraduate students from across the entire institution, check “All undergraduate students.” If activities have been intended for undergraduate students in only some departments or disciplines, check “Specific discipline(s).” If activities have not been intended for undergraduate students at all, check “Not targeted” and continue to the next page.

| All undergraduate students | 7 | 13% |
| Specific discipline(s)     | 0 | —   |
| Not targeted               | 48 | 87% |
Which topics were addressed in SC education activities for undergraduate students? N=6

For each topic below indicate whether it was addressed to all undergraduate students, only to undergraduate students in specific disciplines (check all disciplines that apply), or was not addressed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOPICS:</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>All undergraduate students</th>
<th>Not addressed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economics of scholarly publishing</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6 (100%)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author rights management</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5 (83%)</td>
<td>1 (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits and examples of open access journals</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4 (80%)</td>
<td>1 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author activism (e.g., refusing to publish in expensive journals)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2 (40%)</td>
<td>3 (60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implications for teaching of giving away copyright</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3 (60%)</td>
<td>2 (40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributing to digital repositories</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2 (40%)</td>
<td>3 (60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor activism (e.g., working within scholarly societies to improve open access to articles)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3 (60%)</td>
<td>2 (40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future of the scholarly monograph</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2 (40%)</td>
<td>3 (60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future of scholarly society publishing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4 (80%)</td>
<td>1 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciplinary differences in communication practices</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2 (40%)</td>
<td>3 (60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of new models on peer review, promotion and tenure, etc.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2 (40%)</td>
<td>3 (60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National/international public access developments such as Federal Research Public Access Act of 2006, NIH policy, etc.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2 (40%)</td>
<td>3 (60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other topic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 (50%)</td>
<td>1 (50%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please describe other topic(s). N=1

“Implications of using other people’s copyrighted materials.”

What methods of delivering this content have been most effective for undergraduate students? Rate the following on a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 is least effective and 5 is most effective. Check “Not used” if the library has not used a particular method. N=6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Not used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informal group discussions</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2  (33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web pages</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1  (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brochures and other documents</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4  (67%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal group presentations</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2  (40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-on-one conversations</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1  (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletter articles</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4  (80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail messages</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3  (60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other method</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2  (67%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please describe other delivery method. N=1

“Podcasts.”

Additional Comments N=3

“The Director of Digital Collections Services has made presentations in undergraduate classes on this set of topics.”

“This past year information about the economics of scholarly communication was included in selected bibliographic instruction sessions.”

“Undergraduates are not specifically target, but information is provided to them if they seek out individual consultation or if Scholarly Communications Officer is invited to address an undergraduate class.”
Potential Audience: Librarians and Other Library Staff

13. Please tell us about SC education activities your library has undertaken since 2004 or plans to undertake in 2007 that are intended for librarians and other library staff.

For which librarians and other library staff have SC education activities been intended? N=59

If SC education activities have been intended for librarians and other library staff from across the entire institution, check “All librarians and other library staff.” If activities have been intended for only some librarians and other library staff, check “Specific librarians or other library staff.” If activities have not been intended for librarians and other library staff at all, check “Not targeted” and continue to the next page.

- All librarians and other library staff 49 83%
- Specific librarians or other library staff 7 12%
- Not targeted 3 5%

If you checked “Specific librarians or other library staff,” please describe who these are. N=8

- “Have given presentations about OA to all library faculty at library faculty meetings or seminars; but have also gone around the various subject-related subdivisions of librarians, and told them about THEIR opportunities, when they publish their research. This was done to increase their comfort/knowledge of the publishing opportunities so they might speak to their clients more comfortably about it. They have also heard presentations about putting their own research into the IR.”

- “Liaisons librarians, since they do user education and outreach activities routinely; librarians with collection development responsibilities. Staff who deal with eReserves and who help students with media projects.”

- “Librarians in the Academic Programs division, most of whom are liaisons to assigned departments.”

- “Staff meetings, library workshops for all librarians and library staff on scholarly communications issues, with optional attendance. For ’05 symposium, only invited librarians. So it varies.”

- “Subject Coordinators, Subject Librarians, Staff in Collection Development and Technical Services, Library Management Group.”

- “Subject liaison/selector librarians.”

- “Subject librarians and Library Administrative Cabinet members (Cabinet is made up of Associate Dean for Reference & Instruction, Associate Dean for Research & Access, Associate Dean for Collections & Technical Services, Information Technology Officer, Head of Business Services, Head of Human Resources, and the Dean of the Library).”

- “We are attempting to develop a slowly expanding program that targets bibliographers and public services librarians who have dealings with faculty and graduate students—and who are equipped to relay the
publishing environment in a nuanced manner, and to explain how IRs, OA, societies, and commercial publishers fit, and the different points of view of commercial publishers, scholarly societies, and OA activists—as well as the critical part copyright plays in this environment. This effort is carefully tied to the developments in our IR and OA publishing capabilities.”

Which topics were addressed in SC education activities for librarians and other library staff?

For each topic below indicate whether it was addressed to all librarians and other library staff, specific librarians or other library staff, or was not addressed. N=54

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOPICS:</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>All librarians and other library staff</th>
<th>Specific librarians or other library staff</th>
<th>Not addressed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economics of scholarly publishing</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>46 (85%)</td>
<td>6 (11%)</td>
<td>2 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits and examples of open access journals</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>44 (83%)</td>
<td>6 (11%)</td>
<td>3 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author rights management</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>44 (85%)</td>
<td>7 (13%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributing to digital repositories</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>45 (87%)</td>
<td>7 (13%)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author activism (e.g., refusing to publish in expensive journals)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>36 (72%)</td>
<td>7 (14%)</td>
<td>7 (14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future of scholarly society publishing</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>37 (74%)</td>
<td>6 (12%)</td>
<td>7 (14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National/international public access developments such as Federal Research Public Access Act of 2006, NIH policy, etc.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>30 (61%)</td>
<td>8 (16%)</td>
<td>11 (22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implications for teaching of giving away copyright</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>39 (81%)</td>
<td>3 (6%)</td>
<td>6 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of new models on peer review, promotion and tenure, etc.</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>33 (69%)</td>
<td>5 (10%)</td>
<td>10 (21%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Future of the scholarly monograph

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Not used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>32 (68%)</td>
<td>4 (9%)</td>
<td>11 (23%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Disciplinary differences in communication practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Not used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>31 (67%)</td>
<td>4 (9%)</td>
<td>11 (24%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Editor activism (e.g., working within scholarly societies to improve open access to articles)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Not used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>25 (56%)</td>
<td>5 (11%)</td>
<td>15 (33%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Other topic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Not used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3 (30%)</td>
<td>1 (10%)</td>
<td>6 (60%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Please describe other topic(s). N=3

- “Benefits of institutional repositories.”
- “Changes and developments in copyright law.”
- “Copyright.”

## What methods of delivering this content have been most effective for librarians and other library staff? Rate the following on a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 is least effective and 5 is most effective. Check “Not used” if the library has not used a particular method. N=50

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Not used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informal group discussions</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4 (8%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>15 (30%)</td>
<td>13 (26%)</td>
<td>12 (24%)</td>
<td>5 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal group presentations</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2 (4%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>12 (24%)</td>
<td>17 (35%)</td>
<td>14 (29%)</td>
<td>3 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-on-one conversations</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2 (4%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>13 (27%)</td>
<td>13 (27%)</td>
<td>16 (33%)</td>
<td>3 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web pages</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2 (4%)</td>
<td>4 (8%)</td>
<td>22 (46%)</td>
<td>7 (15%)</td>
<td>4 (8%)</td>
<td>9 (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brochures and other documents</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3 (6%)</td>
<td>4 (9%)</td>
<td>14 (30%)</td>
<td>11 (23%)</td>
<td>5 (11%)</td>
<td>10 (21%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletter articles</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>13 (28%)</td>
<td>11 (23%)</td>
<td>5 (11%)</td>
<td>3 (6%)</td>
<td>14 (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail messages</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>7 (15%)</td>
<td>20 (43%)</td>
<td>5 (11%)</td>
<td>5 (11%)</td>
<td>9 (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other method</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
<td>10 (77%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please describe other delivery method. N=5

“A variety of forums exist for such conversations.”

“Group discussion of assigned readings, group activity to analyze specific author agreement. Required each librarian to set a goal (as part of annual planning/review process) for SC outreach.”

“Scholarly Communication Blog, E-Publishing Symposium.”

“We are in the process of educating librarians and library staff about open access and scholarly communication. Podcasts.”

“We invite the librarians hired for digital activities to meetings of liaisons; we have had group presentations on the new repository.”

Additional Comments N=4

“We conduct briefings and updates for the librarians and interested staff at least twice every academic year on these topics. In addition, the Scholarly Communication Steering Committee holds additional briefings and updates as appropriate when new or critical initiatives related to scholarly communication are relevant and timely.”

“Initiating our collaboration with the [university] press has given many opportunities to foreground these issues with library faculty and staff. In addition, the consideration by our faculty senate of the CIC Provosts Statement on Author Rights gave us another opportunity to raise visibility of those issues during spring of this year. We generally think it is the responsibility of all librarians, but especially subject specialists, to stay current on the economics of scholarly publishing.”

“These topics have also been discussed at Library Faculty meetings.”

“We are in process of beefing up Web pages and wikis that will have FAQs to help staff answer questions from campus.”

Other Potential Audience

14. Please tell us about SC education activities your library has undertaken since 2004 or plans to undertake in 2007 that are intended for the audience specified below. N=9

For which other audience have SC education activities been intended? Please specify audience. N=9

“1. Provincial bioinformatics interest group/researchers 2. Province-wide initiatives for librarians and library staff researchers, faculty, graduate students.”

“Because the Scholarly Communication Librarian doesn’t have any specific liaison assignments, she has been
targeting cross-university groups such as the Association for Faculty Women and the Faculty Association for Scholarship and Research. The intention is to speak to individuals at after-hours meetings/social gatherings and to get time for presentations at these meetings. Other non-departmental programs such as the Sustainability Program have been contacted to consider deposit in our IR."

"Consortia in which the library holds membership."

"During fall 2006, the university hosted delegates from the CIC faculty senates; our dean moderated a panel on scholarly communications featuring our provost, a faculty member, and the Senior VP for Research. This partly led to the CIC Provosts statement."

"Faculty Senate Library Committee, Library Representatives, [university] Scholarly Communications Committee, Copyright Committee, Dean’s Student Advisory Group."

"Three state regents institutions."

"[We are] part of a regional effort to plan a scholarly communication institutional planning event, with [two partners], for Fall 2007. This one-day event targets librarians, faculty and administrators from New England institutions. It is tentatively called 'A Day of Scholarly Communications.' Planned sessions at the Special Libraries Association conferences in 2004 and 2006. The 2004 session was a panel on Open Access with three well-known speakers (David Goodman, LIU; Chuck Hamaker, UNC Charlotte; David Stern, Yale.). Attendance was the highest of any session in the BioMed division that year. At the 2006 SLA annual conference two panelists spoke on 'Institutional Repositories: In-house Versus Outsourced.' This program presented institutions aspiring to establish their own repositories with crucial behind-the-scenes information about the pros and cons of using a commercial repository product, like Digital Commons versus a home grown product like DSpace."

"We are working with GWLA to survey editors of open access journals on our campus."

"While we have not yet developed specific plans, the issues checked below are of interest."

Indicate which topics below were addressed to members of this audience. Check all that apply. N=9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economics of scholarly publishing</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits and examples of open access journals</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implications for teaching of giving away copyright</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future of scholarly society publishing</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author activism (e.g., refusing to publish in expensive journals)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author rights management</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of new models on peer review, promotion and tenure, etc.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Contributing to digital repositories 6 67%
National/international public access developments such as
Federal Research Public Access Act of 2006, NIH policy, etc. 5 56%
Editor activism (e.g., working within scholarly societies to
Improve open access to articles) 4 44%
Future of the scholarly monograph 4 44%
Disciplinary differences in communication practices 4 44%
Other topic (please specify) 0 —

What methods of delivering this content have been most effective for this other audience? Rate the following on a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 is least effective and 5 is most effective. Check “Not used” if the library has not used a particular method. N=8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Not used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formal group presentations</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-on-one conversations</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (14%)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 (29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal group discussions</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (17%)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web pages</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 (50%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 (33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brochures and other documents</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (33%)</td>
<td>1 (17%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletter articles</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (17%)</td>
<td>1 (17%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 (67%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail messages</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (17%)</td>
<td>2 (33%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other method</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please describe other delivery method. N=1
“Survey not sent, yet, but will be sent by mail.”
COLLABORATIVE ACTIVITIES

15. Please indicate whether any of the activities below have been undertaken or are being planned by the library in collaboration with the faculty governance body (e.g., Faculty Senate) at your institution to address scholarly communication issues. Check all that apply. N=47

- Make presentation(s) to the body: 29 (62%)
- Report to the body: 23 (49%)
- Form a committee: 10 (21%)
- Initiate committee action: 12 (26%)
- Develop policy statements: 19 (40%)
- Propose resolutions: 22 (47%)
- Pass scholarly communication resolution: 18 (38%)
- Sponsor education programs: 15 (32%)
- Other (please specify): 8 (17%)

“Ongoing discussions in various fora.”

“Placed on agenda for discussion with Research Committee of the University Senate.”

“Report to faculty committee.”

“The Senate Academic Services Committee will work next year with the library of SC issues, the Senate has also endorsed a draft resolution but it is not finalized yet.”

“To a certain extent, done via the Provost’s committees.”

“Western Libraries and Research Western organized a consultation session on Open Access to provide feedback to SSHRC (Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council) [of Canada].”
### MOST EFFECTIVE ACTIVITIES

16. Please briefly describe up to three SC education activities that have been particularly effective at your institution. N=45

[N.B. Categorization provided by the authors. If respondents included more than one activity in a response, they were parsed out as separate activities.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delivery method</th>
<th>Audience</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Most Effective Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACRL/ARL SC Institute</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Involvement of selected faculty in attendance at the UCLA Institute last year and in the follow-up to that event held on the campus in January.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACRL/ARL SC Institute</td>
<td>Faculty senate</td>
<td>Senate resolution on SC</td>
<td>Educating additional library staff and forming a campus-wide committee to pass a senate resolution. This committee will be attending the Scholarly Communication Institute.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brochure</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>IR; copyright</td>
<td>Two brochures have been created and sent to all faculty, administrators, graduate students and professional staff. The first was a brochure about the repository created in the spring of 2006. The second is a brochure about author rights and copyright management, created in the spring of 2007.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brochure</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Brochures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brochure</td>
<td>Legal Office</td>
<td>Copyright</td>
<td>Sent the ACRL copyright brochure to our Legal Office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus-wide task force</td>
<td>Campus task force on the Library</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Addressing the issues in a campus-wide task force formed by the Provost to envision library needs for the year 2020. This has raised the consciousness of at least a few campus leaders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copyright addenda</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Copyright</td>
<td>Preparation of alternative terminology that can be given to publishers enabling authors to retain copyright of their creative works.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental Meeting</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>IR</td>
<td>Coordinator for Scholarly Communication meets with academic units and departments for informal education and demo of Digital Commons (institutional repository).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental Meeting</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>IR</td>
<td>Departmental meetings discussing how colleagues in the same discipline have been well served by eScholarship repository in starting an open access journal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Have a SC blog. Occasionally send notes out to faculty/library faculty about news items AND post these to the blog. Usually just post items to the blog. (Probably not very effective as few academics use RSS, it seems.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery method</td>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Most Effective Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty meeting</td>
<td>Department meetings</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Liaison participation in departmental meetings seems to generate interesting and discipline-specific discussions. However, it can be difficult to get time on appropriate agendas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty networks</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Word-of-mouth through faculty networks has increased awareness of our services and boosted our reputation due to good recommendations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus groups</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>IR</td>
<td>Starting an institutional repository. This has been a way to address issues of electronic theses and alternatives to commercial publishing. We have used focus groups effectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus groups</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>IR</td>
<td>Faculty focus groups conducted by the libraries on specific topics, such as digital scholarship and reasons faculty have deposited (or not) in institutional repositories. These are some of the few opportunities for cross-discipline communication among faculty, and all participants seems to gain insight and appreciate the opportunity to learn from others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal setting (library)</td>
<td>Librarians</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Engaged librarians through active-learning exercises and official goal-setting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad school info packet</td>
<td>Grad Students</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Info packet as part of electronic thesis submission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal meeting</td>
<td>Department meetings</td>
<td>IR</td>
<td>Talking at departmental, lab or small group levels about the institutional repository. This gives faculty and graduate students concrete activities which they can take, and specific concerns which they can express. Dialog evolves around the repository on all types of topics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal meeting</td>
<td>Department meetings</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Informal meeting with individual academic department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal meeting</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Open access</td>
<td>Discussion of effects of open access publishing on promotion and tenure practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal meeting</td>
<td>Faculty, humanities and social sciences</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Initiating a joint publishing program with the university press has given us multiple opportunities to raise the visibility of collateral damage to humanities and social sciences publishing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture series</td>
<td>Librarians</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Provincial research libraries group: lecture series.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>IR</td>
<td>The various publicizing activities associated with establishing, getting buy-in to, and maintaining our increasingly successful institutional repository.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Journal crisis</td>
<td>Widely publicized rationale for going e-only with journals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>College Faculty Meeting</td>
<td>IR</td>
<td>Marketing of the Institutional Repository at each college's faculty meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery method</td>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Most Effective Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>IR</td>
<td>Campus-wide marketing of our institutional repository.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Open access</td>
<td>Open access journal publishing. This project hosting open access journals has been successful and brought attention to the issues of open access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Scholarly Communications Council establishment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Promoting work done by SPARC and others—this is effective in that it makes it clear that we, as librarians, are engaged in the bigger picture and trying to leverage our professional expertise to address problems faced by all of our peer institutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletters</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Journal crisis</td>
<td>Article in University Week that had color graphs showing journal costs, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletters</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Library services</td>
<td>Advertising library services through the electronic institutional newsletter has been extremely effective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletters</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Relevant articles in our Library Newsletter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletters</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Copyright</td>
<td>Addressing issues in newsletter sent to campus. Since our marketing staff member is doing these, they are very professional. We attached the ACRL copyright brochure to the recent newsletter to make sure all faculty got it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletters</td>
<td>Health Science Faculty</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>We publish two scholarly communication newsletters that highlight relevant and interesting developments. These are targeted to faculty primarily; one for health sciences campus, the other for the rest of campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-on-one</td>
<td>Department heads</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Meetings with individual department heads.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-on-one</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Copyright</td>
<td>Approached by one senior faculty member to describe the options available to faculty with respect to copyright transfer or licensing by authors. We co-wrote an article together which he will use with his colleagues as a way of educating them about the new possibilities and how to act more in their own or the university’s interests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-on-one</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Copyright</td>
<td>Consultations with faculty/instructors about course reserves and copyright have given many opportunities to raise the visibility of the issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-on-one</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Copyright</td>
<td>Individual consulting re. copyright and intellectual property offered to faculty by the Copyright &amp; Scholarly Communications Director.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-on-one</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>IR</td>
<td>Faculty office visits as part of needs assessment to develop IR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery method</td>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Most Effective Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-on-one</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>IR</td>
<td>One-on-one conversations with faculty, whether in person or via e-mail. A project to jumpstart population of our IR involved sending e-mails to faculty requesting permission to deposit in the IR copies of their published articles. The result was greater than the number of articles deposited, because faculty asked questions, were interested in the answers, and a few faculty members even became activists in their scholarly societies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-on-one</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>OA</td>
<td>Responding to e-mail inquiries about cancellation of our BMC membership—teachable moments about OA. Also Nucleic Acids Research membership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-on-one</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Academic liaisons working one-on-one with faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-on-one</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Individual consultations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-on-one</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Individual consultation, especially with faculty, on copyright, rights management, and scholarly publishing issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-on-one</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Individual discussions with faculty members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-on-one</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Informal activities/one-on-one discussions with faculty in selected areas (health science/medicine; science/engineering).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-on-one</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>One-on-one conversations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-on-one</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>One-to-one discussions are still the ideal. However, this is sporadic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-on-one</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>The majority of our efforts have been one-on-one meetings with individual faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-on-one</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>One on one conversations. A good way to get faculty to focus on issues to which they are sympathetic but rarely give attention. We now have on staff two people (on experimental term appointments) who give one-on-one consultations on IP issues. These are valuable in themselves but even more valuable in the way they open up further discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-on-one</td>
<td>Faculty Editors</td>
<td>Open access</td>
<td>Conversations with journal editors about open access and publishing in general.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-on-one</td>
<td>Faculty Editors</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Working with individual faculty regarding the economics of scholarly publishing, especially those who are active with scholarly society or commercial publishing as editors or on boards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open house</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>IR</td>
<td>Open house to highlight IR and other opportunities for faculty self-archiving of research materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery method</td>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Most Effective Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside speakers</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Other speakers on topics such as copyright, faculty rights, promotion and tenure, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside speakers</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Outside speaker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside speakers</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Series of faculty lectures with outside speakers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Open access</td>
<td>Presentations on our institutional repository programme and our open access journal publishing programme have focused on the transformational impact of open access and the value of self-archiving.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>Campus committees that include administrators</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Presenting library initiatives to large formal committees and groups has informed administrators about our projects enabling them to direct relevant queries to the library.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>Department meetings</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Attendance at faculty meetings. Presentations are brief (and it’s hard to get on schedules) but it almost always turns up some follow-up activity with interested faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>Departmental faculty liaisons</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>University Library Committee meeting with teaching faculty Library Liaisons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Formal presentations by medical/health sciences staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Group presentations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Group presentations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>Faculty Senate Committee on the Library</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Two presentations to the Faculty Council on University Libraries this spring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>Faculty Senate Committee on the Library</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>The Scholarly Communication Librarian and the Institutional Repository Task Force have made presentations to the Faculty Senate Library Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>Grad Students</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Presentations to graduate students in two courses: Survival Skills for Grad Students and Responsible Conduct of Research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>Grad Students</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Formal presentations to graduate students as part of Responsible Conduct of Research program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>Grad Students</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Formal presentations to graduate students as part of move toward mandated electronic submission of theses and dissertations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>Librarians</td>
<td>IR</td>
<td>Presentation on author archiving to librarians.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>Librarians</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Presentations arising from the formation of our SC Committee have raised awareness and spawned discussion within the library.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery method</td>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Most Effective Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>Senate Library Committee</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>A presentation to Senate Library Committee raised awareness of the issues and also informed the SC Committee about reservations the faculty have about alternative models of scholarly communications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>Faculty senate</td>
<td>Copyright addendum</td>
<td>Librarians delivered multiple, progressive presentations to governance bodies (e.g., Faculty Senate), culminating in their endorsement of the CIC Author Addendum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation, road show</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Educating, at first, a small group of interested librarians and staff, and presenting informal ’road shows‘ to the university community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Open access publication fees</td>
<td>Developing initiative cosponsored by Vice Provost for Research to fund open access publication fees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Senate resolution on SC</td>
<td>Faculty Senate resolution in support of the budget increase for library acquisitions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Senate resolution on SC</td>
<td>Faculty Senate resolution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution</td>
<td>Faculty Senate</td>
<td>Author Addendum</td>
<td>Two resolutions have been drawn up. The first, passed by the faculty senate in February 2004, was a Resolution on Scholarly Communication, which states that “faculty, staff, students, and university administrators must all take greater responsibility for their scholarly communication system.” The second, proposed by the libraries’ Scholarly Communications Team, asks for university scholars to use authors’ amendments to retain copyright and to deposit digital versions of scholarship in the institutional repository.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution</td>
<td>Faculty Senate</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Two resolutions have been drawn up. The first, passed by the faculty senate in February 2004, was a Resolution on Scholarly Communication, which states that “faculty, staff, students, and university administrators must all take greater responsibility for their scholarly communication system.” The second, proposed by the libraries’ Scholarly Communications Team, asks for university scholars to use authors’ amendments to retain copyright and to deposit digital versions of scholarship in the institutional repository.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery method</td>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Most Effective Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution</td>
<td>Senate</td>
<td>Senate resolution on SC</td>
<td>Several years ago the Faculty Senate endorsed the Tempe Principles. The Scholarly Communications Committee drafted a resolution on open access that was eventually softened to “scholarly publishing;” that was taken to various Senate committees by the Library Committee. The resolution came to the full Senate in May 2006 and was adopted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC Blog</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Relevant articles in our Scholarly Communication Blog.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC Committee</td>
<td>Faculty members</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>The Scholarly Communications Committee was initially populated with department heads who would presumably carry information back to their departments. The experience turned out to be quite informative for the administrators themselves. A second committee has been formed with multi-disciplinary tenured faculty. They invited two high-ranking scholarly society (American Chemical Society and American Mathematical Society) officers to a discussion about the economics of scholarly publishing for a scholarly society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminars</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Copyright</td>
<td>Copyright seminars.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminars</td>
<td>Librarians</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Brought in outside speakers to provide formal presentations to librarians.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status of the Library document</td>
<td>Faculty Senate</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>The Scholarly Communication Librarian has contributed to a status of the Library document that went to the Faculty Senate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic plan, Library &amp; University</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Inclusion of some topics in the library’s and the university’s Strategic Plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject-specific workshops</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Specifically designed workshops for subject disciplines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symposium</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Local SC work</td>
<td>Annual or biannual SC Symposium with outside speakers and updates on recent SC work at the university.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symposium</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Conference on Scholarly Communication sponsored by the University Libraries with outside speakers as well as speakers from the campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symposium</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>University-wide e-Publishing Symposium.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symposium</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Scholarly Communications in a Digital World’ convocation for invited faculty &amp; librarians, held in January 2005.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery method</td>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Most Effective Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symposium</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Annual campus-wide lecture open to all faculty—this resulted in contact with key faculty for our open access journal publishing and repository development. We call the lecture the Nakata Lecture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symposium</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Sponsored Faculty Conference on Scholarly Publishing, 2005.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symposium</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Three-day conference discussing the changes in scholarly communication and in the role of the library.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town hall</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>University-wide e-strategies town hall presentations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web site</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Having information on a Web site, to refer people to for more information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web site</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>New Web site dedicated to copyright and scholarly publishing issues, featuring blog that points out new developments and their impact on scholarly communications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web site</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Scholarly communications Web site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web site</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Web page created 2007.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web site</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Web page on scholarly communication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web site</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Web site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web site</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Open access membership</td>
<td>Open Access memberships bring people to the rest of our Scholarly Communication Web site when they link to get membership information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web site</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>We have created a Web presence designed to educate faculty about various scholarly communication issues including copyright, rights management, and OA publishing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work w/ Faculty Senate Cmte on Library</td>
<td>Faculty Senate Committee on the Library</td>
<td>Copyright</td>
<td>Working with Council on the Libraries and College Counsel to develop a local Author’s Addendum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work w/ Faculty Senate Cmte on Library</td>
<td>Faculty Senate Committee on the Library</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Work with Faculty Senate Committee on University Libraries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work w/ Faculty Senate Cmte on Library</td>
<td>Faculty Senate Committee on the Library</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Working with the Faculty Senate Library Committee: Educate and propose guidelines and policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work w/ Faculty Senate Cmte on Library</td>
<td>Faculty Senate Committee on the Library</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Library committee meeting discussions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery method</td>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Most Effective Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work w/ Faculty Senate Cmte on Library</td>
<td>Senate Library Committee</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Discussions at Senate Library Committees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops, campus-sponsored</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Workshops offered through the university’s Center for Teaching and Academic Growth (TAG) (to faculty, researchers, librarians).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops, campus-sponsored</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Offering sessions as part of the annual ‘Enriching Scholarship’ series (a two week series every May with 100s of workshops on technology, teaching and research). SC topic workshops are consistently well attended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops, campus-sponsored</td>
<td>Grad Students</td>
<td>Copyright</td>
<td>Collaboration with the Graduate School to produce scholarly communication-focused workshops for graduate students, such as a session on copyright. These sessions actively engaged faculty and students in conversations about copyright, author rights, and ethical issues in the use of research and scholarship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops, library-sponsored</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Copyright</td>
<td>Regularly scheduled Copyright Education workshops in the high tech information commons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops, library-sponsored</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Copyright</td>
<td>The Copyright Committee sponsored a workshop focusing on issues in the ARL brochure Know Your Copy Rights. It was well attended by campus faculty, staff and library staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops, library-sponsored</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>IR</td>
<td>Workshop on Digital Curation &amp; Trusted Repositories held in conjunction with the Joint Conference on Digital Libraries and co-sponsored by the School of Information &amp; Library Science and the University Library.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
17. Please briefly describe up to three significant challenges the library has faced in educating library users and staff about SC issues. N=50

[N.B. Categorization provided by the authors. If respondents provided more than one challenge in a response, they were parsed out as separate challenges.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Category of Challenge</th>
<th>Description of Challenge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>Apathy</td>
<td>Indifference to fact that a “problem” exists by library users and staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>Apathy</td>
<td>Indifference within and outside the library to the topic. This includes authors who sign publishing agreements without considering the content of the license, and librarians and staff who don’t deposit their work in the institutional repository.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>Busy</td>
<td>Time constraints on faculty and staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>Content with status quo</td>
<td>Even when people are interested, lack of incentive for them to change behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>Populating IR</td>
<td>There is a perception that open access repositories have failed as a concept, producing little if any benefit to the institutions that have developed them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>Campus Leadership</td>
<td>Lack of larger university support for SC change—no involvement by university governing bodies—lack of standing for librarians.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>Campus leadership</td>
<td>The lack of designated central campus resources for significant scholarly communication functions, such as for example a central authority on copyright issues or a scholarly communication czar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>Decentralized campus structure</td>
<td>Decentralized university structure makes communication and collaboration across various units very difficult. It is often the case that one unit is pursuing an initiative relevant to scholarly communications about which no one else is aware.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>Decentralized campus structure</td>
<td>The mechanisms for contacting users (faculty) are limited to brochure mailings and an occasional mass e-mail (which are limited in length and must go through campus approval).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>Decentralized campus structure</td>
<td>There is currently no scholarly communications committee and no campus-wide copyright policy. Challenge for the scholarly communications program is to overcome the decentralized structure to get both of these things going.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>Decentralized campus structure</td>
<td>Transmission—Lack of an easily accessible network across all disciplines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Apathy</td>
<td>A low interest level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Apathy</td>
<td>Antipathy towards scholarly publication issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Apathy</td>
<td>Apathy on part of faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who</td>
<td>Category of Challenge</td>
<td>Description of Challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Apathy</td>
<td>Apathy. Only concerned when it directly affects them: their teaching, research, students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Apathy</td>
<td>Creating broad interest in the issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Apathy</td>
<td>Faculty apathy and attitudes regarding SC and relation to promotion/tenure and institutional repository concept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Apathy</td>
<td>Faculty participation and input.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Apathy</td>
<td>Faculty perception of SC as a non-issue, particularly in the last few years of relative flush collections budgets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Apathy</td>
<td>Getting the attention of faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Apathy</td>
<td>Getting the faculty and administrator’s attention and commitment of time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Apathy</td>
<td>Getting them interested and attending.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Apathy</td>
<td>Lack of faculty interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Apathy</td>
<td>Lack of interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Apathy</td>
<td>Unwillingness to take action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Apathy</td>
<td>Getting “air time” at meetings to present the challenges related to scholarly communication, open access, author rights, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Busy</td>
<td>Attention of a very busy group of people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Busy</td>
<td>Competing with other time and attention intensive issues: teaching, faculty meetings, et cetera.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Busy</td>
<td>Competition for faculty attention—unless there is a clear self interest, it is difficult to get faculty interested or involved in scholarly communication topics. Large forums generally don’t work, so small group interaction is required. Coupled with the lack of library staff time mentioned above, this is a real problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Busy</td>
<td>Faculty receptiveness and lack of time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Busy</td>
<td>Finding time to meet with busy faculty members to discuss issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Busy</td>
<td>Getting busy faculty to show up for events or take an interest in SC issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Busy</td>
<td>Getting them to spend time with the issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Busy</td>
<td>Getting time and attention of busy library users.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Busy</td>
<td>Making our voice heard through the “noise” of everything else that folks do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Busy</td>
<td>Simply finding the right time and the right place. Our faculty and students are much more teachable about SC issues when they are working from a real need/urgent question than when we introduce the ideas in the abstract. But they don’t necessarily know to come to us to have those needs met and questions answered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Busy</td>
<td>Time limitations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who</td>
<td>Category of Challenge</td>
<td>Description of Challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Busy</td>
<td>Time constraints on faculty—they seldom even have departmental gatherings where we might invite ourselves to speak!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Busy</td>
<td>Faculty are very busy writing grants, conducting research, managing labs, and teaching students. If they have an established pattern for where they disseminate their research, it is difficult to get them to change their routine and submit research to other places.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Complexity</td>
<td>Many conversations are driven by concern over copyright issues, and the lack of clarity about what is and is not permissible frustrates many who perceive the university as being deliberately conservative or difficult.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Complexity</td>
<td>Number of connected issues (e.g., society revenue sources, faculty compensation and recognition/impact, open access controversies.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Complexity</td>
<td>Tremendous variety of SC issues exists; tremendous number of constituents, with many different circumstances. One size definitely cannot fit all at a large research university.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Content with status quo</td>
<td>Faculty members who are used to traditional publishing practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Content with status quo</td>
<td>Most faculty are happy with things just the way they are.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Decentralized campus structure</td>
<td>The most effective meetings with faculty are ones that are interactive and relatively small and that also are timed when the faculty have questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Developing a clear message</td>
<td>Creating a common definition of the crisis in scholarly communication that is comprehensible and meaningful across a broad array of staff, disciplines, and stakeholders, sufficiently strong that it endures over time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Developing a clear message</td>
<td>Defining the issues in terms they understand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Developing a clear message</td>
<td>Developing an appropriate language/vocabulary for framing scholarly communication issues - something that is more user-centered than library-centered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Developing a clear message</td>
<td>Helping define issues in ways that are actionable by people, and that will spur people into action. Many recognize the issues, but don’t know how to address, or see any real benefits to them personally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Developing a clear message</td>
<td>It is very difficult to make the topic relevant to people’s own lives and professional behavior. It is hard to make clear in a convincing manner why the university community should care. Unless it’s tied to a specifically required action (such as promotion and tenure) it is difficult to get their attention, much less encourage participation in creating change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Disciplinary SC differences</td>
<td>Addressing the differences of SC issues within a variety of disciplines/environments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who</td>
<td>Category of Challenge</td>
<td>Description of Challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Disciplinary SC differences</td>
<td>Perception—Overcoming traditional paradigms of scholarly publishing within specific disciplines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Education about author addenda</td>
<td>Faculty unawareness of ability to modify a publisher license agreement without penalty from publisher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Education about author addenda</td>
<td>Persuading faculty to retain their intellectual property in signing publishers’ agreements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Fear of damaging scholarly societies</td>
<td>Faculty fear that open access will harm scholarly societies and scholarly publishers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Fear of damaging scholarly societies</td>
<td>Faculty may want more concrete answers than are available about economic impact of moving their society publication to an open access model.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Fear of damaging scholarly societies</td>
<td>Faculty protectiveness of pet journals, status quo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Fear of damaging scholarly societies</td>
<td>Getting faculty to be willing to step outside of the traditional scholarly publishing arena. Faculty are especially protective of their associations, and especially concerned of the impact any publishing decision will have on promotion and tenure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Keep momentum going</td>
<td>Holding the gains once agreements for a new practice has been made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Keep momentum going</td>
<td>Keeping the topics listed above on the radar screens of administration as well as faculty and researchers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Misinformation about OA</td>
<td>Faculty still view peer-reviewed journals as gold standard especially those with high impact factors. Many do not understand that open access journals are peer-reviewed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Misinformation about OA</td>
<td>Overcoming misinformation about the issues, such as Open Access voiding the ability to publish in peer-reviewed journals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Perception that it’s a library issue</td>
<td>Difficulty in having faculty understand that SC issues are just as much their responsibility as the library’s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Perception that it’s a library issue</td>
<td>Faculty don’t see the problem as theirs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Perception that it’s a library issue</td>
<td>Faculty perspective that problems associated with scholarly publishing is library problem rather than a faculty issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Perception that it’s a library issue</td>
<td>Making them view SC as not just a “library problem.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Perception that it’s a library issue</td>
<td>Some faculty view this as a library, rather than a faculty issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Populating IR</td>
<td>Determining how much emphasis to place on/develop the local Institutional Repository and populate it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Populating IR</td>
<td>Populating our very successful IR with post-print (it has many other types of collections.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who</td>
<td>Category of Challenge</td>
<td>Description of Challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Tenure process</td>
<td>A certain reluctance by some (many?) faculty to accept that OA journals can be every bit as scholarly as non OA journals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Tenure process</td>
<td>Communicating and explaining the detrimental impact on our campus’ institutional (library) budget of individual faculty decisions to publish in and serve on the editorial boards of journals with irresponsible pricing models. The issue is compounded by the fact that expensive commercial journals may appear ‘free’ to many users working in their offices or home computing environments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Tenure process</td>
<td>Communicating message that faculty promotion and tenure system needs to change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Tenure process</td>
<td>Criteria for promotion and tenure (scholarly publication requirements).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Tenure process</td>
<td>Difficulties addressing changes to promotion and tenure requirements that would be needed to become more active with open access initiatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Tenure process</td>
<td>Difficulty of influencing cultural change (such as the P&amp;T process, habits of publishing...)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Tenure process</td>
<td>Emphasizing and reemphasizing the need for authors to retain their copyright. Again, the pressure to publish outweighs the rights issue for many.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Tenure process</td>
<td>Faculty are concerned that if they publish in an open access journal or if they add addenda to the agreements that they sign with publishers, high quality publishers, especially the highly regarded scholarly societies like the ACS and RCS will not want to publish their work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Tenure process</td>
<td>Faculty are hesitant to do anything that will disadvantage them in the promotion and tenure process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Tenure process</td>
<td>Faculty have fears and reservations about open access particularly with respect to tenure and promotion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Tenure process</td>
<td>Faculty tenure process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Tenure process</td>
<td>Like everyone else, we face the challenge of anxiety about promotion and tenure getting in the way of faculty working for change in the SC environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Tenure process</td>
<td>Many faculty still say that it’s most important to publish in the most prestigious journal in their field and are dubious about the merits of open access journals. This is changing, but changing slowly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Tenure process</td>
<td>The basic rewards issues are still tough areas to deal with. Despite years of discussions, the rewards process remains relatively the same with publishing in high profile journals a major component of rewards systems. Other work in OA journals, etc. is now considered but still the major considerations are the high profile journals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who</td>
<td>Category of Challenge</td>
<td>Description of Challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Tenure process</td>
<td>The current criteria for tenure and promotion precludes publication in open access journals in some disciplines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Tenure process</td>
<td>The publish/perish models that still prevail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Apathy</td>
<td>Activating the subject bibliographers into action on this matter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Complexity</td>
<td>Complexity of the issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Complexity</td>
<td>Diversity of issues and trying to get the most effective people involved with the most appropriate issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Complexity</td>
<td>Making these issues fresh: we have to move past talking about serial inflation and copyright: you can only raise those issues so many times before people begin to tune us out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Complexity</td>
<td>Many of the proposed solutions are highly problematic, which is not lost on those faculty with analytical abilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Complexity</td>
<td>Rapid change (constantly evolving Scholarly Communication environment).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Complexity</td>
<td>The biggest challenge is the amorphous nature of the problem. Overall, the problems affect everyone in the profession. However, the STM librarians clearly ‘get it’ in a more direct and meaningful way. The impact is much more immediate. In a nutshell, the challenge is the same for reaching faculty or staff— ‘how do these issues impact on me and mine?’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Complexity</td>
<td>The term scholarly communication means different things to different people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Developing a clear message</td>
<td>Devising good overall plan, including communication plan with ‘talking points’ documents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Developing a clear message</td>
<td>Different people mean different things by scholarly communication and often they apply a narrow definition; this is more than just a journals pricing crisis issue—more even that the basic issue is about more than just money, is also about values, practices, intent, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Educating all librarians</td>
<td>A need to first bring librarians up to speed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Educating all librarians</td>
<td>Awareness. Maintaining cutting edge awareness of current issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Educating all librarians</td>
<td>Differing levels of librarians’ knowledge, engagement, and commitment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Educating all librarians</td>
<td>Educating all librarians and staff about open access and scholarly communication, so they confidently work with their faculty on a one to one basis if necessary. This education takes time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Educating all librarians</td>
<td>Educating librarians so they are equipped to engage faculty in discussions of issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Educating all librarians</td>
<td>Educating library faculty and staff who work with teaching faculty on the policies and issues so we are talking the same talk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who</td>
<td>Category of Challenge</td>
<td>Description of Challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Educating all librarians</td>
<td>SC in the library tends to be perceived as someone else’s responsibility because individuals are focused on their specialty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Librarians have cried “Wolf” too long</td>
<td>Twenty years of proclaiming that there was a Scholarly Communication Crisis (what is the name for a crisis that never ends?) and telling successful, experienced researchers and authors that they should alter the behavior that made them and their research successful, has left us with a reputation for being a bit hair-brained and out-of-touch with reality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Library funding</td>
<td>Lack of resources to devote to the issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Library funding</td>
<td>Mounting a scholarly communication initiative without funding for a full or part time SC Officer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Library funding</td>
<td>Resources for developing the program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Library funding</td>
<td>There is a capacity and resource issue for the library because the need for education and outreach throughout the campus (but particularly the faculty) is greater than the resources we have at our disposal to address. As more issues arise the gap widens. This is particularly the case for issues related to intellectual property and copyright.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Library funding</td>
<td>These activities continue to be on the margins of everyone’s jobs. The library/ institution needs to decided if they should be supported as mainstream activities. If so, where does the money come from? New money is unlikely, so what do we STOP doing if we’re going to make these activities a permanent part of our work?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Library leadership</td>
<td>Lack of common goals of the library.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Library leadership</td>
<td>Lack of dedicated librarian focused on Scholarly Communication issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Library leadership</td>
<td>Library to assign higher priority to this issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Library staffing</td>
<td>Attention and effort to effect long term change have a hard time competing with short term work pressures for library users and staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Library staffing</td>
<td>Finding time to devote to these issues. The staff that are currently tasked with educating library users and staff about SC issues have other responsibilities. However, we have initiated a search for a new Scholarly Communication librarian position.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Library staffing</td>
<td>Having sufficient staff in place to develop and support program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Library staffing</td>
<td>Lack of a dedicated primary scholarly communications officer means that effective leadership on this topic is only a part time effort.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Library staffing</td>
<td>Lack of trained staff to devote adequate time to process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category of Challenge</td>
<td>Description of Challenge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library staffing</td>
<td>Not nearly enough staff time to devote to this effort—any successful scholarly communication initiative requires the support of liaisons and other library folks beyond those in leadership roles. So many things compete for liaisons’ attention that scholarly communication issues don’t get a strong enough focus to be effectively conveyed across campus.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library staffing</td>
<td>Organizing a program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library staffing</td>
<td>SC issues are not immediately connected to a faculty member’s or librarian’s daily responsibilities, and thus are difficult to get onto the campus radar screen.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library staffing</td>
<td>The SC Committee is made up of librarians who have many other responsibilities and thus have limited time to dedicate to SC initiatives.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library staffing</td>
<td>Time and staff resources.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library staffing</td>
<td>Time of the outreach librarians.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library staffing</td>
<td>Time required of staff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library staffing</td>
<td>Turnover and re-organization within the library in the positions responsible for establishing the program in scholarly communications.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception that it’s not a library issue</td>
<td>There is a perception in the library that advocating for scholarly communications issues is beyond the scope of a librarians responsibility. Attitudes suggest that librarians should be more focused on delivery of traditional services. There’s also the perception that the academic culture won’t change and there’s no chance of competing with commercial publishers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OUTCOMES OF SC EDUCATION ACTIVITIES**

18. Has the success of the library’s SC education activities been evaluated? N=58

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5 9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>53 91%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If yes, please briefly describe the evaluation criteria/process. N=5

“Evaluations of the Faculty Conference on Scholarly Publishing.”

“Only as part of yearly evaluation of Scholarly Communications Officer.”

“Only in the presentations to librarians, attendees filled out evaluation forms (e.g., 'The information presented will help me inform faculty library users. agree/neutral/disagree').”
“Portions have been evaluated. Deposit and usage statistics for the IR show slow but steady growth. Graduate students complete evaluation forms for the scholarly communications workshops.”

“Office of Scholarly Communication has done surveys of faculty across all the campuses on scholarly communication issues in both 2004 and 2006.”

19. Please describe any demonstrable outcomes (such as statements from faculty governance bodies, changes in promotion and tenure criteria, author’s switching to open access journals, etc.) related to the library’s SC education activities. N=23

[N.B. Summary provided by the authors. If respondents provided more than one outcome in the response box, they were parsed out as separate outcomes.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative awareness</td>
<td>The conference resulted in a Statement of Principles. Produced Executive Summary forwarded to campus administration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative support for OA</td>
<td>Library directors were also successful in persuading the Executive Associate Provost to create a fund to help subsidize faculty in paying any fees attached to publishing in open access journals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative support for SC education</td>
<td>There is a commitment from the Provost’s office to instigating and supporting education and outreach on these issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better pricing</td>
<td>Journals “big deals” have better financial terms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversations with university editors</td>
<td>We are now identifying university editors and board members of open access and scholarly society journals, and actively engaging in dialogue and gathering information about these journals. The editors and board members are genuinely pleased the library is taking an active role.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copyright addendum support</td>
<td>CIC author’s rights addendum has been endorsed by the provost and is waiting to be endorsed by the faculty senate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copyright addendum support</td>
<td>Faculty now consider changing the terms in publishing contracts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copyright addendum support</td>
<td>Faculty want to use an author’s addendum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copyright addendum support</td>
<td>High level support for the author’s addendum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copyright addendum support</td>
<td>Faculty resolution passed to support retention of rights.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copyright addendum support</td>
<td>Senate Library Committee, the Faculty Consultative Committee, and the University Senate all endorsed use of the CIC Author Addendum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copyright education support</td>
<td>The Provost and Chancellor are committed to copyright education and support a 50% FTE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty awareness heightened</td>
<td>Surveys show there is a bit more faculty awareness now than in the past but we need to collect more information along these lines and conduct ongoing research in this area to assess.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in library’s OA journal platform</td>
<td>Open access journals “edited” by campus faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in library’s OA journal platform</td>
<td>The most visible outcomes from our SC program have really been the result of developing a publication initiative, the Office of Digital Scholarly Publishing. Through this effort we have been able to educate our collaborators very effectively and have convinced three journals to publish their back files online open access through us, as well as developing an open access publishing model for a professional organization’s conference proceedings in engineering education. The initiative has given us the ability not only to talk about the system, but point to concrete examples of how one might address the problems in the system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in library’s OA journal platform</td>
<td>We have a number of faculty members who are also editors of journals who are now engaged in the process of moving their publications to OA, using the Open Journal Systems platform, which the library hosts. Many others are interested and have approached us for more information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in library’s OA journal platform</td>
<td>Journals@UIC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in library’s OA journal platform</td>
<td>The library’s creation/sponsorship of four peer-reviewed OA journals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR developed</td>
<td>The library’s institutional repository.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR development support</td>
<td>A high level committee has been formed to develop a college-wide Digital Repository. College Counsel is very interested in staying updated on these issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR development support</td>
<td>Resolutions passed by Faculty Council in 2005: to engage the Provost to create a task force on scholarly communications... and create a task force on establishing an institutional repository.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR development support</td>
<td>The university is currently in a strategic planning phase; the university strategic plan discussion paper includes a proposal to develop a policy statement related to archiving and providing open access to its research output.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR submissions</td>
<td>Number of items deposited in Digital Commons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR submissions</td>
<td>Faculty starting open-access journals via eScholarship Repository, as well as submitting other types of research materials (post-print articles; working papers; conference papers, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much talk but little movement</td>
<td>We have some general resolutions and statements, etc., but many of us have stacks of these stuck away in our bottom drawers. What I’d like to see is more OA journals &amp; books based in IRs and action from funding agencies that require OA reporting of results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OA support</td>
<td>We have had some success convincing journal editors to switch to an open access model and have seen individual faculty members emerge as strong advocates for open access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate Resolution</td>
<td>Resolutions from the Faculty Senate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate resolution for increased library funding</td>
<td>Faculty Senate resolution in support of increased funding for library acquisitions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate resolution for OA and ownership</td>
<td>Resolution passed by Faculty Council in 2005: ...faculty are owners of their own research &amp; should retain ownership and use open access publications, whenever possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate resolution heightened faculty awareness</td>
<td>The endorsement of the Tempe Principles and the Scholarly Publishing Resolution by the Faculty Senate generated vigorous discussion and heightened awareness of the issues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary | Outcomes
--- | ---
Senate resolution on OA | Dean/Director and survey respondent contributed to development of a draft statement in support of Open Access that is being adopted for the university.
Senate resolution on SC | Faculty senate and graduate student senate both passed resolutions on scholarly publishing last year.
Senate resolution on SC | Faculty senate resolution: In 2003, endorsed the Tempe Principles, a set of principles devised by several major American research libraries in 2000 and intended to guide the transformation of the scholarly publishing system.
Senate resolution on SC | The University Senate passed a resolution entitled “Albany Faculty Action Needed to Secure Access to journals at an Affordable Price for SUNY Faculty and Students.”
Senate resolution to support copyright addendum usage | Faculty Senate resolution, in 2007, endorsed the CIC Provosts’ Statement on Publishing Agreements, which urges the faculty to modify their copyright agreements so they have greater ownership/usership of their own publications.
Support for digital scholarship | Hiring of cross discipline digital scholars is a sign that the terms for academic achievement may be gradually shifting to accept digital scholarship.

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS**

20. Please enter any additional information regarding scholarly communication education initiatives at your library that may assist the authors in accurately analyzing the results of this survey. N=22

“Again, it’s early days here. We really began working in earnest on the education aspects of this less than a year ago. About ten months ago, we brought in our Intellectual Property Specialists (who do this, but do other things too . . .) and we’ve been working on assessment and planning since then, going out and ‘educating’ as opportunities arise. The formal program will really only begin in the fall.”

“As mentioned in the ‘challenges’ section above, we have had turnover in the assistant dean’s role, and both he and the head of Scholarly Communications Services have been in their roles less than a year. As a result, our current efforts are still evolving, and have focused more heavily on the publication initiatives, rather than education programs. The Office of Digital Scholarly Publishing has given the dean and the director of the university press multiple opportunities to raise the visibility of these issues internally and externally.”

“I received the appointment as Scholarly Communication Officer in January 2007. I currently have a concurrent administrative appointment as a department chair. The 15% estimate of time devoted to SC education activities noted in #3 relates mostly to the time I have taken to come up to educate myself rather than outward education. Prior to my appointment, the library had created a Web page about SC issues though its primary focus was on the crisis in journal price inflation. Because we have done no evaluation of effectiveness of any SC efforts, all such efforts were rated a ‘3.’ This is meant to indicate that we simply do not know what has or hasn’t been effective. A team from the university (including me, an intellectual property specialist, and two faculty members—one a journal editor and the other an editorial board member for a different journal)
has been accepted to attend the Institute on Scholarly Communication in July. We hope to emerge from that experience with an action plan that will certainly include SC education efforts that we can pursue with the help of the Faculty Library Council."

“I would like to see a list of outcome measurements for teaching scholarly communication.”

“If we are going to succeed we’ve got to get off our high horse and cut back on missionary activities and instead be honest about the publishing options that exist, and the pressures that academics face. What is important is developing relationships on campus based on trust and honesty. If we can get to a place where responsible librarians will advise a young faculty member that it is in her best interest to publish in a specific Elsevier journal, and to suggest to another senior faculty member that they place their article in a specific OA journal published by a society or another university, then we will have a chance of success because we will be seen as acting in the best interest of that individual faculty member and that specific discipline. If, every time a faculty member or graduate student comes to us they instead get a lecture about OA or retaining copyright, then we’re probably in a dying profession.”

“In 1999, there was an Inter-institutional Task Force on Scholarly Communication (made up of representatives from the three state regents institutions)."

“Key library staff engaged in efforts of scholarly communication education are no longer at the library.”

“Our apologies for not providing more information, but this area is being revisited and we are hoping to have more specific plans and programs soon. We are sending someone to the ARL/ACRL Institute on SC this summer and plan to hire a new AUL within the year whose responsibilities will include this area.”

“Our approach to SC activities has been different from that implied by these questions: Mellon-funded Scholarly Communication Institutes focusing on how the issue affects & can be used in specific disciplines; workshops & one-on-one advising for interested faculty on IP issues, i.e., ‘point-of-need;’ subject librarians with faculty in their disciplines; sponsoring a fellow from the CLIR Post doc program, creating new leaders in this area.”

“Our institutional repository currently contains 43 communities of varying size, including liberal arts, professional schools, the graduate school, health center, law school, university archives, regional campuses, and a variety of centers and institutes. We have included all journals in the Directory of Open Access Journals in our catalog for ease of access.”

“The University Provost has appointed a Task Force on Scholarly Communication to address scholarly communications issues from a broad perspective. The Task Force, chaired by the Dean of Libraries, includes faculty, researchers, librarians, and administrators. A campus-wide symposium on scholarly communication is planned for 2008. The Libraries is in the process of recruiting an Associate Dean for Information Resources and Scholarly Communication, whose role will be to develop a program on scholarly communication issues in collaboration with the Office of Copyright and the University Press.”

“Senate Committee on Library and Scholarly Communications endorsed system-wide document promoting faculty retaining copyright of scholarly articles.”

“Several librarians are interested in educating their colleague librarians, at least, about copyright issues in regards to scholarly communication, reserves, etc. We are also hoping to invite an outside expert to speak to us on this issue. We have also proposed that the three campuses hire a copyright expert who will be better
equipped to advise the researchers. We are going to prepare a flyer about open access and author rights. This will be distributed to incoming graduate students, but will also be handy to just have on hand in the libraries.”

“The intent at our library is to involve all departmental liaison librarians in the education process. So far there is not a significant percentage of librarians that have begun to include scholarly communication activities into their repertoire. Everyone is stretched thin as it is so adding something more is not relished.”

“The Libraries have received funding for a new position for scholarly communication and research liaison, and recruitment will begin shortly. Other information: We are a founding member of SPARC and continue to support SPARC initiatives. Some of our researchers have created new journals which are open access or have modest subscription costs. Librarians have advised researchers on creating journals. Open access journals are linked from the libraries’ catalogue and Web site. Our strategic plan (2007 through 2011) includes outcomes related to scholarly communication to ‘promote and support open access,’ ‘work collaboratively with Research Western to achieve a method of managing publication costs for researchers who publish in open access electronic journals,’ and ‘coordinate the development of an institutional repository.’”

“The library has recently created an AUL position to focus more on this issue and create initiatives to address this area of concern.”

“The library, in collaboration with the University Provost, is planning to establish a Scholarly Communication Committee composed of faculty and librarians.”

“We are re-organizing to form a Scholarly Communications Support Unit by fall 2007. Hopefully, our responses will be different by next spring. Please consider repeating the survey.”

“We have been engaging in SC activities for some years but only in 2007 have we begun formalizing these activities in a coherent SC program with a committee dedicated to coordinating the activities and the communications to support them.”

“We have created a position description for reallocating a vacant librarian position to become a Scholarly Communications Librarian. We have started a digital press to demonstrate open access publishing for peer-reviewed scholarly and specialized works.”

“We will be rolling out our institutional repository in fall 2007 and will undertake an authors rights education initiative at that time.”

“Work in this general area is a strategic planning emphasis/target for the libraries over the next year.”
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Committee Charges/Proposals for SC Initiatives
Scholarly Communication In Crisis: A Call For Action

Introduction
The academic community in research institutions across the nation and around the world is becoming aware that the promise of increased access inherent in digital technologies may prove to be a threadbare myth. Business practices of some academic publishers threaten to effectively limit access to scholarly research, thus bypassing the educational call to promote inquiry and knowledge. When faculty are required to sign away all rights to their research in exchange for publication, they are prohibited from posting their articles on their own websites or within a course management system, distributing copies to peers, or including copies in course packs, unless they seek the publisher’s permission. Many refer to this situation as the crisis in scholarly communication.

Arizona State University Libraries and the Collections and Scholarly Communication Office (CSCO) offer a multi-faceted program to promote scholarly communication issues on ASU campuses. The program includes a website with general introduction and detailed information about copyright, open access, self-archiving and trends in other institutions, as well as sample contracts and sample contract riders tailored to ASU faculty. CSCO has also created two podcasts on scholarly communication; the first is more general while the second is a thorough treatment of intellectual property rights. In the future, CSCO plans to offer presentations to faculty across ASU campuses.

This is a call for action coming out from ASU Libraries and CSCO. Currently we are establishing a University-wide scholarly communication committee with members from the Libraries and targeted offices across all four campuses. We are charged to embed scholarly communication issues into action agendas. We aspire to introduce a University Senate resolution on each campus encouraging alternative publishing models.

While research at ASU is meticulously tracked and documented by OVPRES (externally-sponsored projects) and ORSPA (annual report of sponsored project activity), there is no formal University-wide working group charged to foster awareness of new alternatives for publishing, disseminating, and accessing the results of research conducted by ASU faculty. Since research expenditures at ASU reached a record high of $203.5 million in FY 05–06, we call faculty of the New American University to participate in the decision making process and resolve the following: who will control research results and the academic record — educators and researchers or third-party interests?

Charge for the Committee
Whereas, the New American University’s goals of access, excellence, and impact are tremendously enhanced by free and open access to research results conducted by ASU faculty and affiliated researchers, this committee is charged to:

1. Encourage faculty to maintain control of their scholarly work by retaining intellectual property rights, in order to allow them greater freedom to direct the dissemination of their work and thereby maximize the impact of their scholarship.
2. Encourage faculty and other members of the University community to support new models for scholarly publishing, including: open access journals and archives; disciplinary and institutional repositories; and other approaches that enhance the broad dissemination, depth, and impact of knowledge while preserving peer review and excellence in scholarship.

**Desired Committee Outcomes**

- Forums and/or outreach programs are held to educate faculty and researchers on new models for scholarly publishing (e.g., institutional repository, open access journals, etc.)

- Measures are implemented that support the flexibility for faculty and other researchers to employ their work for teaching, learning, and research in an evolving technological environment.

- Faculty and researchers are provided with sample language that they can use to retain all rights and license publication or transfer copyright but retain some specified rights.

- Issues are presented to the Academic Senate on each campus in the form of a resolution.

**Current Membership**

- Jeannie Richardson, Tempe Campus, Chair
- Marilyn Myers, West Campus
- Brian Doherty, Polytechnic Campus
- Deborah Abston, Downtown Campus
- Representative from the OGC
- Representative from ORSPA
- Representative from the OVPRES
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Connecting the Dots...

**Introduction**

The University of Guelph Library has recognized the importance of supporting the transformation of scholarly communication for some time. As a result we are engaged in many activities that support this transformation. However, what we lack is a cohesive program to guide our actions and engage the University. The integrated plan calls for the development of a scholarly communications program to address this issue. If successful, such a program will permeate the library and become a part of our everyday dialog.

Scholarly communication, in a nutshell, is the process used by scholars to share the results of their research. It is the system through which research and other scholarly writings are created, evaluated for quality, disseminated to the scholarly community, and preserved for future use. One of the fundamental characteristics of scholarly research is that it is created to facilitate inquiry and the creation of new knowledge.

The traditional system of scholarly communication, that of publication in commercially produced peer-review journals, is breaking down. Libraries and their institutions can no longer keep up with the increasing volume and cost of scholarly resources. Scholars end up giving away their articles to journals that their institutions can no longer afford. Access to scholarly communication is limited, producing barriers to the creation of new knowledge.

Thankfully, electronic publishing, innovative business models and the intervention of scholars and societies offer new opportunities for sharing scholarly information. The Library’s role in this transformation is primarily in the areas of education, awareness and advocacy, spurring the scholars into action and pressing our publishers for new economic models that provide broader access. In this program we also play the roles of publisher, advisor, collaborator, and facilitator.

The core components of a scholarly communications program are:

- Education, Awareness and Advocacy
- Author Rights – Copyright Management
- Alternative/New Publishing Models
- Digital Collections Development
Current Context

Library Preparedness and Faculty Awareness

The Library has been fostering emerging services with the open access scholarly journal publication service and the pilot institutional repository. The Emerging Services Steering Team (ESST) institutional repository working group has recommended a strategy to move the service into production with an institution-wide mandate and the implementation plan is forthcoming. The journal publication service now publishes four peer-reviewed journals, collaborating with the College of Arts, Office of Research, and the Axévod Institute of Ichthyology (the fourth collaboration is with The Partnership of provincial library associations).

The Campus Author Recognition program has raised the profile of authors who have published books in the previous year and has reinforced the library’s role in supporting scholarly communications.

The Library’s active participation in consortial licensing and purchasing initiatives such as the Ontario Scholars Portal and the Canadian Research Knowledge Network ensures that we achieve more favorable pricing models on a regional and national scale. We also contribute to the transformation of scholarly communication through participation in regional, national, and global digitization initiatives such as the Open Content Alliance, Our Ontario and Alouette Canada.

Through E-Learning and Reserves operations the Library has been providing advice and information on scholarly communication issues as faculty request that materials be made available in digital format. Faculty contact the library with inquiries about copyright and licensing issues around materials used for teaching or research needs. They request information on and assistance with payment for copyright permissions, integrating material in course management systems, and providing stable links to materials.

The faculty are perhaps most aware of scholarly communication issues surrounding electronic journal publications. The high cost of scholarly journals and the need for copyright clearance are generally understood. However, they are largely unaware of the role they could play in changing the system. There is little indication of an awareness of author rights/copyright management, or, alternative publication models. The exception being that faculty in editorial roles are beginning to come to the library for advice on bringing print publications online and they are willing discuss the possibilities of open access publication. We are beginning to see faculty inquiries about the possibilities of providing access to their electronic texts through the library but in most cases they clearly have not considered the copyright transfer issues.

The library also works with the university’s Office of Research and Business Development Office on intellectual property issues and will refer faculty to these resources for more detailed information, or to receive advice from the Copyright Officer or an expert on technology transfer. Here faculty can receive assistance dealing with copyright, patents, and the ownership of innovation. The Office of Research also has its own policy on the issues of copyright and the ownership of intellectual property for creations developed at the university or utilizing university funding.
Connecting the Dots....

The proposed scholarly communications program will establish the framework from which our activities in support of the transformation of scholarly communication will hang. Without the cohesion of an articulated frame of reference it is difficult for our initiatives to be understood and for them to reach their full potential. The program allows us to “connect-the-dots” between emerging and established services that may seem to be, to some, disconnected and to others, out of the picture altogether.

The difficulty in approaching an issue such as scholarly communications is its sheer scope. What can one library do that will make a difference? What can one individual faculty member do? What can one university do? What affect can we have? However, we believe we can affect change and that we must do our part. We must engage our faculty and enable them to do their part. If we do not start this dialog on our campus, who will?

Scholarly communications programs experience and advance through a series of stages on the road to achieving real and lasting change. Joyce Ogburn suggests that there are five stages on the road to transformation: awareness, understanding, ownership, activism, and transformation itself. The key to success is having those who create scholarly materials pursue and lead initiatives.

This is a long process. Libraries are not the primary creators of scholarly material and so our role is to raise the awareness of the scholars on our campus and to engage them and enable their own efforts to affect change.

Program Coordination

Scholarly Communications Steering Team (SCST)

Mandate
The SCST is a group with the authority and resources to assume leadership, responsibility, and coordination of the scholarly communications program. The steering committee oversees the program but it must recruit many people to develop expertise, take direct action on the issues, and support, implement and integrate program elements. As the scholarly communications program matures this committee should evolve into an institutional, campus-wide committee reporting to a senior academic officer.

Objectives
- Develop strategy, and identify outcomes that will lead to change
- Set goals and the action agenda and timelines
- Establish policies
- Identify resource requirements
- Identify and engage in partnerships for change

Membership
Head, Academic Liaison
Head, Information Resources
Digital Initiatives Librarian
Academic Liaison Librarian
Associate Chief Librarian, IT Services
Campus Partners
Program Elements

Education and Awareness Campaign

Goal
The creation of a communication, outreach, and education campaign.

Objectives
- Website creation
- Library education, awareness and training - development of internal expertise, creation of talking points, use existing contact/service points to deliver the message
- Creation of a Campus Awareness Program - forums for discussion, campus communications, integration with Liaison communications and activities
- Incorporation of SC program elements into existing events and communication opportunities (NFO, Graduate Student Orientation, Freedom to Read, Author Recognition etc.)
- Campus outreach - begin dialog and build relationships with campus partners in order to enable new collaborative efforts in support of scholarly communications.

Resources
SCST Task Force(s)
- Website: Content – Academic Liaison Librarian to co-ordinate
- Design/Development - Eric Bungay
- Library awareness and education: SCST and program element coordinators
- Communications: SCST and User Communications Committee

Author Rights, Copyright and Publishing Models

Goal
Raise awareness, educate and encourage action with regards to author rights, copyright, and publishing options.

Objectives
- Establish the Library as an expert in the area of author rights, copyright, and publishing options (working in conjunction with the Office of Research and other college experts) by identifying library experts for contact, making resources available on the web, and providing current awareness updates
- Facilitate action through the promotion of publishing options and alternative publication models
- Promote the use of Creative Commons licensing (i.e. author identifies appropriate use of work with attribution upfront “some rights reserved” rather than “all rights reserved”)
- Promote the use of an author addendum to copyright agreements where the author retains some rights to their work (i.e. allowing for submission in repositories and posting on their website)
- Measure impact through adoption rates

Resources
- Information Resources Unit [program coordinator(s) from within this unit]
- E-Learning Operations
- Academic Liaison Unit
Institutional Repository

Goal
To promote scholarly communication by collecting and preserving the University of Guelph’s intellectual output and ensuring greater accessibility.

Objectives
- Promote the repository as a vehicle for the transformation of scholarly communications, as well as, a service for contributors, a resource for researchers and a portrait of the research of the university
- Establish a repository that enables open access and the use of creative commons licensing
- Ensure the repository meets standards for access and harvesting in order to increase the impact and visibility of resources
- Collaborate with faculty and campus partners to create a content recruitment strategy (a faculty participation strategy) that speaks their language

Resources
- Program Coordinator – Digital Initiatives Librarian
- Institutional Repository Project Team
- Graduate Studies
- Office of Research
- Academic Liaison Unit

Open Access Journal Publication

Mandate
Provide the support and infrastructure to publish open access journals for campus editors.

Objectives
- Promote the concept of open access
- Enable open access scholarly publication on campus
- Establish service agreement that identifies service levels and responsibilities for the library and editors
- Contribute to the national Synergies CFI initiative which will create a scholarly communications infrastructure to support open access to peer-reviewed journal literature and other research outputs

Resource
- Program Coordinator – Digital Initiatives Librarian
- Information Technology Services
- Academic Liaison Unit
- Ontario Synergies Node – Operational and Management Teams
- Campus partners

Digital Collections Development

Goal(s)
Contribute to the transformation of scholarly communication through participation in regional, national, and global digitization initiatives.
Provide resources and infrastructure for the creation, dissemination and preservation of digital scholarship with an emphasis on the development of new scholarship and non-traditional publication.

Objectives

- Establish digital collections development strategy and collections policy
- Identify high priority print collections for digitization
- Establish resource strategy (local or external partnerships) to meet digitization targets
- Establish digitization standards for internal projects and external digitization partners
- Develop access strategy for effective dissemination of digitized books and texts

Resources

- Program Coordinator – Head, Information Resources
- Information Resources Unit
- Archival and Special Collections
- Information Technology Services (ITS)
- Academic Liaison Unit
- Selected Academic Departments & Faculty

Consortia Licensing Initiatives

Goal

Capitalize on the lobbying power present in library consortia. Ensure scholarly communications issues are present in setting directions, policies and strategies for various library consortia involved in the licensing of electronic resources.

Objectives

- Advocate for change in the scholarly publishing community and forums
- Seek licensing terms for electronic resources that advance open access principles
- Adhere to strong principles in negotiation and licensing of published material

Resources

- Program Coordinator – Head, Information Resources
- Information Resources Committee
- OCUL IR Committee
- Canadian Research Knowledge Network (CRKN)
- Canadian Association of Research Libraries (CARL)

Best Practice Sites and Scholarly Communications Resources

Create Change (Developed by ARL and SPARC - Catherine’s favourite)
http://www.createchange.org/index.html

Libraries and Scholarly Communication – University of California Libraries
(examples of outreach toolkits and talking points for faculty discussions)
http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/scholarly/

Reshaping Scholarly Communication - University of California, Office of Scholarly Communication
http://ose.universityofcalifornia.edu/
Scope

The Scholarly Communication Collaborative will have a two-pronged focus: develop and implement as appropriate a coordinated plan for the University Libraries to inform and educate its staff, and recommend appropriate approaches for engaging the campus community in the policy and practice issues that surround the process of scholarly communication. The Collaborative should focus efforts on the dissemination or sharing of scholarly works. The creation aspects of scholarly communication, such as the development of collaborative tools, are out of scope for this group.

Context

Scholarly communication first entered our professional consciousness in the 1990s, centered on the topic of rising serials prices and their impact on libraries’ budgets. Our lexicon was one of problems, crises, and the clear definition of an enemy. Several years experience working in this arena has led to a more informed, broader perspective – part of a natural evolutionary process. Formerly we focused almost exclusively on the economic case, with some real successes. A number of faculty and administrators did become outraged and engaged. But many also told us the system works just fine for them; publishers told regulators that the real problem is under funding of universities. To achieve a marked, sustained impact on scholarly communication, librarians need to be advocates for faculty and administrative action. Scholars must be the new face of this effort and focus on how the present system restricts access to their scholarship. In other words, this is no longer just a library problem of serials inflation (with a spillover effect of reduced monograph purchases), but a series of scholarly communication issues and opportunities owned by scholars, their campuses and their societies. As librarians, we are uniquely positioned to serve as educators and advocates for influencing the development of new forms of scholarly communication. Our expertise with traditional publishing, digital technologies, and intellectual property, coupled with our liaison model makes us well situated to provide leadership for reshaping scholarly communication.

We still recognize access problems caused by continued high subscription costs, changing copyright laws, and the licensing of access. Current publishing models are still not economically sustainable. But there is a growing awareness of new opportunities for more sustainable models through ongoing advances in technology. There is genuine hope that the symbiotic relationship between higher education institutions, scholarly societies, and commercial publishers, which could previously be characterized as tense and antagonistic, will realize more cooperative and beneficial partnerships in the future.

Even as we envision a future where productive partnerships are the norm, we know the road ahead will be bumpy for a while. We are trying to change systems that are largely out
of the control of any one campus. The recent ARL / ACRL Institute on Scholarly Communication was designed to prepare participants to be educators and advocates, and to develop sustained campus programs informed by the sharing of peers’ best practices, rather than a series of singular efforts that have limited impact. We need to develop collective action in arenas such as e-resource licensing and educating faculty on author’s rights. While acting locally is an important component; we must also spend some energy on legislative advocacy. Through the cumulative effect of our actions we can accomplish infinitely more than we could alone.

Sponsors
- Linda Watson, Director, Health Sciences Libraries
- Karen Williams, AUL for Academic Programs
- Charles Speland, Collection Development Officer; Liaison to the Collaborative

Initial Co-chairs
- Dan Donnelly, Copyright Information & Education
- Jim Stemper, Collection Development

Purpose / Focus
- Collaborative members will develop deeper expertise in scholarly communication; will share knowledge and provide support and leadership to colleagues
- Define baseline expertise that all liaisons should possess
- Plan, develop and deliver professional development programming in scholarly communication to all Libraries staff
- Inform and influence collection management policies and practices in support of sustainable models of scholarly communication
- Coordinate efforts with University Digital Conservancy, particularly around related policies and educational efforts
- Communicate regularly with Libraries staff
- Raise campus awareness of scholarly communication issues
- Involve the Senate Library Committee in the efforts of this group
- Assess need for and develop, revise, update and maintain web sites, brochures and other publications related to scholarly communication and intellectual property
- Facilitate partnerships with UM faculty, students, campus offices, CIC libraries, and other partners as appropriate
- Assess need for, develop and deliver campus programming in partnership with campus stakeholders
- Develop a mechanism for an ongoing environmental scan and inventory of issues, including attention to campus priorities, interests, and needs
- Create a three year plan for a campus scholarly communication program using a collaborative process for designing goals; update and revise plan as necessary, to reflect what we learn from environmental scans

Program Priorities 06-07
- Develop librarians with expertise in author’s rights issues specifically, and scholarly communication broadly, so they feel confident to work with faculty and graduate students in this arena.
- Develop sharable, reusable materials for librarians to use with faculty and students
- Encourage faculty to manage the copyrights in their work. Provide the information resources and tools to do so, including a publishing infrastructure that encourages innovative dissemination of their work through the University Digital Conservancy. This campus education program is envisioned as happening at the department level, through liaisons and Collaborative members
- Begin development of a campus program plan, which includes identification of program priorities and development of timelines.
- Communicate regularly with Libraries staff through the Monday Memo, an established wiki, and other means as appropriate
Timeline
° Professional development program on author's rights completed by mid-February to allow librarians time to work with faculty and graduate students before end of spring semester.
° Plan and timeline for author's rights awareness program and materials for librarians to use completed by mid-February

Collaborative Members
Brent Allison
Laura Dale Bischof
Katherine Chew
Linda Eells
Kris Fowler
Laurel Haycock
Beth Kaplan
Charles Spetland

Time Commitment
Collaborative members should plan to spend 2-4 hours per week on this work in the initial phase.

Stakeholders
° Academic Programs Directors
° Academic Programs staff
° Health Sciences Libraries staff
° Collections Council
° Libraries Organization Development
° University community

Budget
For FY 06-07 there is some funding to support staff development efforts.

Related Issues / Projects
° University Digital Conservancy
° Copyright Information & Education Initiative
° Mellon funded project with CLA
° EthnShare project
° Sciences Assessment project
° Rights Management

Collaborative Review
° The initial co-chairs agreed to lead this effort for the first six months, to get the program up and running. The sponsors will consult with the group and the co-chairs and appoint an ongoing chair(s) by April 30, 2007.
° After this first six-month review, the Sponsors will conduct a review of the Collaborative at the end of each fiscal year to determine if any changes need to be made to the group membership, chair(s), and/or its charter.
Scholarly Communications Task Force

Charge

Introduction:
The system of scholarly communication is a complex matrix of intellectual property, publishing practices and economics, legislative action, technological developments, and academic expectations for tenure, promotion, research, and publication. Scholarly communication has become an increasing concern of the Libraries and the University administration as it is apparent that the Libraries’ ability to acquire and provide access to information is intimately tied to the healthy functioning and interplay of the elements within this system. To support the Libraries’ role in the system and to be a proactive agent in facilitating change, the Scholarly Communications Steering Committee has been established.

Charge:

- Develop strategies and actions, set timelines, and determine outcomes that will advance the Libraries efforts to facilitate change.
- Track local, national, and international developments within the broad area of scholarly communications.
- Coordinate the Libraries' educational efforts in the area of scholarly communications. Stimulate discussion, generate supporting material and develop venues for communication and education.
- Seek collaborative ventures internally and with other institutions.
- Explore and identify possible high impact initiatives that the Libraries could either launch or support, such as the establishment of a competitive scholarly electronic journal, participation in an open archive project or the creation of an institutional repository.
- Identify potential faculty partnerships for demonstrations/discussions of alternatives to traditional scholarly communication venues with an eye towards implementing local experiments.
- Advise the Director, Information Services, Collections, and Scholarly Communication on actions and initiatives that should be taken and resources needed.
- Establish working groups as necessary to carry out the work of the committee.
- Consult broadly with individuals, groups, and units as needed.
Assistant/Associate University Librarian for Scholarly Communications and Collections

Cornell University Library (CUL) seeks a dynamic and knowledgeable manager to provide creative leadership for the Library’s innovative scholarly communications and renowned collection development programs. Reporting to the University Librarian, the successful candidate will participate in system-wide stewardship, resource allocation, policy development, planning, and fundraising; serve on the Library’s senior management team; and chair a cross-disciplinary and cross-functional executive advisory group. The successful candidate will initiate sustainable collaborative relationships with other libraries and institutions and will lead the Library’s partnerships with scholars and scientists in the creation and dissemination of knowledge.

From its leadership in conceptualizing collection development over 25 years ago, through pioneering digital projects such as Making of America, to the present commitment to developing new channels for scholarly communication, Cornell University Library has initiated and supported thoughtful transformation of collections, services, and resources that serve and advance instruction, research, and scholarship. For 18 years, the late Ross Atkinson provided inspiring leadership in the development of Cornell’s internationally acclaimed collections, now nearing 8 million volumes. The Cornell University Library now seeks an energetic and creative colleague to shape and implement a shared vision of the Library’s role in the provision of information and the advancement of knowledge through varied means, including material and electronic collections.

The AUL for Scholarly Communications and Collections will be responsible for planning, organization, policy development, and implementation of the Library’s scholarly communications and collections programs.

- Provides policy, context, and strategic direction for the Center for Innovative Publishing, which includes numerous entrepreneurial electronic publishing and open access repository activities such as Project Euclid, DPabS, and DSpace.
- Serves as the Library’s primary spokesperson for collections and scholarly communications to faculty, students, alumni, and administrators, and forges collaborations with academic departments and programs. Works with academic departments to assess the impact of proposed new academic emphases on the collections budget and aligns resources effectively with academic priorities.
- Leads the Library’s collection development and management programs, including the work of 45 subject specialists. Oversees the selection of materials in a wide variety of formats and languages. Engages with the information provider community to develop the broadest terms of access to serve the academic user community.

Cornell University is an equal opportunity, affirmative action educator and employer.
• Administers directly a materials budget of over $12 million and coordinates a total materials budget of $17 million for the 20 libraries comprising the Cornell University Library, including resources from the Weill Cornell Medical Library, the Cornell Law Library, the Johnson School of Management, the School of Hotel Administration and the contract college libraries (agriculture, applied social sciences, labor relations, life sciences, and veterinary medicine).

• Depending on qualifications of the successful candidate, may oversee the Library’s Special Collections, including the University Archives and the Division of Rare and Manuscript Collections.

• Works collaboratively and library-wide with unit, division, and functional heads in all areas to develop strategic directions for collections in an era of increasing digital access, changing modes of information dissemination, and growing interlibrary interdependence.

• Participates in recruiting and hiring librarians with collections and scholarly communications responsibilities; oversees their training and evaluation in these areas. Fosters professional development of librarians and staff to meet the challenges of a rapidly changing environment.

• Represents the Cornell University Library on local, regional, university, national, and international committees and initiatives in the areas of scholarly communications and collections.

**Required:** MLS or appropriate graduate degree. Significant experience in a major research university with at least five years in research library collection development and/or scholarly publishing/communications; significant experience in digital library programs and/or electronic publishing. Deep knowledge of current trends in scholarly communications and collection development, with strong expertise in digital collection development. Experience in increasingly responsible positions with demonstrated excellent administrative abilities including leadership, effective supervisory and budgetary skills, and commitment to diversity. Ability to effect change in a challenging and complex environment. Excellent communication and interpersonal skills; enthusiasm for collaborative work. Ability to nurture effective and positive relationships with faculty.

**Desired:** Ph.D. Experience in the innovation and promotion of new technologies and services. Experience in management and planning for archives and special collections.

**Background:** Cornell University is an Ivy League comprehensive research university located in Ithaca in the scenic Finger Lakes region of upstate New York. The town and university offer a unique cosmopolitan and international atmosphere in a beautiful natural setting of waterfalls, gorges, and lakes. The university comprises 14 schools with 2600 faculty members and 20,000 students enrolled in undergraduate, graduate and professional schools. The Cornell University Library is a vigorous professional organization of 468 staff with a strong track record in innovation and service quality. It consists of 20 libraries, including a nearby high-density storage facility with a capacity of 6.8 million volumes. It contains nearly 8 million printed volumes, 62,000 current serials, 378,000 networked electronic resources, and rich materials in other formats. Ranking 9th among 113 North American academic library members of the Association of Research Libraries, the Library was a recipient of the Association of College and Research Libraries’ Excellence in Academic Libraries Award in 2002.
Scholarly Communication Officer

Duke’s newly created Scholarly Communication Officer will coordinate scholarly communication activities for Duke University by taking a leadership role in building a scholarly communications program and educating the university community about intellectual property issues and their impact on the nature and conduct of scholarly inquiry and instruction. This position reports to the Director of Academic Technology and Instructional Services. It is a three-year term appointment with the possibility of renewal.

Responsibilities

- Directs copyright activities for the university’s libraries and serves as copyright advisor to the university community; serves as the libraries’ primary resource on fair use and other copyright issues; assists with obtaining copyright permissions.
- Sustains development of the Libraries’ scholarly communication Web site; organizes educational forums on scholarly communication topics as they relate to academia and to research libraries.
- Represents the interests of Duke University Libraries and the university community in the development of university policy on copyright, the public domain, user privacy, and other scholarly communication issues.
- Monitors national scholarly communication policy issues, informs and educates the Duke community of their significance and participates in campus efforts to ensure that scholars, students and libraries in the digital environment retain the full benefits of the current and evolving intellectual property regime.
- Works in close consultation and cooperation with university’s Office of General Counsel, the Office of Information Technology, academic departments, and senior university administrators on issues and programs related to scholarly communication.
- As appropriate, coordinates work with the Triangle Research Libraries Network on issues and programs related to scholarly communications.
- Performs other related duties incidental to the work described herein.
POSITION DESCRIPTION

OFFICIAL TITLE
Scholarly Communication Librarian

TITLE CODE

WORKING TITLE
Scholarly Communication Librarian

POSITION CODE

APPOINTMENT STATUS
Faculty, Tenure-track, Annual, 100% FTE

ORGANIZATION AND LOCATION
This position is part of Public Services and is located on the 4th floor of the Pullman campus of Washington State University.

Outreach and
Holland Library, located at

BASIC FUNCTION
The primary responsibility of this position is to formulate plans for moving the WSU Libraries forward in meeting the challenges of changing modes of scholarly communication.

REPORTS TO
Assistant Dean, Public Services and Outreach

SUPERVISORY RESPONSIBILITY
This position does not supervise or lead any other positions.

DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES:

A. Scholarly Communication (70%):

1. Monitor and report on current developments in scholarly communication, open access, institutional repositories, and related legislative initiatives.
2. Inform library faculty, research faculty, graduate students, and University administrators of changes in scholarly communication and ways in which they can contribute to new and evolving methods for distribution of research results.
3. Develop educational opportunities for sharing information about scholarly communication, open access, institutional repositories (specifically the WSU Research Exchange), and legislative actions that might affect these issues.
4. Develop and maintain the Libraries Scholarly Communication Website and assist in the development of Web-based information for the Research Exchange.
5. In collaboration with the Libraries Systems office personnel and other library staff, develop policies governing deposit of content in the Libraries repository, the WSU Research Exchange.
6. Help develop procedures and workflows to expedite content deposit in Research Exchange.
7. Serves as official WSU Libraries’ representative to institutional, regional and national organizations at the request of Assistant Deans, or Dean.

B. Professional/Scholarly Activities (20%)

1. Keeps current on trends and developments in the areas of scholarly communication, open access, institutional repositories, and related areas by reading professional literature, monitoring appropriate email lists, participating in professional organizations and committees, and attending workshops, institutes, seminars and conferences at local, state, regional, national and international levels.

2. Conducts research in areas of library and information science related to this position or other scholarly subjects for potential publications and/or presentations.

3. Share with library colleagues and department faculty and staff relevant information gained from professional activities and use that knowledge to improve departmental operations.

C. Service to the Library, University and the Public (10%)

1. Serves on library working groups, search committees, standing committees, and ad hoc groups as appropriate.

2. Serves on WSU university committees and task forces.

SIGNATURES BLOCK

This position description describes the essential functions and qualifications for the position. This document does not exclude an opportunity for modifications consistent with providing reasonable accommodation. This position description is not a contract. Your signature indicates that you have read this position description and understand the essential functions and qualifications of the position.

________________________________________________________________________
Employee Date

________________________________________________________________________
First-Level Supervisor Date

________________________________________________________________________
Second-Level Supervisor Date
Scholarly Communication Web Sites
Regain Control of Scholarly Communication

The University of California's scholars and their partners across the academy are reshaping scholarly communication. Understand the challenges, the crises they have produced, and opportunities to address them.

View a summary...

Current News & Issues

- Proposal for a UC Open Access Policy
- UC Libraries report onvalue-based journal pricing

The Facts

Current scholarly publishing models are not economically sustainable. Researchers and students have access to a diminishing fraction of relevant scholarship. But remedies and alternatives are being developed and tested.

Learn about:

- The economics of publishing
- Alternatives for scholarly communication

UC Responses

- Scholarly Publishing Initiatives
- Systemwide Faculty Committee
- Systemwide Administrative Committee
- UC Libraries’ Program
- Office of Scholarly Communication

T A K E  A C T I O N

Scholars influence the scholarly communication system to increase the impact and benefit of your scholarship

- Review and discuss the UC Open Access Policy proposal
- Manage your intellectual property
  - Retain certain copyrights
  - Maximize the reach and impact of your work
- Use alternative forms of publishing
  - Deposit your work in open access repositories
  - Submit to open access journals
- Support sustainable scholarly communication
  - Build your influence with publishers
  - Promulgate society publishing best practices
  - Support publishing experiments and new business models
About the Libraries

Scholarly Communication

"Scholarly communication" describes both the dissemination of and access to scholarship and research in a variety of formats and states of completion, such as published books or journal articles, research results and data sets, and drafts of papers. In recent years the concept of scholarly communication has also begun to connotate faculty collaborating with publishers, librarians, and others, in solving the gneous problem of the inability of libraries to keep up with the ever-increasing volume and cost of scholarly resources.

The UC Davis General Library joins many U.S. academic libraries which partner with faculty to address the scholarly communication challenges facing universities. The issues of copyright, intellectual property, journal costs, and library budgets all affect the ability of academic institutions to provide access to research results and instructional materials.

UC Davis General Library

Faculty Action and Copyright

Faculty play an influential role in addressing the issues and identifying potential solutions since they create, edit, and review research data and benefit significantly from publication of journals and monographs.

The following white papers are the product of the Academic Council Special Committee on Scholarly Communication (SCSC) under the collective title Responding to the Challenges Facing Scholarly Communication:

- Evaluation of Publications in Academic Personnel Processes (draft 12/05)
- The Case of Journal Publishing (draft 12/05)
- The Case of Scholarly Book Publishing (draft 12/05)
- Scholarly Societies and Scholarly Communication (draft 12/05)
- The Case of Scholars' Management of Their Copyright (draft 12/05)
- Proposal for UC Faculty – Scholarly Work Copyright Rights Policy (draft 12/05)

Intellectual Property Information

The Library's Copyright & Intellectual Property web site provides information and guides to UC Davis, University of California, United States, and international policies and law on the topics of copyright, patents, trademarks, and licensing. This web site also provides links to the related topics of scholarly electronic publishing initiatives and the scholarly communication challenges facing universities. The UC Davis General Library provides guidance on copyright for faculty posting articles to a website, and protecting copyright for published articles.

Librarian Subject Specialists

Librarian Subject Specialists are assigned to each discipline and provide a wide range of services, including collection assessment and development, specialized reference consultation, and introductions to library resources for classes with intensive library projects.

University of California

Reshaping Scholarly Communication

Through the California Digital Library's web site, the Office of Scholarly Communication, coordinates the UC libraries actions associated with scholarly publishing and presents options for campus librarians and faculty to consider. Campus librarians are available to discuss options for scholarly publishing, such as the evolving eScholarship program.

eScholarship Repository

The California Digital Library hosts the eScholarship repository, the institutional repository for the UC System. Here you'll find papers, postprints, journals and seminar series from across the UC system. The mission of eScholarship is to facilitate and support scholar-led innovations in scholarly communication by providing an alternative publishing mechanism. All papers are searchable through the site and organized by campus, department or research unit. Explore what's happening at UC Davis.

A New World of Scholarly Communication

In the November 7, 2003 Chronicle of Higher Education, retired UC President Richard C. Atkinson discussed the future of university libraries and the mushrooming costs of academic publications which faculty and higher education leaders must address to ensure the future viability of scholarly communications.

Campus Library Scholarly Communication Programs

Describes the challenges and strategic plans related to managing campus library collections. Contains information on collection management strategies from libraries at Berkeley, Davis, Irvine, Los Angeles, San Francisco and Santa Barbara.

Other Academic Research Libraries
Scholarly Communication Crisis

University of Connecticut Faculty Senate Resolution on Scholarly Communication
Approved February 9, 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Background</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is the Scholarly Communication Crisis?</td>
<td>What the Crisis Means to UConn</td>
<td>What Faculty Can Do To Help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading List</td>
<td>Journal Price Inflation at UConn</td>
<td>Policies and Proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Sites</td>
<td>Other Journal Price Studies</td>
<td>Open Access and Other Alternative Publishing Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative Updates</td>
<td>Book Price Studies</td>
<td>What Librarians Can Do</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is the Scholarly Communications Crisis?

What is the scholarly communication crisis? It is the loss of access to the scholarly research literature, as the rising cost of journal subscriptions far out-strip institutional library budgets. Each year libraries can afford to subscribe to fewer and fewer journals. Over the last 15 years, the price of research journals has risen over 200% (compare with the Consumer Price Index, up 57% over this same period). Consequently, academic libraries are subscribing to fewer and fewer titles - and slashing book buying as well (see ARL's The Impact of Serial Costs on Library Collections). The inflation is due to a number of factors; most prominently, commercial publishers controlling an increasing percentage of titles, at the expense of scholarly societies and university presses. Profit margins for commercial publishers typically are at least 20% - with the profits coming from university libraries. Mergers and acquisitions exacerbate the trend, to the point where five publishers now produce over 50% of the science journals received at the University of Connecticut.

In short, the current system of scholarly publishing is unsustainable. Unable to keep up with the annual price
SCHOLARLY COMMUNICATION

SCHOLARLY COMMUNICATION MATTERS
The University Library has developed this website as a resource for the University of Illinois community. It is intended to encourage dialogues: between faculty and publishers, between faculty and the library, between faculty and their scholarly societies, and within departments. Why is this discussion important?

- **Scholarly communication is in flux.** The web publishing revolution has made it possible to disseminate research more quickly and inexpensively than ever before. At the same time, some publishers have raised prices to a point where libraries are having to make incredibly difficult budget decisions.

- **Scholarly communication is valuable.** In addition to intellectual value, your research has economic value. Even though you provide it free of charge to publishers, it can be packaged and sold for great profits. More than ever before there are alternative publishing options, such as open access, for you to consider that will give your work greater visibility.

- **Scholarly communication is the lifeblood of the university.** The dissemination of knowledge is an imperative of land grant universities like Illinois. Anything that threatens access to, or the free flow of, research and ideas is a threat to the health of the entire system.

ISSUES IN THE SPOTLIGHT

- OPEN ACCESS
  - MOVEMENT
  - How does OA work? Are OA journals being read?

- SKYROCKETING JOURNAL COSTS
  - What is the impact on scholarship and libraries?

- MONOGRAPH PUBLISHING
  - Do you need a book to gain tenure in the humanities?
The Crisis in Scholarly Communication

The Issues
The publishing system enabling scholars to distribute research results to a wide audience is in danger of collapse. Crushing price increases for peer-reviewed journals have far outpaced meager growth in library budgets. The result, within a few years, could be drastic reductions in library purchases of books, journals, and digital resources in every academic field. Scientists, researchers, and scholars will lose access to the information critical to their research and their careers.

The purpose of this web page is to provide information on this crisis, the reasons behind it, and possible responses. UNM faculty, staff, and students and staff can learn what the university is trying to do and how they can take part.

Information available on this site:
- Annual Symposium
- Background on the crisis
- Introduction to the Open Access movement
- Open Access at UNM
- Promotion, Tenure, and Open Access
- What you can do
- Links to further information

Background on the Crisis
Scholars depend on a communications system to distribute their research and commentary to colleagues. In another decade or so, that system could be crippled or destroyed.

Since the late 1980s, academic publishers have increased prices of scholarly journals far faster than libraries have been able to increase their budgets. If this situation continues, libraries around the world will be forced to cancel hundreds of journal subscriptions and book purchases in the coming years. Researchers will lose access to the latest findings in their field, because the institutions where they work won’t be able to afford the prices publishers impose.

Consider the following information from the Association of Research Libraries, available at [www.createxchange.org](http://www.createxchange.org):

- From 1987 to 1999, the U.S. consumer price index increased by a cumulative total of 52%. The unit cost of academic library journal subscriptions increased 206%.

- During this period, academic and scientific publishers achieved profit margins of up to 40% per year - far more than the 5% annual average for the publishing industry as a whole.

- To compensate for increasing journal prices, the average U.S. research library purchased 26% less books in 1999 than it did in 1986.

- By 2015, if current trends continue, the average research library will have to reduce its number of annual journal subscriptions by as much as 45% compared to 1986 levels. For most libraries, this will mean hundreds less titles on the shelves or accessible via the Internet.
SCHOLARLY COMMUNICATION AND OPEN ACCESS PUBLISHING

An Overview of the Scholarly Communication System

Scholarly communication is the system whereby researchers and educators communicate their ideas to peers and others in the scholarly community, traditionally through established mechanisms such as refereed professional journals. It includes the creation, evaluation, distribution, and preservation of the output of researchers and scholars. It is the essential force that gives life and energy to the university, and libraries play a key role in the process as they provide the access to and preservation of scholarship without which further scholarship would be impeded.

The System in Peril

The scholarly communication crisis refers to the current and future erosion of access to the scholarly literature resulting from the inability of institutional library budgets to keep pace with the rising cost of journal subscriptions. For more information, see:

What is the scholarly communication crisis?

What can be done? What is being done?

One response to the scholarly communication crisis is open access publishing. For the past several years, open access publishing initiatives have been proposed to increase the visibility of scholarly output. In its purest form, open access publishing provides immediate public access to scholarly publications on the Internet, whether in the form of open access journals or through some form of archiving. Charles W. Bailey, Jr., of the University of Houston's University Libraries, has published a comprehensive bibliography of open access literature and key open access concepts:

Key Open Access Concepts (concise)

Open Access Bibliography: Liberating Scholarly Literature with E-Prints and Open Access Journals (expanded)

Several statements advocating for open access in scholarly communication have been promulgated:

Principles/Statements

Following these principles, a variety of implementations now exist. Some are pure forms of open access; others are "hybrids," such as business models that delay access for a period of time or provide only partial open access. Examples:

Repositories
Scholarly Communications Issues

Scholarly communications involve complex dynamics among intellectual property, the economics of publishing, technological developments, legislative action, and the academic culture for research, publication, promotion, and tenure. A number of factors, especially the increasing commercialization of scholarly publishing and dramatic increases in journal costs, have decreased scholars' access to essential research resources all over the world. Each year fewer scholarly publications are available to scholars worldwide. Universities are acquiring a smaller portion of available journals and monographs, even though the production of scholarly information is growing exponentially. Faculty members publish articles that universities buy back at premium prices.

Administrators, scholars and librarians are pursuing options for "reclaiming" the research produced in the academy. National information associations, scholarly societies, librarians, and researchers are experimenting with alternatives to make scholarly research easily accessible to scholars, their students, and to the world at large. Their efforts are resulting in the emergence of systems for collecting and disseminating peer-reviewed articles online and growth in personal web sites that contain faculty publications. Libraries are becoming scholarly publishers. Universities are creating digital repositories of the intellectual work of their faculty and students. The following links connect to associations, projects, and visions illustrative of sharing scholarly communications for the common good.

UT Scholarly Communications Committee

UT Blog: Scholarly Communication Issues @ the UT Libraries

Associations
Association of Research Libraries
Office of Scholarly Communications
Council on Library and Information Resources
Digital Library Federation
SPARC - Scholarly Publishing & Academic Resources Coalition

Raising Awareness
Changing Scholarly Publishing: A Guide for Graduate Students (brochure)
Scholars Under Siege: Changing our Scholarly Publishing Culture (brochure)

ARL Brochures
The Book & the Scholar: Celebrating the Year of the University Press
Talking Points for Discussions with Faculty and Graduate Students
University of Tennessee Faculty Senate Scholarly Publishing Resolution, May 1, 2006
Cornell University Library Issues in Scholarly Communication
Scholarly Communication: Academic Values and Sustainable Models (UC Berkeley Center for Studies in Higher Education)
Libraries & Scholarly Communication (University of California Libraries)
Off the Page and Onto the Web...Essays on Scholarly Publishing @ UT
Scholarly Communications (Boston College Libraries)
Scholarly Publishing & The Common Good: Changing our Culture (University of Tennessee symposium)

Intellectual Property
Copyright Information for University of Tennessee Faculty
University of Tennessee Office of the General Counsel
Know Your Copyrights (Association of Research Libraries) New!
Creative Commons Licenses
University of Minnesota Copyright Information and Education
The University of Texas Office of the General Counsel
North Carolina State University Scholarly Communication Center

Open Access
Framing the Issue: Open Access
Budapest Open Access Initiative
Directory of Open Access Journals
Open Access News (Blog edited by Peter Suber)
Tools for Open Access Publishing
   - BOAI Open Access Journal Guides
   - Open Journal Systems (free software for journal management and publishing)

Proposals & Principles
Copyright Web Sites
How to Retain Ownership of Your Copyright when Dealing with Publishers

(A Very Short Guide to Negotiation)

The term "negotiation" may be a bit formal, and may bring to mind images of legally sophisticated advocates vying for advantage over one another by inserting arcane phrases into a complex document. Rest assured that such a scenario is not being referred to here. Nevertheless, in seeking to retain some or all of your copyright when submitting a manuscript for review and publication, you are entering a negotiation, and ASU Libraries offer this succinct guide to help you be successful in your dealings with publishers.

First and foremost, understand that you are in control. You are not begging the publisher for a favor, a hand-out or a concession. Your manuscript is your intellectual property — you own it. The publisher is asking you to give up ownership of your intellectual property so that the publisher can turn around and sell that property to its subscribers. The publisher is gaining a major benefit in obtaining your work for free, so you are in an excellent position to ask to retain certain rights. In fact, all the publisher needs in order to publish your work is your permission. You do not need to transfer all your rights to the publisher.

A Note on Individual Rights: "Copyright" is actually a group or "bundle" of rights. An author has complete discretion over these rights and can transfer all or part of them, or even just components of the rights themselves. A full discussion of copyright is available in F.A.Q. and will soon be available as a podcast on this website.

A successful negotiation with a publisher can be a very easy process and most of the time it will follow the same pattern. Once your article has been peer reviewed and accepted for publication, the publisher will send you a letter along with a legal document for you to sign (usually called an "assignment of copyright" or "transfer of copyright"). You contact the publisher and ask to retain certain rights. A back and forth discussion will ensue, as you try to understand each other's needs and concerns, and finally, an acceptable agreement is reached and the final draft signed.

The important steps in this process are preparation before contacting the publisher, the actual back and forth discussion and closing the deal with a signed writing.

Preparing

- Understand the basics of copyright, so that you know what you own and what you can transfer in a copyright agreement. (See Copyright and Copyright and Intellectual Property Glossary)
- Make a list of the things you want and the things you need.
- Consider how your requests affect the publisher.

The most important step in any negotiation is preparation. To be successful know what you need (and what you cannot concede), and what you want (and what you're willing to concede); then consider these things from the publisher's perspective. It is helpful to reduce these considerations to writing because the process focuses your thoughts and can often result in finding that your initial
perception of your goals isn’t entirely accurate, or that your goals change with further consideration.

What you need depends on what definite plans you have for your work after publication: these are things that are “deal-breakers” meaning that if a publisher won’t agree to them you will be willing to walk away from that publisher and find another avenue for publication, or maybe decide not to publish the article for the time being. For instance, if you are working on a compilation that will form a textbook, then you need to retain the right to use the article as part of a derivative work or compilation. If a publisher is unwilling to concede these things, can your textbook survive without this particular material, or is the textbook more important than the separate publication of this single article? If the textbook is more important, then this is a true need and a deal-breaker.

What you want depends on potential uses for your work in the future. Maybe it would be useful to post your article to a departmental or institutional repository to share with your colleagues, though the department doesn’t require it. In order to do this, you must retain at least a limited right to republish and/or distribute the work. You can seek to retain the necessary rights and if the publisher will not agree, then you can still concede the issue and move on to other areas of the negotiation.

Consider also what the publisher needs: most publishers are in business to make money, while others exist to disseminate scholarly research but must still pay for overhead. So when you ask to retain certain rights, it’s important to know ahead of time how this will affect the publisher’s revenue stream. For instance, if you are seeking to retain the right to post your article to a departmental or institutional repository to share with your colleagues, a publisher may worry that permitting free, unlimited access to the article in such a way will detrimentally affect sales of their journal. Knowing this will help you in later discussions with the publisher.

Discussing

- Where possible, have in-person or telephone discussions. Correspondence works, but it is more time consuming and lacks some of the advantages of verbal conversations.
- Frame your requests in a way that explains your needs and offers to work with the publisher to find an acceptable agreement.
- Remember to barter.

The most important thing to remember is that communication is the key to success. Face-to-face communication is best, because individuals engaged in discussion can see body posture and facial expressions, and hear vocal tones and inflections that convey information subtlety. Plus, when meeting face to face, there is a natural tendency for the parties to try and resolve all of the outstanding issues at the meeting, avoiding the need for additional meetings. Of course, many times it won’t be possible to negotiate face to face, and so telephone conversations are the next best method of communicating, because they still convey two of the three benefits of face to face communication.

Most often, however, you will likely be dealing with correspondence, either traditional or electronic, and so you will have to account for the limitations of these mediums. Because the recipient can’t read your posture or tense, it is very important to fully express everything in writing that would otherwise be conveyed in a face to face meeting. For instance, a short, direct email meant to save time can often be mistaken for terse, or even rude, by the recipient, and thus risks beginning negotiations on the wrong foot. More importantly however, a short, direct email risks failure because it does not allow for much information to pass to the recipient. Don’t assume that your motivations or needs are obvious to the publisher – explain why you seek to retain the enumerated rights.

For instance, if you’d like to retain the right to upload your work on Blackboard, explain how Blackboard is an integral part of your class plan, and how disruptive it would be to have your published work unavailable through that medium.

Overall, explanations are helpful to the process; however, keep in mind that many people, publishers included, view negotiations as a bartering game. They expect you to ask for more than you will ultimately accept, and they will initially offer less than they will ultimately accept. So, two important tenets of bartering in this context are (1) ask for more than you need, and (2) don’t tell the publisher which of your
requests are deal-breakers and which aren’t. During discussions, you can then trade away requests that matter less to you for requests that are more important (especially the deal-breakers).

Of course, it is not necessary to trade away a request entirely in order to come to agreement. If the publisher refuses a particular request, you can still attempt to gain the concession: ask what concerns caused them to refuse on this particular right, and suggest that you work together on a solution that addresses the needs of both parties. As an example, consider a request to retain the right to post your work on your personal website. If the publisher won’t agree to this, ask why. The answer might be that your website is available to the public, and so their exclusive content could be downloaded by anyone without a subscription. You could agree to post it behind a limited-access area of your site, or to post it six months after publication.

A Note on Opening Negotiations: it is much easier to pick up the phone and explain what you’re interested in doing, and then send along a follow up letter according to what is decided in the conversation. If that isn’t possible, sending a letter to the publisher explaining your interest in retaining certain rights, your reasoning and asking whether they’d prefer to a new contract an addendum to their contract is the next best thing. ASU Libraries provides some examples of contracts and addenda (“riders”) to help guide you.

Closing the Deal

- Make sure all agreements made are explicitly stated and understood before ending negotiations.
- Memorialize the agreement in a signed writing.

Although these steps sound obvious, they are very important and worth at least some small discussion. It is easier than it seems to misunderstand what a party is offering or agreeing to, and it is also very easy to forget details during a discussion. This is why it is important once you feel an agreement has been reached to restate the terms generally and have the other party review them before you end discussions.

Once you have agreed explicitly to the terms, a signed writing is necessary both because copyright must be transferred in writing under the law, and because promises made orally may or may not be enforceable after the fact. Although publishers are fairly sophisticated legally and should know better, you will find that too often they assure you that it will be alright to use your work in the ways you seek to, but they suggest that you simply sign their contract without getting these promises in writing. Don’t fall for this - insist on writing that reflects your agreement.

For More Information and Additional Resources

- Copyright and Intellectual Property Glossary
- Contract Sample
- Rider Sample
- Link to Addenda
Retaining Your Copyright: An Introduction to the Use of the Author's Addendum

What is covered by copyright?
Any content you create in a tangible format! Not only scholarly work, but even your to-do list at home, your monthly report, your email messages, your child’s art work or notes you take at meetings and presentations.

What is not covered by copyright?
- Facts
- Ideas
- Lists, e.g. telephone book!
- Public domain materials

Do I have to register copyright?
No! Copyright protection is automatic, but if you wish, you can register with the U.S. Copyright Office. You also may provide a copyright notice, for example: © 2005 Trisha L. Davis
More information is available at: http://www.copyright.gov/register/

What rights does the Copyright Law provide?
The Author’s Bundle of 5 Rights:
- Right to Reproduce
- Right to Prepare Derivative Works
- Right to Distribute
- Right to Display Publicly
- Right to Perform Publicly

And by default, the right to authorize others to exercise any of these rights.

What happens when I sign a Publisher’s Agreement?
You may unknowingly sign away all your personal rights, including Fair Use! This means you may have to request permission to:
- use your own works for a course pack;
- store a copy on your web site;
- distribute a copy to colleagues.
SO, WHAT CAN I DO?

- Explicitly retain ownership of your content.
- Transfer only "some" of your rights to the publisher.

WHAT RIGHTS CAN I RETAIN?

- The “Author’s 5 Basic Rights” in connection to any personal, professional or non-profit educational activities.
- The right to grant the author’s home institution any of the 5 Basic Rights.

HOW CAN I RETAIN THOSE RIGHTS?

- Only sign a publishing agreement after you read and understand the content.
- Talk to your publisher about granting only those rights needed for their publication.
- Try to keep all other rights, specifying those of particular value to you or your institution.

I'M NOT A LAWYER! IS THERE A PLACE I CAN GET INFORMATION?

Yes! There are several sources publicly available that you can use. Two convenient ones are from Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition (SPARC) and Indiana University.

SPARC Author’s Addendum, available at [www.arl.org/sparc/author/addendum.html](http://www.arl.org/sparc/author/addendum.html), was developed by Michael Carroll of the Villanova University School of Law.

Indiana University has two addenda available at: [www.copyright.iupui.edu/nego.doc.htm](http://www.copyright.iupui.edu/nego.doc.htm)

- **Addendum A**: Spells out specific rights retained by the author.
- **Addendum B**: Describes in general terms the rights retained by the author and the author's home institution

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Copyright Help Center
The Ohio State University Libraries
Science and Engineering Library, Room 002
175 West 18th Avenue
Columbus, Ohio 43210
(614) 688-5849
libcopyright@osu.edu

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 2.5 License. To view a copy of this license, visit [http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/2.5/](http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/2.5/)

Disclaimer: This publication is not meant as legal advice. It was prepared to inform authors about copyright. If legal advice or expert assistance is required, the services of a competent legal professional should be sought.

© 2007, The Ohio State University Libraries.
1858 Neil Avenue Mall
Columbus, OH
43210-1286
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Who Owns Your Work: Copyright in the Digital Age

Comment on this issue

It’s been ten years since CSU Libraries launched its Web site, and since then the Internet has revolutionized the way we bring you information. Today the Library provides you with access to more than 24,000 electronic journals and more than 198 databases, regardless of whether you’re at home, at the office, or out in the field. The Library Web site has no doubt transformed the way that CSU faculty and staff conduct their writing and research. The Internet has had a similar effect on the classroom, with students now able to do research from computer labs inside the Library, across campus, in their dorm rooms, and beyond. Thanks to the Library’s Electronic Reserve system, we’re also making it easier for you to share materials online with your students without the costly expense of paper copies.

As a society, we are in the midst of an information revolution. For the first time in history, Internet technology enables the dissemination of knowledge and the exchange of ideas both globally and instantly. The Internet is also transforming notions of authorship. As blogging, e-mail listservs, and other forms of online publishing have embraced academia, the ways in which we publish and share our work are being radically transformed. In the midst of this burgeoning technology, lawmakers are faced with important questions on the ways in which to govern—or, some would argue, to protect—information in the digital environment. This issue of Library Connection explores copyright in the digital age. Who owns creative work and who has the right to share it? For educators, the Know Your Copy Rights will serve as a quick guide to help you navigate some important questions when sharing digital content in the classroom. We’re happy to assist you in the Library and the General Counsel’s Office can also answer specific legal questions pertaining to copyright information. The article we present here in Library Connection is address to you as authors. It is meant to help you explore the options of ownership of your own creative work—the rights you have, the rights you sign away, and the rights you may want to keep.

Posted by Judea Franck at 05:31 PM | Permalink

Exploring Copyright

In an academic setting, publishing is essential. It enables us to communicate our research and teaching to others, to further the exploration of ideas and theories, to share discoveries and make important advances that directly impact our communities and quality of life. Ideally, publishing gives us a voice in the vast discourse of our fields. Most practically, it provides us with professional standing and enables us to pursue important advancements such as tenure. Most view publishing as the end result of months or sometimes years of toil—the products of our research and teaching. Once our work has been accepted, especially if it is to be published by a top tier journal, we often sign whatever paper the publisher puts in front of us. It is so important that our work has made the journey from our own desktop and into the wider world to be read, discussed, and hopefully cited that most of
Can Google inherit quality?  August 14, 2007

That is the question posed by Paul Duguid, a professor at UC Berkeley, the University of London and Santa Clara University, about the Google Books Project. His article, “Inheritance and Inefficiency: A Brief Survey of Google Books” was just published in First Monday, a peer-reviewed online journal about the internet.

Duguid’s point is that the Google Books project will really outstrip most other projects to digitize cultural artifacts, making them “appear inept and inadequate.” But the authority and quality of the Google project, Duguid argues, is based on a kind of inheritance from the reputation of the libraries involved. So Duguid sets out to see if Google really is the qualitative heir of Harvard and Stanford.

His results are disheartening. His search for a deliberately unconventional book, Sterne’s “Tristram Shandy,” returns results likely to confuse and discourage a casual reader. The first result on Google’s results list is a copy from Harvard, it is so badly scanned that it is virtually illegible, with words cut off by the gutter on nearly every line. Elsewhere the text fades into indecipherable scratchings. And some of Sterne’s eccentricities are missing, the black page of mourning for the dead Parson Yorick simply is not included in the Google scan. When Duguid tries the second result from his search, things get worse. The first page of the scan is blank and the second page puts the reader at the end of chapter one and the beginning of chapter two — of the second volume. Nothing informs the reader (other than comparison with a printed text) that they have been plunged into the middle of the book.

Duguid’s judgments on Google Books are harsh: the project ignores essential metadata like volume numbers, the quality of the scans are often inadequate, and sometimes editions that are best consigned to oblivion are given unserved prominence for no discernible reason that is his conclusion regarding the second text he found, from Stanford. Rather than inheriting quality from Harvard and Stanford, he concludes, “Google threatens not only its own reputation for quality and technological sophistication, but also those of the institutions that have allied themselves to the project.”

It is true that the real value of the Google Books Project is not so much to find reading matter for people as to direct them to which books are most likely to be of help or interest to them. Few people, one presumes, will try to read “Tristram Shandy” in the Google books format. But the failures of visual quality and metadata control threaten even the more modest vision of Google Books as a giant index. Without a higher degree of quality than Duguid discovered, it is hard to argue that Google is superior in any way to a comprehensive online catalog from a major library.

Yale says no to an OA flavor  August 10, 2007

The announcement this week that Yale University will no longer maintain its membership in BioMed Central is another example of the growing pains involved as scholar publishing adapts itself to new business models and forms of distribution.

BioMed Central is an open access publisher that relies on author fees and institutional memberships to pay the cost of online publishing. The resulting 110 peer-reviewed electronic journals are freely available to all users. But open access is not free, and Yale decided to withdraw its institutional membership, which covered the fees for all articles published in BioMed Central journals by Yale authors, because the price was getting too high. In one sense, this is good news for open access publishing, it means that lots of authors from this prestigious university are publishing in BioMed One journals. Clearly quality, peer-reviewed scholarship is compatible with open access. In its response to
ISSUES IN SCHOLARLY COMMUNICATION: SC News for the UIUC Community

August 9, 2007

Yale Drops Its Pre-Pay Membership to BioMed Central

As widely reported in the media, Yale University has dropped its institutional membership in BioMed Central.

This isn’t a reflection on lack of support in Yale’s part for the idea of open access; in fact, membership was dropped because Yale authors are apparently flocking to publish their articles in the openly accessible BMC journals, which made the cost to the library—which was picking up the publication fees for the papers—was out of hand. There were 41 BMC papers published by Yale authors in 2006; already in 2007 there have been 41 (as of July 29). The corresponding author, whom the institution pays the publication fees, was not necessarily a Yale author in all these cases. By taking an institutional “pre-pay” membership in BMC, the Yale library had opted to try to pay the BMC author publication fees (via the Institutional Membership program) and these fees put just a little bit too much for them to bear on top of the more and more Yale authors opting to publish in BMC titles.

To be sure, the article charges for publishing in BMC journals have been rising, too. Yale authors can, of course, continue to publish in BMC journals, and it will be interesting to see how many still opt for this. They will have to pay the page charges out of their grant money, as well. Half of the BMC authors have been doing.

As David Strom, Yale’s science librarian, noted on his blog, [http://library.yale.edu/venus/]

The libraries’ BioMedCentral membership represented an opportunity to test the technical feasibility and the business model of this OA publisher. While the technology proved acceptable, the business model failed to provide a viable long-term revenue stream built upon logical and scalable options. Instead, BioMedCentral has asked libraries for larger and larger contributions to subsidize their activities. Starting with 2005, BioMedCentral article charges cost the libraries $4,995, comparable to a single biomedical journal subscription. The cost of article charges for 2006 then jumped to $31,690. The article charges have continued to soar in 2007 with the libraries charged $29,935 through June 2007, with $34,965 or potential additional article charges in submission.

He goes on to conclude...

“We believe in the widest possible access to scholarly research supported by worldwide business models and think BioMedCentral develop a viable economic model which allows them to remain entirely where costs across all interested stakeholders, we would consider reviewing our financial support.”

BMCC Publisher, Matthew Goldblatt, has of course, [http://library.yale.edu/venus/2007/07/03/bmc-publishing-changes/], pointing out that the article publishing charges that were going to be $31,690 in 2006 were cut to $29,935 in 2007. He went on to suggest that libraries consider the future when instead of purchasing some subscriptions to journals it may be a role of the library to support open access publishing for the greater good. From his posting...

That is why BioMedCentral introduced its institutional membership scheme, which allows institutions to centrally support the dissemination of open access research in the same way that they centrally support subscription journals, thereby creating a “level playing field”.

In order to ensure that funding of open access publication is sustainable, we have encouraged institutions to set aside a small fraction of the indirect funding contribution that they receive from funders to create a central open access fund.

It should be noted that BMCC’s Institutional Membership program, whereby universities (usually the library) pay a pre-pay all or most of the author’s article fees is not the only way in which the institution can show its support for the BMC model of open access; BMC also offers a “sustaining membership” which is not tied to the number of articles submitted from an institution; it offers a modest (usually 15%) reduction in the article publication charge.

At this point, the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign is neither an Institutional nor a Supporting member of BMC.
Newsletters
Scholarly Communication News@BC

The Boston College Libraries have gone from strength to strength over the past decade with their collections, print, electronic, and other, having expanded dramatically. The Libraries are committed to continue building and making accessible strong collections in both traditional and digital formats in support of research and the curriculum. Nevertheless, the Libraries are challenged by the escalating quantity and costs of research publications that are rendering it increasingly difficult to purchase all the materials that will meet the scholarly needs of current and future faculty and students. On the other hand, while research libraries face complex and multi-faceted challenges, great innovative opportunities abound with respect to the dissemination of scholarship and research results. Growing numbers in the Academy are becoming aware that solutions to the problems facing libraries and to the various barriers restricting access to and dissemination of scholarship must center on the Academy reclaiming much of the power and control presently wielded by publishers or at least establish mechanisms, mainly electronic, for alternative diffusion of scholarship.

As a vehicle to discuss, publicize, and to garner feedback on some of these issues Boston College Libraries have recently established a blog, Scholarly Communication News@BC. This provides frequent information updates for the Boston College community about developing scholarly communication issues, policy debates, legislation and innovative examples of dissemination/discourse practices. Numerous other topics are candidates for discussion, for example Open Access; institutional and disciplinary repositories; authors’ rights and copyright; digital scholarship and its relation to promotion and tenure; publisher mergers and acquisitions; author pays publication options; Google Book Project; the Bergstrom Eigenfactor; journal bundling/aggregating/big deal subscriptions; Web 2.0; Federal Research Public Access Act; the effect of open access and downloads on citation impact; the

Alliance for Taxpayer Access; Directory of Open Access Journals. Many other subjects can be covered too.

The blog is fashioned with “permanent” links along a right section – subsections entitled: About (a brief description of the blog scope); Related Library Pages (local resources); Recommended Sites (national & international news); Academic Scholarly Communication Blogs (blogs created by peer institutions); and Blog Archive (links to older postings). The main area will be updated regularly, providing up-to-date news on the rapidly changing Scholarly Communication landscape. The libraries are providing this forum to inform and support discussions about posted news items. Contributors for both posting (posting requires an email invitation from blog administrators) and commenting are welcome. If you are interested in posting please contact Brendan Rappe or Mark Caprio.

Mark Caprio
eScholarship Program Manager
WHO SHOULD HAVE ACCESS TO FEDERALLY FUNDED RESEARCH?

Inside the 2006 Federal Research Public Access Act
Opening Acc
Exploring the Federal

If Only Someone Else Had Heard

After his experiences on the battlefields of World War I, Alexander Fleming made a shocking discovery—bacteria could be an even deadlier force than enemy artillery. In the startling conditions of trench warfare, infection caused 15 percent of war-related fatalities, or roughly 5.5 million out of 37 million total deaths. Fleming returned to his London laboratory driven to find some way to prevent these deaths. His pursuit eventually led to the discovery that mold, specifically penicillin, could kill bacteria. Today, penicillin has become one of our most successful defenses against infectious disease; however, when Fleming published his findings in the British Journal of Experimental Pathology in 1928, his work raised little interest and was nearly lost to scientific obscurity.

It was not until 1938, ten years later, that British scientist Ernst Chain and Australian scientist Howard Florey rediscovered Fleming’s article. On the eve of World War II, they began to test the effectiveness of Fleming’s “miracle” mold on human subjects. Chain, Florey, and an expanded team of scientists, later known as the Oxford Group, took their discoveries to America where USDA scientists perfected the production process, manufactured the drug in mass quantities, and distributed it to Allied forces. The new “wonder drug” saved countless lives that would have otherwise been lost to infection on the battlefields of Europe and Asia. In fact, after the introduction of penicillin, deaths from infection virtually disappeared. Since then, penicillin has saved millions more lives worldwide and is one of the most widely prescribed antibiotics.

Many of our most profound scientific discoveries share similarly humble beginnings. Anyone working in laboratories knows that it takes more than just one scientist, working in the predawn hours to unlock the secrets of the world. It takes another scientist, and then another, and then another to move from a first significant discovery to the practical application of research. Communication between researchers has long been the key to advancing research and accelerating the real world impact of those discoveries. Fortunately, the research community—with the assistance of scholarly associations, publishers, and libraries—has moved worlds beyond shouting “Eureka!” and running through the streets. Yet in today’s world, with information increasingly at one’s fingertips, it is amazing to note that some of the very same barriers that resulted in the ten-year delay of penicillin research and countless other discoveries still exist.

Research Public Access Act (FRPAA)

Scholars in all fields communicate their discoveries, ideas, and innovations largely through publication in peer-reviewed journals. Many of those scholars, working in universities around the country, depend on their university libraries to provide access to those journals through subscriptions. However, with journal prices escalating at rates that are two to three times greater than general inflation, this mode of communication is becoming increasingly impractical. Colorado State University Libraries provides the campus with over 31,000 current serials, including more than 23,000 full-text online journals, at a cost of approximately $3.6 million per year. That’s roughly 65 percent of the Libraries’ materials budget solely dedicated to supplying the campus with scholarship published in journals, leaving only 35 percent to spend on books and other important resources.

Unfortunately, in the past five years CSU Libraries has gone through two major journal cancellation projects due to exploding journal costs. Although the Libraries continues in its efforts to provide access to significant research findings via consortial partnerships, which permit the bulk purchase of journal titles in association with other universities, and an ever-expanding interlibrary loan effort, which vastly improves access to articles not in CSU’s own collection, access is shrinking—not growing—in a way that contradicts modern advances in technology.

The Internet should enable instantaneous, immediate communication between researchers and scholars. Just imagine if Fleming could have sat down at a computer and told colleagues in England and beyond about the miracle mold that could knock out staph bacteria. In fact, the number of visitors to digital content on Web sites so far outnumbers traditional journal circulations that the potential to broadly, widely, and immediately impact the scientific community via publishing online is nearly limitless. Take, for example, the journal Science. Science is one of the most commonly cited journals and boasts 130,000 print subscriptions. Yet its Web site, which contains a mix of free and subscription-required portions, receives 1.8 million weekly visits.3

While many publishers are choosing to offer their materials electronically, the need for costly subscriptions, even for materials available online, continues to limit access. Such barriers to the exchange of information between scholars and researchers ultimately threaten to stifle research worldwide.

Public Access Denied

Coupled with the strain on researchers is a growing movement to grant taxpayers access to research that is funded with taxpayer dollars. Led largely by the Alliance for Taxpayer Access (http://www.taxpayeraccess.org), an organization in which CSU is a founding member, the movement insists on developing open, online access to federally funded research. Its main advocates include universities, libraries, consumer groups, and perhaps most notably a long list of patient advocate groups including the Genetic Alliance (http://www.geneticalliance.org), a coalition of 600 disease-specific organizations that advocates for better healthcare treatments.

Sharon Terry became the coalition’s president after she and her husband encountered astounding barriers to research literature that would help them understand the debilitating genetic disorder from which both of their children suffered. The Terrys worked around those barriers by volunteering at a hospital and gaining access to the hospital’s library. Armed with the research that they were first denied, the Terrys became experts on their children’s disorders and, working with a network of scientists, became co-discoverers of the gene responsible for the disorder. Although it is uncommon for lay individuals to make such a significant impact in the research community, 80 percent of taxpayers, according to a recent Harris interactive poll, support a right to “open access” and have a strong desire not necessarily to view research findings themselves, but rather to feel the real-world benefits reflected when their own doctors, pharmacists, and other practitioners have better access to cutting-edge discoveries.

What Everyone Should Know

The use of Prozac to treat depression in teenagers is a prime example of the kind of information arising from government funded research that the public needs and wants to know. In 2002, 11 million antidepressant prescriptions were written for U.S. children. However, no large scale study had been conducted on the impact of using those drugs in the younger population. Fortunately, a team of researchers at Duke University Medical Center conducted a study of adolescents taking antidepressants and found overwhelmingly that Prozac combined with talk therapy was the most effective means to substantially improve teen depression. However, the federally funded research study also revealed an increased likelihood for teens on Prozac to engage in harmful behaviors, including suicide attempts.

The results of the study were first published in August 2004 in the New England Journal of Medicine. It was not until two months later, in October of 2004, that the FDA issued warnings about the drug’s risks and not until March of the following year that drug manufacturers issued “black box” warning labels for Prozac. NDC Health Inc. reported a 20 percent overall drop in prescriptions after the warning was issued. It is difficult to know how many suicides or attempted suicides were impacted by the FDA’s warnings. Regardless, teens, their parents, and their doctors had a stake in understanding the risks and benefits of the drug. This controversy illustrates an important point for those in favor of FRPPA and similar legislation: delayed communication of research findings can result in more than just intellectual stagnation and can have a costly, even devastating, effect on communities.

The Voluntary Experiment

Advances in technology, combined with a desire for researchers to broaden the impact and scope of their work and the public outcry for access to research funded from their own pockets, have spurred advances in open access to federally funded research. The National Institutes of Health (NIH), whose $28 billion budget accounts for one-third of all federal dollars spent on research and which funds an estimated 65,000 peer-reviewed journal articles each year, adopted an open access policy in May of 2005. The NIH policy requests and strongly encourages all investigators to make NIH-funded research available to other scientists and the public through the NIH National Library of Medicine’s PubMed Central (PMC) database immediately after the final date of peer-reviewed journal publication. The NIH has developed a password protected, Web-based NIH manuscript submission system that requires a simple uploading of a PDF version of final manuscripts; however, only 3 percent of researchers have participated in this program.

It is unclear why the NIH’s voluntary submission policy did not work, particularly since it was created by a balanced panel of publishers, scientists, patient advocates, scientific associations, and other organizations in conjunction with the NIH’s director, Dr. Elias A. Zerhouni. Advocates of the NIH’s policy quickly realized that the voluntary submission process may need to be mandatory in order to serve the research community and reach the Institute’s open access goals.

In May of this year, one year after the voluntary deposit experiment was launched with little success, Senators Cornyn and Lieberman introduced the Federal Research Public Access Act (FRPAA), a bill that would have federal agencies require grant recipients to publish their papers—online and free—within six months of their publication elsewhere.

Key Features of FRPAA

At its core, FRPAA aims to expand access to research in order to improve information exchange between researchers, help prompt new advancements, broaden impact of discoveries, avoid duplications, and support a greater return on taxpayer investment. The bill impacts federal agencies with an annual research budget of more than $100 million. This includes the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Defense, Education, Energy, Health and Human Services (which houses the NIH), Homeland Security, Transportation, the Environmental Protection Agency, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the National Science Foundation.

The key difference between FRPAA and the current policy is that the bill would require grant recipients to deposit their papers, post peer-review and post publication, in an online repository maintained by the granting agency that ensures free, online, worldwide access and long-term preservation. The anticipated expectation is that these repositories would be similar to that of PubMed Central, which is searchable, stable, and easy to use. “The goal is to share information…and help spur new ideas which down the road can mean new treatments and cures for researchers, medical professionals, and patients,” noted Lieberman in a joint press release to announce the bill. “It will help accelerate scientific innovation and discovery,” added Cornyn.


Impact on the CSU Campus

If FRPAA were to pass today:

- CSU students, faculty, and staff would have unlimited access from home, office, or campus computers to the more than 65,000 scholarly articles published as a result of research supported by federal funds.
- CSU faculty, staff, and students working on federally funded projects would be guaranteed a highly visible, easy-to-access venue in which to publish their work.
- The scholarly work of the CSU community would reach millions of people worldwide.
- The research findings of the CSU community would be preserved and protected to influence the discovery and scholarship of the future.
A Good Idea, So Why the Debate?

Given the significant impact that online technology has had on improving research, proponents contend that expanding the use of that technology to increase global access would no doubt have a positive effect on scholarship; however, the legislation has sparked a fierce debate. At the heart of that debate lies questions of how the policy will impact peer-review, challenge current publishing policies, and impact the budgets of the federal agencies.

The American Chemical Society (ACS), the world’s largest scientific society, and the Association of American Publishers (AAP), with some 260 member publishers around the country, are two of the most vocal forces opposing the bill. In letters to Senators Cornyn, Lieberman, and Susan Collins (R-Maine), opponents argue that the bill would destroy the peer-review system, which ensures journal quality, and would pit federal agencies as competitors against scholarly publishers. The ACS’s Publications arm and the Chemical Abstracts Service (CAS), a rich database of chemical information and literature, in 2004 earned $40 million for the society after accounting for the divisions’ publication expenditures. If their arguments against the bill hold water, the ACS has much at stake, at least commercially. But what of their societal mission “to encourage in the broadest and most liberal manner the advancement of chemistry and all its branches”? During their national conference in August of 2005, after ACS came out against the NIH’s open access database PubChem, a growing number of ACS members began to challenge the society’s leadership, citing the contradiction in the society’s stance. “I am growing increasingly upset with their direction,” said Chris Reed, an inorganic chemist at the University of California, Riverside in a 2005 article published in Nature. Some members have even wondered how the society could support limits to free access when it would benefit their own research.

Proponents of FRPAA note that the bill stresses the deposit of manuscripts post-peer review and implements a six-month embargo on public access, to acknowledge publishers’ contributions and to avoid competition with their subscribers. According to the bill’s FAQ, authored by Senator Cornyn, “The six month embargo will preserve the important role of journals and publishers in the peer review process. This provision balances important interests and ensures that research is widely available while it still is useful.”

In addition to the bill’s own provisions, the idea that open access will damage subscriptions remains an open-ended question with some evidence pointing to the contrary. The few scholarly societies that have chosen to allow their authors to publish online, open access versions of their work after publication demonstrate that open access has had little effect on their ability to sell subscriptions in addition to the content they offer for free.

A key example of this is the American Physical Society (APS). More than 30,000 articles a year are submitted to the APS, with some institutions paying upwards of $20,000 for full access to their publications. The society

---

10. Ibid. 807.
11. Ibid. 807.
allows physicists to post their work anywhere that allows free access and without any delay. The editor, Martin Blume, notes that their policy has forced him to improve their publications and that subscribers, especially institutions, are still willing to pay. Since APS’s journals date back to 1893, there is little or no comparison between what subscribers get access to for a fee and what an open access government depository could provide.\textsuperscript{13}

Some argue that with postings that include and credit the article’s original publisher, the federal agency would seem to serve less as a competitor and more as a means to attract subscribers seeking the wealth of past publication that only for-fee services currently provide.

Although proponents argue that the bill protects peer-review by definition, some add that broadening access to scholars worldwide may also result in increased scrutiny of published work, which would in turn ensure greater quality control in scholarship. The January 2006 scandal of South Korean scientist Dr. Hwang Woo-suk, whose fabricated cloning research was published in the highly reputable \textit{Science}, has brought speculation on the peer-review practice as a whole. Robert Terry, senior policy adviser at the U.K. medical charity the Wellcome Trust, suggests that adopting open access publishing models could be the key to detecting plagiarism and other problems. “We think it would be harder for people to plagiarize work once you can do extensive word searches and access more material free on the Internet,” said Terry in an interview with the BBC in 2006, shortly after the scandal broke.\textsuperscript{14} Scrutiny by a community of experts, made possible by increased access, may in fact be the extra checks the peer-review practice needs to shore up the process of ensuring accuracy in research.

Opponents also contend that creating and maintaining the required online depositories would divert dollars away from supporting research.\textsuperscript{15} The NIH’s \textit{PubMed Central} depository, according to agency estimates, has cost the agency less than 1 percent of its overall budget.\textsuperscript{16} It is, perhaps, a very small price to pay for the potential impact of opening the doors to such important scholarship.


\textsuperscript{14} Riscoon, P. and J. Ames. Interview, BBC News, United Kingdom, 16 January 2006.

\textsuperscript{15} Baum, B. “Take a Stand.” \textit{Chemical & Engineering News} 84 (23) 2006.

WHO OWNS YOUR WORK?

Copyright in the Digital Age
Who Owns Your Work? Exploring Copyright in the Digital Age

In an academic setting, publishing is essential. It enables us to communicate our research and teachings to others. To further the exploration of ideas and theories, to share discoveries and make important advances that directly impact our communities and quality of life. Ideally, publishing gives us a voice in the vast discourse of our fields. Practically, it provides us with professional standing and enables us to pursue important advancements such as tenure. Most view publishing as the end result of months or sometimes years of writing—of the products of our research and teaching.

Once our work has been accepted, especially if it is to be published by a top-tier journal, we often sign away whatever power the paper puts in front of us. It is so important that our work have a chapter. In our own work and in the wider world to be read, discussed, and hopefully cited that most of us probably don’t even know what it is we are signing away.

I use the term “we” deliberately to include librarians. Although open access is one of the key issues being tackled by libraries and librarians worldwide, a recent study shows that libraries are not more aware of the academic and scholarly aspects of the way to which we publish and store our work are being radically transformed. With the advent of this changing technology, how are they facing some important questions on the way we use our time, and how we can best prepare it for the digital environment?

The reasons for this change: the digital age is being created by the new “copy rights” insert, produced by the Association of Research Libraries (ARL), that will serve as a guide to researchers. It helps researchers face some important questions about access and the digital rights of their own intellectual property. And in today’s online environment, when publishing looks like some of the traditional barriers and the environment more radically supports the dissemination of information, what is the effect of this behavior? Should we be doing something different with the rights to our own work?

---

Copyright was born of this exchange—of the belief that printing was introduced in 1450 in England, and with it sprang up a literate public. It was then that authors began the tradition of selling their works to publishers, who in turn printed copies. The first laws governing this trade were a means for the Crown to control “assiduous tracts” and required registry with the Stationers’ Company. This policy of censorship created essentially a monopoly of the book trade in England, and as such, a privileged class of book publishers and sellers emerged. Even when royal censorship waned, they controlled what books were published because they held the rights to make copies, and so they controlled the ideas circulating in the public sphere and for how much these ideas were bought and sold.

Authors then, like the authors of today, retained some rights. The publisher could not add or subtract text, change the words, etc. However, the small number of publishers holding perpetual copyrights dictated what was publicly disseminated and their power control limited the number of people who could gain access to it. Effectively, their power amounted to a kind of censorship similar to that of the British monarchy. It was generally in the publishing contract to publish that sold, even if the work protected ideas that were controversial. If it work was not making it out and onto the shelves, how would the public know what was lost?

It was generally in the publishing contract that publishers would not allow books to go out of print. The copyright law, the Department of Communications and Creative Services, offers a copyright license and permission to service fees and departments that print course packets on the campus, sold at the University Bookstore. For more information, contact Juliann Basso, the copyright and license coordinator at 570-484-4002, or visit the website online at http://www.creativearts.psu.edu/copyright/index.html. Some permissions can take up to eight weeks to receive from publishers and authors, so planning ahead is a must as the world of copyright.

---

2. Creative Commons. "License Agreement for Copyrighted Works." Available at http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/".
4. Copyright: A Guide to Understanding Copyright Basics. "Understanding Copyright Basics." Available at http://www.copyright.gov/about.html. Copyright is not a valuable commodity unless it is not controlled by any one person or organization. Copyright is not a valuable commodity unless it is not controlled by any one person or organization.
could make copies of that work as long as they could afford the printing press technology. For the consumer, the expiration of copyright dramatically reduced the cost of books, especially popular ones. In essence, the copyright limits greatly broadened the pool of those gaining access to knowledge. The decision broke the monopoly power of the book-sellers, but also struck a balance between an author’s rights (and by extension a publisher’s rights) to profit from their creation while recognizing that knowledge is a public good. By offering a limited monopoly, publishers could profit for a time and then the works became public, more affordable, and more likely to benefit society as a whole.

In America, the Constitution gave Congress the power to promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries.” In order to prevent the concentrated power of publishers, the framers of the Constitution supported “a structure that kept copyright away from publishers and kept them short,” at least for the first two hundred or so years (Lanese, 2014, p.130-131).

Fast Forward: Publishing Goes Digital

Now it is 2007. We are all publishers. We all have the power and tools to create copies. This is not some Orwellian fantasy, this is our reality. We can all think of things, write them down, take pictures or record sounds, and transmit that information to a broad range of audiences around the world. We can send an e-mail to a library with a readership of hundreds. We can print a thousand copies of something and have it professionally bound for a few dollars. The very article that you’re reading right now is also published online, in a blog. You’re welcome to log on and publish your thoughts on this issue for the world to read at http://libraries.colorado.edu/blogs/libraryconnections/.

In this market, traditional publishing still happens and copyright is still exchanged. Each of you will probably publish one or more articles in a peer-reviewed journal this year. Chances are that your work will end up in an online version of the journal, or perhaps will only be published online when the journal publisher eliminates print versions to take advantage of the high speed and low cost afforded by the Internet. Therefore, publishing in this traditional fashion supports a broad-based dissemination of your work.

But, by giving publishers the rights to disseminate your work, does this exclude you from exercising your own right to share your work with students and colleagues with the ease and convenience of the digital environment? Can you send the link of your work to a library of your colleague? Can you reproduce a copy of your work to share with your class? Can you post your work on a personal, departmental, or university Web site? What if your library doesn’t own the journal you’ve published in? What if your colleague’s librarian doesn’t own the journal you’ve published in? If a few years from now, the journal in which you’ve published goes under, what happens to your work?

Free Culture vs Permission Culture

The answers to these questions? It depends. This is not meant to make you panic. Of the 149 publishers included in the RoMEO publishers’ copyright database, approximately 78% allow you to retain those rights, including the right to self-archive (giving up to a personal, departmental or university Web site). Those publishers include the American Chemical Society, the American Physical Society, Elsevier, and Cambridge University Press. You can access this list of publishers online at http://www.ropems.ac.uk/romeo.php.

The “Know Your Copyrights” pamphlet produced by ARL also explains that sharing your work with your students constitutes fair use, and is therefore allowed in the academic setting. But this also means that 22% of publishers included in the RoMEO database don’t allow you to retain those rights to your own work. Indeed, among the publishers that don’t allow you to self-archive are the American Chemical Society, the American Medical Association, and the Modern Humanities Research Association. Because the RoMEO database is not comprehensive, it is likely that other publishers also don’t allow you to retain your rights.

Almost as fast as we develop information sharing technology, laws pop up to govern that technology. Copyright law is constantly shifting. In his book, Free Culture, Lawrence Lessig paints a bleak picture of how we are migrating away from a free culture that understands and values creativity and knowledge—where the best minds of the present exist because they can collaborate and build upon the creative giants of the past —toward a permission culture that seeks to define and limit the uses of culture and its future creators. In his book, Lessig outlines the ways in which the reach of copyright law has steadily expanded.

Over the last forty years, Congress has extended existing copyrights eleven times. One such addition, the Sonny Bono Copyright Term Extension Act of 1998 (CTEA), extended copyright effectively to 95 years. The law extends back to any work published after 1923 and prevents that work from passing into the public domain. Legally, when a work passes into the public domain, this means that the author is still given credit for the work, but that the work can be copied and reproduced without the specific permission of the copyright holder. As previously mentioned, in the 1800s the introduced consumer competition into the great publishing market, and the result was that copies of works such as Shakespeare’s plays could be acquired for much less money. Therefore, works in the public domain were accessible to many more people and many more people could be enriched by them. Extending copyright to 95 years greatly alters this equation, especially in the context of the Internet. For example, one could scan the Complete Poems by Charlotte Bronte (whose works are in the public domain) and make her work freely available online to anyone with an Internet connection. Bronte would, of course, need to be given credit for her work. However, one could not create the same type of Web site using poems by William Carlos Williams, whose work is not in the public domain.

More importantly, when a work enters into the public domain, it commonly forces others to make creative or derivative works from it. Imagine, for example, if Shakespeare’s works were not in the public domain. Would the copyright holder have approved Arthur Laurent’s West Side Story or Craig Pearce’s 1996 film Romeo and Juliet? Copyright was originally intended to expire so that published works would enter into our body of knowledge and could be creatively used by anyone. However, the CTEA restricts those rights to a single copyright holder and requires that individuals who wish to use that work track down the copyright holder and get their permission to use it—nearly 100 years after the work was produced. Why?

6. Citation Credit: www.colorado.edu
Arguably, the CTEA provides important benefits to those whose works are still commercially viable. The law has enabled copyright holders who retain the rights to profitable works to make money off of them. For example, Disney still owns Mickey Mouse, and Robert Frost’s estate still owns the rights to his collection, New Hampshire. However, what about works that are no longer commercially viable? What about works that are orphaned or have gone out of print? What about works that could and should be shared with the masses? What about works that other creative minds wish to use as springboards?

Copyright requires no registration. There is no system of tracking copyright ownership. Therefore, if someone wanted to digitize these abandoned works to make them available again to the public, they would first have to track down the copyright holder, which takes a tremendous amount of time and considerable effort.

In 1990, 10,047 books were published. In 2000, 174 of those books were still in print. 9

Unlike it is stored in optimal conditions, the average shelf life of a book is 50–60 years. Legally, a library must go to extensive lengths to prove that it is not violating copyright when it distributes a book. In 1991, the United States Library of Congress issued a report titled, “Digital Millennium Copyright Act (DMCA) of 1998: Follow-up Study” that acknowledged that the law is designed to protect the interests of copyright holders. However, the restrictions enacted by the DMCA and the technology needed to enforce those restrictions severely limit our access to digital materials that we’ve paid for—much more so than the DMCA law for print materials.

The DMCA effectively rendered behavior that was previously legal suddenly illegal. Under the DMCA, we cannot even store purchased materials for free even if it’s to a single friend, just like you would have done with that printed book. Access to materials can be restricted by digital publishing technology so that individuals can no longer read a book as many times as we want as we could have with a printed book. And forget about selling these items at a used media store or donating them to a library. In other words, if you purchase a printed book, you can give it to a friend. If you download and download an EBook and give that to a friend, you are committing an act of piracy. When a library purchases a print magazine, anyone could walk into the library and read it. When a library purchases rights to an online journal, the library may restrict access to only those who are formally affiliated with the institution that signed the contract and is paying for access. If you purchase a CD you can sell it at any used music store and collect the profits. You could not do the same with the MP3 flas of the same CD, even if you were to delete them completely from your computer. 10

The DMCA is a recognition of an industry reaction to the fact that items in a digital environment can be shared much more readily. An EBook could be sent to 100 people by e-mail, much like a music CD could be sent to 10,000. These acts have been rendered illegal. Yet in doing so, we have allowed the passage of a law that exponentially expands owner’s control over how we use knowledge and ideas that we have bought and paid for. Is there a better balance that might be struck?

Current Standings

Regardless of where you fall in the copyright debate or the degree to which you view knowledge as individual property, a public good, or a mix of both, the reality is that something is happening with the current state of copyright law. The forces of copyright and ownership and being paid for distributing intellectual property drive balance with the free exchange of knowledge and ideas in the way Internet technology can facilitate. There is evidence of this everywhere across all disciplines.

According to a recent survey conducted by the Association of American Universities for the Advancement of Science, scientists used to fear that patents would limit their access to research tools and technologies; however, that concern has been replaced by an increased difficulty in getting access to data. 11 Even though Congress has repeatedly extended copyright terms over the last forty years, patent terms have been left alone and those rights expire after twenty years. The research community has long debated whether or not patents might infringe on important scientific advancement. Might this community raise the same debate around copyright, which now lasts almost a century?

The law as it stands seems also to be limiting the histories that can be told. When professors Cathy Davidson and Ada Norris sought to document the life of Yehudi Menuhin, they were told by the Menuhin family that they could not do so without permission of the Menuhin-Jenkins trust. This situation ended up being resolved through a copyright license, but it raises concerns about the future of intellectual freedom.

The law as it stands seems also to be limiting the music that can be played. Dr. Susan Pickert, Katharine Clamin Professor of Music at Whitman College, has been dealing with the problem of orphaned copyrighted works for over 15 years of research on women composers. Franklin: I can see why people who are just beginning to break the law, the there are so many barriers and dead ends and just so frustrating. There is an international registry of people who have legal rights over music so that it's easier to find your music to contact for permission. 12

There’s no universal international body that administers the copyright law, so there’s no one to go to if you don’t know who owns the rights. The DMCA effectively renders behavior that was previously legal suddenly illegal. Under the DMCA, we cannot even store purchased materials for free even if it’s to a single friend, just like you would have done with that printed book. Access to materials can be restricted by digital publishing technology so that individuals can no longer read a book as many times as we want as we could have with a printed book. And forget about selling these items at a used media store or donating them to a library. In other words, if you purchase a printed book, you can give it to a friend. If you download and download an EBook and give that to a friend, you are committing an act of piracy. When a library purchases a print magazine, anyone could walk into the library and read it. When a library purchases rights to an online journal, the library may restrict access to only those who are formally affiliated with the institution that signed the contract and is paying for access. If you purchase a CD you can sell it at any used music store and collect the profits. You could not do the same with the MP3 flas of the same CD, even if you were to delete them completely from your computer. 10

1. Minimal, 2017. "The Digital Millennium Copyright Act of 1998." Colorado of Public Domain, 1992. 11. Franklin: I can see why people who are just beginning to break the law, the there are so many barriers and dead ends and just so frustrating. There is an international registry of people who have legal rights over music so that it's easier to find your music to contact for permission. 12.

Find Out More

Additional information about copyright and digital legislation

- The Leesig Blog [http://www.leesig.org/blog/]. Author of Free Culture. Lawrence Lessig is a professor at Stanford Law School and founder of the Stanford Center for Internet and Society. This blog discusses current copyright law and its cyber implications.

- Public Knowledge [http://www.publicknowledge.org]. An advocacy group working to promote and defend a "public domain" commons in the digital environment. The site includes resources, news releases, current legislation, litigation, and a blog on copyright and fair use policy.

- American Library Association Copyright and Public Policy Committee [http://www.alastaff.org/ala/whatsnew/05copyright/legalcopyright.html]. Includes information on current copyright policies and advocacy.

11. Lessig, 2007. "The Digital Millennium Copyright Act of 1998." Colorado of Public Domain, 1992. 12. Franklin: I can see why people who are just beginning to break the law, the there are so many barriers and dead ends and just so frustrating. There is an international registry of people who have legal rights over music so that it's easier to find your music to contact for permission. 12.
Managing Your Copyright

The great value of the Internet is that having a journal publish your work is no longer the end of the story. You have the power and tools to help distribute your own work so that it can resonate in ways never before imagined. First, you have to be sure to retain at least some of your copyright during the publishing process. Here’s how:

- **Establish a Creative Commons License** (www.creativecommons.org). Creative commons is a nonprofit organization that helps "authors, scientists, artists, and educators easily mark their creative work with the freedoms they want it to carry.” It allows you to copyright your work while enabling people to more readily copy and distribute your work—provided they give you credit—in the ways you want them to.

- **Publish in journals that allow you to retain your rights.** This will make it possible for you to share your work in the digital environment. The RoMEO database (http://www.sherpa.ac.uk/romoe.php) is a growing list of permissions that are normally given as part of each publisher’s copyright transfer agreement. It is searchable by publisher and enables you to add publishers to the list. Self-archiving (posting on a personal/departmental website or in a digital collection supported by the University) is a key right to retain so that you can create a digital copy of your own body of work.

- **Download the SPARC Author Addendum** (http://www.arl.org/sparc/author/addendum.html). When added to traditional publication agreements, the addendum will help you to retain more of your own rights to your journal publications and make it possible for you to more easily control your work in the digital environment (including protecting your right for online posting or using portions of your articles in future work.)

What Are Your Thoughts?

Log on to the Library Connection Weblog (http://lib.colostate.edu/blogs/libraryconnection) to post your comments on this issue.

Library Connection is a publication of Colorado State University Libraries. Published each semester during the academic year, the newsletter explores issues of information policy and access that impact the CSU campus and beyond.
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KU ScholarWorks takes research to world
Research conducted by KU faculty members is regularly cited in publications around the world, but a new online repository is helping push it even further.

KU ScholarWorks, a digital collection of peer-reviewed research, conference papers, supplements to published items and books produced by KU faculty, has recently been made available to the public. The program stores the work and makes it easily accessible to information seekers.

Holly Mercer, coordinator of digital content development for the KU Libraries, said there are nearly 1,000 research articles and journal publications archived in the program. So far, the items have been downloaded more than 210,000 times and viewed more than 370,000 times.

Making the program available to the public has significantly increased the traffic within the program.

"People are finding the items in KU ScholarWorks," Mercer said. "It's indexed in Google and other major search engines. People are finding their way there."

The program is effective at helping people find the research for several reasons. Often people don't have access to an academic journal that publishes research useful to an individual's academic purpose. Every item in KU ScholarWorks has a permanent, citable URL that will not change. Faculty can give the URL to colleagues who request copies of publications. Plus, with the ever-increasing dependence on Internet search engines for information gathering, it makes sense to harness it as a resource to proliferate KU research, Mercer said. A digital repository also can help keep research in the public eye longer than a regularly published journal.

Mercer mentioned the long tail theory, which states that wider (electronic) distribution channels tend to increase readership for older, yet still relevant, research. Among print library collections, about 20 percent of items circulate regularly. When the idea is applied to online collections, the percentages are reversed, and about 80 percent of the content is viewed regularly.

Program's publishing power lands deal

Using the publishing power of KU ScholarWorks, Susan Craig, art and architecture librarian, helped land a partnership with ArtXart.com, an online art database.

Her 2006 work, "Biographical Dictionary of Kansas Artists," is a rich collection of more than 1,700 artists who called Kansas home before 1945.

Right at home in database format, the searchable archive — or eBook — makes it possible for researchers to locate an artist by name, town or subject. KU ScholarWorks creates a living dictionary, and a stable URL allows libraries across the country to catalog the award-nominated work.

Given the depth and breadth of her project, Craig's efforts attracted the attention of ArtXart.com, an online resource that features more than 52,000 American artists. The site is used primarily for collectors and art galleries, and offers a tremendous amount of information crucial to the art world.

When the president of ArtXart.com contacted Craig with an offer to exchange a personal lifetime membership to their site for permission to upload "Biographical Dictionary of Kansas Artists," Craig countered with a proposal for campus-wide access. The current agreement provides six months of access campuswide, and ArtXart.com has agreed to seek private support to underwrite the cost of long-term use.

"This partnership highlights the importance of KU ScholarWorks as a powerful resource in many fields," said Craig. "I'm pleased to be part of this program, and I look forward to seeing it grow in the coming years."
Three percent of the items in KU ScholarWorks have been downloaded at least 1,000 times, and 31 percent have been downloaded at least 500 times.

Allison Rose Lopez, public relations and marketing manager for Information Services, said KU ScholarWorks is taking advantage of evolving technology to archive and present the university’s research.

"It's storing the information we're developing here for the KU of the future. But it's for more than just posterity. This is a new way of sharing knowledge."

Four students were recently nominated for Barry M. Goldwater Scholarships, regarded as the premier undergraduate award to encourage excellence in science, engineering and mathematics. Since Congress established the scholarship program in 1986, KU has produced 41 winners.
Presentation Descriptions
A select group of Berkeley faculty and administrators met on March 31, 2005 at the Oakland Marriott City Center in downtown Oakland to discuss the critical topic of scholarly publishing.

The purpose of the meeting was to discuss changes in scholarly communication — changes that are influencing the university’s ability to provide access to the information on which members of the Berkeley community base their research. As a group, they discussed how to make best use of the present publishing environment and create opportunities for the future.

Lawrence Lessig, Stanford University Professor of Law and founder of the Creative Commons, and Bruce Alberts, UCSF Professor of Biochemistry & Biophysics and President of the National Academy of Sciences, were among the speakers. Conference participants worked in smaller breakout session groups in both the morning and the afternoon to consider steps that UC and its faculty can take to reshape scholarly communication.

Conference Planning Committee: Gail Ford, James Hunt, Nicholas Jewell, C. Judson King, Anthony Newcomb, John Ober, Margaret Phillips, Elaine Tennant, Beth Weil

Sponsored by: Academic Senate Berkeley Division, Office of the Chancellor, The Library, Librarians Association of the University of California, Berkeley (LAUC-B)
Scholarly Publishing

UCSD-Specific Documents and Information

This page will offer a growing list of presentations and publications from the UCSD Libraries and other UCSD campus-specific information about scholarly publishing and related matters.

Audio and slides are available from several speakers in the 2005-06 Faculty Club Luncheon series: Publish and/or Perish: Changes in Scholarly Communication: (Please see the series page for full speaker details.)

* November 22, 2005:
  **Blaise Cronin:** "Authorship and Attribution; Access and Attention: Trends in Scholarly Communication" (November 22, 2005)
  Audio is available in streaming RealAudio format:
  [Part 1 (46 min)](http://example.com/part1) • [Part 2 (6 min)](http://example.com/part2) • [Get RealAudio player](http://example.com/player)

* January 11, 2006:
  **Carl Stahmer**, Associate Director at Maryland Institute of Technology in the Humanities,
  "Scholarship in the Age of Ephemerality."
  [Streaming RealAudio format](http://example.com/streaming) • [MP3 for download](http://example.com/download) (37MB)

  **Philip Bourne**, UCSD Professor of Pharmacology: "Realizing the Power of Online Publishing."
  [Streaming RealAudio format](http://example.com/philip) • [MP3 for download](http://example.com/download) (30MB)
  [PowerPoint™ slides](http://example.com/slides) from presentation available for download.

* February 22, 2006:
  **Stephen Rhind-Tutt**, CEO Alexander Street Press,
  **Lynne Withey**, Director, University of California Press and President, AAUP
  Theme: Electronic Publication, Changing the Way your Work is Disseminated and Read
  Audio is available:
  Introduction - Susan Starr: [Streaming RealAudio format](http://example.com/susan) • [MP3 for download](http://example.com/download)
  Stephen Rhind-Tutt: [Streaming RealAudio format](http://example.com/stephen) • [MP3 for download](http://example.com/download)
  Lynne Withey: [Streaming RealAudio format](http://example.com/lynn) • [MP3 for download](http://example.com/download)

* April 17, 2006:
  **Ted Bergstrom**, Professor of Economics, UC Santa Barbara
  **To Have and be Had: Some Economics of Academic Journals**
  Audio is available: [Streaming RealAudio format](http://example.com/ted) • [MP3 for download](http://example.com/download)
  Please note: the first few minutes of the presentation audio are missing, and Professor Bergstrom's remarks closely follow his slides - we recommend viewing the slides while listening.
  [PowerPoint™ slides](http://example.com/slides) are also available for download.

* May 31, 2006
  **Michael Carroll**, Villanova School of Law
"Valuing and Managing Your Copyright in Scholarly Articles."
Audio is available: Streaming RealAudio format • MP3 for download (70MB)
The PowerPoint™ slides are also available for download.

- **The Economics of Scholarly Publishing** (PowerPoint™ presentation)
  Presentation by Brian E.C. Schottlaender, University Librarian at UCSD Academic Senate
  Representative Assembly, November 2003

- **Academic Libraries and the Evolution of Scholarly Communication** (PowerPoint™ presentation)
  Presentation by Brian E.C. Schottlaender, University Librarian at a UCSD Faculty Luncheon Seminar, 20 February 2003

- **Electronic Publications Task Force Report** (PDF)

- **Flyer: "Electronic Journal Issues"**
  Flyer sent to Academic Senate mailing list concerning rising costs of journals and outcome of UC Libraries' negotiations with Reed Elsevier. January 2004.

- **Flyer: "New Electronic Reprint Service"**
  Flyer announcing the availability of the CDL e-Scholarship post-print repository, distributed to All-Academics and Key Administrators/Key Support Staff mailing lists, February 22, 2005

- **Currents, the Biomedical Library Newsletter** featured an article on Open Access, which was followed by two faculty comments.
  - Winter 2004 issue (PDF) - original article
  - Spring 2004 issue (PDF) - includes faculty responses

- **E-mail to Faculty about PubChem Debate** (PDF)
  Content of an e-mail distribution by Susan Starr, Associate University Librarian, Sciences & Scholarly Communication, concerning the debate about the NIH PubChem database. In May 2005, the American Chemical Society called on Congress to scale back this free database, claiming unfair competition.
Scholarly Communication: Issues and Trends for Scholars and Librarians at Dartmouth College

Development History

The Library gave 5 presentations to the Council on Libraries, 3 in the spring of 2004, one in Spring 2005 and one in Fall 2005. It also developed documents discussing aspects of scholarly communication and drafted a web site to better present issues in scholarly communication to the Dartmouth community.

- **Scholarly Communication: Threats, Problems and Opportunities Part 1**
  Presentation given to Council on Libraries April 12, 2004
  PowerPoint File

- **Scholarly Communication: Threats, Problems and Opportunities Part 2**
  Presentation given to Council on Libraries May 10, 2004
  PowerPoint File

- **Scholarly Communication: Threats, Problems and Opportunities Part 3**
  Presentation given to Council on Libraries June 9, 2004
  PowerPoint File

- **Scholarly Communication: Threats, Problems and Opportunities II**
  Presentation given to Council on Libraries April 14, 2005
  PowerPoint File

- **Scholarly Communication: An Issues Update and Discussion with the Council on Libraries**
  Presentation given to Council on Libraries November 17, 2005
  PowerPoint File
Scholarly Communication

RESOURCES

Nakata Lectures

"Digital Knowledge Environments: A Grand Challenge for the Humanities and Social Sciences" by John Unsworth, April 28, 2006

"Universities and the Ecology of Scholarly Publication" by R. Michael Tanner, April 26, 2005

"Unlocking the Value of Scientific Research" by Rick Johnson, April 8, 2004

Open Access

Timeline of the Open Access Movement | SPARC Open Access Newsletter
By Peter Suber, Earlham College

Open Access Bibliography: Liberating Scholarly Literature with E-Prints and Open Access Journals [Full book in PDF]
By Charles W. Bailey, Jr., University of Houston Libraries

News

- Issues in Scholarly Communication: UIUC University Librarian Paula Kaufman maintains this newsletter/blog to keep readers apprised of the latest developments in scholarly communication.
- Open Access News: Peter Suber's frequently updated news blog focuses, as the title suggests, on developments in the open access movement, but also covers other scholarly communication areas. Suber also puts out a monthly newsletter.

Taking Action

- Scholarly Communication Toolkit: This excellent resource from the Association of College and Research Libraries provides a concise overview of the issues. Problems are linked to direct actions that faculty, librarians, and universities can take.
- Create Change: Like the Toolkit, this website aims to support faculty and librarian action in creating a better system of scholarly communication.

Resources for Authors

- Directory of Open Access Journals: If you are interested in submitting your work to an open access journal, you can use this directory to find titles in your field.
- SHERPA: Use this database to check publishers’ policies on author self-archiving of pre- and post-prints.

Publishing Organizations

- BioMed Central: Open access publisher of peer-reviewed biomedical research.
- Public Library of Science (PLoS): A leading open access publisher of peer-reviewed scientific journals.
- SPARC: An organization that works to create and support low cost and open access scholarly journals.
- UIC Institutional Memberships

Copyright Issues

- Copyown: A resource on copyright ownership for the higher education community from the University of Maryland and the Association of Research Libraries.

Scholarly Communication Sites at Other Universities

- University of California: Reshaping Scholarly Communication
- Cornell University: Transforming Scholarly Communication and Libraries
Scholarly Communication Education Initiatives

Annual UNM Symposia on Scholarly Communication

Co-sponsored by: the UNM Office of the Provost for Academic Affairs, the Office of the Executive Vice-President for Health Sciences, the UNM University Libraries, the Health Sciences Library and Informatics Center, and the Law Library

About the Symposium

Scholarly communication is changing rapidly in ways that hit at the heart of the academy across all disciplines. These trends affect how faculty, researchers, librarians, and students undertake work and have an impact on authorship, editorial boards, promotion and tenure decisions, and budgets.

The purpose of the Symposium is to raise consciousness, seek advocacy, and create a greater sense of self-determination about major issues and opportunities as they relate to the faculty at the University of New Mexico (UNM) and the future of scholarly communication on this campus. UNM faculty must be knowledgeable about the changes relative to scholarly communication. It is an important first step toward building support in the academic community for adopting new approaches to publishing and disseminating faculty knowledge. The Symposium is designed to lay the foundation for a robust campus dialogue and new initiatives.

Past Symposia

5th Annual Symposium: Navigating the Currents of Scholarly Communication: Government Mandates for Public Access to Research

Speakers:
Jean-Claude Guédon, PhD [Keynote]
Guédon's presentation was titled "Researchers and the Public Good: Why Mandating Open Access is Both Important and Fair"
[View streaming video of presentation]

Holly Phillips, MLS, MS
Phillips' presentation was titled "The National Institutes of Health (NIH) Public Access Policy: UNM Author Participation and Attitudes"
[View streaming video of presentation]

Christina Zuni-Cruz, JD
Zuni-Cruz's presentation was titled "Putting Theory into Practice: Experience as Editor-in-Chief of the Open Access Publication Tribal Law Journal"
[View streaming video of presentation]


Held November 1st, 2005

Speakers:
Ann J. Weilert, MLS [Keynote]

http://hsc.unm.edu/library/sc/symposium.shtml
Alby Smith, PhD

The title of her talk was “More Innovation than We Think.”
[View streaming video of presentation]
[More information about the 4th Annual Symposium]

3rd Annual Symposium: Cultural Transformation of the University’s Knowledge Base
Held March 3rd, 2015

Speakers:
Daniel Greenstein [Keynote]
Greenstein’s presentation was titled “Institutional Repositories: What Problems Are They Trying To Solve, For Whom, and Who Should Care?”
[View streaming video of presentation]
[More information about the 3rd Annual Symposium]

2nd Annual Symposium: Stewardship of the University Community’s Knowledge Base
Held March 12, 2004

Speakers:
Lawrence Lessig, JD. [Keynote]
Lessig’s presentation was titled “The Progress of Science: What’s at Stake in the Free Culture Debate.”
[View streaming video of presentation]

Johann van Reenen, M.S.
[View streaming video of presentation]
[More information about the 2nd Annual Symposium]

1st Annual Symposium: The Scholarly Communication Crisis: A Call for a Public Goods Solution
Held February 27, 2003

Speakers:
David Shenker, Ph.D. [Keynote]
Rick Luke

UNM Faculty Panel Discussion: Moderated by Provost Fote, the panelists included Samuel Keith, MD, Department of Psychiatry; Bernard Morel, PhD, Computer Scientist; and Vera Norwood, MD, Assistant Dean, College of Arts and Sciences.

The past four Annual Symposia were well attended by university faculty, staff and students and generated many requests to continue the dialog. If you have any questions, or wish to provide feedback for the symposium planning committee, please feel free to contact Dr. James Are <Holy Diver>. 
Designing Incentives and Support

Assertion: Incentives and support can be designed to assist scholars to shift their publishing behavior:

- from high-profit commercial journals to more sustainable models
- from printed monographs to digital, print-on-demand online works
- from “smallest publishable unit” to complete research report
- by placing research into open access repositories

Question: What support and incentives (monetary, time, staffing, training, etc.) could the university offer to Berkeley authors and editors to facilitate this change?

A Few Background Facts:

Subventions are not uncommon¹:
For 1¹ publications:

- UT-Austin distributes $30,000/yr using campus bookstore profits. Authors may publish with any academic press and need not be tenured to apply.
- Yale provides up to $5,000 to younger faculty members in the humanities.
- Ohio State approves subsidies up to $2,000, funded equally by departments and academic divisions. Others include the University of Iowa, North Carolina State University, and the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

For use of alternatives
- UNC VC for Research created a subsidy for open access publication fees

The UC Libraries have arranged memberships that assist with publication in open access journals²

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publisher or Publication</th>
<th>Normal publication fee</th>
<th>UC discounted fee</th>
<th>Based on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BioMed Central (all BioMed Central journals)</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>$0 (100% discount)</td>
<td>Institutional membership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nucleic Acids Research (from Oxford Univ. Press)</td>
<td>$1500</td>
<td>$600 (40% discount)</td>
<td>Included as part of UC's subscriptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proceedings of the National Academy of Science (PNAS)</td>
<td>$1000 (to provide open access; separate from page and other charges)</td>
<td>$750 (25% discount)</td>
<td>Included as part of UC's online subscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Library of Science (all PLoS journals)</td>
<td>$1500</td>
<td>$1200 (20% discount)</td>
<td>Institutional membership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

² Maintained at http://osc.universityofcalifornia.edu/alternatives/submit_work.html
Faculty Statements and Resolutions: Excerpts

University of California, Berkeley

Statement of Principles

Advancement and Promotion: All those involved in the process of academic review will not discriminate against alternative venues for scholarly communication. As always, work will be judged based on its individual quality and scholarly content. The role of a publication in this process will be assessed according to such criteria as its demonstrated standards, degree of selectivity, and the quality of its peer review.

Support the Library: Libraries around the world are beginning to take a hard line when negotiating contracts with publishers and societies that put profits above scholarly communication. The faculty and administration of the University of California, Berkeley will support the Library’s efforts to curtail unsustainable pricing structures even if this sometimes means losing access to titles.

University of California Systemwide Library and Scholarly Information Advisory Committee (SLASIA C)

Resolution G: Digital Library Journal Collecting Principles
http://www.slp.ucop.edu/consultation/slasiac/SLASIA C_Res010lution_G.html

Resolved: To align costs with value, the Committee recommends that UC libraries, in close consultation with the faculty, initiate a Systemwide review and renegotiation of the University’s contracts with publishers whose pricing practices are not sustainable...

University of California, Irvine

Joint Resolution on Scholarly Communication and Faculty Copyrights
http://www.lib.uci.edu/scamp/joint_resolution.html

... Support broad access and availability of scholarly information and research to the academy and society by considering publication in high-quality journals that also have affordable pricing models that sustain wide dissemination...

University of California, Santa Cruz

Resolution on Ties with Elsevier Journals
http://senate.ucsc.edu/col/res.1405.pdf

The Senate also calls upon its Committee on Academic Personnel to recognize that some faculty may choose not to submit papers to Elsevier journals even when those journals are highly ranked. Faculty choosing to follow the advice of this resolution should not be penalized.

University of Connecticut

Faculty Senate resolution on the crisis in scholarly communication
http://www.arl.org/scomm/resolutions/conn.html

The Senate also calls on University administrators and departmental, school, college and University committees to reward efforts by faculty, staff, and students to start or support more sustainable models for scholarly communication. It calls on them to provide financial and material support to faculty, staff, and students whose work helps to ensure broad access to the scholarly literature. It also calls on professional associations and the University to invest in the infrastructure necessary to support new venues for peer-reviewed publication.
Cornell University
Faculty Senate Resolution regarding the University Library’s Policies on Serials Acquisitions, with Special Reference to Negotiations with Elsevier
http://www.library.cornell.edu/scholarlycomm/resolution2.htm

Recognizing that the increasing control by large commercial publishers over the publication and distribution of the faculty’s scholarship and research threatens to undermine core academic values promoting broad and rapid dissemination of new knowledge and unrestricted access to the results of scholarship and research, the University Faculty Senate encourages the library and the faculty vigorously to explore and support alternatives to commercial venues for scholarly communication.

Indiana University
Resolution on Journals, Databases, and Threats to Scholarly Publication
Approved by the Bloomington Faculty Council: March 2, 2004

Additional steps should be taken by individuals in the course of their scholarly activities to support publishers whose business practices tend to make the products of scholarly activity more widely available and affordable. Faculty and staff may wish to separate themselves from publishers whose business practices do not support open access … In tenure and promotion decisions faculty and staff must be confident that there is departmental and university support for their decisions to publish in referred journals with more open access.

Stanford University
Faculty Senate Minutes

Faculty, especially senior faculty, are strongly encouraged in the future not to contribute articles or editorial or review efforts to publishers and journals that engage in exploitive or exorbitant pricing, and instead look to other and more reasonably-priced vehicles for disseminating their research results.

University Resolutions on Scholarly Communication – Essential and Common Elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Explicit Element</th>
<th>UCB</th>
<th>UCOP</th>
<th>UCI</th>
<th>UCSC</th>
<th>Cornell</th>
<th>Indiana</th>
<th>Stanford</th>
<th>Conn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action is mission critical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide leadership to academy</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inform/educate ourselves</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage copyrights</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evolve tenure &amp; reward system</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage/Support library efforts to change marketplace</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support affordable journals (or resist involvement with high-priced journals)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use alternative forms of publication</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use/support “open access” venues/models</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide incentives/subventions for change</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use influence as authors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use influence as editors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Publishing Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Access</th>
<th>Who Pays</th>
<th>Peer Review</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Publisher</td>
<td>Restricted</td>
<td>Subscriber</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Elsevier (see chart on verso)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Access</td>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
<td>Author/Sponsor</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>PloS BioMed Central See DOAJ^2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee for Access/Free After Delay</td>
<td>All articles restricted for a period after initial publication, then freely available^1</td>
<td>Subscriber</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>195 HighWire journals Science Journal of Biological Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee for Access/Open Access Options</td>
<td>Some articles unrestricted, some restricted^4</td>
<td>Subscriber, Author/Sponsor</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>PNAS Springer Nucleic Acids Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Repository</td>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Sometimes (depends on content type and policy)</td>
<td>eScholarship Postprint Server DSpace (MIT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preprint Server</td>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
<td>Grant funding to Archive</td>
<td>Post-publication</td>
<td><a href="http://www.arXiv.org">www.arXiv.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


^2 Some HighWire journals make their content available for free, typically after 12 months.

^4 For example, in Nucleic Acids Research, UC faculty can pay $500 for their article to be Open Access.
Commercial Publisher Mergers and Acquisitions

This chart indicates the consolidation of control of commercial scholarly publishers over the last 15 years. 37 publishers are now controlled by 6 entities. "In the biomedical field alone, significant price increases occurred in 10 of the 11 mergers."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reed Elsevier</th>
<th>Taylor &amp; Francis Informa</th>
<th>Wolters Kluwer</th>
<th>Candover &amp; Cinven</th>
<th>Wiley Blackwell</th>
<th>Verlagsguppe George von Holtzbrinck</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>~1800 journals</td>
<td>~1000 journals</td>
<td>~275 journals</td>
<td>~1350 journals</td>
<td>~1250 journals</td>
<td>~70 journals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell Press</td>
<td>BIOS Scientific Publishers</td>
<td>Adis International</td>
<td>Plenum</td>
<td>GIT Verlag</td>
<td>Scientific American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congressional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Service</td>
<td>CRC Press</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WH Freeman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsevier</td>
<td>Curzon Press</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VCH</td>
<td>Bedford, Freeman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Gordon &amp; Breach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Worth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excerpta Medica</td>
<td>Harwood Academic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interscience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harcourt</td>
<td>Marcel Dekker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Blackwell Publishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan Kaufmann</td>
<td>Routledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Blackwell</td>
<td>Parliamentary Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosby</td>
<td>Swets Zeittinger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Blackwell Synergy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pergamon Press</td>
<td>Taylor &amp; Francis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Munksgaard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban &amp; Fischer</td>
<td>Garland Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB Saunders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Societies are the original scholarly publishers and crucial stakeholders in building sustainable, effective, healthy scholarly communication. Over time, some societies have contracted with commercial publishers, and in some cases have come to consider their journals to be a primary source of revenue. The introduction of profit into the scheme of scholarly communication is having, perhaps unintended, and unwanted consequences. Scholars may want to engage their societies on the issue of how best to weigh profit against timely and world-wide dissemination of research.

Societies Make Choices:

Some societies have opted for maximizing publishing revenues.

The American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS), for example, netted $34,520,893 in 2002, a whopping return on their investment of almost 17%. In that year, membership dues provided 26% of total income, while the other 74% came from revenues associated with the journals they publish (subscriptions, advertising, and reprint & licensing fees).

Other societies dedicate themselves to cost-recovery.

For 2005, The American Physical Society (APS) will cut rather than increase prices to libraries. "APS will begin to reverse the trend of increasing prices by taking advantage of the cost reductions made possible by technology. For example, said McIlrath, software that automatically copyedits and formats manuscripts greatly reduces the manpower needed. Also, almost all manuscripts are now submitted on-line, saving the cost of having to reenter them."

Price cuts will be tiered to the size of the subscribing institution, with cuts ranging from .5% to 3%. (http://www.aps.org/apsnews/0704/070402.cfm)

And others experiment with new business models.

The Optical Society of America’s Optics Express was founded in 1997 as an open access journal. “From the beginning, OSA designed Optics Express to be an ‘author-centric’ journal. Its online peer-review process and rapid turnaround from submission to publication—averaging 47 days—were groundbreaking steps. Free publication of color figures and acceptance of all kinds of multimedia also helped boost the journal’s standing among authors...OSA elected to make access to articles free and recover costs through a publication fee ($500). This has proven not to be a barrier to submission, and the journal never refuses a worthy article because the author cannot afford the fees. By 2002, Optics Express broke even, with a revenue covering staffing, overhead and development costs, and this year, OSA will generate a modest net surplus.”


A Few Background Facts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>For-profit</th>
<th>Non-profit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ecology</td>
<td>$1.19</td>
<td>$0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>$0.81</td>
<td>$0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atmos. Sci.</td>
<td>$0.95</td>
<td>$0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>$0.70</td>
<td>$0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroscience</td>
<td>$0.89</td>
<td>$0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>$0.63</td>
<td>$0.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Historically, journals from non-profit publishers, including societies, are significantly less expensive than journals from commercial publishers.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>CPI</th>
<th>US society journals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While generally less expensive than for-profit journals, society journals have average yearly price increases that are much higher than inflation.

**Sources: The annual average price changes for U.S. society journals were from the Allen Press annual studies. Consumer Price Index is from the U.S. Department of Labor.
Societies Make Choices (continued)

Some societies provide free access after a delay.
Some societies choose to make their material freely available three to 24 months after an initial subscription-only access period.

Currently, 195 society journals published by Highwire Press follow this practice creating a large archive of free full-text science. As of 3/28/05, HighWire is assisting in the online publication of 842,357 free full-text articles for a list of free HighWire journals, see http://highwire.stanford.edu/lists/freeart.dtl

Some societies have chosen cost-effective publishers.

BioOne provides integrated, cost-effective access to a thoroughly linked information resource of interrelated journals. Focusing on the biological, ecological and environmental sciences, BioOne covers 73 journals from 58 publishers. BioOne is the product of innovative collaboration between scientific societies, libraries, academe and the private sector. Visit BioOne at http://www.bioone.org

A Few Background Facts: (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Average price increases (2003/2004)</th>
<th>Number of titles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hum/SS</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STM</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Societies often partner with commercial publishers. The effect can be dramatic price increases as demonstrated above in the list of price increases for a sample of society titles now published by Blackwell.

***Source: compiled by the UC Office of Scholarly Communication using data from Ulrich’s Guide to Periodicals.

Society Members Can Make a Difference

➢ encourage your association to explore alternatives to contracting or selling publications to commercial publishers

➢ encourage your association to maintain reasonable prices for its published products and to establish access terms that are friendly to faculty and other users

➢ encourage your scholarly society to consider creating enhanced competitors to expensive commercial publications

The Monograph

Scholarly monographs have long been viewed as the "gold standard" for scholarship in the humanities and social sciences. Over the last several years, however, we are hearing significant worries about the long-term viability of the monograph from scholars, publishers, and libraries alike.

- Young scholars feel they must have one, or maybe even two monographs in their portfolio to qualify for tenure.
- University presses report ever-increasing difficulty in finding markets for the scholarly monograph, at the same time that sources of revenue other than sales (e.g., subsidies from campuses, endowments and grants) have shrunk or disappeared altogether.
- Library budgets have not kept pace with inflation; libraries are struggling to purchase both electronic and print resources in all fields while the volume of monographic material keeps rising.

In a nutshell,
"Tenure committees usually judge the merits of young scholars by how deeply and knowledgeably they expand on previous research, but they must publish their work in presses that are increasingly making decisions on the basis of breadth and crossover appeal rather than scholarly depth."1

Demand for outlet is up

- "Schools that once considered a group of articles acceptable evidence for tenure now routinely demand a published book; other schools have begun to make the transition from requiring one book to requiring two." 2
- "The publication record of faculty achieving tenure has increased since the 1970s, suggesting that requirements for promotion and tenures in CIC schools have increased…Of faculty tenured since 2000, …89% had one or more completed manuscripts at the time they were considered for tenure. Of the faculty tenured prior to 1980, fewer than two-thirds report having a completed manuscript at the time they were considered for tenure." 3
- "From 1986 to 2002…the world-wide production of books increased approximately 50 percent." 4
- "Based on preliminary figures, Bowker is projecting that U.S. title output in 2003 increased a staggering 19% to 175,000 new titles and editions, the highest total ever recorded." 5

Who’s selling? Who’s buying? Prices and Budgets.

Inflation occurs with monographs as it does with journals, and as with journals, non-profit publishers tend to set better prices than for-profit publishers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>consumer price index</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>monograph unit cost</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>monograph expenditures</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>monographs purchased</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


2 Ibid.


Who’s selling? Who’s buying? Prices and Budgets (continued)

University Presses

Although a subset of monographs purchased by libraries come from university presses, their missions and that of the academy are closely linked. The view from the university press underlines the challenges faced by all who wish to publish a monograph:

- “1 book in every 10 new books published in the United States is published by a university press.”
- “The American Association of University Presses reports that overall sales in the industry decreased by 1.5% in 2003, on top of a 3% reduction in 2002 and a 2.6% drop in 2001.”
- “While print-runs of 1,000 to 1,500 copies were standard ten years ago [1987], university presses are now confronting sales of 400-500 copies.”
- “…about 75% of the domestic sales revenue for university press books is coming from individuals buying through a bookstore, online retailer, or direct from the publishers, and about 25% from institutional purchasers, most of them libraries.”
- “…whereas we could once count on selling about 800 copies to libraries worldwide, we are now lucky if we can sell 200. And scholars are no longer buying as many books for their personal libraries, either…If print runs get much smaller, the question arises, Why publish at all? And if prices go much higher, scholars…may simply refuse to buy…”

Are monographs our best choice?

Advances in pre-print and post-print technologies, together with the rising interest by scholars in access to materials online, offer new opportunities and raise questions the academy has begun to address:

- “We asked faculty members to rank some of the advantages of and incentives to use of electronic publishing. Most frequently cited were: (1) wider dissemination; (2) lower publishing delay; and (3) allows multimedia and hyperlinked components.”
- “The survey of faculty also asked ‘As you think about the nature of your current research and the best ways to publish it, is a book length manuscript the best way in which to present your work?’ Fewer than half…stated ‘Yes a book length manuscript is needed to develop fully the logic of my argument and ideas.’ An additional 35.4 percent stated they would ‘prefer to publish as a book; but it would be possible to break down the work into a series of articles.’”
- “I predict that the genre of scholarship that will replace the book will be the thematic research collection… I think they may be more viable, because they have something that most scholarly books do not, namely an audience. It's hard to sell five hundred copies of most humanities monographs; few sell in the thousands. And yet, these Web-based projects, on relatively esoteric subjects, receive thousands of visitors each day, serve up gigabytes of their content to avid users each week, and reach readers of all ages, inside and outside academia, and around the world.”

---

9 Researching Specialized Audiences: The Publisher’s Compendium. Joanna Hitchcock, Director, University of Texas Press.
11 Ibid.
Scholarly Communication: Issues and Services

The Library’s Scholarly Communication page can be found at http://www.library.cornell.edu/scholarlycomm/

How to ensure that your publications are (a) broadly disseminated and actively used and (b) securely preserved for the long term:

Know your publisher.
Manage your copyright.
Store your stuff.

Specifically:

1. Pick a publisher that charges the buyer a reasonable price. Some publications, especially commercially published subscriptions, have become prohibitively expensive to sustain.

   • For examples of expensive Cornell subscriptions, see http://www.library.cornell.edu/scholarlycomm/10most.html.

   The California Digital Library has an excellent section on the economics of publishing at their Reshaping Scholarly Communication website at http://ode.universityofcalifornia.edu/facts/econ_of_publishing.html

2. Publish in open access journals. These are journals that are freely accessible to anyone online. They are cataloged in (and accessible through) many academic library catalogs, including ours.

   • You can find a list of currently published open access journals at http://www.doaj.org/. All of these journals are subject to quality control, and most are peer reviewed.

3. Make your article (or book) openly accessible online before or after its publication. See a list of publishers that permit this at http://www.sherpa.ac.uk (click on “SHERPA/RoMEO Publishers’ Copyright Listings,” and then click on “view all publishers”).

   • If your publisher is not on the SHERPA list, you will need to make adjustments to your copyright agreement before signing it. The easiest way to do this is to add an addendum to your copyright agreement. See http://www.arl.org/sparc/author/addendum.html.

   • For questions about copyright agreements and the copyright of your own publications, contact Peter Hirtle (phirtle@cornell.edu). For questions about obtaining copyright permissions or for help investigating the copyright status of a work, contact the general copyright information mailbox at copyright@cornell.edu or Fiona Patrick at 5-1830. See also the Cornell copyright page at http://www.copyright.cornell.edu.

4. Use a Repository. The best place to put your openly accessible article (or book) is in an institutional or disciplinary repository. If that repository is maintained by a library, your publication will be preserved for the long term, and will be accessible through standard search engines such as Google.

   • The Cornell University Library maintains two repositories: a general institutional one (DSpace) and a disciplinary one (arXiv) for physics, computer science, mathematics and quantitative biology. Information about using both of these repositories will be found below.
5. Found and publish your own peer-reviewed journal or series.
   - The Library’s Center for Innovative Publishing can provide you with advice and software to publish your own journal or series. For further information, see below.

**CENTER FOR INNOVATIVE PUBLISHING**

The Library's Center for Innovative Publishing (CIP) is a field station for the design, deployment, and effective management of on-line publishing projects from Cornell University, as well as other academic communities, university presses, and scholarly societies. Services and projects currently under the auspices of the CIP include Project Euclid, the on-line version of the journal, *Indonesia*, and DPubS v.2 (under development).

[http://www.library.cornell.edu/dlit/cip.html](http://www.library.cornell.edu/dlit/cip.html)

**PROJECT EUCLID**

Project Euclid is a user-focused publishing service design to meet the unique needs of independent and society publishers of mathematics and statistics journals. Euclid was funded in 2000 by the Mellon Foundation. Today it supports 40+ journals and 100+ subscribers to its aggregation, Euclid Prime.

[http://projecteuclid.org](http://projecteuclid.org)

**arXiv**

A groundbreaking user-driven service for the efficient on-line dissemination of research results in physics, mathematics, non-linear science, computer science, and quantitative biology. The arXiv was launched in the summer of 1991 by Paul Ginsparg, then a member of the research staff at the Los Alamos National Laboratory. Now managed by the Library, the arXiv current hosts ~330,000 pre-prints with an average submission rate of ~4000 papers per month.


**DSpace**

DSpace is an open source digital repository system that captures, stores, indexes, preserves, and redistributes an organization’s research data. DSpace was originally developed at MIT in collaboration with H-P Labs. It is currently deployed at 100 institutions worldwide.

[http://dspace.library.cornell.edu](http://dspace.library.cornell.edu)

**DPubS**

DPubS (Digital Publishing System) is a modular on-line publishing system designed for the cost-effective management and distribution of scholarly publications (journals, conference proceedings, monographs). DPubS was developed at the Cornell University Library and it is currently utilized by Project Euclid, the journal, *Indonesia*, and a number of important digital collections within the Library. DPubS v.2 is under development and will be released as an open source toolkit in mid-2006.

[http://dpubs.org](http://dpubs.org)
Scholarly Communication – Discussion with the Divisions
Katie Newman, May, 2006

Dialogue — what innovations / issues in your areas?
We all know there’s a crisis as far as journal prices are concerned. But beyond this is the issue of how scholarly communication has changed in this highly changing, electronic, web-based environment!
You won’t win any converts / listeners from the faculty if you just whine about journal prices. Rather, a way to get their attention is to talk of the greater impact/ readership their articles will have if they have them in an open access environment. More readers, more discovery, more users, more citations!

SC Website – a resource for you and for your patrons!
http://www.library.uiuc.edu/scholcomm/

At the website you’ll find:
- Sherpa database, which details permissions that are normally given as part of each publisher’s copyright transfer agreement http://www.sherpa.ac.uk/romeo.php
- DOAJ (Directory of open access journals), http://www.doaj.org/, to find an OA journal in a particular subject area.
- An addendum you can add to copyright transfer form, retaining some rights, http://www.arl.org/sparc/author/addendum.html
- Glossary of SC terms: http://www.library.uiuc.edu/scholcomm/glossary.htm
- Link to article detailing OA coverage in ISI http://www.thomsonscientific.com/media/presentrep/essayspdf/openaccesscitations2.pdf

Figure 1: Change in coverage of OA journals from February 2004 to June 2004.

**FIGURE 1**
Comparison of Citation Rates Across Disciplines for Open and Not Open Articles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Open (n)</th>
<th>Not Open (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical and electronic</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: for MANY other studies on the effect of OA, see the constantly updated bibliography started by Hitchcock, "The effect of open access and downloads ('hits') on citation impact: a bibliography of studies", http://opcit.eprints.org/oacitation-biblio.html

Peter Suber's "What you can do to promote Open Access, http://www.earlham.edu/~peters/fos/do.html#faculty

Learn about new publishing models, and options to make an article open access – http://www.library.uiuc.edu/scholcomm/pubmodels.htm http://www.library.uiuc.edu/scholcomm/openaccess.htm
  - Publish in OA journal
  - Publish OA article in non-OA journal
  - Place pre or (better) post-print in IDEALS or other repository

Learn what UIUC is doing: http://www.library.uiuc.edu/scholcomm/uuicresponse.htm
  - IDEALS http://ideals.library.uiuc.edu/ Illinois Digital Environment for Access to Learning and Scholarship
  - Membership in SPARC http://www.arl.org/sparc/
  - SC News (blog) http://www.library.uiuc.edu/blog/scholcomm/
Note: keep up to date on issues involving Open Access by subscribing to or visiting Peter Suber’s Open Access News, http://www.earlham.edu/~peters/fos/iosblog.html
2003 UIUC Senate resolution on scholarly communication:
The Committee believes that full access to the published literature is critical for scholarly activities and must be maintained. The Committee would like the Senate to approve the following recommendations:
1. that the Library and the faculty work to reduce costs of journals by applying pressure communicating concerns to publishers,
2. that the Senate engage faculty in debate on this issue in order to encourage the faculty to apply such pressure facilitate such communication,
3. that the University encourage alternative publishing models, especially electronic publishing,
4. that the Senate consider the implications of electronic communication to the promotion and tenure process,
5. that the Senate endorse the Tempe Principles.

SC: Let our researchers know they have options; don’t have to sign away their copyrights, or lose all control over their work.

Take a look at some other repositories, to see what IDEALS can become!
- Oregon's Scholars Bank: https://scholarsbank.uoregon.edu/dspace/index.jsp (2291 OA records)
- MIT's DSpace: https://dspace.mit.edu/index.jsp (19652 records)
- California’s e-scholarship repository: http://repositories.cdlib.org/escholarship/ (11469 OA records)
- Cornell’s Open Access Repository: Open Access Repository (?? Records)
- U Mich Deep Blue: http://deepblue.lib.umich.edu/index.jsp (23903 OA records)

Search multiple repositories

Search for an appropriate repository:
- ROAR: (Registry of Open Access Repositories): http://archives.explora.org/ (673 archives)
  Useful to gauge the number of entries in repositories, and to discover them.
- OpenDOAR: (Open Directory of Open Access Repositories): http://www.opendoar.org/ Use this to find a repository that includes a given subject or is located in a particular country (number of repositories in the subject shown in parentheses; 2120 total):
  Agriculture and Food Sciences (66)
  Arts and Architecture (122)
  Biology and Life Sciences (154)
  Business and Economics (168)
  Chemistry (120)
  Earth and Environmental Sciences (147)
  Health Sciences (145)
  History and Archaeology (126)
  Languages and Literatures (144)
  Law and Political Science (161)
  Mathematics and Statistics (157)
  Philosophy and Religion (116)
  Physics and Astronomy (133)
  Science General (87)
  Social Sciences (251)
  Technology and Engineering (235)
Subject Repositories... (note: some publishers only allow deposits into institutional repositories, not into for profit subject-based archives)

- **RePEc (Research Papers in Economics):** [http://www.repec.org/](http://www.repec.org/) 178,000 working papers; 192,000 journal articles; and more
- **E-Lis: Research in Computing and Library and Information Science,** [http://eprints.rclis.org/](http://eprints.rclis.org/) As of 5/06: 3700 entries
- **DLIST: Digital Library of Information Science and Technology:** [http://dlist.sir.arizona.edu/](http://dlist.sir.arizona.edu/) Browse by author, year, subject, and type of material. As of 5/06: nearly 600 entries.
- **History and Theory of Psychology.** A free service to the community of scholarly historians and theoreticians of psychology with the goal of promoting the rapid dissemination of new work in the field. [http://htprints.yorku.ca/](http://htprints.yorku.ca/) As of 5/06, 107 entries.
- **Digital Library Network for Engineering and Technology.** [http://www.dlnet.vt.edu/](http://www.dlnet.vt.edu/) Not primarily a journal article archive, rather it is a repository of "Learning Objects" as well as a platform for information discovery, interaction, content-building and distribution that will support pedagogy and learning in Engineering and Technology Covers all areas of engineering: Aerospace/Aeronautical | Bioengineering | Chemical | Civil | Electrical | Environmental | Industrial and Systems | Information and Communication Technologies | Materials Science and Engineering | Mechanical | Mining | Computational Methods | Engineering Education | Professional Development
- **arXiv.org,** e-print archive for physics, mathematics, and related fields such as qualitative biology, [http://arxiv.org/](http://arxiv.org/) As of 5/17/06, there were 368, 128 submissions!
- **PubMed Central,** Archive of life sciences journal literature at the U.S. National Institutes of Health (NIH), developed and managed by NIH’s National Center for Biotechnology Information, [http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/](http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/) As of 5/06 after one year of operation there were nearly 2500 author-submitted manuscripts as well as publisher-submitted archives from about 250 journals.
Presentation Slides
Messages to Faculty

- Talking about costs can be perceived as whining
- Authors still not aware of OA or public access
- Open Access as a public good is not resonating with faculty
- Current library messages are not working

Change Message – Create Advocates

- Help faculty recognize the benefits they will gain from helping to change scholarly communication.
- Faculty are in influential and powerful positions
- Appeal to their power and influence in making changes

Why do faculty publish?

- Communicate results to peers
- Advance career
- Personal prestige
- Gain funding (higher citations, more likely)
- Financial reward (tenure, promotion)

Benefits of Open Science (Access)
- High visibility of work
- Immediate communication to peers
- Wide distribution of research
- Easier access to latest research results
- More citations and ultimately prestige for authors

Our Message
- Remind authors signing away rights
- Discuss with faculty who are decision makers
- Discussion with faculty who can pressure decision makers
- Tailor message to the person
  - Her role(s)
  - Her discipline

Faculty Have Power & Influence
To Make Changes As:
- Members and officers of societies
- Editors of journals
- Authors of journal articles
- Heads of Department/division/center
- Educators, Researchers, Faculty
- Advocates for public good

Society Members / Officers
Raise questions about:
- Pricing models for libraries – how costly
- Free access policies
  - Do the articles become freely accessible?
  - Can the embargo period be shorter?
- What other activities are being funded by the journal revenue? Is that reasonable?
- Consider being a role model/leader in OA for the field
Editors / Editorial Board Members

Ask about:
- Access-friendly policies – embargo periods
- Subscription costs for libraries
- Restrictive licenses – e.g. no interlibrary loans to foreign libraries or individuals
- Other cost/revenue models considered
- Activities the revenue is supporting
- Copyright ownership – author or journal
- Policies on the authors’ use of their articles
- Consider another publisher with better policies

Editors of Emerging Journals

When starting a new journal, find a publisher that:
- Supports access-friendly policies
- Allows short embargo periods
- Allows authors to keep the copyright
- Has reasonable subscription fees for libraries
- Consider new publishing partnerships
  - university presses, SPARC, and other models

Authors

- Choose journals with access-friendly policies
  - Consider access for colleagues, students and patients
- Choose journals with shorter embargo periods or more flexible policies
- Choose granting agencies that support publication costs
- Library can provide data on journals in their field
- Library can post Web sites with journal policies

Educators

- Ask journals for increased use for classes
  - Posting on course Web sites
  - Distributing digital copies to students
- Increased or free access for all students
- Advocating for importance of free and easy access to all for learning
Scholarly Communication Education Initiatives

Researcher

- Ask for funding from granting agency
- Identify funding agencies supporting public access
- Identify publishers working with public access
- Comment on policies and legislation, e.g., NIH
- Advocate importance of access for scientific discovery
  - Global research issues in developing countries

Heads of Department/Division/Center

- Encourage faculty to publish in high quality open access journals
- Fund author fees and fees for immediate release of articles
- Recognize increasing prestige of OA journals during APT decisions
- Ask faculty to keep their copyright rights
- Be a role model in their own publishing choices

Faculty Member

- Mentor junior faculty
- Push for changes in promotion/tenure process
- Promote petitions and declarations promoting OA and public access
- Deposit articles in an institutional repository or post on his/her Web site

Advocates for Public Good

- Open scientific information benefits everyone and is a public good
- Taxpayer supported research should be accessible
- Power of freely accessible information in global health
- Monitor legislative proposals and send in comments and opinions
- Can influence future policies on the national level
Assistance from Library

- Identify access and embargo policies
- Compare with other journals in field
- Find information on impact factors of open access journals
- Refer to alternative publishing models and partnerships
- Connect them to Scholarly Communications Officer

As Experts, Faculty Have the Power and Influence to Alter and Shape Scholarly Publishing
Publishing Issues:
Access and Today’s Publishing Environment

THE PUBLISHING PROCESS

Sticker Price: $6,365.00

Sticker Price: $10,450
Average 2005 Price for Scientific Disciplines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Average Price per Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>$2,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>$2,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>$1,443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>$1,494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>$1,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math &amp; Computer Science</td>
<td>$1,362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astronomy</td>
<td>$1,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology</td>
<td>$1,187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>$1,169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Science</td>
<td>$1,107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>$1,081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Science</td>
<td>$1,059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoology</td>
<td>$1,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>$945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>$799</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Journal Cost Crisis

UI Libraries Spending by Publisher
Print and Electronic Journals

Next expected UI journal cuts
See http://www.lib.uiowa.edu/collections/cancell2007/

2007-2008

$225,000
Journal cuts at other universities:

- University of Michigan ($1.1 million)
- University of Florida ($750,000)
- University of Kansas ($500,000)
- University of Oregon ($600,000)
- University of Colorado/Boulder ($500,000)
- Duke University ($308,000)
- Stanford University ($900,000)
- University of Notre Dame ($400,000)
- University of Wisconsin/Madison ($400,000)
- University of New Mexico ($750,000)
- Loyola University ($320,000)

Impact on You

- Higher prices = fewer databases for libraries = fewer journals = less access to research
- Research takes longer and is more difficult

PUBLISHING VENUES:

**Traditional Publishers**

- Restrict access to paying subscribers
- Authors usually transfer copyright to publisher
- Researchers are often unpaid workers (editors, reviewers)
- For profit publisher: NEJM, Nature
- Society publisher: AHA (Circulation Research)

**Open Access Publishers**

- Anyone can read for free online
- Authors usually retain copyright or some rights
- Authors often pay publishing fees
- Researchers are often unpaid workers (editors, reviewers)
- New publisher: PLOS Medicine
- Society publisher converted to open access: Transactions of the American Ophthalmological Society
Digital Repositories

- Discipline: PubMed Central
- Institution: MIT DSpace and ALADIN
- Individual: Your own web page
WHAT YOU CAN DO

Author's Submissions

Submit the rights you need.

When you write in life, the submission of scholarly work is an important part of the process. It is a way to share your ideas and communicate with others in your field. However, it can also be a way to make money. The process of submitting a scholarly work involves a number of steps, including:

1. Writing the manuscript
2. Identifying the journal
3. Preparing the submission
4. Submitting the manuscript
5. Reviewing the manuscript
6. Revise the manuscript
7. Accepting the manuscript
8. Publishing the manuscript

Once the manuscript is accepted, it is sent to the publisher's editorial office where it will be reviewed by the editor. The editor will then determine whether the manuscript is appropriate for the journal or not. If the manuscript is not appropriate, it will be rejected. If the manuscript is appropriate, it will be sent to the journal for publication.


What's the Big Deal?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>Price Cap</th>
<th>2017 Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Springer</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>$483,983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiley</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>$349,163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackwell</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>$214,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsevier</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>$1,293,443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL:</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,204,301</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Springer: 316 subscribed, 800 titles accessed via consortia
- Wiley: 156 subscribed, 461 titles accessed via consortia
- Blackwell: 396 subscribed, 760 titles accessed via consortia
- Elsevier: 788 titles subscribed, 1,316 titles accessed via consortia
- TOTALS: 1,066 titles subscribed to from the 4 publishers; 3,335 titles accessed via consortia agreements (100% increase in access)
**Bundle of Author Rights**

- To publish and distribute a work in print or other media
- To reproduce it (e.g., through photocopying)
- To prepare translations or other derivative works
- To perform or display the work publicly
- To authorize others to exercise any of these rights

**Surrendered Copyright? May Need Permission to:**

- Post the work on your web site or to a course management system like WebCT
- Re-use excerpts in another work
- Translate the work into another language
- Make copies of the work for your colleagues
- Place the work in course-packs
- Place the work in a digital repository or archive

**Author Option: maintain the status quo**

Continue the frequent existing practice of transferring ownership of copyrights to publishers in exchange for publication
despite the restrictions it places on you to use your own work
Retaining Copyright: American Mathematical Society

This Consent to Publish has explicit instructions:
"If the Author(s) wishes to retain copyright of the content and image of this Work, . . . the Author(s) may strike out items 3, 4, and 5 above."

Author’s New Opportunity:
Retain rights - some or all

Reserve only specific rights you need, such as
• the right to copy material for instructional purposes
• the right to post your work on your web site
• the right to republish an essay in a book
---but otherwise transfer ownership of the copyright to the publisher

OR
Retain ownership of the copyright and license to publishers only specific rights, such as
• the right of first publication

Reserve Some Specific Rights

• Sharing your work with others
  - On your web site
  - In an open access repository
• Teaching
  - Course reserves (electronic or print)
  - Course packs
• Future uses of your work
  - Derivative works, translations
  - Anthologies, edited volumes

Sharing: Wiley Copyright Transfer

"The rights listed below are permitted without having to request further permission from the publisher. . . .

"The right to post preprints as electronic files on the author’s own Website for personal or professional use, . . . or on a secure external Website at the author’s institution"
Teaching: American Physical Society

Transfer of Copyright Agreement:

"The author(s) shall have the following rights (the "Author Rights"):

"(3) The right to use all or part of the Article, including the APS-prepared version without revision or modification, on the author(s)’ web home page or employer’s website and to make copies of all or part of the article for the author(s)’ use for lecture or classroom purposes."

Teaching: Wiley Agreement

Wiley allows, without requesting permission:

"The right to photocopy the article for course packs to be distributed to students at the author’s institution free of charge or for storage in electronic format in datarooms for access by students at the author’s institution as part of their course work, and for in-house training programs at the author’s place of work."

But paradoxically...

Future uses: American Institute of Chemical Engineers

Copyright Assignment Form:

"The undersigned retains the following rights in the paper:
b) The right to reproduce, have reproduced, prepare derivative works, . . . for such purposes as teaching, scholarship or research . . . "

\[\text{Libraries}\]
Negotiating: Success Story

Professor Gary Balas, of U of M’s department of Aerospace Engineering and Mechanics, initiated a change by his professional organization:

The American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics (AIAA) agreed to modify their self-archiving policy to allow web posting without requesting permission.

Negotiating: Author Addendum

http://www.arl.org/spsarc/bn-doc/AuthorsAddendum2_F.pdf

"THIS ADDENDUM hereby modifies and supplements the attached Publication Agreement concerning the following Article . . .

1. Author’s Retention of Rights. Author retains:
   (i) the rights to reproduce, distribute, . . .
   (ii) the right to prepare derivative works . . .
   For example, Author may make and distribute copies in the course of teaching and research and may post the Article on personal or institutional Web sites and in other open-access digital repositories . . ."
Questions?

Contact [name, email]
Discussion Forum: The CIC Provosts' Statement on Publishing Agreements
Mike Furlough, Becky Albitz, Linda Friend
February 20, 2007

Today’s Purpose
• Informational
  – Update on a specific CIC initiative
  – Overview of related advocacy issues
  – Directing you to available resources

• Discussion
  – Clarification of the issues
  – Awareness of our own publishing habits

Background Trends
• Commercial-academic publishing trends
  – Serial inflation outpaces rest of economy
  – Conglomeration in STM publishing
  – Move to electronic delivery/renting

• Increased awareness of limits to sharing of scholarly information.
  – Web delivery increases awareness of controls
  – DMCA and TEACH act
  – Open access and FRPAA

Background to the Statement
• Nov 3 meeting of CIC Faculty Senate Leaders.
  – Forum on Scholarly Communications
  – Urging for some CIC-based collective statements and action.

• Outcome: the CIC Provosts’ Statement on Author Rights and Sample Author Addenda.
The CIC Provosts’ Statement

- Suitable publishing partners for academic enterprises should be encouraging the widest possible dissemination of the academy’s work, and the management of copyright should be directed to encouraging scholarly output rather than unnecessarily fettering its access and use.

CIC Provosts’ Statement

- The goal of publication should be to encourage widespread dissemination and impact. The means for accomplishing this will necessarily depend on the nature of the work in question, the author’s circumstances, available suitable outlets, and expectations in the author’s field of inquiry.

CIC Provosts’ Statement

- ... we encourage authors to consider publishing strategies that will optimize short and long-term access to their work, taking into account such factors as affordability, efficient means for distribution, a secure third-party archiving strategy, and flexible management of rights.
CIC Provosts’ Statement

• Protecting intellectual property rights is a particularly important consideration, as many of our authors unwittingly sign away all control over their creative output.

CIC Provosts’ Statement

• Toward this end, the CIC Provosts encourage contract language that ensures that academic authors retain certain rights that facilitate archiving, instructional use, and sharing with colleagues to advance discourse and discovery.

CIC Provosts’ Statement

• The CIC Provosts recognize the complexity of the issues involved in publication, but are nonetheless committed to helping our faculty make the most of their work. For further discussion of these issues, or for help in assessing options for the publication of particular works, members of our faculty are encouraged to consult with academic deans, campus counsels, university librarians, or academic staff in the provosts’ offices.

Author Addenda Terms

• Publisher and author agree that where there are conflicting terms between the publication agreement and this addendum, the provisions of this addendum will be paramount. In addition to the rights granted the author in the publication agreement and by law, the parties agree that the author shall also retain the following specified rights:
The Addendum to Publication Agreements for CIC Authors

Author Rights 1

- The Author shall, without limitation, have the non-exclusive right to use, reproduce, distribute, and create derivative works including update, perform, and display publicly, the Article in electronic, digital or print form in connection with the Author’s teaching, conference presentations, lectures, other scholarly works, and for all of Author’s academic and professional activities.

Translation:

Author retains the right to do pretty much anything with the article contents he or she wants, as long as it is for educational/research purposes.

Author Rights 2

- After a period of six(6) months from the date of publication of the article, the Author shall also have all the non-exclusive rights necessary to make, or to authorize others to make, the final published version of the Article available in digital form over the Internet, including but not limited to a website under the control of the Author or the Author’s employer or through digital repositories including, but not limited to, those maintained by CIC institutions, scholarly societies or funding agencies.
Translation:
After six months, the author can post the final, published version of the article on a web site either he or she controls, or that is managed by their institution. No access restrictions are noted.

Author Rights 3
- The Author further retains all non-exclusive rights necessary to grant to the Author's employing institution the non-exclusive right to use, reproduce, distribute, display, publicly perform, and make copies of the work in electronic, digital or in print form in connection with teaching, conference presentations, lectures, other scholarly works, and all academic and professional activities conducted at the Author's employing institution.

Translation:
The author may also allow others at his or her institution to use the article content for educational purposes—such as course packs, reserves, reproduction in institutional publications, etc. What the final phrase "at the Author's employing institution" means is questionable, considering electronic access is permitted.

Note—the authors rights are non-exclusive. The publisher retains the same rights, and also the ability to grant to others all of the rights given to the author.
What are publisher’s allowing?

- Every publisher has a different author agreement, which permits varying degrees of content sharing
- The RoMEO project—lists publishers and their archiving/copyright policies
  http://www.sherpa.ac.uk/index.html

RoMEO Archiving policy key
- **Green**—can archive pre-print and post-print
- **Blue**—can archive post-print (i.e., final draft post-refereeing)
- **Yellow**—can archive pre-print (i.e., pre-refereeing)
- **White**—archiving not formally supported

Remember—everything is negotiable!

Issues with Author Addenda

- Pressure to publish, and related time constraints
- Support for alternative publishing outlets
- Practices and needs vary across disciplines
- A large number of similar/varying addenda models—how do you manage them?
- Lack of awareness of what publishers already allow

Sample Approaches to Author Agreements

- SPARC
- MIT
- Creative Commons
- University of California
SPARC Initiatives

Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition

- Initiated by ARL
- Purpose is to “correct market dysfunctions in the scholarly publishing system”

• CIC Provosts’ Statement is modeled on SPARC license content

SPARC language

1. Author’s Retention of Rights. In addition to any rights under copyright retained by Author in the Publication Agreement, Author retains: (i) the rights to reproduce, distribute, publicly perform, and publicly display the Article in any medium for non-commercial purposes; (ii) the right to prepare derivative works from the Article; and (iii) the right to authorize others to make any non-commercial use of the Article so long as Author receives credit as author and the journal in which the Article has been published is cited as the source of first publication of the Article. For example, Author may make and distribute copies in the course of teaching and research and may post the Article on personal or institutional Web sites and in other open access digital repositories.

Creative Commons License

E.g. Used by Public Library of Science (PloS) journals

Summary of the Creative Commons Attribution License

You are free:
- to copy, distribute, display, and perform the work
- to make derivative works
- to make commercial use of the work

http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/2.5/legalcode
Libraries Are Beginning To Provide Information to Faculty About the Issues & Their Options
ACRL Providing Info for Faculty, Too

http://www.ala.org/ala/acrl/acrlissues/scholarlycomm/scholcommcommunicationtoolkit/faculty/facultyauthorcontrol.htm

Action at Penn State

- Statement/addenda presented to:
  - Senate Committee on Libraries (R)
  - Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs (Qs)
  - Senate Committee on Research (Qs)
- March 20 Faculty Senate:
  - Presented as informational report
- Library discussion or action?
E-LIS

- E-prints in Library and Information Science
- Begun in 2003, currently over 5000 documents

E-LIS is an open access archive for scientific or technical documents, published or unpublished, on Librarianship, Information Science and Technology, and related areas. E-LIS relies on the voluntary work of individuals from a wide range of backgrounds and is non-commercial. It is not a funded project of an organization. It is community-owned and community-driven. We serve LIS researchers by facilitating their self-archiving, ensuring the long-term preservation of their documents and by providing word-wide easy access to their papers.

http://errors.rcis.org/

Discussion

Open Access Discussion Forums

Compiled by Peter Suber:
- American Library Open Access Forum from American Libraries, moderated by Steven VanKleeck.
- Bookshare: The forums associated with the National Open Access Initiative, moderated by Kevin Yuen.
- Institutional Repository: The forum associated with the Connexion software.
- AskLib about the Open Access Initiative.
- Open Access from YALEFCE: On open-access to data, moderated by Peter Murray-Rust.
- Oregon: On OA archiving developments in Australia, moderated by Iwinds Webster. To subscribe, send an email to iwinds@unimelb.edu.au with the message 'subscribe Oregon' in the body of the message.
- PubAffairs Roundtable from the Public Library of Science.
- Publishers from the National Library of Australia on scholarly communication.
- JSTOR from the Society for Industrial Medicine.
- ORCID from ORCID. On institutional repositories.
- OA Open Access Forum (OAIF) from Peter. Formerly called the FOA Forum. On open-access developments broadly construed, especially issues raised by the OAIF.
- OAIS from Open Access News.
- Peter Suber's Open Access Forum. Maintained by Peter Suber.

http://www.corlham.edu/~peterfs/lists/pod-discussion
**Articles and Reports**


Web Resources

Author’s Addenda
CIC addendum (Committee on Institutional Cooperation)
http://www.cic.net/groups/CICMembers/archive/Report/authorsrightsfinalversion.pdf

SPARC addendum (The Scholarly Publication and Academic Resources Coalition)
http://www.arl.org/sparc/author/index.html
Creative Commons
http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/

Scholar’s Copyright Addendum Engine
http://scholars.sciencecommons.org/

**Brochures**
ARL Library Brown Bag Lunch Series-Discussion Leaders Guides
http://www.arl.org/sc/brownbag/

University of California, San Francisco
http://www.library.ucsf.edu/research/scholcomm/scbrochure.pdf
http://www.library.ucsf.edu/research/scholcomm/stickershock.html

Cornell University
Sticker Shock: The Rising Costs of Scientific Journals
http://astech.library.cornell.edu/ast/engr/about/StickerShock.cfm

**Committee Charges**
University of California, Irvine
http://www.lib.uci.edu/scamp/aboutscamp.html

University of Tennessee
http://www.lib.utk.edu/colldev/schcomm.html

University of Virginia
http://www.virginia.edu/uvacommittees/presidentialcommittees/libraries/

University of Wisconsin-Madison
http://oscp.library.wisc.edu/about.html

**Copyright and Intellectual Property Glossary**
Arizona State University
http://www.asu.edu/lib/scholcomm/glossary.htm

**Position Description**
Northwestern University
http://www.library.northwestern.edu/jobs/librarian/job_descriptions/publicservices/Scholarly_Communication&Sciences.htm

**Presentation Handouts**
University of California, Berkeley
http://www.lib.berkeley.edu/scholarlypublishing/handouts.html
University of California
http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/scholarly/

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
http://www.library.uiuc.edu/scholcomm/OpenAccess-9-9-05.ppt

**Scholarly Communication Web sites**
Association of Research Libraries
http://www.arl.org/sc/

Arizona State University
http://www.asu.edu/lib/scholcomm/

University of California
Office of Scholarly Communication
http://osc.universityofcalifornia.edu/

University of California, San Francisco
http://www.library.ucsf.edu/research/scholcomm/index.html

Cornell University
http://www.library.cornell.edu/scholarlycomm/

Georgia Institute of Technology
http://www.library.gatech.edu/scholarlycommunication/

University of Illinois at Chicago
http://www.uic.edu/depts/lib/projects/scholcomm/

Johns Hopkins University
http://openaccess.jhmi.edu/index.cfm

University of Minnesota
http://www.lib.umn.edu/scholcom/

University of Pennsylvania
http://www.library.upenn.edu/scholcomm/

University of Washington
http://www.lib.washington.edu/scholcomm/

Washington University in St Louis School of Medicine
http://becker.wustl.edu/services/scholarly/index.html
**Toolkits**
Create Change, ARL
http://www.createchange.org/about.html

Scholarly Communication Toolkit (ACRL)
http://www.ala.org/ala/acrl/acrlissues/scholarlycomm/scholarlycommunicationtoolkit/toolkit.htm

**Open Access**
Journal Info
http://jinfo.lub.lu.se/

Directory of Open Access Journals
http://www.doaj.org/

Lists Related to the Open Access Movement
http://www.earlham.edu/~peters/fos/lists.htm

NIH Public Access
http://publicaccess.nih.gov/

Open J-Gate
http://www.openj-gate.com/

Sherpa-Romeo Publisher copyright policies & self-archiving
http://www.sherpa.ac.uk/romeo.php

Taxpayer Alliance
http://www.taxpayeraccess.org/

**Newsletters**
Scholarly Communication Column in C&RL News
http://www.ala.org/ala/acrl/acrlissues/scholarlycomm/scholcommcolumn.cfm

E-News for ARL Directors
http://www.arl.org/news/enews/

ARL Bimonthly Report

Open Access News
http://www.earlham.edu/~peters/fos/fosblog.html

Note: All URLs accessed 7/12/07.
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<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPEC Kit Title List</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SP243 TL 8: Users with Disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP242 Library Storage Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP241 Gifts and Exchange Function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP240 Marketing and PR Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP239 Mentoring Programs in ARL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP238 ARL GIS Literacy Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP237 Managing Food and Drink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP236 TL 7: E-Theses/Dissertations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP235 Collaborative Coll Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP234 TL 6: Distance Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP233 ARL in Extension/Outreach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP232 Use of Teams in ARL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP231 Cust Service Programs in ARL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP230 Affirmative Action in ARL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP229 Evaluating Academic Lib Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP228 TL 5: Preserving Digital Info System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP227 Org of Doc Coll &amp; Svcs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP226 TL 4: After the User Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP225 Partnerships Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP224 Staff Training &amp; Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP223 TL 3: Electronic Scholarly Pubs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP222 Electronic Resource Sharing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP221 Evol &amp; Status of Approval Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP220 Internet Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP219 TL 2: Geographic Info Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP218 Info Technology Policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP217 TL 1: Electronic Reserves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP216 Role of Libs in Distance Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP215 Reorg &amp; Restructuring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP214 Digit Tech for Preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP213 Tech Svcs Workstations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP212 Non-Librarian Professionals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP211 Library Systems Office Org</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP210 Strategic Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP209 Library Photocopy Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP208 Effective Library Signage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP207 Org of Collection Develop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP206 Facility Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP205 User Surveys in ARL Libs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP204 Uses of Doc Delivery Svcs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP203 Reference Svc Policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP202 E-journals/Issues &amp; Trends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP201 E-journals/Poll &amp; Proc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP200 2001: A Space Reality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP199 Video Collect &amp; Multimedia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP198 Automating Preserv Mgt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP197 Benefits/Professional Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP196 Quality Improve Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP195 Co-op Strategies in Foreign Acqs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP194 Librarian Job Descriptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP193 Lib Develop &amp; Fundraising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP192 Unpub Mats/Libs, Fair Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP191 Prov Pub Svcs Remote User</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP190 Chang Role of Book Repair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP189 Liaison Svcs in ARL Libs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP188 Intern, Residency &amp; Fellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP187 ILL Trends/Staff &amp; Organ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP186 Virtual Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP185 System Migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP184 ILL Trends/Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP183 Provision of Comp Print Cap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP182 Academic Status for Libns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP181 Perf Appr of Collect Dev Libn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP180 Flexible Work Arrangements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP179 Access Services Org &amp; Mgt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP178 Insuring Lib Colls &amp; Bldgs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP177 Salary Setting Policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP176 Svcs for Persons w/Disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP175 Scholarly Info Centrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP174 Expert Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP173 Staff Recognition Awards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP172 Information Desks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP171 Training of Tech Svcs Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP170 Organization Charts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP169 Mgt of CD-ROM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP168 Student Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP167 Minority Recruitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP166 Materials Budgets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP165 Cultural Diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP164 Remote Storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP163 Affirmative Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP162 Audiovisual Policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP161 Travel Policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP160 Preservation Org &amp; Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP159 Admin of Lib Computer Files</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP158 Strategic Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP157 Fee-based Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP156 Automating Authority Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP155 Visiting Scholars/Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP154 Online Biblio Search</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP153 Use of Mgt Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP152 Brittle Books Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP151 Qualitative Collect Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP150 Bldg Security &amp; Personal Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP149 Electronic Mail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP148 User Surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP147 Serials Control/Deselection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP146 Lib Dev Fund Raising Capabilit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP145 Lib Publications Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP144 Building Use Policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP143 Search Proc St LibAdmin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP142 Remote Access Online Cats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP141 Approval Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP140 Performance Appraisal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP139 Performance Eval: Ref Svcs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP138 University Copyright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP137 Preservation Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP136 Managing Copy Cataloging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP135 Job Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP134 Planning Mgt Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP133 Opt Disks: Storage &amp; Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP132 Library-Scholar Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP131 Coll Dev Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP130 Retrospective Conversion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP129 Organization Charts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP128 Systems File Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP127 Interlibrary Loan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP126 Automated Lib Systems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SPEC Kit Title List**
SPEC Kit Price Information

Individual Kits: $35 ARL members/$45 nonmembers, plus shipping and handling.
Individual issues of the Transforming Libraries (TL) subseries: $28, plus shipping and handling.

Shipping & Handling

U.S.: UPS Ground delivery, $10 per publication.
Canada: UPS Ground delivery, $15 per publication
International and rush orders: Call or e-mail for quote.

Payment Information

Make check or money order payable in U.S. funds to the Association of Research Libraries, Federal ID #52-0784198-N. MasterCard and Visa accepted.

Send orders to: ARL Publications Distribution Center, P.O. Box 531, Annapolis Junction, MD 20701-0531
Phone (301) 362-8196; fax (301) 206-9789; e-mail pubs@arl.org
Order online at: http://www.arl.org/resources/pubs/index.shtml