



SURVEY RESULTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

Recent developments in scholarly communication have raised the issue of author rights on academic campuses with increasing frequency. The NIH Public Access Policy, the expanding interest in and use of institutional repositories, the innovation of new models of publishing, and the growing number of universities mandating open access policies are changing the current environment of scholarly dissemination. Consequently, it is increasingly important to manage copyright in ways that serve author interests and those of the scholarly community. A report titled “The University’s Role in the Dissemination of Research and Scholarship — A Call to Action,” released in February 2009 by the Association of American Universities, the Association of Research Libraries, and others, implores university administrators to adopt the principle that the “dissemination of knowledge is as important to the university mission as its production.”¹ One strategy addressed in the report recommends universities to “encourage faculty authors to modify contracts with publishers so that their contracts permit immediate open access or delayed public access to peer reviewed work in a manner that does not threaten the viability of the journals or monographs.” This approach will require authors to use an addendum or to modify publication agreements on their own, and it illustrates the increasing awareness and relevance of the topic of author rights in academia.

This survey on author addenda was distributed to the 123 ARL member libraries in February 2009.

Respondents were asked to provide information on the use of author addenda at their institutions, which rights authors were encouraged to retain, and the methods by which libraries are conducting promotion and outreach efforts on the topic of author rights and addenda. Seventy libraries (57%) responded to the survey. Of those respondents, 35 (50%) indicated that authors at their institutions are using an author addendum, and 33 libraries (47%) indicated that they “did not know.” Only two libraries indicated that authors at their institutions were not using author addenda.

Addenda Promotion & Endorsement

The majority of respondents (77%) do not formally collect information on the use of author addenda on their campuses. Mostly, evidence is gathered in an informal way, either when an author contacts the library with a question related to copyright or an author addendum, or through anecdotal stories of success or failure in using an addendum. One library collects information by asking authors to follow instructions on their institution’s addendum to fax or e-mail a copy to the library, but several libraries made comments such as, “We collect information when we hear from authors about use which is not very often and has only been when the addendum has been rejected. We hear much more often questions about general copyright transfer” and, “We sometimes learn anecdotally about experiences with addenda, but we do not systematically seek to gather this information.”

The survey investigated the prevalence of the endorsement or promotion of author addenda by respondents' institutions. For the purposes of this survey, "endorse" means a formal act by an institution (either by administrators, or by the faculty governing body) in support of author rights and the use of an author's addendum. "Promote" means active outreach to authors to educate them about author rights and to encourage the use of an author's addendum.

Endorsement

Fifty-two percent (36) of the responding libraries reported that an author addendum had been endorsed by administrators or a governing body at their institution or by their consortia, while 62% (43) responded that there had been no endorsements. The numbers reveal that there are more endorsements at the consortial level than at the institutional level. Eight libraries (12%) reported that an institutional endorsement was under consideration at the time of the survey. One library indicated that an addendum had been endorsed by their Faculty Senate, but that "It was not without controversy, and I would consider the endorsement to be rather weak. At least one subcommittee thought that the addenda unnecessarily inserted the university into the author-publisher relationship and could damage such relationships. Others pointed out (on the floor of the Senate) that such addenda are meaningless unless the university can put resources behind the faculty in negotiations."

Promotion

A larger number of libraries (46 or 68%) reported that their institution or consortium had worked to *promote* the use of an author addendum; 40 respondents (87%) indicated promotion by their institution and 25 (54%) promotion by their consortium. Promotional activities mostly included providing links to an author addendum and copyright information on library Web sites, and some libraries have done faculty presentations on author rights (particularly pertaining to the NIH Public Access Policy). However, general consensus shows there is not much active promotion on institutional or consortial levels.

Twenty-one respondents (30%) reported that their institutions have not promoted the use of an author addendum in any capacity. They are not included in the following results.

Addenda Use and Rights Retained

Addenda Use

Forty-seven libraries responded to a question about which addendum their institution promoted or endorsed. Forty-one have promoted an addendum, most frequently the SPARC addendum (20 respondents or 43%) and/or an institution-specific addendum (17 or 36%). However, results show that all but 10 institutions promote more than one kind of addendum. Others include, in order of frequency, consortia-specific addenda, the Science Commons addendum, and funding agency-specific addenda. The 13 libraries that have promoted a funding agency-specific addendum all verified that this represented the suggested language from the National Institutes of Health (NIH).²

Sixteen institutions have provosts who have endorsed an addendum; 12 (75%) of those endorsed a consortium-specific addendum, likely representing the members of Committee on Institutional Cooperation (CIC) consortium whose provosts had all endorsed their addendum as of June 2008.³

The addendum most often endorsed by a faculty governing body (10 of 14 responses) was also a consortia-specific addendum, which may also reflect the CIC institutions. Only seven respondents report that a department has endorsed an addendum, typically an institution-specific one. Five report an endorsement by their university legal counsel office.

Only nine responding institutions have publicly announced the endorsement of an addendum with a press release, though several report less formal ways of spreading the news, such as e-mails to faculty. Only four have contacted publishers about their endorsement. When solicited for comments about contacting publishers, one library responded that they sent a letter to the top publishers of the university's authors notifying them of the addendum. Another university system prefers to do large institutional negotiations with publishers—rather than promoting

addenda to individual authors—and has been successful in negotiating a pilot project with Springer to have all of their institutions' articles published under a Creative Commons compatible license.⁴

Rights Retained

A tally of the rights authors are encouraged to retain by the responding libraries' various author addenda show that most addenda ask for a basic set of rights. Most of these rights extend beyond the author to include uses by the author's institution as well. Between 57% and 91% of the respondents said their promoted addendum included each of the rights outlined below:

- Deposit work in an institutional repository
- Deposit work in a disciplinary repository
- Post on a personal Web site
- Post on a departmental Web site
- Distribute work in courseware
- Distribute to students
- Distribute to colleagues
- Create derivative works
- Right to reuse their work

The survey results indicate that retaining rights for the published version of the manuscript is only slightly favored (often by less than a percentage point) over retaining rights for the author manuscript (either pre- or post-print).

Retaining all rights except that of first publication appears in only about half of the addenda, though several respondents reported that they encourage authors to retain as many rights as they can, knowing that a negotiation process with the publisher will ensue. One respondent noted, "I like to encourage researchers to retain as many rights as possible particularly for the author manuscript. The preference, of course, is to retain rights for the published version but given the current push back by publishers, getting the manuscript rights would be a significant accomplishment." A respondent for an institution that uses the SPARC addendum commented, "Authors are counseled to try and obtain the broadest possible range of rights they can negotiate back from their publishers.

Because very little success has been reported with publisher acceptance of the SPARC addendum (except as a point of discussion or departure), we do not recommend a single approach but rather suggest faculty look at the SPARC materials and other sites and templates and try to get the rights that are the most important to them individually." The survey results illustrate that authors must take initiative to understand the rights they are asking for and be prepared to invest time and effort in the negotiation process with a publisher.

Publishers are not particularly keen to negotiating a plethora of different addenda and it is unclear how much they have modified their existing agreements to accommodate some basic archiving rights.⁵ Anecdotally, it appears that more publishers are offering agreements that allow basic rights to the author, even if they do not allow the author to obtain exclusive copyright to their work. SHERPA, a consortium of UK institutions that investigates "open-access institutional repositories in universities to facilitate the rapid and efficient worldwide dissemination of research," offers some evidence that the number of publishers offering self-archiving rights has increased. In a response to an e-mail query, the administrator of SHERPA's RoMEO, a database of publisher's copyright and archiving policies, said that the percentage of publishers who allow authors to archive pre-print and post-print versions (coded as "green" publishers) has fluctuated since 2004 but ultimately the percentage remained the same (at around 31%), though the overall quantity of green publishers added to the database has risen from 29 to 161 (and the total number of publishers in the database has risen from 85 to 539). The number of publishers who do not allow any self-archiving (coded as "white" publishers) has decreased in percentage (from 44% to 37% since 2004), and overall, 61% of publishers in RoMEO allow some form of self-archiving, which is a promising number.⁶

Library Promotion of Author Addenda

The majority of responding libraries (34 or 71%) have staff at more than one library in their system working

on promoting an addendum and providing services to authors. Another 10 (21%) have staff at one library working on these endeavors, while four of the respondents (8%) were still in the planning stage of providing promotion and support services. Several respondents noted that, in addition to library staff, author services and addenda promotion receive support from another department or unit on campus, such as their university copyright office, their institutional repository, and an "Office of Research Administration."

When asked which types of libraries promote an addendum and provide author services, the largest percentage of institutions (82%) indicated that most of the promotional activities take place in the main campus library, with libraries supporting the health professions coming in second (61%), and other science libraries coming in third (43%). Twelve of the 44 respondents (27%) answered "Other." One respondent remarked that it is a "collaborative effort by all university libraries, including the main campus library and the health sciences library." Another wrote, "The campus libraries have a Scholarly Communications and Publishing committee that helps support this work," and another said it "depends on subject librarians and interests of authors in their disciplines but all subject librarians have author support as a part of their activities."

Participating Staff and Staff Training

Leadership and Promotion Responsibilities

The majority of respondents reported that the leadership role rests with the library director or an assistant or associate director of the library (both categories received 26 or 62% of the responses). About half (22 libraries) indicated that leadership rests with a scholarly communications officer. Other frequently reported leaders include staff who have legal or copyright expertise (15), digital library or repository staff (12), and heads of collections (11).

Library leadership on promoting author addenda is widely shared across staff categories, though. Only seven respondents reported that a single individual had this responsibility: three directors, one AUL, two

scholarly communication officers, and a collection development librarian.

At the 23 other libraries where the library director plays a leadership role the responsibility is shared with AULs (19 responses), a scholarly communications officer (14), staff with legal expertise (10), the head of collections (8), digital library staff (5), and collection development and reference librarians (3 and 2 respectively).

Promotional activities rest primarily with four different types of library staff: reference librarians (67%), collection development librarians (59%), a scholarly communications officer (59%), and digital library or repository staff (48%). The results show that the promotional work is shared and falls to almost all staff in the system, ranging from an electronic resources librarian, library support staff, individuals with legal expertise, to even library directors.

Coordinating with units outside the library on addendum promotion occurs at 18 institutions. Eight respondents indicated that they work collaboratively with a campus legal office or a copyright/licensing office, six (including some of the same institutions) indicated that they collaborate with a high level administration office, such as the provost's office or the university's office of research, four mentioned that there is a scholarly communications committee or task force, and two libraries noted cooperative efforts with their campus technology office. While these numbers are small, they are noteworthy as an indication of where collaborative opportunities may rest outside the library system.

Staff Training

A large majority of survey respondents provide educational materials (86%) or training events (78%) to library staff, though many indicate that some of these are intended for faculty, and library staff benefit from them. Comments from respondents show that training may not be specifically about an author addendum, but that the topic arises in scholarly communication activities, such as training related to the NIH Public Access Policy or publicity about international Open Access Day.

All but a few of the responding institutions (38 or 93%) have a public Web site that serves to educate staff and authors on the issue of author rights and author addenda. Other popular means of training staff are face-to-face workshops (73%), handouts on key issues (59%), and PowerPoint slides (49%). The library staff charged with spearheading training efforts is primarily a scholarly communications officer (if the library has one), a library committee devoted to scholarly communications activities, or library administrators (55%, 48%, and 45% respectively).

Educating authors on the use of an addendum takes place mostly when presenting on compliance with public access policies (84%). However, other situations include discussing depositing authors' work in a digital repository (74%), author sharing of their work (70%) and use of their work in teaching (65%). When queried about which department or group on campus takes a leadership role in promoting the use of addenda, predictably 100% of the respondents indicated the library. However, of interest is which other groups or units also serve a role. Thirty-five percent of respondents confirmed that the faculty senate and/or the provost's office is involved in a leadership role, and 33% answered that a different group on campus fulfills that role, ranging from the "VP of Research," to "Academic Technology," to the "Faculty board advising the library." Notable is that this work takes place across a wide variety of campus units outside the library system.

Author Education

Activities

Two of the most used and most effective activities to educate authors about using an author addendum are presentations to faculty and one-on-one visits with faculty. Eighty-six percent have used faculty presentations to convey information about addenda; 66% indicated this was the most effective form of outreach and 63% indicated that on-on-one conversations with faculty was the most effective. Handouts and brochures are used often by libraries (65%), as are Web sites (60%), although the effectiveness of these efforts ranked much lower than their frequency of use (at

17% and 26% respectively). Across the board, results show that libraries made varied efforts to educate authors, but that most were viewed as not very effective. Sixty percent of respondents have made presentations to graduate students, but only 26% noted that they felt this was an effective activity. This result may imply that the efficacy of efforts to educate graduate students is not easily measurable since graduate students are not publishing much and are more likely to be contributors to a paper than the primary author. Perhaps in the future, the value of libraries' efforts at outreach to graduate students will become more apparent.

The respondents were invited to describe up to three activities that were most effective in accomplishing their outreach efforts to educate authors about addenda. Comments revealed, again, that one-on-one meetings with authors, where librarians have the opportunity to discuss author rights, were the most common activity. Presentations to faculty groups, and often over a lunch "series," a brown bag, or at a departmental meeting, were also deemed effective. One respondent wrote, "Presentations at formal and informal department events like faculty meetings and coffee hours have been very effective in getting the word out about author rights." Another commented that they did "presentations to faculty departments and groups where faculty get the 'deer in the headlights' look when you describe what happens when they give away their author rights. They start using addenda after that and also want to participate in the institutional repository. There have also been many individual meetings as follow-up from these department meetings." One library felt that faculty presentations are effective, but that it was "difficult to get such opportunities," which may suggest that presentations are useful if you can get faculty to commit the time to listen. Other libraries have sent letters and e-mails to faculty, and one library described presentations to grant writers.

The main topic in outreach activities about addenda was copyright law (98%), with institutional repositories and the freedom to use their work in the classroom coming in as the second most frequently addressed topics (71% each). Freedom to share work

with colleagues and to reuse their work were also important topics; one respondent commented, “The vast majority of faculty have been doing these activities all along without realizing that in most cases they are violating the agreements they have signed and seem quite stunned by this information.” Other respondents indicated that they bring up author rights and addenda while discussing open access, or how to select a publisher with a friendly publishing agreement or with paid open access options.

Frequently Asked Questions

The survey asked respondents to report who provides advice on answering authors’ copyright-related questions. Library staff with legal expertise or in-depth copyright knowledge field questions from authors most often (85%), and 49% of respondents direct authors to solicit advice from their institution’s legal counsel. The questions below offer a sample of frequently asked questions the survey respondents have received from authors.

The publisher has rejected the addendum. What do I do now?

I submitted the author addendum but the publisher sent it back to me all marked up with other language. What do I do now?

How can I use the addendum when I have to submit my paper through a Web site?

Which addendum should I use?

What do I do when there are multiple authors?

What does this publication agreement really say?

What is the difference between my publisher’s copyright form and what the addendum would give me?

Is using the addendum or negotiating copyright terms going to put my publication in jeopardy?

Do most publishers accept the addendum?

Which version of the manuscript is covered by the addendum?

I submitted the author addendum with my article but they will only allow me to post my final draft on the institutional repository. I am very concerned about multiple versions of my work being available. How do we address this? Which copy will people cite? What do I do when I want to make revisions to the article?

Can an individual author really make a difference?

What will these changes mean for the survival of journals that are important in our discipline?

Are publishers really willing to negotiate?

An informal look at a sampling of ARL libraries’ scholarly communication Web sites did not turn up many answers to these questions, suggesting a need for these to be answered by the library community (and easily discoverable on the Web).

Conclusion

The survey reveals that among ARL member libraries, author addenda education, promotion, and outreach services are distributed among many staff members. Additionally, those who do the work and the extent to which outreach is performed varies widely. In a time of pervasive budget problems in higher education, it is not surprising to find that libraries are doing what they can with the resources that exist. Undoubtedly, many libraries found success by coupling outreach on an author addendum with other services, such as PubMed Central article deposits, institutional repository development and deposit, copyright discussions, and general outreach about the NIH Public Access Policy. Comments from two respondents illustrate these efforts:

“Since the NIH Public Access mandate, we frequently connect our promotion of author addenda to a broader education campaign about PMC deposit. The library offers a service that assists with PMC deposit, and much of our one-on-one addendum consulting occurs as a result of that service.”

“While these voluntary addenda provide a useful tool in discussions with faculty, we don’t believe that active promotion of the addenda will result in substantial adoption on our campuses. Thus we have taken an approach of discussing author rights and copyright in the context of other services we offer, e.g., publishing, instructional support, [and] reserves.”

Clearly there is difficulty in measuring the efficacy of author addenda, and this in turn makes it difficult to sell the concept to authors. However, author addenda can serve as a “tool” to educate authors about their rights, even if they never end up using an addendum. One respondent explained, “in general, addendum[s] have not been useful except as an education tool for faculty and graduate students.” And another noted, “it’s very difficult to claim to faculty that it is an effective tool.”

Despite the difficulty in measuring success with addenda, librarians are being asked by their administrations, with increasing frequency, to “demonstrate active participation in scholarly communication activities,” which includes discussing author rights and author addenda. Many libraries are in the process of developing or posting positions which require legal expertise to help them manage the increasing demand for author rights management, and to help promote the rights of their institution’s authors. One librarian explained, “As head of collection development I tried for several years to convince the Provost’s Office and the Dean of Libraries that the faculty need legal counsel who will advise them about the amount of risk to take, rather than protecting the university from risk. Some of the faculty agree, but no position has been forthcoming.”

The topic of author rights may arise in any situation or discussion with faculty authors which underscores why understanding and explaining author rights is becoming a necessary part of many librarians’ work. One person noted, “We have seen an important change in our experiences with the issues. . . [a] conversation about OA quickly shifted to a conversation about author agreements and addenda, with attention on the many various reasons for entering into better agreements. We always conclude with one simple point of emphasis: Whatever you sign, keep a copy.”

The survey suggests that academic libraries face a steep learning curve in this arena. Increasingly, libraries are providing services, or are being asked to provide services, to help authors navigate a new environment where intellectual property, author rights, and copyright have become a substantial component of discussions related to scholarly communication, and to the endeavors of the university at-large.

Notes

1. Association of American Universities, Association of Research Libraries, The Coalition for Networked Information, National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, “The University’s Role in the Dissemination of Research and Scholarship,” February 2009
<http://www.arl.org/bm~doc/disseminating-research-feb09.pdf>
2. Committee on Institutional Cooperation, *Statement on Publishing Agreements*, 2008
<http://www.cic.net/Libraries/Library/authorsrights.sflb>
3. NIH example language: “Journal acknowledges that Author retains the right to provide a copy of the final peer-reviewed manuscript to the NIH upon acceptance for Journal publication, for public archiving in PubMed Central as soon as possible but no later than 12 months after publication by Journal.”
<http://publicaccess.nih.gov/FAQ.htm#c3>

4. Ivy Anderson, "UC Libraries and Springer Sign Pilot Agreement for Open Access Journal Publishing," UC Newsroom, 1/21/2009

<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/news/article/19335>

5. Sanford G. Thatcher, "On the Author's Addendum." *Journal of Scholarly Publishing* 40, no. 1 (October 2008): 97-115.

6. SHERPA RoMEO, "Statistics for the 596 publishers on this list."

<http://www.sherpa.ac.uk/romeo.php?stats=yes>

SURVEY QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

The SPEC survey on Author Addenda was designed by **Karen Fischer**, Collections Analysis & Planning Librarian, University of Iowa. These results are based on data submitted by 70 of the 123 ARL member libraries (57%) between February 2 and March 20, 2009. The survey's introductory text and questions are reproduced below, followed by the response data and selected comments from the respondents.

Recent developments in scholarly communication, such as the NIH public access policy, growing interest and use of institutional repositories, open access and new models of publishing, and the Harvard Faculty of Arts and Science Open Access Policy, are raising the topic of author rights with increasing frequency. In the current environment of publishing, it is more important than ever to manage copyright in ways that serve author interests and those of the scholarly community.

Faculty at many large academic institutions have endorsed author addenda, to be used by authors when signing a publication agreement. These addenda, if accepted by the publisher, allow the author to retain rights to use their work in several ways. Some examples are: freely posting their article on their own Web sites, depositing copies of their work in a repository (institutional or disciplinary), and using their work in future works, such as new editions or in ways not yet imagined. In short, an addendum allows authors to share their research more widely, and gives them the added benefit of increasing the impact of their research and creative outputs.

The use and success of author addenda at ARL institutions has not been studied as of yet. This survey is designed to answer the following questions:

- To what extent are author addenda being promoted and used at ARL institutions? Are there institution-wide implementations?
- How are libraries promoting the use of addenda?
- Within a library's organization, who is spearheading efforts to educate and train librarians to promote an author addendum?
- What talking points are librarians using to educate authors about author addenda?
- How successful are addenda as a negotiating tool for authors?

For the purposes of this survey:

- endorse means a formal act by your institution (either by administrators, or by the faculty governing body) in support of author rights and the use of an author's addendum.
- promote means active outreach to authors to educate them about author rights and to encourage the use of an author's addendum.

BACKGROUND

1. To your knowledge, are any authors at your institution using an author’s addendum to retain rights to their creative work? N=70

Yes	35	50%
No	2	3%
I don’t know	33	47%

If yes, is the library collecting information on authors’ use of addenda? N=35

Yes	8	23%
No	27	77%

Selected Comment from Respondents

Answered Yes

CISTI is the library of the National Research Council of Canada (NRC). NRC authors do not use an author’s addendum because all NRC authors must use the NRC Licence to Publish form. Because elements of the ARL and CARL author addenda were incorporated into the NRC Licence to Publish form in January 2009, the survey is being answered as if NRC authors used an author’s addendum. NRC has always used a Licence to Publish form because NRC authors are employees of the Canadian federal government and all works by NRC employees are covered by Crown Copyright. Crown Copyright cannot be assigned. NRC authors are directed to sign the NRC Licence to Publish form and not to use any licence to publisher forms of publishers. NRC established a policy making it mandatory, starting in January 2009, for NRC institutes to deposit copies of all peer-reviewed, NRC-authored publications and technical reports in their institutional repository (NRC Publications Archive, NPARC). The NRC Licence to Publish (Crown Copyright) has been updated to declare the NRC’s intent to deposit the full-text of NRC-authored publications in NPARC and to retain specific rights. The ARL and CARL author’s addenda were used as models for the wording of these specific rights. On the submission form for NPARC, authors (or delegates) must indicate that they have used the NRC Licence to Publish form and any changes made to the form.

The library only collects information on authors who contact the library in regard to using the addendum.

We are not formally collecting information on authors’ use of addenda, but when we consult with authors about the addendum we request that they report back to us on their success or failure. Sometimes they do, but only rarely.

We are not systematically tracking; it’s mostly just anecdotal at this point.

We collect information when we hear from authors about use which is not very often and has only been when the addendum has been rejected. We hear much more often questions about general copyright transfer.

We have information on the subset of authors who, when using the addendum, follow the instructions on the addendum to fax or e-mail a copy to the Libraries.

When we are contacted to help out.

Answered No

A law professor told me he had retained some of his author rights, but he did not say how.

Actually, what I have heard from 2 different faculty members is that they have “tried” to use the SPARC author’s addenda and were turned down flat by the publisher.

Not yet. However, we plan to do so as we build a new Faculty Publications Database as part of our IR.

We are unaware of anyone adopting the addenda, primarily because we are not staffed to a degree that would allow us to easily promote and collect information on faculty activity on copyright, author’s rights, etc.

We collect anecdotal stories of the use of addenda, but do not have a centralized place to aggregate the stories.

We sometimes learn anecdotally about experiences with addenda, but we do not systematically seek to gather this information.

2. Has a specific author rights addendum been endorsed by administrators or a governing body at your institution, or by a consortium to which your institution belongs? Check all that apply. N=69

	N	Institution N=67	Consortium N=57
Yes	36	22	27
No	43	37	27
Under consideration	11	8	3

3. Has your institution, or a consortium to which your institution belongs, promoted the use of an author rights addendum by authors affiliated with your institution? Check all that apply. N=68

	N	Institution N=66	Consortium N=53
Yes	46	40	25
No	29	19	24
Under consideration	9	7	4

Selected Comments from Respondents

A Faculty Senate subcommittee has drafted a resolution concerning open access, etc., that encourages faculty, the Libraries, and university administration to take various actions, and the faculty section includes the following: "...adopt and use an Addendum to Publication Agreement such as that provided by the Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition (SPARC) in order to retain their rights to use their work in the classroom and in future publications and to archive final accepted manuscripts." However, action on the resolution won't be taken for another month or two, so there is not yet an official endorsement or promotion.

A year ago we were planning on doing a large campaign to promote the recently endorsed addendum. However, we then starting hearing from other institutions who where trying this that outreach and promotion for their author addendum was not easy. At the same time, we saw that many publishers' policies regarding author rights were improving. Additionally, the addendum that our university endorsed (the CIC one) has a 6-month embargo request — anecdotal evidence is showing that this may be too short for publishers (given that NIH policy is 12 months). Another important factor that has delayed progress on the promotion of our addendum is the fact that we have been between provosts for the past year (there was an interim provost for a year), we had a terrible flood (summer 2008) which flooded many campus buildings and which has demanded the attentions of our administration since then.

Discussion at Faculty/Academic Council on campus, promotion on the CIC Web site.

Editing publisher contracts with a couple of standard paragraphs has proven more successful than addenda.

Except for a link on the libraries' copyright site and a single PowerPoint slide that was shown to 4 groups of faculty and graduate students as part of a copyright presentation, promotion of author's addenda is not taking place on this campus of the university.

I do not have information about the possible consortia we may belong to. We have several addenda links from library and scholarly communications Web sites as a service and education, but we don't endorse or promote beyond that. We do educate about author rights but don't endorse or promote any specific addenda. We are a member of SPARC which does promote and endorse.

I'm on the GWLA IR task force and we've been discussing the possibility of recommending that the SPARC addendum be endorsed.

Institutional negotiations with publishers are a preferred approach. For example, recent negotiations with Springer have resulted in a pilot project in which articles are published under a Creative Commons compatible license (see: <http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/news/article/19335>).

The university's addendum was developed under the auspices of the Committee on Intellectual Property, which is chaired by the Vice President for Research, in 2006. The Vice President for Research and the Director of Libraries visited many academic departments to promote the addendum when it was first released. Since that time, the Libraries have hired a Scholarly Publishing and Licensing Consultant, whose responsibilities include supporting and promoting the use of the addendum. One of the means of promoting the addendum is a Web site explaining the reason for it and how to use it.

Office of the General Counsel advised authors that they, at a minimum, must retain the right to deposit work arising from NIH funding into PubMed Central. Authors were encouraged to consider using a second, broader

addendum modeled on the SPARC addendum. Both are available on the Scholarly Communications Web site. Librarians met with faculty groups to promote the addenda and to inform faculty about the NIH Public Access Policy.

OhioLINK has promoted this idea but has not written a specific addendum.

Our institution is not inclined to endorse an author addenda (in fact questions what, exactly, endorsement means), but we are in the process of increasing the information we provide to faculty, including providing informational links to author addenda.

The Libraries encourage it, but our "institution" doesn't really.

The author rights addendum is posted on the University Libraries' Web site. The University Libraries have had speakers from the University Press and the General Counsel's Office inform librarians about the addendum who are in turn informing faculty members.

The Canadian Association of Research Libraries collaborated with SPARC to create the SPARC Canadian Author Addendum.

The CIC Provost's Addenda was endorsed by the Faculty Senate in the Spring of 2008. It was not without controversy, and I would consider the endorsement to be rather weak. At least one subcommittee thought that the addenda unnecessarily inserted the university into the author-publisher relationship and could damage such relationships. Others pointed out (on the floor of the Senate) that such addenda are meaningless unless the university can put resources behind the faculty in negotiations.

The Faculty Senate has urged faculty members to use the SPARC Author's Addendum. Since the passage of this recommendation, the library has advised faculty to use the Scholar's Copyright Addendum Engine.

The Scholarly Communication Team promotes the use of the SPARC addendum to faculty and students.

We support the use of the UC-wide author addendum, which is found on the UC Reshaping Scholarly Communication Web site.

We have an approved publisher letter addressing NIH policy compliance.

We are holding a series of meetings with faculty and others to advance the notion of negotiating author agreements and using addenda to reserve rights.

Web pages have been developed with information and links to a variety of addenda. These are not actively promoted.

While the Faculty Senate endorsed and the Provost promoted the use of the addendum, there has not been consistent promotion.

If the use of an author addendum has been promoted or endorsed by your institution, please continue the survey.

If the use or endorsement of an author addendum is under consideration at your institution, please complete as much of the survey as possible at this time.

If your institution has not promoted the use of an author addendum, please click the Next>> button below to submit the survey now. N=21

SPECIFIC ADDENDA PROMOTED OR ENDORSED

4. Please indicate which addendum has been promoted and which endorsed at your institution. Check all that apply. N=47

	N	Promoted N=41	Endorsed by Provost N=16	Endorsed by a Department N=7	Endorsed by Faculty Body N=14	Other Endorsement N=5
Institution-specific addendum	22	17	5	4	4	2
SPARC addendum	22	20	1	—	2	2
Consortia-specific addendum	17	13	12	1	10	—
Science Commons	14	12	—	1	—	1
Funding agency-specific addendum	13	11	2	3	—	1
SPARC Canadian addendum	2	2	—	—	1	—
Other addendum	11	11	—	—	—	—

Please specify the funding agency. N=13

National Institutes of Health

Please specify other addendum. N=11

"AMENDMENT TO PUBLICATION AGREEMENT" found at http://osc.universityofcalifornia.edu/manage/retain_copyrights.html

Boston Library Consortium Addendum. See <http://www.blc.org/news/amendment.html>

CIC Addendum, and an addendum created in-house.

CIC Author Rights' Statement & Addendum.

Creative Commons license is also promoted. Institutional addenda is part of our NIH Public Policy toolkit.

Joint Resolution on Scholarly Communication and Faculty Copyrights. (http://www.lib.uci.edu/scamp/joint_resolution.html). While the faculty have not formally endorsed a specific addenda, the libraries are collaborating with the faculty on these issues.

Law School has promoted their addendum.

See UC Office of Scholarly Communication — <http://osc.universityofcalifornia.edu/>— and The UCLA Library Scholarly Communication — <http://staff.library.ucla.edu/scholarlycommunication/>

UC System.

The university consulted with legal counsel to develop an addenda specific to the requirements of the NIH open access mandate. See <http://www.hmc.psu.edu/library/PMC/amendment.pdf>

University of Kansas' copyright contract language; Boston Library Consortium's Agreement to Extend Author Rights (based on MIT's).

Please specify other endorsing entity and the corresponding addendum. N=7

Institution-specific addendum

General Counsel.

The institution-specific addendum is explicitly endorsed by the University Office of the General Counsel. The Libraries' University Library Committee is the advisory committee to the Dean, the University Libraries, and the Library and Information Science Program and is comprised of representatives of the University's faculty, students, and staff. The ULC has endorsed the institute-specific agenda and through its Web page issued a "challenge [to] their faculty colleagues to take action on the matter of copyright." See <http://www.lib.wayne.edu/geninfo/units/las/dean/ulc/>.

NRC Legal Services (original mandate came from the NRC Senior Executive Committee).

Science Commons

The Library has promoted the use of the Scholar's Copyright Addendum Engine from Science Commons.

SPARC addendum

General Counsel.

University licensing office/counsel.

Funding agency-specific addendum

The Vice President for Research approached the University Libraries for help in gathering information about the NIH mandate. The Libraries developed a Web site and conducted training at the main campus and at the medical campus.

5. Was a press release issued following endorsement of an addendum? N=41

Yes	9	22%
No	32	78%

6. Has there been a systematic effort by your institution to contact individual publishers about the endorsement? N=43

Yes	4	9%
No	39	91%

Selected Comments from Respondents

A letter was sent to the top publishers of university authors when the addendum was released.

A recent agreement with Springer during purchase negotiations has resulted in a pilot project in which articles are published under a Creative Commons compatible license (see: <http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/news/article/19335>).

BC Libraries' adoption of the addendum of both SPARC and the BLC was communicated to faculty by means of an e-mail, by a blog posting, by a presentation at a Council of Deans meeting. It is also posted on a Library Web page.

Efforts are done on an ad hoc basis. The word 'systematic' is too strong to describe current efforts.

Our general counsel office did review the addendum but I wouldn't consider that an endorsement.

We are in the process of promoting the SPARC addendum on a department-by-department basis.

We have just started working with publishers. If required, we will create customized NRC Licence to Publish forms for specific publishers.

SPECIFIC AUTHOR RIGHTS

7. What rights are authors encouraged to retain through use of an addendum? Check all that apply.

(Note: An author manuscript is a pre- or post-print version of the work.) N=44

Right to:	N	Author Manuscript N=35	Published Version N=33
Deposit work in an institutional repository	42	32	32
Deposit work in a disciplinary repository (e.g., arXiv.org, Social Science Research Network, Oxford Text Archive)	38	28	29
Create derivative works	37	27	28
Right to reuse their work	37	26	30
Post on a personal Web site	35	25	27
Distribute to students	35	25	26
Distribute to colleagues	35	24	27
Distribute work in courseware	34	24	27
Post on a departmental Web site	30	20	25
Retain all rights except right of first publication	23	15	17
Other right(s)	9	6	7

Please describe other rights and indicate whether they are for the author manuscript or the published version.

Author Manuscript

Post Author Manuscript to funding agency site. Allow author's employer to have the same rights re: the Author Manuscript.

To authorize others to make any non-commercial use of the Accepted Manuscript so long as the author(s) receives credit as author(s) and the publication in which the Version of Record has been published is cited as the source of publication of the Version of Record.

Published Version

Grants rights above to the author's employer as well.

The CIC Addenda provides for all these rights, as well as the ability to grant similar rights to the author's institution. The NIH addenda we are using covers ONLY the right to deposit in PubMed Central.

Both

I like to encourage researchers to retain as many rights as possible particularly for the author manuscript. The preference, of course, is to retain rights for the published version but given the current push back by publishers, getting the manuscript rights would be a significant accomplishment.

Rights for the institution include "all academic and professional activities conducted at the Author's employing institution." Version is not specified. Rights for the author include: "and for all of Author's academic and professional activities." MIT's addendum refers to the final published version in some cases, and to the article or the work in others. The intention is to retain rights for both the author's manuscript and the published version.

The Faculty Resolution stated that the faculty should transfer only the right of first print and electronic publication, but retain all other rights.

Additional Comments

Authors are counseled to try and obtain the broadest possible range of rights they can negotiate back from their publishers. Because very little success has been reported with publisher acceptance of the SPARC addendum (except as a point of discussion or departure), we do not recommend a single approach but rather suggest faculty look at the SPARC materials and other sites and templates and try to get the rights that are the most important to them individually. The faculty Senate is currently considering a resolution like Harvard's that would support institutional deposit rights.

Authors really choose; no official policy although encouraged to retain all rights.

Digital rights for print only published versions.

Generally, the terms of conditions of the SPARC addenda without specifically encouraging any particular ones. UNC also has a fund to support publication in Open Access journals, if this counts, and an NIH Public Access Policy toolkit that provides a sample cover letter to the publisher.

Iowa's addendum does not explicitly allow for posting in courseware, but it does specify that the author may "display publicly, the Article in electronic, digital, or print form in connection with the author's teaching...." Also, regarding the Published Version, our addendum specifically states the author's non-exclusive right to use this version (after a 6-month embargo) to post freely on the Internet or in a repository.

Many of these rights are retained only after a period of six months from the article's publication.

Publishers are asked to allow nonprofit educational and library duplication and distribution of the published work, including but not limited to reserves and coursepacks made by nonprofit or for-profit copy shops.

Retain copyright ownership.

We offer two addenda. One required, which is limited to compliance with the NIH Public Access Policy. The second retains broader rights. The answers above reflect both.

WU form is customizable and there are several other forms available.

LIBRARY PROMOTION OF AUTHOR ADDENDA

8. Do staff in any library at your institution (for example, a main library, a health sciences library, a business library, etc.) promote the use of author addenda or provide support services to authors?
N=48

Yes, staff at more than one library promotes the use of author addenda or provides support services to authors	34	71%
Yes, staff at one library promotes the use of author addenda or provides support services to authors	10	21%
Not yet, but planning for such promotion and/or support services is in process	4	8%
No, support for such promotion and/or services is currently the responsibility of another department or unit in the institution	0	

If you answered yes above or if planning for such promotion and/or services is in process, please complete the survey.

If you answered not yet above or if this is the responsibility of another department or unit in the institution, please click the Next>> button below to submit the survey now. N=4

LIBRARY THAT PROMOTES AUTHOR ADDENDA AND/OR PROVIDES SUPPORT SERVICES

9. Please indicate which type(s) of library(ies) promote author addenda and/or provide support services to authors. Check all that apply. N=44

Main campus library	36	82%
Library supporting the health professions (Medicine, Nursing, Dentistry, Pharmacy, Optometry, etc.)	27	61%
One or more science libraries OTHER than those supporting the health professions	19	43%
Other	12	27%

Please identify other type of library.

All branch libraries.

Arts & Humanities & Social Sciences Library.

Arts and Music, all libraries reporting to University Librarian.

Collaborative effort by all university libraries, including the main campus library and the health sciences library.

Depends on subject librarians and interests of authors in their disciplines but all subject librarians have author support as a part of their activities.

Law School.

Library liaisons are expected to promote and discuss author addenda with their faculty. Science and health science librarians are more likely to have these discussions with their faculty.

The university has no main library but there are libraries devoted to specific disciplines or constituencies. Each library provides different levels of support services in promoting author addenda.

The "promotion" has been mostly on an informal basis to date.

The campus libraries have a Scholarly Communications and Publishing committee that helps support this work.

We have a position assigned to the director's office, as part of a Scholarly Publishing & Licensing program, that belongs to the entire library system, rather than a main library or individual library.

We have only one science library that supports both the health professions and the other sciences. The librarians work closely with the Scholarly Communication Librarian in promoting and providing support for author addenda.

10. If more than one library promote author addenda and/or provide support services to authors, do they all follow the same strategy/provide the same services? N=34

Yes	28	82%
No	6	18%

If No, please select one of the libraries and complete the survey based on that library's activities. Please indicate for which type of library you are responding. N=6

Main campus library	2	33%
Science library OTHER than those supporting the health professions	2	33%
Library supporting the health professions (Medicine, Nursing, Dentistry, Pharmacy, Optometry, etc.)	1	17%
Other	1	17%

Please identify other type of library.

Library Administration.

PARTICIPATING LIBRARY STAFF

11. Which staff at your library are participating in the effort to promote the use of an addendum by authors affiliated with your institution? Please indicate whether the participant plays a leadership role or a promotional role (or both). Check all that apply. N=45

	N	Leadership N=42	Promotion N=42
Library director	32	26	16
Assistant/Associate library director	31	26	17
Reference librarians	30	5	28
Collection development librarians	28	7	25
Scholarly communications officer	27	22	25
Digital library or repository staff	25	12	20
Individual with legal expertise or in-depth copyright knowledge	23	15	18
Head of collections	16	11	12
Library support staff	5	—	5
Technical services librarians	3	—	3
Other staff category	6	3	3

Please identify other staff category and specify his/her role. N=6

Promotion

Electronic resources librarian.

Grant writers, departmental secretaries.

All librarians are called Liaison Librarians — responsibility of each.

Leadership

Collections Analysis & Planning Librarian — works directly with AUL of Collections on collections and scholarly communication issues.

Departmental librarian (both reference and collections in responsibilities plus co-chair of scholarly communications group on campus).

Vice Provost for Research provides leadership. Office of the General Counsel provides legal expertise, leadership, and support.

12. Please describe any other unit with which the library coordinates addendum promotion. N=18

A group based in the Law School has developed a Web site offering complementary advice to faculty authors:
<http://keepyourcopyrights.org/>.

Campus legal services.

In the past, the library has consulted with the Law School's Copyright & Scholarly Communications Director and she has presented information on this topic to library staff.

Information technology.

Office of Research Office of Information Technology, Academic Computing Department.

Office of the Vice Provost. Office of the General Counsel. University Libraries Council.

Other subjects as requested and often collaboration with medical library.

Scholar Services.

Scholarly Communications Committee.

Scholarly Communications Task Force.

Sponsored Projects Administration (the office that helps administer grant funding).

The librarian who serves the College of Veterinary Medicine (in the Agriculture-Veterinary Medicine library) is the most dynamic and ardent advocate for the author addendum. The Chancellor's Office and the university Office of Research are also aware of author rights issues and encourage faculty to negotiate their rights in any way possible. The Office of the Chancellor appointed a Scholarly Communication Committee that has discussed the SPARC addendum many times; it has also been discussed in the Faculty Senate Library Committee and among Library Representatives, faculty who provide liaison between academic departments and the library.

The library works closely with the Copyright/Licensing Office. Though physically housed in the library, Copyright/Licensing is not administratively part of the library.

This is being done in collaboration with Legal Counsel, an Assistant Provost, and head of Academic Technologies. Legal Counsel is taking the lead.

University Copyright Office.

USC Office of Research - Sponsored Awards Management.

We have a centralized coordination and decentralized outreach services. The Library's Scholarly Communication Steering Committee and the Digital Collections Services Department does most of the coordination, but all library liaisons have responsibility, including outreach on scholarly communication in their duties.

We have coordinated with the Vice Chancellor for Research in conjunction with the NIH Public Policy.

LIBRARY STAFF TRAINING

13. Does your library provide educational materials and/or training events to library staff about the use of author addenda? Check all that apply. N=44

	N	Educational Materials	Events
Yes	39	38	31
No	10	6	9

Selected Comments from Respondents

Educational materials: we plan to. Events: we will offer workshops, lectures, etc., when this topic will be mentioned, but won't be sole focus.

Educational Materials: Link to SPARC Web site from Health Sciences Library's Web page, Copyright Committee's Web page. NIH Public Access Policy toolkit (materials) and accompanying workshops (events).

It's hard to tease apart materials and events directly related to the addenda from ones that more generally cover author rights. I haven't actually found that the author addendum is all that effective — teaching faculty/graduate students how to negotiate on their own terms has been much more effective.

Open Access Research Guide; Participated in International Open Access Day.

The events have not been held specifically for library staff. They have been held for faculty and library staff have been invited. There has not been a big educational campaign around author rights or addenda.

We are in the process of holding discussion sessions with faculty at their departments.

We are still developing education materials, but some are available.

We have conducted lunch brown bag events to provide education and training about author rights, use of addenda, and other scholarly communication topics. We have held training sessions for liaison librarians on the creation of Selected Works (Personal Researcher) pages.

We have done sessions about NIH Public Access Policy and how to comply and this includes mention of NIH addendum and others but use of addenda is not the focus of the sessions.

We have held several public awareness conferences and meetings about scholarly communication issues over the past decade and staff have participated.

If yes, what materials/events are offered to educate library staff on the issues of author rights and author addenda? Check all that apply. N=41

Public Web site	38	93%
Face-to-face workshops	30	73%
Handouts or talking points on key issues	24	59%
PowerPoint slides	20	49%
Reading or resource lists	16	39%
Outside guest speakers	13	32%
Intranet Web site	9	22%
Video or tutorials online	5	12%
Webinars	3	7%
Departmental assessment tool (to survey academic departments on scholarly activities)	3	7%
Other	10	24%

Please identify other materials/events.

All day "Scholarly Communication Retreat."

Bibliographer group meetings.

Developed new brochure especially targeted for library liaisons to use with faculty to promote our Institutional Repository and author rights.

Individual appointments with faculty.

On NIH public access.

Podcasts; developing a libguide.

Presentations to graduate student classes.

Staff-only wiki for materials not appropriate to public Web site. This could be a type of "Intranet Web site."

We use ARL brochures and post committee minutes from discussions where author addenda are on the agenda. We also use the MIT video.

While we have had a presentation to library staff on an author addenda in the past 3 years, it is not an ongoing educational initiative.

14. Which individual(s) is spearheading the effort to educate/train library staff to promote an author addendum at your institution? Check all that apply. N=40

Scholarly communications officer(s)	22	55%
A library committee devoted to scholarly communication activities	19	48%
Library administrator(s)	18	45%
Individual with legal expertise or in-depth copyright knowledge	9	23%
Collection management department head	7	18%
Other	11	28%

Please identify other individual.

Coordinator, E-scholarship@Mcgill.ca.

Copyright specialist; we don't call it Scholarly Communications Officer, but it's the same idea.

Director and Associate Director of Copyright/Licensing Office.

Head of Scholar Services.

I'm not sure anyone is really "spearheading" the effort, although the Health Sciences Library staff in general makes information available and manages the Open Access publication fund.

Liaison Services Coordinator.

Our Science Collections Coordinator has taken the lead on this issue.

Primarily reference and/or subject specialist librarians at our Health Sciences and Life Sciences libraries.

Repository coordinator (and head of scholarly communications committee).

Subject specialists in the library also participate in the faculty department meetings.

The veterinary medicine subject librarian mentioned earlier has probably had the greatest impact on staff awareness.

PROMOTING AN AUTHOR ADDENDUM

15. In what context is use of an author addendum being promoted to authors affiliated with your institution? Check all that apply. N=43

Compliance with public access policies	36	84%
Deposit of authors' works in a digital repository	32	74%
Author sharing of their work	30	70%
Use of authors' works in teaching	28	65%
Institutional intellectual property management	13	30%
Other	7	16%

Please describe other context.

Authors retain rights to reuse of their work.

Fair use guidelines on using material in teaching.

In the context of the economics of scholarly publishing. We have been saying for a decade that the current scholarly publishing economics are not sustainable.

Information on scholarly communication.

Other issues do come up in the context of face-to-face training, but the primary concern is compliance.

Reuse of works in future publication. Control of uses to prevent improper uses by copyright transferee. Promotion of Open Access for publications.

Reuse of work.

16. What department (or group) has taken a leadership role in promoting the use of an author addendum to authors affiliated with your institution? Check all that apply. N=43

Library	43	100%
Faculty senate	10	23%
Provost office	7	16%
Campus legal office	5	12%
Other	14	33%

Please identify other department or group.

Academic Technology.

Associate VP for Research/VP for Research Office.

California Digital Library.

California Digital Library, eScholarship program. <http://repositories.cdlib.org/escholarship/>

Contracts and Grants.

Copyright/Licensing Office.

Office of Research.

Office of Research Support.

Office of the Executive VP for Research.

Office of the Vice President for Research and Economic Affairs; Office for Research and Sponsored Projects.

Office of VP for Research.

Scholarly Communications Committee.

The Faculty Board advising the Library.

Scholarly Communication Committee, Faculty Senate Library Committee, and Library Representatives (convened by the Library) have all discussed the author addenda in the contexts listed above.

AUTHOR EDUCATION

17. What kinds of activities is your library engaged in to educate authors affiliated with your institution about using an author addendum? Check all activities that the library has used. Check up to three of those that seem to have been the most effective (this is not a ranking). N=43

Activity	N	Have Used N=43	3 Most Effective N=35
Presentations to faculty	37	37	23
One-on-one visits with faculty/graduate students	31	31	22
Handouts/brochures/posters (such as SPARC's Author Rights brochure and poster)	28	28	6
Presentations to graduate students	26	26	9
Author addendum Web site	26	26	9
Letters/e-mails to authors	20	20	5
Blog posts	15	15	—
One-on-one visits with institution administrators	14	14	5
Author addendum FAQ	12	12	3
Videos/tutorials posted to a Web site	5	5	2
Other activity	11	11	2

Please describe other activity. N=11

Most Effective

Guest speakers from outside the university, for example John Willinsky.

Other activity includes a 2005 Scholarly Communication Symposium. We also use copyright questions to the Copyright Committee as an opportunity to make faculty aware of the Open Access Publication Fund and the SPARC addendum.

Other

Library presentation to Council of Deans.

Scholarly communication Web site.

Addenda are discussed on IR site.

Annual Scholarly Communication Colloquium series that addresses a different topic each year. Faculty find out about the institutional repository, open access, electronic publishing and similar topics. Presentation to Senior Administration of the University in a group setting.

Committee meetings described earlier have helped to inform the campus. The veterinary librarian wears an open access t-shirt once each week. We use PLOS promotional materials in displays. We use the MIT video.

Encouraging faculty members to work with their professional societies, editorial boards, and others means available to influence publication policies among the leading journals in their disciplines.

Information on faculty resolutions on general scholarly communications Web site.

News items on Library and School of Medicine Web pages, and print and electronic newsletter article(s).

Podcasts.

Please briefly describe the most effective activities the library has engaged in. N=30

Activity 1	Activity 2	Activity 3
A 2005 Scholarly Convocation sponsored by the Copyright Committee was held to gather information and discuss scholarly communication issues with faculty. Clifford Lynch was the keynote speaker. Discussion of the addenda was included. It was a one-time thing, not an ongoing initiative.		
Faculty Lunch Series Workshop 2–3 times a semester on timely topics they care about — Permissions, Author’s Rights, Fair Use, Copyright Basics, Patent and Trademarks, Updates on NIH Policy.	One-on-one visits or exchange with faculty often lead to other opportunities to discuss author addenda or to meet with departments or other faculty.	
Faculty luncheons.		
Faculty workshops.	One-on-one advising by library attorney.	
FAQ on the Intranet.	Intranet site with information about the NRC Licence to Publish form and the NRC mandate	Numerous presentations to directors, managers and authors.
Going straight to the faculty; meeting them in groups at their departments.		
Guest speakers, Scholarly Communications Web site.		
Incorporating author rights and other scholarly communications issues into ETD workshops for graduate students.	Discussion of addenda during presentations on funding agency policies.	Just-in-time consultations with faculty.
Letter to all faculty.	Contact with individual faculty.	

Activity 1	Activity 2	Activity 3
New faculty luncheons where author rights retention and IR deposit are promoted.	Author rights brochure is available and is given out at new faculty luncheons as well.	
Not sure, haven't measured in any way.		
One-on-one interviews.	Web site.	
One-on-one visits.	Presentations to graduate students.	Presentations to faculty.
One-on-one visits, tailored to the individual requester.		
Presentation to graduate students — it's rare that anyone has talked to grad students about author rights; they are very interested especially as they are about to embark on their own careers.	One-on-one visits with faculty/grad students: answer in depth questions and give lots of personal guidance; usually try to include the liaison librarian as well.	
Presentations.		
Presentations to faculty.	Presentations to grant writers.	Web site with information, instructions, link to addendum.
Presentations to faculty are effective, though it is difficult to get such opportunities. We recently had the opportunity at an on-campus teaching/technology conference. We presented on author rights. Attendance was low, but those that came were engaged.	One-on-one visits with faculty are the most effective. These meetings are opportunistic, in that you may be meeting about something else, but have the opportunity to bring up author rights.	Our library has a Web site on author rights, where we feature our addendum. General knowledge about author rights leads authors to engage in ways to retain their rights, which may mean they will use an addendum.
Presentations to faculty departments and groups where faculty get the deer in the headlights look when you describe what happens when they give away their author rights. They start using addenda after that and also want to participate in the institutional repository. There have also been many individual meetings as follow up from these department meetings.	Active engagement with the Office of Research. He has now mandated that faculty who receive Leadership in Action research grants from the Office of Research must put their materials in the institutional repository. This includes proceedings from conferences held on campus, new born digital journals, and led to their reliance on library expertise for education about the NIH Public Access Mandate.	Presentations to graduate students and graduate student advisors under the auspices of the Graduate School. The Graduate School now uses the institutional repository for open access masters theses (students download themselves) and we are working on piloting open access to dissertations.
Presentations to faculty through departmental meetings and brownbags.	Letters and e-mails to authors.	Web site on scholarly communications issues.

Activity 1	Activity 2	Activity 3
Presentations to graduate student organizations including question and answer session.	Presentations to faculty including question and answer session.	Providing brochures/handouts in response to specific questions at informational session or to individuals with questions.
Self playing PowerPoint tutorial on author's rights.	Public event featuring Kenneth Crews of Columbia entitled Who Owns Your Scholarship? for which attendees earned Responsible Conduct of Research continuing education credit.	Brochure on author's rights, which will soon be posted to the ACRL scholarly communication program development site as a template for others to adapt.
The veterinary librarian says that the most effective activity is when faculty become outraged because publishers won't permit them to use their own work for classroom teaching and derivative works.	One-to-one contacts in the context of the scholarly publishing context overall have been effective.	Planning for the institutional repository has raised faculty awareness about intellectual property issues.
Visits to faculty department meetings to discuss issues.	One-on-one conversations with faculty.	One-on-one conversations, and workshops, with graduate students.
We have held several workshops at medical and main locations; at medical campus, more direct faculty contacts were made.	Workshops at main campus were conducted using a video recording/streaming technology to enable remote users to view.	
We routinely host speakers and have organized forums on scholarly communication issues, including addenda.	We've met with the Vice Provost for Research and research administrators to develop effective policies and activities related to author addenda and other scholarly communication policies.	The author addendum FAQ is an effective resource for answering questions by faculty who seek to comply with the NIH Public Access Policy.
When faculty consult one-on-one with a librarian about a publishing agreements, they are steered towards author addenda.	Presentations at formal and informal department events like faculty meetings and coffee hours have been very effective in getting the word out about author rights.	
Working with General Counsel to educate ourselves.	Accurate and easy to navigate Web site.	Small group presentations.
Working with research compliance office.	Presentation at new faculty orientation.	Talking with individual authors.
Workshops on managing your copyrights.	Individual contacts with faculty.	E-mail responses to questions.

18. In presentations, handouts, Web sites, videos, etc., what are the main topics that library staff are addressing when educating authors about author addenda? Check all that apply. N=42

Copyright law	41	98%
Institutional repository	30	71%
Freedom to use their work in the classroom or through a course management system	30	71%
Freedom to share their work with colleagues	29	69%
Ability to create derivative works	23	55%
Other self-archiving (i.e., personal Web site)	14	33%
Other	13	31%

Please describe other topics.

Compliance with funder requirements.

Compliance with NIH Public Access Policy.

Compliance.

Freedom to post to disciplinary repositories (a kind of sharing with colleagues, but seems important enough to name separately.) In terms of derivative works, our emphasis tends to be on reuse/repurposing in future publications and the classroom.

Increased citations from publishing in open access environment.

NIH Mandate.

Promotion of Open Access. We are finding that many faculty are eager to support OA, especially when they realize that many people in the country and the world now have Internet access, but do not have funds to purchase access to journals.

Public access mandates.

See UCLA SCSC Website — <http://staff.library.ucla.edu/scholarlycommunication/> See UC Office of Scholarly Communication — <http://osc.universityofcalifornia.edu/>

Select publisher who is willing to accept author addenda and has open access options.

The main emphasis is on the fact that by faculty retaining their author rights they are able to do the self-archiving, have freedom to use their materials as they wish, create derivative works, etc that they signed away when they signed the publisher agreement without the addendum. The vast majority of faculty have been doing these activities all along without realizing that in most cases they are violating the agreements they have signed and seem quite stunned by this information.

We always talk about both sides of the copyright coin when talking to faculty, so we also focus on their rights as users of other peoples' copyrighted material: fair use, etc.

Wider exposure through open access & OAI initiatives.

AUTHORS' QUESTIONS

19. Does the library collect questions received from authors during presentations or other encounters? N=43

Yes	11	26%
No	32	74%

If yes, please describe up to three of the most commonly asked questions. (e.g., How do I use an addendum when the publishing agreement is an online form on the publishers Web site? The publisher has rejected the use of my addendum.... what can I do? Is there someone who can help me decipher this publishing agreement so that I can understand it?) N=11

Question 1	Question 2	Question 3
Can an individual author really make a difference?	Are publishers really willing to negotiate? How can they negotiate when many of the agreements are now online click through style?	What will these changes mean for the survival of journals that are important in our discipline?
How can this be made simple?		
How quickly can you negotiate use of the NRC Licence to Publish form with publisher X?	I'm being asked to sign the publisher's Licence to Publish form, which doesn't allow for retaining the same list of rights as the NRC Licence to Publish form. Can I sign it or can I submit both forms?	
How to use the form when publisher's copyright form is in electronic format.	Comparison of rights allowed by the publisher vs. those in our addendum.	

Question 1	Question 2	Question 3
I would like to use the author addendum that you've mentioned but I don't yet have tenure and I'm concerned about making sure that I publish in premier journals in my field. What happens if I submit the addendum and they refuse to accept it?	Okay, I submitted the author addendum but the publisher sent it back to me all marked up with other language. What do I do now?	I submitted the author addendum with my article but they will only allow me to post my final draft on the institutional repository. I am very concerned about multiple versions of my work being available. How do we address this? Which copy will people cite? What do I do when I want to make revisions to the article?
The addendum has been rejected. What now?	Is using the addendum or negotiating copyright terms going to put my publication in jeopardy?	What does this publication agreement really say?
The publisher has rejected the addendum. What do I do now?	How can I use the addendum when I have to submit my paper through a Web site?	What is the difference between my publisher's copyright form and what the addendum would give me?
We don't collect the questions but the most common question is if the publisher will turn down a manuscript or refuse to publish the material if you want to use an addendum or to negotiate rights.		
What do I do if a publisher rejects the addendum?	Who can I contact to discuss my copyright transfer agreement?	Do most publishers accept the addendum?
What do I do when there are multiple authors?	Which version of the manuscript is covered by the addendum?	Won't open access hurt my society's revenue?
Which addendum should I use?	What if the publisher does not accept my addendum?	Has this publisher accepted an addendum? How successful are addendum?

20. Who provides advice on answering authors' copyright-related questions? Check all that apply.
N=39

Library staff with legal expertise or in-depth copyright knowledge	33	85%
Institution's legal counsel	19	49%
Other advisor	10	26%

Please specify other advisor.

Attorney in the Office of Research, Innovations/Access Unit.

Copyright/Licensing personnel.

I serve as the copyright counsel for the University in liaison role with Office of General Counsel.

Librarians do their best and refer to each other first — then institution legal counsel is next place to turn.

Library Copyright Specialist.

Our Electronic Resources librarian also serves as a copyright advisor in general. Most questions tend to come directly to subject librarians and are referred either to the Electronic Resources librarian or to Assistant Dean, or both.

Repository manager and librarians with copyright knowledge can give general guidance; will direct specific questions to legal counsel.

Special assistant to the provost.

The library staff only provide advice. For legal opinions, we refer them to the University System Legal Counsel (institution's legal counsel is not a copyright expert and refers to system) or to their own lawyer.

We have posted a job ad for a campus copyright officer.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

21. Please enter any additional information about library activities to promote the use of author addenda that may assist the author in accurately analyzing the results of this survey. N=13

Selected Comments from Respondents

Again, the use of and promotion of author addendum is so tied up in author rights generally and negotiation of copyright that it is VERY difficult to pull these apart. I have also found that in general addendum have not been useful except as an education tool for faculty and graduate students. Because we are not consistently collecting information on use of the addendum (something that should have been coordinated at the start of the consortium addendum we are using), it's very difficult to claim to faculty that it is an effective tool — I've yet to hear of a successful use of the CIC addendum at Illinois.

All activities occurred in early 2008. Little activity after May 2008.

Faculty don't understand that they can deposit in the campus IR and still publish in journals, or that we can harvest from journals. They always question it.

In general we have focused most of our attention in this area on the NIH mandate, rather than the CIC Addenda. We believe that the NIH mandate has greater potential to increase awareness precisely because it *requires* adoption. We thought that the Faculty Senate's hesitant acceptance of the CIC Addenda was surprising. While these voluntary addenda provide a useful tool in discussions with faculty, we don't believe that active promotion of the addenda will result in substantial adoption on our campuses. Thus we have taken an approach of discussing author rights and copyright in the context of other services we offer, e.g., publishing, instructional support, reserves.

Our library is in the process of hiring a Head of Digital Services and Scholarly Communication. This person will build a team of librarians and staff who will be charged with promotion of scholarly communication services, including the author addendum.

See description in Question #10 regarding the 2005 Scholarly Convocation. This was a one-time event that doesn't really fall into the category of ongoing educational initiatives.

Since the NIH Public Access mandate, we frequently connect our promotion of author addenda to a broader education campaign about PMC deposit. The library offers a service that assists with PMC deposit, and much of our one-on-one addendum consulting occurs as a result of that service.

The Scholarly Communication department in the library was established in July 2008 and now officially serves in this capacity, although the knowledge is somewhat limited. As head of collection development I tried for several years to convince the Provost's Office and the Dean of Libraries that the faculty need legal counsel who will advise them about the amount of risk to take, rather than protecting the university from risk. Some of the faculty agree, but no position has been forthcoming.

We are actively engaged in conducting additional educational activities for the library liaisons this year. In fact, the library director now expects the liaisons to demonstrate active participation in scholarly communication activities such as discussing the author addendum with faculty, assisting faculty in the creation of Selected Works pages, and providing referrals to the Scholarly Communication Librarian when faculty express an interest in features of our institutional repository such as digital publishing and/or electronic conference proceedings.

We have an Intellectual Property/Copyright/Scholarly Publishing business card which is handed out at all our events and other places around campus. Also some of our subject librarians give these out. They offer a "help line" via e-mail and phone. This connects them to someone in the Digital Collections Services Unit who will answer their question or find someone who can.

We have been working on an ad hoc basis for sometime and now are planning more group activities and participation.

We have seen an important change in our experiences with the issues. We began our promotion of addenda and the issues with a view toward advancing Open Access. We still promote OA actively and aggressively. But the conversation about OA quickly shifted to a conversation about author agreements and addenda, with attention on the many various reasons for entering into better agreements. We always conclude with one simple point of emphasis: *Whatever you sign, keep a copy.*

RESPONDING INSTITUTIONS

University at Albany, SUNY
University of Alberta
University of Arizona
Arizona State University
Boston University
Boston College
Brigham Young University
University of British Columbia
University of California, Davis
University of California, Irvine
University of California, Los Angeles
University of California, San Diego
University of California, Santa Barbara
Canada Institute for Scientific and Technical Information
Case Western Reserve University
University of Chicago
University of Colorado at Boulder
Columbia University
Cornell University
Duke University
University of Florida
University of Georgia
University of Hawaii at Manoa
University of Illinois at Chicago
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Indiana University Bloomington
University of Iowa
Iowa State University
Johns Hopkins University
University of Kansas
Kent State University
University of Kentucky
Library of Congress
University of Louisville
McGill University
McMaster University
University of Massachusetts, Amherst
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
University of Miami
University of Michigan
Michigan State University
University of Minnesota
University of Missouri
University of New Mexico
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
North Carolina State University
Northwestern University
University of Oklahoma
Oklahoma State University
University of Pennsylvania
Pennsylvania State University
Purdue University
Rice University
University of South Carolina
Southern Illinois University Carbondale
University of Tennessee
University of Texas at Austin
Texas A&M University
University of Utah
University of Virginia
University of Washington
Washington State University
Washington University in St. Louis
University of Waterloo
Wayne State University
University of Western Ontario
University of Wisconsin–Madison
Yale University
York University

