



# SPEC Kit 311

Public Access Policies  
August 2009

---

**Cathy Sarli**

Scholarly Communications Specialist  
Becker Medical Library, Washington University in St. Louis

---

**Ellen Dubinsky**

Librarian  
Becker Medical Library, Washington University in St. Louis

---

**Bob Engeszer**

Associate Director, Translational Research Support  
Becker Medical Library, Washington University in St. Louis

---

**Ruth Lewis**

Biology and Mathematics Librarian  
Olin Library, Washington University in St. Louis



ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

---

Series Editor: Lee Anne George

SPEC Kits are published by the

Association of Research Libraries

21 Dupont Circle, NW, Suite 800

Washington, DC 20036-1118

P (202) 296-2296 F (202) 872-0884

[http://www.arl.org/resources/pubs/spec/  
pubs@arl.org](http://www.arl.org/resources/pubs/spec/pubs@arl.org)

ISSN 0160 3582

ISBN 1-59407-823-8

978-1-59407-823-1

Copyright © 2009

This compilation is copyrighted by the Association of Research Libraries. ARL grants blanket permission to reproduce and distribute copies of this work for nonprofit, educational, or library purposes, provided that copies are distributed at or below cost and that ARL, the source, and copyright notice are included on each copy. This permission is in addition to rights of reproduction granted under Sections 107, 108, and other provisions of the US Copyright Act.



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

## SURVEY RESULTS

Executive Summary.....	11
Survey Questions and Responses.....	17
Responding Institutions.....	59

## REPRESENTATIVE DOCUMENTS

### Web Sites

University of California, Irvine	
NIH Guide.....	64
University of California, San Diego	
NIH Public Access Policy - Tips from BML .....	65
Columbia University	
NIH Public Access Policy .....	67
Duke University	
Tutorials: NIH Public Access Policy Overview .....	68
Emory University	
NIH Public Access Policy.....	70
University of Iowa	
NIH Public Access Policy .....	72
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	
NIH Public Access Policy: Details for MIT Authors.....	73
Northwestern University	
NIH Submission Policy: Research to Publication.....	76
Yale University	
NIH Public Access Policy .....	86
York University	
Information for CIHR Grant Recipients .....	87

## **Addenda**

Duke University	
Language for Publishers' Agreements/Contracts.....	90
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	
Instructions to Authors For Use of MIT Amendment to Publication Agreement.....	92

## **FAQs**

University of Iowa	
NIH Public Access Policy - FAQ.....	96
Washington University in St. Louis	
NIH Public Access Policy FAQs .....	98

## **Flowcharts**

Columbia University	
Submitting to PubMed Central.....	108
Washington University in St. Louis	
Complying with the NIH Public Access Policy.....	109
How to Demonstrate Compliance with the NIH Public Access Policy.....	110

## **Handouts**

University of California, Irvine	
NIH Public Access Policy Summary .....	112
Case Western Reserve University	
NIH Public Access .....	113
University of Utah	
New NIH Reporting Requirements.....	118

## **Letters to Publishers**

University of California, San Francisco	
Letter to Publisher .....	122
University of Louisville	
Letter to Publisher .....	123
Washington University in St. Louis	
E-mail to Publishers for Submission Status of NIH-Funded Works .....	124

## **Newsletter/Blog**

Emory University	
Pixel. Woodruff Health Science Library Newsletter.....	126

## **Presentations**

University of California, Irvine NIH Public Access Policy.....	132
University of Massachusetts NIH Public Access Policy Mandate.....	142
Pennsylvania State University NIH Public Access Policy – What are the Implications for Penn State .....	151

## **Publisher Policies**

University of California, Irvine NIH Public Access Publisher Policies for Top 100 UC-Authored Sciences Journals.....	158
University of Rochester Publishers’ Policies on the NIH Public Access Policy .....	166

## **Submission Services**

Duke University Submission By Us .....	172
University of Illinois Let Us Do It For You .....	173

## **SELECTED RESOURCES**

<b>Articles and Books</b> .....	177
<b>Web Sites</b> .....	178





---

## **SURVEY RESULTS**





---

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

---

### Introduction

The concept of a public access policy for research results is based on the premise that government-funded research results should be freely available without barriers to taxpayers who provide support for the funding. With the recent enactment of the US National Institutes of Health (NIH) Public Access Policy and the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR) Policy on Access to Research Outputs, much attention has been devoted to public access policies. Non-governmental entities, such as Howard Hughes Medical Institute and Autism Speaks, have enacted public access policies as well — promoting wider dissemination of research findings they fund.

In many academic and research institutions, libraries have taken the lead in developing resources and services to support authors who are required to comply with public access policies. This survey was designed to explore the role libraries are playing in supporting public access policies in their institutions. Specifically, this survey sought to identify:

- Staffing models for PAP compliance support
- Partnerships and collaborations for PAP compliance support
- Resources and services developed for PAP compliance support
- Resources used by library staff to monitor PAPs
- Challenges related to PAP compliance support.

The survey was distributed to the 123 ARL member libraries in February 2009. Seventy libraries (57%)

from 67 institutions responded by the March 23 survey deadline. Of the respondents, 63 (90%) were at libraries located within the United States and 7 (10%) were at libraries located in Canada.

### ARL Libraries and PAPs

The majority of the libraries responding to this survey provide, or plan to provide, resources and services that help authors affiliated with their institution (and/or their support staff) to comply with public access policies (PAP). Thirty-seven respondents (53%) indicated that more than one library within their system provides PAP compliance support; eleven (16%) indicated that just one library within their institution is providing PAP compliance support. Four other institutions (6%) are planning for PAP compliance support.

Of the libraries that do not provide PAP compliance support, eight (11%) indicated that this support is provided by another department or unit within their institution. Eight (11%) others responded that no PAP compliance support is offered by their institution.

In the instances where the library is not involved in PAP compliance support, respondents were asked to identify which department or unit was responsible. The institution's Office of Research and/or Sponsored Programs was the most frequently cited non-library unit (six out of eight responses).

Nineteen of the responding libraries submitted the survey at this point: 17 that do not provide PAP compliance support and two where planning for such services is not far along; 51 respondents continued.

At the institutions where libraries provide PAP compliance support, the main campus library is most often involved (76%), though a significant number

of respondents indicated that libraries supporting health professions (65%) and other types of science libraries (39%) play a role. The involvement of both the libraries supporting health professions (e.g., Medicine, Dentistry, Nursing) and the libraries supporting other sciences is not surprising, given that the current PAPs were mandated by agencies involved in the health sciences and health research (e.g., NIH, CIHR).

At seven of the 11 institutions where one library supports PAP compliance the main library provides these resources or services. At the other four, a library that supports a health profession (medicine, nursing, dentistry, pharmacy, optometry, etc.) provides these services.

In the institutions where more than one library (e.g., a main campus library and/or a health profession or other science library) provides PAP compliance support, there is evidence of coordination and cooperation between the individual libraries. A solid majority (75%) indicated that all the libraries in their system follow the same strategy or offer the same services/resources for PAP compliance support.

It is not surprising that all respondents from the US provide support for the NIH policy or that four of the five Canadians provide support for the CIHR policy, but more than half of the respondents provide support for multiple policies. These include two Canadian institutions that support both NIH and CIHR policies and ten respondents (20%) that support an institutional policy on public access. Other supported policies include the Wellcome Trust (12%) and Howard Hughes Medical Institute (10%), with one library reporting support of the Autism Speaks policy.

### **Models for PAP Compliance Support**

There was no one single organizational model for ARL libraries' PAP compliance activities. Respondents reported that the responsibility for coordinating and/or planning activities to support authors' compliance with public access policies falls either on a single individual, a committee (both ad hoc and standing), each librarian who works with authors who are subject to PAP compliance, or a combination of these individuals and groups.

At seven libraries (14%) PAP compliance activities are handled by a single individual. All but one

of these devote 10% or less of their time to those activities; the other devotes 35% of his/her time to PAP activities.

In 11 libraries, responsibility for PAP compliance activities is assumed by a committee (either ad hoc or standing). At three institutions, librarians who work with authors assume coordination or planning responsibility.

About half of the respondents report that a combination of individuals and groups shares these responsibilities. One example of a collaborative model within the library for PAP compliance support was noted by a respondent: "The Medical Center Librarian monitors developments and coordinates Web resources for authors. Librarians within medical center library provide support for deposit. Scholarly Communications Officer coordinates policy development and supports authors in retaining needed rights."

Regardless of the organizational model, the top four library activities are monitoring PAP developments, developing resources and programs, coordinating services, and consulting with authors and/or their support staff on PAP compliance. Of the libraries in which committees are responsible, coordinating PAP compliance support training of library staff is common. A less common practice among individuals or committees is providing mediated deposits for authors in the form of third-party submissions.

One interesting finding from the survey results is that "scholarly communications" is the most frequently noted term in individual position titles and either ad hoc or standing committee titles. Some examples include: "Scholarly Communication Librarian," "Scholarly Communications Specialist," "Coordinator of Scholarly Communication," "Scholarly Communications Committee," "Scholarly Communications Group of the University Libraries Council," and "Project: Scholarly Communications."

### **Partnerships and Collaborations for PAP Compliance Support**

In most instances, libraries' PAP compliance activities are coordinated with another department or unit of their parent institution. Forty of forty-three libraries (93%) reported collaborating with a unit outside of the library. Most respondents noted the other department

or unit was an Office of Research or equivalent. The most often cited units were an Office of Research, an Office of Grants and Contracts, a General Counsel's Office, or an Office of Sponsored Projects. As one respondent noted, "The Health Sciences Library director worked with the School of Medicine's Associate Dean for Research Administration and the University's Office of Sponsored Projects Administration in developing the PAP support program." In some cases, the library initiated the partnership: "The Library brought existence of NIH mandate to attention of Office of Sponsored Projects and suggested strategy to comply with it."

### **Resources and Services for PAP Compliance Support**

Though the intent in this survey was to differentiate between resources and services, no strict definition of terms was given. This resulted in significant overlap in the responses about the specific types of resources and services offered by the responding institutions. Web sites were most often referenced by respondents as resources, but group presentations and one-on-one consultations predominated whether they were designated as resources or services.

No matter what term is used to categorize activities, it is apparent from the survey that ARL libraries are drawing from a wide range of actions to support PAP compliance. Ninety percent of the respondents publish a Web site with PAP information. Almost the same number offer copyright addenda to help authors retain the right to comply. The majority of respondents employ group presentations (e.g., PowerPoint presentations, tutorials, workshops, classes). Over half of the respondents review copyright agreement forms, and between 30% and 40% responded that their institution maintains a listing of journal publisher policies, sample letters to publishers, and FAQs. One quarter of the respondents offer blogs, and an equal number offer brochures or pamphlets. In direct service to authors, slightly fewer than half provide third-party submissions to institutional repositories on behalf of authors and 28% provide third-party submission services. Selected examples of ways that responding libraries provide PAP compliance support are highlighted in the following Representative Documents section.

Personalized, one-on-one consultations stand out as the premiere means of active communication of information about PAP compliance within ARL libraries. Among the 30 respondents who track consultations the number per institution ranges from 2 to over 100. One respondent noted that one-on-one consultations are "very effective and very much appreciated by the PI." If e-mail consultations are also included, the number of faculty/staff served increases many times over. One library reported an average of 20 e-mail consultations a week and added, "These are very effective as it allows for more information to be included that can be retained for future use." Some libraries reported that consultations also involved support staff for authors: "A large portion of these consultations are with support staff who will handle deposit for many faculty members in a department."

Commonly asked questions in one-on-one consultations included: "How do I comply?" "Do I need to comply?" "How do I retain the right to comply?" "How do I find my PMCID number?" "How do I submit an article?" "What is this publisher's policy?" "Can I retroactively comply?"

Thirty libraries also reported giving classes, workshops, or presentations about PAP compliance in 2008. The number of sessions offered most often ranged between one and ten per institution; however, the number of participants reached often soared into the hundreds. Clearly, presentations (whether generic or geared to specific departments) are a popular way to communicate to institutional community members about PAP compliance.

Respondents noted some interesting examples of other services and resources, including:

- Customized list of publisher policies regarding the NIH Public Access Policy from the journals most frequently used by campus authors
- Web form for NIH-funded authors for third-party submissions by the library
- Review of citations to be included in a proposal, progress report or application to confirm that documentation of compliance is noted for applicable citations.

While preparing this report, a number of additional resources (e.g., Web sites, newsletter articles, handouts) were discovered, both from respondents that did not list these resources in their surveys and from ARL libraries that did not respond to the survey. Selected resources from respondents are noted in the Representative Documents section, and ARL libraries (respondents and non-respondents) that provide PAP compliance support are noted in the Selected Resources section.

### **Effectiveness of Resources and Services for PAP Compliance Support**

Personalized, one-on-one consultations were judged the single most effective resource or service provided for PAP compliance support. Whether the activity was described as “consultation with author,” “individual consultation,” “e-mail address for questions,” “personal interaction with individuals,” “personal contact,” “personal discussions,” or “individualized counseling,” this type of service that addressed the immediate and specific questions of an individual was rated effective most often. One respondent rated the most effective service for helping authors and/or support staff to comply with PAPs as “an expert who can answer questions and guide them through the process.” Another reported that one-on-one consultations were the most effective means of “providing reassurance about the NIH PAP.” The relative newness of the PAP mandates (especially the NIH policy), the immediate compliance requirement, and the complexity of challenges to compliance faced by authors may explain the need for such personalized service. Many authors feel their situation is unique and, thus, requires something more than a “stock” answer from a Web site or FAQ page.

Other types of face-to-face contact with authors (and/or their staff) such as presentations, classes, and workshops were also rated as highly effective. These have been standard training tools for librarians for decades, and they remain useful in reaching a larger audience at one time. As one respondent commented, “Certainly in-person presentations — either one-on-one or to a group — seem to be the most effective. This is when researchers engage with the topic. It is hard to catch their eye with an e-mail or a link to a Web site.”

Web sites and Web-delivered tools were also rated effective by a majority of respondents. Web sites with PAP information, sites or pages that link to external resources, FAQs, links to addenda or flowcharts for compliance were all judged effective by respondents. One respondent noted that their Web site was effective as “it is nice to have more detailed information available to which we can point people.” Another effective service mentioned by several responding libraries was that of mediated deposits (third-party submissions).

### **Resources Used by Libraries to Monitor PAPs**

It was clear from the survey responses that library staff members involved in supporting PAP compliance in their institutions rely on a number of different resources to stay current on PAP developments. The top resources used by librarians — listed by over three-quarters of the respondents — were Web sites of national/international organizations, electronic discussion lists, and attendance at conferences. Over 50% utilize blogs and in-house presentations, workshops, and/or discussions to stay current. Academic newsletters and RSS feeds were used by over 40% of respondents. SPARC (Scholarly Publishing & Academic Resources Coalition) was also cited as a source for current information about PAP compliance. One noteworthy response was, “Health sciences librarians have excellent access to policy enforcers at the National Library of Medicine and the National Institutes of Health. We can use these contacts to clarify compliance points, and to report problems the investigator community is having complying with the NIH Public Access mandate.”

While two-thirds of the respondents expressed contentment with the available resources for keeping current about PAP compliance, there were a number of interesting suggestions for additional resources such as blogs, webinars, and newsletters. Another suggestion was the creation of a listserv solely for librarians and administrators, to be moderated by a member of the NIH staff. It was also suggested that short, to-the-point, and direct training materials (whether online or print) be developed so that these could be more easily assimilated by busy staff members. The provision of case studies that include



“examples of the various issues and how they were resolved” was another suggestion.

### **Challenges with PAP Compliance Support**

ARL libraries listed a number of challenges encountered when helping authors comply with public access policies. Addressing the initial lack of knowledge and understanding of public access policies, on the part of both authors and library staff, was one frequently cited challenge. Some respondents related the challenge of dealing with authors who have paid little attention to copyright — authors did not understand the publisher agreements they had signed or had little knowledge of author rights in general. One library reported that most of the questions it fielded pertained to “publisher contracts and intellectual property rights in general, rather than directly related to the NIH mandate.” Clarification of journal policies was also cited as a challenge. One library reported that their greatest challenge is getting the attention of busy researchers.

In order to address some of these challenges, respondents offered a variety of solutions. Those solutions include providing copyright support services and educational programs, creating flowcharts that outline the compliance process, developing workshops for library staff, creating letters to be used for publishers, and creating lists of publisher policies. Two strategies noted by respondents to address the challenge of meeting with busy researchers were: “using familiar contact people to make the initial approach” and “library staff remaining flexible as to when and how they met with researchers.”

### **Conclusions**

Based on the responses to the survey, academic libraries have forged a prominent role in responding to PAP mandates. ARL libraries have swiftly responded to the urgent need for information about PAP compliance to the members of their university communities and, in many instances, have initiated collaborations with units outside of the library. ARL member libraries are proactively providing comprehensive PAP compliance support to authors. There is no “one-size-fits-all” resource or service that addresses the compliance challenge. It is the multiplicity of resources and services provided, such as policy overviews, compliance

guidance, training materials, FAQs, flowcharts and guides, personalized one-on-one consultations, and customized presentations, that are successfully addressing the needs of authors. As familiarity with PAPs increases over time, individual authors may have less need for specialized individualized services and resources. However, at this early stage of PAP compliance, the personalized services and resources provided by the ARL libraries are effectively addressing the needs within their institutions.

It is evident from the responses that interactions with authors who are required to comply with PAPs have allowed ARL libraries many opportunities to introduce peripheral issues such as author rights, copyright and intellectual property, open access publishing, and institutional repositories — topics not typically associated with libraries. Many libraries reported providing services and resources such as reviewing publisher copyright forms and grant applications, counseling on copyright and negotiation of author rights, creating customized addenda, establishing a fund to help pay for publisher fees, establishing or expanding institutional repositories, creating Web sites on copyright, and providing presentations on publishing and publication models. Such services and resources help to ease the burden of authors and in turn, arm authors with options for exercising control over the dissemination of their scientific discoveries and intellectual output.

One promising trend noted in the survey responses is the extent of the collaboration with units outside of the library. Respondents reported partnerships with units such as an Office of Research, Office of General Counsel, Grants and Contracts, Vice Provost of Research, Office of Sponsored Awards Management, and others. A number of libraries reported taking the initiative in reaching out to these units and in some cases, guiding the development of programs for PAP compliance support and serving as active partners. As one respondent reported, the library provides “consultation, expertise, drafting of language, and advocacy for policies in support of public access.” Another respondent noted, “The librarians tend to keep abreast of developments, provide training and assistance, and recommend procedures. The units external to the library serve more as receivers

of information than leaders in responding to it.” The responses from the ARL libraries demonstrated many successful examples of forging alliances beyond the walls of the library.

While PAPs in general are a relatively new development, the level of resources and services developed by the responding libraries and their alliance-building collaborative efforts provide a prime example of

how libraries are evolving to address the complexity of research in the 21st century coupled with the transformation of information technology. Such targeted program efforts to leverage expertise and resource sharing for PAP compliance support is evidence that libraries are poised to quickly and efficiently respond to possible future mandates, including the Federal Research Public Access Act (FRPAA).