

Assessment  
of the  
ACRL Scholarly Communications Program  
2002-2006

## 1. Introduction

This report provides an assessment of the ACRL scholarly communications program, which began as an ACRL initiative in January 2002 upon ACRL Board approval of the recommendations of the ACRL Scholarly Communications Task Force. The task force report recommended that the initiative be authorized for an initial three-year period, that it be assessed at the end of that time, and that it be continued as a regular ACRL program if the assessment found that the initiative was effective and worthwhile.

The evaluation of the program was delayed due to a heavy agenda of activities and the fact that there was no staff support for the initiative for a significant portion of the initial three-year period. The program has, however, been considered to be a strong success and there appears to be general agreement that it should continue to be a high priority for ACRL. The initiative has, in effect, already evolved into a regular ACRL program, as demonstrated by the fact that the ACRL Executive Director has reallocated staff to support the program on a continuing basis.

While the continuation of the program is not at issue, the Scholarly Communications Committee did feel that it would be appropriate to provide a full assessment of the program in order to 1) document the program's history, 2) demonstrate its impact on ACRL members and its contributions to change in the broader system of scholarly communication, and 3) lay the basis for charting future directions.

This report provides overviews and discussion of 1) the history of the program, 2) recent major scholarly communications developments, 3) major accomplishments of the scholarly communications program, 4) the program's impact on ACRL members as demonstrated through member surveys, and 5) future program direction. Appendices provide analysis and documentation of member surveys and a full listing of program activities.

## 2. History of the Scholarly Communications Program

### a. Scholarly Communications Task Force

ACRL scholarly communications program began with the establishment of the ACRL Scholarly Communications Task Force at the June 2000 ALA annual conference in Chicago. Members of the task force were Ray English (chair), Karyle Butcher, Deborah Dancik (ACRL Board representative), James Neal, and Cathy Wojewodski. The task force conducted a membership survey and focus groups in order to gain broader member input regarding scholarly communications issues and ACRL's potential role in addressing them. To assist in defining an appropriate role for ACRL, the task force also did a detailed inventory of scholarly communications activities and directions by allied organizations.

The task force recommended to the ACRL board that ACRL make scholarly communication "one of its highest strategic priorities" and that the association begin an initiative with activities focusing on four broad areas: education of librarians and faculty on scholarly communications issues; advocacy, particularly at the national level; coalition building; and

research. Specifically, the task force recommended that ACRL establish a standing committee on scholarly communication that would be responsible for coordinating the initiative. The task force also recommended that ACRL hire a part time consultant to serve as staff for ACRL scholarly communication activities. Finally, the task force recommended that ACRL establish an annual budget for scholarly communication of approximately \$65,000 to \$90,000 for an initial three-year period and, as noted above, that the program be evaluated at the end of that period and continued on a regular basis if it was deemed to be effective.

ACRL's initial scholarly communication activities date from the time of the task force, when the task force chair began developing cooperation with SPARC and ARL on scholarly communications issues. Initial activities included sponsorship of the ACRL-SPARC Forum and the Create Change program.

#### b. Scholarly Communications Committee

The ACRL Scholarly Communications Committee was appointed during the spring of 2002. Ray English was named chair and has served in that role for the four years of the program; other members of the initial committee were Karyle Butcher, Mary Carr, Deborah Dancik (Board representative), Richard Fyffe, James Neal, Lee Van Oresdel, and Cathy Wojewodski. Over the past four years the committee has met regularly at both mid-winter and annual conferences and it also held numerous conference calls. The committee established close communication with the ACRL Board from the beginning of the initiative. It provided reports to the Board at six-month intervals and it presented at each annual conference an "ACRL Scholarly Communications Agenda" to guide activities for the subsequent year.

The Scholarly Communications Committee developed a document entitled "Principles and Strategies for the Reform of Scholarly Communication," which was approved by the ACRL Board in June 2003. This document serves as a foundation statement for the ACRL scholarly communications program and has been cited widely in the literature. It describes fundamental dysfunctions in the system of scholarly communications and enumerates both general principles and specific strategies for fostering fundamental reform.

#### c. Staffing

Sue Martin, who had recently retired from the position of University Librarian at Georgetown University, was named the ACRL Visiting Program Officer for Scholarly Communication in September 2002. In her half-time position she did initial work on developing the scholarly communications toolkit, established contacts and working relationships with a variety of organizations concerned about scholarly communications issues, and began working on advocacy concerns. She resigned the position in the fall of 2004. When it proved difficult to fill the part-time program officer position on a temporary basis, ACRL Executive Director Mary Ellen Davis redefined a continuing position on the ACRL staff, making it primarily responsible for scholarly communication and legislative advocacy. Kara Malenfant was hired as the ACRL Scholarly Communications and Government Relations Specialist in September of 2005 and has since worked on all aspects of the scholarly communications program. She devotes approximately 40% of her time to scholarly communication.

#### d. Education

The Scholarly Communications Committee has created or coordinated a variety of activities designed to increase awareness of scholarly communications issues and developments among both librarians and faculty. These have included numerous ALA conference and ACRL National Conference programs, a preconference, the ACRL scholarly communications discussion group, the SCHOLCOM listserv, a bimonthly column on scholarly communications issues in *C&RL News*, the ACRL scholarly communications website, the Create Change program (in partnership with ARL and SPARC), and the web-based ACRL Scholarly Communications Toolkit. Most recently ACRL is partnering with ARL to hold a 2 1/2 day intensive scholarly communication institute that will focus on campus scholarly communications programs; the first institute will be held in July at UCLA.

#### e. Advocacy

The Scholarly Communications Committee has been active throughout the four-year period in advocacy related to two broad areas of scholarly communications concerns -- anti-trust issues in the journal publishing industry and open access to federally funded research.

ACRL joined with other major U.S. library organizations to form the Information Access Alliance in 2003. See: [www.informationaccess.org](http://www.informationaccess.org). With leadership from Mary Case of the ARL Office of Scholarly Communication, the IAA developed a white paper on publisher mergers, it challenged with the U.S. Department of Justice the merger of Bertelsmann/Springer and Kluwer publishers, and it held an invitational conference on anti-trust issues in February 2005. More recently the IAA has focused on anti-competitive practices related to electronic journal licenses.

SPARC, ACRL, other major U.S. library organizations, a prominent open access publisher, and two public interest groups came together in late 2003 to form the Open Access Working Group. The OAWG has worked actively on the issue of public access to research funded by the National Institutes of Health, advocating in a variety of ways for a policy that would require NIH-funded researchers to deposit their final peer-reviewed manuscripts in PubMed Central and for manuscripts to be made openly accessible within six months. The group has also been instrumental in introducing into the U.S. Congress the Federal Research Public Access Act of 2006, bipartisan legislation that would require federally funded research be made openly accessible.

Members of the Scholarly Communications Committee saw early on in their advocacy efforts that there was a need to improve ACRL's advocacy capabilities, particularly at the grass roots level. To that end the Scholarly Communications Committee joined with the Copyright Committee and Government Relations Committee to recommend that a task force be formed to recommend ways to improve ACRL's advocacy effectiveness. The task force was established and made a final report to the ACRL Board in January 2005. Among other things, the task force called for recruiting designated ACRL legislative advocates, who would be part of a more

coordinated advocacy program. Implementation of the task force's recommendations are on the agenda for the ACRL Scholarly Communication and Government Relations Specialist.

#### f. Coalition Building

ACRL's partnerships with SPARC and ARL grew and matured during the four years of the scholarly communications program. The partnership with SPARC has been particularly beneficial for both organizations. Cooperative activities have included the regular SPARC ACRL Forum at mid-winter and annual meetings and co-sponsorship of ALA conference and ACRL national conference programs. Cooperative programs involving all three organizations have included the Create Change website, the Create Change brochure, and the Open Access brochure.

ACRL has played an integral role in forming the two broad advocacy coalitions described above. ACRL participated in founding the Information Access Alliance and also helped to develop the Open Access Working Group. ACRL has also participated in the Alliance for Taxpayer Access, a broad umbrella group that has been developed under the leadership of SPARC to provide grass roots advocacy on the issue of public access to federally funded research. Activities of the ATA are summarized on its website at: [www.taxpayeraccess.org](http://www.taxpayeraccess.org).

### 3. The Current Landscape: Major Scholarly Communications Developments

During the four years of the scholarly communications program there have been a number of major developments that demonstrate substantial progress in fostering fundamental reform in the system of scholarly communication. These changes reflect the work of many individuals and organizations, both in this country and abroad. They show the impact of coordinated efforts to effect change in the scholarly communications system. Although these developments cannot in any sense be attributed directly to the impact of the ACRL program alone, our association can take pride in its role as a participant in these developments.

#### a. Growth of Open Access

The past four years have brought enormous growth in the open access movement. ACRL was an early endorser of the Budapest Open Access Initiative, the first (and still today the most prominent) proclamation on open access. The Budapest statement outlined the two fundamental strategies of the open access movement – open access journals and author self-archiving in open repositories.

Open access journals can be defined as journals that are openly available on the internet and whose production costs are covered prior to publication through any of several business models. Open access journals have grown steadily in recent years. The Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ) currently lists 2,280 titles, accounting for between 5-10% of all peer-reviewed journals. Just a little over a year ago the number of titles listed was 1440. The DOAJ is the primary source for tracking peer-reviewed open access titles.

Author self-archiving involves depositing one's work (typically final peer-review manuscripts or final published versions) in institutional repositories or disciplinary repositories. The strategy relies to some extent on authors' controlling their copyright in order to make their work openly accessible. In recent years there has been steady growth in both institutional and disciplinary repositories. Most major publishers have responded to the open access movement by allowing their published authors to self-archive their final peer reviewed manuscripts. While publisher policies vary, the broad acceptance of author self-archiving is noteworthy. A site that tracks publisher policies for author self-archiving is SHERPA: <http://www.sherpa.ac.uk/romeo.php>.

One immediate affect of the open access movement has been development of delayed open access. Under this model the journals make their content openly accessible after a specific embargo period. Many society journals, such as those published through the High Wire Press at Stanford University, follow a delayed open access model. While there is no data to document the extent of delayed open access, the practice has become quite widespread among non-commercial publishers and it represents a clear gain in access to research literature. ACRL adopted this approach for retrospective access to *College and Research Libraries*.

In response to the open access movement several commercial publishers have established programs that allow authors to make their articles openly accessible by paying a publication fee. Springer, Blackwell, and Elsevier are examples of major commercial publishers that have created such programs. Author charges for open access under these commercial programs are expensive, usually in the range of \$3,000 per title, so they have not yet been widely adopted.

Movement toward public access to federally funded research has been an especially encouraging development. In May 2005 the National Institutes of Health announced a public access policy under which funded researchers may make their final peer reviewed manuscripts publicly accessible in PubMed Central, the digital library of the National Library of Medicine, within 12 months of publication in a peer reviewed journal. This policy is voluntary and so far only a small percentage of funded researchers are participating in the program. There are, however, a number of developments that are leading toward a strengthened NIH policy that would require deposit by researchers.

The introduction into the U.S. Senate of two bills that would mandate public access to federally funded research has been especially exciting. Of particular importance in this regard is the Federal Research Public Access Act (FRPAA) of 2006, which was introduced by Senators John Cornyn (R-TX) and Joseph Lieberman (D-CT) in early May 2006. In addition to FRPAA, Senators Lieberman (D-CT) and Thad Cochran (R-MS) introduced in December 2005 the American Center for CURES Act. This bill has a provision that would mandate public access to all research funded by agencies in the Department of Health and Human Services. These agencies account for approximately one-half of all federally funded research.

It is apparent from these developments that the principle of public access to federally funded research has strong support both in Congress and from the public. Early Congressional support for the NIH policy was bipartisan and that is also evident in the Cornyn-Lieberman and Cures bills. Public support is demonstrated through a May 2006 poll by the Harris organization,

which indicated that over 80 percent of Americans agree that federally funded research should be made publicly accessible.

The principle of public access to government-funded research is gaining substantial support in other countries. In July 2004 the United Kingdom held a parliamentary inquiry into scientific publishing. The report resulting from that inquiry strongly recommended that publicly funded research in the UK be made openly accessible in institutional repositories. The Research Councils of the United Kingdom have subsequently drafted a policy that would require funded researchers to make their research openly accessible in repositories. The final version of the RCUK policy has not been announced, however. The European Commission recently issued a lengthy report on scientific publishing. Among other things, the report endorses public access to government-funded research. National policies for access to government-funded research are under consideration in several other countries.

Private funding bodies have demonstrated strong support for open access. The Wellcome Trust in Britain now requires funded authors to make their work accessible in open access repositories and it also supports authors' fees for publishing in open access journals. The Howard Hughes Medical Institute in the U.S. and the Max Planck Society in Germany are examples of funding agencies that provide similar support open access.

#### b. Librarian Engagement

Academic librarians throughout the United States have shown much greater knowledge and interest in scholarly communications issues in recent years. The development is clearly evident among ACRL members, as the membership survey discussed below in Section 5 demonstrates. This parallels substantial increases in the extent to which scholarly communication concerns are discussed in the literature of librarianship, listservs, and blogs. The literature related to open access alone has become so voluminous that it is now virtually impossible for any one person to read all of it.

Increased activism on the part of academic librarians is demonstrated by the extent to which they have worked with faculty to raise scholarly communications issues at the campus level. Campus symposia on scholarly communications issues, for example, are now relatively commonplace

#### c. Faculty Activism

Faculty activism on scholarly communications issues has also increased substantially during the past four years. This increase in faculty engagement is reflected by the growing numbers of faculty/university resolutions that oppose high journal prices and large bundled electronic journal license agreements or that endorse open access, author control of copyright, and author self-archiving in open access repositories. Peter Suber's Open Access News website contains a list of twenty-six such actions at such institutions as Columbia University, the University of Kansas, the University of California, the University of North Carolina, Macalester College, and Carleton College. More such resolutions can be anticipated in the future. See: <http://www.earlham.edu/~peters/fos/lists.htm#actions>

Faculty activism also includes instances where journal editorial boards have resolved to move journals from commercial publishers to independent or open access frameworks. While such “Declarations of Independence” remain relatively small in number (Peter Suber’s site lists a total of 14; see:<http://www.earlham.edu/~peters/fos/lists.htm#declarations>), they are evidence of increasingly faculty interest in reasserting control over the system of scholarly communication.

#### 4. Major Accomplishments of the ACRL Scholarly Communications Program

ACRL can point with some pride toward its accomplishments in achieving the stated goals of the scholarly communications program. The association has been particularly successful in terms of educational programming and cooperative advocacy efforts.

##### a. Educational Programming

As noted in the historical section, the Scholarly Communications Committee has sponsored numerous programs on scholarly communications issues. These have included the regular ACRL-SPARC Forum at midwinter and annual meetings, two ACRL National Conference Programs, two preconferences, and one annual conference program. These programs have been well attended and positively evaluated. Some programs, such as the SPARC ACRL Forum on the National Institutes of Health Public Access Policy and the ACRL National Conference Programs on the same topic have drawn audiences of 300 or more.

The scholarly communications column in *C&RL News* has featured articles by many prominent figures engaged with scholarly communications issues. In addition to members of the Scholarly Communications Committee, authors of columns have included Rick Johnson of SPARC, Heather Joseph of BioOne and SPARC, Helen Doyle of the Public Library of Science, David Prosser of SPARC Europe, Mary Case and Prue Adler of ARL, Peter Suber (one of the most prominent open access advocates), Sharon Terry (President of the Genetic Alliance). Columns have been widely cited in the literature. The member survey, discussed below, points to the importance of the column in raising awareness of the issues. As one member said, “...what I know is what ACRL has published.”

The ACRL Scholarly Communications Toolkit, which was developed by Karen Williams during a sabbatical leave from the University of Arizona, was made available prior to the ACRL National Conference in Minneapolis in 2005. As survey results discussed below indicate, the toolkit is clearly fulfilling its primary purpose as a site designed to make librarians familiar with scholarly communications issues and with the actions that they can take to promote systemic change. The toolkit has been linked from numerous scholarly communications websites. The Scholarly Communications Discussion Group, which was established in June 2002, has become an active forum for discussing scholarly communications issues at midwinter and annual conferences. Attendance usually averages between 50 and 100 participants. The discussion group was chaired by Richard Fyffe beginning in January 2003. The Scholarly Communications Committee found it valuable to tie the topic of the discussion group to the topic of the SPARC ACRL Forum, which was addressing cutting edge scholarly communications issues.

The SCHOLCOMM listserv, which was established in the fall of 2002, has grown to have approximately 600 members. It has been used primarily for communicating information about ACRL scholarly communications activities and scholarly communications developments generally. To some extent it has also functioned as a discussion forum on scholarly communications issues.

A full listing of all of the scholarly communication program's educational activities is provided in Appendix E.

#### b. Advocacy

ACRL and its allies have clearly been successful in advocacy work in support of the principle of public access to federally funded research. The Open Access Working Group can take major credit for moving forward the NIH public access policy, working to strengthen its provisions, and introducing broader legislation into congress that would establish into law the principle that taxpayers have a fundamental right to have wide and easy access to the results of the research that they fund.

ACRL's advocacy efforts related to anti-trust issues in the publishing industry are also bearing fruit. While an initial effort to halt the merger of Bertelsmann, Springer-Kluwer proved unsuccessful, the group's efforts have clearly drawn greater attention to this issue on the part of policy makers. The invitational symposium in Washington DC, which was coordinated by the Information Access Alliance, was attended by representatives of the U.S. Department of Justice, some representatives from state attorney general offices, and by economists who were participating in their European Commission report on scholarly publishing. It is especially encouraging that several state attorney general offices have expressed interest in the issue of anti-trust aspects of electronic journal license agreements. At this stage, there are now four state attorney general offices that are making preliminary inquiries into these issues. The report of the European Commission has also recommended increased scrutiny of future mergers in the industry.

#### c. Coalition Building

ACRL has been especially successful in developing a strong working relationship with SPARC. Rick Johnson and Heather Joseph, the executive directors of SPARC during the four years of the program, have characterized the relationship as follows: "SPARC's partnership with ACRL has been vital and highly productive. It has enabled a broader reach to and effective coordination of our mutual efforts, allowing us to leverage resources and amplify our message. From our perspective, the interaction between SPARC and ACRL to advance shared scholarly communication objectives has been effective, dynamic, and agile."

ACRL has also developed close working relationships with the Association of Research Libraries, as evidenced initially in the Create Change program (which also included SPARC as a partner) and more recently in the partnership to jointly sponsor the scholarly communications institute.

ACRL has worked with ARL, SPARC, and other organizations to build strong coalitions to work on both open access and anti-trust issues. The Open Access Working Group and the Information Access Alliance constitute well functioning coalitions that are addressing issues of concern to both groups.

The Scholarly Communications Committee hoped, as an integral part of the scholarly communications initiative, to develop better partnerships with both higher education associations and disciplinary organizations by building on existing ACRL liaison relationships. Progress in both areas has been slow due primarily to constraints related to time and staffing. ACRL liaisons to the primary higher education associations were asked to fill out a checklist questionnaire in order to document existing interest in scholarly communications issues and potential areas of cooperation. Some initial cooperative activities with the American Association of Community Colleges were begun in 2005-2006. Improved outreach to other higher education associations and especially to disciplinary organizations remain important agenda items for the future, as demonstrated in the strong support for this in the member survey and noted below in the section on future directions.

#### d. Research

There was a perceived need at the beginning of the scholarly communications initiative to document more fully the effects of dysfunctions in the system of scholarly communication on all types of academic libraries. Data related to large research university libraries formed the basis for much of the initial literature promoting systemic change, such as the Create Change website and brochure. Since scholarly communications issues affect all academic libraries, both the original task force and the committee felt it would be advisable to have data and research that was more broadly based. It was not possible, however, to carry out the research program as initially envisioned. As an alternative strategy, that committee developed an “ACRL scholarly communications research agenda” that was designed to encourage academic and research librarians to pursue specific desired research projects.

#### 5. Impact on ACRL Members

Recent surveys of the ACRL membership document the impact of the scholarly communications program. The Scholarly Communications Committee conducted a survey about the program by e-mail with a 10% sample of ACRL members in the spring of 2006. A full analysis of the survey results is provided in Appendix A; survey data and open-ended comments are included in Appendices B and C respectively. The recent ACRL member survey, which was distributed to all ACRL members in April 2006, included two questions on scholarly communications issues. The membership survey questions are analyzed in Appendix A, Section III; response data for the survey questions is provided in Appendix E.

Both surveys document the importance of scholarly communications issues to ACRL members. 81% of members ranked “Promoting awareness of scholarly communications issues” at 5 or higher on an importance scale of 1 to 7, with 7 being the highest rating (“Extremely Important”). All 14 specific issues in the scholarly communications survey were rated “very important” or “somewhat important” by a large majority of ACRL member respondents.

ACRL members' knowledge of scholarly communications issues has increased substantially since 2000. A large majority of respondents indicated that their knowledge of the 14 scholarly communications issues had "increased a great deal" or "increased somewhat." Issues with the highest increase in knowledge were open access to scholarly output, fair use for digital information, archiving electronic publications, licensing terms for electronic publications, and increasing consolidation in the publishing industry.

Question four of the scholarly communications survey asked members to indicate the extent to which their increase in knowledge in recent years was a result of ACRL programs, ACRL publications, and ACRL website resources. All items listed in the survey were credited with having some impact on a portion of the respondents. More than 50% of the respondents indicated that the scholarly communications column in *C&RL News*, ACRL news releases on scholarly communications actions, and the ACRL scholarly communications website had increased their knowledge either a great deal or increased it somewhat. The ACRL Scholarly Communications Toolkit was credited with increasing knowledge greatly or somewhat by 40% of respondents. Activities that reach smaller audiences, such as annual and national conference programs, preconferences, the discussion group, and the SCHOLCOMM listserv were rated as increasing knowledge somewhat or a great deal in a range from 20% to 10% of respondents.

Responses from the ACRL all member survey indicated a high degree of satisfaction with ACRL's performance in addressing scholarly communication issues. 69% of the respondents (representing 2007 individuals) rated their satisfaction with ACRL's role in promoting awareness of scholarly communications issues at 5 or higher on a scale of 1 to 7, with 7 being the highest rating ("Extremely satisfied") and 1 the lowest ("Not at all satisfied").

## 6. Directions for the Future

The results of the two member surveys provide strong support for ACRL continuing to follow the direction that it has set out in its scholarly communications program and for expanding into some new areas. ACRL members clearly wish to receive educational programming related to scholarly communications issues and they are strongly supportive of ACRL's advocacy efforts at the national level. Responses to the scholarly communications survey indicate strong member interest in building their scholarly communication knowledge and abilities. Large majorities of respondents ranked all 8 mechanisms for increasing awareness and abilities as either very important or somewhat important. Respondents also expressed overwhelming support for "advocating national policy changes that would mandate open access to federally-funded research" and "working on anti-merger, antitrust, and anticompetitive practices as they apply to scholarly publishing."

The survey responses also indicate strong support for ACRL expanding its activities in three areas that have not been adequately addressed so far, even though they have been part of the overall concept for the program. Over 98% of respondents indicated that "raising awareness of scholarly communication issues and possible actions among scholarly disciplinary societies and associations" and "raising awareness of scholarly communications issues and possible actions among higher education organizations" were either very important or somewhat

important. Respondents rating these activities as very important were approximately 70% for both activities. In addition, over 90% of respondents ranked “encouraging research on scholarly communications issues” as either very important or somewhat important. This suggests that ACRL might reexamine its approach to research on scholarly communications issues, perhaps working in collaboration with coalition partners in the Open Access Working Group and the Information Access Alliance on a coordinated research agenda or specific research projects.

## Appendix A

### ACRL Scholarly Communication Program And Future Agenda Survey March 2006

As part of the review of the ACRL scholarly communication program of the last four years, the Scholarly Communications Committee sought input from the membership on the importance of scholarly communication issues, on their knowledge and use of our educational and communication tools, and on future directions the initiative might take. When this initiative first began, similar input was garnered from members, the results of which the Committee used to set the agenda for the initiative to date. For perspective on the evolution on scholarly communication issues, a comparison of current data with that of the 2001 survey is included in this report.

#### I. Analysis

The 2006 Scholarly Communication Program and Future Agenda Survey was sent by e-mail to 10% of the ACRL membership, totaling 1350 individuals. 53 surveys were returned as undeliverable and thus the survey reached 1297 individuals of which 162 responded for a return rate of 12.5%. Detailed results of the quantitative part of the survey are appended. Open ended questions have been categorized in this analysis and compared with responses in the statistical questions; those concepts listed more than once are noted. Summary conclusions are as follows:

1. Question 1 asked respondents to rank a series of 14 scholarly communication issues as to importance. All 14 issues were ranked by a large majority of responders as “somewhat important” to “very important,” suggesting that the ACRL membership places a high priority on the significant issues associated with scholarly communication generally. The five issues that received the highest rankings (archiving of electronic publications, cost of scholarly journals, preserving fair use of digital information, open access to scholarly output, and licensing terms for electronic publications, followed closely by a sixth, increasing consolidation of publishing industry) are consistent with the interest shown regarding these issues in the professional library press and increasingly in the popular press. These responses also reflect those areas where the library community and now public interest groups have initiated action for change.

2. Question 2 is a follow-up to question 1, asking respondents to add other scholarly communication issues of importance. The items listed more than once were the bundling of journals and the preservation of works in digital format and continuing access to them. With these two additions, the major issues identified in question one are the most significant to ACRL members.
3. Question 3 asked respondents to indicate the degree to which their knowledge of 14 scholarly communication issues increased between 2000 and the present. Respondents reported their knowledge of all 14 issues “increased somewhat” to “increased a great deal,” which suggests the growing awareness of scholarly communication issues by academic librarian professionals. The four top ranked issues where knowledge “increased a great deal” from 2000 to date were open access to scholarly output, preserving fair use of digital information, archiving of electronic publications, and cost of scholarly journals. These four are consistent with the group ranked as most important in question one.
4. In order to try to ascertain whether the activities undertaken as part of ACRL’s scholarly communication initiative have had a direct impact on the membership, question 4 asked respondents to indicate to what extent their knowledge increase between 2000 and the present was a result of their participation in or use of ACRL programs, literature, and website resources. All items listed were credited with having had some impact on a portion of the respondents. Overall, responses were not as strong or definitive as those to other questions. The three highest ranking items: bi-monthly articles on scholarly communication in *C&RL News*, ACRL news releases on scholarly communication actions, and the ACRL Website on Scholarly Communication were ranked by at least 50% of the respondents as having contributed to an increase in their knowledge. This result is important since, by their nature, these are vehicles that reach across ACRL’s membership and are the most accessible. The fourth ranked item, the ACRL Scholarly Communication Toolkit, had an impact on the knowledge growth of 40% of the respondents, which suggests good utility of an item that has been publicly available only 18 months.
5. As a follow-up to question 4, question 5 asked respondents what other means have been helpful to them in learning about scholarly communication issues. This open-ended question had 83 responses of which 28 cited scholarly articles and/or literature generally as a mechanism for increasing

their knowledge on this subject. 21 individuals credited blogs or listserves and 15 cited colleagues as the source of information. 14 respondents noted local or in-house programs or communications.

These responses are interesting because of their connection to questions 3 and 4. In question 3, 63% to 93% of the respondents indicated their knowledge of 13 major scholarly communication issues “increased somewhat” or “increased a great deal”. The responses in question 4 would imply, when comparing the responses to the strong response in question 3, that individuals learned about scholarly communication from a broader array of places beyond those of ACRL’s efforts. With a few exceptions (e.g. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, *Journal of Scholarly Publishing*), it is not clear from the answers to question 5 which publications, blogs or other vehicles might be the source. Several respondents wrote they get their knowledge from reading, listserves, conferences, etc., but were not necessarily aware after the fact what knowledge came from which sources. Thus, what is clear is that members’ knowledge has increased significantly, the knowledge has been gleaned from a variety of sources, and ACRL’s efforts have played a role in that increase for at least 50% of the respondents.

6. Question 6 asked respondents to indicate what tools or mechanisms would be useful to them in increasing their awareness and enabling them to speak about the issues in scholarly communication with faculty or other staff on campus. All eight mechanisms listed received responses of “somewhat important” to “very important”. Strongly favored mechanisms were regular articles in ACRL publications on various topics focused on scholarly communication, information on the ACRL Website, and regional sessions with speakers or pre-conference curricula. The next tier of rankings: Information/instruction on use of the ACRL Toolkit, a train the trainer program targeted to the local level, and sessions at ALA Midwinter or Annual conferences reinforces an important educational role for the association. Responses indicate strong interest among members for building knowledge about scholarly communication issues. The strongly favored mechanisms are those that ACRL has in place, and thus the responses confirm their utility. The responses also provide good direction for the type of educational efforts on which ACRL should focus in the future.
7. Question 7 asked respondents to add other means to those listed in question 6. Ideas cited more than once include scholarly articles on the subject, periodic short articles or announcements sent out to members that

summarize the issues, local discussions, and a conference fund to support attendance at scholarly communication workshops.

8. Question 8 asked members to rank actions where ACRL should be putting its efforts in the next two years to reform scholarly communications. All five items were strongly supported with 67% to 72% of the responses indicating the following items were “very important”: raising awareness of scholarly communication issues and possible actions among scholarly disciplinary societies and associations, raising awareness of scholarly communication issues and possible actions among higher education organizations, and advocating national policy changes that would mandate open access to federally-funded research. These responses clearly indicate support for ACRL’s involvement in education and advocacy on a national scale.
9. The survey asked respondents in open-ended question 9 to recommend additional issues ACRL address or actions the Association should take. 5 individuals suggested ACRL find ways to involve and/or appeal to the interests of all stake holders, particularly faculty. 3 recommended sponsored sessions for or liaison with faculty either through their own organizations or done locally. 2 suggested ACRL involvement in developing or promoting permanent digital archives and 2 recommended advertising or communication beyond the academy to inform an educated populace that might care about this issue. The predominant responses here are congruent with the findings in question 8, providing a finer lever of detail.
10. Question 10 asked respondents to comment on the impact – or lack of impact – the ACRL scholarly communications program has had on them. 23 of the 93 individuals who responded to this question said that the program had a direct, significant impact, 25 said it had a modest or indirect impact, 19 said it had no impact on them. What follows are some representative comments from respondents:

It is a useful communication source. I am also a member of MLA and have found that they are a day or two behind announcements in ACRL.....

Since I left the university for a community college, what I know is what ACRL has published.

*I would say there hasn't been a great deal of direct impact from the ACRL scholarly communications program, though I imagined its agenda-setting has influenced a number of the articles I've read elsewhere.*

*The ACRL program has not had a great effect. I have learned more from Chronicle of Higher Education articles and local discussions than from the national forums.*

*I have learned a great deal from your web site on scholarly communication.....I have used your site as a reference to starting a discussion about a repository.*

11. Questions 11 and 12 captured the demographic data on who answered this survey. Clearly individuals from larger academic institutions and in administrative and reference and user services positions are more represented in the survey sample, reflecting the make-up of the ACRL membership as a whole.
12. Question 13 asked respondents if they had any additional comments. All responses expanded on points made within the survey or were personal statements from the respondent on their own work or learning. Here is a sample of the responses:

I do think that many faculty are more loyal and connected to the scholarly associations in their field.....I do wish that the library organizations such as ACRL were working more pro-actively with broader educational organizations on the current review of Orphan Works and Section 108.....

*.....While on an abstract level, I support change, in reality the journal system is so institutionalized and so critical, I'm not sure how we can get from point A to point B. Has ACRL tried to get on the program at conference at the American Political Science Meeting, for example?*

*Be careful what you wish for. It's hard to be against all information being freely available, but.....will there remain a role for libraries ....? Will we just become study halls and community centers?*

*I would love to learn more about this topic and have been reading everything I can find. So please keep the discussion going.*

## Conclusion:

The cumulative responses to this survey demonstrate continuing strong interest by the membership in the issues around scholarly communication and support of ACRL's involvement in working for change in this arena. Education, advocacy and coalition building as future directions for the association are all supported by these results. Education for librarians through established ACRL vehicles (e.g. publications and website, and conference sessions) with a new direction of regional and local training were favored. In addition, education and advocacy within higher education organizations and advocacy at the federal policy level received strong endorsement.

## II. Comparison with 2000 ACRL Member Survey on Scholarly Communication

The 2000 and 2006 surveys garnered different response rates, with the 2000 survey at a 22.5% return and this year's at 12.5%. The raw numbers show a closer return rate, however, with only 20 fewer respondents in this year's survey (182 in 2000 compared with 162 in 2006). Despite the lower return rate, more librarians across various positions and levels answered the survey this year than last time. The surveys did not ask identical questions, but some comparisons can be drawn.

The four scholarly communication issues members ranked as most important were the same in both surveys although their mean scores varied slightly. In this year's survey, a fifth factor emerged in this group: that of open access to scholarly output, a concept that had not been fully developed in 2000. Overall, the mean scores indicating the importance of all the issues listed were higher in this year's results, suggesting a heightened awareness of the issues and their impact on the professional landscape.

The questions seeking rankings on actions ACRL should take to respond to scholarly communication issues are framed rather differently in the two surveys. Educating librarians captured the highest ranking in the 2000 survey. The question in 2006 survey was framed in terms of what mechanisms would be most useful in support of member education on the subject, and thus education per se was assumed to be a priority. What is clear from looking at the results of both surveys is the support for an advocacy role for ACRL. This direction was strongly

indicated in the 2006 survey, highlighting the need to go beyond the local campus to have a national impact.

### III. Responses from April 2006 ACRL All Member Survey

Two questions in the recent all member survey related to scholarly communication. The responses to these complement the findings of the 2006 survey discussed above.

The first question in the All Member Survey sought input on the importance of 12 issues (one of them being promoting awareness of scholarly communication issues) to the respondent and/or the respondent's library. On a scale of 1 ("not at all important) to 7 ("extremely important"), 31% of the respondents rated scholarly communication a 7, 31% a 6, and 20% a 5. Thus, 82% of the respondents (2478 individuals ) consider this issue important to extremely important.

The second question was "How satisfied are you with the performance of organizations representing the field (considering ACRL and any other potential source) in addressing these same issues?" On a scale of 1 ("Not at all satisfied") to 7 ("Extremely satisfied"), respondents rated "Promoting awareness of scholarly communication issues" thus: 13% at 7, 28% at 6, 28% at 5. 2007 individuals, or 69% of the total respondents, were satisfied to extremely satisfied with performance of organizations in promoting awareness of scholarly communication issues.

## Appendix B

### ACRL Scholarly Communication Program and Future Agenda Survey-- March 2006 Detailed Responses and Mean Score Report

Note: responses are listed in ranked order, not in order listed on questionnaire.

1. Rank the following scholarly communication issues.

	3 (very important)	2 (somewhat important)	1 (not important)	Mean Score	Rank
archiving of electronic publications	86.71%	12.66%	0.63%	2.861	1
cost of scholarly journals	84.18%	14.56%	1.27%	2.829	2
preserving fair use for digital information	79.25%	18.87%	1.89%	2.774	3
open access to scholarly output	77.36%	21.38%	1.26%	2.761	4
licensing terms for electronic publications	65.61%	31.85%	2.55%	2.631	5
increasing consolidation of publishing industry	56.69%	38.85%	4.46%	2.522	6
creation of low cost alternative publishing vehicles	52.87%	41.40%	5.73%	2.471	7
commercial control of scholarly publishing	56.69%	33.12%	10.19%	2.465	8
scholarly communication as a national public policy issue	48.43%	44.03%	7.55%	2.409	9
cost of scholarly monographs	50.32%	10.13%	9.55%	2.408	10
faculty/researcher reluctance to explore new publishing models	46.84%	44.94%	8.23%	2.386	11
criteria for faculty promotion and tenure	39.49%	45.86%	14.65%	2.248	12

number of journals being published	20.38%	62.42%	17.20%	2.032	13
number of monographs being published	14.56%	62.66%	22.78%	1.918	14

3. Indicate to what degree your knowledge of the following scholarly communication issues increased between 2000 and the present.

	3 (increased a great deal)	2 (increased somewhat )	1 (no increas e)	Mea n Scor e	Ran k
open access to scholarly output	50.94%	45.28%	3.77%	2.472	1
preserving fair use for digital information	48.10%	42.41%	9.49%	2.386	2
archiving of electronic publications	42.41%	48.73%	8.86%	2.335	3
cost of scholarly journals	45.91%	36.48%	17.61%	2.283	4
licensing terms for electronic publications	38.61%	44.94%	16.46%	2.222	5
increasing consolidation of publishing industry	38.85%	42.68%	18.47%	2.204	6
creation of low cost alternative publishing vehicles	31.01%	52.53%	16.46%	2.146	7
commercial control of scholarly publishing	31.01%	49.37%	19.62%	2.114	8
scholarly communication as a national public policy issue	27.04%	47.17%	25.79%	2.013	9
faculty/researcher reluctance to explore new publishing models	26.58%	46.20%	27.22%	1.994	10
cost of scholarly monographs	25.16%	44.03%	30.82%	1.943	11
criteria for faculty promotion	22.15%	40.51%	37.34%	1.84	12

and tenure				8	
number of journals being published	14.65%	48.41%	39.94%	1.77 7	13
number of monographs being published	9.49%	45.57%	44.94%	1.64 6	14

4. To what degree would you say your knowledge of scholarly communication issues increased between 2000 and the present as a result of your participation in or use of ACRL programs, literature, and website resources?

	3 (increased a great deal)	2 (increased somewhat)	1 (no increase)	Mean Score	Rank
bi-monthly article on scholarly communication in C&RL News	18.71%	54.19%	27.10%	1.916	1
ACRL news releases on scholarly communication actions	18.95%	47.71%	33.33%	1.856	2
ACRL Website on Scholarly Communication	13.16%	36.84%	50.00%	1.632	3
ACRL Scholarly Communication Toolkit	8.61%	31.13%	60.26%	1.483	4
ACRL National conference programs on scholarly communication	11.92%	7.33%	88.67%	1.153	5
SPARC/ACRL Forum at ALA Midwinter or Annual conferences	10.53%	15.13%	74.34%	1.362	6
ACRL Scholarly Communication Discussion Group held at ALA	6.62%	11.92%	81.46%	1.252	7
ACRL Scholarly Communication listserv SCHOLCOMM	7.48%	8.16%	84.35%	1.231	8
ACRL/ALA Pre-conferences on scholarly communication	4.00%	7.33%	88.67%	1.153	9

6. What tools or mechanisms would be useful to you in increasing your awareness and enabling you to speak about the issues in scholarly communication with faculty or other staff on your campus?

	3 (very important)	2 (somewhat important)	1 (not important)	Mean Score	Rank
regular articles in ACRL publications on various topics focused on scholarly communication	71.52%	25.95%	2.53%	2.69	1
information on the ACRL Website	50.31%	43.40%	6.29%	2.44	2
regional sessions with speakers or pre-conference curricula	40.38%	32.69%	26.92%	2.135	3
information/instruction on use of the ACRL Toolkit	27.27%	46.10%	26.62%	2.006	4
a train the trainer program targeted to the local level	32.28%	34.18%	33.54%	1.987	5
sessions at ALA Midwinter or Annual conferences	21.15%	44.87%	33.97%	1.872	6
intensive 2-3 day scholarly communications immersion institute	21.66%	32.48%	45.86%	1.758	7
information on the ACRL scholarly communication listserv SCHOLCOMM	15.29%	40.13%	44.59%	1.707	8

8. ACRL has been actively working with other library organizations to reform scholarly communications. Rank each item in order of importance to help us determine where ACRL should be putting its efforts in the next two years.

	3 (very important)	2 (somewhat important)	1 (not important)	Mean Score	Rank
--	--------------------	------------------------	-------------------	------------	------

raising awareness of scholarly communication issues and possible actions among scholarly disciplinary societies and associations	72.33%	25.79%	1.89	2.704	1
raising awareness of scholarly communication issues and possible actions among higher education organizations	67.30%	31.45%	1.26%	2.66	2
advocating national policy changes that would mandate open access to federally-funded research	68.79%	23.57%	7.64%	2.611	3
encouraging research on scholarly communications issues	44.59%	49.04%	6.37%	2.382	4
working on anti-merger, antitrust, and anticompetitive practices as they apply to scholarly publishing	41.67%	44.23%	14.10%	2.276	5

11. Please provide the following information about yourself: What type of library or other organization do you work in?

	Number of Respondents	Response Ratio
Community/Junior College	13	8.02%
College Library	19	11.73%
University Library	98	60.49%
Special Library	5	3.09%
Other	27	16.67%

12. Please provide the following information about yourself: What job category best describes your work?

	Number of Respondents	Response Ratio
Director/Dean	28	17.28%
Other Administration	17	10.49%
Reference and User Services	60	37.04%
Collections	13	8.02%
Technical Services	15	9.26%
Information Technology	4	2.47%
Other	25	15.43%

## Appendix C

### ACRL Scholarly Communication Program and Future Agenda Survey-- March 2006

#### III. Comments on Open Ended Questions

##### What other scholarly communication issues would you cite?

- ❖ Survival of the university presses as a non-commercial alternative
- ❖ Longevity and preservation of digital resources, including web resources
- ❖ Search engine creation for open source journals and materials in institutional repositories (need more than google scholar)
- ❖ Significant repositories for social science and humanities publications
- ❖ Preservation of the variety of types of creative expression in digital formats
- ❖ Creating and maintaining a discovery commons
- ❖ I am concerned about government publications being delayed, edited by political employees, and censored.
  
- ❖ Frequent publisher changes for journals and subsequent potential loss of electronic backfiles.
- ❖ Ownership of electronic publications, cost of periodical publications.
- ❖ Faculty knowledge/understanding of Preprint vs. Post-Prints AND the basic idea of author rights to publish material online (telling people which journals allow posting of materials online in a institutional repository or web page)
- ❖ Cost of information. Honestly, to whom is all of this money going? Printing, paper, and shipping costs are no where near the cost for some books and journals. Also, why the huge discrepancy between the cost of information in the arts vs. the sciences?
- ❖ Standards for data collection, management, and access--metadata formats, etc.

##### What other means have been helpful to you in learning about scholarly communication issues?

- ❖ General discussion on library listservs, reading about these issues in other library journals
- ❖ Meetings with other librarians in-house and at consortia meetings. Some faculty inquiries. Newspaper and NPR articles/segments on aspects of communication and the government.
- ❖ Involvement in NDIIPP projects, US copyright office roundtables on Orphan Works, Section 108 + independent research.
- ❖ Discussions in the public policy arena. Participation in discussions of digital archiving and participation in research related to digital archiving and preservation metadata. Rising costs for scholarly journals in my institution and other institutions resulting in the growth of discussions involving the faculties of many universities.
- ❖ Teaching a credit-bearing information literacy class in a college.
- ❖ Paying attention to articles that appear on this issue; having organized and ACRL/NY symposium of this topic, and attending conferences and workshops devoted to it.
- ❖ Journal of Scholarly Publishing; American Council of Learned Societies; Journal of Electronic Publishing
- ❖ Romeo Green; OAI; Scholarship and Libraries in Transition : A dialogue about the impacts of mass digitization projects conference
- ❖ I'm a Canadian, so I've been using CLA more than ALA methods of staying abreast of the issues, especially since they differ somewhat between the 2 countries.

**What other means would be helpful to you for increasing your awareness or enabling you to speak about the issues?**

- ❖ I tend to think of scholarly communication discussions as coming from on-high, it seems to need to become more of a grassroots effort
- ❖ ACRL should bring in information and speakers OUTSIDE of library and information science, to anchor knowledge and solutions pragmatically to how these issues are arising in faculty academic environments and what is needed for academicians to know the value of libraries and librarianship in taking leadership roles in this process.
- ❖ Perhaps having similar sessions/venues for faculty members at their professional meetings & publications.
- ❖ I would love to attend more workshops and conferences on this subject, but as we are a small university in budget trouble, we just don't have the resources right now to attend all the conferences.
- ❖ More distance methods, since I have only attended the ALA conference once, and ACRL never.
- ❖ Having these issues be a higher priority at my institution--they're pretty much ignored here, or simply paid lip-service to, with no real action/communication with the university/library community.
- ❖ ALA president should be vocal about such issues.

**What other issues would you recommend ACRL address or actions the Association should take?**

- ❖ Get a good representative into press opportunities (business pages and feature articles in newspapers, on TV, in magazines; make ACRL's presence and expertise known; issue press releases before court or government decisions are made or legislation is put to a vote. Get an ACRL spokesperson on PBS's NOW with David Brancaccio, Warren Olney's To the Point on NPR, the PBS NewsHour, etc. This audience is well-educated and might give real support when crises approach.
- ❖ Has anyone tried at a state level to leverage a state legislature to require the post of state-funded (at any level) research in a designated state repository. Everyone doing research in a public university in their state receives support at some level for research. Is there a way for ACRL members to be proactive legislatively rather than reactive.
- ❖ Not limiting to library organizations - in my work I have learned that professional associations, academic administrators, journalists, and students are interested in the "what about me?" aspects of scholarly communication. See recent OCLC research on marketing the digital library and branding.
- ❖ Working on anti-merger, antitrust, and anticompetitive practices as they apply to scholarly publishing<---- Won't work.
- ❖ Sponsor a research award for a scholarly communications research article
- ❖ Compile and disseminate statistics on trends in scholarly publishing. The scientists I work with can be convinced that changes are being made if confronted with data in the form of charts/graphs. Otherwise, their perceptions and opinions tend to remain unchanged and based on false assumptions.
- ❖ Funding mechanisms (endowments, shared collection development pools)to support alternate electronic publishing
- ❖ While librarians certainly can raise the issues with faculty members, the move to open access needs to come from the local departments and needs to be bolstered by discipline-based, professional associations.
- ❖ Students sacrifice quality of information for expedience/electronic formats. Implications of a push for print-to-electronic formats.
- ❖ Make cooperative arrangements with key stakeholders to enter this process together with libraries and librarians.
- ❖ Communicate to community colleges more
- ❖ Publish or host on the ACRL website a list of scholarly open access journals (if you already do this, my apologies, but in a brief going-over of the site, I couldn't find it).

**Please describe in a few sentences the impact - or lack of impact - the ACRL scholarly communications program has on you as an ACRL member.**

- ❖ I would say there hasn't been a great deal of direct impact from the ACRL scholarly communications program, though I imagined its agenda-setting has influenced a number of the articles I've read elsewhere
- ❖ I'm sorry to say that, although I used to read ACRL publications cover-to-cover, I have fallen behind and often don't keep up with my reading, and thus am neither as knowledgeable nor as involved as I ought to be. Not ACRL's fault. You can lead a librarian to a good article, but...
- ❖ ACRL is providing critical support for libraries and higher education as LOC and the copyright office review the section 108 code.
- ❖ It is a useful communication source. I am also a member of MLA and have found that they are a day or two behind announcements by ACRL. I wish that there were more ways that I could take an active role in ARCL SC program or committee
- ❖ These issues rarely drift down to RBMS, although all the section's publications are generally on-line already. It's hollow and contradictory of ALA/ACRL to scream and complain about this issue and yet not make its own publications widely available electronically at little or no cost. In some ways, ALA/ACRL is no better than the publishers' "consortiums" so often complained of. At Midwinter in San Antonio I paid \$49 for a lousy little ALA paperback that any commercial publisher would have charged about \$19.95 for. ALA/ACRL needs to get its own house in order before it takes on other publishers.
- ❖ I work in an ARL library and I must admit that between ARL activities and communication and ACRL activities and communication I am not always certain where the schol. comm. info. is coming from...ARL or ACRL. That said, however, I feel very informed about scholarly communication issues. The distinction between who (ARL or ACRL) is behind the scholarly communication information I receive is not important to me.
- ❖ Since I left the university for a community college, what I know is what ACRL has published.
- ❖ The ACRL program has not had a great effect. I have learned more from Chronicle of Higher Education articles and local discussions than from the national forums.
- ❖ ACRL has done a good job of keeping general members informed of basic issues related to scholarly communication--e.g., getting publicly funded medical research into the public domain. The use of press releases and announcements through ALA and ACRL communication tools has been consistent in keeping members up to date.
- ❖ Impact seems to have been indirect but may have had more of a trickle-down effect than I'm aware of. This survey itself has had an impact. I intend to explore some of the resources it referred to.
- ❖ ACRL has provided useful and even valuable information, but , for me the issue is more local and regional. We need to influence public policy by reaching the political leader within states as well as nationally. These political leaders need to realize the problems created by publishing monopolies and the need to support open access and preserve digital and other information formats on a larger scale than we are able to today.
- ❖ It's invisible. It's not inserting at the point of practice for me.
- ❖ Unfortunately, the lack of impact has nothing to do with ACRL and everything to do with my institution's administration.
- ❖ The lack of communication to those at a lower level in the profession has increased the difficulty in understanding the relevant issues.
- ❖ This is an area that is widely covered ion the library and higher education literature and in regional and national conferences. I can't really separate out ACRL activities from those of other professional organizations.
- ❖ The ACRL scholarly communications program has had a strong impact on me as an ACRL member
- ❖ I have learned a great deal from your web site on scholarly communication. Now the hard part is obtaining faculty support for a new publication medium like our institutional repository. I have used your site as a reference to starting a discussion about a repository.
- ❖ I am in Government Documents, so this issue affects me more as a researcher looking to publish than as a librarian looking to help patrons. There are similar issues in accessing government information, but the ACRL program hasn't affected me directly.

**We welcome your additional comments below.**

- ❖ I do think that many faculty are more loyal and connected to the scholarly associations in their field than they are to the institutions where they work. Also, I do wish that the library organizations such as ACRL were working more pro-actively with broader educational organizations on the current reviews of Orphan Works and Section 108. Section 108 is critical to higher education, and should be of great interest to educational technology groups such as AACE and EDUCAUSE, yet they are absent from the current roundtable discussions. Libraries need as many allies as possible in these discussions!
- ❖ As a scholar and researcher myself, I have no interest in publishing my work electronic instead of in print. I'd rather we focused on ways to reduce the costs associated with print publishing.
- ❖ On the whole, ACRL is doing a great job.
- ❖ I think on our own campus we've had some good initiatives (i.e. digital repositories), but practically speaking journals are the most important means of scholarly communication for my faculty. While on an abstract level, I support change, in reality the journal system is so institutionalized and so critical, I'm not sure how we can get from point A to point B. Has ACRL tried to get on the program at conferences at the American Political Science Meetings, for example?
- ❖ Thank you for addressing this important issue with a survey.
- ❖ Be careful what you wish for. It's hard to be against all information being freely available, but (making the huge assumption that it is possible) will there remain a role for libraries that we're both skilled in and that someone is willing to pay us for? Will we just become study halls and community centers?
- ❖ I like to see ACRL taking practical steps rather than setting up statements, guidelines, etc. ACRL might facilitate and coordinate regional efforts to make changes in scholarly communication.
- ❖ At times, the faculty that I work with (Anthropology, Economics, Psychology) do not seem to know a great deal about the escalating costs of serials, open source issues, IR, the move from online away from print. I find that when I talk to people one on one, they understand these issues a bit better and seem more aware.
- ❖ Community colleges are below your radar screen.
- ❖ Gaining the support of professional organizations/societies is crucial.
- ❖ I would love to learn more about this topic and have been reading everything I can find. So please keep the discussion going.

## Appendix D

### ACRL Member Survey, Questions 25 and 26

<b>25. How important are the following issues to you and/or your library?</b>								
<i>The top percentage indicates total respondent ratio; the bottom number represents actual number of respondents selecting the option</i>	7 Extremely important	6	5	4	3	2	1 Not at all important	N/A
1. Building a culture of assessment in academic/research libraries	32% 963	29% 883	20% 590	10% 303	3% 101	2% 61	1% 39	3% 77
2. Promoting and defending intellectual freedom in academic/research libraries	39% 1178	28% 832	18% 536	9% 269	3% 90	1% 40	1% 27	2% 50
3. Increasing the visibility of academic/research librarians	48% 1469	30% 913	12% 375	5% 153	1% 44	1% 19	0% 15	1% 41
4. Helping to recruit a more diverse workforce	27% 807	25% 755	21% 640	13% 402	6% 169	3% 86	2% 75	3% 89
5. Promoting awareness of scholarly communication issues	31% 941	31% 940	20% 597	10% 309	4% 113	2% 46	1% 33	2% 46
6. Encouraging widespread adoption of information literacy across the curriculum	44% 1320	25% 756	16% 473	8% 250	3% 81	1% 41	1% 40	2% 57
7. Creating awareness of librarians as respected authorities on knowledge management	47% 1408	28% 844	14% 414	7% 219	2% 46	0% 11	1% 21	1% 44
8. Increasing the technological competencies of librarians	43% 1297	31% 941	16% 479	6% 179	1% 32	1% 21	1% 18	1% 32
9. Planning for succession in academic and research libraries	26% 783	28% 825	20% 610	13% 394	4% 111	2% 67	1% 41	6% 167
10. Developing academic and research librarians as leaders and experts in information technology applications	35% 1036	33% 997	18% 549	9% 259	2% 69	1% 23	1% 19	1% 43
11. Increasing libraries' influence on higher education and research environments	44% 1310	32% 960	14% 426	7% 206	1% 35	0% 15	0% 15	1% 42
12. Influencing accrediting entities	29% 874	29% 858	19% 560	13% 382	3% 104	2% 53	2% 46	4% 114

How *satisfied* are you with the performance of organizations representing the field (considering ACRL 26. and any other potential sources) in addressing these same issues?

<i>The top percentage indicates total respondent ratio; the bottom number represents actual number of respondents selecting the option</i>	7 Extremely satisfied	6	5	4	3	2	1 Not at all satisfied	N/A
1. Building a culture of assessment in academic/research libraries	10% 281	25% 740	29% 848	20% 579	5% 134	2% 50	1% 31	9% 258
2. Promoting and defending intellectual freedom in academic/research libraries	17% 503	33% 977	24% 710	13% 386	3% 90	1% 33	1% 26	7% 206
3. Increasing the visibility of academic/research librarians	10% 283	23% 666	28% 820	21% 604	7% 218	3% 86	2% 44	7% 199
4. Helping to recruit a more diverse workforce	7% 210	19% 550	27% 784	23% 670	7% 218	3% 88	2% 70	11% 322
5. Promoting awareness of scholarly communication issues	13% 372	28% 804	28% 831	17% 494	5% 135	2% 44	1% 27	7% 209
6. Encouraging widespread adoption of information literacy across the curriculum	15% 438	26% 768	26% 747	17% 498	5% 160	2% 59	1% 37	7% 210
7. Creating awareness of librarians as respected authorities on knowledge management	8% 240	18% 531	26% 751	23% 672	10% 303	4% 129	2% 69	7% 218
8. Increasing the technological competencies of librarians	9% 257	20% 580	27% 795	22% 647	9% 272	3% 100	1% 43	7% 210
9. Planning for succession in academic and research libraries	6% 168	14% 402	22% 630	25% 731	11% 313	5% 139	2% 64	16% 458
10. Developing academic and research librarians as leaders and experts in information technology applications	8% 226	18% 532	26% 764	24% 691	10% 291	4% 115	2% 56	8% 229
11. Increasing libraries' influence on higher education and research environments	9% 250	18% 525	25% 735	24% 686	10% 301	4% 130	3% 74	7% 216
12. Influencing accrediting entities	7% 207	16% 470	22% 624	25% 717	10% 282	4% 123	2% 69	14% 405

## Appendix E

### Scholarly Communication Program Activities 2002 – 2006

#### Education

##### Immersion Institute

2006:

- Institute on Scholarly Communication, 2.5 days immersion, Los Angeles, July 12-14, jointly sponsored with the Association of Research Libraries

##### Conference Programs

2006:

- *Authors and Authority: Perspectives on Negotiating Licenses and Copyright*, SPARC/ARCL Forum, ALA Midwinter (Attendees: 250)

2005:

- *Three Big Ideas Transforming Scholarly Communication*, SPARC/ACRL Forum ALA Annual (Attendees: 200)
- *Taxation with Dissemination: Does the Public Have a Right to Open Access to Federally-Funded Research?* ACRL National Conference
- *In the Public Interest: Open Access and Public Policy*, SPARC/ACRL Forum, ALA Midwinter (Attendees: 300)

2004:

- *Trust and Antitrust: responding to consolidation in the journal publishing industry*, ALA Annual
- *Scholarly Communication in the Humanities: Does Open Access Apply?* SPARC/ACRL Forum, ALA Annual (Attendees: 200)
- *Open Access: Getting from Here to There*, SPARC/ACRL Forum, ALA Midwinter (Attendees: 200)

2003:

- *Creating Change: Best Practices in Campus Advocacy*, SPARC/ACRL Forum, ALA Annual
- *Scholarly Communication: taking stock, charting next steps*, ACRL National Conference
- *And Then There Was One: Industry Consolidation in Journal Publishing and What it Means for Libraries*, SPARC/ACRL Forum, ALA Midwinter
- Co-sponsorship of related programs by WESS and ALCTS

2002

- *Open Access to Scholarship: Paths for Libraries*, SPARC/ACRL Forum, ALA Annual

- Academic Institutions Transforming Scholarly Communication, SPARC/ACRL Forum, ALA Midwinter

2001

- *Outward Bound: Effecting Change in Scholarly Communication from Outside the Library*, SPARC/ACRL Forum, ALA Annual
- *Creating Change: Tailoring a Campaign to Fit Your Community*, SPARC/ACRL Forum, ALA Midwinter

#### Pre-conference Programs

2005:

- *Institutional Repositories Workshop*, ACRL National (Attendees: 50+)

2004:

- *Scholarly Communication 101* ALA Annual (Attendees: 50+)

#### Discussion Group Sessions

“Authors and Authority: Perspectives on Negotiating Licenses and Copyright - Continuing the Discussion”. January 2006. Speakers: David Hoole, and John Ober. (Attendees: 80)

“Three Big Ideas Transforming Scholarly Communication” June 2005 Chicago. Speakers: Bonnie MacEwan, Karen Williams, Peter McDonald. (Attendees: 50)

“Open-Access Economics and the Public Interest: The Conversation Continues” January 2005 Boston. Speakers: James Neal, Lee Van Orsdel, Phil Davis, and Rick Johnson. (Attendees: 60)

June 2004 Orlando program not held in order not to be in conflict with ALCTS program “Open Access, Open Minds.”

“Open Access: Getting from Here to There, the Conversation Continues”. January 2004 San Diego. Speakers: Joseph Branin, Helen Doyle, Henry Hagedorn. (Attendees: 40)

“Best Practices in Campus Advocacy: The Conversation Continues”. June 2003 Toronto. Speakers: Randall Ward, Joyce Ogburn, Leslie Chan. (Attendees: 35)

“The ACRL Scholarly Communications Initiative.” January 2003, Philadelphia. Speakers: Ray English, Sue Martin. Kevin Guthrie and Bruce Hetterick of JSTOR also spoke on JSTOR and scholarly communications issues in general. (Attendees 100)

#### Articles published in C&L News

“Public Access to Federally Funded Research: The Cornyn-Lieberman and Cures Bills” (Ray English and Peter Suber, June 2006)

“Facilitating Open Access: Developing Support for Author Control of Copyright” (John Ober; April 2006)

“The Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition: An Evolving Agenda” (Heather Joseph; February 2006)

“Building a New Future: Preparing ‘Future Faculty’ and ‘Responsible Conduct of Research’ Programs as a Venue for Scholarly Communication Discussions” (Richard Fyffe and Scott Walter; October 2005)

“In the Public Interest: Open Access” (Sharon Terry; July/August 2005)

“Antitrust Issues in Scholarly and Legal Publishing: Report on an Invitational Symposium in Washington, D.C.” (Lee C. Van Orsdel; May 2005)

”The ACRL Scholarly Communications Toolkit Now Online: A Resource for Administrators, Faculty, and Librarians” (Karen Williams; March 2005)

“Preparing tomorrow's professionals: LIS schools and scholarly communication” (Cheryl L. Davis and Barbara B. Moran; January 2005)

“Enhanced Public Access to NIH-funded Research: Frequently Asked Questions” (Prudence S. Adler, November 2004)

“The ACRL Scholarly Communications Initiative: A Progress Report” (Ray English, September 2004)

“Information Access Alliance: Challenging Anticompetitive Behavior in Academic Publishing” (Mary Case, June 2004)

“The View from Europe: Creating International Change” (David Prosser, May 2004)

“Open Access in the Real World: Confronting Economic and Legal Reality” (Rick Anderson, April 2004)

“The Public Library of Science: Open access from the ground up” (Helen J. Doyle, March 2004)

“Electronic Journal Publication: A New Library Contribution to Scholarly Communication” (Eulalia Roel, January 2004)

“Two Years After the Launch: An Update on the BioOne Electronic Publishing Initiative” (Heather Joseph and Adrian W. Alexander, November 2003)

“Widespread Academic Efforts Address the Scholarly Communication Crisis” (Randall Ward, David Michaelis, Robert Murdoch, Brian Roberts, and Julia Blixrud, June 2003)

“The Bewildering New World of Scholarly Communication” (Howard Dess and Myoung Wilson, April 2003)

“Removing Barriers to Research: An Introduction to Open Access for Librarians” (Peter Suber, February 2003)

“ACRL Takes up the Challenges of Scholarly Communication: The Year Ahead for the New Program Officer” (Susan K. Martin—ACRL Program Officer for Scholarly Communication, December 2002)

“SPARC and ACRL: Working Together to Reform Scholarly Communication” (Rick Johnson, October 2002)

“ACRL's New Scholarly Communication Initiative: Addressing a Growing Crisis” (Ray English and Deborah Dancik, May 2002)

“On Scholarly Evaluation and Scholarly Communication: Increasing the Body of Quality Work” (David E. Shulenburg, September 2001)

“Create Change: Shaping the Future of Scholarly Journal Publishing” (Ray English and Larry Hardesty, June 2000)

### **Political Advocacy**

2006

- Comments on the European Commission's "Study on the Economic and Technical Evolution of the Scientific Publication Markets in Europe" (May 2006). Letter submitted by the Information Access Alliance to the European Commission commending the commission on its "Study on the Economic and Technical Evolution of the Scientific Publication Markets in Europe."
- Comments on the European Commission's "Study on the Economic and Technical Evolution of the Scientific Publication Markets in Europe" (May 2006). Letter submitted by the Open Access Working Group to the European Commission commending the commission on its "Study on the Economic and Technical Evolution of the Scientific Publication Markets in Europe."

2005

- Response to the Research Councils' UK draft position statement on improved access to research outputs (August 2005). Letter and memorandum submitted by the American Association of Law Libraries, ALA, Association of Academic Health Sciences Libraries, ACRL,

Association of Research Libraries, Medical Library Association, Public Knowledge, and SPARC in response to the Research Councils' UK June 28, 2005 draft position statement on their emerging views on the issue of improved access to research outputs.

2005:

- Letter to NIH regarding implementation of new open access policy (February 2005). Letter from ACRL to the National Institutes of Health supporting the new open access policy with suggestions for improvements.

2004:

- Letter to NIH supporting "Enhanced Public Access to NIH Research Information." Letter from ACRL to the National Institutes of Health supporting "Enhanced Public Access to NIH Research Information" NOT-OD-04-064, which proposes to provide free public access through PubMed Central to articles that result from NIH-funded research.
- Letter to NIH Encouraging Support of Open Access (August). Letter by ACRL to the National Institutes of Health encouraging them to support open access to journal articles documenting agency-funded research.
- Letter to NIH Encouraging Support of Open Access (January). Letter, sent on behalf of ALA, ACRL, ARL, SPARC, the Association of Academic Health Sciences Libraries, and the Medical Library Association, to the National Institutes of Health encouraging them to support open access to journal articles documenting agency-funded research.
- US Response to the UK Inquiry into STM Publishing (February). Letter, sent on behalf of ALA, ACRL, ARL, SPARC, the American Association of Law Libraries, the Association of Academic Health Science Libraries, Public Knowledge, and the Medical Library Association, to the Science and Technology Committee of the UK parliament in response to its inquiry into scientific, technical, and medical publishing.

2003:

- Launched consideration of open access for ACRL publications and author agreements.
- Development of legislative advocacy plan in conjunction with ACRL Advocacy Task Force.
- Development of ACRL's *Principles and Strategies for the Reform of Scholarly Communication*, the foundation statement that provides overall guidance for initiative. Board approved.

In conjunction with the Information Access Alliance:

- Development of a White Paper submitted to the US Department of Justice in response to a proposed merger involving Bertelsmann/Springer and Kluwer.
- Development of public version of White Paper and a communication strategy that involved prominent spokespeople and champions for anti-merger effort.

With EBSS section and others within ACRL:

- Formulated a response to a U.S Department of Education proposed Statement of Work that could substantially overhaul the ERIC system.

With ACRL Government Relations Committee and Copyright Committee:

- Recommended ACRL form an advocacy task force to recommend ways to improve ACRL's effectiveness in national policy advocacy.

2002:

- Endorsed Tempe Principles and Keystone Principles
- Endorsed and signatory to Budapest Open Access Initiative
- Recommendation for \$5000 for Anti-merger campaign; Board approved

### **Coalition Building**

- Developed a Scholarly Communications Checklist for ACRL Liaisons to Higher Education and Disciplinary Associations to track initiatives in allied associations on scholarly communication, intellectual property, and legislative advocacy with the intent of possible partnerships and joint action.
- Participated in the Information Access Alliance, a coalition of library organizations created to address mergers in journal publishing industry. Participating organization: AALL, ACRL, ALA, ARL, MLA, SLA, SPARC.
- Participated in the Open Access Working Group, a coalition of library and public interest groups concerned primarily with the issue of public access to federally-funded research. Participating organizations: AAHSL, AALL, ACRL, ALA, ARL, Creative Commons, MLA, Public Knowledge, Public Library of Science, SLA, SPARC.

### **Research**

Developed in 2004 a research agenda on scholarly communications issues. List of desired research topics:

- Monograph purchasing levels in recent years across all types of academic libraries.
- Print subscription levels in recent years across all types of academic libraries
- Levels of electronic journal access at all types of academic libraries.
- The extent to which academic libraries of various types are moving towards e-journal-only access.
- A faculty research profile by type of institution – particularly non-ARL institutions.
- Changes in institutional promotion and tenure structure that encourage or reward publishing in alternative channels.
- Information on the extent to which academic libraries are cataloging open access journals.
- Usage patterns of open access journals, including geographic origin of readers.
- The impact of open access journals relative to subscription-based journals, measured in article citations and other factors, and building on existing studies.

- Quantifying the cost that libraries are paying for alternative means of access to the literature to support teaching and research, such as document delivery and costs paid to the Copyright Clearance Center.

## Other

### IV. ACRL Scholarly Communications Toolkit

An ACRL toolkit was designed to support advocacy efforts that work toward changing the scholarly communication system and to provide information on scholarly communication issues for librarians, faculty, academic administrators, and other campus stakeholders. The kit is updated regularly. See: <http://www.ala.org/ala/acrl/acrlissues/scholarlycomm/scholarlycommunicationtoolkit/toolkit.htm>

The links below are examples of the use of and reference to the kit:

The Wikipedia article on Open Access  
[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Open\\_access](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Open_access)

The OA Librarian (see right hand side)  
<http://oalibrarian.blogspot.com/2006/01/open-access-to-digital-medical-athenum.html>

A University of Texas Libraries site on the cost of information  
<http://www.lib.utexas.edu/chem/costs.html>

Cornell Faculty Senate Resolution on open Access (see footnotes)  
<http://www.library.cornell.edu/scholarlycomm/resolution.html>

Georgia State University blog on scholarly communication (on right hand side)  
<http://www.library.gsu.edu/news/index.asp?typeID=62>

Brown University Library page  
[http://www.brown.edu/Facilities/University\\_Library/disgroups/oasc.html](http://www.brown.edu/Facilities/University_Library/disgroups/oasc.html)

New Jersey Institute of Technology (I think)  
<http://www.library.njit.edu/publications/scholarly-comm/>

New York State Higher Education Initiative  
<http://www.nyshei.org/Resources/scholcomm-resources.htm>

**SCHOLCOMM** (ACRL Scholarly Communication listserv established, for dissemination of information and to facilitate discussion (592 subscribers as of June 2006).

**Scholarly Communication section of ACRL Web page.**

<http://www.ala.org/ala/acrl/acrlissues/scholarlycomm/scholarlycommunication.htm>

Provides information on ACRL's scholarly communication activities.