



Meeting: 01-02 MWI **Agenda Item:** 120

Agenda Document: 12.0

To: ACRL Board of Directors

Subject: Scholarly Communications

Submitted by: Deborah Dancik

Date submitted: January 9, 2002

ACTION RECOMMENDED:

Whereas the ACRL Task Force on Scholarly Communications has determined that the issues surrounding scholarly communication and publishing are of major import to ACRL members, and
Whereas ACRL members see an active role for the organization in helping to address the issues, and
Whereas the recommendations in the Task Force on Scholarly Communication Report build on the strengths of the organization, and
Whereas scholarly communication is one of ACRL's strategic priorities, and
Whereas scholarly communication will involve considerable liaison activity;
I move that the Board implement the Task Force's recommendations

- "that ACRL be actively engaged, as one of its highest strategic priorities, in working to reshape the current system of scholarly communication" for a period of three years beginning at ALA Annual 2002

- that ACRL's activities in the area "include broad-based educational work, political advocacy, coalition-building, and research"

- that "ACRL establish a standing committee on scholarly communication" that has primary responsibility for coordinating ACRL's scholarly communications activities, under the general direction of the Board" including recommending an agenda for action, establishing criteria against which the on-going nature of this strategic priority can be evaluated, and developing a mechanism for liaison with other groups, organizations, etc. This Committee will make regular reports to the Board on this initiative, with a recommendation on the on-going nature and funding of ACRL's involvement in these issues at the ALA Annual 2005.

- that "ACRL hire a consultant to serve as a staff person who can work actively on scholarly communication issues," including carrying out ACRL's scholarly communication agenda. The consultant will report to the ACRL Executive Director and work under the general direction of the Standing Committee and the Board.

- that ACRL budget up to \$90,000 for each of the 3 years of this initiative

- that "the scholarly communication initiative be evaluated at the end of the initial three year period" with a recommendation to the Board at ALA Annual 2005 about the continuance of this as a "regular program if it is deemed to be effective and worthwhile."

Moved by Deborah Dancik, seconded by Robert Rose

**STRATEGIC DIRECTION SUPPORTED: Please add additional sheets as needed to explain.
(Select the strategic direction that will be affected most by this action.)**

- 1.0 Society recognizes the contributions that academic and research libraries and librarians make in higher education, scholarly communication, and civic development.
- 2.0 Academic librarians advocate for public policy, legislation, and institutional change that enhance the values and contribution they make to learning, teaching, and research.
- 3.0 ACRL is an inclusive organization serving academic librarians and other information professionals in related professions.
- 4.0 Academic and research librarians are continually engaged in learning for their professional development and growth.
- 5.0 ACRL is a national and international interactive leader in creating, expanding, and transferring the body of knowledge of academic librarianship.
- 6.0 ACRL is an effective and a dynamic organization that continually enhances its capacity to create its future and assess and improve its performance in carrying out its mission.

FISCAL AND STAFFING IMPACT:

MOTION: Above recommendation moved No motion made Motion revised (see motion form)

Moved by:

Seconded by:

ACTION TAKEN: Motion Approved Motion Defeated Other: _____

Minority vote (list names):

**Report of the
ACRL Scholarly Communications Task Force**

January 2002

Ray English, Chair
Karyle Butcher
Deborah Dancik
James Neal
Catherine Wojewodzki

Executive Summary

The ACRL Task Force on Scholarly Communications has sought broad member input--through both a survey and a series of focus group meetings--regarding scholarly communications issues and ACRL's potential role in addressing them. Based on that input as well as its own assessment, the task force recommends that ACRL make scholarly communications one of its highest strategic priorities and that the association be active in the areas of education, advocacy, coalition building, and research. It further recommends that ACRL establish both a standing committee and a discussion group for scholarly communications and that it hire a part-time consultant to serve as a staff person for the association's scholarly communications activities. Finally, the task force recommends that ACRL establish for an initial three-year period an annual budget for scholarly communications of approximately \$65,000 to \$90,000 and that the program be assessed at the end of that period and continued as a regular program if it is deemed to be effective.

I. Task Force Charge

The ACRL Scholarly Communications Task Force was established at the 2000 ALA annual conference in Chicago. The task force charge was to "examine and make recommendations regarding the role that ACRL can play in shaping the future of scholarly communications and make a report to the ACRL board by annual conference 2001."

Members of the task force were appointed by ACRL President Betsy Wilson. They are: Ray English (chair), Karyle Butcher, Deborah Dancik, James Neal, and Catherine Wojewodzki.

II. Task Force Process

The task force has met eleven times since the 2000 annual conference, including nine telephone conference calls and two in-person meetings at the 2001 midwinter and annual conferences. Members of the task force agreed in our initial meetings that any discussion of how ACRL might contribute to shaping the future of scholarly communication requires envisioning what such a future might be like. This question is discussed briefly below in Section III, "Shaping the Future of Scholarly Communications." We also agreed that understanding what other associations and organizations are doing to address scholarly communications issues was necessary in order to recommend a role for ACRL that complements other initiatives. Two members of the task force, Debbie Dancik and Ray English, developed an inventory of the scholarly communications work of other groups, including both library associations and higher education organizations. This inventory, entitled "Scholarly Communications Activities and Directions of Allied Organizations," is attached as Appendix A.

Members of the task force felt that it was very important to understand how ACRL members view scholarly communication issues and the role that ACRL might play in addressing them. Jim Neal conducted an e-mail survey to gain member input on these questions. An analysis of the survey responses, including the raw response numbers, is attached at Appendix B. Both the

inventory of other organizations and the results of the membership survey as they apply to the work of the task force are discussed below in Section IV, "A New Role for ACRL."

In order to gain additional member input on these issues--and particularly on how ACRL might go about addressing them--the task force conducted a series of six focus groups. Participants in the focus groups included both present and past leaders of ACRL as well as ACRL members who volunteered on the membership survey. Two in-person focus groups were held at the ACRL national conference in Denver and three focus groups were conducted by teleconference, including one with members of the current ACRL board. Ray English also conducted an in-person focus group with the ACRL executive committee. These focus groups were exceptionally valuable for members of the task force, shaping in substantial part the recommendations that are made in Section V of this report. A summary of the focus groups, prepared by Catherine Wojewodzki, is included in Appendix C.

The task force presented a preliminary version of this report for discussion and feedback from the ACRL board during the San Francisco conference. The board responded positively to the overall direction outlined in the preliminary report. Specific suggestions from board members were incorporated into a draft the full report, which was discussed at some length with the board at its retreat in Chicago in December, 2001. The task force's final report, which is being submitted at the 2002 midwinter conference in New Orleans, incorporates additional suggestions from board members based on the retreat discussion.

III. Shaping the Future of Scholarly Communications

While all academic librarians are familiar with the "serials crisis"—an issue that the profession has grappled with for many years—focus on the broader concept of "scholarly communications" or the "scholarly communications system" is more recent. Interest in the broader topic has grown as the library community has realized that the serials issue, however pressing and problematic it continues to be, is intertwined in a complex ways with the entire system by which scholarly research is produced and disseminated. In other words, our profession has begun to understand that the serials crisis is part of a growing crisis in the system of scholarly communication that will be resolved only through a fundamental restructuring of the system itself.

The higher education community has also begun, through such documents as the Tempe Principles (see Appendix D), to envision what a new system of scholarly communications would look like. While a consensus on this is still developing, some of the key characteristics of a desired future include:

- reasonable prices for scholarly information,
- increased control by the higher education community (as opposed to commercial interests),
- utilization of new and innovative electronic technologies for publishing,
- appropriate and effective access following principles of fair use,
- user privacy,
- quality assurance through peer review or an analogous process, and
- archiving of electronic publications to ensure long-term access.

While envisioning the future is relatively easy, creating such a future will be a long and difficult process, requiring the combined efforts of faculty, librarians, and administrators, both in this country and abroad. Working to change the system of scholarly communication involves analyzing and dealing with complex issues that are economic, political, and sociological in nature. The issues range from the extraordinary concentration of economic power in the hands of a few scientific publishers, to the politics of legislation to protect fair use in the digital environment, to cultural aspects of the tenure and promotion system. It is also clear that genuine power in the system of scholarly communication rests with the faculty and other researchers who create, review, and edit new research. These researchers must be the key players in the process of change, and strategies developed by ACRL and other library organizations must recognize and deal with that reality.

IV. A New Role for ACRL

Responses to the task force's survey indicate that ACRL members attach a high priority to scholarly communications issues generally (see Appendix B). Virtually all issues listed in the first series of questions on the survey were ranked between 2 (somewhat important) and 3 (very important). The membership survey responses, coupled with the task force's own assessment of the importance of scholarly communications issues, lead us to conclude that ACRL should make scholarly communication one of its highest strategic priorities.

Responses to the third series of questions on the survey--regarding what actions ACRL might take to address scholarly communications issues--suggest that ACRL's activities should fall into four main areas: 1) education of librarians, faculty, and higher education administrators, 2) advocacy of various kinds, 3) coalition-building and developing an action plan within the higher education community, and 4) research.

Given the complexity of these issues, and the importance of working on them in a sustained way over time, we believe there is a critical need for ACRL to mount ongoing programs to educate academic librarians about scholarly communications issues and for ACRL to create support mechanisms, programs, and publicity efforts to help make faculty researchers and higher education administrators more aware of the importance of these concerns. ACRL's broad membership base and its strong record in programming and continuing education puts the association in a unique position to be effective in these areas. The need for broad-based educational efforts creates opportunities for ACRL to partner with other organizations, such as SPARC, ARL, and ALCTS, in the development of specific programs.

There is also an ongoing need for advocacy on legislative and policy issues. The recent proposed merger of Harcourt and Reed Elsevier, statements by Pat Schroeder on behalf of the Association of American Publishers, and legislation such as DMCA and UCITA are all examples of issues and incidents that require a strong advocacy role. In some instances there is a need for a visible spokesperson and in others a need for coordinated political lobbying. As is the case with educational programming, ACRL's advocacy efforts will be most effective if they are carried out in partnership with other organizations, such as SPARC, ARL, the ALA Washington Office, AAU, and NASULGC. ACRL can build on its existing legislative network and its liaison relationships with higher education associations in these efforts.

Respondents to the membership survey ranked very highly the need for ACRL to help build a consensus and an action plan on scholarly communications across the higher education community. Since faculty and other researchers are the key to changing the system of scholarly communication, they need to be actively encouraged by both librarians and higher education administrators in their efforts to create change. Our inventory of other organizations suggests that there is growing awareness of the importance of these concerns in both the academic library and higher education communities generally. At the same time, there are only a few organizations that have ongoing programs that include staff assigned to these issues, with ARL and SPARC being the most prominent. The need to develop a coordinated action plan goes hand in hand with the need to partner with other organizations in educational and advocacy efforts.

A final area of activity for ACRL to address regarding scholarly communications issues is research. While the effects of the serials crisis have been very well documented in ARL libraries, much less is known about its effects in smaller university, college, and community college libraries. In order to mount the educational, advocacy, and coalition-building efforts that the membership survey suggests ACRL should undertake, we need to know more about how scholarly communications issues have affected all academic libraries, not just those in the ARL group, and also how smaller institutions can contribute to the development of a new system of scholarly communication.

Members of the task force believe that it is important that ACRL undertake a new scholarly communications initiative that fits ACRL's character as an association and that is closely coordinated with other organizations working on these issues, including (but not limited to) ARL and SPARC. We believe ACRL is very well positioned to be successful in these efforts.

V. Organizational Concerns

Fulfilling these new roles will require ACRL to develop new internal structures and also devote significant time and financial resources to these issues. The task force's advice regarding organizational structure is contained in recommendations 3, 4, and 5 below, with specific rationales provided for each recommendation. Financial concerns are addressed in recommendation 6.

As background we note that the focus group discussions tended to suggest two different approaches to addressing organizational concerns. Focus group participants emphasized the importance of leadership on scholarly communications issues, but they also stressed the need to develop grassroots membership involvement. The task force believes that the two strategies are complementary and that both should be pursued.

Most participants in the focus groups were in agreement that ACRL could not be successful in dealing with scholarly communications issues unless it had strong leadership – from the president, the board, and those members who are most concerned about and involved with the issue. In order to focus the association's efforts, they felt it would be necessary both to establish

a standing committee on scholarly communications and also have an experienced staff person assigned this area.

Several focus group participants also suggested that creating a discussion group for scholarly communications would be the best initial way to generate membership involvement in these issues. A discussion group could potentially foster larger member participation on these issues.

VI. Recommendations

The task force makes the following recommendation to the ACRL board:

1. The task force recommends that ACRL be actively engaged, as one of its highest strategic priorities, in working to reshape the current system of scholarly communication.

Rationale: The growing crisis in the system of scholarly communication, including continuing high rates of cost increase for serials, is one of the most important issues facing academic libraries. The results of the task force's survey underscore the fact that ACRL members rate scholarly communications issues as being very important to them and to their libraries. As the largest association of academic librarians, ACRL is obligated to develop a strong and effective role on these issues. The factors that will need to be put in place in order to change the system of scholarly communication also argue for ACRL attaching a high priority to these concerns. Change will occur only through broad-based political and educational efforts that enlist the support and engagement of both faculty researchers and college and university administrators. Active involvement by ACRL in these educational, political, and advocacy roles is critical for building the level of awareness and concerted action that is required.

2. The task force recommends that ACRL's activities in the areas of scholarly communication include broad-based educational work, political advocacy, coalition-building, and research.

Rationale: The survey of membership ranked highly each of these four areas of potential ACRL activities. Members of the task force are in agreement that this ranking of potential areas of activity draws on the strengths of ACRL as an association, while leaving other potential activities (such as developing new journals that compete with expensive commercial titles) to other organizations. This recommendation clearly implies that ACRL will try to assume, in partnership with other organizations engaged on these issues, a visible public role in addressing these issues. Scholarly communication issues offer a continuing opportunity for ACRL to work in partnership with ARL and SPARC, building on the success of the Create Change initiative.

3. The task force recommends that ACRL establish a standing committee on scholarly communication that will have primary responsibility for coordinating ACRL's scholarly communications efforts.

Rationale: While ACRL does have existing committees with responsibilities that touch on scholarly communications issues, the task force believes ACRL should create a new committee that will have primary responsibility for coordinating the association's scholarly

communications efforts, under the general direction of the ACRL board. As noted above, ACRL needs to create ongoing programming for its members, provide a variety of support mechanisms for educational efforts that reach out to faculty and administrators, develop an improved mechanism for legislative advocacy, and establish a program of research. These efforts need to be coordinated with those ACRL committees and sections (as well as other ALA divisions, such as ALCTS) that are interested in scholarly communications issues. ACRL also needs to build on the liaison relationships that it has developed to higher education associations and develop broad-based collaborative efforts with other organizations concerned about these issues. In the assessment of the task force members and many of the focus group participants, it is simply not possible to carry out these efforts without having a committee that is charged with overall responsibility for scholarly communication. Appointments to the committee should include those who have active interest and experience on these issues and care should be taken to include representatives from ACRL units that are particularly concerned with these issues. The committee also needs to be chaired by an experienced member who has a good understanding of the way in which ACRL functions. One of the initial tasks of the committee would be to develop a scholarly communications action agenda for ACRL that would be reviewed periodically by the ACRL board.

4. The task force recommends that ACRL hire a consultant to serve as a staff person who can work actively on scholarly communications issues; the consultant would have primary responsibility for carrying out ACRL's scholarly communications agenda; he or she would report to the ACRL executive director and work under the general direction of the standing committee and the ACRL board.

Rationale: Members of the task force believe that there is a limit to what can be achieved by ACRL on scholarly communications issues by relying solely on the volunteer efforts of its members. In our view, it is not possible to address these concerns with the force and visibility that is required without assigning a staff person to this area. For a variety of reasons the task force does not believe that it is advisable at this point to add continuing ACRL staff for this purpose. A consultant, working approximately half-time on a limited-term but renewable basis, would seem to be the best way to address staffing, at least initially. Most participants in the focus group discussions of this question were in agreement with this assessment. The consultant chosen for this role needs to be an experienced academic librarian who is very familiar both with ACRL and with scholarly communications issues. It is critical that this person have excellent communications skills as well as strong abilities in dealing with group processes and political issues in the broadest sense. It is especially important to choose someone who can establish credibility with faculty and administrators. For that reason it might be desirable for the consultant to have some academic background or teaching experience. Many participants in the focus group provided us with similar assessments of the desired characteristics of the consultant.

5. The task force recommends that ACRL establish a discussion group on scholarly communications.

Rationale: A number of participants in the focus group sessions emphasized the importance of opening up scholarly communications issues at the ACRL grass roots level. Some kind of forum is needed that will provide an outlet for member participation on these issues.

Task force members agree that a new ACRL scholarly communications initiative, one that includes a mechanism for open member participation, could attract academic librarians who are currently not participating in ACRL. A discussion group appears to be the best initial mechanism for this purpose. The group would be a source of ideas as the association's scholarly communications agenda is developed and revised. It would also provide an effective way to assess ongoing member interest in these issues. If it proves successful, it could expand into a more formalized structure within ACRL, such as a scholarly communications section.

6. The task force recommends that ACRL establish for a three-year period a consolidated annual budget for scholarly communication of approximately \$65,000 to \$90,000.

Rationale: The task force believes that the following approximate annual budget amounts would be needed to carry out the scholarly communications initiative recommended in this report:

Consultant:	\$40,000 to \$55,000
Travel:	\$5,000 to \$7,500
Program and materials:	\$10,000 to \$15,000
Research:	\$5,000 to \$15,000
SPARC participation:	\$5,000
Total:	\$65,000 to \$90,000

Since \$5,000 is currently budgeted for ACRL's affiliate membership in SPARC, this would represent an additional annual budget expenditure of \$60,000 to \$85,000. More specific budget figures should be developed by the executive director and the budget and finance committee, as the program takes shape. Expense for the consultant will depend upon his or her level of experience and the amount of time that is contracted. Travel expenses will depend in part on the home location of the consultant, particularly his or her distance from Washington, D.C. Program and materials costs will depend on the specific educational and advocacy agenda that is developed. Research costs will vary depending on the extent to which existing data sources can be utilized or it is deemed necessary to conduct original research, perhaps through an outside contract. While the task force does not believe that ACRL's scholarly communications activities will be a source of significant revenues, it does recommend that the scholarly communications committee look for opportunities to fund activities in cooperation with other groups and that it also explore possibilities for external funding.

7. The task force recommends that the scholarly communications initiative be evaluated at the end of the initial three-year period and continued as a regular program if it is deemed to be effective and worthwhile.

Rationale: As noted in Section III, scholarly communications issues are, by their very nature, complex and difficult to address. While the task force believes that ACRL would play a very effective role regarding these issues, success is by no means guaranteed. Building in an evaluation of the program toward the end of its third year would insure that the effort is continued as a regular program only if it is deemed to be worthwhile. The task force suggests

that the evaluation criteria be developed by the standing committee, in consultation with the executive director.

VI. Conclusion

Members of the task force believe that the recommendations outlined in this report would, if implemented, allow ACRL to play a prominent national role in shaping the future of scholarly communications in partnership with other groups.

APPENDIX A

Scholarly Communications Activities and Directions of Allied Organizations: An Inventory

The task force gathered information on the organizational structures, initiatives and educational programming of organizations that were identified by Task Force members as having some relationship to ACRL by virtue of type of organization or because of an organization's involvement in scholarly communication issues. The goals were to identify possible organizational models that could inform ACRL's own structure, to determine whether there might be any synergy or opportunities for cooperation between ACRL's efforts, either programmatic or in advocacy, with any of these groups, and to avoid duplication on ACRL's part.

A review of ACRL's activities in the arena of scholarly communication is included in the Library Association section.

Library Associations:

American Association of Law Libraries: contact: Roger Parent, Exec. Director

Organizational Structure:

- They have had the Washington Affairs Office for 10 years, headed by a lawyer (who as it happens is also the current AALL president and is director of the law library at Georgetown).
 - This individual receives a "healthy" honorarium for the time he contributes to AALL work.
 - The head of the Washington Affairs Office, although not a member of the Board, attends all Board meetings at which he gives a regular report.
 - The Office primarily tackles intellectual property and copyright, for which they right briefing and position papers and provide testimony at federal hearings, etc.
 - The Washington Affairs Office publishes a monthly column in Spectrum on the issues and they also do regular membership alerts both in Spectrum and electronically.
- AALL has both a Government Relations Committee and a Copyright Committee that work directly with the Washington Affairs Office. There is an official liaison from both committees to the Office.
- There is also a Committee on Relations with Information Vendors (CRIV) that is quite powerful within AALL and positions on this committee are sought after by the membership.
 - This committee is AALL's advocate for fair business practices among legal publishers.
 - They do site visits to at least one publisher a year, meeting with management, looking at practices, bringing concerns of the Association forward.
 - This group writes papers for publication on their findings and on issues.
 - They also hold a forum at every annual conference inviting legal publishers to participate.

- CRIV has a major and full website to which publishers contribute and which they consider their major link to general members. This group is important enough to the publishers that they run things past them before they make announcements. Roger considers this a very businesslike relationship. The group does not have a close relationship with the Board beyond having Chair and members appointed.
- The Executive Director plays a coordinating role among the various groups and individuals working on the scholarly communication issue to ensure all parties are well informed, questions get addressed, etc.

Programming:

- AALL is resuscitating by popular demand its Publishing Price Index after a 3-year lull. The editor is an AALL member and receives an honorarium for the work. The individual comes from an acquisitions department so they know the issues.
- Much of their educational efforts grow directly out of the activities within the organizational structure.

Advocacy and Other Initiatives:

- AALL Board has commissioned an economic analysis of price increases resulting from mergers and acquisition of legal publishers. (The individual doing this had done some work for SPARC).
- AALL is not a member of SPARC, primarily because they see the focus of that organization as Science and Technology.
- Their interests in scholarly communication lie primarily with fair pricing practices, relations with legal publishers, and intellectual property issues and most of their initiatives, organizational structures, and educational efforts reflect this.

Association of College and Research Libraries:

Organizational Structure:

- Ray English has been the informal point person for ACRL on these issues for the last two years.
- He is a member of the SPARC Board.

Programming:

ACRL and SPARC have been partnering on the ACRL/SPARC Forum on scholarly communication held at Mid-Winter and Annual

Advocacy and Other Initiatives:

ACRL Board passed a resolution in support of SPARC in 1998 provided a contribution of \$5,000 in support. As an affiliated member, ACRL has contributed \$5,000 to SPARC on an annual basis since then.

ACRL was a full partner with SPARC and ARL in the development of the Create Change program, which included a brochure, web site, and hiring of consultant to develop these materials. ACRL contributed \$21,000 to the cost of the Create Change initiative, one-third of the total budget of \$63,000.

Association for Library Collections and Technical Services: contact Bill Robnett, President

Organizational Structure:

- ALCTS is format driven in their structure, rather than issue driven; the scholarly communications issue does not fit well into any of their existing committees.
- ALCTS has only a Scholarly Communication Discussion Group that functions like all other such groups in ALA.

Programming:

- All done through the Discussion Group. The focus has been primarily journal pricing issues

Advocacy and Other Initiatives:

- Topic is of interest to all ALCTS members.
- When asked if ALCTS would be interested in lending its name to initiatives from ACRL, Robnett said they would indeed be. He thinks there might be opportunities for ACRL and them to work together; overtures from ACRL could be a catalyst for ALCTS to codify its own interests around this issue.

Association of Research Libraries: contact Mary Case

Organizational Structure:

ARL has an Office of Scholarly Communication with Mary Case as the 1 FTE.

Programming:

Much of the work related to its member institutions, but provides speakers for conferences and acts as resource generally.

Prepares educational material, like the Create Change brochure, which may be adapted by others

Advocacy and Other Initiatives:

ARL does advocacy and intervention related to the marketplace on behalf of their community e.g. Reed/Elsevier kind of merger.

Also does legal advocacy and advises on policy development.

Does a lot on copyright related issues which bleeds over into development of copyright education and working with organization such as AAP and university presses to come up with come common statement on copyright

Been working with AAU, trying to move them along with this agenda, trying to get the Presidents and Provosts engaged on the topic and then to see what action they might take

Continuing work with the humanities community to get a national humanities alliance to try and bring the humanities and social sciences societies and university presses along on this issues and initiatives they might participate in.

Has done and would like to do much more coordinated data collection among members on things like cost for use, citation data in different disciplines, etc.

Medical Library Association: contact -- Michael Homan, President

Organizational Structure:

- In the case of the current President, Michael Homan, he has been the editor of their Bulletin and thereby has a professional interest in this and has been involved in these issues on behalf of the Board.
- MLA has a structure of formal Liaisons, generally individuals who do not sit on the Board, to allied organizations or organizations where the Association wants a voice e.g. SPARC. As are other committee chairs, these individuals are appointed by the President. Liaisons are appointed for a period of 3 years (may be renewed for another 3 years). MLA does not generally provide financial support for these individuals but looks for people who would have institutional support. The Liaisons communicate directly with the Board, write statements on the issues for the Board. The Board is the “voice” of the Association on the issues, using the documentation and information prepared by the Liaisons.

Programming:

- MLA considers the scholarly communications issue as a major issue of the organization and as such has had plenary and keynote sessions are their conference on this.
- At each conference they also have what is called an “open forum” where the latest hot topics are given airing. Michael expects the one this spring to be on the Public Library of Science.

Advocacy and Other Activities

- MLA was one of the original signatories to SPARC
- MLA has strong links with NIH and with the National Library of Medicine
- Association is actively supporting the PubMed Central initiation (a permanent archiving repository) headed by NIH. Michael reviewed the NIH proposal (originally called E-Biomed), providing input. He then wrote a supporting editorial in the MLA Bulletin.
- They actively support the concept of “barrier freed access”, which is the PubMed Central’s concept of free access to archives after 6 months.
- The most recent initiative is the Public Library of Sciences where scientists are encouraging colleagues to not publish with publishers who do not have free and long term archiving. The MLA Board would be the body to endorse such a concept (they expect to do so at their next Board meeting in May).

Special Libraries Association: contact: Doug Newcomb, SLA Communications Officer

Organizational Structure:

- Any voice in SLA on scholarly communications issues comes from the members of the academic sector, who are often disproportionately represented on the Board, but this is a minority view.
- SLA has a practice statement (as opposed to a policy statement) on serials pricing which was passed in 1988, but nothing more recent (for statement see <http://www.sla.org/content/SLA/Policies/67-88.cfm>).

Programming:

- SLA does no programming relating to these issues.

Advocacy and Other Initiatives:

- SLA is not a member of SPARC.
- 85% of SLA’s members are corporate who, while they favor fair and equitable pricing, are not supportive of free access and generally do not take a stance on the issues that are of interest in our ACRL Task Force.

Canadian Association of Research Libraries: contact: Tim Marc, Executive Director

Organizational Structure:

- CARL has a small office and all advocacy is through the Executive Director and any energy that the institutional CARL members put forth individually.

Programming:

- CARL's most recent activity is to develop a Canadian version of the Create Change pamphlet, with Canadian content. They are on their second print run of this and using the distribution of this pamphlet to reach allied groups in Canada (e.g. Council of Prairie and Pacific University Libraries, the Canadian Association of University Teachers, etc.).
- CARL is trying to reach all non-CARL libraries with the Create Change message and the pamphlet.
- They act as a resource on the topic for organizations like the Humanities and Social Sciences Federation of Canada, where they recommend speakers, etc.
- In 1995 they joined with the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada to form an Task Force which looked at this issue from a Canadian perspective and produced a report and conference that was the first national consciousness raising effort.

Advocacy and Other Initiatives:

- CARL joined SPARC early and takes the responsibility to feed Canadian content to it.

CARL is currently talking with SPARC about folding into their initiatives as an affiliate member.

Other Organizations:

Association of American Universities (AAU): contact – John Vaughn

Organizational Structure:

- AAU has a Council on Federal Relations to which each Provost appoints a representative from their respective campuses. The group directs the whole legislative agenda for AAU. Each member belongs to one of several subgroups that deals with particular issues.
- Intellectual Property Forum is the AAU Council sub group that deals with issues surrounding scholarly communication. This group frames and recommends policy to the Council and then implements the policy statements/goals that come out of the Council e.g. group may try to influence Congress to do or not do something according to the policy goals.

- AAU Office has 22 staff. John Vaughn, the Executive Vice President, is responsible for the association's policy studies agenda and handles issues related to intellectual property, information technology, research libraries, and scholarly communication. He works closely with the Council and Forum.
- AAU has retained outside Counsel for last four years; has been crucial to lobbying on federal policy issues.

Advocacy and Other Initiatives:

- They work at both the federal level, trying to influence policy, and at the institutional level, framing policy that each institution can adapt.
- AAU endeavors to frame a campus view on intellectual property and scholarly communication to avoid the segmentation the various sectors on campus, (e.g. libraries vs. computing), may have on an issue.
- AAU trying to frame independent view from ARL (sometimes the campus Librarian and the President's views don't mesh), although they cooperate significantly. They work a great deal with other organizations, like ARL, to marry the expertise of those groups with AAU to work out joint policy and implementation plans.
- AAU has worked in partnership with ARL on scholarly communication issues. John Vaughn and Mary Case working together now on proposals to take to the AAU advisory committee.
- One thrust has been to get scholarly publishing back under the institution umbrella, and out of the commercial sector. They work with their member institutions on such initiatives. They are seeking to determine whether AAU can have a real role in working with scholarly societies and perhaps university presses. This is an example of AAU helping frame policy at the institutional level.

Big 12 Plus: contact – Adrian Alexander

Organizational Structure:

- Big 12 Plus has a small task force of library deans who coordinate the activities on scholarly communication for the group.
- Adrian Alexander, a librarian himself, is the principal Big 12 Plus staff person who works with the above task force and on behalf of the organization on these issues.

Advocacy and Other Initiatives:

- Active in last three years.

- Hosted meeting that include deans and directors and members of the U.S. National Commission on Library and Information Sciences where the major topic was scholarly communication system and the economics of scholarly publishing.
- Worked with provosts of Big 12 Athletic Conference schools to publicize a statement on scholarly communication issues they had adopted at their spring meeting and they also got an article in the Chronicle of Higher Education about this statement as well.
- This issue was part of the first strategic planning sessions of the deans and directors group.
- Dean and directors authorized Adrian to begin work with their strategic partners in building the coalition of libraries and scholarly societies that has launched BioOne, Inc. Big 12 Plus has 2 seats on the BioOne Board. Adrian serves as Treasurer of BioOne, Inc.
- In 2001 held a meeting of all member institutions provosts on how to actually implement the Tempe Principles on their campuses.

Coalition For Networked Information: contact -- Joan Lippincott, Associate Executive Director

Programming:

- They develop programs and program content or participate as speakers in the programs of others.

Organizational Structure:

- CNI has only 6 staff, 3 of whom are part-time.
- Cliff Lynch, as Executive Director, participates on national and international organizations, like the National Academy of Sciences committee that considers digital issues, sits on Boards that give grants (e.g. NSF/DLI, IMLS for their digitization and leadership grants, NEH, and the National Historic Preservation and Records Commission). He also participates in the development of White Papers and program delivery.
- Joan, as Associate Director, handles all the administrative activities, has a program development role, contributes to the development of White Papers.

Advocacy and Other Initiatives:

- One of CNI's three major thrusts is "Developing and Managing Networked Information Content."
- The organization provides advice on an informal basis to many organizations and works with agencies that are interested in how they (CNI) see technology trends. This is advice that informs the development of policy and programs and sometimes leads to legislation. It is not intended as lobbying (which CNI leaves to two sponsoring organizations ARL and EDUCAUSE) but is rather an informal exchange.

- CNI is invited to participate on national and international initiatives.

CNI produces White Papers of the nature “here’s how we see the key issues and what could be done.”

Programming:

Their pattern has been to work with leading edge institutions on what is needed in the institutions themselves and then developing programs out of this to disseminate. In 1994-97 CNI partnered with ACRL on the “New Learning Communities” initiative. They developed two workshops, one on leading edge issues and one for institutions who needed a jump start on awareness and action on the scholarly publishing issues. They did a pre-conference with ACRL and did a session on assessment at the ’98 ACRL National Conference. They continue to be very interested in partnering with ARCL on professional development.

National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges: contact David Shulenberger

Programming:

NASULGC has education sessions on scholarly communication at their annual meetings but Shulenberger did not know how many members would have had similar sessions on their campuses.

Advocacy and Other Initiatives:

NASULGC endorsed the Tempe principles for discussion each of their member campuses.

NASULGC is monitoring activities at the federal level, such as attempts to do away with PubScience, but at the same time there is not organized activity by NASULGC

SPARC (Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition)

Organization Structure:

- SPARC is supported through membership contributions.
- It currently has approximately 180 members composed of libraries, research institutions, and organizations. It encourages competition in the scholarly communications marketplace and undertakes other activities to shape the future of the scholarly communications system.
- SPARC has a staff of 3.25 FTE.

Publishing Activities:

Although SPARC is not a publisher, its primary focus has been to encourage publishing activities that fall into three broad categories--the SPARC Alternatives and Leading Edge programs and SPARC Scientific Communities.

- The SPARC Alternatives program has involved working with nonprofit publishing partners to establish new STM journals that compete directly with high priced commercial titles. SPARC has now facilitated the publication of eight journals as part of this strategy.
- The SPARC Leading Edge program encourages the use of innovative technologies and business practices in scholarly publishing.
- SPARC's Scientific Communities program supports the development of non-profit portals that serve the needs of specific scientific communities by aggregating peer reviewed research and other scholarly content. Examples include *BioOne*, Columbia Earthscape, MIT CogNet.

Education and Advocacy:

- SPARC has been very involved in a variety of educational and advocacy efforts; these are often intertwined. SPARC partnered with ARL and ACRL in the Create Change initiative, which was developed to assist libraries in creating campus communications strategies to educate their faculty about scholarly communications issues.
- SPARC was the primary initiator of the Declaring Independence project, which was designed to educate editorial boards of commercial journals about the business practices of scholarly journals and to make them aware of other publishing options, such as moving their journals to non-profit and independent publishers.
- SPARC has been very effective in generating publicity in the national media regarding scholarly communications issues.

International Efforts:

- Although SPARC has been an international organization from early in its history, it has recently facilitated the launch of SPARC Europe. Membership of SPARC Europe includes several library organizations in Europe countries and the United Kingdom.

Future Direction:

- SPARC is now in the process of developing a new strategic plan. Although the plan is not yet finalized, it is likely to include three broad areas of activity--publishing, education, and advocacy. SPARC is eager to collaborate with ACRL on scholarly communications issues, particularly those that fall into the categories of education and advocacy.

APPENDIX B

ACRL Member Survey

I. ANALYSIS

The task force sought input from the membership of ACRL on the importance of scholarly communication issues and on the priority actions for the association. A member survey was developed and distributed via e-mail to a ten percent random sample of the personal members of ACRL. A total of 812 individuals received the survey, and 182 responded, for a return rate of 22.4 percent. Detailed results of the survey are provided below. Summary conclusions are as follows:

1. Question 1 asked respondents to rank a series of 21 scholarly communication issues as to importance. Overall, all issues were evaluated as "somewhat important" to "very important" suggesting that ACRL members attach a high priority to scholarly communication issues generally. The four issues that captured the highest rankings: cost of scholarly journals, licensing terms for electronic publications, archiving of electronic publications, and preserving fair use for digital information, are consistent with the topics that have captured the most significant professional attention over the last several years.

2. Question 2 asked respondents to rank a series of 14 possible actions to respond to scholarly communication issues as to importance. The three actions that captured the highest rankings: educate faculty and researchers, educate university administrators, and fight legislative actions which undermine fair use, point to an important educational and advocacy role for the library community. The next tier of ranked actions reinforce the advocacy strategy, but also include a planning and research role.

3. Question 3 asked respondents to rank a series of 14 possible actions for ACRL to respond to scholarly communications issues as to importance. The actions that captured the highest rankings are consistent with the results of question 2, that is endorsement of the educational, advocacy, planning and research activities, but with a much higher ranking assigned to the education of librarians about the issues.

4. It is important to understand who responded to the survey, in terms of type of library and type of position:

70.0% University Library
15.3% College Library
7.9% Community/Junior College Library
4.7% Special Library
2.1% Other

25.7% Director/Dean
16.6% Other Administrative
31.4% Reference/User Services

- 11.4% Collection Development
- 4.6% Technical Services
- 3.4% Information Technology
- 6.9% Other

Clearly, there is an administrative and large library bias to the survey results. Nevertheless, this is consistent with the membership makeup of ACRL.

II. SURVEY QUESTIONS AND RAW RESPONSES

Survey on the Role of ACRL in Scholarly Communication

We need your guidance in defining the role of the Association of College and Research Libraries in shaping the future of scholarly communication. The ACRL Board has charged a task force to develop a set of recommendations and we are turning to the ACRL membership for input.

Scholarly communication is the process by which the work of researchers is created, evaluated, documented, distributed, used and archived. The economics, technologies and institutions which underpin this process are being transformed. Libraries are important players in scholarly communication, now participating across all stages of the information value chain and seeking to influence the policies and processes which define the scholarly publishing market.

This brief survey is being sent to a random sample of ten percent of the personal members of ACRL. We request that you complete the survey and return to Jim Neal at jneal@jhu.edu. It should take no longer than ten minutes to record your responses. Your input will be treated in confidence, and once the results are tabulated, the individual survey responses will be destroyed. The task force will use these results and the outcomes of follow-up focus group discussions to prepare our recommendations for future action to the ACRL Board.

Thanks for your cooperation and assistance. Please complete and submit your responses as quickly as possible. We will begin to analyze the results on Friday, March 9.

1. Rank the following scholarly communication issues on a scale of 3 (very important) or 2 (somewhat important) or 1 (not important).

a. cost of scholarly journals	2.84
b. cost of scholarly monographs	2.32
c. number of journals being published	2.21
d. number of new books being published	1.95
e. licensing terms for electronic publications	2.81

f.	archiving of electronic publications	2.81
g.	preserving fair use for digital information	2.79
h.	insuring scholarly quality	2.55
i.	insuring privacy in the use of electronic publications	2.16
j.	increasing consolidation in publishing industry	2.38
k.	commercial control of scholarly communication	2.60
l.	innovative applications of technology in scholarly publishing	2.24
m.	technological protection of electronic publications	2.23
n.	linking capabilities among electronically published works	2.35
o.	quality of searching tools for electronic publications	2.55
p.	faculty/researcher reluctance to explore new publishing models	2.02
q.	timeliness/currency of scholarly publishing	2.33
r.	imbalances in information authorship and ownership (we give too much away)	2.11
s.	scholarly communication not treated as major public policy issue	2.09
t.	availability of historical literature in digital formats	2.05
u.	criteria for faculty promotion and tenure	2.13
2.	Rank the following possible actions to respond to scholarly communication issues on a scale of 3 (very important) or 2 (somewhat important) or 1 (not important).	
a.	educate faculty and researchers about the issues	2.69
b.	educate librarians about the issues	2.47
c.	educate university administrators about the issues	2.75
d.	launch competitive publishing activities	2.20

e.	fight legislative actions which undermine fair use provisions of copyright	2.80
f.	document pricing trends for scholarly publications	2.57
g.	build consensus and action plan across the higher education community	2.55
h.	promote innovative models of scholarly communication	2.44
i.	encourage journal editorial boards to move to non-profit publishers	2.37
j.	encourage university presses and scholarly societies to accept journals moving from commercial publishers	2.51
k.	oppose consolidation in the publishing industry	2.07
l.	support open archives initiatives	2.52
m.	encourage retention of copyright ownership by faculty/researchers	2.43
n.	support the development of discipline pre-print server programs	2.08
3.	Rank the following possible actions FOR ACRL to respond to scholarly communication issues on a scale of 3 (very important) or 2 (somewhat important) or 1 (not important).	
a.	educate faculty and researchers about the issues	2.53
b.	educate librarians about the issues	2.68
c.	educate university administrators about the issues	2.48
d.	launch competitive publishing activities	1.65
e.	fight legislative actions which undermine fair use provisions of copyright	2.74
f.	document pricing trends for scholarly publications	2.51
g.	build consensus and action plan across the higher education community	2.51
h.	promote innovative models of scholarly communication	2.27

i.	encourage journal editorial boards to move to non-profit publishers	2.10
j.	encourage university presses and scholarly societies to accept journals moving from commercial publishers	2.20
k.	oppose consolidation in the publishing industry	2.07
l.	support open archives initiatives	2.47
m.	encourage retention of copyright ownership by faculty/researchers	2.22
n.	support the development of discipline pre-print server programs	1.92

APPENDIX C

Focus Groups

Our survey of ACRL members identified the following actions as the most important for ACRL with regard to the current crisis in scholarly communication:

- educate faculty, researchers, and university administrators
- engage in advocacy of various kinds
- build coalitions and action plan within the higher education community
- conduct research on scholarly communications issues.

The Task Force held a series of six focus groups to elicit how members believe ACRL should proceed to implement a program to address these scholarly communication issues. Each group was asked to consider how ACRL should address the three areas identified by the survey with regard to (1) providing educational programming, (2) advocacy, and (3) coalition building. In addition to ACRL members who volunteered on the membership survey, the focus groups included both present and past leaders of ACRL.

The first two focus groups took place at the ACRL conference in Denver (March 16-17, 2001). One was comprised largely of current and former ACRL leaders (who were not currently on the ACRL board), the other primarily of volunteers from the survey. Discussion leaders Ray English and Deborah Dancik discovered that the discussion with the focus group of ACRL leaders encompassed a greater range of ideas and issues and had insightful suggestions on ACRL structural issues. These participants were better able to conceptualize a role for ACRL. Where the groups overlapped in topics, there was considerable congruence in thinking. Because of these results, telephone focus groups held subsequently were composed primarily of librarians chosen from a list of former ACRL leaders. These telephone focus groups supported and added to the focus group discussions at the ACRL conference. Additionally, focus groups were conducted with members of the ACRL executive committee and with the members of the ACRL board not at the executive committee discussion.

The points made by these six focus groups are summarized below according to the three action areas identified by the survey: educational programs, advocacy, and coalition building. Organizational issues and research are treated separately.

Education

The lines between educational and advocacy effort are blurred, especially for a topic such as scholarly communication where there is little awareness of the issues. The following ideas emerged from the focus groups.

- Nearly all the focus group participants believe that ACRL has a significant role to play in addressing the current problems in scholarly communications, primarily with regard to educating both librarians and faculty about the threats to scholarship.

- The important role of faculty was mentioned by each focus group. Participants in each group believe that it is important to have people “of the academy” be part of the educational role with faculty. They stated that faculty listen to other faculty rather than librarians; so faculty and journal editors need to be part of any educational team.
- ACRL should develop a tool kit to be used by librarians. This kit would provide describe what the crisis in scholarly publishing is, provide relevant facts and talking points for discussion, and guidelines on how to educate academic administrators and faculty. The “Create Change” brochure and recent ACRL information literacy report and guidelines were cited as good models. There were several suggestions that ACRL develop materials like the Create Change brochure that campuses could adapt to their local circumstances.
- Participants suggested that ACRL develop a faculty education package, using the experience of Arizona and Colorado libraries; so that campuses could see the strategies that were employed, the campus players involved, and some sample presentations or printed material.
- Chapters are a good vehicle for regional education. ACRL could have a “canned” program and set of speakers who would be available for chapter meetings/conferences.
- C&RL News is a good vehicle for dissemination of information to academic librarians.

Advocacy/Leadership

There was general agreement that ACRL needs to assume a leadership role and move beyond education about the crisis in scholarly communication. The focus groups had a number of ideas of how ACRL might proceed to build on educational efforts and train librarians and scholars to be advocates for improving scholarly communication. A role of ACRL was suggested as follows:

- ACRL should assume a leadership role with regard to issues that may limit scholarly communication. This role should encompass coalition building, political leadership within both the scholarly community and the broader political realm, and education efforts. ACRL members come from a wide variety of academic institutions and ACRL must tailor its message and the information it provides to meet the diverse needs of its members.
- The ACRL president must speak out on this issue; leadership should not originate only with the executive director. However, there should be an individual attached to the ACRL office who can speak forcefully and with credibility in the higher education and the government arenas and be ready to respond quickly to things like publisher amalgamations, etc.
- Aggressive programming such as Web-casts, videos was suggested. Participants also called for materials aimed at campus editors of journals, materials that could be adapted for local serials cancellations projects, and some suggested models for publishing and archiving.
- Regional institutes and pre-conferences on scholarly communications issues and effective communication techniques for advocates were suggested. Chapters can play an

advocacy/legislative role. ACRL should provide training for advocacy and a concise message for chapter members to use locally.

- ACRL should help its members keep this issue visible, in order to draw attention to its importance and encourage favorable action.

Coalition Building

- ACRL should work with other library organizations such as SLA and MLA, since librarians in all disciplines need an understanding of these issues.
- Cooperative efforts with SPARC are important. Other important associations include establishing liaisons to public publisher organizations and scholarly societies. The Society for Scholarly Publishing and the American Association of Publishers were specifically mentioned.
- ACRL should continue its affiliation with ARL and its support of SPARC initiatives.
- ACRL should use its liaisons with higher education groups. Our liaisons to these organizations need to be knowledgeable about the scholarly communication issues, ACRL's message, and speak out on this issue in their liaison work.
- Additionally, ACRL should look for opportunities to open conversations with scholarly associations/organizations, higher education groups, etc. with which there is no formal liaison relationship.
- ACRL could form an outreach team to meet with members of relevant organizations in each city where ACRL or ALA meets.
- ACRL should work with the Washington Office, which has access to government officials and lobbying groups involved with higher education. Since these groups include faculty and university/college administrators, this is one avenue to advocate for change and to educate policies makers at the same time. ARL is already part of this discussion in Washington and ACRL should continue to work with ARL on this issue.

Organizational Structure

Focus group members consistently supported the contention that the problems in scholarly communication are important and that they will not be resolved soon. They believe that this task force report will lay the groundwork for addressing this issue. A parallel was repeatedly drawn with ACRL's information literacy initiatives. Participants pointed out that this report must provide the rationale for action, the details of the task force's conclusions, and suggestions for action. Concern was expressed about past task force reports that the ACRL board has received and then let languish when administrations changed. There were many ideas for how ACRL might organize for action and some general areas of consensus.

- ACRL should define a role that capitalizes on what we do best and honors what ARL and our partner or sister organizations do best. ACRL can:
 - deal with individual librarians and groups by type of library and discipline
 - work with through chapters and grassroots
 - build coalitions among like groups, along with SPARC
 - provide the educational materials to reach individuals librarians, campuses and groups of faculty
 - provide training

- It is important that ACRL have a single message that all ACRL players can know. Whether a single individual or a committee should play this role was discussed. Participants generally favored having an individual who could (1) respond to outside queries, initiatives, etc. and (2) provide the education for liaisons, ACRL sections, and subcommittees; thus making our efforts consistent and coordinated.

- Board leadership is essential. Board members need to be repeatedly engaged and informed about this issue. Perhaps this report should be followed by periodic e-mails to keep the issue in the forefront and a special educational program on current scholarly communications issues just for the board. ACRL Fellows might also be included in this effort.

- Since there was general agreement that a person is needed to focus, lead, and coordinate ACRL efforts, some discussion of the qualifications of such a person were discussed by each group. We need someone who:
 - has connections or credibility with the scholarly community
 - has familiarity with library issues
 - is politically savvy
 - has excellent communication and negotiation skills
 - is able to work in a consortial environment
 - “can persuade anyone to do anything” i.e. strong lobbying techniques
 - has connections and clout and be able to speak with authority and in a timely way.

The need for someone very experienced and able to speak with authority in the world of librarians, scholars, and politicians was deemed important. The actual duties and qualifications of this person would be developed by the board.

- Most of the focus groups concluded that this individual would need to be a consultant for the initial years of this effort. There was some discussion of “someone at the ACRL Office” taking on this role, but this was generally not considered the most desirable course

- There was agreement on the need for on-going oversight of this issue by the board, but varied opinions on how to best institutionalize the ongoing work; whether it should be through standing committee, a discussion group, a staff person, or some combination of the three. Most participants seemed to favor having a standing committee in addition to a staff person.

ACRL should encourage coordination among its sections and might draw a wider audience to its programs by engaging CLS and ULS members in the program planning process.

- ACRL needs to engage more of its members in this issue by reaching out to the subject/discipline subsections (Education and Behavioral Sciences, Women Studies, Western European Students, etc.). Their members need to understand these issues because these are individuals who deal directly with faculty.
- It would be beneficial for ACRL to work to also engage these issues at the grassroots level. The information literacy initiative developed almost entirely from the “bottom up.” Providing vehicles for member-level participation, which could be done through a section or initially through a discussion group, would help attract subject specialists and others into membership in ACRL.

Research

The need for research on the issues of scholarly communication was an important component the discussion with the ACRL executive committee and was also mentioned by other focus group members. Research that documents the effects of the serials crisis and other scholarly communications problems among non-ARL libraries was considered particularly important.

6 Focus Groups:

2 focus groups in Denver (March 16 & 17) included 14 attendees

2 follow up telephone focus groups (May 15 & 16) had four and eight participants respectively

5th focus group was held with the ACRL executive committee on April 28, with six participants

6th focus group on May 22 included 3 additional members of the ACRL board

APPENDIX D

Principles for Emerging Systems of Scholarly Publishing

The following set of principles was agreed to as a result of a meeting held in Tempe, Arizona, on March 2-4, 2000.

1. The cost to the academy of published research should be contained so that access to relevant research publications for faculty and students can be maintained and even expanded. Members of the university community should collaborate to develop strategies that further this end. Faculty participation is essential to the success of this process.
2. Electronic capabilities should be used, among other things, to: provide wide access to scholarship, encourage interdisciplinary research, and enhance interoperability and searchability. Development of common standards will be particularly important in the electronic environment.
3. Scholarly publications must be archived in a secure manner so as to remain permanently available and, in the case of electronic works, a permanent identifier for citation and linking should be provided.
4. The system of scholarly publication must continue to include processes for evaluating the quality of scholarly work and every publication should provide the reader with information about evaluation the work has undergone.
5. The academic community embraces the concepts of copyright and fair use and seeks a balance in the interest of owners and users in the digital environment. Universities, colleges, and especially their faculties should manage copyright and its limitations and exceptions in a manner that assures the faculty access to and use of their own published works in their research and teaching.
6. In negotiating publishing agreements, faculty should assign the rights to their work in a manner that promotes the ready use of their work and choose journals that support the goal of making scholarly publications available at reasonable cost.
7. The time from submission to publication should be reduced in a manner consistent with the requirements for quality control.
8. To assure quality and reduce proliferation of publications, the evaluation of faculty should place a greater emphasis on quality of publications and a reduced emphasis on quantity.
9. In electronic as well as print environments, scholars and students should be assured privacy with regard to their use of materials.

The complete text of the Tempe Principles, with commentary on each principle, is available at: <http://www.arl.org/scomm/tempe.html>