Association of College and Research Libraries  
Scholarly Communications Committee Meeting  
Midwinter Meeting  
Sunday, June 24, 2012  
8:00 AM – 12:00 PM  
Disneyland Hotel – North Exhibit Hall, Room IJ

Minutes

**Members present:** Jeff Belliston (Chair), Kevin Smith (Vice-Chair), Lis Chabot (Board Liaison), Adrian Ho, Molly Keener, Joy Kirchner (VPO), Lisa Macklin, Kara Malenfant (Staff Liaison), Shawn Martin, Terry Owen, Kristi Palmer, Jen Waller, Jean Zanoni

**Visitors present:** Julia Blixrud, Zach Coble, Barbara DeFelice, Kim Douglas, Ada Emmett, Lorraine Haricombe, Andrea Higginbotham, Scott Lapinski (incoming member), Colleen Lyon, Ann Campion Riley (incoming member/Board Liaison), Claire Stewart (incoming member)

1. Preliminaries (Belliston)
   a. Introductions
   b. **Agenda review** – approved as presented
   c. **Minutes review/correction/approval** – minutes from conference and conference call were approved

2. Updates from the Domain
   a. ARL (Julia Blixrud)

ARL’s Reshaping Scholarly Communication has now changed to Advancing Scholarly Communication, and goals and objectives have been tweaked to reflect what is going on currently in scholarly communication. One of the projects dealing with the goal of changing the marketplace is the work with LYRASIS on eBooks and university presses. On the topic of new models of scholarly communication, Frances Pinter presented at the ARL meeting on Knowledge Unlatched, which is a cooperative financial model to support OA journals and books.

ARL has a joint committee with American Association of University Presses. Two topics continue to swirl around; a joint project between the two organizations (could be a few libraries and a few presses) and to digitize backfiles of the Presses (not just converting to pdfs but also for data mining purposes). ARL is looking at getting some case studies on costs, etc. for university presses and their backfiles.

Two surveys of interest: ARL SPEC Survey on organizational structures for scholarly communication and survey on journal bundles that will be shared with ARL members and perhaps the larger library community.
There is interest among the Provosts on scholarly communication issues, which ARL is assisting with. The paper on 21st Century Collections includes lots of information on scholarly communication.

ARL is re-doing their website and the Create Change site will likely change somewhat.

ARL will be pushing out information on SCOAP3 to their members, particularly on re-calculation the costs per institution.

ARL has discussed having another Institute on Scholarly Communication program. Planning is going forward on a program titled Increasing the Effectiveness of your Scholarly Communication Program: Strategies for Success to perhaps take place in conjunction with the ACRL 2013 conference in Indianapolis. Focus would be on strategy, organizational position and influence. Since the Roadshow will also be at the ACRL conference, we will want to make sure they are complementing and not competing with each other.

b. COAPI (Ada Emmett and Lorraine Haricombe)

Coalition of Open Access Policy Institutions now number 46, including institutions with OA Policies and some who are working on policies. COAPI submitted a response to the White House RFI and drafted a letter of support for FRPAA that SPARC is circulating to members of Congress. The group met prior to the SPARC meeting in Kansas City, and continues working though a closed website. SPARC has generously given COAPI a web presence on their website and COAPI now has a logo.

There is a coordinating group which is looking for ways to move the work of the group forward, and finding opportunities for the COAPI members to meet face-to-face.

c. SCOAP3 (Kim Douglas)

In early June an announcement was made that SCOAP3 is going forward with the tendering process. The bids were opened last Friday, and the Steering Committee expects to release a statement in July as to the success of the bidding process. If the bidding process is successful, they will then begin collecting MOUs from all of the institutions who signed Expressions of Intent. Expect to have MOUs signed by November. The invitation to tender is on the SCOAP3 website, and the tender includes language about this tender and the intersections with license agreement.

d. OAWG/SPARC (Andrea Higginbotham)

The petition for OA on the White House website garnered 25,000 signatures in half the amount of time. First day had 6,000 signatures, and total was 27,496. The White House has 2 weeks from last Tuesday to respond. SPARC has answered several questions from White House staffers.

Still collecting co-sponsors on FRPAA. Currently have 31, evenly divided between parties.

Will be doing a launch of the redesigned SPARC website in August. Have a SPARC Europe webcast upcoming on July 12th. The Pete Binfield webcast on article level metrics was very successful.
OA Week is Oct. 22nd – 28th and the theme is “Set the Default to Open Access.”

3. Work Plan item: Routine activities
   a. SPARC/ACRL Forum (Smith)
      i. Review of yesterday’s forum
      ii. Ideas for Forum at ALA Annual

   Topic was the Compact for Open-access Publishing Equity (COPE) on OA funds for article processing fees with three speakers (Chuck Eckmann [Simon Fraser University], Sue Kriegsman [Harvard], and Andrew Waller [University of Calgary]). An informal count of attendees is 113. This is down from Midwinter, but the meeting room was more isolated in the Disneyland Hotel and the topic was also more specific.

   Q- Is the Forum a program? The SPARC/ACRL Forum is a forum and not a program, and is one of the three major goal areas for ACRL. ALA is considering a proposal that all programs will be in the convention center. Open question whether the Forum will also be at the convention center if the proposal is approved.

   Ideas for future forums: Role of COAPI in questions such as policies of Elsevier, article level metrics (which was the first idea for this forum but which conflicted with an event that all of the potential speakers were attending).

   b. Scholarly Communications Discussion Group (Macklin)
      i. Preview of today’s DG
      ii. Ideas/comments for upcoming DGs

   Topic this afternoon is the Georgia State University case. Lisa is moderating. Kevin and Molly are making short presentations prior to opening it to discussion.

   Ideas for future DGs (and/or Forums) include:
   - Digital Humanities and the intersections with libraries. There is a Digital Humanities DG which has a session at the same time. We might be able to do a joint DG
   - Kathleen Fitzpatrick’s -- open peer review.

   c. Column (Furlough)
      i. Editorship
      ii. Ideas for future columns

   Written report from Mike Furlough is appended. Claire Stewart will become column editor beginning in July.

   Ideas for future columns:
   - digital fair use
   - column on the Forum topic
   - upcoming conferences, specifically Open Repositories and Berlin 10 (seconded)
   - data curation and data mining (one of the ACRL goals)
   - survey of open access index as alternative metric (from JISC)
d. Toolkit (Belliston, Palmer)
   i. **Idea for updating**
      ii. One-page guide to editing in Drupal (not discussed)

Kristi Palmer put forward the idea that students in the Scholarly Communication class she is teaching would update content on the Toolkit as part of the class. The assignment would be to review and update portions of the Toolkit, send to committee member to review, and then, if approved, it could be posted. The class size is 15, and Kristi anticipates that each student will work on one of the toolkit pages.

Joy’s library school might also be able to do an “internship” around the toolkit.

A thorough look at and possible redesign of the Toolkit might be an appropriate Emerging Leaders Project. Applications are due 1 October and the projects take place between January and June. This was strongly supported by a member who is a former “Emerging Leader.”

Proposal One: Lisa, Kevin and Joy will identify topics that are gaps and areas that need to be revised on the Toolkit by early August and send to Kristi. Kristi will have students complete assignments and return to committee members by the end of September, for updates to Toolkit before OA week Oct. 22-28.

Proposal Two: We will submit a proposal to do a comprehensive review of the Toolkit as an Emerging Leader project by October 1. Since these projects happen Jan. – June, so could get a report for Annual meeting and make changes to the Toolkit before OA Week 2013.

4. Work Plan item: KPI development (Belliston)
   a. KPIs tweaked slightly
   b. Report going forward

At yesterday’s Board meeting questions arose about whether the KPI’s actually show the impact of ACRL, how frequently should they be reported, and whether they should be reported at the goal level or the objective level.

KPI’s and work plans now need to be tied to an objective. There are at least 10 other groups who also contribute to achieving the Research and Scholarly Environment goal of the Plan for Excellence. The one KPI that we cannot gather data for is the number of libraries providing open access journal support. Perhaps this KPI should drop from our list.

ACRL will be having a Strategic Planning Orientation Session (SPOS) in September where Kevin and Lisa (2012-2013 Chair and Vice-Chair) will get more information.

Kevin will be asking for schedules for a conference call in October. KPI’s will be on the agenda.

5. Work Plan item: Scholarly Communications across the disciplines
   a. Survey of our own librarians
      i. Discuss results
ii. **Next steps**
   
b. Monitoring/reporting from other ACRL/ALA groups

The list of non-library associations that liaisons belong to is an interesting result of the survey, including the number of these groups that have some form of scholarly communication component. 53% of respondents said they belonged to a non-library association. Also of interest is where librarians get information on scholarly communication. One respondent belonged to 8 non-library professional associations. We did not ask about attendance at non-library association conferences.

Next steps:
- Share report with Coordinating Committee of Liaisons.
- Consider a joint program with CCL about how to engage non-library organizations on scholarly communication issues.
- Suggest that there be a similar survey of all ACRL members.

Monitoring and reporting activities of other scholarly communication groups did not happen this year, so may be a good item for next year’s plan. We can invite others to attend our meetings (both relevant ACRL communities of practice as well as other divisions such as ALCTS), and solicit our members to attend their meetings to promote joint awareness of projects that are going forward.

6. Work Plan item: Intersection of SC and information literacy
   
a. Report on retreat (Barbara DeFelice, Smith, Zanoni, Malenfant)
   
b. Next steps

A group is working on a white paper on the intersection of scholarly communication and information literacy under the auspices of ACRL. Goal is to finish the paper in September, and distribute it by Midwinter. The changing nature of scholarly communication means that the nature of librarianship is also changing and all librarians have opportunities to teach aspects of scholarly communication.

Next Steps:
- Consider having the ACRL Scholarly Communication DG focus on this white paper and topic at Midwinter as one aspect of the vetting process.
- There is a placeholder at the ACRL conference that could be used to have presentations on this white paper and related topics.
- Consider modeling new dissemination methods (one of our objectives) by posting on Media Commons for open peer review.

7. Work Plan item: Roadshow (RS presenters and Belliston)
   
a. Report on roadshows done thus far in 2012
   
b. Report on new presenter selection and involvement
   
c. Application review
      
      i. Was presenter involvement in process helpful?
      ii. What are the next steps in sustainability plan?
      iii. Davis-Kahl survey – Has this had any impact on the curriculum?
   
d. Thanks for submission of ACRL 2013 program proposal
Four out of the five 2012 road shows have been done, with the last one in August. The name has been changed to Scholarly Communication: From Understanding to Engagement. The roadshow has been expanded to a full day to give more time for discussion and engagement.

The first roadshow was in Toronto where there was a lot of experience in scholarly communication. The folks in Toronto reported learning a lot from each other, so moving from a basics approach to engagement on the issues was useful. Toronto drew attendees from all over Canada. Other roadshows drew attendees primarily from within a state.

Having a full day allowed shift back to basics when required by the audience’s knowledge of scholarly communication issues.

This is the first year that the participants had to pay something, and we still had 12 applicants for 5 Road Shows. We think that having to pay something has increased the level of commitment to the success of the Road Show.

Stephanie Davis-Kahl is the new presenter and participated in the Virginia roadshow.

This year the presenters chatted with the selection sub-committee prior to the selection process, which the presenters found useful. Some of the selected institutions were past applicants. The Roadshows this year seem to be more representative of the target audience. The selection sub-committee also found talking with the presenters helpful because several members had not completed the Roadshow selection previously, and it was useful information when reviewing applicants.

To move the Roadshows toward sustainability, a middle ground of charging a $2,000 fee, which does not cover all of the expenses, was settled on. Some sites expressed they thought this amount reasonable. For 2013 budget, Kara made the assumption that this fee, in this amount, would continue, but this can be re-considered.

Stephanie Davis-Kahl did a survey of scholarly communications practices/needs in liberal arts colleges and is doing a follow-up focus group today. There were a low number of respondents engaging faculty and students around scholarly communication issues, and only 28% participated in OA Week. Looking at adding back into the Roadshow some elements of how to take action on these topics. In liberal arts colleges, librarians often have more than one area of responsibility and may not have someone with the title ‘scholarly communication librarian.’

Question – Are there opportunities to do virtual webcasts on selected scholarly communication topics? Will discuss in the tasks for next year.

Question - Do we want to add presenters? The work of the presenters is to revise the curriculum as well as present, so there is a lot of work in addition to the presentations that can be shared. This will be on the agenda for the fall conference call.

Belliston thanked Kirchner for drafting the committee’s proposal to present the Roadshow as a pre-conference for ACRL 2013 National Conference.

8. Report from the VPO on her work (Kirchner)
   a. Projects
In addition to the sustainability for the Roadshow, Joy has been working on case studies for possible webcasts and inclusion in the Toolkit. Joy will continue on the committee, so an exploration of moving the work Joy has done into the work of the committee will need to be discussed. Perhaps the Emerging Leaders program would be a model for us to consider. Joy will do a report with recommendations by the end of August.

9. 2012-2013 Work Plan Ideas and Preview (Smith and Macklin)
   a. Ongoing activities
   b. Possible new initiatives

Work Plan to be completed by August 1st.

ACRL Plan for Excellence: Research and Scholarly Environment

- Objective One: Model new dissemination practices.
- Objective Two: Enhance members’ ability to address issues related to digital scholarship and data management.
- Objective Three: Influence scholarly publishing policies and practices toward a more open system.
- Objective Four: Create and promote new structures that reward and value open scholarship.

Ann Riley is on the ACRL Board and will be a committee member as well as the new Board Liaison.

Brainstorming on new initiatives:
- Programming in conjunction with the Liaisons group.
- Reaching Deans of Libraries and Library Directors on scholarly communication topics.
  - The Road Show participants often wish their Deans attended the roadshow. ARL Directors know the importance of schol comm because it is an ARL strategic objective.
  - Challenge is to find ways to reach out to liberal arts college deans
  - Would a Dean/Director dinner or meeting prior to a roadshow be effective?
  - Reach out to College Library Section and the Community and Junior College Library Section?
  - Economic implications of OA is often a driver for smaller institutions, ex. ILL costs for non-subscribed journals
- Toolkit – two prong approach:
  - Kristi’s class for update before OA Week 2012
  - Emerging Leaders project exploration for update before OA WEEK 2013
- Research Networking Tools and Research Profiling Tools
  - ORCID
- Scholarly societies and perhaps doing a road show at a scholarly society meeting
- Funding and sustainability for OA journals
  - Moving from a subscription model to an OA model for society journals
- Data sets and data curation
  - Role of the library? not a consensus within the profession
  - Library as facilitator
  - Add something to the toolkit? (e.g. data management, e-science/research, text mining)
- Data retention policies as a policy issue, see Council on Government Relations

Work Plan will be circulated by e-mail before being finalized.

10. Fall conference call date and time set
   a. Possibilities include Oct. 3, 4, 8 and 10th. Kevin will circulate a Doodle poll.

   As a result of the Doodle poll, the conference call has been set for Tuesday, 9 October 2012, from 2:00 to 3:30 PM Eastern time.
The Scholarly Communications column runs every other month in *College & Research Libraries News*. Because the magazine publishes 11 issues per year, the column appears 5 or 6 times each year. That schedule is sometimes adjusted in order to accommodate an authors needs for more time or the magazine's need to allocate space differently.

Because the readership of *C&RLN* is potentially so broad, the column must stretch to cover a range of scholarly communication topics of interest to librarians in many different contexts and with varying degrees of knowledge. In general, I have tried to balance the topics between “issue” columns that address matters such as copyright, licensing, business models, or other trends, and “practical” columns that discuss lessons-learned, provide examples of best practices, or offer advice and models for outreach.

Claire Stewart will assume responsibility as the editor of the column after the June 2012 ALA meeting as I depart the ACRL Scholarly Communications Committee. I have scheduled two columns yet to be submitted to assist her in the transition. The publishing schedule for the coming year is found below, followed by a listing of columns published under my editorship.

### Column Schedule for 2012-2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Title/Topic</th>
<th>Manuscript Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sep 2012</td>
<td>NO COLUMN</td>
<td></td>
<td>30-Jul-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 2012</td>
<td>Sarah Shreeves &amp; Tom Teper</td>
<td>Digitization of historical dissertations</td>
<td>27-Aug-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 2012</td>
<td>NO COLUMN</td>
<td></td>
<td>24-Sep-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 2012</td>
<td>Kathleen Fitzpatrick</td>
<td>MLA Commons/OA contracts</td>
<td>29-Oct-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 2013</td>
<td>NO COLUMN</td>
<td></td>
<td>26-Nov-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 2013</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
<td>28-Dec-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 2013</td>
<td>NO COLUMN</td>
<td></td>
<td>28-Jan-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 2013</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
<td>25-Feb-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2013</td>
<td>NO COLUMN</td>
<td></td>
<td>22-Mar-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun 2013</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
<td>29-Apr-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July/August 2013</td>
<td>NO COLUMN</td>
<td></td>
<td>27-May-2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Articles Published October 2009-July/August 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oct 2009</td>
<td>Tim Hackman</td>
<td>What Is The Opposite Of A Pyrrhic Victory? Lessons Learned From An Open Access Defeat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 2010</td>
<td>Gavin Baker</td>
<td>Open Access: Advice On Working With Faculty Senates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 2010</td>
<td>Dan Lee &amp; Adrian Ho</td>
<td>Recognizing Opportunities: Conversational Openings To Promote Positive Scholarly Communications Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 2010</td>
<td>Sayeed Choudhury</td>
<td>Data Curation: An Ecological Perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July/Aug 2010</td>
<td>Deborah Ludwig</td>
<td>Open Access At The University Of Kansas: Toward A Campus Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep 2010</td>
<td>Maria Bonn</td>
<td>Free Exchange Of Ideas: Experimenting With The Open Access Monograph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 2011</td>
<td>Jonathan Miller</td>
<td>Open Access And Liberal Arts Colleges: Looking Beyond Research Institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 2011</td>
<td>Gwen Bird</td>
<td>Small Scale Digitization Goes Big Time: Implementation Of A Scholarly Digitization Fund At Simon Fraser University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July/Aug 2011</td>
<td>Gail Clement</td>
<td>The Copyright Self Help Movement And Its Promise For Campus Copyright Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 2011</td>
<td>Nancy Sims</td>
<td>Library Licensing And Criminal Law: The Aaron Swartz Case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 2011</td>
<td>Caroline Sutton</td>
<td>Is Free Inevitable In Scholarly Communications?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 2012</td>
<td>Stephanie Davis Kahl</td>
<td>Engaging Undergraduates In Scholarly Communication: Outreach, Education, And Advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July/Aug 2012</td>
<td>Michah Vandegrift &amp; Gloria Colvin</td>
<td>Relational Communications: Developing Key Connections</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>