Submitting for Publication

From Idea to Publication
(An ACRL Webcast Series sponsored by the ACRL Research Program Committee)

December 1, 2010

Contact: Faye A. Chadwell, 121 The Valley Library, Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR 97331, faye.chadwell@oregonstate.edu; 541-737-8528

SLIDE ONE: Welcome to the 3rd and final component of the ACRL e-Learning webcast series, From Idea to Publication. This component focuses on submitting articles for publication. I want to thank the members of the ACRL Research Program Committee for inviting me and give thanks to the staff at ACRL, with special gratitude to Hope Gershik from Learning Times for her advice and technical guidance.

SLIDE TWO: My name is Faye Chadwell. I am currently the Interim University Librarian and Oregon State University Press Director. Before the interim appointment I served as the Associate University Librarian for Collections and Content Management at OSU. Since July 2007, I have been the editor for *Collection Management,* a Taylor & Francis journal. I am responsible for writing a regular quarterly feature, "What's Next for Collection Management and Managers." In edition to serving in this editor role, I have authored or co-authored journal articles, biographical entries for multiple reference works, bibliographic essays, and book chapters, and have written more than 100 book reviews for *Library Journal*. It is my pleasure to join you today to talk about getting published.

My companion is Izzy, the youngest of my cats. She has no publishing experience—at least not yet. When you see a slide with our picture, expect for me to ask you a question that you can respond to using Elluminate's interactive quiz feature. Then everyone else should be able to see the results for the group. I promise there won't be any essay questions—only multiple choice or yes/no.

SLIDE THREE: As participants in this webcast you will learn how to select an appropriate journal or publisher, learn about preparing a manuscript for submission, and gain an understanding of what the submission process encompasses. You will also learn about communicating or querying editors, and how to manage your rights as an author. I would like to encourage you to type questions or comments in the chat box as they arise during the webcast. I will do my best to respond to these but we might not get to them until the end. At this time, I have planned to set aside some time for questions so that we can interact more to talk about publishing experiences and learn from each other.

SLIDE FOUR: Let's jump right in with our first question so I can get to know the composition of the audience today. In particular, I would like to know what motivates you the most to get published. Is it to:

Advance librarianship

Obtain tenure and promotion

Gain visibility

All of the above?

Briefly discuss results.

SLIDE FIVE: (Identifying Top Tier and/or Relevant Journals) Aside from revealing something about today's audience and your motivations for publishing, this question and your responses also help us get at some core issues or important factors in determining where you try to publish and how you communicate and interact with journal editors during the submission process. Let's begin by covering how these motivating factors influence how you may go about identifying the appropriate journal to submit your manuscript to. We will talk about how these issues have relevance when communicating with editors later in the session.

The first step in submitting for publication is identifying the appropriate journal. There are a several broad criteria to consider:

a) the title needs to be applicable to a the specific field of study or category that matches your research topic.

You most likely have a particular audience in mind that you are trying to reach. Actually, you ought to have given this activity some thought before you even start your research and writing. In this way you can determine if the research and writing you are undertaking is going to be viable because it fulfills an audience's need and advances the literature/discussion. From a practical standpoint, you don't spend valuable time, especially if the tenure clock is ticking, working on a project that isn't going to be viable because it isn't a unique or new perspective or it doesn't advance the field. Also, you can try to prepare your manuscript with particular journals' guidelines in mind. A little later on I will show examples of some journals' aims and scope as well as their guidelines. Reading these guidelines for a particular journal is an excellent way to determine if you are going to reach the appropriate or intended audience.

One of the most frequent mistakes that inexperienced authors make is to submit their work to a journal whose audience won't be interested in the research topic.

b) Another criterion: the title needs to be peer-reviewed or refereed.

Many of us seek to publish our research not only to share it but also to advance the profession, However, meeting promotion and tenure requirements is also very important. Most librarians who are faculty are tenure-track faculty. In her study to describe and classify the academic status of librarians at United States research institutions, Mary Bolin found that of "the proportions are 62 percent faculty, 51 percent tenure track, and 37 percent staff." With such a preponderance of tenure-track status among academic librarians, that means there is a high likelihood that many librarians are expected or encouraged to pursue scholarship which may result in a publication. My knowledge about promotion and tenure criteria suggests that publication needs to be peer reviewed or refereed.

c) Yet another significant criterion: Ideally you want to publish in a reputable journal that will give your article higher visibility and thus you gain visibility yourself as an author. Thinking again about promotion and tenure though, most often you want to identify the top tier journals and try to get published in them because it will help you make your case for promotion and tenure.

The UlrichWeb Global Serials Directory lists nearly 4,000 library and information science titles worldwide. About 2200 are active and about 300 are active and refereed (peer reviewed).

Library and Information Science Abstracts (Proquest) covers 440 periodicals from more than 68 countries and in more than 20 different languages.

Library, Information Science & Technology Abstracts (Ebsco) indexes about 560 core titles.

So, the universe of library science publishing is not endless but it isn't microscopic either. My point is that there are a few hundred journal possibilities within our field. And even though a resource like UlrichWeb or LISA may allow you to narrow your search and identify peer-reviewed titles, it may not help you get at the qualitative nature of a journal to identify the top tier titles or rank LIS journals based on various types of metrics.

CHECK FOR QUESTIONS.

SLIDE SIX: One familiar metric for ranking journals is the Impact Factor. The Impact Factor is calculated by dividing the number of citations in the JCR year by the total number of articles published in the two previous years. An Impact Factor of 1.0 means that, *on average*, the articles published one or two years ago have been cited one time. An Impact Factor of 2.5 means that, on average, the articles published one or two years ago have been cited two and a half times. Citing articles may be from the same journal; most citing articles are from different journals.

There is an ongoing debate or controversy about how impact factors are determined so obviously their value is a moot point. While that debate rages, however, their emphasis and use continues across the academy. For the time being, knowing the high impact journals in a field like librarianship remains useful.

One resource which can provide information on the impact factors of journals in a given discipline is *Journal Citation Reports* or *JCR*. This slide shows a screen shot with results from a search in *JCR* to identify titles in the field of library science. *JCR for Social Sciences* lists 66 titles in the field of information science and library science. And as the screen shot demonstrates, each title comes with requisite impact factor information—number of cites, impact factor, & 5-year impact factor.

SLIDE SEVEN: Another type of impact factor is the Eigenfactor score. *JCR* will provide this for journals that it lists, but if your library cannot afford access to *JCR*, Eigenfactor.org is freely available on the Internet. What is the Eigenfactor score? It is a measure of the overall value provided by all of the articles published in a given journal in a year. You can also get the Article Influence™ Score(AI). The Article Influence Score is a measure of a journal's prestige based on per article citations and comparable to Impact Factor.

Do either of these resources work for library science? No not particularly well. With JCR, you see an emphasis on "information science" titles and these tend to dominate the list. [SEE SLIDE SIX AGAIN]. Like JCR, there isn't a separate category for LIS in Eigenfactor. In fact, you have to use the advanced search and then you can get at the JCR category, information science and library science, to find titles.

Why use them either of these resources then? Because if you have identified journals whose audiences seem to match your research topic, you might be able to use these resources to figure out the journal's impact factor or Eigenfactor to help you narrow your search to high impact titles.

SLIDE EIGHT: Another way to identify important journals in the field is to discover where your colleagues have published. At Oregon State University, we used the Web of Science to do this. We searched on a truncated version of the word **library** and used the address search field to search on the campus zip code. However, it is important to remember that getting an accurate list from Web of Science is dependent on how consistently author affiliations are listed or how the address field is provided for a department or group. Also as with *JCR*, your search in Web of Science will be limited only to those titles included in the Thomson Reuter universe.

If your library doesn't subscribe to Web of Science, try to find out if someone maintains a list of faculty publications at your library. Some libraries do so if you are new to a library you might ask for this to see where your colleagues have published.

SLIDE NINE: Another excellent way to identify top tier journals in LIS is to search for research on the value or reputation of journals in the field. LIS like other disciplines does occasionally cover its own publishing habits or review and evaluate journals in ways other than JCR or Web of Science. In 2005, Nisonger and Davis surveyed library school deans as well as ARL directors to measure their perception about the prestige of various library science journals. In their article, "Perception of Library and Information Science Journals by LIS education deans and ARL Directors," Nisgoner and Davis list the titles that the two surveyed groups valued for the purpose of promotion and tenure.

SLIDE TEN: A more recent article by Christopher Stewart analyzed the publishing impact of academic librarians and used the 5-year impact factor to assess journals. The 5-year journal Impact Factor is the average number of times articles from the journal published in the past five years that have been cited in the JCR year. It is caclulated by dividing the number of citations in the JCR year by the total number of articles published in the five previous years.

Anyway, I think you will see that there are some similar titles showing up on these lists which should give you some idea of the more highly regarded titles in LIS—*portal; College and Research Libraries; Journal of Academic Librarianship; Library Trends*.

There are other characteristics you might you consider when trying to identify top tier journals. These factors include:

1) the journal's discoverability—Is it indexed in the important databases for the field?

2) low acceptance rate—how difficult is it to get an article accepted?

3) the circulation rate—how many libraries subscribe to the journal?

4) the make up of the editorial board—are the members well-known in the field

While important, I suggest that you not focus on any one of these to the exclusion of the others. Instead I would recommend trying to identify journals that embody more than just one of these qualities. Try to identify, for instance, a journal that is well indexed, may have a low acceptance rate and has a strong board.

In addition to doing research on some of the factors I have mentioned, the next best thing or perhaps the best thing is to discuss possible places to submit with your colleagues, your peers, your supervisor, or your mentors who have published before. They should be able to provide good information about what journals are important for you in your area of librarianship, given your organizational climate.

One last comment about identifying the top tier or reputable journals: The high impact journals are enticing; it is pretty cool to get published in one. However, be sure to cast a broader net when creating your list of possible places to submit. That way if you are unsuccessful with *portal* or *College and Research Libraries*, you have a back-up plan.

Since a lot of the top-tier titles cover broader areas, you also want to identify other journals in a narrower field. For example, if you were going to publish a journal article about instruction, you might look at these broader journal possibilities:

portal: Libraries And The Academy
College & Research Libraries
Journal of Academic Librarianship
Library Trends

But you also might look at more specific titles or niche journals like**:**

Reference & User Services Quarterly
Journal of Library Administration
College and Undergraduate Libraries

Public Services Quarterly

And you also don't want to be afraid to consider titles that might not be specific to librarianship but that have published articles by librarians. So for the instruction article, you might also consider:

Journal of Information Literacy
New Directions for Teaching and Learning
College Teaching.

SLIDE ELEVEN: Once you have identified or created a list of titles, you want to investigate the titles more thoroughly before submitting your manuscript. The best advice is to go straight to journal website as the source for information and do some research:

1) at the journal website read the aims and scope, or the journal purpose and description. This is an excellent way to be sure you are going to reach your intended audience.

SLIDE TWELVE

2) Sometimes the author guidelines will also provide details about what topics the journal covers or the types of articles being sought. For instance, maybe you have your heart set on writing a bibliographic or review essay; that's great but maybe the journal you want to publish in doesn't do bibliographic or review essay.

There are three more ways to help you determine if a journal is going to meet your needs and help you reach the appropriate audience

3) First, in addition to reading the website for aims and scope, be sure to browse the journal table of contents, taking time to read titles and abstracts.

4) Secondly, many journals will provide you with a copy of a sample issue or access to it on their website. I suggest taking advantage of such offerings when possible especially if your library doesn't subscribe to the title.

5) Third and perhaps most importantly, contact the journal editor directly. You can query the editor quickly about whether your topic is of interest to the journal. Once again, this is a great way to avoid the most frequent reason for rejection—submitting to a journal with an inappropriate audience.

Remember that journals are looking for research that hasn't been published previously. So you need to let the editor know: Is the content (analysis, theory, application) unique? Does it advance the field? Is it new? Also if the work has been presented at a conference tell the editor when you inquire and certainly do so when you submit.

While you query the editor about these issues, you also want to ask about the publishing schedule, the best way to maintain contact with the editor, the typical length of time it takes to review an article, and the publication lag from the point of acceptance—six months, a year? The answers you receive may influence whether you eventually submit to a journal or not.

CHECK FOR QUESTIONS

SLIDE THIRTEEN: Before we move on to discussing the submission process, I have another question for you.

How many of you have published:

No journal articles
At least one article
1-3 articles
More than 3 articles

Briefly discuss results.

SLIDE FOURTEEN: I asked that question to get a sense of the audience's level of experience with the submission process. Now I ask you to imagine that you have identified a list of possible places to submit, and then you have narrowed down the list to a couple of titles and finally you have chosen a journal that seems to fit the bill, you are ready to begin the submission process.

Selecting the most appropriate and reputable journal is the most important decision you can make but if after you spend time carefully choosing a journal and then don't follow the yellow brick road, you are going to waste your time and waste the time of the editor. As an editor I have to say that it doesn't make me happy to get manuscripts that don't use the right style for references or don't format tables correctly.

SLIDE FIFTEEN: To be on the yellow brick road or the path to success, be sure to read and follow the author or submission guidelines as closely as possible. If you need help because you don't understand what is required, ask the editor. If you need a visual, again look at sample articles.

SLIDE SIXTEEN: Most journals have some similar submission guidelines but they all have differences. Once again, be sure to read the guidelines and then be prepared to send the manuscript properly formatted along with any other components—a separate abstract, tables, figures, appendices, graphics, copyright transfer agreement—whatever is required according to the submission guidelines.

Here are a couple of other tips:

Get someone else to pre-review your manuscript before you submit.

SLIDE SEVENTEEN: Be sure you have identified the appropriate person to send the MSS to.

If you are collaborating with others, designate one person as the official contact with to correspond with the editor. That contact person need not be the lead author.

SLIDE EIGHTEEN: Send your manuscript with a cover letter. This sample cover letter shows you the basic components to include—the title of your work, a sentence or two about the work's significance, verification that it hasn't been published or submitted elsewhere, and your contact information.

CHECK FOR QUESTIONS.

SLIDE NINETEEN: Before we move on to talk about the next step in the submission process, the peer review process, I have another question:

If you have submitted a manuscript before, please tell us: How long (on average) did the peer review process take from the time you initially submitted to hearing whether your manuscript was accepted or rejected?

30 days or less
4-6 weeks
More than 6 weeks but less than 3 months
More than 3 months

Briefly discuss results.

SLIDE TWENTY: This slide shows a painting by Titian depicting Sisyphus pushing a rock up hill. While I don't think journal editors want the submission experience to be like this, I daresay some authors may think this is the case.

SLIDE TWENTY-ONE: Here is what I hope is a better and more hopeful depiction of how the typical submission process ensues though it doesn't make it any less complicated.

Briefly explain the workflow diagram.

What are some suggestions for making this go smoothly?

1) Follow submission guidelines closely.

2) Ask the editor for an approximate date when you can expect to hear back about the status of your article. At the beginning of the webcast I mentioned how what motivates you to get published may have impact on your communication and interaction with a journal editor. Well if the driving force for you is tenure and your clock is ticking, then you want to be sure you stay on top of your communication with the editor. I tell authors it is okay to bug me if they think it is taking too long and I try to be sure and bug reviewers, reminding them that our authors need to

know about the status of their article. The bottom line is this: if you think too much time has passed, at some point you may need to let the editor know and withdraw your submission and resubmit it elsewhere.

3) Ask the editor about the type of peer review the journal follows.

4) Ask the editor (if you haven't already) in what future issue your article might be published if it is accepted and revised somewhat quickly.

5) Stick to deadlines the editor sets for you and query the editor if a deadline comes and goes and you haven't heard about the status of your article.

6) Make inquiries about the copyright transfer agreement as soon as you can—but more on that later.

7) When you hear about the status of your article, be sure you understand what you are being asked to do in terms of revisions, re-submission, deadlines, etc.

SLIDE TWENTY-TWO:

Remember the depiction of Sisyphus. I think what makes the submission process so onerous is the peer review component. It's onerous because you work really hard on a manuscript and then after submitting it you have to wait however many days, weeks, or months before hearing your fate. And then when you finally get a response, typically you have to rework the piece at least once if not twice in order to get it accepted and then you likely have to do some more cosmetic revisions to prepare it for the final submission, and finally, depending on the publisher, you may have to look at proofs after the manuscript has been formatted for printed.

So what goes on during peer review?

As the figure in this slide suggests, there are 3 or 4 types of peer review that might be used:

1) single-blind review where the author's identity is known to the reviewers, but the reviewers' identity remains hidden from the author;

2) double-blind review where the identities of both the author and reviewers remain unknown to each other. Proponents for the double-blind process, and this is the type of review that we use at *Collection Management*, argue that when the reviewer does not know the author or the author's institution, they focus on the manuscript's content and aren't as bias.

3) the open peer review model is a newer approach which I haven't seen used in our field. In this model, the author's and reviewers' identities are known to each other, and the reviewers' names and (optionally) their reports are published alongside the paper. If someone in the audience is aware of a journal that uses this model, please let us know about it via the chat box.

4) A variation of the open review model is the post-publication model which also is not common in library and information science. In this model, peer reviewers selected by the editor read the manuscript but also any and all readers may review and comment on the paper and in some cases even rate it on a numerical scale following publication. Again, if someone knows of an LIS journal using this model, let us know.

(Figure 1: Types of peer review experienced by authors and used by journal editors;
From: *Peer review: Benefits, Perceptions and Alternatives* by Mark Ware, Mark Ware Consulting, Publishing Research Consortium, PRC Summary Papers No. 4,
URL: http://www.publishingresearch.net/documents/PRCsummary4Warefinal.pdf.)

At *Collection Management*, our reviewers receive peer review instructions and a checklist to help guide them through the process. In my mind this is a way of insuring that there is some consistency from one review to the next. However, I have to admit that even with this checklist, all peer reviews are not equal. Some reviewers are just going to be more thorough than others and provide authors with greater feedback.

Typically there are 2 reviewers per manuscript. The reviewers are often members of the editorial board though several LIS editors suggest that they occasionally call on expertise from outside their board. If the response between the 2 reviewers is split, the editor may make the call or else another reviewer may be consulted to break the tie.

When you get your response back you can expect (SEE SLIDE 21) one of several responses which will direct your next move as an author:

<u>Accepted as is</u>: a response which almost no one receives**.**

<u>Accept with revisions</u>: a response that means you have to make anything from minor to somewhat substantial changes. In my editorial experience, it is not common for an author to receive a response that says only minor changes need to be made.

<u>Revise and resubmit</u>: a response that I would interpret as the journal is interested in your manuscript but your work has not been accepted. In an instance like this, I would seek clarification from the editor. The important thing to remember is that the journal is interested in your work.

<u>Reject</u>: In this instance, it is clear that your paper has not been accepted, but depending on the peer review comments it is possible that you could still revise the piece and resubmit it. Once again, I advise you to seek clarification from the editor about resubmitting the work once you have revised it.

Let me say one more thing about the peer review process before we move on. Unless you are one of the rare individuals who writes the perfect article, typically there may be an emotional component to manage after you have received your peer review comments. It is probably a good idea to take a break before going back to the manuscript. It is just hard to read those comments sometimes even when your manuscript has been accepted. There are some heartless reviewers out there on occasion. Overall, I would advise you to try and look at the comments as a means for improving your piece.

CHECK FOR QUESTIONS

SLIDE TWENTY THREE: This is the last section I want to cover today and it has to do with author rights and why they are important and what you can or should do to try and maintain as many of author rights as possible.

SLIDE TWENTY FOUR: Another factor that more and more LIS authors are beginning to consider when choosing to publish with a particular journal has to do with how open access friendly the journal publisher is. With the passage of more OA mandates and policies across the U.S and Canada, this factor is becoming more than just a consideration. Obviously the focus is on whether a publisher will allow you to deposit a copy of your work in an institutional repository. There is more to author rights than just being able to deposit some version of your article, but if you want to use this as means for identify journals to which you might submit, I recommend you use the resource Sherpa/ Romeo. This website will allow you to look up a journal title or a publisher and find out the journal or publisher's policy on self-depositing.

SLIDE TWENTY FIVE: Actually Sherpa/Romeo is a "web accessible database" .. That "categorizes [copyright transfer agreements] according to the permissions given by publishers to self-archive material. Sherpa/ROMEO uses color codes to represent the levels of self-archiving that a journal or a publisher allow. In this slide, I have represented several LIS publishers and a few of their titles to show their policies on self-archiving. As you can see,

White means a journal publisher does not formally support archiving;

Yellow means a journal publisher only allows archiving of a pre-print version and often with an embargo period;

Blue means a journal publisher only allows archiving of a post-print version; and the top rating indicated by the color

Green means a journal publisher allows archiving of a pre-print and a post-print version.

While Sherpa/ROMEO is a terrific site, I recommend reading the copyright transfer agreement and/or author guidelines to get the best understanding of what a publisher may allow in regard to self-archiving. You can also ask an editor about this prior to submitting or during the submission process.

SLIDE TWENTY SIX:

As I said there is more to copyright transfer agreements and authors' rights than self-archiving. But before move on to more about authors' rights, my question to you is:

Have you ever made changes to a publisher's copyright transfer agreement?

Briefly discuss results.

SLIDE TWENTY SEVEN:

Why would you want to make changes to a copyright transfer agreement? Because the copyright transfer agreement is a legal document covering what you as an author will be able to do with your article content according to the agreement established between you, the author, and the publisher. And as you might guess, the CTA is going to favor the publisher and typically not you the author and your rights.

Why are authors' rights important:

- CTA is a legal document
- Natural to want to share your work and make use of the technology that will enable this; however, many CTAs put up an obstacle to sharing your work more openly.
- As library professionals we want to see wider access to information and as researchers and authors we want our published research to reach a wider audience for the good it may do and for selfish reasons like higher visibility. Again, some CTAs will restrict the ability to deposit in IRs or discipline specific repositories.
- Many of us work at taxpayer-assisted institution. It seems that the research we create is not available to those who it might benefit and who sort of underwrite it. More specifically for OSU, we are a land (and sea, space, sun) grant institution that should be giving back to the state.
- Many of us are involved in SC work. I think as a result it is important for us not to just talk the talk but to walk the walk. It's disingenuous or hypocritical to ask other authors among our faculty to push on their author rights if we don't pursue them for ourselves.
- If you don't pay attention to what is in the CTA, you may not end up with as much control of your work as you want and need and this could lead to a disadvantageous situation for you. Columbia U points out a few scenarios where a researcher would not benefit and in fact it would not be advantageous to have signed over copyright to a publisher. See: http://scholcomm.columbia.edu/manage-your-copyrights.

Paying To Use Own Work Professor wants to include her own article in a packet of readings distributed at a conference. Because the professor assigned the copyright to the publisher, the publisher's permission is necessary (assuming it is not "fair use"). The publisher grants permission only through the Copyright Clearance Center, leaving the professor to secure permission and pay fees to use her own work.
Outdated Research Republished Professor published an article in a leading medical journal, and transferred the copyright to the publisher. Five years later, the article appears as a chapter in a book from the same publisher. The publisher has the legal rights as the copyright owner, but the reprinting of an early article with a new date is damaging to the professor's reputation.
Reuse of Author's Work Without Credit or Royalties Professor publishes a book and transfers the copyright to the publisher. Significant portions of the work appear in a later book from the same publisher under another author's name. The professor not only lost control of the

work, but does not even have rights of attribution or royalties unless provided in the original publication agreement.

Conflict with NIH Public Access Policy Professor conducts research under a grant from the National Institutes of Health (NIH) and is obligated by law to submit a version of the research article to PubMed Central. If the agreement transfers all rights to the publisher, the professor is caught between compliance with the NIH policy and compliance with copyright obligations.

This slide presents some questions you can use to review any copyright transfer agreements that you encounter. Once again I would encourage you to consult with the journal's editor though my experience shows that in cases when you are negotiating your rights as an author, more likely than not, you are going to deal with the publisher's representative and not the journal editor.

SLIDE TWENTY EIGHT: This next slide is drawn from a table that my co-author Andrea Wirth and I used for our publication, "Authors Rights Well: An Authors' Rights Workshop for Librarians," published in *portal: Libraries and the Academy*. It shows excerpts from actual CTAs from various LIS publishers and demonstrates what various publishers are asking authors to do when it comes to transferring copyright.

SLIDE TWENTY NINE:

Have you used an addendum to change a publisher's copyright transfer agreement?

SLIDE THIRTY:

An addendum gives an author the opportunity to modify the CTA and retain rights not addressed or granted automatically by the publisher. There are several examples out there but one that is frequently used is the SPARC addendum as shown on this slide. If you want to change a publisher's CTA, you use this addendum or another and attach it to the publisher's CTA.

Do they work? That isn't clear. I can say that publishers do not like to receive addenda and with regularity they deny them. Why use them? As an open access and authors' rights advocate, I think sending an addendum is a very pointed way of letting LIS publishers know that librarians take these matters seriously and we aren't just signing our copyright away.

Inevitably the question arises about how much or how far an author should push when making changes to the CTA. I would say that you aren't risking rejection; you are just going to receive a stonewall and at some point, you need to decide as an individual whether it is more important to be published or to hold to your principles.

SLIDE THIRTY ONE: I would like to wrap up today's webcast just by pointing out a few resources that might be useful as you prepare for publication. I also want to tell you that the complete presentation with my notes will be available in OSU's ScholarsArchive later this week. Here is the link: http://ir.library.oregonstate.edu/xmlui/

SLIDE THIRTY TWO: Thanks for your participation today. I'd like to take the time we have left to field some questions.