Rights Well: An Authors' Rights Workshop for Librarians

Andrea A. Wirth and Faye A. Chadwell

abstract: This article seeks to make a compelling case for authors' rights training through emphasis on academic librarians' dual roles as both authors and as liaisons to research and teaching faculty. Using the example of the Rights Well Workshop developed at Oregon State University Libraries, the article demonstrates the value of training librarians as authors in order to further develop their own understanding of copyright transfer and negotiation. The workshop provides a customizable model that librarians can use when educating faculty in other disciplines about author rights, with emphasis on the practices of the publishers relevant to the targeted discipline.

Introduction

At most institutions, presentations regarding authors' rights are part of a broader scholarly communication program. These presentations address authors' use and reuse of their own research products. They encourage colleagues and peers to pay particular attention to the retention of their rights as outlined in publisher agreements or copyright transfer agreements (CTAs) rather than just signing these rights away to publishers. They represent a pathway to changing the behavior of individual authors and, thus, to transform scholarly communication.

This article describes an authors' rights workshop, conceived at Oregon State University (OSU), that provides an effective method for achieving a common goal of most libraries' scholarly communication programs—convincing faculty not to give up their rights as authors. Known as the Rights Well Workshop, this workshop was deliberately designed to train librarians in their roles as authors and as envoys to educate others on campus.[1] Its design addresses some known challenges to achieving scholarly communication education initiatives. The Rights Well Workshop also was created to integrate scholarly communication activities into an already established and robust subject liaison

program at any academic library. It incorporates methods for adapting the workshop to meet the needs of authors in disciplines other than librarianship. Knowing whether the workshop is achieving its purpose is essential. This article, therefore, also discusses an assessment plan that is underway to help achieve that goal.

Background and Needs

The wealth of library-generated information about scholarly communication and authors' rights indicates that libraries are taking these issues seriously. Three recent surveys initiated as part of the Association of Research Libraries' (ARL) SPEC Kit series contend that libraries are leading campus-wide efforts to change scholarly communication. Survey results from ARL's *SPEC Kit 299 Scholarly Communication Education Initiatives* report that most respondents indicated that the leadership for campus scholarly communication initiatives originated in the library; only 17 percent of the 73 responding libraries reported that "a group outside the library plays a leadership role" in initiating scholarly communication activities.[2] *SPEC Kit 310 Author Addenda* reports that 100 percent of respondents state that the library is taking a "leadership role in promoting the use of an author addendum to authors."[3] A third, *SPEC Kit 311 Public Access Policies*, examines library support for authors' compliance with public access policies. It concludes that the "majority of libraries…provide, or plan to provide, resources and services that help authors affiliated with their institution (and/or their support staff) to comply with public access policies (PAP)."[4]

Because libraries are assuming the leadership mantle for scholarly communication issues on campuses across the globe, arguably libraries want to succeed. Libraries seek to regularly deploy well-trained librarians to present informative sessions and provide up-to-date and relevant information. Although libraries are taking the lead, it is clear

> **Although libraries are taking the lead, it is clear that there are challenges to be overcome to meet the goals of educating faculty about scholarly communication issues, especially authors' rights.**

that there are challenges to be overcome to meet the goals of educating faculty about scholarly communication issues, especially authors' rights. There has been no established needs assessment to measure librarians' training requirements in the area of scholarly communication, although the challenge or need for adequate preparation and training has been acknowledged. In *SPEC Kit 299*, Kathleen Newman, Deborah Blecic, and Kimberly Armstrong asked respondents to describe up to three significant challenges that the library faced in educating others about scholarly communication. The authors then categorized the challenges as those that involve the external audience (faculty concerns about promotion and tenure) and those that focus on the internal environment (library administrative support for a central scholarly communication position). Within the internal environment, staff training and staff time are key considerations. Specifically, *SPEC Kit 299* reported that "another major stumbling block…is the difficulty of 'educating librarians so they are equipped to engage faculty in discussions

of issue.'"[5] Further evidence of the need for librarian training comes from the responses to the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) scholarly communication program and future agenda survey. This survey indicated that the ACRL membership wanted more training in a variety of formats that "[enable librarians] to speak about the issues in scholarly communication with faculty and other staff on [their] campus."[6] Joy Kirchner also reports that one of the first steps of the newly formed Scholarly Communication Steering Committee at the University of British Columbia was to develop a training program for their liaison librarians so that they would "have greater confidence and expertise in their understanding of scholarly communications activities."[7]

Another recently published report in *College & Research Libraries* adds weight to the argument that academic librarians may feel unprepared to discuss authors' rights. Authored by Kristin Palmer, Emily Dill, and Charlene Christie, this study confirms that 74 percent or more of the respondents surveyed about librarians' attitudes concerning open access believed that libraries should

- Take actions to shape the future of scholarly communication
- Educate faculty about open access
- Educate campus administration about open access
- Educate faculty about copyright issues related to faculty's publications.[8]

However, 56 percent of the respondents had never even talked to others outside the library about open access.[9] Palmer and her co-authors later provide three avenues that a library's open access advocates might pursue in order to improve the promotion of open access, including talking to librarians about the nature of their hesitancy.[10] Palmer's study unfortunately did not address why this hesitancy exists. Although little has been published about assessing scholarly communication training needs, perhaps the hesitancy is a result of being unfamiliar with the issues, as OSU Libraries discovered when beginning to amplify scholarly communication education initiatives.

At OSU, as the Libraries' Scholarly Communication Program launched its initiative to discuss authors' rights with other faculty, OSU librarians, expecting to participate in scholarly communication initiatives, communicated concern about their depth of knowledge regarding authors' rights, copyright transfer agreements, and addenda. They openly acknowledged their uneasiness in talking about the topic with others because of their own lack of expertise. They sought training. As a consequence of the collective apprehension experienced at OSU, work commenced to develop the Rights Well Workshop.

Program Goals

Outcomes identified early in the planning phase helped to provide the framework for the Rights Well Workshop. (An outline for the workshop schedule can be found in the appendix.) These outcomes, stated early in the workshop, introduce the workshop content. They outline the expectations of a librarian's role in the Scholarly Communication Program—especially as these relate to talking about authors' rights.

At the end of the workshop, the audience should

- Know what authors' rights are and the importance of retaining these rights

- Know how to identify relevant library and information science (LIS) journals and learn which publishers support self-archiving
- Be familiar with copyright transfer agreements—rights allowed and authors' expectations
- Have a basic understanding of author addenda and how to use an addendum to amend a copyright transfer agreement (CTA)
- Be able to adopt this model for application to other disciplines

The outcomes also relate to the workshop evaluation to be discussed later in this article.

At OSU, the Rights Well Workshop plays a central role in scholarly communication outreach. The workshop's clearly delineated outcomes and its focus on authors' rights help the Scholarly Communication Program overcome other challenges that librarians have enumerated about their experiences educating others about scholarly communication issues. One challenge, which *SPEC Kit 299* authors Newman, Blecic, and Armstrong called "complexity," acknowledges that "SC [scholarly communication] is made up of many complex issues about which it is difficult to keep up to date."[11] The Rights Well Workshop outcomes make it unmistakable that authors' rights and the amendment of copyright transfer agreements are the center of the discussion. Librarians who adopt the Rights Well Workshop at their institutions can focus conversations on this specific, yet important, aspect within the complex realm of scholarly communication rather than the multitude of other possible issues such as open access journal publishing and various business models or the history and effect of high serials inflation. By delivering this part of the scholarly communication message, libraries (and, as a result, campuses) advance along the scholarly communication continuum that Joyce Ogburn describes.[12]

The "complexity" issue coincides with another challenge articulated in *SPEC Kit 299*—"developing a clear message."[13] One survey respondent described this challenge in this manner: "Helping define issues in ways that are actionable by people, and that will spur people into action. Many recognize the issues, but don't know how to address, or see any real benefits to them personally."[14] The Rights Well Workshop, as a communication tool, conveys a clear and consistent message about how any librarian—and any librarian as an author—might individually contribute to changing the scholarly communication paradigm. The outcomes impart to librarian participants where and how the libraries want to concentrate their training and their subsequent outreach efforts—talking to authors across campus about their research with a possible outcome of changing that behavior. When the workshop is conducted as part of a scholarly communication outreach program, the outcomes make it clear for an individual author that being aware of one's rights and using an addendum can make a difference.

Discussion about the importance of authors' rights follows the presentation of the workshop's outcomes. Though this discussion does not occupy much time in the workshop, it is a crucial component. Drawing on the literature of authors' rights, particularly the scenarios described by Columbia University Libraries' Scholarly Communication Program and the authors' experiences at Oregon State, the workshop provides several examples to explain why authors' rights are important.[15] The rationale for promoting awareness of authors' rights could vary in different settings. For example, at OSU, some

emphasis is given to the university's role as a land grant institution with its mission to connect "university level research, teaching, and extension into a network for all people to access and apply new knowledge."[16] Other institutions might emphasize within their authors' rights workshops the requirement to comply with a mandate, like the U.S. National Institute of Health's Public Access Policy, which is an important consideration that examples from *SPEC Kit 311 Public Access Policies* demonstrate.[17] While flexible enough to address institution-specific reasons or funding agency mandates that have an impact on authors' rights discussions, the Rights Well Workshop focuses on two principal reasons for promoting authors' rights. These two reasons should resonate with the multiple audiences that the workshop might address: (1) the desire and sometimes duty (if a mandate applies) to share research with colleagues, other researchers, and the public; and (2) the maintenance of control over the uses of one's own work, including maximizing reuse for teaching and the development of derivative works or republication of originals.

Training the Trainers—Librarians as Authors

The outcomes of the Rights Well Workshop highlight the importance of the dual roles many librarians play as both authors and as liaisons to teaching and research faculty. Librarians should understand that their conversations with other faculty about authors' rights provide an opportunity to avoid yet another challenge that *SPEC Kit 299* describes—the perception that scholarly communication issues are seen as library issues.[18] Librarians learn to communicate that our profession's aim to provide wider access to information relates strongly to a researcher's goal of achieving impact and the wide distribution of scholarship. Librarians also become aware of their own rights as authors and act upon these whenever possible.

Why design an authors' rights workshop to educate librarians about authors' rights and copyright transfer agreements by teaching them about their own rights as authors? There are several strong reasons for concentrating on librarians as authors and using the LIS literature as an example for training librarians in authors' rights. 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 "the proportions are 62 percent faculty, 51 percent tenure track, and 37 percent staff."[19] These percentages are higher for librarians at land grant schools—80 percent of librarians are faculty, and 70 percent are on tenure track; among the public institutions, 76 percent of librarians are faculty, and 64 percent are on tenure track.[20] With the preponderance of tenure-track status among academic librarians, there is a strong likelihood that many librarians are expected or encouraged to pursue scholarship that may result in a publication. June Garner, Karen Davidson, and Becky Schwartzkopf surveyed tenure-track librarians at Carnegie institutions classified as "Very High Research, High Research, and Doctoral Granting Universities" and found that "scholarship is mandatory for promotion and

> **There are several strong reasons for concentrating on librarians as authors and using the LIS literature as an example for training librarians in authors' rights.**

tenure applicants according to 190 respondents, while it is encouraged for another 50 respondents."[21] Additionally, whether or not a librarian is part of a tenure-track system, academic librarians do publish a significant amount of the peer-reviewed literature in LIS, although the percentage of their contributions to the total body of LIS literature is known to fluctuate.[22] It seems disingenuous for libraries to advocate for authors' rights without first ensuring that their own authors are knowledgeable about their rights.

It has already been established that academic libraries are leading the campus campaigns to transform the landscape of scholarly publishing. What recent research makes evident is that, despite that advocacy, librarians as authors may not be walking the walk as frequently as they are talking the talk. Librarians may be discussing authors' rights, but there is some indication that librarians are not amending agreements on average any more than other fields. In their study of library faculty's attitudes and awareness of intellectual property issues, Howard Carter, Carolyn Snyder, and Andrea Imre found that "only 10 respondents (7 percent) said they had negotiated for better intellectual property rights from their publisher(s), and only one person had tried and failed."[23] Librarians also are not self-archiving any more than other fields. Anita Coleman found in her study that 90 percent of the LIS journals allow some form of self-archiving.[24] However, Carter, Snyder, and Imre reported that the LIS authors they studied "are self-archiving on average about one-half as much as the total faculty members in a major international study [a study conducted by Alma Swan and Sheridan Brown]."[25] Likewise, Doug Way's study, to be published in *College and Research Libraries*, "found OA versions of only 27 percent of the articles examined" from top-ranked LIS journals. This finding led Way to conclude that the LIS discipline has "failed to embrace archiving and OA as a regular practice."[26] There is no reason that librarian authors should not be self-archiving their articles in significant numbers while simultaneously working to inform authors in other disciplines to do the same. In fact, there is support for self-archiving among LIS editors. The Library and Information Science Editors' best practices include activism on the part of the editors; and, specifically, editors are asked to work with authors by "encourage[ing] or assist[ing] in self-archiving in the LIS subject repository and the author's institutional repository."[27]

Addressing librarians as authors requires that the workshop be tailored to their publishing habits. The Rights Well Workshop first covers the methodology for selecting the pertinent LIS journal publishers and, more importantly, the corresponding CTAs that are discussed later in the core portion of the workshop. There are five recommended routes for identifying the journals and consequently the publishers whose CTAs will be discussed. The suggestions that translate well to the literature of other disciplines include

- An in-house list of publications (if one exists) that identifies where the authors in the library (or academic department) have actually published
- *Web of Science*, using the address search field to limit to local authors
- *Journal Citation Reports* (*JCR*) to identify the journals with highest impact factors
- *Eigenfactor*—an alternative to *Journal Citation Reports* that incorporates the quality of the journals that are citing a journal to arrive at the score (Eigenfactor also includes article influence score, which is comparable to the JCR impact factor.)

- A recent review of the journals within the discipline if available (For example, in library science, Thomas Nisonger and Charles Davis describe the prestige of several journals as rated by library program deans and ARL directors.[28])

No matter how the list of relevant journals is compiled, the next steps are to identify the publishers of those journals and obtain the appropriate CTAs. For the OSU audience, the selected titles reflected journals in which OSU librarians had published recently as well as some from the top tier of the *Journal Citation Reports* "Library and Information Science Category." Using a list of eight titles, the authors located CTAs for each publisher, which was not as easy as one may expect since not all of the CTAs were posted on the journal homepages or publisher Web sites.[29]

To prepare for the workshop, the authors reviewed each publisher's CTA, identified questions for discussion (described below), and looked each title up in the SHERPA/RoMEO database. The SHERPA/RoMEO database provides a straightforward method for determining whether self-archiving of some kind is allowed in the author agreement and labels each publisher with a corresponding color. "Green" publishers allow self-archiving of both pre- and postprints, "blue" allow archiving of postprints only, "yellow" means only the preprint can be archived, and "white" publishers do not support any self-archiving.[30] The information in the database was then compared with the portion of the CTA text that addresses archiving (authors are advised to refer to the CTA for the final word on archiving and other rights as well). Table 1 provides an example of the policies (indicated by RoMEO database color) for several selected LIS journals and their publishers.

The time spent investigating self-archiving and SHERPA/RoMEO is essential. Judging from the number of papers published and presentations given on the concept of self-archiving and institutional repositories, the number of repositories in existence,[31] and the technology they offer for managing deposited research, the issue of posting research publications online is probably in the forefront of many academic librarians' minds. Also, posting research articles online is not uncommon among academics, although the level of access provided may be out of synch with publisher policies.[32] During the Rights Well Workshop, it is established that the variations in self-archiving conditions (even with "green" publishers) are endless and that authors should carefully review the CTA they sign before posting their work online. Table 1 provides an example of the policies (indicated by RoMEO database color) for several selected LIS journal publishers, including an instance where the journal's policy deviates from that of the publisher.[33]

The next component of the Rights Well Workshop, the piece which outlines how the LIS model can be adapted to another discipline, helps the librarians become colleagues talking with other colleagues about their rights as authors. This is preferable to librarians lecturing to "the faculty" about what they should and should not be doing with their scholarship.

Adapting to Other Disciplines

Knowing the discipline of the audience is vital for librarians rather than relying solely on hypothetical and philosophical arguments for retaining rights as authors. This section of the workshop is pivotal. The Rights Well Workshop's purpose is to make use of the

Table 1
Self-Archiving Policy with RoMEO Color Code for Selected LIS Journals

Publisher	Example title	RoMEO color code
American Library Association/Association of College & Research Libraries	*College & Research Libraries*	Green
Elsevier	*Library Collections, Acquisitions, & Technical Services*	Green
Johns Hopkins University Press	*portal: Libraries and the Academy*	Green
Medical Library Association	*Journal of the Medical Library Association*	Blue *(allows publisher's PDF only)
Springer	*Scientometrics*	Green
Taylor & Francis	*Collection Management*	Yellow
University of Chicago Press	*Library Quarterly*	Yellow
Wiley	*Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology (JASIST)*	Yellow* However, the CTA for *JASIST* indicates that this journal is a "Green" journal

subject librarian liaison program that most academic libraries maintain to communicate the library's messages about collection development, instruction, and other library services. Deploying the subject librarians to promote authors' rights ensures that the work of scholarly communication is not siloed in the work of one person or one group. In

fact, Kara Malenfant reports that the University of Minnesota (UM) subject librarians' position descriptions have been changed to reflect their shared responsibility and administrative expectations for supporting the scholarly communication initiatives at UM.[34]

> **Deploying the subject librarians to promote authors' rights ensures that the work of scholarly communication is not siloed in the work of one person or one group.**

Most of the workshop presentations identified in the literature are not discipline specific. The design of the Rights Well Workshop allows the subject librarians to tailor a workshop easily for a particular discipline. The workshop's design, therefore, addresses concerns of librarians, as expressed in *SPEC 299*, that most libraries' scholarly communication initiatives are an addition to an already heavy workload.[35] Outreach efforts need to be coordinated and implemented so as to maximize the use of personnel rather than relying on each librarian to create and produce a distinctive workshop from scratch for each area of responsibility. At the same time, the fact that the workshop would be customized to fit the needs of prospective participants in a discipline-specific workshop provides assurance that librarians are educating themselves about the disciplines they serve. It ensures that the content for sessions outside the library focuses on the faculty members' literature, where they work and publish. In her presentation to Georgia Tech librarians, Leigh Van Orsdel encourages the audience to "know their turf, use their issues."[36]

In the Rights Well Workshop, librarians learn to use the Web of Science address search field and the "analyze results" feature to identify important journals in which a specific department's faculty may have published frequently. The publishers representing those journals are then described in the same way that the LIS journals were presented to the librarian audience (see table 2 for an example based on the OSU geoscience faculty). Happily, most of the publishers in this case are "green," although the society publisher that one might likely expect to support self-archiving is not "green."

Discussion of Copyright Transfer Agreements

Copyright transfer agreement (CTA) review and discussion is the heart of the workshop, whether talking to librarians or non-librarians. It demands audience participation as the audience analyzes actual CTAs. The purpose of this participatory section of the workshop is to impart a better understanding of the meaning of signing a CTA, the nuances of the language used in a typical agreement, variations in language between publishers,[37] and some insight into how the terms in a CTA may differ from the rights that are expected or assumed by the author. The audience is asked what rights they believe they have and what rights they want to keep when publishing. Then the audience is divided into small

Table 2
Self-Archiving Policy with RoMEO Color Code for Selected Geosciences Journals

Publisher	Example title	RoMEO color code
American Association for the Advancement of Science	*Science*	Green
American Geophysical Union	*Geochemistry Geophysics Geosystems (G^3)*	Green (there is no RoMEO record for G^3 specifically, but AGU allows authors to place postprints on their own Web sites without embargo—Green)
Elsevier	*Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta*	Green
Geological Society of America	*Geology*	White
Wiley-Blackwell	*Boreas*	Yellow

groups, and each group is provided copies of a CTA from one of the journal publishers, along with a copy of the discussion questions to consider:

- What rights is the author being asked to transfer to the publisher?
- At what point in the publishing process does the transfer occur?
- What rights does the author retain?
- What are the publisher's expectations of the author in regard to posting, sharing, redistributing, republishing the work?
- Are co-authors addressed? If so, how?
- What if the author is a government employee, or the work is for hire?
- What terms did you come across that need clarification?

In order to facilitate discussion, the authors captured answers to these questions in a matrix, as table 3 shows, for quick reference.[38]

Approximately 30 minutes is allotted for the introduction of this exercise, the small group discussions, and for the audience to report back what they found in the different CTAs. It is important to remind librarians to listen for points not previously covered in their review of CTAs. Despite having read these CTAs numerous times, presenters will discover that new questions and points always arise from audience members, contributing greatly to knowledge shared during these discussions.

The final section introduces the concept of amending author agreements. Unless an institution requires or recommends a specific addendum (this is not the case at OSU), the Rights Well Workshop provides examples of various author addenda including those from SPARC, Science Commons Addendum Engine, MIT, University of Michigan, and the University of Minnesota.[39] It is imperative to provide alternatives to accepting the CTA as is, including editing the CTA itself or using an addendum to make desired changes. To demonstrate how to amend an agreement, the Rights Well Workshop highlights sources of addenda and provides examples of amended agreements. The major emphasis of this discussion stresses that an author (and co-authors) should decide what it is they want to do with the article, what rights should be retained, and then to make the appropriate

> **The questions of how much risk should an author take with making changes to the CTA or what to do in the case of rejection of the addendum by a publisher are frequently asked.**

adjustments to the CTA if necessary. The issue of co-authorship is especially important in the LIS field since many publications are co-authored. There is also a need to reiterate that publishers' requests for copyright transfer can vary wildly, as the discussion of CTAs demonstrated; and, in some cases, adjustments or amendments may not be necessary. In sum, the audience is encouraged to read CTAs carefully before deciding how to proceed.

The questions of how much risk should an author take with making changes to the CTA or what to do in the case of rejection of the addendum by a publisher are frequently asked. Recognizing that authors often have much riding on the success of their publications (for example, tenure and promotion), the answer is to do as much as one is

Table 3

Excerpts from matrix used to facilitate discussion regarding the question "What rights is the author being asked to transfer to the publisher?"

Publisher (example LIS journal)	Excerpted talking points from workshop matrix
ALA / ACRL (*College & Research Libraries*)	Asks for non-exclusive right to publish
Elsevier (*Library Collections, Acquisitions, & Technical Services*)	Asks to assign copyright
Requests that authors obtain waivers from their institution if copyright transfer is not allowed	
Johns Hopkins University Press (*portal: Libraries & the Academy*)	Asks for copyright and other rights of "whatever kind"
Medical Library Association (*Journal of the Medical Library Association*) Asks for a non-exclusive license to "publish, print…and create new works"	Asks for right of first publication
Springer (*Scientometrics*)	Asks for exclusive rights to reproduce the work in any form
Taylor & Francis (*Collection Management*)	Asks for all copyright and "related rights" in the article
University of Chicago Press (*Library Quarterly*)	"Guidelines for Journal Authors' Rights" do not specify which rights are being transferred (CTA not available)
Wiley (*JASIST*)	Asks for assignment of all copyright to the American Society for Information Science and Technology

comfortable with and weigh options before deferring to the publisher's requirements. Once tenure status is attained (or dissertation requirements fulfilled, and so on), the author can be more discriminating regarding the means chosen to communicate future research.

The Rights Well Workshop is wrapped up by sharing selected resources such as SPARC's authors' rights brochure or Jim Till's post on selecting an addendum.[40] The remaining time left is open for questions that the participants might have about CTAs, addenda, or other scholarly communication topics, and the workshop concludes by asking participants to fill out a short evaluation form that is discussed below.

Next Steps

Promoting Authors' Rights on the OSU Campus

In addition to two workshop presentations for the benefit of OSU librarians, the Rights Well Workshop has been conducted for library faculty audiences at the University of Oregon and Portland State University and for audiences at the 2009 Iowa Library Association and the conference, Sustainable Scholarship: Open Access and Digital Repositories, sponsored by Pacific University (Forest Grove, Oregon). To date, OSU Libraries has auditioned some version of the workshop with three departments or units outside the library. The content has also been included as a component in a graduate student and faculty workshop series that supports the research enterprise. The next most important step will be to schedule workshops across campus. While there is some evidence that the Rights Well Workshop has increased OSU librarians' knowledge about CTAs and authors' rights, in preparation for broadening campus outreach, the OSU Libraries' Scholarly Communication Working Group will survey OSU librarians to determine additional training needs. Survey results could indicate the need to focus such a session more deliberately on addenda or on the CTAs for a particular discipline. The working group expects that the first round of workshops will need to be team taught, requiring that one of three experienced presenters accompany the appropriate subject librarian. A subject librarian who has completed a successful co-presented workshop should have the confidence to fly solo and conduct the workshop alone.

Workshop Feedback and Assessment

In the course of developing the Rights Well Workshop, the authors recognized the need to include some feedback mechanism for measuring the workshop's effectiveness. As a result, the workshop concludes by asking participants to complete a simple evaluation form. This method of assessment is not different from what most other libraries report using to evaluate their scholarly communication outreach efforts.[41] This form is based fundamentally on the stated objectives of the workshop. Though useful, it requires further development and enhancement since the intention is to provide librarians as presenters with a useful evaluation tool for when they launch their customized workshops.

OSU Libraries will also consider other methods of gaining feedback on the Rights Well Workshop presenters. One method might be to employ a self-review technique or a debriefing session between a member of the Scholarly Communication Working Group

and a workshop presenter after each presentation. Such a debriefing would help OSU Libraries to determine the gaps that the Rights Well Workshop content does not cover. As part of the libraries' course-based instructional sessions, OSU Libraries already uses a peer-review technique to help gather information about an instructor's performance. This technique could be modified for the purpose of improving authors' rights workshops. Fortunately, OSU Libraries recently hired an instructional design librarian. This hiring could not have coincided better with the Scholarly Communication Working Group's desire to improve the effectiveness of the authors' rights workshops. The plan will be to call upon her expertise in designing and evaluating sessions to apply to the scholarly communication workshop series.

The more difficult part of assessment involves determining whether the workshops have actually transformed the behavior of OSU faculty in regard to negotiating their rights as authors. The Libraries' Scholarly Communication Working Group seeks to determine if the workshops are influencing self-archiving behavior among OSU faculty, perhaps resulting in increased deposits in ScholarsArchive@OSU, the university's institutional repository. Conducting this type of assessment demands more planning, but it will probably involve a combination of approaches. One approach might be to capture a snapshot of a department's self-archiving behavior prior to the workshop and then follow up with another snapshot after the workshop was held—perhaps in three-month increments. This assessment approach would require the inclusion of more information about depositing in ScholarsArchive@OSU in the Rights Well Workshop or scheduling a follow-up workshop featuring a presentation by the libraries' digital production librarian on the mechanics of depositing. Another approach is to follow up a year or two of authors' rights workshops by surveying faculty about how they have changed their responses to CTAs and/or their self-archiving behavior.

As a profession, the need to assess scholarly communication education activities is a discussion that is past due but would perhaps be well received. According to *SPEC Kit 299*, 91 percent of the libraries surveyed reported that they had not evaluated their scholarly communication education activities.[42] The development of a meaningful assessment instrument tool would help an individual library like OSU determine if it were achieving the stated goals of its scholarly communication plan—to build internal capacity among librarians and provide resources and tools so that the librarians could "incorporate the information into their liaison and instruction activities."[43] If such a tool were used by multiple libraries, it could establish benchmarks for comparing efforts across libraries and, more importantly, for measuring the impact of the profession's advocacy and scholarly communication education initiatives.

Conclusion

Since many authors have yet to understand that they must negotiate what Stevan Harnad calls "the right rights," arguably retaining authors' rights may be the first most important step to making the promise of open access a reality.[44] OSU Libraries has acknowledged the importance that the retention of authors' rights plays in transforming the scholarly publishing landscape, even when the authors are librarians. The challenge was to find a way to educate librarians so that they were better prepared to talk about this complex

issue and to understand the diverse manifestations of CTAs that they and other authors regularly confront. It is for this reason that the Rights Well Workshop was designed and has become a central part of our developing scholarly communication program.

Faye A. Chadwell is associate librarian for collections and content management, Oregon State University Libraries, Corvallis, OR; she may be contacted via e-mail at: faye.chadwell@ oregonstate.edu.

Andrea A. Wirth is geosciences and environmental sciences librarian, Oregon State University Libraries, Corvallis, OR; she may be contacted via e-mail at: andrea.wirth@oregonstate.edu.

Appendix

Rights Well Workshop Outline

1) Introduction and outcomes (5 minutes)
   - Describe objectives of workshop and, for librarian audiences, the dual role of librarian as author and liaison.
2) Background (5 minutes)
   - Address importance of authors' rights in context of scholarly communication as well as clarify terminology in use throughout workshop (for example, copyright transfer agreement and addenda).
3) Identifying journals and publishers for discussion (15 minutes)
   - Two-fold purpose of highlighting the importance of the selected publishers for the workshop audience and for librarian audiences to discuss methods for developing the list of publishers.
4) CTA review and discussion (30 minutes)
   - This section is divided into equal parts between small group discussions and reporting back to larger audience.
5) Amending CTAs and reviewing author addenda use (10 minutes)
   - Overview of available addenda and approaches to take when asking for changes to the CTA.
6) Resources and questions (25 minutes)
   - Selected resources are shared, followed by Q & A and distribution of the workshop evaluation forms.

Notes

1. Faye A. Chadwell and Andrea A. Wirth, "Rights Well: Presented at the University of Oregon Libraries" (workshop presentation, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR, January 21, 2010), http://ir.library.oregonstate.edu/jspui/handle/1957/14705 (accessed March 22, 2010).
2. Kathleen A. Newman, Deborah D. Blecic, and Kimberly L. Armstrong, *SPEC Kit 299 Scholarly Communication Education Initiatives* (Washington, D.C.: Association of Research Libraries, 2007), 11.

3. Karen S. Fischer. *SPEC Kit 310 Author Addenda* (Washington, D.C.: Association of Research Libraries, 2009), 37.

4. Cathy Sarli et al., *SPEC Kit 311 Public Access Policies* (Washington, D.C.: Association of Research Libraries, 2009), 11.

5. Newman, Blecic, and Armstrong, 16.

6. Association of College and Research Libraries, "Assessment of the ACRL Scholarly Communications Program 2002–2006," American Library Association (2007), Appendix, B-4, http://www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/divs/acrl/issues/scholcomm/ACRLSCAssessmntFNLREVISED.pdf (accessed April 17, 2010).

7. Joy Kirchner, "Scholarly Communications: Planning for the Integration of Liaison Librarian Roles," *Research Library Issues: A Bimonthly Report from ARL, CNI, and SPARC* 265 (August 2009): 23, http://www.arl.org/resources/pubs/rli/archive/rli265.shtml (accessed April 17, 2010).

8. Kristi L. Palmer, Emily Dill, and Charlene Christie, "Where There's a Will There's a Way? Survey of Academic Librarian Attitudes about Open Access," *College & Research Libraries* 70, 4 (2009): 324.

9. Palmer, Dill, and Christie, 327.

10. Ibid., 328.

11. Newman, Blecic, and Armstrong, 16.

12. Joyce L. Ogburn, "Defining and Achieving Success in the Movement to Change Scholarly Communication," *Library Resources & Technical Services* 52, 2 (2008): 44–53.

13. Newman, Blecic, and Armstrong, 71.

14. Ibid.

15. Columbia University Libraries/Information Services, "Scholarly Communication Program, Manage Your Copyrights," Columbia University Libraries/Information Services, http://scholcomm.columbia.edu/manage-your-copyrights (accessed March 22, 2010).

16. Oregon University System, Office of the Chancellor, "Statewide Public Services Programs," Oregon University System Issue Brief, 2009, 1, http://www.ous.edu/about/legnote09/files/OSU%20Public%20Services%202009.pdf (accessed April 17, 2010).

17. Sarli et al.

18. Newman, Blecic, and Armstrong, 72.

19. Mary K. Bolin, "Librarian Status at U.S. Research Universities: Extending the Typology," *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 34, 5 (2008): 423.

20. Ibid.

21. June Garner, Karen Davidson, and Becky Schwartzkopf, "Images of Academic Librarians: How Tenure-Track Librarians Portray Themselves in the Promotion and Tenure Process," *The Serials Librarian* 56, 1 (2009): 205.

22. Stephen E. Wiberley, Jr., Julie M. Hurd, and Ann C. Weller, "Publication Patterns of U.S. Academic Librarians from 1998 to 2002," *College and Research Libraries 67, 3* (2006): 205–16.

23. Howard Carter, Carolyn A. Snyder, and Andrea Imre, "Library Faculty Publishing and Intellectual Property Issues: A Survey of Attitudes and Awareness," *portal: Libraries and the Academy* 7, 1 (2007): 73.

24. Anita Coleman, "Self-Archiving and the Copyright Transfer Agreements of ISI-ranked Library and Information Science Journals," *Journal of the American Society for Information Science & Technology* 58, 2 (2007): 292.

25. Carter, Snyder, and Imre, 77.

26. Doug Way, "The Open Access Availability of Library and Information Science Literature," [preprint] *College and Research Libraries* 71, 3 (2010): 9, http://www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/divs/acrl/publications/crljournal/preprints/Way.pdf (accessed March 22, 2010).

27. Library and Information Science Editors, "A Statement of Ethics and Guide to Best Practices for Editors of Library and Information Science Journals, Section 5: Authors Rights Practices," (July 2009), http://www.lis-editors.org/best-practices/2009section5.shtml (accessed March 22, 2010).

28. Thomas E. Nisonger and Charles H. Davis, "The Perception of Library and Information Science Journals by LIS Education Deans and ARL Library Directors: A Replication of the Kohl-Davis Study," *College & Research Libraries* 66, 4 (2005): 341–77.

29. In Anita Coleman's study of LIS journals, she found that only 32 percent of the of the journals in the Thomson ISI Information Science and Library Science category made their copyright transfer agreements publicly available on the Web. Coleman, 290.

30. Using the Sherpa/RoMEO definition, the authors define preprint as "the version of the paper before peer-review" and postprint as "the version of the paper after peer-review" but not necessarily including typesetting and formatting by the publishers. Sherpa, "Definitions and Terms," Sherpa/RoMEO, University of Nottingham, 2006, http://www. sherpa.ac.uk/romeoinfo.html#colours (accessed March 22, 2010).

31. OpenDOAR reports more than 1,500 repository listings. OpenDOAR (Directory of Open Access Repositories), "OpenDOAR Charts—Worldwide: Proportion of Repositories by Continent—Worldwide," University of Nottingham, http://www.opendoar.org/find. php?format=charts (accessed February 25).

32. Denise Troll Covey, "Self-Archiving Journal Articles: A Case Study of Faculty Practice and Missed Opportunity," *portal: Libraries and the Academy*, 9, 2 (2009): 248.

33. Wiley-Blackwell "Copyright Transfer Agreement" for the *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, http://www3.interscience.wiley.com/ homepages/76501873/nscta.pdf (accessed April 18, 2010).

34. Kara J. Malenfant, "Leading Change in the System of Scholarly Communication: A Case Study of Engaging Liaison Librarians for Outreach to Faculty," *College & Research Libraries* 71, 1 (2010): 69.

35. Newman, Blecic, and Armstrong, 9.

36. Leigh C. Van Orsdel, "Faculty Roles in Scholarly Communications: Promoting Activism on Their Turf Using Their Issues" (presentation, Issues in Scholarly Communication Seminar, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA, October 15, 2007), slide 9, http://smartech. gatech.edu/bitstream/1853/17000/2/Van_Orsdel.pdf (accessed March 22, 2010).

37. As part of the RoMEO Studies series of articles, Celia Jenkins et al. describe the process by which a controlled vocabulary for CTAs was established for the Copyright Knowledge Bank—an enhancement to the SHERPA/RoMEO database. Jenkins et al. reviewed the abundant variations in terminology used by publishers, which were sometimes merely difficult to define and categorize; and, in other circumstances, some publishers seemed to use terms that were inappropriate and, under further investigation, did not appear to be what the publishers actually intended. Celia Jenkins et al., "RoMEO Studies 7: Creation of a Controlled Vocabulary to Analyze Copyright Transfer Agreements," *Journal of Information Science* 34, 3 (2008): 290–307.

38. To develop the matrix, CTAs for each of these publishers were consulted. In most cases the CTAs were found online as follows: ACRL, http://www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/ divs/acrl/resources/forms/C percent26RLAuthorAgreement.pdf; Elsevier, http:// www.elsevier.com/framework_authors/pdfs/JPA_example.pdf; Medical Library Association, http://www.mlanet.org/pdf/jmla_checklist.pdf; Springer, http://www. springer.com/?SGWID=3-102-45-69724-0; Wiley, http://www3.interscience.wiley.com/ homepages/76501873/nscta.pdf. In some cases the CTAs were not available online: Johns Hopkins University Press *portal* CTA received upon request from editorial board member; Taylor & Francis *Collection Management* CTA received from the editor and "Schedule of Authors' Rights" consulted online, http://www.tandf.co.uk/journals/pdf/copyright-author-rights.pdf; and University of Chicago Press, *Library Quarterly* CTA not available online, but we consulted online guidelines http://www.journals.uchicago.edu/page/lq/ rights.html (accessed March 22, 2010).

39. SPARC (Scholarly Publishing & Academic Resources Coalition), "Author Rights," SPARC, (2006), http://www.arl.org(/sparc/bm~doc/SPARC_AuthorRights2006.pdf (accessed March 22, 2010); Science Commons, "Scholar's Copyright Addendum Engine," http://

sciencecommons.org/projects/publishing/scae/ (accessed March 22, 2010); Massachusetts Institute of Technology, MIT Amendment Form (Amendment to Publication Agreement), http://info-libraries.mit.edu/scholarly/mit-copyright-amendment-form/ (accessed March 22, 2010); MLibrary, University of Michigan, "Author Addendum," http://www.lib.umich.edu/copyright/author-addendum (accessed March 22, 2010); and University of Minnesota, University of Minnesota Author's Addendum, http://www.lib.umn.edu/scholcom/CICAuthorsRights.pdf (accessed March 22, 2010).

40.   Jim Till, "How to Select an Author Addendum," Be Openly Accessible or Be Obscure Blog, (June 21, 2007), http://tillje.wordpress.com/2007/06/21/how-to-select-an-author-addendum/ (accessed March 22, 2010).

41.   Newman, Blecic, and Armstrong, 76.

42.   Ibid.

43.   Oregon State University Libraries, *Oregon State University Scholarly Communication Program: Developing and Refining Strategy* (Corvallis, Oregon: Oregon State University Libraries, 2009), 2.

44.   Richard Poynder, "The Open Access Interviews: Stevan Harnad," Open and Shut, (July 1, 2007), 12, http://www.richardpoynder.co.uk/Stevan Harnad Interview.pdf (accessed April 17, 2010).