

William M. Cross. The State of the Scholarly Communication Librarian: A Content Analysis of Position Descriptions from Association of Research Libraries Member Institutions. A Master's Paper for the M.S. in L.S degree. April, 2011. 55 pages.
Advisor: Phillip M. Edwards

As scholarly communication has emerged as a strategic imperative among universities, there is an increasing need for legal, technical, and leadership expertise in the field. Many academic libraries have taken on these roles, providing expertise, resources, and acting as the hub for partnerships across campus. Libraries have had particular success by creating full-time positions, often called a "scholarly communication librarian," which would be dedicated to these issues, but the responsibilities associated with these positions remain ill-defined and idiosyncratic.

This study examines the current state of the scholarly communication librarian. It presents a content analysis of the position descriptions of current scholarly communication librarians submitted by Association of Research Libraries member institutions, highlighting shared characteristics and points of disagreement between skills and requirements for these positions. It offers conclusions about this nascent position's title, requirements, and job duties, and it presents projections about the future of similar professional positions.

Headings:

Librarians/Supply and demand

Content analysis

Job hunting

THE STATE OF THE SCHOLARLY COMMUNICATION LIBRARIAN:
A CONTENT ANALYSIS OF POSITION DESCRIPTIONS FROM ASSOCIATION
OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES MEMBER INSTITUTIONS

by
William M. Cross

A Master's paper submitted to the faculty
of the School of Information and Library Science
of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Science in
Library Science.

Chapel Hill, North Carolina

April 2011

Approved by

Phillip M. Edwards

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	2
Research Problem	4
Literature Review.....	5
Methods.....	22
Results.....	25
Summary and Conclusions	36
References.....	43
Appendices.....	52

Introduction

The phrase "scholarly communication" has animated a good deal of the discussion in Library and Information Science (LIS) literature recently (Borgman, 2007; Van Orsdel, 2007), but it has roots going back more than twenty years (Ho, 2010; Odlyzko, 2002). Arising from the physical sciences, which faced a financial crisis in journal pricing in the 1990s, scholarly communication has evolved to encompass every facet of the process of creating and disseminating scholarly research. Journal pricing and new publication models such as the Open Access (OA) movement remain major parts of the scholarly communication discussion, but scholarly communication also encompasses new forms of scholarship such as the storage and publication of data sets and digital humanities projects (Nancy & Smith, 2008).

There has also been an increasing recognition that the issues of scholarly communication are tied closely with legal issues (Gasaway, 2010). The relationship between the academy and copyright is obvious, as ownership of scholarship and the use of copyrighted works are at the heart of writing and teaching. Similarly, the ubiquity of publication agreements governing faculty scholarship has made contract law an integral part of scholarly communication, as has the rise of libraries licensing resources for their collections (Vesely, 2007). The practice of librarianship also implicates other legal regimes including the First Amendment and statutory privacy protections (Ghosh, 2009; Bell & Shank, 2008). For these reasons, the scholarly communication skill set is now

generally understood to include a strong foundation in legal issues and practices (Van Orsdel, 2007).

In the last decade, scholarly communication has moved from an academic- and library-oriented topic of discussion and into a practiced discipline (Nancy & Smith, 2008). Librarians recognize that these issues are central to their profession and that the library can be an important source of expertise and leadership in this area (Taylor, 2007; Danner, 2009). Numerous academic institutions have established scholarly communication committees, task forces, and offices to organize and guide libraries and institutions on questions of digital copyright, open access and knowledge management (Newman, 2007). Some institutions have designated one or more employees, usually librarians with a background in law, as scholarly communication librarians. In the wider academic community, however, this emerging position is not well-understood and in many ways it remains undefined (Fuches & Brannon, 2008; Malenfant, 2010).

This confusion presents several problems for libraries seeking to join the conversation about scholarly communication. At a basic level, scholarly communication remains a concept that is opaque to many campus stakeholders which makes it difficult to build partnerships or marshal support for programs and activities (Cortois & Turtle, 2008). Administrators who are unfamiliar with the term "scholarly communication" and the issues that fit under this umbrella may be unwilling to fund scholarly communication programs even if they would be beneficial for the institution.

Scholarly communication efforts on campus need a leader: a voice that can gather and mobilize resources, advocate for change, and offer guidance on legal issues (Fuches

& Brannon, 2008; Vesley, 2007). For an increasing number of institutions this leadership has come in the form of a scholarly communication librarian. Although different institutions have assigned this position a variety of distinct titles, a review of positions reveals a shared set of traits coalescing around organization of open access and new forms of publication as well as legal, particularly copyright, expertise (Ho, 2010). Throughout this paper the phrase "scholarly communication librarian" will be generally defined as an academic librarian whose full-time position consists of providing expertise on issues of copyright, authors' rights, and new publication models.

Despite these commonalities, scholarly communication librarian positions remain idiosyncratic (Newman, 2007). This creates challenges for individual librarians seeking to reach out to colleagues. It also creates difficulties for institutions seeking to establish new scholarly communication positions or to evaluate existing positions. There is a clear need for information about these positions and, where appropriate, agreement about what qualities these positions encompass.

Research Problem

Few scholars have systematically examined scholarly communication librarian positions, although a few groups such as the Association of Research Librarians (ARL) and Ithaka S+R have begun to gather scattered statements of purpose and position descriptions (Newman, 2007; Nancy & Smith, 2008). The skills and qualifications of scholarly communication librarian positions, however, remain idiosyncratic and our understanding of trends in the descriptions is limited. More complete information is needed for libraries to establish these positions and for librarians to effectively fulfill this role.

Research Questions

This paper will address two interrelated research questions:

1. What are common characteristics of scholarly communication librarian position descriptions included in the ARL database?
2. How are shared keywords used to identify common themes in this nascent professional role?

Literature Review

This literature review will describe key issues in scholarly communication that libraries engage directly. This will help identify the major themes and terms that should be addressed by the study such as open access and digital scholarship as well as legal issues such as copyright and author's rights agreements. This literature review also aims to explore the methodology of evaluating position descriptions by examining scholarly analysis of analogous positions such as digital and interdisciplinary library positions.

Overview of Scholarly Communication and Libraries

The LIS literature has often led the way in engaging scholarly communication issues and this topic has developed into a sophisticated area of study over the last decade. Often the tone of the literature is alarmist, describing a system "in turmoil" (Drake, 2007) or offering guidance on the "crisis in scholarly communication" (Corbett, 2009). Indeed, scholarly communication is often seen as a "movement" within LIS (Ogburn, 2008) that has successfully built momentum within libraries (Bergman, 2006) and animated pure scholarly analysis (Borgman, 2007).

Case (2009) describes the groundbreaking work of the Association of Research Libraries (ARL), a major partner in library scholarly communication efforts, which

established the influential Office of Scholarly Communications (OSC) in 1991. The OSC was charged with three specific goals related to scholarly communication: leading efforts with external constituencies to communicate the nature of the problem and the actions needed to address the causes of it, as well as to developing library-oriented consumer advocate services, orchestrating actions to introduce greater competition to the commercial publishers, and forming a partnership with scholarly groups to examine the scholarly publishing process and find ways to manage the explosion in research and knowledge and the explosion in publishing. These themes of advocacy, competing publication models and new forms of scholarship run throughout scholarly communication efforts.

Literature and practice in scholarly communication has often focused on building partnerships within the academy. Librarians are traditionally positioned as the “hub” of the scholarly communications wheel (Lynch, 1993; Ginspar, Rockwell, & Unsworth, 1997) that reaches out to the entire campus (Duncan, Walsh, Daniels, & Becker, 2006). Scholars have identified university presses (Furlough, 2008) and fellow librarians (Donovan & Estlund, 2007) as promising partners.

Harley, Acord, Earl-Novell, Lawrence, & King (2010) published a study based on a series of in-depth interviews with stakeholders across seven disciplines regarding academic partnerships. Based on the responses of 160 scholars across 45 academic institutions in 7 disciplines the researchers concluded that collaboration is valued in the abstract but that pressure from funding agencies, publication venues, and promotion and tenure regimes often made it difficult to engage in new forms of scholarship. It

specifically identified libraries as the “front line of support [for] the dissemination of scholarship” (Harley, Acord, Earl-Novell, Lawrence, & King, 2010, p. 27).

A recent conference presentation by Adrian Ho (2010) describes one effort to engage the campus with scholarly communication issues. The Scholarship@Western program was developed by the libraries at Western Ontario University in order to facilitate library engagement with campus stakeholders. Ho identifies three key roles of library engagement: identifying and building relationships with stakeholders, raising awareness about scholarly communication issues, and providing services through the library to address scholarly communication issues.

Scholarly communication and open access. The scholarly communication literature has focused heavily on open access (OA) and public access initiatives. Charles Bailey (2010) published a wide-ranging, lengthy bibliography on libraries and OA that provides an excellent overview and organizational principles. Bailey identifies the major players in open access: authors, publishers, and librarians. He also describes the main sources of OA material: OA journals, e-prints, disciplinary archives, institutional repositories, open archives, and OA books.

Many scholars have focused on the philosophical underpinnings of OA. In a recent book James Boyle discussed the role of knowledge in service of the public good (Boyle, 2008). Boyle describes the importance of the public domain - the realm of material that everyone is free to use and share without permission - for public and scholarly discourse and argues that misunderstanding about this concept leads to enclosure of the "commons of the mind" and a consequent loss to society. Professor John Willinsky expands on this point in his seminal work *The Access Principle* (2005) which

argues that the scholarly enterprise is uniquely tied to a duty to circulate scholarly work as widely as possible. He describes the history of access to scholarly work and the varied models of access currently provided by scholarly institutions.

Legal scholar Lawrence Lessig has analyzed the harm done to expression by restrictive copyright regimes (Lessig, 2005). Lessig, an outspoken advocate for "free culture," describes the way that rapidly expanding copyright ownership laws and norms enrich individuals at the cost of societal advancement in technology, culture, and scholarship. John Ober's (2006) influential editorial on methods for implementing OA initiatives offers another perspective on the issue. Ober argues that in the context of scholarly works many of the copyright problems described by authors such as Boyle and Lessig can be addressed by encouraging authors to retain their rights and permit wide noncommercial use rather than surrendering their rights to journals who commercialize their work and charge libraries for use.

Empirical analysis has often focused on the attitudes of various stakeholders regarding OA practices. Hoorn (2006), for example, presents the results of a web survey among 1,226 corresponding authors. 81.4% indicated their support for open academic reuse. Asked about their preferred OA model a strong plurality (45%) chose a model that allows reuse by others in all circumstances except for commercialization of the author's work. Palmer, Teffeau, & Newton (2008) report the results of a national survey of librarians that also found strong support for OA, but cautioned that librarians were less comfortable engaging in tasks which went beyond their traditional expertise.

Mercer (2010) builds on the findings of the Palmer study, describing significant diversity within the academic library community in terms of enthusiasm for open access

initiatives. She concludes with several recommendations for building further support including better graduate and post-graduate education as well as greater support from library administrators. Overall, open access is one of the "hot topics" that has garnered significant scholarly attention, but the literature has identified limitations in the effectiveness and value of current OA efforts.

The Palmer and Mercer studies highlight the way that libraries are suited to address OA issues but traditional librarians may not be equipped with the legal and technical expertise to do so. As OA continues to evolve these efforts may be led by a librarian with this mandate and expertise: a scholarly communication librarian.

Scholarly communication, digital scholarship, and institutional repositories.

Closely tied to these issues, the literature has also explored the library's relationship with digital scholarship and institutional repositories (IR's). One of the early themes of the literature was the rise of online and digital scholarship and new digital journals. Cassella and Calvi (2010) describe the diversity of these efforts in a recent article and suggest strategies for publishers to offer value-added services such as navigational and discovery services. Roel (2004) offers the case study of a library-centered digital journal, the *Journal of Insect Science*, and uses it as an example for other libraries to emulate.

There is a significant body of empirical literature studying the effects digital and open publishing has on readership and citation. An influential study by Thompson ISI published in the journal *Nature* found positive effects on citation rates for articles published in an online OA journal (Pringle, 2004). A 2006 study of citations of astronomy journals suggests more modest benefits. Examining the so-called "core journals" in the field, Kurtz et al. (2006) concluded that much of the supposed "OA

effect” could be attributed to two other variables: selection bias and a preference for early access. Despite these reservations, a 2010 annotated bibliography by Wagner (2010) suggests a growing scholarly consensus of at least a 10-15% OA citation advantage. An opinion piece by Harnad and Brody (2004) reviewed numerous studies showing that digital open access may boost citations, and concluded that “the ball is now in the universities’ court” in terms of incentivizing and promoting digital open access.

The literature has also focused on libraries’ use of digital technologies to offer new services. McGinnis (1999), for example, describes the process of establishing an electronic reserves system, while Bell and Krasolski (2004) describe the challenges of integrating online course management systems into the library’s existing resources.

In particular, practice and literature have both focused on the rise of institutional repositories. Raym Crow (2002) championed IRs in a seminal position paper arguing that IRs offer libraries an opportunity to reclaim their place at the heart of scholarly publishing. Scholars such as Lynch (2003) followed Crow’s lead explaining and advocating for IRs as a promising avenue of scholarly reform. Jantz and Wilson (2003) surveyed 113 institutions to see if they had IRs and, if they did, how they managed faculty deposit. Examining institutional web pages they found that 63 institutions did have IRs but that current models were “immature” in terms of development and value-added services.

A literature review by Brown (2010) concluded that studies on the effect of IRs so far have not documented significant advantages or reached consensus about best practices. Shreevs and Cragin (2008) argue that this is primarily because IRs have not been widely embraced and stakeholder participation has been minimal. Dorothy Salo

(2008) archly observed that IR librarianship today is akin to being an “innkeeper at the roach motel” (Salo, 2008, p. 1). Data may come into the IR, but since it is rarely, if ever, used, that data never comes out.

Recent literature has attempted to address this issue by focusing on case studies and interviews. Palmer, Teffeu, and Newton (2008) compared IR initiatives at three institutions, identifying common challenges around balancing content acquisition and service provision as well as the changing roles of librarians. Rieh, St. Jean, Yakel, Markey, & Kim (2008) conducted semi-structured interviews with 170 librarians involved with IRs drawing prospective telephone interview subjects from *The Census of Institutional Repositories in the United States* and asking respondents who volunteered their name and e-mail address if they would be willing to complete a follow-up phone interview. From this group they created a purposive sample of 40 people for analysis based on the stage of development of the IR, the size and Carnegie classifications of parent institutions, the extent of materials in the IR, and the position of respondents. Based on these responses they found that IR staff members are enthusiastic about the projects but that there was a lack of comprehensive service models so the development of policies was critical. Scholars such as Ferreira, Rodrigues, Baptista, & Saraiva (2008) have synthesized these studies to craft proposals for increasing IR use.

A recent special issue of *Reference Services Review* (33:3) focused on the role of reference librarians in institutional repositories. Articles in this issue discuss reference librarians’ role in specific institutions (Chan, Kwok, & Yik, 2005; Phillips, Carr, and Teal, 2005) as well as analysis of the literature (Allard, Mack & Felter-Reichard, 2005) and new models of repositories (Graham, Skaggs & Stevens, 2005).

Overall, the literature on libraries and scholarly communication reveals several trends that impact this study. Libraries have generally aligned themselves at the heart of scholarly communication efforts. Librarians have focused primarily on open access and digital scholarship initiatives with varying levels of success. The literature is less developed in terms of providing successful models for building those bridges.

As with open access, digital scholarship is an area where the library is a natural partner. Leadership in this area, however, requires more expertise than many librarians are able to provide. A full time scholarly communication librarian is uniquely positioned to guide institutional responses to digital scholarship and build partnerships in this area.

Librarians and the Law

The study of legal issues related to librarianship is a second area of the literature that relates to library scholarly communication efforts and informs this research. Distinct from law librarianship issues such as collection development and reference services in the subject library, this branch of scholarship focuses on tensions and practices related to providing access and licensing resources in the academic library generally.

There has been an increasing recognition in the literature that the practice of scholarly communication is tied closely with legal issues. Vesley (2007) identifies major copyright issues that affect libraries and scholarly communication such as ownership of scholarship and the use of copyrighted works. Similarly, Gasaway (2010) discusses the way the ubiquity of publication agreements governing faculty scholarship has made contract law an integral part of scholarly communication, as has the rise of libraries licensing resources for their collections.

The practice of librarianship also implicates other legal regimes including the First Amendment and statutory privacy protections (Ghosh, 2009; Bell & Shank, 2008). For this reason scholars such as Van Orsdel (2007) conclude that the scholarly communication skill-set is now generally understood to include a strong foundation in legal issues and practices.

Legal information needs of librarians. The rise of scholarly communication issues has highlighted the fact that librarians encounter significant legal issues in their day-to-day practice, particularly in the digital age. Ferullo (2004) describes the statutory and judicial analysis librarians must understand in order to make informed decisions in a legal environment that is complex and ambiguous.

The American Library Association (ALA) recently recognized the roles that legal issues play in modern academic librarianship as well as the law-related professional obligations which academic librarians must shoulder (ALA Core Competencies, 2009). Core Competency 1G explicitly states that librarians “should know and, where appropriate, be able to employ...the legal framework within which libraries and information agencies operate”

Scholars such as Wagner (2008) have recognized that librarians often act as the “touchstone” for legal expertise on campus. As such, there is a substantial body of literature dedicated to introducing legal issues to librarians (Smith & Presser, 2005; Peck, 1999). Indeed, the output of scholarly communication librarians often focuses primarily on supporting academic librarians as they engage the legal issues of the profession. Kenneth Crews' *Copyright Law for Librarians and Educators* (2006), Kevin Smith's *Scholarly Communications @ Duke* blog and Soules and Ferullo's “Copyright

Implications for Electronic Resources” (2008) are all leading resources written by scholarly communication librarians that offer legal guidance for general librarians.

Legal information needs: Copyright. The literature identifies intellectual property (IP), particularly copyright (Gasaway, 2010; Vesely, 2007), as the primary area where librarians require legal information. Copyright issues are discussed in the scholarly communication literature in two main areas: library use of copyrighted material and efforts to secure author’s rights to their own work.

The literature has engaged library use on both broad, theoretical ground as well as in specific areas of practice. At the theoretical level, research has investigated the effects of strong intellectual property regimes on the dissemination of knowledge. Murray and Stern (2007) investigated the "anticommons effect" – where too many owners paralyze markets because everyone blocks everyone else's use - of scientific scholarship tied to patented ideas unavailable to the general public. Employing a differences-in-differences estimator for 169 patent-paper pairs, they found evidence for a modest anticommons effect with the citation rate after the patent grant declining by approximately 10 to 20 percent and dropping even further as time passes.

Banks and de Blaaj (2007) describe similar anti-commons effect for copyrighted materials, particularly in the grey literature – literature that cannot be found easily through conventional channels such as publishers - that is not readily available through traditional publication channels. In each case unfavorable IP regimes hinder the core mission of the library – to gather, curate and disseminate information to the public - and librarians must be able to engage these issues to protect the public interest and their institutional missions (Kapczynski, 2008; Bennett, 1994).

The literature also addresses specific IP practices in librarianship. Fair use is a major concern. Gasaway (1996) describes the complex, uncertain nature of fair use analysis which is further complicated by the digital environment. Frazier (1999) discusses how a common response to the uncertainty of fair use, the adoption of fair use guidelines, may do more harm than good. This confusion presents significant problems for traditional library practices. Melamut (2000) describes how reserve systems struggle with fair use analysis, particularly in the context of electronic reserves where both law and practice are unclear and evolving. Secor (1997) describes similar problems in the context of acquisitions. In particular he highlights how fair use is harmed, or even surrendered, when libraries license works based on agreements that limit the application of library rights.

Library information needs: Authors' rights. Closely related to copyright, literature on contract law and licensing, often discussed in tandem under the rubric of "author's rights" is also central to scholarly communication. As with copyright, the literature clearly defines the issues (Seadle, 2005) and offers solutions that require library expertise in these areas. Coleman (2007) reports a study of the copyright transfer agreements (CTS) employed by 52 ISI journals. 62% of journals had no information online about self-archiving and 10% prohibit self-archiving.

Scholars such as Leary and Parker (2010) describe the primary remedy to these limitations: author's rights agreements that alter contracts to allow authors to retain their copyrights for use in teaching, archiving, and so forth. These agreements, often called author's addenda since they are added to existing publication agreements to reassert or

retain rights, are crucial to open access initiatives because they “unlock” scholarship so that it can be used for broad library access.

This interrelation between author's rights and scholarly communication has led to the creation of resources such as the ARL SPEC Kit, a collection of position descriptions, exemplary web pages, and other scholarly communication materials (Fischer, 2009). Training programs have also become popular. Wirth and Chadwell (2010) describe a representative example, the Right Well workshop developed at Oregon State University Libraries. This workshop is designed to prepare academic librarians to advocate for best practices as well as supporting their efforts as scholars. A recent study by Austin, Heffernan, and David (2008) surveyed 509 authors about their experience and developed a proposed author's rights agreement based on the results.

Overall, legal issues play a significant role in the scholarly communication process. An analysis of the literature reveals the library community's value of these skills and recognition that they are vital to engaging scholarly communication. A scholarly communication position description must certainly include legal expertise, particularly copyright and author's rights skills and experience.

Creating New Library Positions

Having mapped the literature regarding scholarly communication in libraries and the legal skills that scholarly communication librarians require to engage the scholarly communication process, it is important to consider how these qualities should be operationalized in a position and how these positions should be analyzed in this study. As discussed earlier, there have been efforts to incorporate scholarly communication expertise into the job duties of general librarians. The interdisciplinary nature of

scholarly communication, along with the sort of legal expertise required, however, suggests that there is great value in creating a full-time position (Vesely, 2007; Newman, 2007).

The literature identifies several general qualities that are important for all academic library positions. Although not always the case historically, today all academic librarians should be expected to have at least a graduate degree in the LIS field (Grimes & Grimes, 2008). Similarly, all academic librarians should be comfortable in a collaborative environment (Kloppenborg & Lodge, 2010). The literature also makes it clear that job descriptions should be closely linked to the strategic goals of the library as a whole (Bednarek-Michalska, 2002).

An examination of scholarly communication literature suggests several qualities relevant to a scholarly communication librarian position. Engagement with scholarly communication requires legal expertise, interdisciplinary focus, and the mandate and vision of a leadership position (Newman, 2007). These qualities can inform the selection of comparable positions and may offer useful analogies when evaluating position descriptions.

The first analogy is to technical librarian positions, or those that require specialized non-library skills. In this context a useful analog might be the position descriptions for electronic resource and metadata librarians. Like a proposed scholarly communication librarian, these professionals must have strong grounding in skills that relate to librarianship but special expertise that goes beyond the traditional LIS skillset. For scholarly communication librarians this specialized skill set relates to legal expertise

and familiarity with the forms and practices of publishing. For digital librarians this skill set relates to digital and programming expertise.

Cronies and Henderson (2002) conducted an instructive content analysis of "electronic and digital librarian" positions. Conducted during the 1990s when these positions were first becoming ubiquitous, this study informs the analysis of scholarly communication librarian positions at a similar point in their evolution. Cronies and Henderson reviewed 223 advertisements that included key phrases relevant to the position. They evaluated these positions based on four attributes: title, functional area, institution, and year. They found dramatic increases in the number of "electronic" and "digital" position announcements. Significantly, "electronic" positions involve reference, instruction, collection development, and Web pages. Those tended to be more traditional, library-oriented, and user-centered duties. "Digital" positions, on the other hand, were found to be primarily responsible for administration and project management with emphases on securing funding and overseeing production. This study is useful as a model for data collection based on key phrases and for examining a type of position that develops quickly. Its findings regarding the nature, magnitude, and swiftness of changes in the profession because of technology are also helpful in understanding the way that scholarly communication librarian positions have appeared and developed based on related changes in technology.

Park and Lu (2009) conducted a more thorough examination of 107 metadata librarian positions applying multivariate techniques of cluster and multidimensional scaling to their content analysis. They found that principal responsibilities centered on a core of metadata creation, electronic resource management, awareness of trends, and

digital library development. Han and Hswe (2010) ran a similar study of metadata positions with a focus on the overlap between metadata librarians and traditional catalogers. They found that the metadata librarian position was gradually replacing "cataloging librarian" positions, indicating a change in terminology but also a distinct set of skills. Their analysis of responsibilities broke data down based on "required" and "preferred." Required responsibilities centered on graduate level education, knowledge and experience with metadata schemes, trends, and emerging standards, and technical skills. Preferred responsibilities included experience in cataloging and knowledge of foreign languages. Significantly, many skills appeared in "required" on some descriptions but "preferred" on others. Han and Hswe concluded that there was a "core" set of skills that could fit in either "required" or "preferred" based on individual libraries' preferences and the idiosyncrasies of the position creation process.

A particularly useful point of comparison is offered by a 2009 article on employee expectations for head of technical service positions (Zhu, 2009). Using a similar form of content analysis of job descriptions, this article highlights four areas that have been considered particularly important above and beyond the librarian's skillset: academic preparation through additional advanced degrees, tenure-track position with the accompanying academic credentials, increased technical expertise and experience, and experience and skills outside the technical field.

A second set of scholarly articles, addressing interdisciplinary librarianship, also sheds light on this research. The two best illustrations of this are provided by a 2009 study of Interlibrary Loan Supervisors (Butler, 2009) and an earlier study of subject specialist librarians (White, 1999) both of which engage with multiple disciplines within

and beyond the library and the institution. Butler's study examined purposes, qualifications, typical duties and responsibilities, variations by different types of libraries, collection of interlibrary loan statistics, the best ways to include technology in a job description, relationships among librarians, compliance, ethics and, particularly relevant to this study, "responsibility for copyright compliance" (Butler, 2009, p. 28). It also includes a model job description.

The White study examines another important area: harmonizing positions with shared responsibilities but different titles. Examining business librarians, the study describes numerous distinct job titles with comparable duties including "Business Reference Librarian," "Business Reference Bibliographer," and "Reference/Business Specialist." The study concludes with an overview of the positions and with the observation that the rise of specialized and interdisciplinary librarians creates "a critical need for further research to gain a better understanding of the roles of these types of positions and the benefits that they bring to the academic community" (White, 1999 p. 382).

The third area of research relevant to scholarly communication library positions focuses on the leadership role these librarians play. Leadership is an important issue in academic librarianship that has been written about frequently (Soutter, 2007). Here, the scholarly work most on point is Hernon, Powell, & Young's (2003) *The Next Library Leadership*. This book describes a major Delphi study of the qualities necessary for successful library directors. Using interviews with library directors, the researchers developed a list of attributes and built a consensus on the top-ranked attributes. They also solicited written comments from several members about the final list. This use of

the Delphi method for describing preferred attributes, rather than predicating outcomes, is especially well-suited to library position descriptions, and this book provides a blueprint for future research studies such as this study on scholarly communication librarians.

Creating Scholarly Communication Positions

A consensus has developed that these are important issues and libraries are uniquely-positioned to address them (Nancy & Smith, 2008). These issues are central to librarianship and library skills and expertise are a natural fit to address these issues, making librarians natural leaders in this area (Taylor, 2007; Danner, 2009). In response academic institutions have begun to create scholarly communication committees, task forces, and offices, generally centered in the library. Some institutions have elected to create a full-time position filled by a librarian with a strong background in law. These positions, given a variety of titles but referred to here as a Scholarly Communication Librarian, are increasingly common and a shared set of values tend to animate the duties. In the wider scholarly community, however, this emerging discipline is not well-understood and in many ways it remains undefined (Fuches, & Brannon, 2008; Malenfant, 2010). Even within the limited community of the positions there is little knowledge about the specifics of practice across the positions.

Groups such as ARL (Newman, 2007) and Ithaka (Nancy & Smith, 2008) have begun to gather scattered statements of purpose and position descriptions, but scholarly communication librarian positions remain idiosyncratic and our understanding of trends in the descriptions is limited. The most complete resource is the ARL's "Position Description Collection" which collects twenty-two position descriptions in an online

database (ARL's *Position Description Collection*). While this collection is helpful no one has analyzed or organized these positions.

In short, the literature generally situates the library as the locus for bringing together stakeholders in this field and suggests that the unified voice and subject expertise of a scholarly communication librarian can be especially effective. A very few organizations have begun to collect position descriptions but the literature has only begun to analyze and describe these types of positions.

The ACRL Research and Planning Review Committee identifies scholarly communication as one of the Ten Trends in academic librarianship (ACRL Research Planning & Review Committee, 2010). The Committee describes a trend toward proactive efforts to educate faculty and students about authors' rights and open access publishing options and to recruit content for institutional repositories and explicitly notes the rise of scholarly communication librarians as a preferred method for meeting these aims (ACRL Research Planning & Review Committee, 2010, p 4). This is a burgeoning area that has been studied based on theoretical support and practical action. There has been limited study of the position of scholarly communication librarian itself. Using the themes discussed in this literature review, this study will provide an overview for institutions interested in understanding these positions and aligning their own practice with established practice.

Methods

Qualitative content analysis of existing position descriptions was used to examine data about the current state of the profession. This section introduces and describes this method, its appropriateness for this study, and the way it was used.

Qualitative Analysis of Job Descriptions

Qualitative analysis of content has been described as “a research method for the subjective interpretation of the content of text data through the systematic classification process of coding and identifying themes or patterns” (Hsieh & Shannons, 2005, p. 1278). Patton (2002) adds that this method encompasses “any qualitative data and sense-making effort that takes a volume of qualitative material and attempts to identify core consistencies and meaning” (p. 453). This method is used to analyze raw data by identifying themes within the text and drawing connections across related texts.

This method is appropriate for analysis of scholarly communication job descriptions because this study is designed to interpret the content of job descriptions through a systematic classification of job qualities. It uses this classification to identify core consistencies and meaning across those position descriptions. This method has been used by numerous scholars to examine job descriptions of digital librarians (Cronies and Henderson, 2002), metadata librarians (Park and Lu, 2009; Han and Hwe, 2010), heads of technical service (Zhu, 2009), interlibrary loan supervisors (Butler, 2009) and subject specialist librarians (White, 1999).

Sample, population, and sampling technique. This study examines job descriptions gathered from the Association for Research Libraries’ Position Descriptions Collection (Collection) devoted to scholarly communication positions. This collection, gathered by the ARL’s Institute on Scholarly Communication (ISC) is the largest, most reputable collection of positions in the field. Position descriptions are submitted by individual institutions that choose to volunteer their documents as examples of scholarly

communication positions. These self-selected materials are lightly vetted by the ARL but generally presented in the same form in which they were submitted.

Description of study procedure. Position descriptions were gathered and coded inductively (Wildemuth, 2009, p. 311) based on shared attributes. Categories were developed using the constant comparative method (Glaser & Strauss, 1967), which relies on systematic comparison of each text and integrating categories and their properties through the development of interpretive memos (Wildemuth, 2009, 311). Since the literature provides some theoretical basis for categories the researcher generated an initial list and modified it as new categories emerged inductively (Miles & Huberman, 1994). The coding scheme was tested on a sample text (Weber, 1990) and checked repeatedly throughout the process to prevent “drifting into the idiosyncratic sense of what the codes mean” (Schilling, 2006 p. 33) and rechecked to assess coding consistency.

The data was analyzed based on shared attributes. Conclusions were drawn from the coded data with a particular emphasis on testing categories against the full range of data (Bradley, 1993), in this case the position descriptions. Conclusions reflect the scope of the ARL’s collection – a self-selected group of position descriptions supplied voluntarily and minimally vetted.

This method is advantageous because it is unobtrusive and looks directly at the relevant content. It also allows "closeness" with the text that permits not only investigation but familiarity with the content. Analysis of position descriptions has strong validity – the extent to which test scores measure the attribute it was designed to measure (McDonald, 1999, p.63) - since these documents are carefully crafted to describe

the position and since the group of descriptions analyzed will include the majority of descriptions in the field.

Disadvantages include its subjective nature and openness to errors based on the individual doing the analysis. It can also be time-consuming and cumbersome when large amounts of data are being analyzed. Qualitative methods such as the analysis of job descriptions often have lower reliability – the measure of its consistency (Janda, 1998) - since they represent the subjective decision-making of the researcher. These concerns are mitigated by the small, homogeneous group.

Results

This section presents the results of a content analysis of the 22 position descriptions that make up the ARL's Position Description Collection. It begins with the title assigned to each position. It then describes the qualifications required for each position, including degree requirements, amount of experience needed and expectations for scholarly engagement. Next it turns to the areas of expertise that define the positions. These are grouped based on legal issues, author's rights, and digital issues. Finally, this analysis examines the duties expected of each position. These include monitoring and reporting on trends, providing consultation and instructional support across campus, leading outreach and partnerships across campus and providing leadership and advocacy on campus and on behalf of the university in the larger academic community.

Analysis of positions listed in the ARL's database reveals major trends across the positions but often expressed in distinct ways. The shared attributes revealed by the literature all appear in position descriptions, generally in the overwhelming majority of

positions. These qualities, however, are often couched in terms that are related but distinct.

Title

As scholarly communication librarianship develops across institutions one of the indices of what the position entails is the title of the position. Since “scholarly communication” is a new field encompassing a broad diversity of issues and priorities it should come as no surprise that job descriptions come with a variety of titles.

Naturally the phrase “scholarly communication(s)” is extremely common. 14 of 22 positions (63.6%) include this phrase with another 2 using the phrase “scholarly publishing” or “scholarly services.” Scholarship and scholarly activities seem to be at the core of these positions and this catch-all term is favored by many.

Along with to this emphasis on scholarship, the two touchstones of the discipline - copyright and digital issues - are frequently represented. The term “digital” is included in four positions (18%) as is the term “collections.” Legal issues are included even more frequently with seven uses (31.8%) of “copyright,” “intellectual property” and so forth.

This trend towards enumerating the specific role of the position may be an indication that the library does not expect all parties to know what the phrase “scholarly communication” means. It may also represent an effort to make it clear what kind of scholarly communication position they have created, putting emphasis on legal issues, digital skills and so forth where those skills are most prized.

Table 1.**Characteristics of Job Titles**

Characteristic	Percentage of Positions Representing the Characteristic	Common Examples
“Scholarly”/”Scholarly Communication(s)”	72.7%/63.6%	“Scholarly Communication Librarian” “Library Director, Collections and Scholarly Communication”
“Copyright/Intellectual Property”	31.8%	“Copyright and Licensing Librarian” “Director, Copyright and Publishing Resource Center”
“Digital”	18%	“Head of Digital Services and Scholarly Communication” “Digital Projects Librarian and Institutional Repository Coordinator”

Qualifications

Degree. Since scholarly communication librarianship straddles several established disciplines there is some question about the type of degree preferred and required. Not every position description lists any degree requirements, but of those that did every position requires a graduate degree from an ALA-accredited graduate program in library science.

There is substantially less uniformity on the issue of legal credentials. Of the 17 position descriptions that list degree requirements only 5 (29.4%) require a JD degree from a school of law. Two other institutions prefer “another advanced degree” but do not specify whether that means a JD, a subject degree (MA/MS/PhD) in another academic field, or another type of degree. As we will see there is a broad consensus that legal skills

are crucial to the work of the scholarly communication librarian, but so far libraries seem comfortable with applicants who have demonstrated that expertise even without formal credentials.

Table 2.

Degree Requirements

Characteristic	Percentage of Positions Representing the Characteristic (Percentage of Positions That List Any Degree Requirements)
Master of Science in Library Science	81.8% (100%)
Juris Doctor	22.7% (29.4%)
“Another Advanced Degree”	9% (11.7%)

Experience

Almost half of the position descriptions in the ARL database do not list any required amount of experience. Of those that do the average is between 2-3 years with only two positions going as high as five years of required experience. Analysis of such a small group leaves this number vulnerable to disproportionate influence by a very few positions but within the group that reports there is almost total unanimity.

This level of required experience is interesting and seems to reflect two competing aspects of the position. On the one hand the scholarly communication librarian is generally a highly-ranking position. Often classified as a director, and generally reporting to an Associate University Librarian or even directly to the University Librarian, this position often ranks at a level that would usually require substantial experience and demonstrated leadership ability.

At the same time, however, this type of position is fairly new, so candidates may not have had the opportunity to acquire substantial experience at any institution. Whether

this means the profession will be dominated by younger librarians with outstanding credentials, by older librarians who migrate from related jobs in acquisitions and licensing, university counsel, and so forth, or some other source, remains to be seen.

Table 3.

Experience Required

Characteristic	Percentage
2 Years Experience	18%
3 Years Experience	13.6%
Range of 2-4 years Experience	9%
5 Years Experience	9%
No Experience Requirements Listed	50%

Scholarship

The record of scholarship expected for successful applicants also reflects this tension between an administrative role and a new type of position. Ten of the position descriptions do not list any expectation of scholarly activity, but many of these are brief, with little mention of qualifications generally, focusing more on job duties.

With that said, the majority of positions do indicate that scholarly activity is required. These range from a general requirement to be “active professionally” to the demand for a “strong record of scholarship.” This requirement reflects two roles that are common for scholarly communication librarians. At base, this position serves as an advisor on trends and developments, so it is important to be professionally engaged, keeping abreast of the latest literature, attending conferences, and so forth. One position’s requirement for the scholarly communication librarian to have an “understanding of the environment” gets to the heart of this role.

A scholarly communication librarian also has a second role as an advocate. Because this is an evolving field that was spurred, at least in part, by dissatisfaction with copyright, licensing and the “journal pricing crisis,” there is a strong expectation that these positions will raise awareness and marshal support for changes in these areas. Scholarship in service of these aims – including research, writing and presentations – is at the heart of the scholarly communication librarian positions included in the ARL collection.

Areas of Expertise

Legal issues. Better than 95% of the positions in the ARL database indicate that a scholarly communication librarian will be working with legal issues. As is the case throughout this analysis the terminology varies a good bit, but the underlying theme is consistent. Well over half of the position descriptions (63.6%) use the term “copyright” while another roughly 60% use the term “intellectual property” to describe the duties of the position. Obviously there is some overlap, but these phrases taken together indicate the central role that legal issues play.

The other term that is frequently used is “licensing.” Better than a third of the positions (36.3%) explicitly refer to licensing or a related term such as “permissions.” In the current environment acquisitions of digital databases and individual documents for use in electronic reserve systems is a major part of keeping the collection up to date. The legal skills expected of scholarly communication librarians are a natural fit for these transactions.

Related terms such as “fair use” and “public domain” are also mentioned in several position descriptions as are other legal terms such as “privacy” and “international

law.” Catch-all phrases such as “legal issues” also appear and a sizable minority (22.7%) use language that indicates the scholarly communication librarian’s role keeping abreast of “legislative action” or “legislative developments.”

Table 4.

Areas of Legal Expertise

Characteristic	Percentage of Positions Representing the Characteristic	Common Examples
Copyright	63.6%	“Copyright Issues” “International Copyright”
Intellectual Property	60%	“Intellectual Property Issues” “Intellectual Property Compliance”
Licensing	36.3%	“Licenses Electronic Resources” “Licensing of Print and Electronic Material”
Legislative Developments	22.7%	“Legislative Initiatives” “Legislative Actions that Might Effect These Issues”
Fair Use	13.6%	“Policies Related to Copyright and Fair Use” “Serve as the Library’s Primary Resource on Fair Use”
Other	36.3%	“Public Domain” “Rights Management” “Privacy”

New forms of scholarly activity. Along with this legal expertise, scholarly communication librarians are consistently expected to provide guidance and advocacy for core “scholarship management” issues such as open access and institutional repositories. As with legal issues, better than 90% of the positions in the ARL database explicitly describe duties in this area.

There is not, however, a single phrase that captures these issues. Some positions describe a role “advising faculty as they work with publishers” or providing “guidance for faculty on scholarly communication matters.” Others refer to “sustainable models of scholarly communication” or “the library as a key partner in new models of scholarly communication.” As much as in any area language here is penumbral; an unspoken “core” role exists but libraries are struggling to name and define it, instead relying on terms and phrases that suggest or imply that core.

The most prevalent terms refer to projects and methods that relate to these issues. “Open access” is included in just over 40% of the position descriptions. “Institutional repositories” appear even more frequently, with 68% of descriptions including the phrase. Certainly these phrases appear because they are “hot” issues that many libraries are exploring in the present moment. They also seem to appear as a sort of signifier for the larger issues alluded to by the phrases quoted above.

There is also a growing consensus that this work relates specifically to faculty, not just in their role as authors but also in their work within the institution teaching and leading student work. A small majority (54.5%) of position descriptions expressly list “faculty support” as an important trait.

Digital. The other prong of these inchoate “new” issues is the use of digital technologies. As with legal issues there is not an indication that major credentialing is generally expected but a successful scholarly communication librarian must have experience and expertise with digital scholarship. More than 95% of the position descriptions refer to digital issues, web-based publishing, eScholarship and the like.

Table 5.**Areas of Scholarly Expertise**

Characteristic	Percentage of Positions Representing the Characteristic	Common Examples
Institutional Repositories	68%	“Value of Depositing Scholarship in the Institutional Repository” “policies and Practices Relating to Institutional Repositories”
Faculty Support	54.5%	“Scholarly Communication Needs of Faculty” “Outreach to Faculty”
Open Access	40%	“Outreach About Open Access” “Ability to Address Issues Such As Open Access”
Others	40.9%	“New and evolving Methods of Distribution” “Sustainable Models of Scholarly Communication”

Some position descriptions use targeted phrases such as “metadata” or “eScience” but most rely on general phrases such as “emergent technology” or “new and developing methods of distribution.” These descriptions tend to center around specific digital practices such as digital publishing (36.3%) and building digital collections (27%). Other than these phrases that include the term “digital,” no single term or phrase is used by more than 15% of the position descriptions. As with “author’s rights” above the position descriptions are less about defining specific tasks and more focused on outlining a general area where the scholarly communication librarian will establish expertise and then provide leadership for the university.

Table 6.**Areas of Digital Expertise**

Characteristic	Percentage of Positions Representing the Characteristic	Common Examples
Digital	95.4%	“Digital Environment” “Digital Initiatives”
Digital Publishing	36.3%	“Web-Based Publishing” “New and Evolving Methods of Distribution”
Digital Collections	27%	“Building Digital Collections” “Digital Archives”
Other	59%	“Emergent Technology” “New and Evolving Methods of Distribution”

Duties

Monitor trends. As discussed above, a scholarly communication librarian has the unique role of defining their own discipline for the university. As much as any position on campus the scholarly communication librarian must monitor trends to report to administration. More than 90% of the positions surveyed address this role. Many simply list “monitor trends” along with reporting on developments as a duty but several go further. Some specify that this should include “national and international” trends, while other focus on “legislative and policy developments” or “opportunities for growth.”

Consultation/instruction. In many ways the scholarly communication librarian acts like a specialized reference librarian, assisting the university with information services in both one-on-one consultations and small group instruction sessions. 68% of position descriptions explicitly include these phrases as important aspects of the day to day practice of the scholarly communication librarian.

Consultation is mentioned infrequently, with less than 20% of positions including the phrase. Many others, however, include terms that may encompass this duty. Several indicate that “advisory services” be offered and the scholarly communication librarian should “support the university’s researchers,” “assist faculty,” or offer “guidance” on legal issues. All fifteen positions that refer to these issues use general language that might be interpreted to include some form of on-on-one consultation with stakeholders beyond library administration.

Similarly, just over 40% of the positions expressly mention “instruction” or related terms such as “workshops.” But all 15 positions that address these issues use language that may be read as requiring instruction across the university. In most cases the position “advises, counsels and educates” by whatever means best-serve the university community. As with most librarians, the scholarly communication librarian is a campus resource, not simply a policy advisor for administration.

Outreach. That campus-wide role often goes beyond answering questions or bringing stakeholders up to date on legal rules. The literature identifies the scholarly communication librarian as the hub of campus activities and the position descriptions in the ARL database confirm this role. More than 95% of positions include language describing outreach in terms of both seeking out partnerships and promoting new projects. Once again many phrases are used to get at a shared core practice. Some positions describe a “liaison” role while others discuss a “partner” role.

A substantial minority of the position descriptions (45%) focus on promotion of services. Several go further, empowering the scholarly communication librarian to set the “strategic and innovative direction.”

Leadership. These institutions that so empower make up the bedrock of the final role of scholarly communication librarians identified in the position descriptions: leadership. Better than 81% of the positions surveyed mention this leadership role with almost half explicitly using the term “lead.” This leadership comes in two main forms, on campus leadership and national advocacy.

On campus leadership is the most common with all 18 relevant positions including some form of “leadership role within campus” or “taking the lead in developing policy.” A quarter of positions take this a step farther, charging their scholarly communication librarians to “represent the library in state, regional, and national forums” as well as in consortial groups to “advocate for change.”

Summary and Conclusions

This analysis reveals some shared characteristics as well as several points of tension in the evolution of the scholarly communication librarian. The core set of issues identified in the literature appear in the position descriptions analyzed, but the language used is highly variable. This represents a starting point for understanding. To the extent that uncertainties revealed by this study reflect uncertainty in the profession, there is work to be done guiding the evolution of scholarly communication librarianship in the coming years.

Table 7.**Duties**

Characteristic	Percentage of Positions Representing the Characteristic	Common Examples
Monitor Trends	95%	“Legislative and Policy Developments”
“Consultation” – Exact Term	20%	“Primary Focus Will be on Communications, Consultation, and Problem-Solving”
Consultation - Related Terms	68%	“Provide Counsel on Copyright Issues”
“Instruction” – Exact Term	40%	“Provide Reference Consultations and Instruction”
Instruction – Related Terms	68%	“Plays a Critical Educational and Advisory Role”
Outreach - General	95%	“Lead Scholarly Communication Outreach Efforts”
Outreach - Services	45%	“Enhance Awareness of Scholarly Communication and Digital Copyright Issues”
Outreach – Strategic Direction	27%	“Provides Strategic and Innovative Direction”
Leadership - General	81%	“Leadership Abilities” “Lead the Libraries’ Efforts”
Leadership – On Campus	81%	“Provide Campus Leadership” “Provide a Leadership Role Within the Campus Community”
Leadership - National	25%	“Lead Change” “Represent the Library in State, Regional, and National Forums”

Common Characteristics of Scholarly Communication Librarian Position

Descriptions

Analysis of the position descriptions in the ARL collection reveals a set of characteristics that may be described as making up a “typical” scholarly communication librarian position, or at least one typical of the descriptions included in the collection. Institutions that have not chosen to deposit descriptions are not reflected and the absence of serious vetting creates the possibility that a few idiosyncratic positions may alter the contours of a “typical” position.” That said, the data reveals several areas where broad consensus seems to exist among the collection.

A hypothetical “typical” scholarly communication librarian position title is very likely to include the phrase “scholarly communication.” There is a good chance that that term will be linked to another descriptive term related either to legal or digital issues. Whether this reflects uncertainty about general knowledge surrounding the phrase “scholarly communication,” a desire to more specifically identify the areas of expertise expected in this broad field, or simply the administrative oversight of multiple units expected of many of these positions is unclear.

This hypothetical position almost certainly requires a graduate degree in Library Science. A second degree is less likely to be required but may be preferred, especially where that degree is evidence of subject expertise such as a Juris Doctor. Roughly two to three years of experience are likely to be required and a record of scholarly activity – both presentations and publication – can be expected to be at least strongly preferred.

In terms of expertise, this position is overwhelmingly likely to require strength in three areas: legal issues, new forms of scholarly ship, and digital issues. Legal expertise

generally centers around copyright and intellectual property issues. There is also a strong minority that expresses a need for expertise on licensing practice and tracking legislative developments. Expertise related to new forms of scholarship is equally valued with explicit support for work with institutional repositories and authors' rights issues. Expertise related to digital issues is also required for essentially all of the positions included in the collection, but there is less agreement on the specific issues and practices this should center around.

The duties of this hypothetical position are a bit more varied, but it almost certainly will include responsibilities related to monitoring trends in the area and providing outreach across and beyond the campus. There is also strong support across the collected position descriptions for leadership and coalition-building. Specific duties are likely to include instruction and consultation.

Taken together, a rough outline of a position emerges dedicated supporting and raising awareness about practice the intersection of legal, digital and scholarly work. Significantly, as illustrated by Appendix B, these positions descriptions are most similar in the duties they require. The greatest percentages of agreement relate to the leadership, outreach and monitoring responsibilities of the position. There is also broad agreement about the type of expertise required with legal and especially digital issues appearing in nearly all of the position descriptions.

The most diverse area in the collection relates to qualification. Here there is substantially less agreement and other than the requirement for an advanced degree in library science, no qualification or level of experience appears in more than a quarter of the position descriptions. In the context of this collection, at least, consensus is forming

around what these positions should provide but there is substantially less agreement on what qualities are required in a candidate to prepare them to meet these needs.

Common Themes

Distinctions with a difference? As noted throughout, despite the shared priorities found in the literature, the language of scholarly communication position descriptions is quite varied. What is unclear is whether this is a distinction without a difference. It is possible that the phrases “copyright” and “intellectual property” are being used interchangeably to refer to a general need to address legal ownership of scholarly output. Although it might confound a patent attorney, this somewhat colloquial use effectively communicates the general - and often uncertain - nature of the legal issues involved.

On the other hand, it might be unwise to simply dismiss these distinctions. Position descriptions are drafted with great care. An STM university whose faculty has a substantial output of patentable ideas may choose the term “intellectual property” deliberately to signal that the scholarly communication librarian must be able to handle the full panoply of rights involved.

Most likely the position descriptions in the ARL’s collection include both of these phenomena; some institutions carefully selected terms with an eye to technical nuance while others chose to use the more general sense to convey their needs and expectations in broad strokes. This muddies the waters for the current study but does reveal a question for institutions creating or revising positions in the future. As the profession continues to evolve institutions will have to decide how much they want to target specific attributes and how comfortable they are with using terms in a more general sense.

A “penumbra position?” This study also raises the issue of how much an institution is able to carefully describe the duties of a scholarly communication librarian. As described above, much of the scholarly communication librarian’s role consists of monitoring trends. This presents an immediate issue for drafting a position description since the nature of the work can be expected to be in a constant state of flux.

More broadly, the umbrella term “scholarly communication” still seems to function as a stand-in for a broad, undefined set of concerns. Institutions hoping to engage these issues may be frustrated by the inability to pin down exactly what defines these issues. Certainly raising awareness and mobilizing support is more difficult when librarians are not able to articulate exactly what is involved.

One of the challenges that scholarly communication librarians must grapple with is articulating what they do and why it is important. Particularly in a climate where budgets are being slashed and every library effort is being heavily scrutinized the absence of a clear coherent description of the needs being met jeopardizes scholarly communication efforts and even the positions themselves. Despite the current definitional difficulties scholarly communication cannot afford to remain a penumbra position.

The Future of Scholarly Communication Librarianship

Scholarly communication is a vital but inchoate discipline in academic librarianship today. Modern practice is poorly-defined within many institutions and idiosyncratic from institution to institution. There is a clear need for information about current practice for decision-makers. There is also a need for dialogue between stakeholders about the priorities of the discipline as it evolves in the coming years.

This research can help meet each of these needs by aggregating and analyzing position descriptions. But this first impression should be a catalyst for greater action. Whether they choose to form a committee, host an event, or create a position, institutions can use this information to engage scholarly communication more effectively in light of current practice. Established scholarly communication librarians should begin a normative discussion about their profession and the direction it should develop. It is hoped that this information about the state of the scholarly communication librarian will help make the future of the profession brighter.

References

- ACRL Research Planning & Review Committee. (2010). 2010 top ten trends in academic libraries: A review of the current literature. *College & Research Libraries News*, 71(6), 286-292.
- ALR's Institute on Scholarly Communication. (n.d.) *Position Description Collection*. Available at: <http://www.arl.org/sc/institute/fair/position-descriptions.shtml>
- Allard, S. Mack, T. and Feltner-Reichard, M. (2005). The librarian's role in institutional repositories: A content analysis of the literature. *Reference Services Review*, 33(3) 325-336.
- Austin, A., Heffernan, M., and David, N. (2008). Academic authorship, publishing agreements and open access: Survey results. Available at: <http://eprints.qut.edu.au/13623/>
- Bailey, C. (2010). Transforming scholarly publishing through open access: A bibliography. *Digital Scholarship*. Available at: <http://www.escholarlypub.com/tsp/transforming.pdf>
- Bankier, J. and Perciali, I. (2008). The institutional repository rediscovered: What can a university do for open access publishing? *Serials Review*, 34(1), 21-26.
- Banks, M. and de Blaaj, C. (2007). Implications of copyright evolution for the future of scholarly communication and grey literature. *The Grey Journal*, 3(1), 31-35.
- Bednarek-Michalska, B. (2002). Creating a job description for an electronic resources librarian. *Library Management*, 23(8), 378-383.

- Bell, S. and Krasulski, M. (2004). Electronic reserves, library databases and courseware: A complementary relationship. *Journal of Interlibrary Loan, Document Delivery & Electronic Reserve*, 15(1), 75-85.
- Bell, S. and Shank, J. (2008). *Academic librarianship by design: A blended librarian's guide to the tools and techniques*. New York: American Library Association.
- Bennett, S. (1994). The copyright challenge: Strengthening the public interest in the digital age. *Library Journal*, 119(19), 34-37.
- Bergman, S. (2006). The scholarly communication movement: Highlights and recent developments. *Collection Building*. 25(4), 108-128.
- Borgman, C. (2007). *Scholarship in the digital age*. Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Boyle, J. (2008). *The public domain: Enclosing the commons of the mind*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Brown, D. (2010). Repositories and journals: Are they in conflict? A literature review of relevant literature. *Aslib Proceedings*, 62(2), 112-43.
- Butler, M. (2009). Job descriptions for interlibrary loan supervisors: Core functions and best practices. *Journal of Interlibrary Loan, Document Delivery & Information Supply*, 19(1), 21-31.
- Case, M. (2009). Scholarly communication: ARL as a catalyst for change. *portal: Libraries and the Academy*, 9(3), 381-395.
- Cassella, M and Calvi, L. (2010). New journal models and publishing perspectives in the evolving digital environment. *IFLA Journal*, 36(1), 7-15.
- Chan, D. Kwok, C. and Yip, S. (2005). Changing roles of reference librarians: The case of the HKUST Institutional Repository, *Reference Services Review*, 33(3), 268 - 282.

- Choia, Y. and Rasmussen, E. (2009). What qualifications and skills are important for digital librarian positions in academic libraries? A job advertisement analysis. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 35(5), 457-467.
- Coleman, A. (2007). Self-archiving and the copyright transfer agreements of ISI-ranked library and information science journals. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 58(2), 286-296.
- Corbett, H. (2009). The crisis in scholarly communication, Part I: Understanding the issues and engaging your faculty. *Technical Services Quarterly*, 26(2), 125-134.
- Courtois, M. and Turtle, E. (2008). Using faculty focus groups to launch a scholarly communication program. *International Digital Library Perspectives*, 24(3), 160-166.
- Crews, K. (2006). *Copyright law for librarians and educators*. Chicago: American Library Association.
- Croneis, K, and Henderson, P. (2002). Electronic and digital librarian positions: A content analysis of announcements from 1990 through 2000. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 28(4), 232-237.
- Crow, R. (2002). The case for institutional repositories: A SPARC position paper. Discussion paper. *Scholarly Publication and Academic Resources Coalition*. Available at: http://scholarship.utm.edu/20/1/SPARC_102.pdf
- Danner, R. (2009). Supporting scholarship: Thoughts on the role of the academic librarian, *Journal of Law and Education*, 39, 1-12.
- Donovan, G. and Estlund, K. (2007). New librarians and scholarly communication: get involved. *College & Research Libraries News*, 68(3), 155-158.
- Drake, M. (2007). Scholarly communication in turmoil. *Information Today*, 24(2), 18-19.
- Duncan, J., Walsh, W., Daniels, T. and Becker, J., (2006). Issues in scholarly communications: Creating a campus-wide dialog. *The Serials Librarian*, 50 (3/4), 243-248.

- Ferreira, M, Rodrigues, E., Baptista, Ana, and Saraiva, R. (2008). Carrots and sticks: Some ideas on how to create a successful institutional repository. *D-Lib Magazine*, 14(1).
- Ferullo, D. (2004). Major copyright issues in academic libraries: Legal implications of a digital environment. *Journal of Library Administration*, 40(1), 23-40.
- Fischer, K. (2009). *SPEC Kit 310 Author Addenda*. Washington: Association of Research libraries.
- Frazier, K. (1999). What's wrong with fair-use guidelines for the academic community? *Journal of the American Society for Information Science*, 50(14), 1320-1323.
- Fuchs, S. and Brannon, P. (2008). Developing effective scholarly communication advocates: A case study. *Georgia Institute of Technology*: <http://hdl.handle.net/1853/20663>
- Furlough, M. (2008). University presses and scholarly communication: potential for collaboration. *College & Research Libraries News*, 69(1), 32-36.
- Gasaway, L. (1996). Universities, libraries and fair use in the digital age. *The Acquisitions Librarian*, 8(15), 69-87.
- Gasaway, L. (2010). Libraries, digital content, and copyright. *Vanderbilt Journal of Entertainment and Technology Law*, 12(755), 755-778.
- Ghosh, M. (2009). Information professionals in the open access era: the competencies, challenges and new roles. *Information Development*, 25(1), 33-42.
- Ginsparg, P., Rockwell, R., and Unsworth, J. (1997). The gateway in research and scholarly communication. In Dowler, L. (Ed.) *Gateways to knowledge: the role of academic libraries in teaching, learning, and research*. (pp. 41-92). Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Graham, J. Skaggs, B. and Stevens, K. (2005). Digitizing a gap: a state-wide institutional repository project. *Reference Services Review*, 33(3), 337-345.
- Grimes, M. and Grimes, P. (2008). The academic librarian labor market and the role of the master of library science degree: 1975 through 2005. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 34(4), 332-339.

- Hall, G. (2008). *Digitize this book! The politics of new media, or why we need open access now*. Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press.
- Han, M. and Hswe, P. (2010). The evolving role of the metadata librarian: Competencies found in job descriptions. *Library Resources & Technical Services*, 54(3), 129-141.
- Harley, S. Acord, S. Earl-Novell, S., Lawrence, S. and King, C.J. (2010). Assessing the future landscape of scholarly communication: An exploration of faculty values and needs in seven disciplines. *Center for Studies in Higher Education*. Available at: <http://escholarship.org/uc/item/15x7385g>
- Harnad, S. and Brody T. (2004). Comparing the impact of open access (OA) vs non-OA articles in the same journal. *D-Lib Magazine* 10(6) <http://eprints.ecs.soton.ac.uk/10207/>
- Hernon, P. Powell, R. and Young, A. (2003). *The next library leadership: Attributes of academic and public library directors*, New York: Libraries Unlimited.
- Ho, A. (2010) Developments in library scholarly communication services, *Western Libraries Librarian & Archivist Presentations*: <http://ir.lib.uwo.ca/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1016&context=wlpres>
- Hoorn, E. and van der Graf, M. (2006). Copyright issues in open access research journals: The authors' perspective. *D-Lib Magazine*, 12(2).
- Jantz, R. C., and Wilson, M. (2008). Institutional repositories: Faculty deposits, marketing, and the reform of scholarly communication. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 34(3), 186-95.
- Kapczynski, A. (2008). The access to knowledge mobilization and new politics of intellectual property. *Yale Law Review*, 117(1), 804-885.
- Kloppenborg, P. and Lodge, D. (2010). Forgotten anything: library staff competencies for the learning commons. *Library Management*, 31(3), 169-185.

- Kurtz, M. Eichhorn, G. Accomazzi, A., Grant, C., Demleitner, M., Henneken, E., and Murray, S. (2006). The effect of use and access on citations. *Information Process and Management*, 41(6), 1395-1402.
- Leary, H. and Parker, P. (2007). Academic author rights: Knowing is more than half the battle. *Tech Trends*, 54(3), 23-25.
- Lessig, L. (2005). *Free culture: The nature and future of creativity*. New York: Penguin.
- Lynch, C. (1993). The transformation of scholarly communication and the role of the library in the age of networked information. *The Serials Librarian*, 23(3/4), 5-20.
- Lynch, C. (2003). Institutional repositories: essential infrastructure for scholarship in the digital age. *portal: Libraries and the Academy*, 3(2), 327-336.
- Malenfant, K. (2010). Leading change in the system of scholarly communication: A case study of engaging liaison librarians for outreach to faculty, *College & Research Libraries*. 71(1), 63-76.
- McGinnis, L. (1999). Electronic reserves at the University of North Carolina: Milestones and challenges in implementing a new service. *Journal of Interlibrary Loan, Document Delivery & Information Supply*, 9(4), 73-85.
- Melamut, S. (2000). Pursuing fair use, law libraries, and electronic reserves. *Law Library Journal*, 92(2), 157-192.
- Mercer, H. (2010). Almost halfway there: An analysis of the open access behaviors of academic librarians. *College and Research Libraries* (in press) Available at: <http://crl.acrl.org/content/early/2010/09/14/crl-167.full.pdf+html>
- Murray, F. and Stern, S. (2007). Do formal intellectual property rights hinder the free flow of scientific knowledge?: An empirical test of the anti-commons hypothesis. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 63(4), 648-687.

- Nancy, M. and Smith, K. (2008). Current models of digital scholarly communication: Results of an investigation conducted by Ithaka for the Association of Research Libraries, *ARL Report*: <http://eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED503401.pdf>
- Newman, K. Blecic, D. and Armstrong, K. (2007). *SPEC Kit 299: Scholarly communication education initiatives*. Washington: Association of Research Libraries.
- Ober, J. (2006). Facilitating open access: developing support for author control of copyright. *College & Research Libraries News*, 67(4), 219-221.
- Odlyzko, A. (2002). The rapid evolution of scholarly communication. *Learned Publishing*, 15(1) 7-19.
- Ogburn, J. (2008). Defining and achieving success in the movement to change scholarly communication. *Library Resources & Technical Services*, 52(2), 44-53.
- Palmer, C., Teffeau, L. and Newton, M. (2008). Strategies for institutional repository development: A case study of three evolving initiatives. *Library Trends*, 57(2), 142-167.
- Palmer, K., Kristi L., Dill, E., and Christie, C. (2009). Where there's a will there's a way?: Survey of academic librarian attitudes about open access. *College & Research Libraries*, 70(4), 315-35.
- Park, J. and Lu, C. (2009). Metadata professionals: Roles and competencies as reflected in job announcements, 2003-2006. *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly*, 47(2), 145-160.
- Phillips, H. Carr, R. and Teal, J. (2005). Leading roles for reference librarians in institutional repositories: One library's experience. *Reference Services Review*, 33(3), 301-311.
- Pringle, J. (2004) Do open access journals have impact? *Nature* (Web Focus).
<http://www.nature.com/nature/focus/accessdebate/19.html>
- Robert S. and Peck, R. (1999). *Libraries, the First Amendment, and cyberspace: What you need to know*. Chicago: American Library Association.

- Rieh, S. St. Jean, B., Yakel, E., Markey, K., and Kim, J. (2008). Perceptions and experiences of staff in the planning and implementation of institutional repositories. *Library Trends*, 57(2), 168-190.
- Roel, E. (2004). Electronic journal publication: A new library contribution to scholarly communication. *College and Research Libraries News*; 65(1), 23-26.
- Salo, D. (2008). Innkeeper at the roach motel. *Library Trends*, 57(2), 98-123.
- Seadle, M. (2005). Copyright in the networked world: Author's rights. *Library Hi Tech*, 23(1), 130-136.
- Secor, G. (1997). Fair use in a pay-per-use world. *Library Acquisitions: Practice and Theory*, 21(1), 53-59.
- Shreeves, S. and Cragin, M. (2008). Introduction: Institutional repositories: current state and future. *Library Trends*, 57(2), 89-97.
- Smith, N. and Presser, P. (2005). Embed with the faculty: Legal information skills online. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 31(3) 247-262.
- Soutter, J. (2007). Academic librarian competency: A description of trends in the peer-reviewed journal literature of 2001-2005. *Partnership: the Canadian Journal of Library and Information Practice and Research*, 2(1) Available at:
<http://www.criticalimprov.com/index.php/perj/article/viewArticle/252/376> (E)
- Soules, A. and Ferullo, D. (2008). Copyright implications for electronic resources. In Yu, H. Ed. *Electronic resource management in libraries: Research and practice*, 145-173 New York: Information Science Reference.
- Taylor, S. (2007). Coming full circle: Scholarly communication and the role of liaison librarians, *University of British Columbia*: https://darchive.mblwhoilib.org/bitstream/handle/1912/2876/Taylor_IAMSLIC2008.pdf;jsessionid=EAFE2E8825675FF386F5BDE453791416?sequence=1

- Turtle, E. and Courtois, M. (2007). Scholarly communication: Science librarians as advocates for change. *Issues in Science and Technology Librarianship*, 51(1).
- Van Orsdel, L. (2007). The state of scholarly communications: An environmental scan of emerging issues, pitfalls, and possibilities. *The Serials Librarian*, 52(1), 191 - 209.
- Vesely, S. (2007). Do you need a copyright librarian? *Internet Reference Services Quarterly*, 11(4), 69 – 82.
- Wagner, B. (2010). Open Access Citation Advantage: An Annotated Bibliography. *Issues in Science and Technology Librarianship*, <http://www.istl.org/10-winter/article2.html>
- Wagner, V. (2008). Processing reserves, seeking permissions and engaging the campus: How the library serves as the copyright touchstone. *Journal of Interlibrary Loan, Document Delivery & Electronic Reserve*, 18(2), 247-254.
- Waaijers, L. (2002). Stratum continuum of information: Scholarly communication and the role of university libraries. *New Library World*; 103(4)165-71.
- White, G. (1999). Academic subject specialist positions in the United States: A content analysis of announcements from 1990 through 1998. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 25(5), 372-382.
- Willinsky, J. (2005). *The access principle: The case for open access to research and scholarship*. Cambridge, MIT Press.
- Wirth, A. and Chadwell, F. (2010). Rights well: An author's rights workshop for librarians. *portal: Libraries and the academy*, 10(3), 337-354.
- Zhu, L. (2009). Employers' expectations for head of technical services positions in academic libraries. *Library Collections, Acquisitions, and Technical Services*, 33(4), 123-131.

Appendix A: List of Position Descriptions

Institution	Title
Appalachian State University	Scholarly Communications and Intellectual Property Librarian
Binghamton University	Scholarly Communications and Library Grants Officer
University of California, Los Angeles	Associate University Librarian, Scholarly Communications
University of California, Los Angeles	Copyright and Licensing Librarian
University of California, Riverside	Licensing, Copyright and Scholarly Communications Librarian
Columbia University	Digital Repository Coordinator
University of Connecticut	Digital Projects Librarian and Institutional Repository Coordinator
Georgia Tech	Systems Analyst
Harvard University	Office for Scholarly Communication Program Manager
University of Kansas	Assistant/Associate Dean for Collections and Scholarly Services
MIT	Scholarly Publishing and Licensing Consultant
University of Michigan at Ann Arbor	Lead Copyright Officer
University of Minnesota	Director, Copyright and Publishing Resource Center
North Carolina State University	Scholarly Communication Librarian
Northwestern University	Scholarly Communication and Sciences Librarian
University of Oregon	Head of Scholarly Communication Services
Texas A&M University Libraries	Head of Digital Services and Scholarly Communication
University of Texas–Pan American	Copyright and Scholarly Communication Librarian
University of Washington	Director, Information Resources, Collections and Scholarly Communication
Washington State University	Scholarly Communication Librarian
Wayne State University	Library Director, Collections and Scholarly Communications
University of Western Ontario	Research and Development Librarian, Scholarly Communication

Appendix B: Aggregated List of Characteristics in ARL Collection Position Descriptions

Ranked from Most to Least Common

Characteristic	Percentage of Positions Representing the Characteristic
Expertise > Digital - General	95.4%
Duties > Outreach - General	95%
Duties > Monitor Trends	95%
Degree > Master of Science in Library Science	81.8%
Duties > Leadership - General	81%
Duties > Leadership – On Campus	81%
Duties > Instruction – Related Terms	68%
Duties > Consultation - Related Terms	68%
Expertise > Institutional Repositories	68%
Expertise > Copyright	63.6%
Expertise > Intellectual Property	60%
Expertise > Other Digital	59%
Expertise > Faculty Support	54.5%
Duties > Outreach - Services	45%
Expertise > Others - Scholarly	40.9%
Duties > “Instruction” – Exact Term	40%
Expertise > Open Access	40%
Expertise > Licensing	36.3%
Expertise > Other Legal	36.3%
Expertise > Digital Publishing	36.3%
Expertise > “Copyright/Intellectual Property”	31.8%
Duties > Outreach – Strategic Direction	27%
Expertise > Digital Collections	27%
Duties > Leadership - National	25%
Duties > Legislative Developments	22.7%
Degree > Juris Doctor	22.7%
Duties > “Consultation” – Exact Term	20%
Experience > 2 Years	18%
Expertise > “Digital”	18%
Expertise > Fair Use	13.6%
Experience > 3 Years	13.6%
Degree > “Another Advanced Degree”	9%
Experience > Range of 2-4 years	9%
Experience > 5 Years	9%