I. GROWING SYNERGY: There is a growing synergy among seven forces at American, major-research universities:

1) **Access by faculty members to others’ work:** the need for faculty to have access to the latest scholarly/research journals, books, and other materials;

2) **Access by others to faculty members’ work:** the need for faculty to have the largest possible audience of like-minded scholars and researchers for their work;

3) **Electronic infrastructures:** the growing availability, power, and falling costs of nonproprietary, electronic infrastructures—such as those in universities like Rutgers—to disseminate scholarly materials, e.g., RUL’s own RUcore web site, which provides a venue for collections of faculty e-prints and for the open-access posting of RU dissertations.

4) **Working models:** the growing adoption of policies and infrastructure to support electronic open-access to scholarly/research materials:

   A) by the Federal government (specifically, NIH),

   B) by specific disciplines, such as

      a) the web site [http://arXiv.org](http://arXiv.org), which includes “open access to 530,415 e-prints in Physics, Mathematics, Computer Science, Quantitative Biology, Quantitative Finance and Statistics.”

      b) the Public Library of Science (PLoS) journals, at [www.plos.org](http://www.plos.org), which specializes in biology and medicine journals.

   C) by such leading universities as Harvard (having the university own copyrights to faculty journal articles; MIT (putting all faculty publications in an open-access repository); and the University of California.
5) **Growing costs of proprietary journals, etc.:** The growing costs of proprietary journals, books, and scholarly/research materials—for an excellent summary of these and related issues nationally and at Rutgers, see the Powerpoint slides from Bob Sewell’s January 30 presentation to the NBFC, which is available in RuCore at: [http://mss3.libraries.rutgers.edu/dlr/TMP/rutgers-lib_24342-PDF-1.pdf](http://mss3.libraries.rutgers.edu/dlr/TMP/rutgers-lib_24342-PDF-1.pdf)

6) **Moving journals from proprietary to nonproprietary:** The technical feasibility of moving journals and other scholarly materials to open-access venues, since faculty typically produce the content of these materials, perform the associated editorial work in preparing them for publication, and sit on journal editorial boards.

   A) This feasibility has been demonstrated by instances—e.g., in the computer sciences—in which journals with their editorial boards have simply moved from proprietary to nonproprietary, open-access venues.

7) **Need to reduce costs:** The increasing pressures to reduce costs within American Universities, in part because of the worldwide economic recession.

II. **FACULTY ROLE NATIONALLY:** Generally, this collection of forces strongly argues for university faculty to work closely with administrations to promote increases in open-access publication—for both increasing access and for reducing costs.

8) **Library organizations:** A coalition of academic library organizations, in which the RUL was represented by Marianne Gaunt, recently called for this goal in a report entitled: “Universities Need to Promote Broader Dissemination of Research and Scholarship.” The groups in the coalition include: The Association of Research Libraries (ARL), The Association of American Universities (AAU), The Coalition for Networked Information (CNI), and the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC)

9) An excellent discussion of these issues, with many important details, has been written by Bob Sewell and Jim Niessen of RUL. It can be found on a section of RUL’s web site, titled, “Scholarly Communication and Open Access: Research and Publication in Flux,” at the following: [http://www.libraries.rutgers.edu/rul/scholarly_comm/scholarly_comm.shtml](http://www.libraries.rutgers.edu/rul/scholarly_comm/scholarly_comm.shtml)

III. **POTENTIAL CONCRETE ACTIONS AT RUTGERS:** Specifically, this collection of forces argues for particular actions at Rutgers, such as:

10) **Promotion criteria:** Urging faculty involved in promotion decision-making to consider the quality of journals, independent of whether they are proprietary or open-access—to combat the present, second-case status frequently ascribed to open-access journals.

11) **Survey of faculty:** Having the university conduct a University-wide survey of faculty attitudes towards, involvement with, and use of open-access publications.

12) **Recognition for RUcore participation:** Providing University-wide recognition to faculty who list their publications on RUcore.

13) **Google-searchable:** As part of encouraging faculty to list their publications on RUcore, RUcore should be accessible by Google Scholar, or some other open-access search engine. Otherwise, this limits the accessibility of the items on RUcore, and other related university
repositories. What would be ideal is to search with Google Scholar and have access in a single search to all the university repositories.

14) **Scanning services**: Note that as an effort to promote RUcore, RUL’s Imaging Services is piloting a new service for Rutgers faculty that involves scanning eligible paper-based materials at no charge. (Since it is a pilot, it is not yet listed on the RUL website.)

15) **“One-stop-shopping”**: Coordinating the documentation of faculty accomplishments—now in different places—into one place and one entry point. This one entry point would then list faculty accomplishments in:

   A) The Annual Faculty Survey (run by Institutional Research),
   B) The Promotion forms,
   C) The RUcore (run by RUL), and
   D) NIH’s PubMed Central (via RUcore entry),
   E) Individual departments like Mechanical Engineering, which have their own repository of faculty articles – see [http://mech.rutgers.edu/research/publications.php?order_by=pub_id](http://mech.rutgers.edu/research/publications.php?order_by=pub_id)

   **Note**: This “one-stop-shopping” coordination would help to save faculty time and encourage faculty to use the RUcore. Ideally, then, there would be one point of data entry for the faculty member, including the reference and a pdf (or maybe Word) copy of the article.

   The reference would be entered in BibTeX (nonproprietary) or Endnote (proprietary) format, so it could later be automatically transformed into disciplinary-specific format.

   The data entered the one time would go into single database that could be accessed and properly formatted automatically by RUcore, by the Faculty Survey, for individuals creating forms for Promotion, by individual Departments like Mechanical Engineering, and for individuals submitting articles to NIH.