Open access policymaking: roles for academic librarians as "change agents" in research institutions

Laura Bowering Mullen[1] and Jane Johnson Otto[2]

[1] Behavioral Sciences Librarian, Rutgers University Libraries, Library of Science and Medicine, Piscataway, NJ, USA 08854
[2] Media and Music Metadata Librarian, Rutgers University Libraries, Technical and Automated Services, Piscataway, NJ, USA 08854

Abstract: Many institutions have voted to pass open access policies. It has often been stated that a "faculty champion" needs to be identified in order for any policy to move successfully through various university stakeholder groups. Librarians have been warned not to make open access a "library issue." At the same time, academic librarians already possess demonstrated expertise in repository development, have established liaison relationships with departmental faculty, and are most likely to have deep knowledge of scholarly communication and publishing trends. Librarians can leverage this expertise and experience by taking on open access leadership roles in the wider institution. Academic librarians can become true change agents in the transformation of institutional scholarly communication practices. Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, working through a small Senate open access subcommittee with librarian leadership provided by the authors, successfully passed an open access policy resolution in October, 2012.

Keywords: open access, open access policies, change agents, scholarly communication, research libraries, academic librarians, library innovation

1. Introduction

At the first QQML (Qualitative and Quantitative Methods in Libraries International Conference), Hernon (2009) described the interplay between leadership and management inherent to libraries thus: "Library and information science (LIS) has a managerial focus; librarians manage the infrastructure of a library: its collections, staff, technology, and facilities. For this reason, the interconnection between management and leadership is the domain of LIS theory and practice. The purpose of leadership is to challenge the status quo as libraries undergo a transition in organizational culture, the services they offer, and workforce restructuring as they try to better fulfill the organizational and

broader institutional mission. Management, on the other hand, prepares the infrastructure for that transition." (p.27)

As the library engages more with its larger mission, open access provides perhaps the greatest opportunity for enhancing the library's influence and the leadership capability of librarians. Librarians can assume responsibility for the institutional response to open access through deep engagement by liaisons, leveraging of repository expertise, moving into research data management, and establishing roles in scholarly publishing. By taking this initiative, the academic library can expand the integral role it has always had as the intellectual heart of the university. Librarians who work on open access policy initiatives with other university bodies such as Senates, Faculty Councils and institutional scholarly communication committees are taking the management role of library stewardship for the university's data and scholarship to a new level. The library can move from a passive management role to a strategic, more influential leadership role when library leaders not only partner and collaborate, but actually lead open access efforts with expertise and confidence. Librarians can become "change agents" in the wider institution. They need not wait to be asked to assume these roles, but can be proactive in showcasing open access expertise and a desire for these new leadership roles.

Hernon (2009) goes on to describe attributes of leadership. "In addition to focusing on a shared vision, leadership is about giving people confidence to meet organizational expectations and to serve as change agents."(p.27) In developing strategic directions for the academic library of the future, librarians must set their sights on becoming leaders in open access policymaking, education and outreach, and in developing the infrastructure and expertise that continues to inspire the trust of the academic community. Libraries and librarians are trusted parties in collecting, disseminating, and preserving the products of scholarly research. The university library can expand those roles to encompass stewardship of institutional scholarship and data, keeping them safe, open and preserved over time. Development of knowledge about all aspects of open access allows librarians to contribute significantly to a large conversation around these topics. Open access research and innovation provide new opportunities for any library organization. Librarians who are able to get out and lead open access policymaking and implementation efforts find themselves positioned in a central role in this exciting scholarly communication area. This type of leadership allows visibility and impact for the work of the library and librarians.

Incorporation of the scholarly communication mission also balances out other waning areas of librarianship, such as some areas of collection development, cataloguing, or traditional reference services. New roles may reinforce librarians' roles in the institution, especially in times where faculty status may be in jeopardy. In some universities where librarians have had faculty status, there are efforts to remove them from those ranks. (Horowitz, 2013) In terms

of transforming the university through a research- and evidence-based agenda, librarians with faculty status are best placed to engage with departmental and teaching faculty. Librarians with faculty status often do research and write for publication, which can lead to a deeper understanding of publishing trends, disciplinary differences in scholarship, and the importance of strategic planning toward a more visionary future. Finally, LIS programs will need flexibility in curricula in order to be able to educate librarians of the future and prepare for a "new librarianship" that also includes open data and open access to scholarship.

2. Librarians as Change Agents in the Institution

Are librarians who are working in open access policymaking roles acting as "change agents?" R. David Lankes (2011a) of Syracuse University's School of Information Studies said "librarians must adopt a mission of transformative social action to improve society, not simply document it" and also that "librarians need to offer something besides the materials and tools." There must be a move from service alone to a greater engagement. This may be the missing piece, the need for librarians to engage more deeply with their work, moving from a focus on daily production and a model of reactive service, to a proactive stance that has broader institutional impact. With all of the changes to the work of librarians in recent years, Lankes's idea challenges current paradigms but also presents a hopeful vision for the sustainability of librarians' future roles. Lankes (2011a) reminds librarians not to be passive, that we need to talk with the community, innovate and 'make it happen'." By taking a more active institutional role and invoking transformational rhetoric, librarians can be cast in a different light in the wider conversation. Lankes is a true motivator, and discusses how "today's global challenges require a new librarianship based on community engagement."(2011a) Working on open access policy allows such engagement. In his *Atlas of a New Librarianship*, Lankes (2011b, p.15) presents a blueprint for a future of greater engagement where "the mission of librarians is to improve society through facilitating knowledge creation in their communities."

Notable is the reminder from Lankes (2011b, p.15) that this is a mission of *librarians*, not the profession, or an organization or association. As part of their new mission, librarians will find that this is an opportune time for fostering true dialogue based on the expansive topic of open access. For the subject specialist or liaison librarian, there have been recent exhortations to embed, to engage, and to join new teams. Rather than having the implementation of an open access policy focus only on the mechanics of the repository, the conversation can be much broader and involve cross-pollinated work teams. Working on open access policy implementation allows librarians that are departmental liaisons and subject specialists to showcase scholarly communication knowledge using a more nuanced discipline-specific conversation that really resonates. Because scholarly communication norms will evolve quickly and eventually affect all libraries, continuing education in these areas is a necessity for all librarians, regardless of current roles.

The topic of open access has recently moved outside the walls of the library and academia. In recent years, the greater community has become more aware and involved in the issues due to greatly expanded media coverage in the popular press. For example, with the recent reintroduction of enhanced open access legislation in the United States (FASTR), followed by the Obama Administration's directive in 2013, researchers receiving federal funding from more than 20 granting agencies must comply with open access as part of the process of scholarly research and publication. The incorporation of language regarding research data in the directive will propel universities to implement programs to manage the data that results from funded research. Libraries that have been strategic and focused on open access trends, repository development, and management of institutional research data should be well positioned to assume responsibility in these areas. No other role, especially one that may be truly transformational for academic libraries, can be said to have the growth or strategic potential of open access policy implementation.

3. Academic Library Leadership and Organizational Change

Jantz (2012), writing on academic library leadership, focuses on issues of the complexity of organizations and the institutional environment, but also on the impact that leadership can have, especially in flattened (nonbureaucratic) organizations. In his recent study of university librarians, Jantz emphasized the importance of innovation to the survival of the 21st century academic library. In his interviews with university librarians, Jantz points out that many libraries and librarians may not be ready to take risks and move out into new roles and responsibilities. For librarians working throughout the wider organization on building consensus leading to open access policy, there may be a fear of failure, a worry that policies may not pass (leading to stalling or impasse), or even that the conversation may fall on deaf ears. The value is in the conversation regardless of the outcome. Librarians need to be free to be innovators, to test out new ideas and to take advantage of current momentum around open access. University library leadership can empower librarians to share their often vast knowledge of scholarly communication, especially in the disciplines, by supporting them in taking leadership roles in open access policymaking, education and outreach in the wider institutional context. Strong library leadership will be needed to move this agenda forward with new organizational strategies and teams. Creativity at all levels may be needed in order to mobilize the most effective scholarly communication and open access teams.

Should librarians with certain leadership traits be identified or hired to facilitate this wider open access conversation? New position descriptions may want to focus on identified leadership traits and scholarly communication skill sets. Expanding the traditional definition of "liaisons" in order to empower all librarians in an organization to have potential responsibilities for outreach can leverage the talents and skill sets of a wider cross section of the library's workforce. Librarians working in technical services as well as public services

may find themselves as liaisons in scholarly communication roles. Teams can be created where those with metadata knowledge, for instance, may be paired with subject specialists on data management teams. The possibilities are endless, and provide existing groups of librarians with exciting new opportunities for working together across boundaries. At Rutgers, the authors, one from technical services and the other from the science libraries, exemplify the advantageous "mashup" of two librarians from different library roles and backgrounds working successfully together on the open access policy.

When it comes to institutional open access policies, there has been a notion that a university needs a faculty champion to lead the effort. However, librarians can lead these efforts on campus, considering the expertise they already possess. Along with discussing open access policy, liaisons and subject specialists also have a chance to share with faculty new ways of measuring impact, to talk about open access publishing, or to demonstrate social networks where authors can place links to their publications. Talking about open access creates a conversation that faculty will welcome.

4. Open Access as Strategic Direction and "Top Trend"
Many institutions are incorporating a focus on scholarly communication into their strategic plans. An important corollary is that library organizations also reiterate this focus. For instance, in the latest Association for Research Libraries (ARL, 2012) strategic plan, in a section entitled "Transforming Research Libraries," we see two expected outcomes as "ARL members will be making significant contributions to e-research and cyber-infrastructure development and will be engaged in a variety of partnerships for data management and sharing of research content with faculty. They will be an integral part of university centers and collaboratives for cyberinfrastructure, including multi-institutional programs"(p.4) and "ARL libraries will have a diverse and growing body of professionals prepared to develop new roles and work in new modes."(p.5) As for these "new librarians," Vandegrift and Colvin report that at Florida State University, a "scholarly communication component was added as a recommended duty to the list of expectations for librarians who serve as departmental liaisons."(Vandegrift &Colvin, 2012, p.388)

Areas of scholarly communication and research data management have been identified as "top trends" in academic libraries, (ACRL 2012) and the emphasis can only be expected to grow. Leveraging the use of a whole new cadre of librarians trained and empowered to be the experts in areas of open access, research data management, and new publishing trends may be the only way to create a scalable and sustainable future. The academic library may come to be associated with openness, creation of new modes of scholarship, and consultation around new research services. Open Access Week events have helped bring conversations back into the library. Library websites will draw new eyes by showcasing local digitized collections. Repositories will become more synonymous with dynamic and exciting collections, rather than as silos

seeking a mission. Successful open access policymaking may be the linchpin that draws needed institutional attention to available scholarly communication services. Having a policy encourages all faculty to engage with the tenets of open access. A focus on graduate students as well as faculty allows more depth and breadth to the implementation, and gives the "faculty of the future" a place at the table. Additionally, a policy draws the attention of publishers with whom librarians already have good relationships, signalling a new kind of author/publisher/librarian collaboration; one built on an expanded idea of readership, visibility, and research impact that benefits all parties. The timing is beneficial, because it is becoming more possible to say that "open access is here to stay," and in fact some researchers believe that the library of 2025 will have been transformed by it to a great degree.(Lewis, 2012)

Open access policymaking exemplifies a new type of strategic role for librarians. At Rutgers, the authors engaged in discussion with many university groups prior to an overwhelmingly successful Senate vote on open access policy. Building consensus around the complex topic of open access requires a thoughtful approach, and as Emmett and Peterson (2010) attest: "Achieving reasonable levels of consensus across such a diverse faculty required diplomacy, patience, forethought, and careful crafting of presentations and messages to faculty."(p.7) At Rutgers, the authors' work leading to a successful
Senate vote on open access policy mirrored Emmett and Peterson's experience.

5. Case Study: Building consensus toward the successful passage of the Rutgers Open Access Policy Resolution
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey is a major U.S. public research university and the largest institution for higher education in New Jersey. Rutgers University Libraries is a system of nearly 30 libraries and resource centers on three main campuses across the state.

Rutgers faculty play a major role in guiding University policy, through a shared governance system which includes the Rutgers University Senate. In contrast to most American academic senates, the Rutgers Senate includes representatives of not just faculty, but students, staff, administrators, and alumni. Co-author Jane Otto was elected to the University Senate at the very time the University's research office proposed that a Senate committee explore the possibility of a University open access policy. The idea was met with enthusiasm and it was proposed that a group of librarians with expertise in scholarly communication, including co-author Laura Mullen, be invited to brief the Senate's Research, and Graduate and Professional Education Committee.

The response was quite positive, and a small subcommittee of volunteers was then formed to launch the initiative, including the authors, another faculty member, two deans, and a graduate student representing alumni in the Senate. Otto, as the Senator representing the Libraries, assumed the role of chair. The pairing of these two librarians was an interesting one. Open access is a primary

research area for Mullen; regularly working with both faculty and publishers, she possesses a clear understanding of possible concerns and consensus points, from both perspectives. Otto's expertise is in metadata and repository development, and thus she was well-positioned to assess the viability of any repository developments which could support implementation. Additionally, Otto's earlier role as project manager for an innovative North American archives initiative combined collaborative community building and outreach with technical development work within a diverse and geographically dispersed user community. These skills, with Mullen's long experience as a science librarian, brought nuance to conversations that went beyond simple open access advocacy and allowed for deeper engagement on the complexity of the issues.

Within the new Open Access Subcommittee, the authors became the leads, organizing meetings, gathering and distributing documentation, proposing policy language and talking points, and drafting a background report on open access for review by the subcommittee. Part of the process was gauging buy-in amongst particular stakeholders, and it was during this discussion that the group's graduate student member made a strong case for inclusion of Rutgers' "faculty of the future," graduate students and post-doctoral fellows. The arguments were persuasive, and the team was convinced that these "scholars in training" should be covered under the policy. At this same point in time, it was agreed to include, within the policy itself, a mention of data deposit, since the Rutgers repository can link data to associated publications. These are two innovations of the Rutgers Open Access policy: inclusion of graduate students and expansion of the conversation to include research data management.

The Subcommittee revised the report as a group, and in the course of discussion, came to consensus on a critical point. The more informed the community of Rutgers scholars, the more likely it would be to embrace the policy, and participate more fully and enthusiastically, should the policy be instituted. The subcommittee agreed that it must educate faculty, and that the librarians were most qualified to take the lead roles here as well. Together the group compiled a list of university leadership and stakeholders across all three campuses. The members of the Senate Subcommittee had the seniority, diversity, and familiarity with University structure to make them well suited for identifying these constituencies.

Next, the authors developed a 20-minute presentation that would be the basis for this "travelling show." The presentations, in each case delivered by the authors, evolved over time, starting with pilot presentations to the Libraries Advisory Committee (composed largely of departmental faculty) and to Libraries faculty. As time went on and more groups were addressed, the message was repeatedly revised to reflect new responses and questions from the audience. Often other Subcommittee members attended the presentations, helping to assess responses and shape future strategies.

In tandem with the stakeholder presentations, Committee members kept Senate caucuses abreast of developments, sent the policy language through University Counsel for review, and discussed the initiative with the University Librarian and the Academic Affairs office responsible for establishing and implementing all University policies. By the time the policy resolution reached the Senate floor for a vote, the message had been carefully crafted, honed, and perfected. As Thomas Jefferson wrote of the Declaration of Independence, the object was not to find out new principles, or new arguments, but to make the case "in terms so plain and firm as to command their assent." Fortuitously, the vote fell on the eve of the internationally observed Open Access Week, and the policy passed by an overwhelming margin.

To lead at the University level, it is necessary to get outside the library, and the library mindset. Throughout the process, the authors were mindful that this was a Senate, not a Libraries, initiative, and took some care to ensure it did not appear otherwise. Meetings and presentations took place outside the Libraries, and in presentations, the authors' Libraries affiliations were evident but not emphasized. The institutional repository, administered by the Libraries, was discussed only to the extent necessary for faculty understanding of the policy initiative. The authors found that faculty are generally unfamiliar with open access and did not know of RUcore, the Rutgers repository; they don't know what a repository is, and they do not understand the relationship between publishing and repository deposit. However, they are familiar with subject repositories and can relate the Open Access policy to those.

In their presentations and the discussions that followed, the authors removed the focus from libraries, institutional repositories, and the serials crisis, and placed it squarely on those issues most important to faculty: Authors can publish in the journals of their choice, at no cost to them. The policy applies only to works for which there's no expectation of payment. The process will be quick and easy. Repository staff will take on any required rights research. The repository is crawled by Google. Opt-outs are available. Implementation will take some time. Further, the authors cited University-wide precedents, such as FRPAA support and the electronic thesis and dissertation mandate.

This process of discussion confirmed a number of points. Faculty are concerned about the availability of multiple versions, and want a link to the canonical version (publisher-branded pdf). Many want the ability to limit repository searches to peer-reviewed materials, and like the option to link publications to their underlying data. They particularly appreciated the promise of permanence, especially the ability to migrate their scholarship from declining and obsolete formats. All of these consensus points are readily addressed, either through faculty education, repository enhancements, or both. Academic librarians already possess demonstrated expertise in repository development, have established liaison relationships with departmental faculty, and are most likely to have deep knowledge of scholarly communication and publishing trends. The

library can and will facilitate open access for the university, making Rutgers scholarship widely and freely available on the web.

As a case study, Rutgers' experience with open access policymaking, led by librarians, can be illustrative of library leadership and transformational change in a university research library. Besides creating a new vision for research libraries, this future can include the confident leadership of librarians in open access policymaking, implementation, and related roles.

6. Lessons Learned during the passage of the Policy

Throughout this experience, the authors learned that passing an open access policy requires leveraging librarians' expertise in both open access and repository development with a sustained focus and a constant outreach effort over a very specific period of time. The authors found it helpful to move the conversation forward incrementally while building consensus over time. These conversations were a tremendous learning experience and always produced interesting food for thought. Presenting even for five minutes to important stakeholder groups allows the topic to "trickle down." Creating a conversation that is accessible, appealing and based on a high level of knowledge that takes into account the complexities of open access allows people to "come along." Certain topics elicited reaction, either good or bad, and all of that experience led to an improved presentation for the next time. This is a conversation that ideally percolates out into the institution with a carefully crafted and consistent message. Outreach and education about this complex topic requires active listening and the type of engagement with an audience that allows them to ask their tough questions or air disagreement with any perceived agenda in a free and open exchange. Moving an open access policy conversation forward requires the ability of the presenters to avoid being too simplistic or taking any strident advocacy position.

Many scholars have widely divergent ideas about the topic and about an open access policy agenda. Because many scholars conflate open access with poor quality journal outlets or with an absence of peer review, they may wish to engage on those aspects. This is where librarians with scholarly communication expertise can use open access policy discussions to engage with faculty on many associated topics of interest. Dispelling myths, providing a friendly research-backed discussion that addresses some misinformation while suggesting easy, staff-assisted faculty deposit workflows eases skepticism when it arises. In advancing a "green" open access policy, faculty seem to be willing to do something that does not impede their workflow or cost them money; "simple and easy" is a clear directive. Faculty seem willing to participate as long as there is little or no extra work involved. Interestingly, graduate students seemed to welcome participating in the deposit process. Certainly, academic libraries can meet the need for simple and easy deposit processes, and the authors assured researchers that "behind the scenes" assistance with what might be considered

time-consuming aspects of self-archiving (such as researching permissions) would be readily available.

To meet the exciting challenges of implementing an open access policy, the faculty deposit module of the Rutgers repository, RUcore, will be enhanced to meet user expectations. This implementation period will have a defined timeline and involve a dedicated team in order to ensure success. "Success" could be defined as a university where faculty and students' scholarly work is disseminated widely to a global readership. However, passing an open access policy resolution is not really about faculty simply understanding the benefits of contributing to a worldwide dissemination of personal or institutional scholarship; this goes without saying, nor is it necessarily about scholars seeing an impact increase for themselves. Working at a university where researchers have access to much of the published content they need is an added challenge because faculty have no trouble accessing the research material that they need. Depositing articles in a repository at some point in the publication process is not something that may be appealing to them. A constant reminder that we will make open access happen "to the extent possible" is helpful. This satisfies those who say that OA is not always possible; this fact was always acknowledged right up front. We can then get to work on developing processes that will maximize the availability and discoverability of author-deposited open access content in our repository. Faculty and graduate students will be actively involved in making open access happen.

In hindsight, the authors found the process of working through open access policymaking to be one that benefited greatly by the involvement of librarians with different perspectives, backgrounds and areas of expertise. Covering the bases in terms of complementary areas of librarian expertise as it relates to various aspects of open access allows engagement with researchers in a very targeted and disciplinary manner. It is often necessary to answer tricky questions with a "tag team" approach. Scalability in the conversation will involve education of subject specialists and departmental liaisons about the open access policy so that they can engage their constituencies. The authors are fortunate to have so many colleagues with deep expertise in all areas surrounding open access, including repository development, research data management, altmetrics, metadata development, programming, website development, and more.

For the sake of credibility, it is vitally important that those leading policy efforts have current background and information on the constantly evolving state of open access. Keeping up with this topic can be challenging because the discussion is active and international in scope. Librarians involved in open access policymaking must attend relevant conferences and network with others doing similar work. Some helpful organizations include SPARC (Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition), COAPI (Coalition of Open Access Policy Institutions), and various opportunities at conferences such as

ALA (American Library Association), ACRL (Association of College & Research Libraries), and IFLA (International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions) where groups of "OA librarians" are gathering and sharing best practices. Watching the various listservs devoted to open access, and reading OATP (Open Access Tracking Project) or other digests can keep a librarian up to date with all that is happening from either the publisher or repository side. It is important to also keep current with issues as they relate to academia, funding bodies and other important players in the landscape. Consulting in person with noted open access experts was extremely helpful in our efforts both to pass the policy and to begin our implementation program.

Research offices and other offices of the university that deal with scholarly output allow collaboration that is valuable for librarians. Making sure that effective library representatives are elected to or placed on governance bodies such as Senates or Faculty Councils, allow librarians to be opportunistic about early involvement with policy initiatives as well as to showcase expertise in scholarly communication areas. Having one librarian that can be a consultant in all matters OA is important; someone who has followed the landscape daily, whether that is a Scholarly Communication Librarian or other professional tasked with the responsibility for the "go to" support. Knowledge of other areas swirling around open access policy is helpful; many faculty are interested in traditional citation metrics, altmetrics, online scholarly profiling, or researcher identification systems such as ORCID. Having a unique aspect of the open access policy that sets the institution apart, in our case, a focus on graduate students or early career scientists allows for building momentum and interest both in-house and in the larger open access policy community.

Having a publication record in the traditional literature is helpful for librarians discussing open access with the university's scholars. The authors hold faculty status at their university, allowing a certain level of participation in the open access conversation from their own perspectives as authors, researchers, and experienced academic librarians. Knowing that the topic of promotion and tenure is of high importance, it is helpful to discuss familiar publications with authors, and explain how they relate to an open access policy. For the researcher, it is often important to show a simple example using a traditionally-published, easily recognized high impact journal in the disciplinary area about which you are talking. Using an example of a high impact journal that allows "green" OA is compelling, and demonstrating the Sherpa/RoMEO database garners interest. Showing an example of a high impact factor "gold" open access journal in the field is also engaging. It is often surprising to faculty and graduate students that they do not necessarily have to change their desired publication habits (although some said they might want to) in order to comply with an open access policy. There are some qualms about versioning, and this uneasiness is assuaged by promising a link to the published version on every repository record. This allows those with subscriptions to click through, and all others to read the article in postprint (accepted manuscript) version. We did not delve into

the CC-BY issues with general audiences; this will be a discussion for another day and will involve faculty having choices with various licenses around their scholarship.

Working on open access policy can be time consuming, and for those working toward a successful university outcome, workload must be readjusted and prioritized in order to allow for the time needed for constant planning, changing course, multiple presentations, creating materials, and working with all others in the repository environment. Closing ranks may be necessary for librarians tasked with this work, and library administration must provide support for these efforts. Sustaining momentum while communicating progress to all others in the library and in the university requires a particular sustained focus. Passing an open access policy with librarian outreach places the library in a new role as the center of advances in scholarly communication. The library can be the place where all disciplines come together in these "transdisciplinary" conversations. More exciting new roles for the library can only be expected and should be part of library strategic planning going forward. A successful outcome is well worth the effort required by those involved.

Clearly, passing an open access policy, while a major accomplishment, is not the end of the story. Open access policies must then pass into a period of implementation. Success comes from sustained commitment to the ultimate goals, and of the library prioritizing the work that is to come. As the authors move into co-chairing the newly formed implementation committee for the Rutgers Open Access Policy, another challenge and opportunity is presented to the library and librarians to continue to ensure that the center of the university's open access work will be the library for years to come. This has been valuable work for the authors personally, and is clearly a transformative new role for all interested librarians in the academy.

References

ACRL Research Planning and Review Committee, (2012). 2012 Top Ten Trends in Academic Libraries: A Review of the Trends and Issues Affecting Academic Libraries in Higher Education. *College & Research Libraries News,* Vol. 73, No. 6, 311-320.

Association of Research Libraries, (2012). *ARL Strategic Plan 2010-2012*, 4-5. http://www.arl.org/bm~doc/strategic-plan-2010-2012.pdf

Emmett, A. and Peterson, T., (2010). Achieving Consensus on the University of Kansas Open-Access Policy. *Research Library Issues: A Bimonthly Report from ARL, CNI, and SPARC*, No. 269, 5-7. http://www.arl.org/resources/pubs/rli/archive/rli269.shtml

Hernon, P., (2009). The Next Managerial Leadership: Continuation of a Research Agenda. *Qualitative and Quantitative Methods in Libraries; Theory and Applications. Proceedings of the International Conference on QQML 2009*, Chania, Crete, Greece 26-29 May 2009, 27-36.

Horowitz, J., (2013). Library employee protest changed title: New designation for incoming employees provokes heated debate. *Cavalierdaily.com,* March 7, http://www.cavalierdaily.com/article/2013/03/library-enacts-title-changes

Jantz, R. C., (2012). Innovation in academic libraries: An analysis of university librarians' perspective. *Library & Information Science Research*, 34, No.1, 3-12.

Lankes, R.D., (2011a). *Librarians as Change Agents*, Video Webchat, U.S. Embassy in Rome, Rome, Italy. Screencast at http://vimeo.com/32311075; abstract at http://quartz.syr.edu/blog/?p=1303

Lankes, R.D., (2011b). *The Atlas of New Librarianship*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

Lewis, D.W., (2012). The Inevitability of Open Access. *College & Research Libraries*, Vol. 73, No. 5, 493-506.

Vandegrift, M. and Colvin, G., (2012). Relational Communications; Developing Key Connections. *College & Research Libraries News,* Vol. 73, No. 7, 386-389.