

Asked whether AAHSL should support initiatives to make federally funded research data more openly available, a significant majority (95.8%, 69) who answered this question favored this expansion while 4.2% (3) had no opinion. Asked whether AAHSL should support the expansion of the fair use of copyrighted materials, 93.2% (69) responded they were in favor, 2.7% (2) were not in favor and three had no opinion.

Almost all respondents had the opinion that AAHSL should advocate with publishers for licensing terms that are more favorable to libraries, with 97.3% (72) in favor and 2.7% (2) not in favor.

The second part of the survey asked questions about scholarly communication activities on the campuses of the respondents in order to determine how involved universities are in various initiatives to advance open access and institutional repositories. When asked about university-wide open access mandates for faculty publications, a very small percentage (4.1%, 3) of respondents indicated that such a mandate was in place. Seven respondents indicated that an open access mandate was in the planning stages while 84.9% (62) responded that no mandate was in place. A question also asked whether the medical school or medical center has an open access policy. Sixty-seven respondents or 90.5% indicated “no” to this question, with one respondent indicating that such a mandate was in place. Three respondents noted that a mandate was in the planning stages and three did not know.

The next question probed whether the respondents could determine how well supported an open access mandate was by the medical center or medical school, if the mandate was university-wide. Only 29 respondents answered this question while 45 skipped the question, indicating that many respondents probably could not make a judgment call on how to answer this question or the question was not relevant in their setting. Only two respondents indicated that the mandate was definitely supported, three indicated that the mandate was somewhat supported, 14 answered that the mandate was not supported and ten indicated that they did not know.

When asked whether their institution maintains an institutional repository for faculty publications, 47.9% (34) responded “yes,” 36.6% (26) responded “no,” and 15.5% (11) responded that a repository was in the planning stages.

On the topic of institutional support for authors to comply with the NIH Public Access mandate, 54.8% (40) of the respondents noted that their institutions provided support, 34.2% (25) did not provide support, and 5.5% (4) responded that support was in the planning stages. Responses to the question of whether institutions supported open access by paying either all or part of author submission fees, only 21.2% (14) responded that institutional support was provided, 68.2% (45) responded that support was not available, and three respondents noted that support was in the planning stage.

Some institutions provide memberships to support open access publishers. BioMed Central had the most memberships (26), with PLoS coming in a close second (24), with Hindawi having only seven memberships.

In response to a question about whether their institutions support open data initiatives 40.3% (29) of the respondents indicated that they did not know, perhaps indicating that if open data initiatives were being supported, libraries are minimally involved. However, 23.6% (17) respondents noted that their institutions do support open data initiatives and 16.7 % (12) replied that these initiatives were in the planning stage.

There were a number of open ended questions in the survey, the responses are summarized in a separate document. Both the summary of the survey questions and responses to open ended comments are located in the Survey site on the AAHSL website.

Summary

Support is strong among the AAHSL directors who responded to the survey for public access and open access. AAHSL should continue its advocacy role for both public access to federally funded research and for open access initiatives. Institutional mandates requiring open access for faculty publications and other institutional initiatives in support of scholarly communication are less well developed at AAHSL institutions. Information about institutional initiatives should continue to be shared among AAHSL members. An example of this is the recent UCSF Open Access Policy that was distributed to AAHSL members. AAHSL directors strongly support a role for AAHSL in advocating for favorable licensing terms between libraries and publishers.

The Scholarly Communication Committee should continue to monitor trends in scholarly communication, the public access and open access movements, and to work with the AAHSL Board to continue AAHSL's advocacy role in scholarly communication.