ASIS&T Meetings Continue to Set the Tone for Information Professionals

For nine years now, the ASIS&T Information Architecture Summit has proven itself as the premier gathering place for information architects. The ninth annual summit, held in April in Miami, attracted over 600 attendees presenting, discussing or just absorbing cutting-edge information on social networking, gaming, patterns, tagging, taxonomies and a wide range of IA tools and techniques. As one attendee put it, “Jared M. Spool’s opening keynote on Journey to the Center of Design and Andrew Hinton’s closing plenary on Linkosophy were amazing bookends for a great conference.”

Next up for the IA community is the fourth EuroIA, this year to be held in Amsterdam, September 26-27. EuroIA will explore the theme of Redrawing the Map, between countries and online as we look to forge new international alliances to adapt traditional deliverables to the needs of a Web 2.0 world.

And then get ready for the 10th IA Summit, March 18-22, 2009, in Memphis. But it’s not just the IA community benefiting from cutting-edge conferences sponsored by ASIS&T. The ASIS&T Annual Meeting continues to address the broader fields and boundaries of information science and practice. Coming up in late October in Columbus, People Transforming Information – Information Transforming People will use the lens of the human and social condition to seek a better understanding of the impact of the new information environment made possible by the digital world.

Check the ASIS&T website regularly for updated information on the ASIS&T conferences.

*Ching-chih Chen,* professor in the Simmons Graduate School of Library and Information Science and an international leader in digital library research and development, is the 2008 recipient of the American Library Association Beta Phi Mu Award. The honor is presented annually to a library school faculty member or individual for distinguished service in librarianship education. Chen is a longtime member of ASIS&T, where she has served in numerous local and national capacities in service to the field of information science.

The award jury responsible for Chen’s selection was “extremely impressed” with her “profound impact on the field of global librarianship,” as well as her devotion to her students and her record of publications and presentations.
Designing a User-Centered Conference for User-Centered Information Professionals: The Story of InfoCamp Seattle

by Aaron Louie

In 2007 the ASIS&T Pacific Northwest Chapter and the ASIS&T University of Washington Student Chapter set out to revolutionize our regional annual meeting. Our vision was to create a highly collaborative, vibrant atmosphere where practitioners and students could share ideas and strengthen the local community of practice. The result was InfoCamp Seattle – an unconference that encouraged all to participate and invigorated both professional and student chapters.

What’s Wrong with Normal Conferences?

Serial conference attendees know the drill. We identify the one must-attend annual conference, beg our bosses to let us go, then drop a couple thousand dollars on airfare, hotel room and registration, hoping to be partially reimbursed someday. Once we get to the conference, we desperately hope that they’re offering something of professional value, because this event is our one chance a year to meet people in our field and gain crucial training. Pity those poor souls who work for local government, non-profit organizations, small companies or themselves – they may never get support from their employers to attend the big conferences.

In the library and information science community, there are limited – and often cost-prohibitive – venues for social interaction and professional development. Our field is constantly evolving, and those without a substantial travel budget or professional education program are left behind.

But it’s not just the lack of money or networking opportunities. Most conferences focus on presenting major findings and hosting panels of leading thinkers in the field. This conference format, while useful and important, usually lends itself to a one-way mode of information sharing. Most attendees are only allowed the five-minute question and answer period following a presentation in which to share their thoughts. Since topics and presenters are determined three to six months in advance (mostly to allow time to print the programs and reserve venue space), much of the content of a traditional conference runs the risk of being out-of-date by the time it is presented. In addition, big names and popular topics are often given priority, as the conference must appeal to as many people as possible. This configuration results in a conference that is of general practical value and provides discipline-defining vision but may fail to meet any single attendee’s particular needs.

Finding a Solution

In the Pacific Northwest Chapter we began asking our colleagues: How can we fill this gap? Can we do something at a smaller scale, on the cheap, that can provide specific, practical, up-to-date value to all participants?

As a first step, we started up a regular informal social event for the Pacific Northwest Chapter to discover what user-centered information professionals in Seattle and Portland wanted in a conference. Starting in April 2007, we organized a monthly meet-up at the Elysian Pub, where we sat down to drink and converse with our fellow librarians, information architects, professionals and students.

What we discovered is that there’s a constant need for informal information sharing and development of best practices within specific industries. Conversation at our meet-ups often included tips, tricks and comparing notes about common context-specific challenges. Participants traded business cards and contact information, forming new friendships and...
making important professional connections. We observed that the greatest value to attendees of these informal gatherings was in establishing local ties and brainstorming immediate, practical solutions to everyday problems.

The mix of people who came to our meet-ups was surprising. In any given month, we encountered professionals and students from a wide range of industries. Many of them had never attended a major conference or held a membership in a professional organization. The reasons they gave for this lack of participation? They were too busy working or had no travel budget. What would they rather have? A local, open, no-pressure venue where they could collaborate with other people who were facing the same kinds of challenges they were.

At this point, we decided to design a conference that was affordable and timely, encouraged social interaction and allowed all to participate. We wanted a format where any attendee could present work in progress with little preparation. This informality would encourage all to share nascent ideas, emerging technologies and practical suggestions without fear of rejection by a committee or advance scrutiny by peers. We would also allow groups to evolve organically without preparation or approval. All we would do is provide space, time and attention for group members to form and collaborate.

Fortunately, we didn’t need to look far for alternative conference models. In recent years, collaborative, open conferences have become increasingly popular. The common element is that the attendees create the content, usually day-by-day, at the conference. This species of conference is generally known as an “unconference,” of which there are several common variants. One of these is known as a “BarCamp,” created in response to FooCamp, an invite-only unconference for Friends of O’Reilly (the publisher of many books for computer and information professionals). Since then, hundreds of unconferences have been created in a myriad of industries and disciplines. In fact, Seattle was host to MindCamp, an unconference on technology issues, which Corprew Reed, the secretary and treasurer of our chapter, had helped organize.

Our counterparts at the University of Washington student chapter were also excited to hold an unconference. Rachel Elkington, then vice-chair of the student chapter, tells the following story:

At one of the social mixers [at the 2007 IA Summit], I talked to Nick Finck (from Seattle) and John Allsop (from Australia). They told me about the whole BarCamp phenomenon, which is basically ad-hoc conferences where everyone participates in doing everything so that there is no admission charge and all ideas are allowed to be expressed and exchanged.

Andy, the chair of the student chapter, added this:

From the student perspective, we want to provide our peers a chance to engage the professional community … This was really a chance for the students to plug into the professional community and especially to get to know some of the more dynamic and engaged personalities in that community. This was a chance to engage in discussion without having to be obviously identified as a student. I really feel this format levels the playing field in that regard, because it is so egalitarian.

We decided on a two-day conference over a weekend in the autumn before the ASIS&T Annual Meeting. Following the example of other BarCamps, we decided to call our unconference “InfoCamp,” in reference to the central concern of ASIS&T members and its allied practices: information. We modified the format slightly, adding an opening keynote for each day.

Following the BarCamp format, our schedule would not be decided beforehand. No speakers or topics would be pre-selected. We would create a theme, invite the right people, and let the attendees decide what they wanted to talk about. By design, it would be participatory and user-centered, encouraging input, discussion and debate from everyone who attended. Another common practice in BarCamps, which we adopted, is to solicit sponsorship to cover costs in order to minimize the registration fees for attendees.

Because no sessions would be set before the conference, the participants could talk about the latest developments in their field and the most pressing current issues. And we could focus on providing the right atmosphere to make it all happen.
Making It Happen

Most of our challenges involved selecting and solidifying the date and venue. The sponsors, vendors, publicity and so on were all dependent on those two variables. However, selecting a date is not as easy as one might think. We needed to ensure that school would be in session in order to reach the students. We also needed to consider the other conferences and events happening within our professional community that might conflict. Given these constraints, the date was narrowed down to two weekends in October.

Finding an appropriate venue that was open on either of those two dates was a difficult undertaking. We finally found our venue, though – the Youngstown Cultural Arts Center. It was the perfect size and had parking. However, we were only able to reserve certain rooms in the building during certain times of the day, which turned out to be problematic for scheduling sessions.

Once the date and location were settled, everything else seemed to fall into place. Essential to this success were the committee members and volunteers we added to the team. Kristen Shuyler, a librarian at Seattle University, took on most of the publicity tasks, sending emails to newsgroups and posting on event websites. I created the posters, t-shirts and name badges. Corprew Reed handled venue relations. Andy Szydlowski scheduled the caterer and handled all the equipment. And Rachel Elkington organized a cadre of volunteers who took care of buying food and office supplies, setting up on the day of the event and helping us run the event.

On the day of InfoCamp 2007, over 100 participants arrived, and all our planning and preparation was put to the test. Thankfully, we had plenty of help. Jack Baur, one of our volunteers, recalls this scene:

During the event, I primarily helped get the kitchen ready and the food and coffee into the hands of people who needed it. The set-up was very ramshackle and hurried, but I think that aspect contributed to the high-energy feeling among the staff. We were all so committed to InfoCamp’s success...

The attendees ranged from students to librarians to usability professionals, and several of our sponsors sent representatives. The open BarCamp format proved to be the right approach as the conference unfolded. People enthusiastically signed up for sessions, and all the sessions I attended were alive with discussion and active participation. Our keynote speakers for the two days, Nick Finck and Bob Boiko, gave inspirational and rousing talks in the morning to get people thinking and talking.

ZAAZ, one of the corporate sponsors, held a user interface design mini-event – “Interface-off” – that featured dueling laptops, a series of information architecture and usability challenges and a DJ. A group of librarians spontaneously created a track on library issues, including sessions on technology challenges in rural public libraries and practical uses of social software in libraries. Several disparate sessions were consolidated at the last minute with other sessions with similar topics, such as a combined session on user experience consulting techniques and library reference interviewing. Jack Baur describes the community that emerged:

The atmosphere was open, excited and convivial. The focus was on how much we all had in common as information people no matter where we were working and recognizing the intersections of our work. I got lots of great ideas and met lots of great people. The transparency and openness of the organization really added to that community as well. Everyone’s ideas were valid and everyone’s help, no matter how small, was appreciated. We were all in it together: it really was our conference.

During the closing session of the conference, one participant said that the unconference format was far more valuable than other high-cost training seminars she had previously attended. This comment was met with enthusiastic applause by all in attendance, and we knew we had taken the right approach.

It was such a success, we’re doing it again this year! InfoCamp Seattle 2008 is scheduled for September 27-28 at the Youngstown Cultural Arts Center. For more information, visit http://infocamp.info. For photos of InfoCamp 2007, visit www.flickr.com/photos/tags/infocamp/.
Tips for Planning Your Own Local InfoCamp

Decide on the date & venue first. All other logistical considerations flow from having the days and location set in stone. This will be, by far, the greatest expenditure. Find a space that is large enough to accommodate up to 200 people, with plenty of individual spaces to use as break-out rooms. Look for community centers, schools and libraries if budget is tight.

Don’t choose a theme. It’s not totally necessary to set a slogan or tagline for your InfoCamp. A distinct graphical motif will suffice. The real value of the unconference format is in allowing the themes to emerge organically.

Pursue sponsors early, often. Find local businesses and organizations who are recruiting information architects, librarians, taxonomists, usability specialists and other in-demand information professionals. Give them a proposal describing the perks and benefits to them of sponsoring your conference. We offered sponsors links on our website, an exhibit table at the conference and free attendance.

Make registration cheap. If you’ve gained enough sponsors, you can afford to charge very little for registration. This low cost allows students and practitioners in not-for-profit organizations to afford to attend your conference. You can streamline the registration process by working with BrownPaperTickets.com, a nearly-free online registration and payment processing website that caters to nonprofits.

Publicize using social media. First, set up a website with details about the date and location of your InfoCamp. Then leverage every kind of Web 2.0 social media site you can find to publicize the conference. Create an event and profile for the conference on Facebook and invite everyone in your professional network. Post your event on Yahoo! Upcoming, Meetup.com and other event announcement sites. Post to the local and regional chapter email lists of professional organizations, such as ASIST SIGIA-L, IA Institute, ACM SIG-CHI, ACRL and so on.

Delegate, delegate, delegate. Don’t try to plan a conference alone. Find colleagues who are willing to own some part of the process. Also contact your local university’s library school, communications department or human-computer interaction program to recruit volunteers to help you on the day of the event. Offer free (or nearly free) registration as an incentive for students to get involved. Once you’ve delegated, step back and give your team room to be creative!

Provide free Wi-Fi access. An essential element of the success of an unconference is the ability for any participant to access the Internet at any time. Such access allows people to blog while at the conference, upload photos in real time, share new sites, look up a reference, download files they’d like to share and so on. Make sure you have a fast connection and multiple access points.

Supply plenty of coffee and food. Make sure to provide coffee first thing in the morning and food for lunch, so participants don’t have to leave the site. If you’ve chosen the right venue, they’ll let you bring in your own food and/or caterer, further keeping costs low. Many BarCamps also offer a bar and evening social events to motivate participants to stick around and socialize throughout the conference.

Provide the framework, but not the content. Structure the schedule with plenty of slots for multiple sessions throughout the day. However, leave all but the first welcome session blank. Don’t worry – it will fill up.

Prime the participants. Find a dynamic and provocative speaker to give a pep talk at the beginning of each day of the conference. Also be prepared with a few topics to give participants an idea of the possibilities for sessions. Have each person on your planning committee ready with a recent (less than one week old) development or inflammatory debate topic in the unlikely event that no one signs up to host a session. You’ll have everyone clamoring to sign up for a slot in no time!
The Northern Ohio Chapter of ASIS&T (NORASIST) took a look at Digital Preservation Basics: How to Ensure Long-Term Access to Your Digital Assets as the theme for an April meeting. Karen Gracy, assistant professor in the School of Library and Information Science at Kent State University, planned a presentation to help attendees understand the critical problems of digital preservation, identify the risks to digital collections and devise short- and long-term strategies for keeping collections accessible into the future.

The recently formed Carolinas Chapter of ASIS&T (cc:asis&t) discussed Institutional Repositories: The Great Debate with Helen Tibbo, School of Library and Information Science at the University of North Carolina, and Kevin Smith, Duke University. In the spirit of classical oration and political debate, the two speakers were to square off on such topics as scholarly communication, copyright, institutional memory, digital libraries, metadata, intellectual property and digital preservation.

IN MEMORIAM

Homer J. Hall

The family of Homer James Hall informs us that the 96-year-old research chemist and information scientist, as well as civic leader, father, grandfather, great-grandfather and friend, died peacefully in his sleep in Exeter, New Hampshire, on April 26.

Homer was born in Uniontown, Pennsylvania, and lived most of his childhood in Marietta, Ohio. After graduating from Marietta College in 1931, he went on to Ohio State University where he earned his Ph.D. in chemistry. Homer worked for Esso Standard Oil of New Jersey for 41 years, where, drawing on his ability to read chemistry research reports in seven different languages, he published research abstracts for chemists and chemical engineers to help them stay current in their field. During World War II, he earned patents for the invention of detergent jet fuel. After retirement, he continued to work in the field of information science as a member of the American Society of Information Science and Technology.

In recent years, Homer served on several ASIS&T committees, including Awards and Honors, Constitution and Bylaws, Leadership, Planning and Professionalism. He was also an officer in Special Interest Group/Information Analysis and Evaluation.

Homer was married to Juliet McCarrell Leiper for 65 years until her death a few years ago. He is survived by four children, seven grandchildren; 16 great-grandchildren and his 99-year-old sister. In addition to his wife, he was preceded in death by his parents, a son and his brother.

Memorial contributions may be made to Amnesty International USA, 5 Penn Plaza, 16th Floor; New York, NY 10001.

Sandra Tung

Sandra Tung, formerly of Santa Monica and Altadena, California, died April 23. Sandra retired last year from her position as business information manager for business development at Boeing. Previously she worked at Rockwell, Savage Information Services and NASA Applications Center.

Sandra was a longtime member of the Los Angeles Chapter of the American Society of Information Science and Technology (LACASIS). During the 1980s, she helped make LACASIS a stronger, more vibrant organization. A talented leader with a "can-do attitude," Sandra understood the value of working with new members to insure the next generation of leaders would be strong. She was active in LACASIS for over 15 years, serving as treasurer, marketing/database coordinator, Program Committee member and Awards Committee member. In 1994 she was recognized for her service and won the Outstanding Member Award.

One of Sandra's legacies is the continuing success of LACASIS as a professional organization. She will always be remembered as a LACASIS superstar.

Sandra is survived by her children Doug, Diana and Irene; three grandchildren and a loving extended family.

Donations may be made in her name to San Gabriel Valley Habitat for Humanity, 770 N. Fair Oaks, Pasadena, CA 91103 (www.sgvhabitat.org).
As of January 2008 the *Journal of the American Society for Information Science & Technology* (JASIST) will follow the “green road” open access model – authors publishing in the Journal (and only authors) may post preprints to their own or their institution’s repositories with links to the final article and to the online journal.

The ASIS&T Board of Directors arrived at this decision after a detailed analysis that weighed the logistical, economic and philosophical issues involved. With the JASIST publisher, Wiley-Blackwell, we agreed to institute this policy on a trial basis and to work together to monitor the impact of the new policy. We were interested broadly in understanding what effects the new policy would have on submissions, readership and subscriptions, and we agreed to conduct baseline and subsequent surveys to track changes in these areas.

The first survey was conducted online in late 2007 and addressed four areas:

- Who are our members, authors and potential authors?
- What are the publication trends among these groups?
- What level of access is there to journals among these groups?
- Are our members, authors and the information science community aware of and/or participating in the open access movement?

This article reports generally on the results of survey. Two additional articles in the *Bulletin* in the coming months will continue discussion of the survey results, focusing on the subsets of respondents who were ASIS&T members and open access authors.

### Groups Addressed by Survey

There were three groups we wanted to reach with the survey: current ASIS&T members, JASIST authors and information science researchers. These three groups are not separate and distinct: many individuals belong to all three categories. Blackwell collaborated with ISI to determine contact information for authors currently publishing in the fields of “information science & library science,” “library science” and “information technology and communication systems.” They also determined contact information for authors who had published articles in JASIST or similar publications. The peer-reviewed publications selected for the survey were the *Annual Review of Information Science and Technology*, *Information Processing and Management*, *Information Research*, *Journal of Documentation*, *Journal of Information Science*, *Library Information Science and Research* and *Scientometrics*. From these contacts, Blackwell distributed the survey to 3,740 researchers. Additionally, ASIS&T distributed the survey to a randomly selected group of 2,414 members, some of whom may have overlapped with the authors identified by Blackwell and ISI. We received 581 responses of which 348 (or 59.9%) were from ASIS&T members.

ASIS&T and Blackwell developed the survey questions jointly. A number of questions were taken from surveys created by Ian Rowlands and his collaborators.

[1] [2]

### Who Are Our Members, Authors and Potential Authors?

Information science is traditionally seen as an area of western scholarship, but our survey results indicate that a growing number of scholars resides outside the western world. While most of the respondents were from North America...
(71.9%) and Europe (11.4%), 12.9% identified themselves as being from other areas of the world. Regionally, 7.4% were from Asia, 2.8% the Middle East, 2.2% Australia and 0.5% South America. In addition to these respondents, we received several write-in comments from researchers working in Africa, a region that was accidentally omitted from our responses. As one commenter pointed out, this distribution may reflect “the imbalance in scientific rating globally.” The discipline of information science is growing globally and we must consider the implications of scholarly communication and publication models in a global context.

The majority of respondents (70.2%) identified themselves as employees of colleges or universities. This result is not surprising, considering that academic positions require publication for promotion and tenure and that our survey solicited authors who had published in premier journals in the field of information science. We did see a small number of responses from researchers in other institutions, including commercial organizations (6.7%), government (5.9%), research institutes (3.3%) and self-employed individuals (3.8%).

The respondents were also asked how many years of research experience they had. The two most common responses were 1-5 years (24.6%) and 21+ years (23.8%). This spread seems to indicate that there are many researchers at both ends of the spectrum, when it comes to research experience, with fewer people in the middle. It also underscores the need for mentoring in our field as the reins pass from one generation of researchers to the next. Overall, the discipline seems to be undergoing a transition. There are increasing numbers of new researchers and contributions coming from increasingly diverse regions.

**What Are Current Publication Trends among Information Science Researchers?**

The majority of those surveyed, 68%, submit research papers to peer-reviewed journals. The following are the top 10 journals considered by the 395 people indicating that they submit research papers:

- **Journal of the American Society for Information Science & Technology** (197 responses)
- **Information Processing & Management** (92 responses)
- **Journal of Documentation** (65 responses)
- **Library and Information Science Research (LISR)** (50 responses)
- **College and Research Libraries** (49 responses)
- **Scientometrics** (39 responses)
- **Journal of Academic Librarianship** (35 responses)
- **Journal of Information Science** (35 responses)
- **Library Quarterly** (31 responses)
- **Journal of the Medical Library Association** (24 responses)
- **Portal: Libraries and the Academy** (24 responses)

Authors from JASIST, *Journal of Documentation, Library and Information Science, Scientometrics* and *Journal of Information Science* were solicited for this study so these results may not be reflective of overall trends in the field.

Even though the same authors rated impact factor (IF) as an important criterion when choosing the journal to which they would submit their publications, only three of the 10 journals with the highest impact factor in the field of “information science & library science” as listed in *Journal Citation Reports (JCR)* appear on the list above. They are *JASIST* (IF 1.555, ranked 6th by JCR), *Information Processing and Management* (IF 1.546, ranked 7th by JCR) and the *Journal of Documentation* (IF 1.439, ranked 9th by JCR). The five journals with the highest impact factors in JCR do not appear in the list of the top 10 journals that the authors in our survey consider when submitting. Of these five only two, *MIS Quarterly* (IF 4.731, ranked 1st by JCR) and the *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association* (IF 3.979, ranked 2nd by JCR), appear within the top 25 journals considered by our survey respondents.

The authors who submit research papers to peer-reviewed journals were asked how many journal papers they had written in the past three years. The most common responses were two (16.7%), three (14.7%) and four (12.7%). In the past three years 61.5% of authors had published one to five articles, while 22.8% had published 6-10 articles and...
12.2% had published more than 10 articles. It seems that, for the most part, the authors in our survey averaged one to two peer-reviewed journal articles per year.

When asked how many peer-reviewed journal articles they had published overall in their careers, the responses seemed to be consistent with the number of years of research experience. That is, the most common responses were at the low and high ends of the scale with fewer responses in the middle. The most common responses were three articles (6.6%) and 30+ articles (6.6%). Overall, 32.2% had published 1-10 peer-reviewed articles in their careers, 22.3% had published 11-20 articles, 32.4% had published 21 or more articles in their careers and 13% did not respond.

Of those surveyed 80.8% currently read *JASIST*. The most common frequency of use was every issue (33.6%), followed by one or two times a year (21.7%), every other month (17.4%), never (12.4%) and less than once a year (8.1%). A small number of users, 4.3%, responded “I would use it if I were able to access it easily.”

The respondents were also asked how they accessed *JASIST*. They were asked to indicate all the ways they accessed the journal. In these responses 62.8% used a membership subscription to read the journal in print or online while 42.5% indicated that they accessed the journal through a library or library service, such as interlibrary loan. The most common format used was electronic, with 60% indicating that they access the journal either through their library’s electronic license or through online member access. Among those surveyed, there did not seem to be problems accessing the journal.

**What Level of Access Do ASIS&T Members and Information Science Researchers Have to *JASIST* and Journal Literature in General?**

Overall, the respondents had very good access to journal literature. When asked, “How would you describe your current level of access to the journal literature?” 75.4% responded “good” or “excellent.” The most frequent response was “Good; I have access to most journals I need” with 45.1% of the total. This result was followed by 30.3% responding “Excellent; I have access to all the journals I need.” Only 4.8% rated their access level to journal literature as “poor” or “very poor.” The high level of access to journal literature in our sample group may be related to their professional careers in colleges and universities.

Overall, there was a positive attitude towards open access as evidenced by both the survey responses and comments. Respondents were asked to rate traits they associated with OA journals on a scale of 1-5, with 1 meaning that they “do not associate” the trait with OA and 5 meaning that they “very strongly associate” it with OA. Very few respondents thought of open access as “radical,” “ephemeral” or “not archived properly.” These qualities averaged 2.2, 2.5 and 2.3 respectively (or “associate a little”) on the scale. The concept of the “author pays to publish” was not associated with the concept of open access either. It rated an average of 2.3 or “associate a little” on the rating scale. This result is surprising since the gold road, or full open access model, often relies on author fees for publication.

At the end of the survey the respondents were asked if there were “any other thoughts or experiences they would like to share about the topics of this survey.” One hundred twenty-three people responded with further comments. Approximately 48% (59 responses) commented on open access specifically. These comments fell into three categories: people who were passionately in favor of OA, people who were hesitant about OA and people who liked the idea of OA but did not want publication fees. Many of the comments were strongly supportive of OA, asserting that “open access is no longer why or whether, but when and how” or “open access is vital for the future of publishing.” These comments often
pointed out the accessibility benefits of OA and the need for change and emphasized that scholarly societies should be leaders in the OA movement. There were also several respondents who were hesitant or skeptical about OA, and they provided comments such as, “I’m not sure that the rush to open access is so sensible” and “I am not yet persuaded that a viable economic model for open access can be sustained.” The third group was positive about the merits of OA, but was opposed to the idea of authors paying for publication. A typical comment in this group was, “I am strongly in favor of open access journals, but not if they charge substantial fees to authors.”

**Conclusion**

This survey gave ASIS&T the opportunity to answer four questions:

**Who are ASIS&T members, JASIST authors and information science researchers?**

We found that the face of information and library science is changing. Researchers from Asia, the Middle East and Africa are becoming more active in the discipline. Also, there are many researchers who are either beginning their careers or who have 21+ years of research experience, with fewer researchers in between.

**What are the publication trends among these groups?**

Of those surveyed 68% submit articles to peer-reviewed journals. It appears that on average the authors in our sample group published one to two papers a year.

**What access levels do they have to journal literature in general and JASIST specifically?**

In answer to this question 75.4% of the respondents indicated that they had “good” or “excellent” access to journal literature and 80.8% read *JASIST*. The majority, 60%, accessed the journal on line either through their library’s institutional subscription or through a personal membership.

**Are they aware of and/or participating in the open access movement?**

There was an overwhelming awareness of open access with 95.7% of respondents indicating that they had at least some knowledge of open access journals. However, only 29.4% of authors had published in an open access journal.

This survey establishes a baseline for the further survey data we will solicit after the *JASIST* open access policy has been in place for a period of time.

---
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POSITION DESCRIPTION

Editor-in-Chief

JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR INFORMATION SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY (JASIST)

NATURE OF POSITION: The Editor’s foremost responsibility is to ensure the high quality and quantity of papers published in JASIST. Working in collaboration with the Editorial Board, the Editor’s additional responsibility is to set the vision and scope for the Journal in a manner consistent with those of the Society. The Editor solicits high quality papers that fit the scope of JASIST and oversees the activities of the Associate Editors, Guest Editors, and Editorial Board to ensure that submitted papers are peer reviewed by appropriately qualified persons. The Editor ensures prompt communication with authors to accept or reject manuscripts or to request revisions in response to referees’ reports. The Editor, in consultation with the Society, appoints and renews Editorial Board members for an agreed term ensuring that the Board’s composition is sufficiently international and broad in scope to maintain JASIST’s stature worldwide within its field. The Editor communicates at least annually with the Editorial Board concerning the development of the Journal, editorial strategy, submissions and promotion. The Editor assists the Publisher in promoting JASIST by advising on publicity, and promoting JASIST wherever possible through contacts and at conferences attended. The Editor is responsible for the intellectual workflow (e.g., using the electronic manuscript system, sequencing papers in issues, etc.) and ensuring that the instructions to authors are followed (e.g., that papers are original and have not been published elsewhere; that papers are not defamatory or otherwise unlawful, and that appropriate illustrations and tabular matter, permissions, and assignments of copyright are included). The Editor receives some support for editorial assistance from the Publisher.

BACKGROUND REQUIREMENTS:

a) Education: Graduate degree.

b) Skills Required: The Editor must be a leader who has strong motivational, interpersonal, and communication skills. He or she must be highly motivated to publish a successful journal and must recognize the broad scope of information science and technology. A global perspective, flexibility, and diplomatic skills are required to encourage diverse and creative contributions and to arbitrate controversial issues and points of views. Knowledge of electronic communications and manuscript management systems is essential. The Editor must be familiar with electronic publishing trends, issues of originality and reuse, open access points of view and publishing economics. In additional to oversight abilities, the Editor must be willing and able to delegate responsibilities.

c) Term: The term for this position is five years. A limit of two terms is imposed.

d) Relevant Experience: Substantial knowledge of JASIST and the field of information science and technology and a strong record of scholarly publication. Prior editorship experience and/or editorial board experience with a comparable scholarly, technical, or scientific (refereed) journal is highly preferred.

APPLICATION PROCEDURE

Applications will be considered beginning on March 1, 2008 and until the position is filled.

Send applications to:
JASIST Editor Search Committee
C/o Richard Hill
ASIS&T
1320 Fenwick Lane, Suite 510
Silver Spring, MD 20910, USA

The application package should include, but not be limited to, the following:

- Applicant’s vision of information science: the directions it should take; its hot, warm, and cold areas;
- Applicant’s publishing & editorial experience;
- Reasons why the applicant is specially qualified as Editor-in-Chief of this publication;
- Applicant’s view on current issues and strategies with the publication: backlog, special issues, etc.;
- Applicant’s ideas on ways to improve the readability of the publication: special initiatives, survey articles, etc.;

The applicant must also provide a detailed resume, listing all past and present affiliations, editorial positions held, and activities in professional societies and technical conferences. Further, the applicant should provide a complete list of publications, honors and awards received, and other information deemed relevant to the Editor-in-Chief position.