

Open Access to Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Peter Suber

*Research Professor of Philosophy
Earlham College, Richmond, Indiana-47374-4095
E-mail: peter.suber@earlham.edu*

ABSTRACT

The paper argues for mandating open access (OA) to electronic theses and dissertations (ETDs). ETDs are the most invisible form of useful literature and the most useful form of invisible literature. ETDs should be considered low-hanging fruit for the OA movement, along with journal articles. Their authors are not paid to write them, and can consent to OA without losing revenue. Fears that OA for ETDs will prevent future publication are understandable but groundless. There are easy work-arounds for ETDs describing patentable discoveries or containing chapters for which copyright has already been transferred to publishers. An OA requirement will even elicit better work.

Keywords: Open access, electronic theses, dissertations

1. INTRODUCTION

I finished my dissertation in 1977, before the web, before the internet, and even before personal computers. I typed it on an Olivetti typewriter and, when my committee accepted it, I paid the department secretary a dollar a page to retype it according to the formatting specs of the university. I was honoured when the university made a copy on acid-free paper, bound it in boards, and put it on the open stacks in the main library. It even had a card in the card catalogue. I was also honoured when I discovered a week later that someone had stolen the copy from the library. In addition, I sent a copy to University Microfilms International (UMI), which produced priced paper or microfilm copies on-demand. (UMI is now owned by ProQuest.) As far as I know it is still accessible for a price from UMI. I have no idea whether anyone has ever ordered a copy, let alone how many.

Unlike some other PhDs (the majority? the minority?), I never mined my dissertation for publications. I was too eager to get on to other projects to publish it as a book or turn any of its chapters into articles. So it is only accessible today from UMI, on UMI's terms. If I had the text in digital form, I would certainly want to make it OA through a suitable repository, but I honestly could not tell you whether that would violate the agreement I signed with UMI back in 1977. I would have to research that question, and I do not expect that the research would be easy. But I do not have a digital copy of the text and am not likely to make one any time soon.

2. THE QUALITY OF DISSERTATIONS

I know firsthand that dissertation literature is valuable, and not only because my mother and I think I wrote a good one. I wrote on a fairly obscure topic for which there wasn't

much existing literature—a fairly common phenomenon, given the assignment. But I found a handful of dissertations on neighboring topics in the UMI catalogue and one was better than every book I found on the same subject. Unfortunately, I had to buy these dissertations in order to read them. I had to buy them even to look at them closely enough to evaluate their relevance.

Dissertations are longer than journal articles and cover their topics more comprehensively. They are more responsive to past literature than journal articles and are usually researched, refined, and revised over a longer period of time. And they are not yet salami-sliced into meaningless or trivial snippets. Indeed, they're a prime brand of the salami itself.

Dissertations are more like preprints than post-prints in the sense that they are not formally peer-reviewed. But they undergo a kind of review that is at least as rigorous. If you have ever refereed a journal article, you know that the job can be done in an afternoon, and often is. Moreover, your name is rarely associated with the published (or rejected) work, and rarely known to the authors or readers. This frees referees to criticise powerful authors of flawed articles, but it also frees referees to trash powerless authors of brilliant articles. It frees referees from accountability. By contrast, your dissertation was vetted by your faculty committee for months or even years. You know who they are, and so will most readers of the final product. They feel that their own reputations are on the line, almost as much as yours is. That is why they willingly devote time and care to reviewing a dissertation and why they rigorously, almost jealously, enforce a high standard. When they certify that you have satisfied the university's requirements for originality, contribution to knowledge, and mastery of the relevant literature, their judgment is at least as well-considered, authoritative, and useful as a thumbs up from a journal referee.

Instead of devaluing dissertations, because they are not formally peer-reviewed, we should see a beautiful win-win situation here. They undergo a review that is sufficiently rigorous

to make them good, or to make them worth disseminating and using, but at the same time, their review is sufficiently unconventional (or sufficiently unlike journal review) to carry no publisher's investment and therefore no publisher's resistance to OA.

3. THE INVISIBILITY OF DISSERTATIONS

Dissertations are not just good, they are largely invisible. Libraries rarely hold dissertations not written by their own students. Dissertations are not well indexed. They are available for purchase, but difficult to evaluate before purchasing. Moreover, many details from dissertations never make it into journal articles, and many dissertation topics are too narrow to justify book publication.

In short, dissertations are high in quality and low in accessibility. In fact, I would say they constitute the most invisible form of useful literature and the most useful form of invisible literature. Because of their high quality, the access problem is *worth solving*. You know what I am building up to, but let me get there step by step.

4. THREE DEGREES OF DIFFICULTY IN ACHIEVING OPEN ACCESS

Because OA to copyrighted literature requires the copyright holder's consent, we can rank different bodies of literature according to the ease or difficulty of obtaining that consent. The low-hanging fruit—in the words of the Budapest Open Access Initiative (BOAI)—is the literature that "scholars give to the world without expectation of payment". Let's say that Phase One of the OA movement is to provide OA to this kind of royalty-free literature. Because its authors do not expect to be paid, and write for impact rather than money, they can consent to OA without losing revenue. That makes it much easier for scholars to consent to OA than musicians or movie-makers.

Phase Two is to provide OA to royalty-producing literature like books. This is harder because the copyright holder must be persuaded that OA will either increase sales or bring

benefits that outweigh the loss of sales. If you have been following the book-digitizing wars, you know that some authors are persuaded and some are not.

Phase Three is to reform copyright law in order to reduce permission barriers. It would help to shorten term of copyright, extend the first-sale doctrine to digital content, restore fair-use rights, nullify clickwrap licenses as contracts of adhesion, and safeguard the public domain from further prospective or retroactive enclosure. But because these steps require legislation, and are opposed by well-funded industries, they are the most difficult of all. Fortunately, they are merely desirable and not necessary for OA. We can get all we need from Phases One and Two. For cutting-edge research published in journals, we can get all we need from Phase One.

First Point: Dissertations are Phase One literature, just like journal articles. Graduate students are not paid for their dissertations and can consent to OA without losing revenue. Their consent is even easier to obtain than the consent of faculty members, since dissertations are already subject to the terms and conditions of the university.

If there is a difference, it is that authors of journal articles know they will never be paid for those texts, but some graduate students plan to turn their dissertations into books that generate (or could generate) revenue. I will return to this possibility. But note that it is the future book that is Phase Two; the dissertation is still Phase One.

5. MANDATING OA FOR ETDS

I have read about 30 university web pages on ETD policies. What is remarkable is the way they list the benefits of OA (wider visibility and greater impact) among the benefits of ETDs as if OA were a natural consequence of creating the work in digital form.

In principle, universities could require electronic submission of the dissertation without requiring deposit in the institutional repository. They could also require deposit in the repository without requiring OA. But in practice, most

universities do not draw these distinctions. Most universities that encourage or require electronic submission also encourage or require OA. What is remarkable is that for theses and dissertations, OA is not the hard step. The hard step is encouraging or requiring electronic submission.

For dissertations that are born digital and submitted in digital form, OA is pretty much the default. I need not tell you that this is not at all the case with journal literature.

There are two lessons to draw from this. First, anything that fosters ETDs (as opposed to paper TDs) fosters OA to ETDs. Second, the call for OA to ETDs is not new. It has been part of the ETD movement since the beginning. If there is anything new here, it is that I am arguing for an OA mandate, not just for OA.

Notable, explicit calls for OA to ETDs have already been made by Edward Fox and Gail McMillan¹, Edinburgh's Theses Alive project (2004), JISC's Electronic Thesis project (2005), Richard Jones and Theo Andrew², and Arthur Sale³. UNESCO's ETD project called for "equal access" to ETDs in 1999, but this is just another way of calling for OA, since priced access cannot be equal access. The international Digital Access to Research Theses (DART) project is committed to OA for ETDs but is just starting up its advocacy efforts.

6. NINE REASONS TO MANDATE OA FOR ETDS

1. Nowadays most theses and dissertations are born digital. They are already ETDs even if the university only wants to deal with printouts.
2. ETDs are Phase One, royalty-free works of research literature. Their authors lose no revenue by consenting to OA.
3. ETDs are not formally published. Hence there are no publishers in the picture to resist or oppose OA. There are no publisher fears of lost revenue to answer. There are no publisher permissions to seek. There are no publisher negotiations to delay or deter OA archiving.

4. Mandates work and exhortations do not. This is the universal lesson from OA mandates to date, whether at funding agencies or universities.

The US National Institutes of Health (NIH) has encouraged but not required OA to NIH-funded research since May 2005. It hoped that the increased flexibility would increase participation, but it had the opposite effect. In February 2006, the NIH reported to Congress that the compliance rate by its grantees was only 3.8 per cent. The low rate led the agency's own Public Access Working Group to recommend a mandate (November 2005). The Board of Regents of the National Library of Medicine reaffirmed the call for a mandate in February 2006. And in June 2006, the House Appropriations Committee instructed the NIH to adopt a mandate.

By contrast, the Wellcome Trust has mandated OA to Wellcome-funded research since October 2005 and has enjoyed a nearly 100 per cent compliance rate.

Australia registers all accepted dissertations, giving it a good sense of the denominator, or the number of dissertations eligible for OA. The OA repositories themselves give a good sense of the numerator, or the number that are actually OA at a given time. In April 2006, Arthur Sale summarised the results of different university policies on OA for ETDs: "[V]oluntary ETD deposition results in repositories collecting less than 12 per cent of the available theses, whereas mandatory policies are well accepted and cause deposit rates to rise towards 100 per cent."

5. OA solves the invisibility problem for ETDs. Without OA, there is almost no access, visibility, or indexing for dissertations. They are hard to retrieve even if discovered, and they are hard to discover. When they are OA, ETDs are not only searchable by cross-archive search tools that index the ETD repositories, they are also indexed (in growing numbers but jerky stages) by Google, Yahoo, and Microsoft. Scirus already indexes the ETDs held by the Networked Digital Library of Theses and Dissertations (NDLTD).

By making ETDs visible, OA helps the readers who wouldn't otherwise have ready access. But it also helps the ETD authors, boosting their visibility and impact just as it does for the authors of journal articles. I do not believe that anyone has studied the OA citation advantage for ETDs, but for journal articles it ranges from 50 per cent to 250 per cent and it is likely to be comparable (not necessarily identical) for ETDs.

6. Universities are in a good position to mandate OA. They can make it a simple condition of submission and acceptance.

In fact, if universities mandate OA for ETDs, their compliance rates should be higher, and grumbling lower, than mandating OA for faculty research articles. Graduate students are not as anarchical as faculty, or at least not tenured; graduate students won't be subject to countervailing pressures from publishers, at least not as often; and graduate students more likely to see the benefits of OA and the obviousness of taking advantage of the internet to disseminate research.

Universities that do not have institutional repositories can still mandate OA. The best way is to launch their own institutional repository. But they could use a consortial or regional ETD repository, or they could have their students submit ETDs directly to NDLTD, which functions as a universal or fall-back OA repository for universities without their own. They could use the universal repository I am setting up with the Internet Archive (delayed but still coming). Or they could use ProQuest's UMI, which will offer OA to ETDs when the authors or institutions request OA.

7. Mandating OA for ETDs will educate the next generation of scholars about OA, when they do not already know about it. Young scholars are already more familiar with OA than older ones, at least in the sciences. But even knowledgeable young scholars may not have much experience providing OA to their own work, let alone support and reinforcement from an important research institution. An OA mandate will teach new scholars how easy it is, how beneficial it is,

and how routine and expected it ought to be. It will teach them that OA is not incendiary and countercultural, but mainstream and simply useful. It will help create lifelong habits of self-archiving.

The greatest obstacle to routine self-archiving is unfamiliarity with the process, including groundless fears of the time it takes. Familiarity removes this obstacle.

8. An OA mandate will elicit better work.

All teachers know that students work harder and do better work when they know they are writing for a real audience—large or small—beyond the teacher. The effect is amplified if they are writing for the public. Some teachers try to harness this power by telling students to write as if their work were to appear on the front page of the *New York Times*. Some arrange to give students a real audience beyond the teacher. In a law course in which I conducted moot court, the quality of student preparation and argument improved dramatically after I started videotaping them. I did not even have to put the videos online; I just put them on reserve in the library for the rest of the semester. OA gives authors a real audience beyond the dissertation committee and real incentives to do original, impressive work.

I wrote my dissertation on Kierkegaard's dissertation. The members of my committee were strong on Kierkegaard in general, but comparatively weak on his dissertation. There were many spots in my dissertation where I could have bluffed if wanted to. But even when graduate students think it is safe and easy to fool their committee, it is risky and difficult to fool the world.

9. Finally, an OA mandate shows that the university takes the dissertation seriously.

The university asks for a new and significant work of scholarship and most students deliver one. But because the university doesn't disseminate the dissertation publicly, it sends a subtle signal that it doesn't take it seriously as a work of scholarship. Of course the dissertation committee takes it very seriously as a work of scholarship, but the university

itself doesn't do what it normally does when its scholars produce new and important work: it doesn't apply its publish-or-perish policy. This policy not only proclaims that research good enough for internal recognition is good enough for external distribution. It also proclaims the stronger converse that only research good enough for external distribution is good enough for internal recognition.

Universities have the same interests in promulgating excellent research by graduate students as they have in promulgating excellent research by faculty, the same reasons for taking pride in it, and the same reasons for applying a publish-or-perish policy or public dissemination mandate. It wants the world to know about the quality of the work done there and it wants other researchers to benefit from it. By adopting a serious public dissemination mandate for faculty and not for doctoral students, universities invite students to draw the cynical inference that the dissertation is not so much real scholarship as a hoop to jump through, a final piece of disposable "student work", an admission ticket to the profession, or a rite of passage.

Of course the dissertation is *also* an admission ticket and a rite of passage. Writing a dissertation is a lot like entering the wilderness alone, fasting to delirium, killing a wild animal, and then returning to civilisation where one is welcomed as an adult. But universities should do more to send the signal that it is an admission ticket and rite of passage *because* it is a significant work of scholarship, not the other way around.

Students may regard the dissertation as fodder for some truly significant, adult scholarship they might publish in the future. But if so, the incentive to make it significant, adult, and public comes from a future employer, not from the institution that assigned, supervised, and approved the research.

Without an OA mandate, the university is saying that it does not care whether the dissertation is publicly disseminated. But if the dissertation is really a new and significant work of scholarship, then the university should care. The message should be: If we approve

a dissertation, then we think it is good. If we think it is good, then we want others to be able to find it, use it, and build on it.

Note that this message is about the purpose of universities and the value of scholarship, not about coercion. The school does not have to say "we are requiring OA for your sake" or even "we are requiring OA for our sake". It is saying, "We will do all we can to help you do good work, and then we will do all we can to make your good work available to others." It is about the mission of a research university.

6. MANDATES, COERCION AND CONSENT

Our experience in advocating and implementing OA comes largely from the world of faculty, not the world of graduate students. In the world of faculty, the best rationale for an OA mandate is to get the attention of authors. Authors control the rate of OA growth, but they are not paying attention to OA. We can not appeal to them as a bloc because they do not act as a bloc. It is not hard to persuade them, or even excite them, once we catch their attention, but it is very hard to catch their attention because they are so anarchical, overworked, and preoccupied. So we have to work through the institutions that have the greatest influence on authors.

These arguments apply even more easily to graduate students than to faculty: the benefits are just as valuable and the barriers much lower.

One objection is that a mandate paternalistically coerces students for their own good. If true, this would be a serious problem for me, though perhaps not for everyone who defends mandates. I cannot support paternalism over competent adults, and I certainly put graduate students in that category. Fortunately, the paternalism objection misses the target and is easily answered. (The answer also applies to faculty mandates but here I'll elaborate it only for graduate students).

First, I only support mandates that are conditions on voluntary contracts. They might

be funding contracts: if you take our money, you will have to provide OA to your research; if this bothers you, then do not take our money. They might be employment contracts: if you work here, you will have to provide OA to your research; if this bothers you, then do not work here. An OA mandate for ETDs would belong to the same family. If you attend this university, you will have to provide OA to your dissertation; if this bothers you, then do not attend this university. Students who see this as a threat will go somewhere else; students who see it is a promise are getting the idea.

Second, I only support mandates with reasonable exceptions. Graduate students who have good reasons to be exempt from the mandate should be exempted, not coerced. (More on the exceptions themselves in the next section.)

Third, an OA mandate for ETDs advances the university's interest, not just the student's. The student interest is greater visibility and impact. The university interest is that an OA mandate will elicit better work, better show students that the university is taking the dissertation seriously as scholarship, better fulfill the university mission to share the knowledge it produces, and better assist researchers elsewhere who could benefit from this knowledge.

In short, the paternalism objection does not apply because the kind of OA mandate I am talking about is fundamentally consensual, not coercive, and aims at benefits far beyond the student-authors themselves.

An OA mandate for ETDs is no more problematic than other academic requirements and considerably more mission-critical. Today universities seem more interested in mission-trivial details like the margins and font sizes of a dissertation than in its availability to others who could use it, apply it, or build on it.

Arthur Sale argues that the OA mandate should apply to all dissertations submitted as of a certain date rather than all dissertations by students who enroll as of a certain date. The two methods differ because students

finish their dissertations at different rates. The first method jumps instantly to 100 per cent compliance while the second phases in compliance over a few years. If the primary goal is rapid growth in the body of OA ETDs, then Sale is right to recommend the first method. The drawback of course is that it would change the rules for students who are already enrolled. Hence, if it is important to preserve a consent or contract basis for the OA mandate, then it is better to use the second method, announce the new policy to all new applicants, and apply it only to those who choose to enroll. On the other hand, the possibility of exemptions (see next section) may introduce a sufficient consent element to let us take Sale's recommendation as well.

7. SNAGS AND SOLUTIONS

(1) Some students fear that providing OA for their ETD will disqualify it for future publication. In the world of journals, the policy to disqualify works that have already circulated as preprints is called the Ingelfinger rule. I have not heard a special name for the analogous rule applied to ETDs but for convenience I will use the same name here. Some students fear the Ingelfinger rule. Some fear it even though for decades most universities have submitted dissertations to UMI, which distributed copies on demand by xerography or microfilm to paying customers, a process that certainly counts as "publication" for journals that still follow the Ingelfinger rule.

The fear is justified in a small number of cases and unjustified in most. But we should not harm the students whose fears are justified or simply override the fears of the rest. The solution is straightforward. Universities should require students of approved dissertations to deposit the full-text and metadata in the institution's OA repository. This should take place immediately upon final approval (say, within a couple of days or a week). The university should require immediate OA to the metadata. For the text of the dissertation, immediate OA is not necessary, although it should be the default. Students may apply to the relevant dean for permission to delay OA to the text. They can seek a delay for

the whole dissertation, when they plan to publish it as a book, or for specific chapters, if they only plan to publish journal articles. Deans should approve delays only for the affected chapters and require immediate OA for the rest of the dissertation. Deans should only approve temporary delays and make them as brief as possible. During the period of the delay, deans may temporarily block access to outside users, but they should not block access to everyone. For example, access should still be open to the student, the dissertation committee, the administration, and perhaps all authenticated users affiliated with the university.

The OA metadata helps the dissertation become known to others working in the field and could even help the author gather citations, impact, and reputation while submitting chapters to journals. More critically, most Ingelfinger fears are groundless. In 2001, Gail McMillan reviewed the literature and concluded that "if one looks at the results of the Dalton and Seaman surveys in combination with Virginia Tech's surveys of graduate student alumni, the ready availability of ETDs on the Internet does not deter the vast majority of publishers from publishing articles derived from graduate research already available on the Internet."

(2) Some students make patentable discoveries during their doctoral research and want time to apply for a patent.

We do not have to force students to disclose their research before they have had a chance to patent it. We can use the same solution that we used for students who fear the Ingelfinger rule. The only difference may be the length of the approved delay.

(3) Some sections of the dissertation may be under copyright by others.

In one kind of case, students quote extensively from a copyrighted work, or reproduce a copyrighted illustration, and don't have permission to redistribute it. In another kind of case, a student has already published a chapter as a journal article, has transferred copyright to the journal, and doesn't have the journal's permission to redistribute it.

Here we can use the solution to the Ingelfinger problem with a few tweaks. Some OA delays may have to be permanent rather than temporary—i.e. for the life of the copyright rather than for some fairly short period like six months. Universities could require students to seek permission to reproduce the copyrighted material rather than to give up without trying. They could also require students who publish articles before finishing their dissertations either to retain key rights or to give up hope of using the articles in their dissertations. Students who would like to use the articles in their dissertations should retain the right of OA archiving. Students who try and fail to retain these rights could be required to delay journal publication until after their dissertation is approved. This would not be as onerous as it may look. Students could publish and get the rights they need either by publishing in an OA journal (gold journal) or in a non-OA journal that permitted post-print archiving (green journal), and about 70 per cent of subscription journals already fall into the latter category. Or, with the dean's permission, students could include published articles in the version of their text used for internal review and approval, but replace the articles with citations and links in the version used for distribution and storage.

(4) Finally, a snag of a different kind. The largest obstacle to mandatory electronic submission and OA for ETDs seems to be faculty opposition. When universities give students the option to submit their dissertation electronically, well-meaning faculty advisors often caution students against it. They are thinking of the Ingelfinger rule and preservation. They want to protect their student's shot at future dissertation-based publications and they want to be sure the student's dissertation is well-preserved.

The best solution here is education for the faculty advisors. They need to know that their own Ingelfinger fears are usually groundless. They need to know that whatever anecdotal evidence they may have is negated by Gail McMillan's systematic survey evidence. (I quoted her above: "...the ready availability of ETDs on the Internet does not deter the vast majority of publishers from publishing

articles derived from graduate research already available on the Internet.")

The preservation objection is equally groundless. Paper dissertations are not like published books that exist in hundreds or thousands of copies (benefiting from the LOCKSS principle). They are usually unique and therefore vulnerable—like mine, which was stolen from the Northwestern University library. Universities could lock them up in special collections, but this is exactly the wrong model of stewardship, as if preservation and access were incompatible when the purpose of preservation is precisely to increase, facilitate, and perpetuate access. Moreover, OA to the ETD is perfectly compatible with the existence of paper copies in the university library and elsewhere and perfectly compatible with microfilm copies at UMI.

Beyond education, the university can use its policies to counteract this bad advice. First, the availability of temporary exemptions should fully answer the Ingelfinger fear. And if necessary, universities could require both electronic and paper submission in order to satisfy everyone that dissertations will be no more vulnerable in the digital future than in the paper past.

BTW, it is because faculty advisors show themselves so backward on these issues that I recommend that exemptions from the OA requirement be sought from a dean rather than from the dissertation committee.

8. ADVOCACY AND TACTICS

There are three critical groups who are thinking about, or ought to be thinking about, OA for ETDs: (i) those already working for the spread of ETDs, (ii) those already working for OA, even if primarily for journal literature, and (iii) the university administrators, faculty, and graduate students that both the first two groups are addressing. The first two groups should talk to each other more often in order to talk more effectively to the third group. It can only help us make progress toward our related goals. We can share ideas, arguments, and strategies that work. We can share allies, such as the names of OA-

friendly faculty, librarians, and administrators in given institutions. We can share successes in two senses: we can share news but we can also count on infectious victories. Any university that mandates OA for ETDs is that much closer to mandating OA for journal post-prints and vice versa.

We can also work together on specific goals that would help both groups. For example, most of the high-end packages of OA archiving software have special plug-ins for ETDs. They do not need the plug-ins in order to accept ETDs for deposit, which they do right out of the box, but in order to help faculty supervisors read and comment on drafts, much like peer-review management systems for journals. For example, DSpace has the TAPIR plug-in; Fedora has VALET; Bepress has a tracking and submission system; and eprints has some built-in review features. These tools only work on electronic texts and they only work on digital repositories. Insofar as they are useful, they could help persuade universities to require electronic submission (if they don't already do so) and help persuade them to launch an institutional repository (if they don't already have one). We get the same dual benefit if the review software is separate from the institutional repository, not a plug-in, provided it can easily or automatically deposit the approved dissertation in the university repository at the end of the process.

Another example is the merging of ETD and eprint repositories. Arthur Sale has argued for this and pointed out several benefits. The university need not run two installations of the archiving software, train two staffs (or one staff on two systems), or run twice the number of archival back-ups. It will save money. With a merged repository, there is no danger that the ETD repository will become the poor cousin to the eprint repository, or vice versa, skimping on features or technical support. It will improve performance. A merged repository will have more content than either one alone and therefore will attract more users, traffic, links, citations, indexing robots, and impact. It will deliver greater benefits.

When we talk to graduate students, we can educate them about OA ETDs and OA eprints at the same time. The deposit process

and benefits are just about the same, and the students will want to enhance the visibility and impact of both kinds of work. When we talk to university administrators, we can make the case for OA ETDs and OA eprints at the same time. The two kinds of research output use a common institutional infrastructure and serve common institutional interests in amplifying the visibility and impact of the institution's research. I would like to see graduate students and administrators consult, discover their common interests, and then announce that they have agreed to mandate OA for ETDs because it will serve both groups, the institution as a whole, and researchers around the world.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I want to thank Richard Fyffe, Arthur Sale, Brian Surratt, Scott Walter, and above all, Sharon Reeves, for answering my many questions about ETDs.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Ayris, Paul; Pressler, Chris & McLean, Austin. The DART-Europe Project: Towards Developing a European Theses Portal, presented at the 2005 ETD meeting, Sydney, Australia, 28 September, 2005. <http://adt.caul.edu.au/etd2005/papers/066Ayris.pdf>
2. Charles W. Bailey, Jr. Electronic Theses and Dissertations: A Bibliography, DigitalKoans, 8 July, 2005. <http://www.escholarlypub.com/digitalkoans/2005/07/08/electronic-theses-and-dissertations-a-bibliography/>
3. Charles W. Bailey, Jr., ETD Policies and Procedures at ARL Institutions, DigitalKoans, 21 July, 2005. <http://www.escholarlypub.com/digitalkoans/2005/07/21/etd-policies-and-procedures-at-arl-institutions>.
4. Brody, Tim. Registry of Open Access Repositories (ROAR). <http://archives.eprints.org>.
5. <http://archives.eprints.org/?country=&version=&type=theses&order=recordcount&submit=Filter>.

6. Fox, Edward A. & McMillan, Gail. Request for Widespread Access to ETDs, October 1997. <http://www.ndltd.org/info/pubrequest.en.html>.
7. Fox, Edward A. It is easy for universities to support free culture with digital libraries: The NDLTD Example, presented at the MetaScholar Initiative (Emory University), 5 May, 2005. Only the abstract is free online. <http://www.metascholar.org/events/2005/freeculture/viewabstract.php?id=22>.
8. Jones Richard & Andrew, Theo. Open access, open source and e-theses: the development of the Edinburgh Research Archive, Program: electronic library & information systems, 39, 3, March 2005, pp. 198-212. <http://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/mcb/280/2005/00000039/00000003/art00002>.
9. OA edition. <http://www.era.lib.ed.ac.uk/handle/1842/811>.
10. Joan K. Lippincott, Institutional Strategies and Policies for Electronic Theses and Dissertations, Educause Center for Applied Research Bulletin, June 20, 2006. <http://www.educause.edu/LibraryDetailPage/666?ID=ERB0613>; http://www.earlham.edu/~peters/fos/2006_06_18_fosblogarchive.html#115092901136590442.
11. McMillan, Gail. Do ETDs Deter Publishers? Does Web availability count as prior publication? *College and Research Libraries News*, 2001, **62**(6). <http://scholar.lib.vt.edu/staff/gailmac/publications/pubrsETD2001.html>.
12. Sale, Arthur. The impact of mandatory policies on ETD acquisition. *D-Lib Magazine*, 2006. <http://www.dlib.org/dlib/april06/sale/04sale.html>.
13. Sale, Arthur. Unifying ETD with open access repositories 2005 edited by Tony Carneglutti. In Proceedings of 8th International Electronic Theses and Dissertations Symposium, Sydney, Australia. <http://eprints.comp.utas.edu.au:81/archive/00000202/>.
14. Seamans, Nancy H. Electronic theses and dissertations as prior publications: What the editors say. *Library Hi Tech*, 2003. <http://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/mcb/238/2003/00000021/00000001/art00006;jsessionid=4g9lr4xw0wj0.alice>.
15. Surratt, Brian. ETD release/access policies in ARL Libraries: A preliminary study. In 2005 ETD conference in Sydney, Australia, 30 September, 2005. <http://adt.caul.edu.au/etd2005/papers/055Surratt.pdf>
16. <http://www.besurratt.com/ETDPolicies/index.htm>

About the Author



Peter Suber received a PhD in philosophy in 1978, and a Juris Doctor in 1982, both from Northwestern University. He is a Senior Research Professor of Philosophy at Earlham College, the Open Access Project Director at Public Knowledge, and a Senior Researcher at SPARC (Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition). Suber was the principal drafter of the Budapest Open Access Initiative. He writes Open Access News and the SPARC Open Access Newsletter, considered the most authoritative blog and newsletter on open access. He is the author of *The Paradox of Self-Amendment* (Lang 1990), the first book-length study of self-referential paradoxes in law, and *The Case of the Speluncean Explorers: Nine New Opinions* (Routledge 1998), the first book-length "rehearing" of Lon Fuller's classic, fictional case. He has also written many articles on self-reference, ethics, formal and informal logic, the philosophy of law, the history of philosophy, and open access to science and scholarship.