



SURVEY RESULTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

Borrowing from the Washington University in St. Louis Scholarly Communications Group's statement of purpose, this survey defined scholarly communication (SC) as the creation, transformation, dissemination, and preservation of knowledge related to teaching, research, and scholarly endeavors. The survey explored how research institutions are currently organizing staff to support scholarly communication services, and whether their organizational structures have changed since 2007. It asked respondents about the SC services offered at their institutions, how those services are supported and assessed, and the impacts that SC leadership and services may have had on the institution or larger community. Sixty of the 126 ARL member institutions responded to the survey between May 14 and June 12 for a response rate of 48%. Of these respondents, 56 (93%) affirmed that their library or institution was involved in SC services.

Scholarly Communication Leadership

All but three of these 56 respondents reported that an individual or group in the library had primary responsibility for leading organized SC efforts at their institutions. When asked whether the library's SC leadership is considered to be the institution's main SC leader, 37 of the 49 respondents (76%) answered yes, but several of their comments reveal a hesitation in staking a definitive leadership claim. For example, one respondent stated that leadership roles are, "Perhaps not clear... it's hard to say who the 'main leaders' are." Another offered that their library has "the only dedicated office on campus, but additional units in the library... and outside the library...also contribute." Some of the 12 respondents (24%) who answered that they are

not the main institutional leader had similar comments. One wrote that their team "is as far as I know the only game on campus, but not necessarily recognized by the institution at large." Another respondent explained, "I'm not sure the institution is completely aware of scholarly communication 'services'."

These comments reflect a tension between responsibility and leadership that is perhaps felt by many libraries. They also illustrate how difficult it can be to understand institutional perceptions of SC leadership. The nature of scholarly communication itself may be one cause of the difficulty. SC encompasses such a wide variety of activities, individuals, and groups that identifying one leader may be impossible or irrelevant. In fact, every library identified as involved in providing SC services also collaborates with institutional partners to support those services. Perhaps seeking clarity about definitive leaders is the wrong approach; the best answer to the SC leadership question may simply be that 95% of the respondents identified their libraries as responsible for SC leadership efforts, and are, therefore, SC leaders at the institutional level.

Leadership Structure, Staffing, and Time

The survey asked respondents to select one of six options that best described their SC leadership structure. Seventeen respondents (30%) selected a single individual in the library as the primary leader. Fourteen (25%) reported leadership by a library office, department, or unit. Thirteen (23%) indicated that SC leadership was distributed among two or more individuals in the library (other than a unit or team). Nine (16%) reported that leadership was the responsibility of a library team, committee, or task force. The remaining

three reported that SC leadership was not associated with any single individual or group.

An analysis of respondents' comments indicates this forced choice does not accurately describe the actual distribution of responsibility. Organizational changes are one reason. One library recently transferred SC leadership from a committee to a single position. In at least three instances, SC leadership had been, or was soon to be, transformed by the creation of a new office or unit. Another reason is that multiple leadership structures exist within many of the libraries. As one respondent explained, "We actually have a combination of the three instances above: we have an individual who tends to lead the scholarly communication efforts, a scholarly communications committee, and a (new) unit where these activities rest...."

Individual Leader

The 17 individuals who lead SC efforts are mostly assistant/associate directors, department or program heads, and scholarly communications librarians. All but two report to the library director or assistant/associate director. Their titles indicate their responsibilities range across collections and technical services, research and instruction, digital services, copyright and licensing, and publishing. Eight have special training or degrees related to their SC responsibilities. These include law degrees, publishing experience, copyright and licensing training, and attendance at the ARL/ACRL Institute on Scholarly Communication. Nine have direct reports ranging from .75 to 6 FTE (on average, 1.19 FTE librarians and .76 FTE staff). Four have at least one FTE librarian reporting to them. Four have at least one FTE staff. While the other eight have no direct reports, several have support from SC steering committees and other librarians. These individuals devote between 1% and 100% of their time to SC efforts, with an average of 53%. The table below indicates how much time 16 of these individuals spend leading SC efforts at their institutions.

% Time	N	%
< 25%	3	19
25-50%	6	38
> 75%	7	44

Library Office, Department, or Unit

The names of all but a few of the 14 offices that lead SC efforts include the phrase "scholarly communication." The names indicate that other responsibilities include collections, digital services, copyright, and publishing. The number of staff in these offices ranges from one to 20, with an average of seven. Most of these are full-time staff (average 6.1 FTE) and the office names suggest that SC efforts make up a significant aspect of each position's responsibilities. In half of the offices at least one person has special training in copyright or licensing or has a law degree. Most of the heads of these offices report to the library director. The table below shows the range of staff across these 14 offices.

Total Staff	N	%
1	1	7
3-4	6	43
5-9	3	21
≥10	4	29

Two or More Individuals in the Library

Of the 13 libraries where multiple individuals have primary responsibility for SC leadership, four (31%) report that two individuals share leadership roles and six (46%) report three individuals share leadership roles. Three respondents did not specify the number of individuals. The respondents reported on 34 positions ranging from a library dean and assistant directors to department and program heads to various other librarians. The responsibilities reflected by the position titles are as wide-ranging as reported above.

Eighteen positions (54%) report to the library director. Three libraries have a direct chain of command leading to the dean (e.g., position 2 is overseen by position 1, and position 1 is overseen by the dean). Four libraries have two or more positions reporting to the same individual (e.g., there are three separate positions, and each reports to the same dean). Five are set up in a distributed way, with positions reporting to different deans, associate deans, or heads. One institution uses a combination of these latter two arrangements.

Nineteen of these SC leaders have direct reports; 12 have between .25 and 1 FTE, four have 2 to 5 FTE, and

two have 10 to 25 full-time liaison librarians. Thirteen individuals have copyright, licensing, or publishing training or a law degree. The amount of time that 30 of these individuals devote to leading SC efforts ranges from 5% to 100%, with an average of 43%. The dean spent the smallest amount of time on SC leadership. The table below shows the distribution of time across these positions.

% Time	N	%
< 25%	11	37
25–50%	10	33
75–100%	9	30

Library Team, Committee, or Task Force

The nine teams that lead SC efforts are made up of representatives from a variety of departments including collections/technical services, research/instruction (six teams each), branch/regional libraries, digital initiatives (four teams each), library administration, special collections/archives (two teams each), and library IT. The number of members ranges from three to 12, with an average of eight. Five teams report they have full-time members. Most of the teams report to the library director or a management group. The table below shows the number of members across the nine teams.

Members	N	%
3	3	33
9–10	4	44
≥10	2	22

No Single Individual or Group

One respondent described their institution as a decentralized organization, and while there is a library-led Scholarly Communications Group, “other [institutional] libraries, academic units, and support units can offer their own SC services.”

Scholarly Communication Services in the Library

The survey asked whether four broad categories of SC services—campus-based publishing, education and outreach activities, hosting and managing digital

content, and support for research, publishing, and creative works—were offered by the library, elsewhere in the institution, or not offered. The responses show that educational activities continue to be a defining characteristic of libraries’ SC roles that was first reported in SPEC Kit 299 Scholarly Communication Education Initiatives.

On average, 89% of respondents offer one or more of the seven activities in the education and outreach category. Services to “advise and educate authors about copyright, retaining rights, etc.” are the only ones offered by all the responding libraries. It is notable that librarians very often serve as copyright educators even though only about a quarter of library SC leaders have law degrees or have participated in some form of copyright training. Seventy-six percent of the responding libraries offer services related to hosting and managing digital content, 71% offer campus-based publishing services, and 55% provide the services associated with supporting research, publishing, and creative works.

A deeper analysis of the responses suggests that three different categories would more accurately describe the library services currently offered: 1) liaising, outreach, and support for author rights, 2) hosting and preserving digital content, and 3) digital scholarship support. With the specific services categorized in this way, the percentages change: 75% of the libraries offer liaison, outreach, and author rights support; 75% host and preserve digital content; and 68% provide digital scholarship support.

Liaising, outreach, and support for author rights activities include consultations with researchers as authors and rights holders (advising on publications and legal matters or planning events to increase scholars’ awareness of scholarly publishing issues) and managing outreach requests usually associated with liaison librarian duties, which often support authorship (e.g., fielding requests for purchases or subscriptions or assisting with literature reviews).

Hosting and preserving digital content activities relate to accessing and maintaining institutional research data and content, storing and preserving institutional data and content, and sharing or publishing institutional data and content, particularly via institutional technologies (e.g., institutional repositories).

Digital scholarship support includes the creation of the products of digital scholarship (e.g., multimedia projects), especially the use of tools and expertise to manipulate or create digital products (data mining, data visualization, GIS). These categories relate to scholars as authors and researchers, as curators hosting and preserving digital information, and as content creators using innovative technologies.

Services Provided Outside the Library

Because SC encompasses such a variety of activities, it comes as no surprise that there are many institutional stakeholders that offer SC services outside of libraries. Education and outreach services are also provided by the office of research, general counsel, instructional technology offices, and teaching and learning centers, among others. Not surprisingly, university presses offer publishing services, but so do academic departments, particularly for faculty-hosted electronic journals. Research centers, institutes, and labs host/manage digital content, as do institutional IT offices. Support for research and creative works is distributed among the office of research, academic departments, IT office, technology transfer office, and digital humanities centers. While all respondents report that at least some services are offered both by the library and the institution, the distribution of responsibility shows that the library is the primary SC service provider except in a few cases of patent research, disciplinary repositories, and multimedia production.

Support for SC Services

The survey next asked who else at the library and institution besides the “leaders” supports SC services. The resulting comments are nicely summarized in one respondent’s quip: “I think a better question may be ‘Who doesn’t?’” The comments included below highlight groups or issues not addressed elsewhere in the survey.

Repeated most often among the comments was the importance of liaison librarians in educating their communities about SC issues, including copyright, author rights, open access (OA), and institutional repositories (IR). As one respondent stated, “According to our recently adopted subject librarian position description framework, these librarians are expected to:

educate and inform faculty, graduate students, and campus administrators about scholarly communication issues, copyright, and their rights as authors; advocate for sustainable models of scholarly communication and assist in the development and creation of tools and services to facilitate scholarly communication; and support and promote the IR by helping administrators, faculty and students understand the role of the IR in building and preserving digital collections and assisting in content recruitment.” In fact, in over half of the 44 library staff-related comments respondents drew specific attention to subject librarians and/or liaison librarians. Additionally, two respondents identified a liaison-related service: the creation of web pages or web guides to describe the library’s SC services or, specifically, to identify resources for compliance with the National Science Foundation’s (NSF) Data Management Plan requirements.

Respondents’ comments also highlight the important outreach role for library directors: to be the SC spokesperson who can communicate the variety of librarians’ roles to those outside the library.

Open Journal Systems, a program that allows faculty to host their own peer-reviewed journals, is supported by both library and institution staff. While journal hosting is not a new activity, it is an SC practice that has been made increasingly easier as a growing number of software programs facilitate the process.

At one institution, where open access is a significant part of the institutional culture, a unique position outlined in the comments is the “OA System administrator: [the] librarian [who] designed and manages [the] technical infrastructure for Open Access Policy workflows.” In this position, the librarian plans and handles the practical implementation of institutional SC policy, playing a central role in that institution’s SC – and organizational – landscape. The leadership inherent in that role is very unusual and stands in sharp contrast to many other respondents’ comments, which tend to be more similar to the respondent who wrote that, “one of the questions on our upcoming survey asks who should support open access on campus.” A comment apropos to many responding institutions was that as a result of “leadership changes in the libraries and at the university as a whole, support

for scholarly communication services will continue to evolve.”

Other notable roles in SC that librarians and library staff play include offering a sponsored readings course for graduate students about SC issues, collaborating with non-library faculty on grant proposals related to SC issues, convening campus special interest groups (e.g., a campus serials interest group), and participating in needs assessment activities of the libraries.

One respondent nicely summarized the library’s organizing roles: “We are campus leaders in supporting media software for the creation of new types of scholarly works. We are also the primary place on campus for preservation of digital content. We are the leaders in the open access movement, but we rely heavily on faculty input. We are advisors when it comes to copyright, but leave the final decisions up to the content creators. We convene a faculty group that sets copyright policy for campus.”

Several respondents acknowledged the role that individual faculty members and/or departments have in supporting SC efforts. One respondent stated, “As we have identified champions and supporters of open access and new means of scholarly communication, they have been asked to advocate library services in support of SC among their colleagues and graduate students.” Another respondent wrote, “Faculty often support themselves by learning about and using technology creatively to suit their SC needs,” and another offered, “...I think it’s fair to say that the science, engineering, and architecture colleges all provide some SC support in their own units which are more appropriate to their own expertise and faculty.” Several respondents identified an additional role related to faculty: that of participants in faculty governance, in which they discuss and vote on institutional policies, such as open access resolutions.

Respondents also singled out institutional information technology offices, the office of research, the general counsel, provosts, and graduate schools as SC service providers. Centers for teaching and learning were also identified more than once as partners, especially in referring faculty to the library for SC advice, or inviting the library to offer SC-related workshops or other programs. Many who identified outside offices

or units said they play a role in developing data management strategies and data management plans.

Organizational Changes since 2007

Since 2007, when SPEC Kit 299 was published, nearly three-quarters of the institutions responding to the current survey have undergone organizational changes intended to improve library support for SC services. Of the 39 respondents who described their organization’s changes, 24 created at least one new library or administrative position (either adding a new position or changing position descriptions of an existing position) with SC responsibilities. Sixteen created a new SC department or unit, or significantly rearranged the duties of an existing one. Eight libraries created at least one new working group or team to plan and support SC efforts. One institution rearranged space to provide a centralized location for SC services.

Two institutions provided specific information on a reorganization involving Special Collections departments. In both cases, after the reorganizations, Special Collections reported to the administrator, or became part of the unit, with SC leadership responsibilities in the library. Both institutions reasoned that because digitization, digital publishing, and e-records archiving are significant aspects in Special Collections services, sharing expertise and coordinating efforts would be more efficient if Special Collections were included in the same department or reporting structure as the institutional repository, digital library initiatives, and so on.

Assessment of SC Services

Only eight libraries have evaluated the success of their SC services; however, 18 others say they plan to. Five of the eight have surveyed faculty, open access fund recipients, and/or workshop participants. Seven use annual reports, individual performance reviews, and statistics on use of services (e.g., institutional repository or open access fund) in their assessment activities.

Among those who are planning to assess their SC services, three institutions are considering surveys, and four institutions will be or have been gathering statistics related to participation in or use of SC services, such as numbers of users asking rights-related questions. Two others will be undergoing an audit

for certification as a Trusted Digital Repository, a program offered in conjunction with the National Archives and Records Administration, OCLC, and the Research Libraries Group.

At those libraries that have conducted assessment, one has used the data gathered to better inform liaison work by recognizing differences in SC needs, and approaches to SC, among various disciplines. Another library, using results from their institution's SC survey, has plans to "investigate implementing new services for OA monograph publishing, print on demand, and [to] improve digital preservation." Redesigning the library's SC-related web pages was a priority for one recent assessment project. Finally, several assessment projects aim to survey local trends in SC issues, such as faculty awareness of open access policies, interest in particular SC educational programs, and research data needs, to better plan the library's future SC outreach and technology-related support.

Impact on Authors

The survey asked respondents to identify, from a list, which demonstrable outcomes have resulted from their library's or institution's SC efforts and services. If the prompt had been to "indicate which outcomes might have resulted, at least in part, from the SC efforts and services your library or institution provides," the answers might have been different. Instead, one commenter stated, "I do not feel comfortable in answering this question as I have no way of knowing if authors have changed their practices based solely on the SC efforts we have done," and another offered, "It is my opinion that because we have not engaged in formal assessment, it's difficult or impossible to determine whether the libraries' SC efforts and services have had demonstrable outcomes."

Nevertheless, a majority of respondents provided feedback on how authors participate in SC activities and how institutions support those activities or consider new directions in SC policies. The most common outcomes reported were authors submitting work to the institutional repository (80%), seeking assistance with questions related to authorship, which have increased since 2007 (65%), and authors complying with funding mandates from agencies such as NIH and

NSF (59%). Forty-three percent reported that authors at their institutions have used Creative Commons/Scholars Commons licenses for their work, and 20 institutions (41%) indicated that authors have increasingly published in open access journals. Other outcomes include authors using copyright addenda (35%), submitting work to subject or disciplinary repositories (31%), and declining to publish in or edit particular journals (27%).

The number of institutions reporting that faculty have declined to publish in or edit particular journals was supplemented in the comments by responses referring to faculty and student activism, such as signing the "recent White House petition" on open access and the "'Cost of Knowledge' [Elsevier] boycott." In these comments, more than one respondent again noted that faculty editors are founding open access journals, often using the library-hosted, Public Knowledge Project-developed Open Journal Systems platform. Also included in the comments was the fact that librarians at one institution had themselves adopted an open access resolution.

Impact on Institutions

The respondents' most commonly identified institutional impacts were an increased use of the institutional repository, a growing interest in and support for open access publishing, and growing numbers of staffing and/or physical spaces to handle SC-related responsibilities. The vast majority host an institutional repository (44, or 82%) and most of those repositories have seen an increase in holdings (39, or 70%). Related to this finding, electronic theses and dissertations are available open access at 44 institutions. Furthermore, as noted above, 20 institutions have seen an increasing number of faculty publishing in OA journals and 16 (30%) have created or maintained an open access publishing fund to support this growth.

Organizational changes also reflect the increasing importance of SC issues to institutions. Most respondents have seen the number of positions with SC responsibilities at their institutions increase since 2007 (38, or 70%), 13 (24%) have created new centers or institutes to deal solely with SC questions and support, and 11 (20%) have rearranged or gained physical spaces to better support SC services.

SC Resolutions

Faculty governance bodies have supported open access (OA) resolutions and endorsements at 11 institutions (20%), five others (9%) have endorsed or passed a resolution related to SC exclusive of OA. Most resolutions or endorsements encourage and recommend that faculty authors be aware of the costs of journals where they publish, edit, or review, and make their work available in the IR when possible. Nearly all of these statements “encourage open access when [it] doesn’t conflict with [the professional] advancement of [a] faculty member,” as one respondent phrased it.

Two respondents stated that there is an OA policy that, unlike a mandate or recommendation from a faculty governance body, grants the institutions license to freely share faculty members’ scholarly articles. Both policies also allow authors to apply for a waiver of the license or an embargo on access when either the license or immediate access is not in an author’s best interest. In three cases library faculty passed OA policies or mandates in their departments. Similar to the institutional OA policies, the library OA policies or mandates call on library faculty authors to negotiate rights to deposit their works locally and make articles openly available. A waiver is available if rights cannot be obtained.

One faculty senate resolution stands out in encouraging institutional administration “to work with departments and colleges to assure that the review process for promotion, tenure and merit takes into consideration these new trends and realities in academic publication.” This statement, passed in 2009, is fairly unique in recognizing one of the biggest challenges in asking faculty to publish in OA journals—the entrenched habit of tenure review committees to consider journal impact factors when reviewing a faculty member’s tenure application—and suggests that it is not enough for faculty to be aware of publishing trends in order to significantly change current publishing models and support public access to research.

Some respondents specified the addendum to publishing agreements their faculty use most often, or the copyright addenda they most often recommend to faculty authors. The majority referred to the Science Commons Copyright Addendum Engine, and several more identified the Science Commons-Scholarly

Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition (SPARC) addendum, or Access-Reuse addendum, in particular. Two Canadian respondents also referred to a SPARC-affiliated license, which is similar to the Access-Reuse addendum used by US institutions. Another popular addendum is the one endorsed by the Committee on Institutional Cooperation (CIC), a consortium of 13 ARL member institutions. Several institutions provide authors with recommendations in terms of “basic” and “broader” copyright addenda. In such cases, the “basic” addenda is based on the language used by the National Institutes of Health for compliance with their funding mandate, and the “broader” addenda uses the Science Commons-SPARC addenda or bases its language on a document about negotiating publishing agreements from the IUPUI Copyright Management Center.

Comparisons to 2007 Survey

There are some similarities between the findings from the 2007 SPEC Kit on *Scholarly Communication Education Initiatives* and the current survey. For one, a distributed, shared SC leadership structure within libraries is still the most common model in use. However, in 2007, only 32% of libraries had a Chief SC Librarian, and the majority of those librarians spent less than 30% of their time on SC initiatives. Now, in less than five years, SC leaders are spending closer to 50% of their time on SC efforts. Furthermore, a majority of the respondents to the current survey have carved out formal library positions—one or more individuals, or teams/units—to lead SC efforts.

There are further similarities between the two surveys’ findings. For example, assessment of SC efforts is still rare. In 2007, only five respondents had assessed their SC education initiatives, compared to eight in 2012. A more positive trend that has continued is faculty hosting OA journals using online journal publishing platforms supported by libraries. Likewise positive is the continuing emphasis on educating researchers about SC issues to encourage the use publication agreement addenda, as well as the formalization of institutional support for OA in faculty governance resolutions.

In many ways, the current survey findings highlight the efficacy of the education initiatives that ARL

member libraries were leading in 2007 (at that time, 75% of responding institutions stated that they were engaged in SC education initiatives). Results from this survey point to gains in staffing and spaces for SC, indicating an institutional need and demand for these services, and successful internal educational efforts, since most respondents indicated that SC education is a significant role for liaison librarians.

Furthermore, educational initiatives have likely played a significant role in the rise of author activism. In all the faculty governance statements about OA or SC initiatives that survey respondents provided, libraries were identified as partners in publishing, rights negotiations, and education. Many of these resolutions were passed between 2007 and 2009, around the time that the National Institutes of Health (NIH) Public Access Policy was implemented and prior to the National Science Foundation's requirement for data management plans. Many libraries were involved in advising authors about NIH compliance and may have taken it as an additional opportunity to talk to faculty about open access and author rights. Author activism may now be seen in a variety of outlets: faculty signing national petitions against the high prices of subscriptions to scholarly publications, individual departments adopting open access resolutions, faculty refusing to publish or edit in particular journals, and, as stated earlier, faculty founding and editing their own journals hosted on library servers.

In part because of education and outreach efforts, especially with regard to institutional repositories, libraries have been acknowledged as relevant parties in institutional planning for preserving and hosting digital content. Past SC efforts that reached out to faculty and research groups have also prepared librarians to be included in recent SC developments, not just in the sciences, but also in the humanities. Overall, collaboration among libraries and other institutional units to support SC activities is more prominent and obvious than it was in 2007, as evidenced by the partnerships identified by member libraries in their survey responses. Additionally, with the advent of

digital humanities activities, humanities researchers are more visible and vocal participants in a greater number of SC activities than was the case in 2007.

Conclusion

Overwhelmingly, libraries are leaders in organizing scholarly communication efforts at their institutions. This leadership is highly collaborative. Within libraries, leadership is often distributed among several library units, offices, or staff positions. In the larger institutional setting, libraries have many partners whose activities support and complement their SC services, even though the various centers, units, and groups involved do not use the SC label. Librarians' roles as educators, liaisons, and digital preservationists are well-established, but in the developing area of digital research, including the digital humanities and data management plans, libraries, like most in the academic community, are still finding their way. More assessment of the research community's needs could prove useful in discovering how library SC services and leadership might be better marketed, further developed, or differently arranged to address those needs. In the coming years, as access to datasets, and not just scholarly articles, becomes the norm due to funding mandates and other legislation, the need to develop and use alt-metrics to determine research impact will become more apparent, and may lead to changes in tenure review practices, such as focusing on article-level metrics rather than journal impact factors. As is still the case with open access, any new developments will require information professionals to become savvy users of these new systems, providing feedback to designers, and helping others in the research community understand and apply these features in their own projects. These are just a few of the many changes occurring in the scholarly communication landscape, where libraries seem poised to continue organizing leadership, services, and support that foster researchers' activities and increase their global reach.

SURVEY QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

The SPEC Survey on Organization of Scholarly Communication Services was designed by **Rachel Radom**, Instructional Services Librarian for Undergraduate Programs, **Melanie Feltner-Reichert**, Interim Head of Scholarly Communication, and **kynita stringer-stanback**, 2010–2012 Diversity Resident Librarian, at the University of Tennessee. These results are based on data submitted by 60 of the 126 ARL member libraries (48%) by the deadline of June 12, 2012. The survey’s introductory text and questions are reproduced below, followed by the response data and selected comments from the respondents.

Scholarly communication can be defined as the creation, transformation, dissemination, and preservation of knowledge related to teaching, research, and scholarly endeavors. Among the many scholarly communications issues are author rights, the economics of scholarly resources, new models of publishing (including open access, institutional repositories, rights and access to federally funded research), and preservation of intellectual assets.

ARL has been a leader in advocating the development of innovative systems that offer barrier-free access to scholarly information and member libraries have developed a variety of initiatives to educate researchers on scholarly communication issues. These libraries have also developed services to support scholarly communication activities in their institutions that range from hosting and publishing electronic journals to administering open access publishing funds to providing support for data mining, visualization, and curation.

The last SPEC survey on scholarly communication was in 2007 and focused on libraries’ education initiatives. The purpose of this survey is to explore how research institutions are currently organizing staff to support scholarly communication services, and whether their organizational structures have changed since 2007. The survey first looks at who leads scholarly communication efforts inside and outside the library. It next covers the scholarly communication related services that are offered to researchers, and which staff support those services. The survey also asks how the library measures the success of its scholarly communication services, including demonstrable outcomes of these services.

SCHOLARLY COMMUNICATION LEADERSHIP

1. Is your library or institution involved in scholarly communication services as described in the introduction? N=60

Yes	56	93%
No	4	7%

2. Please select one option below that best describes who has **primary** responsibility for leading organized scholarly communication (SC) efforts (such as developing services, fielding questions, and/or planning policies) at your institution. N=56

A single individual in the library	17	30%
Two or more individuals in the library (other than a unit or team)	13	23%
A library office, department, or unit	14	25%
A library team, committee, or task force	9	16%
An individual, unit, or group outside the library has leadership responsibility	—	—
No single individual or group has leadership responsibility	3	5%

Please enter any comments you have about which individual or group has primary responsibility for leading organized scholarly communication (SC) efforts at your institution. N=27

Single Individual

As the individual with primary responsibility for SC, it should be noted that I have as well other responsibilities for collections management.

Assistant Dean for Technical Services

Having one primary person is a very recent development. Before this person started we had the scholarly communication efforts primarily in the hands of a library committee.

Head, Digital Services & Scholarly Communication

Our SC efforts are led and overseen by the AUL for collection management and scholarly communication, who chairs a library-based committee that assists in the organization and sponsorship of SC activities in the library and on the campus. She also supervises a library department that is responsible for SC-related outreach and education.

The copyright and related legal issues are led by the director of the copyright & digital scholarship center. Other issues (e-science, repository, etc.) are led by stakeholders with relevant expertise.

The dean of libraries assigned responsibility for SC efforts to the associate university librarian for research and instructional services. He enlists others as needed to support different activities. The associate university librarian and dean of libraries consulted the provost in establishing a university committee to assist in leading the effort.

The director of our center for scholarly communication & digital curation has primary responsibility for providing leadership in this area, although she works closely with a scholarly communications committee and with library administration.

The program manager, scholarly publishing & licensing, who is head of the office of scholarly publishing & licensing, has primary responsibility. This individual works very closely with the director's office and with subject liaisons.

There is also a scholarly communication steering committee consisting of librarians that reports to me, and several other people who play key leadership roles. These include the head of our engineering library (who also chairs the SC steering committee), the head of our digital initiatives unit (which manages our IR, supports OJS publishing and performs other SC support work), and our head of access services, who is the Libraries' copyright officer. None of these people report directly to me.

We have a coordinator for scholarly communications (1 FTE) and another scholarly communication librarian (.75 FTE).

Two or More Individuals

Administrative group called the Management Team.

The scholarly communication librarian has primary responsibility for leading education and outreach activities. A component of outreach activities coordinated by the SC librarian is promoting awareness of scholarly communication issues. Primary responsibility for the development and implementation of scholarly communication services rests with a number of individuals within the library, varying according to the specific service. For example, campus-based publishing efforts are led by the digital scholarly publishing officer. Responsibility for the hosting and managing of digital content, as well as support with research, publishing, and creative works, rests with a number of individuals and departments. The librarian for digital scholarship initiatives has primary leadership responsibility for a number of services falling under these categories. Individuals with primary leadership responsibility for SC services are located within different departments and units within the library's organization structure, rather than within a single department/unit.

The umbrella of activities relating to advancing change in scholarly communication practices is distributed across a number of units within the Libraries. In addition, the separately managed health sciences library on campus also pursues various activities advancing change in scholarly communication. As appropriate, some activities are coordinated, but many require minimal direct coordination.

Library Office, Department, or Unit

Our office of scholarly communication is a department of three librarians, one staff assistant, and several student assistants. The office takes its direction from the scholarly communication & special initiatives librarian, who reports to the director of libraries. We also have a team that meets twice a month to review our initiatives and projects, and a committee that helps provide direction for the department. The team consists of seven librarians, and the committee consists of five librarians. There is some staff overlap between the team and the committee.

Responsibility for strategy and program development is at the associate dean level, but we have also had a librarian with the title "Head, Scholarly Communications Services." We are in the middle of creating a new unit that will likely be called "Publishing and Curation Services" which will include that librarian, the digital collections curator, and staff TBD. The responses in this survey thus primarily reflect the activities of those librarians prior to the creation of this unit.

The digital services division has primary responsibility for SC, but also works closely with a librarian from the law library with copyright expertise as well as partnering with others on campus.

The office for copyright and scholarly communications will undergo a change this year, with the addition of a second full-time staff member, in addition to the director and an intern. Up until that time, the persons responsible have not

been part of a single unit. Others in different departments will continue to have central roles.

This is actually a difficult question to answer, as we actually have a combination of three of the instances above: we have an individual who tends to lead the scholarly communication efforts, a scholarly communications committee, and a (new) unit where these activities rest. We're in the midst of a transition on this point, and I have selected what we think will be the end result of that transition: that a unit will have ultimate responsibility.

We have both a department and a team within the library that have responsibility for scholarly communication efforts.

Library Team, Committee, or Task Force

A new group at the university, the scholarly communications working group, was formed in may 2012 and includes librarians from metadata services, libraries IT, scholarly resource development (collection development), and discipline-based subject specialists.

Appropriate units involved in planning and work are represented in the committee on scholarly communication.

IR management team

Our team leader is the head of the health center library. The team is composed of members of the law school library, the health center library, the main campus library and the regional campus libraries.

We have a SC group that has not met much in the last year, due to the overriding focus on a faculty open access committee.

No Single Individual or Group

We are a very decentralized organization. Librarians on the scholarly communications group are from two of the five libraries. The dean has ultimate authority over what services the Libraries offers. But other libraries, academic units, and support units can offer their own SC services.

We are currently searching to fill a position that will lead efforts in this category.

If you answered that an individual or group has leadership responsibility, when you click the Next>> button below you will jump to questions about the individual or group you selected.

If you answered that no single individual or group has leadership responsibility, when you click the Next>> button below you will jump to questions about SC Services.

SC LEADERSHIP: SINGLE INDIVIDUAL IN THE LIBRARY

3. Please indicate the title of this individual, to whom this position reports, and an approximate percentage of time they devote to leading SC efforts. N=17

Position Title	Position Reports To	Time
Assistant Dean for Technical Services	Dean	1%
Associate Dean for Collections & Technical Services	Dean of Libraries	
Associate University Librarian for Collection Management and Scholarly Communication	University Librarian	50%
Associate University Librarian for Research & Instructional Services	Dean of University Libraries	5%
Bibliographer	AD for Collections	2%
Coordinator for Scholarly Communications	Dean of Libraries	100%
Digital Services Librarian	Digital Resources Library Librarian	25%
Director of Collection Strategies and Scholarly Communication	Dean & University Librarian	50%
Director of Copyright & Digital Scholarship Center	Associate Director for Collections & Scholarly Communication	100%
Director, Information Resources and Scholarly Communication	Dean of University Libraries	30%
Head, Collections & External Relations Division	Head, Collections & External Relations Division	20%
Head, Digital Collections and Scholarly Communication Services	Dean of Libraries	50%
Head, Digital Services & Scholarly Communication	AUL, User Services	80%
Program Manager, Scholarly Publishing & Licensing	Associate Director for Information Resources	90%
Scholarly Communication Librarian	Assistant University Librarian, Access Services	90%
Scholarly Communication Officer	Associate University Librarian for Collections and Services	100%
Scholarly Communications Librarian	University Librarian	100%

4. Does this individual have any special training or degree (such as licensing, copyright, or publishing) related to their SC responsibilities? N=17

Yes	8	47%
No	9	53%

If yes, please briefly describe the training or degree.

Position	Training or Degree
Associate University Librarian for Collection Management and Scholarly Communication	JD, PhD in Library and Information Science
Associate University Librarian for Research & Instructional Services	Attended ARL's Scholarly Communication Institute.
Coordinator for Scholarly Communications	The person came from publishing with a specialty in book design.
Director of Copyright & Digital Scholarship Center	JD
Head, Collections & External Relations Division	I have taken courses in licensing and have done some editing.
Head, Digital Services & Scholarly Communication	Graduate degree in sciences and experience in scientific publishing; two certificates in copyright management and leadership (UMUC CIP and SLA).
Program Manager, Scholarly Publishing & Licensing	For licensing: ARL institutes on licensing, University of Maryland University College course on Advanced Licensing. For copyright: University of Maryland University College courses, including full certification in "Copyright Management and Leadership" levels I and II, as well as many other courses. For all areas: MLS.
Scholarly Communication Officer	JD and MLS

5. Is this position also considered the institution's main leader for SC efforts? N=16

Yes	12	75%
No	4	25%

Comments

Answered Yes

A faculty scholarly communication committee was organized to advise and promote SC efforts.

The dean often serves as primary spokesperson; we coordinate our efforts.

Answered No

Do not have institution's focus on SC.

The university has a long-standing and deep commitment to open access that is diffused throughout the culture, and manifested in many positions and individuals. Leadership in these areas comes from the provost, vice president for research, the director of libraries, and key faculty committees, including the faculty committee on the library system, and the open access working group. The Libraries' program manager in scholarly publishing & licensing is carrying out the vision of a much broader agenda, related to the university's mission.

The university librarian, along with faculty members interested in open access issues, provide a voice outside the library to champion and promote various scholarly communication initiatives.

This individual is very interested in copyright and some of the other SC issues.

Other Comment

I'm not sure that our institution is really aware of this, since my position does not have "scholarly communication" in my title. However, the office of fair practices & legal affairs and the research office are aware of this responsibility.

6. Does any library staff report to this individual to support SC services? N=17

Yes 9 53%
No 8 47%

If yes, please specify the category and FTE of the staff who support SC services and report to this individual.

Position	Staff Reports
Assistant Dean for Technical Services	Head of Cataloging spends 5% of her time supporting institutional ETD. Lead Programmer spends 5% of his time supporting institutional repository.
Associate Dean for Collections & Technical Services	A full-time library faculty member and a full-time support staff position.
Associate University Librarian for Collection Management and Scholarly Communication	The Scholarly Communication and Licensing unit consists of 4FTE librarians and 2FTE high-level support staff who contribute to SC services. In addition, the Scholarly Communication Steering Committee is composed of an additional 8 to 10 librarians who devote some percentage of time of supporting SC activities. Subject specialists and library liaisons are also beginning to get involved in SC services; the library is becoming more integrated in this regard, and all professional staff have a role in SC activity.
Director of Collection Strategies and Scholarly Communication	Exempt staff member, full time. Job title is Repository Coordinator: 80% of time is directed toward the institutional repository, 20% of time is directed to collection assessment.
Head, Collections & External Relations Division	1.6 library assistants. One is a technician and the .6 position is a lower level library assistant without a technician's diploma.
Head, Digital Collections and Scholarly Communication Services	One full-time term post-MLIS resident librarian. Although they don't technically report to the CSCDC head, affiliates from throughout the organization dedicate a percentage of their time to supporting SC services: 30% e-science librarian, 10% electronic resources library department head, 25% visual resources librarian.

Position	Staff Reports
Head, Digital Services & Scholarly Communication	Four library faculty, each 100% FTE. One part-time student worker.
Program Manager, Scholarly Publishing & Licensing	.6 FTE – librarian. There are also ‘dotted lines’ connecting two support staff roles to this position, but these are not direct reports: approximately .75 FTE.
Scholarly Communications Librarian	.75 FTE (student worker)

SC LEADERSHIP: TWO OR MORE INDIVIDUALS IN THE LIBRARY (OTHER THAN A UNIT OR TEAM)

7. How many individuals in the library share responsibility for leading organized scholarly communication efforts? N=13

2 individuals	4	31%
3 individuals	6	46%
Unspecified	3	23%

Position 1	Position 2	Position 3
Associate Librarian for Information Resources	Director, Digital Resources and Scholarly Communications Programs	
Digital Repository Services Librarian	Data Library Coordinator	
Director, Scholarly Communications & Instructional Support	Head of Digital Library Services	
Endowed Chair for Scholarly Communications	Coordinator, Copyright Permissions Services	
Scholarly Communications Librarian	Copyright & Digital Access Librarian	
Assistant University Librarian for Scholarly Communication, Assessment, and Personnel	Scholarly Communication Librarian	Scholarly Communication Services Manager
Associate Dean for Academic Affairs	Director, University Press	Director, University Copyright Office
Associate Dean for Collection and Technology Services	Head, Digital Initiatives	Director of Library Graduate and Research Services
Dean and Vice President for Information Technology	Assistant Dean, Digital Library and E-Publishing Services	Assistant Dean, Scholarly Communications
Director, Copyright and Rights Management	Head of Library IT	Digital Services Librarian

Position 1	Position 2	Position 3
Director, Office of Copyright Management & Scholarly Communication	Data Management Librarian	Assistant Librarian
Head, Scholarly Resource Integration	Head, Copyright Support Services	Head, Research Services
Scholarly Communications Librarian	Digital Scholarly Publishing Officer	Librarian for Digital Scholarship Initiatives

8. Please provide the following information for up to three of the individuals. Indicate the title of the individual, to whom this position reports, a brief description of their SC leadership responsibilities, and an approximate percentage of time they devote to leading SC efforts. N=13

Two Individuals

Position Title	Position Reports To	Responsibilities	Time
Associate Librarian for Information Resources	Dean of the Library		7%
Director, Digital Resources and Scholarly Communications Programs	Associate Librarian for Information Resources	Program planning and development; education and outreach; preparation of materials; administration of programs.	40%

Position Title	Position Reports To	Responsibilities	Time
Digital Repository Services Librarian	Associate University Librarian Information and Financial Resources	IR, ejournal publishing, ETD, OA outreach, open data initiatives.	100%
Data Library Coordinator	Associate University Librarian, Information and Financial Resources	Open data initiatives.	85%

Position Title	Position Reports To	Responsibilities	Time
Director, Scholarly Communications & Instructional Support	Dean of Libraries	Most SC activities, especially planning, outreach, copyright education, supporting faculty publication, etc.	50%
Head, Digital Library Services	AUL for Media & Instruction	Institutional Repository, Electronic Theses & Dissertations, some specific research projects, etc.	10%

Position Title	Position Reports To	Responsibilities	Time
Endowed Chair for Scholarly Communications	Dean of Libraries		100%
Coordinator, Copyright Permissions Services	Endowed Chair for Scholarly Communications		100%

Position Title	Position Reports To	Responsibilities	Time
Scholarly Communications Librarian	Two associate deans because of multiple responsibilities	Build tools, communicate with faculty, coordinate subject librarians activities around SC.	25%
Copyright & Digital Access Librarian	Head of Digital Library Services	Answer copyright questions, liaison with general counsel, train other subject librarians.	25%

Three Individuals

Position Title	Position Reports To	Responsibilities	Time
Assistant University Librarian for Scholarly Communication, Assessment, and Personnel	University Librarian	With University Librarian, finalizes library policies for SC. Reports progress/issues to Library and Scholarly Communications Advisory Council. Advocates for SC resources with library administration. Represents the library in national SC discussions.	15%
Scholarly Communication Librarian	AUL for Scholarly Communication, Assessment, and Personnel	Outlines policies/procedures for library SC services (e.g., institutional repository; digital publishing support). Seeks new content partners among campus faculty, departments, and academic colleges. Develops educational resources for campus community. Participates in national, state, and institutional SC discussions.	85%
Scholarly Communication Services Manager	Scholarly Communication Librarian	Manages day-to-day operations of institutional repository and digital publishing via Open Journal Systems. Supervises two student employees.	85%

Position Title	Position Reports To	Responsibilities	Time
Associate Dean for Academic Affairs	Dean of Libraries	Coordinating activities of liaison librarians.	25%
Director, University Press	Dean of Libraries	Library publishing services, including institutional repository for faculty publications.	15%
Director University Copyright Office	Dean of Libraries	Copyright.	25%

Position Title	Position Reports To	Responsibilities	Time
Associate Dean for Collection and Technology Services	Dean of Libraries	Oversight, copyright expertise.	10%
Head, Digital Initiatives	Associate Dean for Collection and Technology Services	Marketing of IR, technical support of IR, liaison with faculty/students, IR promotion.	50%
Director of Library Graduate and Research Services	Associate Dean of Libraries for Research and Instruction Services	Liaison with faculty/students, copyright expertise.	10%

Position Title	Position Reports To	Responsibilities	Time
Dean and Vice President for Information Technology	Provost	Directs all such activity in Libraries.	5%
Assistant Dean, Digital Library and E-Publishing Services	Dean	IR, some copyright, Open access.	10%
Assistant Dean, Scholarly Communications	Dean	College liaison involvement in open access, some copyright and licensing.	10%

Position Title	Position Reports To	Responsibilities	Time
Director, Copyright and Rights Management	Associate University Librarian for Scholarly Services and Collections	Author rights education and support; IR content management.	25%
Head of Library IT	Associate University Librarians for Digital Services and Technical Planning	IR management, data curation.	15%
Digital Services Librarian	Head of Law Library	IR management and content development.	50%

Position Title	Position Reports To	Responsibilities	Time
Director, Office of Copyright Management & Scholarly Communication	Scholarly Publishing and Data Management Team Leader	Copyright education, scholarly communication programming, journal publishing support.	75%
Data Management Librarian	Scholarly Publishing and Data Management Team Leader	Data management.	75%
Assistant Librarian	Scholarly Publishing and Data Management Team Leader	Repository management.	

Position Title	Position Reports To	Responsibilities	Time
Head, Scholarly Resource Integration	Associate Director for Collections, Technical Services, and Scholarly Communication	Leads unit responsible for digital publishing initiatives and management of the institutional repository.	100%
Head, Copyright Support Services	Associate Director for Collections, Technical Services, and Scholarly Communication	Provides a wide range of copyright-related services addressing contracts, policies, education programs, teaching and learning activities, and consultation.	20%
Head, Research Services (new position, new hire just announced)	Associate Director for Research and Education	Leads liaison librarians, develops research services.	TBD

Position Title	Position Reports To	Responsibilities	Time
Scholarly Communications Librarian	Director of Public Services	Coordination of Education and Outreach Activities. Advise and educate authors about copyright, retaining rights, etc. Consult with faculty/graduate students about SC issues and library SC services. Plan campus-wide educational events. Support for digital humanities, e-science, e-scholarship activities.	40%
Digital Scholarly Publishing Officer	Dean of Libraries / Director of University Press	Collaborate on digital publishing ventures. Develop new forms of publications with faculty. Consult with faculty about SC issues and library SC services. Host or manage an institutional repository. Manage manuscript submissions to repositories. Support for digital humanities, e-science, e-scholarship activities.	
Librarian for Digital Scholarship Initiatives	Director of Collection & Research Services	Consult with faculty about SC issues and library SC services; Assist with production of multimedia works; Support for digital humanities, e-science, e-scholarship initiatives.	

9. Do any of these individuals have any special training or degree (such as licensing, copyright, or publishing) related to their SC responsibilities? N=13

Yes 8 62%

No 5 38%

If yes, please briefly describe the training or degree. N=8

Position	Training or Degree
Associate Dean for Collection and Technology Services	Licensing and copyright: special training
Associate Librarian for Information Resources	Workshops in licensing, copyright, and publishing
Copyright & Digital Access Librarian	Law degree, workshops, reading
Digital Scholarly Publishing Officer	Publishing
Director of Library Graduate and Research Services	Copyright: special training
Director, University Copyright Office	Law degree
Director, Copyright and Rights Management	Copyright management certification
Director, Digital Resources and Scholarly Communications Programs	Workshops in licensing, copyright, and publishing
Endowed Chair for Scholarly Communications	JD
Head, Copyright Support Services	JD
Head, Digital Initiatives	Technical training for IR
Scholarly Communications Librarian	Licensing, copyright (JD)
Scholarly Communications Librarian	Various workshops — ARL and other — reading, participating in national discussions

10. Are these positions also considered the institution's main leaders for SC efforts? N=11

Yes 9 82%

No 2 18%

Comments

Answered Yes

Additional partners in SC efforts include the copyright licensing office, which hosts institution's most comprehensive resources on author rights.

Libraries leads scholarly communications efforts for campus.

Perhaps not clear. Health sciences library might beg to differ, however, as they provide leadership to the health sciences units on campus. There is no conflict in this arrangement, but it's hard to say who the "main leaders" are.

Yes, informally, but library dean plays a spokesperson role.

Answered No

Other individuals, offices, and departments are also involved in SC efforts, notably the office of sponsored research, the center for new design in learning and scholarship, the digital media committee, and university information services.

11. Does any library staff report to these individuals to support SC services? N=13

Yes 10 77%

No 3 23%

If yes, please specify the category and FTE of the staff who support SC services and report to these individuals. N=10

Position	Staff Reports
Associate Librarian for Information Resources	Librarian (1 FTE)
Director, Digital Resources and Scholarly Communications Programs	None

Position	Staff Reports
Digital Repository Services Librarian	Data Librarian (1.0 FTE)
Data Library Coordinator	Non-professional staff assistant (1.0 FTE)

Position	Staff Reports
Director, Scholarly Communications & Instructional Support	
Head, Digital Library Services	Department Support Specialist (.75 FTE)

Position	Staff Reports
Assistant University Librarian for Scholarly Communication, Assessment, and Personnel	Student employee (.30 FTE)
Scholarly Communication Librarian	Student employee (.30 FTE)
Scholarly Communication Services Manager	

Position	Staff Reports
Associate Dean for Academic Affairs	Faculty, liaison librarians (25 FTE)
Director, University Press	Academic/Professional (3 FTE)
Director University Copyright Office	Clerical/Service (.5 FTE)

Position	Staff Reports
Associate Dean for Collection and Technology Services	Librarian (.5 FTE)
Head, Digital Initiatives	Two Library Coordinators (1 FTE)
Director of Library Graduate and Research Services	

Position	Staff Reports
Dean and Vice President for Information Technology	IR staff (2 FTE)
Assistant Dean, Digital Library and E-Publishing Services	College liaisons (10 FTE)
Assistant Dean, Scholarly Communications	Collection Development (2 FTE)

Position	Staff Reports
Director, Copyright and Rights Management	Staff (0.5 FTE)
Head of Library IT	
Digital Services Librarian	

Position	Staff Reports
Head, Scholarly Resource Integration	5 FTE
Head, Copyright Support Services	.25 FTE
Head, Research Services	1 FTE

Position	Staff Reports
Scholarly Communications Librarian	None
Digital Scholarly Publishing Officer	None
Librarian for Digital Scholarship Initiatives	Digital Studio technologists

SC LEADERSHIP: LIBRARY OFFICE, DEPARTMENT, OR UNIT

12. Please indicate the name of the office, the title of the head of the office, to whom this position reports, and the number of staff and total FTE in the office. N=14

Name of the Office	Title of Head of the Office	Head Reports To	Staff	FTE
Academic and Scholarly Outreach	Director	Libraries Dean	1	1
Centre for Scholarly Communication	Director	Vice Provost, Libraries and Cultural Resources	16	14.25
Collections & Scholarly Communications Office	Chief Officer - Collections & Scholarly Communications	University Librarian	3	3
Digital Services Division	Associate University Librarian for Digital Services	University Librarian	11	11
Office for Copyright and Scholarly Communications	Director	University Librarian and Vice-Provost for Library Affairs	3	2.25
Office of Digital Initiatives & Open Access	Associate University Librarian for Digital Initiatives & Open Access	University Librarian	4	4
Office of Scholarly Communication	Scholarly Communication and Special Initiatives Librarian	Director of Libraries	4	4
Publishing and Curation Services	Co-heads, Publishing and Curation Services	Associate Dean for Research and Scholarly Communications	5	4
Research, Collections and Scholarly Communication	Associate Dean for Research, Collections, & Scholarly Communication	Dean of Libraries and University Librarian	20	20
Scholarly Commons	Co-Coordinator, Scholarly Commons	Dean of Libraries	7	3
Scholarly Communication & Digital Curation Services Department	Head of Scholarly Communication & Digital Curation	Associate Dean for Scholarly Communications and Access	6	6
Scholarly Communication and Digital Library Initiatives	Head, Scholarly Communication	Associate Dean for Scholarly Communication and Research Services	10	6.5
Scholarly Communication Department	Associate Dean for Collection Development and Scholarly Communication	Dean of Libraries	4	3.5
Science Collections & Scholarly Communications	Head, Science Collections & Scholarly Communications	Director for Collection Development	3	3

13. Do any of the staff in this office have any special training or degree (such as licensing, copyright, or publishing) related to their SC responsibilities? N=14

Yes 7 50%

No 7 50%

If yes, please identify the position(s) and briefly describe the training or degree.

Office	Training or Degree
Academic and Scholarly Outreach	The Scholarly Communications Librarian has a JD and a certificate in copyright law.
Collections & Scholarly Communications Office	Contracts Specialist has JD and/or training in licensing & copyright issues.
Office for Copyright and Scholarly Communications	Director holds a law degree.
Office of Scholarly Communication	Our Copyright and Information Policy Librarian has a JD.
Research, Collections and Scholarly Communication	Scholarly Communication Librarian
Scholarly Communication and Digital Library Initiatives	A technical editor for our digital imprint is pursuing coursework in copyediting.
Scholarly Communication Department	Copyright/IP librarian holds certificates from the University of Maryland University College for completion of levels 1 and 2 of the Copyright Management and Leadership series.

Additional Comment

All staff have attended training and workshops, but do not have degrees beyond the masters of library & information science.

14. Is this office also considered the institution’s main leader for SC efforts? N=14

Yes 10 71%

No 4 29%

Comments

Answered Yes

It’s my belief that yes, this is true. I could see arguments, though, to suggest otherwise.

We are the only dedicated office on campus, but additional units in the library (copyright office, university press) and outside the library (office of sponsored programs, online learning services) also contribute.

Works in close collaboration with campus IT, legal counsel, and research computing.

Answered No

Again, a tricky question to answer: I'm not sure the institution is completely aware of scholarly communication "services".

There are multiple efforts on our campus. The faculty senate has a committee that has developed a draft OA policy for the campus.

15. Does this office have responsibilities outside of SC efforts? N=14

Yes 11 79%
No 3 21%

If yes, please briefly describe the other responsibilities.

Office	Responsibility
Academic and Scholarly Outreach	The Director is responsible for library instruction coordination and academic outreach.
Centre for Scholarly Communication	Scholarly Communication directly involves 6.5 FTE. Other responsibilities include: Digitization Projects (2.0 FTE). Copyright (.25 FTE). Imaging Services (1.0 FTE). University Press (2.5 FTE). Repository Technical Support (2.0 FTE).
Collections & Scholarly Communications Office	Collection development, preservation, & area studies
Digital Services Division	Digital library infrastructure including systems administration, programming, interfaces for digital collections, and overall management of the library's websites.
Office of Digital Initiatives & Open Access	Electronic resources, metadata services, library systems, institutional repository, digital production (scanning, etc.)
Office of Scholarly Communication	The office engages in various special projects from time to time. Our most recent project has focused on open educational resources.
Research, Collections and Scholarly Communication	The department engages in collection development, reference, instruction, and other outreach activities with faculty and students.
Scholarly Commons	Provides support for technology and data intensive services, as well as related research support services. We provide support for numeric and spatial data services, data management consulting services, digitization support services, digital humanities support services, and usability testing.

Office	Responsibility
Scholarly Communication & Digital Curation Services Department	Digital curation: long-term access & preservation of digital scholarship and research.
Scholarly Communication and Digital Library Initiatives	Building digital collections and building/supporting digital library systems.
Science Collections & Scholarly Communications	Collection development for sciences and engineering.

SC LEADERSHIP: LIBRARY TEAM, COMMITTEE, OR TASK FORCE

16. Please indicate the name of the team, the title of the chair of the team, to whom this team reports, and the number of team members and total FTE on the team. N=9

Name of the Team	Title of Chair	Team Reports to	Members	FTE
Committee on Scholarly Communication	Co-chairs	AUL for Collection Development	11	11
eScholarship Committee	Digital Initiatives Librarian		12	12
Scholarly Communication and Copyright Team	Director of the Health Center Library	Director's Council at the main campus library	9	See note 1
Institutional Repository Team	Science/Technology Librarian	Dean	3	3
Scholarly Communication & Management Program	Research Librarian and Scholarly Communication Coordinator	AUL for Collections	3	0.15
Scholarly Communications Group	Associate University Librarian for Research and Outreach Services	University Librarian	3	.25 See note 2
Scholarly Communications Working Group	Chair has not been named yet	Libraries Management Team	10	See note 3
Scholarly Publishing Committee	Associate University Librarian for Collections & Scholarly Communication	University Librarian	10	10
The Scholarly Communications Committee	Digital Initiatives Librarian	University Librarian	9	9

Note 1. None of us are full time on this.

Note 2. I'm assuming that the FTE relates to the actual effort put forth by the team members, none of whom are engaged full time in this work. The effort listed here reflects what might occur in a normal year.

Note 3. Unable to determine at this time.

17. Please list the library departments that are represented on the team. N=7

Team	Departments Represented
Committee on Scholarly Communication	Scholarly Communication Center, Planning & Organizational Research, Special Collections, Technical and Automated Services, disciplinary representation from Research and Instructional Services.
eScholarship Committee	Digital Initiatives, Health Sciences Library and Information Center, eResources, Office of the VP for Research, University Press, Law School Library.
Scholarly Communication and Copyright Team	Health Center Director, Health Center Collection Development, Health Center Reference; Law School Reference; Main Campus IR Coordinator, Main Campus Digital Preservation Librarian, Main Campus Science Librarian (2); Regional Campus Director.
Institutional Repository Team	Collections, Electronic resources, Information services.
Scholarly Communications Working Group	Metadata Services, Libraries IT, Scholarly Resource Development (Collection Development), Arts & Humanities, Social Sciences, Sciences, Archives & Special Collections.
Scholarly Publishing Committee	Digital Publishing & Scholarship, Collection Management, Reference & Instruction, Branch Libraries, Administration.
The Scholarly Communications Committee	Bibliographic Services; Science & Engineering Library; Law School Library; Sound and Moving Image Library; Reference; University Librarian's Office.

18. Does this team include any members other than librarians or other library staff? N=9

Yes	1	11%
No	8	89%

If yes, please identify the other members of the team (for example, administrators, faculty, non-faculty researchers, university press staff, students).

eScholarship Committee: Administrators, university press staff

19. Do any of the team members have any special training or degree (such as licensing, copyright, or publishing) related to their SC responsibilities? N=9

Yes	4	44%
No	5	56%

If yes, please identify the position(s) and briefly describe the training or degree.

Team	Training or Degree
Committee on Scholarly Communication	Copyright & Licensing Librarian
Scholarly Communication & Management Program	AUL for Public Services and AUL for Collections both have extensive copyright training.
Scholarly Communications Working Group	Coursework & practicum experience in digital/data curation.
The Scholarly Communications Committee	The representative from the law library has a Master of Law degree specializing in copyright.

20. Is this team also considered the institution's main leader for SC efforts? N=8

Yes 6 75%

No 2 25%

Comments

Answered No

It is as far as I know the only game on campus, but not necessarily recognized by the institution at large.

There is an open access working group on campus that includes faculty, administrator, and librarian representation from a number of faculties. It is led by the associate vice president of research at the university.

Other

15 (or more) research librarians also have responsibility to keep abreast of issues and trends and to participate in initiatives.

SC SERVICES

21. Please indicate whether the SC services listed below are offered by the library, elsewhere in the institution, or not offered. Check all that apply. N=56

Campus-based Publishing	Library	Elsewhere	Not Offered	N
Collaborate on digital publishing ventures with outside groups (e.g., university press)	37	17	14	56
Develop new forms of publications with faculty	43	20	9	56
Host or publish electronic journals (open access or subscription based)	41	18	7	56

Education and Outreach Activities	Library	Elsewhere	Not Offered	N
Advise and educate authors about complying with funding agency mandates (e.g., NIH, NSF)	50	27	—	56
Advise and educate authors about copyright, retaining rights, etc.	56	23	—	56
Consult with faculty about SC issues and library SC services	55	7	1	56
Consult with graduate students about SC issues and library SC services	53	8	3	56
Consult with undergraduate students about SC issues and library SC services	46	3	13	56
Plan campus-wide educational events (e.g., Open Access Week events)	52	10	3	56
Prepare SC-related documents, whitepapers for faculty discussion	38	14	14	56

Hosting and Managing Digital Content	Library	Elsewhere	Not Offered	N
Data management or curation services	49	19	6	56
Digitization and encoding/text markup services	48	8	5	55
Provide metadata for scholarly content	49	4	7	56
Provide support for data mining, data visualization, GIS, etc.	40	34	6	56
Host or manage an institutional repository	51	2	5	56
Host or manage a subject or disciplinary repository	10	17	31	54
Manage manuscript submissions to repositories	40	6	14	56
Support campus electronic theses and dissertations	53	21	1	56

Support with Research, Publishing, and Creative Works	Library	Elsewhere	Not Offered	N
Administer campus open access publishing fund	18	2	37	55
Assist in assessing research impact	36	23	15	56
Assist with production of multimedia works (films, art, etc.)	27	31	11	54
Support for digital humanities, e-science, e-scholarship initiatives	47	31	4	54
Support researchers with literature reviews	37	6	15	54
Support patent research or applications	23	34	7	56

Please briefly describe any other SC services offered by the library. N=15

Advocacy for federal legislation that would support institutional objectives.

Building faculty e-portfolios.

Certainly, subject liaison librarians support researchers with literature reviews, but these are not coordinated through SC employees. I don't know what support is offered to researchers with literature reviews outside the library.

Depends on disciplines.

Digital archiving of campus-hosted conference proceedings.

Digital library initiatives staff and senior associate university librarian have held discussions with office of sponsored research in order to plan for university support of data management plans and data curation and are preparing web

pages as guidance. The library participates in a regional SC coalition with other academic libraries in the metropolitan area.

Lecture recording service and conference support.

Negotiate with publishers in relation to author rights, including in relation to a faculty open access policy. Create and maintain database of university-authored scholarly articles. Manage implementation of a faculty open access policy, including advising authors about policy, creating and managing workflows, etc. Confer on author publishing agreements. Provide information on fair use. Offer administrative support to faculty committees working on SC issues. Participate in developing model language for licenses in relation to author rights. Please note that the answer to "Campus-based publishing" assumes that the university press, while reporting to the Libraries, is distinct from the Libraries. Please note that the answer to "manage manuscript submissions to repositories" refers to managing submissions to our own institutional repository, not third party repositories. Please note that the answer to "Prepare SC-related documents" refers to the Libraries' involvement in drafting some documents in response to US government RFIs, for example, assuming that the "for faculty discussion" was an example, rather than an exclusive category.

Our office of scholarly communication offers open educational resource services and support for campus research centers and institutes. We also participate in our digital strategies projects re: data management, digital preservation, and metadata.

Support for open peer review systems. Development and hosting of online scholarly network for new forms of publishing (media commons.)

The Libraries are a member of CrossRef and we have assisted faculty in getting DOIs for their data sets.

The library also has a digital library center, in addition to the academic and scholarly outreach office. The DLC offers the institutional repository and affiliated services as well as digital services and open journal hosting.

The library provides some help support for submitting to external repositories but we don't manage the process. We provide space for digital humanities faculty collaboration meetings and are looking to create a service point for ereseach activities.

The library will be administering a new open access research program that will provide funding for researchers interested in studying various aspects of open access.

The Libraries are helping faculty host journals electronically using Open Journal Systems software (OJS). Through this hosting service, the libraries are helping new journals establish themselves, and are helping journals market themselves as widely as possible. The libraries also provide background on creative commons and emerging forms of scholarly publishing.

Please briefly describe any other SC services offered elsewhere in the institution. N=10

California Digital Library provides support for the system efforts as does the system-wide scholarly communication officers group.

Data management, including DMP tool, offered as a partnership with office of information technology and sponsored programs & regulatory compliance (SPARCS).

Patents are supported by the office of the vice president for research.

The campus bookstore also supports scholarly publishing. There are several repositories hosted elsewhere on campus, some by individual researchers, others by specific units.

The office of fair practices and legal affairs are involved with advising faculty and graduate students regarding copyright, in particular use of previously published materials, in their online publications.

The office of general counsel advises on SC matters, writes white papers on legal issues related to SC issues, and routinely supports faculty committees and the libraries in these areas. The office of institutional research gathers and analyzes data related to many SC activities, including publications. The office of sponsored programs acts as the main resource for faculty in relation to their research grants, though they refer specific details of NIH compliance (such as PMC IDs) to the Libraries. Individual departments in some cases provide administrative support for depositing working papers into the institutional repository. Some departments/schools have been exploring methods of showcasing/identifying faculty research using custom or proprietary tools, usually in consultation with the Libraries.

The university press provides open educational resources.

University counsel provides other services.

University research foundation manages application of patents.

Varies by department, very decentralized university.

22. If you indicated that any of the SC services above are offered elsewhere in the institution, please identify the departments, offices, or units that offer the services. N=43

Campus-based Publishing N=25

California Digital Library (CDL) (2 responses)

Campus IT does iPad app development with faculty.

Information technology

Instructional technologists

Not done; library will do within next 18 months.

Office of Information Technology

Other units have hosted their own OJS instances.

Our radiology department hosts an open access journal in that discipline.

Several academic units house journal editors or editing units of journals.

Specific campus departments (for their own faculty)

The college of communications, college of engineering, and possibly others host a couple of faculty-edited journals.

The faculty of law has a new journal that will provide open access to articles as published. The university press is making its books available online through commercial vendors.

University bookstore

University press (4 responses)

University press (journals and conference proceedings); Business school (OA journal); Law library

University press, departments hosting journals
University press (reports to the Libraries, but is an independent unit).
University press, Undergraduate Honors Office
University press, various humanities institutes; within academic departments
University Print and Mail; University bookstore
Varies

Education and Outreach Activities N=29

A university-wide scholarly communication committee is responsible for informing and advising the campus. The Office of Research also hosts workshops.

CDL

Faculty senate open access committee

General Counsel Office helps with copyright. Several academic units touched on SC issues in recent Futures papers.

Health Sciences Libraries

Institute for Teaching and Learning Excellence

Legal Services, Center for Faculty Excellence (in collaboration with the Libraries)

Office for Research

Office of Knowledge Enterprise Development

Office of Research Administration; University Legal Counsel

Office of Research and Creative Activities (ORCA); college deans; department chairs; Copyright Licensing Office; Faculty Advisory Council

Office of Research Development and Administration

Office of Research Services

Office of Research, Academic Senate, CDL, Office of Campus Counsel

Office of Sponsored Projects; departmental grant administrators; Office of the General Counsel; Academic computing-instructional technologists

Office of Sponsored Research collaborating on data management plans. Copyright advice from instructional support center and Computer Services

Office of the VP Research, Centre for Academic Leadership, Graduate Students Association

Provost's Office, Office of General Counsel

Research Compliance Office

Research Services would be involved in funding compliance and the Office of Fair Practices & Legal Affairs with copyright.

Sponsored Programs / University Counsel Office

Teaching and Learning Centre

Teaching Effectiveness Program (pedagogical support)

The Institute for Learning and Teaching; Information Science and Technology Center

Thesis Office; Institute for Digital Humanities

University press, Graduate school

University Research; University Legal Counsel

Various units provide copyright guidance in some way, usually tied directly to their own service mission. Examples include the e-learning/instructional design units in a few different colleges.

We work with Campus IT and Legal Counsel to provide education/outreach.

Hosting and Managing Digital Content N=35

Campus IT as well as divisional IT units

CDL (2 responses)

Center for Digital Libraries, Computer Science Department; Institute for Digital Humanities

Colorado Water Institute

Computing Services: Research Computing

Data Visualization Lab

Departmental support; faculty research service office

Departments and Schools, Provost's office

Diverse

Geography, Computer Science, Romance Languages, Graduate School (ETDs), Information Services

GIS lab is in the geography department. Data mining is in Computational Science Center. Data visualization is at the School of Marine Science.

GIS support from Social Science Data Library (which is administratively separate from the University Libraries), data mining and visualization from a Computing Science lab.

Graduate college (2 responses)

Humanities digital workshop does some, individual science departments do some.

Individual academic departments have IT and support staff for help with data, visualization, manuscript submission.

Individual departments and research centres (data curation), Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies

Information Services & Technology

Information Technology

Information Technology Services / Graduate college

Information Technology; individual department/college

Institute for the Arts and Humanities, Renaissance Computing Institute, Odum Institute

Library and the schools

Some departments individually, Information Technologies

The Faculty of Graduate Studies is involved in supporting ETDs as they approve them before they are posted.

The library is in the early stages of developing these services. Other units: supercomputing lab.

The Office of Information Technology (central campus IT) provides virtual hosting, and colleges and departments host digital content as well.

Units and departments support GIS labs, digital humanities tools, etc.

Units in colleges host some of this; also the Institute for Computing in the Humanities, Arts, and Social Science (I-CHASS)

University IT; Graduate School and other schools/departments support ETDs.

University ITS; School of Business; Courant Institute

University Information Technology Services

University Information Services; Center for New Design in Learning and Scholarship

Various research institutes, centers, and labs host their own data.

Support with Research, Publishing, and Creative Works N=41

Assist in assessing research impact: Office of Vice Provost for Research. Assist with production of multimedia works (films, art, etc.): Campus Information Technology Department.

CDL

Centers and institutes; deans

Departmental support

Digital humanities partnership with Center for the Humanities; Department of History public history program, etc.

Digital Media Union (CIO's office), Office of Research, Technology Licensing and Commercialization

Digital Studio for the Humanities / Office for the Vice President for Research / Information Technology Services

Divisional IT units and some campus IT

Individual departments

Individual departments and offices of vice-deans for research within the faculties

Individual schools

Information Technology, school-based IT units, Office for Research

Institute for Teaching and Learning Excellence

Institute for the Arts and Humanities, Renaissance Computing Institute

Library has an active multi-media unit, but they are not necessarily (or exclusively) tasked with SC responsibilities. Other units: University Technology Transfer.

Office of Communications, Marketing and Interactive Design

Office of General Counsel; Office of Vice Provost for Research

Office of Information Technology

Office of Institutional Research, Academic Departments (such as Comparative Media Studies, Media Arts & Sciences); Technology Licensing Office

Office of Knowledge Enterprise Development

Office of Research Development and Administration, Center for Teaching Excellence

Office of Research; University Press (at the university system level, not part of the local campus)

Office of Sponsored Programs; Online Learning Services

Office of Sponsored Research

Office of Vice Chancellor for Research, Office of Technology Management

Office of Research, Digital Humanities and CDL

Office of Research Support, Office of Licensing and Ventures

Research Services, Office of Vice President (Research), Faculty of Graduate Studies

Schools & Colleges (multimedia production), Technology Transfer (patent), VP for Research

Teaching and Learning with Technology, a division of the campus Information Technology Services, provides the "Media Commons" service centers for video/audio production. College of Liberal Arts has hired one staff member to support digital humanities, but duties are not clear.

Tech Transfer Office, Provost Office, individual academic units

The Center for Commercialization ("C4C") provides patent search services and advice.

The Office of Research assesses research impact.

The Technology Transfer Office as part of the research administration works with patent applications and research.

Units with colleges offer support, as well as central academic computing

University bookstore

University ITS (multimedia); Humanities Initiative (digital humanities); Office of General Counsel (patent); Office of Industrial Liaison (patent)

University Research; Assessment; individual department/college

Various humanities institutes; University IT; Office of Research Administration

SUPPORT FOR SC SERVICES

23. Please briefly describe the role(s) that librarians and other professional library staff play in supporting SC services (other than the primary leadership roles described previously). N=44

According to our recently adopted subject librarian position description framework, these librarians are expected to: Educate and inform faculty, graduate students, and campus administrators about scholarly communication issues, copyright and their rights as authors. Advocate for sustainable models of scholarly communication and assist in the development and creation of tools and services to facilitate scholarly communication. Support and promote our IR by helping administrators, faculty and students understand the role of the repository in building and preserving digital collections and assisting in content recruitment.

Advocacy for open access and author rights, hosting of events, speaking to faculty councils about SC issues.

All liaison librarians and informationists (medical library) provide copyright assistance, answer questions about publishing, funding mandates, open access, and repository deposit. Librarians and staff in GIS and data services help with data sources, using data, and visualizing data. Librarians in data management services assist with the creation and implementation of data management plans.

All liaisons and subject specialists have this responsibility. Extensive support & expertise provided by scholarly communications center. Copyright and licensing education & consultation by copyright and licensing librarian.

All librarians who have liaison responsibilities to departments on campus are charged with doing scholarly communication outreach (it is part of their job expectations), including education about retaining copyrights, open access, repositories, etc. Our department called Digital Publishing & Scholarship offers services for digital publishing to the campus.

All library liaisons help to promote open access, open access publishing, and use of the institutional repository.

An SC team provides general support, and individuals on that team support specific initiatives (e.g., science data services librarian). Subject specialists provide education/outreach to academic departments.

Bibliographers: outreach to faculty, soliciting content for deposit in IR, IT technical setup for IR, and processing. Access Services: limited support with rights questions.

Develop and promote the use of a DSpace IR. Create web guides on NSF data management plans resources. Create an SC webpage describing our services. Create promotional material to market SC services to campus. Host annual speaker series on SC topics such as copyright, author rights, open access, IRs, etc. Give presentations on copyright to faculty and students.

Digital Studio staff: Consult with faculty about SC services; Assist with production of multimedia works. Digital Library Technology Services staff: Digitization and encoding/text markup services; Provide metadata for scholarly content; Development and hosting scholarly network for new forms of publishing. Data Services Librarian/Data Services Studio staff: Data management or curation services; Support for data mining, data visualization, GIS, etc.; Support for

e-science initiatives. Subject librarian: Consult with faculty about library SC services; Assist in assessing research impact; Support for digital humanities, e-science, e-scholarship initiatives.

Discipline-specific guidance on authoring rights, data management, etc.

Each subject librarian links with his or her faculty on these issues.

Education about open access and copyright.

Education, outreach, marketing, acquisitions, technology training and support, intellectual property consultation, description (metadata), curation, preservation, management, finding sustainable models, investigate new technologies, mash-up existing technologies, respond to research/scholar needs — and trying to anticipate them by staying abreast of the SC landscape.

Host and maintain institutional repository.

In addition to what is described above, the library has hired interns to work on the digital repository, and sponsored a readings course for graduate student on the topic of scholarly communication. We have collaborated with other faculty on grant proposals related to scholarly communication issues, including the knowledge commons and a repository for qualitative research data.

Keeping abreast of issues and trends, and participating in local activities and initiatives.

Liaison librarians also consult with faculty and students on scholarly communications issues, referring to the Center where more in-depth assistance is needed. Several departments in the library support closely affiliated services: Archives performs limited digital archiving, Digital Collections provides extensive digitization support, Electronic Resources actively support open access efforts. In addition, the law and medical libraries, which are administratively separate, offer SC services such as training, advice, and publishing support.

Liaison librarians assist with scholarly communication advocacy. Institutional repository librarian assists with advocacy and deposit into IR.

Liaisons recruit content; perform outreach to faculty and graduate students.

Librarians in SCL provide outreach and educational services. The SC steering committee consists of 8 to 10 conditionals librarians who assist in the organization of events and outreach. All librarians will be playing a role in scholarly education and outreach during the coming months.

Librarians outside of our office of scholarly communication assist our initiatives with their expertise in areas such as metadata, digital preservation, e-science, digital strategies, etc.

Librarians should have a certain core level of knowledge about SC issues so that in conversations with faculty, they can refer the faculty to the scholarly communications librarian when necessary.

Librarians, in their roles as liaisons, communicate with their respective faculty and departments.

Our most significant activities at the moment include involvement with faculty digital research and teaching projects, NSF data management plans, copyright advice and support (often through bibliographic instruction), and our participation with the faculty open access committee and our support and management of the digital repository. The library also supports Open Journal Systems, although it is lightly used, mainly for a graduate level course, at the moment.

Part-time librarian: helps acquire and deposit papers under the faculty open access policy; creates and maintains documentation; supports liaison librarians in outreach under open access policy; assists with outward communication

and internal investigations; oversees temporary employee working on deposits. Liaison librarians: request papers from faculty under the open access policy using messages created by central support and librarian staff; Upload papers received; answer questions about open access policy (in conjunction with program manager); meet with faculty and department heads (in conjunction with program manager); participate on committee handling outreach under open access policy. OA system administrator: librarian designed and manages technical infrastructure for open access policy workflows. Metadata librarians: Assign metadata to papers collected under open access policy. Repository manager: oversee deposit structures and development issues related to the repository. Consider repository service development. Engage with system upgrades etc. Head, Software Development: confer on and manage development requests related to repository-related SC services. Software developers: support development of SC-related, repository-based services (e.g., changes to submission form). Associate Director, Information Resources: Oversees activities of office of scholarly publishing and licensing, participating in setting direction, strategy, and priorities for SC related activities. Associate Director, Technology: Assists in assigning resources for technical infrastructure to support SC related activities, including repository, and envisioning technical developments in related to SC issues. Director of Libraries: Leader in setting direction, strategy, and priorities for SC related activities. Please note that many of these roles involve a minimal number of hours from the positions listed.

Participate in outreach activities for scholarly communications, especially open access; make informed referrals to range of SC services; participate in needs assessment activities of the Libraries; technical services in support of SC collections.

Providing consultation services for faculty. Providing systems administration for faculty digital projects as well as providing consultation/advice on project development and design.

Publishing advice, publishing services, metadata creation, text markup, author rights education and advising, digital repository services, open access outreach and education, new modes of scholarly communication outreach and education, etc.

Reference librarians assist in marketing the institutional repository to their assigned faculty.

Regular interactions with faculty in their liaison role. Membership on campus committees (e.g., associate deans (research)). Delivering or arranging special topic training sessions for faculty/department meetings. Facilitating meetings of special interest groups (e.g., campus serials interest group). Partnering with faculty research groups.

Research data librarian: consultation with data management and funder mandates. Scholarly communication librarian: outreach regarding OA, author rights, publishing models, repository services, journal and conference services. Liaison librarians: outreach regarding scholarly communication & repository. Collection development librarians: knowledge of publishing models.

Scholarly communications librarian supports the work of the coordinator for scholarly communications.

Subject liaison librarians promote SC services to campus faculty. The library information technology division supports SC services through programming (e.g., institutional repository submission forms), system administration (e.g., Open Journal Systems), and web page development.

Subject liaisons are expected to maintain familiarity with local services and needs for their disciplines, and to offer first line consultation on a variety of SC issues to their assigned faculty and students, with the understanding that referrals to other staff (e.g., publishing and curation services) may be necessary.

Subject liaisons are responsible for working with faculty in their departments, and are the front line for communicating library SC services, and for reporting faculty needs and trends back to the Scholarly Communication department. They also recruit content for the digital repository.

Subject librarians engage in multi-faceted consultations on scholarly communications issues, depending on need. Center for instructional technology within the library assists with a variety of educational and publishing needs (insofar as latter are related to instruction). Medical librarians provide primary assistance with NIH/PMC deposit. Data and GIS librarians assist with data management, in collaboration with office of research support.

Subject specialists will refer faculty and students to the scholarly commons for support. In some cases, they will work with their constituencies directly on support for SC services. We have provided one librarian with fairly intensive copyright training so that that person can provide more support in terms of fair use for material. Instructional services librarian works to identify potential audiences and areas for workshops. Graduate College liaison works with the GC to identify potential areas for support.

Subject specialists/liaisons provide outreach, training, consulting to academic departments and students. Librarians and staff in scholarly resource development and libraries information technology provide support for content and access issues such as hybrid publishers, predatory open access, freely available resources.

The liaison librarians provide outreach and education to their faculty and students. Access services staff provide front line assistance to users about copyright issues. Acquisitions manages the publication fee funds.

To create more awareness about SC issues, librarians and library administrators make verbal reports to the council of deans, the faculty senate library committee, write blog posts, do programming, etc.

Two programmers are involved in serving our DSpace IR and our digital asset management system. The DSpace programmer also administers our OJS installation. Two library assistants in technical services are involved, one on the retro-digitization of theses and another with ingest of research publications into our IR. There is also an IR working group that involves the DSpace programmer, the SC library assistant/technician, a couple of liaison librarians, and a metadata librarian. They have also helped plan and carry out our OA Week events.

We are campus leaders in supporting media software for the creation of new types of scholarly works. We are also the primary place on campus for preservation of digital content. We are the leaders in the open access movement, but we rely heavily on faculty input. We are advisors when it comes to copyright, but leave the final decisions up to the content creators. We convene a faculty group that sets copyright policy for campus.

While the collections & scholarly communications office plays a leadership role in supporting SC services, another department — information & cyberinfrastructure services — manages the development of the institutional repository.

24. Please briefly describe the role(s) that others in the institution (outside the library) play in supporting SC services (other than the primary leadership roles described previously). N=35

As noted, the dean often plays a key role as spokesperson and “cultivator” of key relationships on campus.

As we have identified champions and supporters of open access and new means of scholarly communication, they have been asked to advocate library services in support of SC among their colleagues and graduate students.

Bringing different stakeholders to the table to discuss SC issues/services.

Campus counsel participates in SC education, academic senate and office of research sponsor and support events and educational outreach.

Depends on the school and department — nothing formally acknowledged.

Faculty: advocates for OA & data stewardship.

Faculty often support themselves by learning about and using technology creatively to suit their SC needs. The university press supports communication amongst scholars in the materials they publish. Academic departments publish a variety of materials (including grey lit) and also host conferences, workshops, colloquia, etc. The university IT division supports SC through a wide range of technologies that facilitate communication including large-scale storage and services for large files and systems.

Funding, technology transfer, research assistants.

Health sciences libraries conduct their own scholarly communication outreach, education, and service delivery including copyright support and public access policy compliance. The chief information officer's unit — digital media union — supports new modes of media creation and delivery.

In addition to those named in Q 9's text responses, I think its fair to say that the science, engineering, and architecture colleges all provide some SC support in their own units which are more appropriate to their own expertise and faculty. These tend to overlap with support for research computing and instructional technology, but I don't think it is easy to draw a clear line between them. They do not provide support for the "classic" library scholarly communications services of OA education, publication advocacy, etc., but those are of less value to their faculty anyway. We are developing our IR services, to be launched as ScholarSphere, with the campus's central IT unit, Information Technology Services, and specifically a sub-division known as Digital Library Technologies. These services will be marketed and co-branded as a joint initiative.

Individual academic units have IT, editing, and other support staff that provide services you define as scholarly communication.

Intellectual property advice.

Legal counsel works with the library to provide advice to faculty and develop copyright policies. Campus IT provides network and storage infrastructure and collaborates with the library in providing services.

University press: Campus based publishing. University ITS: Hosting and managing digital content; Assist with production of multimedia works. Health sciences library: Advise and educate authors about complying with funding agency mandates. School of business: Hosting and managing digital content. Courant Institute: Hosting and managing digital content. University Humanities Initiative: Support for digital humanities. Office of Industrial Liaison/Office of General Counsel: Support patent research or applications.

Office of General Counsel provides guidance on intellectual property issues.

Office of Information Technology and Sponsored Programs & Regulatory Compliance (SPARCS) support data management and the repository.

Office of Information Technology assists with a variety of new publishing platforms, including enterprise-wide WordPress installation. Office of Research Support is working on a data management strategy for the campus, with support from librarians and others, and is responsible for assessing research impact.

Office of Institutional Research: described previously. University Press: journal and book publisher. Office of Sponsored Research: oversees grant application and management. Technology Licensing Office: handles copyright ownership issues. Office of General Counsel: described previously. Provost's Office: provides funding, sets priorities and direction.

Office of Research and Sponsored Programs.

Office of the general counsel offers support to campus concerning intellectual property issues, and information technology services offers data management services.

Office of the vice president for research (OVPR) and the center for computing and visualization (CCV) support patent work and data management (short term), respectively.

Several offices at the university offer services, including the office for research and university information technology, particularly in the area of data management and digital publishing support. These efforts are in their infancy, however, and not closely coordinated across the university. The library works closely with the office of general counsel on selected copyright and other rights issues; neither the library nor OGC officially represent individual faculty.

Technical support for publishing (e.g., OJS); assistance with compliance efforts (OSP); some educational outreach (promotion of Fair Use); creation and revision of institutional policies (Faculty Senate, committees).

The campus office of information technology and the graduate school are partnering with the Libraries to plan for NSF data curation and management mandates. The faculty assembly library committee has been discussing an open access resolution.

The copyright licensing office takes the lead in educating authors about their rights and in providing copyright training.

The center for the advancement of learning hosts a lot of our workshops on copy rights, author rights, and open courses as part of their regular programming by providing space, refreshments, management of registration and assessment, and other kinds of logistical support. The office of the general counsel provides valuable input on guidelines and documents we use in workshops and in other kinds of outreach.

The graduate school approves and submits theses and dissertations into the repository.

The Institute for Teaching and Learning Excellence often refers faculty to the library. They also ask librarians to present workshops concerning open access, copyright, and portfolio creation.

The main SC roles played outside the library are by the office of fair practices & legal affairs on copyright awareness promotion and advice, and research services regarding funding compliance.

The office of the vice chancellor for research and the office of the provost are supporting the open access fund.

The university center of humanities has sponsored programs related to SC issues. Computer Services Instructional Support unit provides some advice on copyright for faculty.

The university deans voted to support the provost-funded open access publishing fund. The faculty, through the faculty senate, voted to endorse the Berlin Declaration and also the creation of an open access policy.

Vice provost for research and CIO are engaged in planning for e-science and data curation.

We have a highly decentralized campus, so you do find some IT units within colleges providing support for an Open Journal System installation, for example. But this is not very well organized. We do have a couple of research centers—I3 and ICHASS—that provide support for faculty working in new areas (particularly the digital humanities). In most cases, this support is helping find and secure grant funding.

We work with our office of research and the provost's office to develop relationships with faculty and graduate students.

Please enter any additional comments you may have about who supports SC services. N=10

At least two departments on campus, Computer Science and Portuguese and Brazilian Studies, support their own peer-reviewed OA journals.

I think a better question may be "Who doesn't?"

Libraries IT has about 1 FTE dedicated to supporting scholarly communication service delivery platforms.

Office of licensing and ventures deal with patent development.

One of the questions on our upcoming survey asks who should support open access on campus.

SC services on campus are supported by the eScholarship committee. The eScholarship committee is made up of members from the three main campus libraries (university, health, and law) and the university press. Each library is administratively independent of the other libraries.

The campus has a very distributed infrastructure, but there is increasing move towards centralized services.

The provost's office certainly has a role in supporting SC services as well.

There have been several leadership changes in the libraries and at the university as a whole, and as a result support for scholarly communication services will continue to evolve.

We are training and integrating all our subject librarians on SC issues.

25. Since 2007, has your library changed its organization structure in an attempt to better provide SC services? N=54

Yes	39	72%
No	15	28%

If yes, please briefly describe the reorganization. N=39

2008: created position "Director, Scholarly Communications & Instructional Support." 2011: created new department, "Digital Library Services" as part of Center for Media and Educational Technologies. 2011: took over responsibility for Wired Humanities Project (digital humanities group).

A major unit in the library is now oriented toward scholarly communication efforts, with changed job descriptions for subject specialist librarians and one full-time scholarly communication librarian. An institutional repository has been developed.

Added a library faculty position and a staff support position.

Added a new department: Data Management Services. GIS and Data Services was created due to other reasons, but is a unit that deals with scholarly communication as you define it.

Added a scholarly communications librarian position.

An intern was added to Office of Scholarly Communications in 2008. In 2012, a Coordinator of Scholarly Communications Technology will also join the office. For the past four years, that person has been working on many SC related projects as part of a grant-funded position in Digital Information Strategies.

Assigned responsibilities to parts of existing positions.

Changed position description and job title of the Director, Digital Resources Program, to include leadership for the scholarly communications program.

Chief Officer - Collections & Scholarly Communications Office reports directly to university librarian (previously reported to associate university librarian).

Created a new unit, Academic and Scholarly Outreach, and hired a director and a scholarly communications librarian.

Created Office of Copyright Management & Scholarly Communication, created Scholarly Publishing and Data Management Team, created director of copyright management & scholarly communication, repository manager, and data management librarian positions.

Created positions of Director of Collection Strategies and Scholarly Communication and Repository Coordinator.

Creation of a Copyright and Rights Management Office within the library.

Creation of the Office of Digital Initiatives & Open Access.

Established the scholarly commons described before. While this wasn't a reorganization strictly to provide better SC services, the ability to have a centralized location for SC services was a factor.

Formally established scholarly communication unit in 2009.

In 2008, we created a library committee to support scholarly communication activities within the university library. In 2012, we hired a Scholarly Communication Officer to spearhead library scholarly communication efforts on campus.

In 2009 we recruited and hired for a newly defined position, Digital Collections Curator, who has been instrumental in leading our initial data management services and the development of ScholarSphere services. As mentioned in Q 3, we are forming a new unit, titled Publishing and Curation Services that is intended to consolidate and make simpler resource allocations for SC activities. In summer 2011 we reorganized our administrative structures so that special collections began to report to the AD for Scholarly Communications (whose title was adjusted to include research). Among other benefits, this has allowed us to better link planning for electronic records archiving with the development of scholarly repository services and to better coordinate activities around digitization to promote more scholarly engagement and partnerships.

In 2012 we will be hiring a Scholarly Communications Officer.

In January 2012 the library reorganized including the creation of a new division and AUL position for digital services in order to better support initiatives to provide increased SC services.

In the spring of 2012 reorganization moved IR staffing to the university press and created a new unit – Library Publishing Services.

Incorporation of the digital library initiatives department into scholarly communication. Appointment of an associate dean for scholarly communication and research services.

New director; also moved technology-based positions to and from digital library initiatives department. Created a position in collections and scholarly communication division for digital preservation.

One additional position added to digital library services.

Restructured committee on scholarly communication to be more broadly representative of SC issues. Added copyright and licensing librarian.

SC services have shifted between library divisions (technical services, public services, library information technology) and now report to the AUL for Scholarly Communication, Assessment, and Personnel.

Scholarly Communication & Access Division - Collection Development Department and Information Delivery Department are now in the same division as the Scholarly Communication & Digital Curation Department and the Collection Acquisitions & Management Department.

Technical services librarian and support staff hiring, particularly metadata support; data curation staff support; digitization librarian hired; digital preservation librarian hired; GIS librarian hired; digital initiatives staff configured into library organization work team; digital initiatives committee formed; born digital materials working group formed.

The library structure has not been reorganized, but new positions relating to SC services have been created since 2007, e.g., digital scholarly publishing officer, scholarly communications librarian.

The open access/scholarly communication services were handled by the associate university librarian, technology and scholarly communication. In a major reorganization, the office of scholarly communication was set up as described above.

The role that collections management played in gifts and assessment of collection support for new programs has been downplayed, to free up time for greater emphasis on SC. Collections management was subsumed into a larger unit of collections & external relations that also includes our archives & special collections department. It is understood that digitization and digital publishing will go hand in hand and thus these two former units are working more closely together and sharing expertise.

The SC department was formed in mid-2011. The department grew to include an e-science librarian in early 2012 (up until then it included the IP and digital publishing librarians). A ½-time staff person was added in early 2012 to work on operations.

The scholarly communication librarian was a member of a department in the public services division. When the position was vacated, it was rewritten and a center to support SC activities was established, with a reporting line directly to the dean of libraries.

The scholarly communications committee was established in 2007. Open access funding support began in 2009.

The Libraries has moved from traditional library divisions (i.e., public services and technical services) to a libraries management team comprised of eight department heads, reporting to two associate deans (senior associate dean, associate dean) and the dean of libraries. Reporting to the senior associate dean are the following re-organized departments: libraries information technology, circulation, scholarly resource development (collection development, acquisition, ILL borrowing), library administration & budget. Reporting to the associate dean: archives & special collections, arts & humanities, metadata services, sciences, social sciences. The members of the newly formed scholarly communications working group represent individuals from seven of the eight departments. The Libraries re-organization is intended to reduce traditional boundaries and divisions and encourage team collaboration across units.

We expanded an existing department, then called Digital Collection Services, to include an additional 3 FTE librarians to support SC efforts. The department changed its name to Scholarly Communication and Licensing to better reflect these responsibilities and its relationship to the AUL who oversees these activities.

We had a team that was just on the main campus with a regional member. The major schools (main, health, law) are drawing closer together in a variety of ways now, so this team composition is indicative of a larger trend.

We have added staff supporting digital humanities and eScience and organized the support for digital projects by faculty and students in a single working group called the Center for Digital Scholarship (CDS).

We integrated open access outreach into the job descriptions for all liaison librarians. We repositioned and named the SC activities as "Office of Scholarly Publishing & Licensing." We established an open access outreach committee. We established an open access policy systems team. We hardened the salary of the program manager, scholarly publishing & licensing, and revised duties to remove some non-SC components. We added a part-time librarian to support SC activities (in addition to full-time program manager role added in 2006). We changed reporting lines for some related acquisitions support functions as a result of changes to program manager role described here. We added some 'dotted lines' to support staff assisting with open access policy implementation.

Answered No

As mentioned above we plan to re-organize this year making SC a priority.

The Libraries underwent substantial reorganization of nearly every unit in the past two years, but improving SC services was not an explicit goal of the reorganization.

ASSESSMENT OF SC SERVICES

26. Has the success of the library's SC services been evaluated? N=54

Yes	8	15%
No	28	52%
No, but we plan to	18	33%

If yes or you plan to, please briefly describe the evaluation criteria/process.

Answered Yes

An online campus-wide survey to faculty was distributed in October 2011.

Annual reporting, monthly reports, staff surveys.

Evaluation has taken place through annual reports and performance reviews, reports to the faculty committee on the library system, reports to the provost and vice provost, reports to the committee on intellectual property, and in surveys of our user community. Evaluation has also taken place informally through anecdotal information from faculty and students.

Ongoing review of statistics and services; regular update of tools.

The only evaluation done so far has been to send a survey to our author fund recipients asking them to provide feedback about their experience. Other initiatives have not been assessed.

We analyze participation in IR, and download statistics (including theses and dissertations).

Workshop participants are asked to answer a short survey, which helps us determine the value of that workshop to that audience. We present our services to different groups to get their feedback on the content and marketing of these services, to determine what is important to them and how to better reach the intended audiences. Liaison librarians

offer input from their discussions with faculty. We track use of the COPE fund. We developed a section of the annual “bibliographer’s report” where the subject specialists record information about trends in open access publishing, faculty activity as editors, and needs for other scholarly communication support within the specific subject area.

Yearly evaluate of director’s performance. No formal assessment plan other than this as yet.

Answered Plan To

Because many of our programs are in the process of being developed, initial evaluation will focus on adoption rates — analyzing how many people use the services and from what disciplines. Later evaluations will include surveys/focus groups to determine success of particular programs.

Numerical data on rights-related inquiries, attendance at SC-related events, etc., had been collected over the past years, and incorporated in the annual report of the section. Particular attention is given to faculty involvement. As part of your strategic planning initiative, we are planning to gather data in a more systematic manner and to evaluate outcomes periodically.

Our current strategic plan includes some SC-specific activities or projects, and we have identified specific outcomes for some of them.

To be determined.

Trusted Digital Repository audit.

Under discussion.

Use of the IR, faculty choosing to publishing in OA journals or using OA funds to make work open access.

We are currently coding data from faculty interview about open access and the event our open access funding had on their decision about choosing open access. With the appointment of our new scholarly communication officer, we will be looking at other assessment related to scholarly communication support on campus.

We have not done formal assessment but we monitor the growth of the institutional repository contents and use, and review feedback from faculty about the repository.

We haven’t determined criteria/process yet.

We plan to, but haven’t defined the metrics yet.

We will be seeking Trusted Digital Repository certification. Evaluation is planned for SC services and will be developed in consultation/collaboratively with assessment librarian.

We’re in the process of hiring an assessment librarian; we will be working with that person to develop a process of evaluation. I think this will involve measuring awareness of services, in particular.

Answered No

The no answer reflects the difficulty of assessing cultural change writ large. On the other hand, individual services concentrating on understanding and lessening copyright barriers in the larger context of scholarly communication beyond publication-centric definitions has been extensively used and welcomed.

The Open Access Publishing Fund Pilot Project (July 2010 – 2012) was evaluated March 2012.

We are in the process of developing an Open Access Awareness survey to administer to all faculty. One question will specifically look at the services offered by the Centre for Scholarly Communication. This is a summer project and we hope to have the results for discussion and promotion during OA Week.

27. If the success of the library's SC services has been evaluated, please briefly explain how the data you've collected has influenced your library's activities, for example modifying, dropping, or adding any services, identifying underserved constituents in your patron base, etc. N=7

Based on survey results, the library will investigate implementing new services for OA monograph publishing, print on demand, and improving digital preservation (already a priority for the library). Survey results also indicate differences in priorities/interests based on academic discipline, providing the basis for targeted information resources and training/background for SC employees and subject liaison librarians when working with teaching faculty.

Because participation and use of the IR is high, we continue to support it.

Survey results are used to plan educational events and judge interest in particular topics.

Update and develop new services, particularly online tools, multimedia, etc.

We are pleased by information in the survey of faculty in relation to awareness of the open access policy but plan to increase marketing to increase awareness ratings even further. We redesigned our scholarly publishing website using input from user experience testing. We have continually modified outreach methods, particularly in relation to the open access policy, based on anecdotal information gathered about responses and on interviews with department heads.

We have reviewed statistics of all of our services — institutional repository, lecture recording service. The lecture recording service is very popular. We have also conducted an assessment regarding research data needs on campus.

We use the reports from participants in workshops and results from discussions with constituents to develop new kinds of programs and to market current services. We track different kinds of publication, such as open access publication, to see where activity is greatest, to help in focusing marketing efforts. Input from liaison librarians helps us develop subject appropriate approaches. We use data from the "bibliographer's annual report" to develop programs and to identify faculty speakers on topics such as trends in publishing.

IMPACT OF SC LEADERSHIP AND SERVICES

28. Please indicate which demonstrable outcomes have resulted from your library's or institution's SC efforts and services. Check all that apply. N=54

Authors N=49

Authors submit work to the institutional repository	39	80%
Authors seeking assistance with questions related to authorship have increased since 2007	32	65%
Authors comply with funding mandates (NIH, NSF)	29	59%
Authors use Creative Commons/Science Commons licenses for their work	21	43%
Authors increasingly publish in Open Access journals	20	41%
Authors use copyright addenda	17	35%
Authors submit work to subject or disciplinary repositories	15	31%
Authors have declined to publish in or edit particular journals	13	27%
Other author outcome	13	27%

Please describe other author outcome.

Authors are more aware of the Faculty Open Access Policy.

Editors founding open access journals or converting print subscription journals to OA. Major portfolios on campus evaluating and integrating resolutions on data sharing and management. Development of university-wide policy on data sharing and management currently underway.

Evidence for these outcomes really is largely anecdotal. In addition, some faculty members have signed the recent White House petition.

Growth and demand for online access journals cataloged and made available by the library; better self-archiving of research; more collaboration between faculty and librarians.

I do not feel comfortable in answering this question as I have no way of knowing if authors have changed their practices based solely on the SC efforts we have done.

It is my opinion that because we have not engaged in formal assessment, it's difficult to impossible to determine whether the libraries' SC efforts and services have had demonstrable outcomes. I think we can guess that they have, but I don't think that's what's being asked here. We know that authors do comply with funding mandates, for instance, but we don't know if they comply because of anything the Libraries are doing. We also know that the number of questions re: authorship to our SC department is up since 2007, but we can't tie it directly to our efforts.

Many of the outcomes above may have resulted, but no evidence has been collected. Editors have sought assistance with questions relating to rights and publisher policies. Editors have sought assistance with publishing their journals or starting new ones. A number of faculty and students have signed the "Cost of Knowledge" boycott.

Open access publishing fund has been created and/or funding has been increasing. Librarians have adopted a resolution on open access.

Presentations about open access to university bodies.

The Libraries has provided workshops and website information about managing authors rights, copyright addenda, and Creative Commons/Science Commons licenses. We assume there have been positive outcomes from our efforts, but it isn't something we have been able to track, which is why we have left the boxes unchecked.

Use of open scholarly services like OJS for faculty publications.

We have seen growth in the areas indicated but it is hard to demonstrate that this came from efforts in a direct cause and effect!

While a number of the non-checked items have happened, the library cannot claim credit for these actions.

Institution N=54

Institution hosts an institutional repository	44	82%
Electronic theses and dissertations are available Open Access	44	82%
Institutional repository has seen an increase in holdings	39	70%
Number of positions with SC responsibilities has increased since 2007	38	70%
Open Access publishing fund has been created and/or funding has been increasing	16	30%
Creation of new centers or institutes related to SC	13	24%

Faculty governance has passed a resolution on Open Access	11	20%
Institution has rearranged or gained physical spaces to better support SC services	11	20%
Faculty governance has passed a resolution on SC not related to Open Access.	5	9%
Examination of the impact of digital publishing on tenure and/or the institution's publishing rewards system	4	7%
Institution has adopted an Open Access self-archiving mandate	2	4%
Changes in promotion and tenure criteria	2	4%
Other institution outcome	16	30%

Please describe other institution outcome.

An open access committee is finalizing its report to the provost as of this writing. A recommendation should be forthcoming soon.

Confusing question. We are starting an open access fund and have an institutional repository. But they are library initiatives, not institutional.

Faculty will be voting on an OA policy in the fall.

Increased campus support for interdisciplinary research and new ways of doing scholarly communication.

Individual departments have passed OA self-archiving mandates.

Libraries faculty have passed an OA resolution. Size of institutional repository has grown substantially with new contributors engaging constantly. Six OA journals are being delivered via library platforms. University press has made its backlist OA in the institutional repository. Provost has joined public statements supporting reform of scholarly publishing and new models.

Many of the above areas are under development right now.

MIT faculty adopted first permission-based, campus-wide open access policy of its kind in the US in 2009. 25% of faculty scholarly articles completed since March 2009 are openly accessible under this MIT Faculty Open Access Policy. MIT has launched MITx, an open online learning initiative, and is collaborating with Harvard on a joint system of the same nature, edX. OpenCourseWare has become a standard concept in the academy, having been launched at MIT. The Libraries are funding a new two-year fellow position in scholarly publishing & licensing, supporting development of new professionals in this area and the creation of new SC-related projects and services at MIT.

NOTE: The Scholarly Communication Institute began in 2003, so it is not "new."

NOTE: We have had ETDs since 1999, predating many other SC activities as defined for this survey.

Our repository was just established in March; contributions and expansion to locally created journals are expected in the next 18 months.

Our university passed a resolution in support of the institutional repository but not open access per se.

Pending: an open access funding initiative. Ongoing: discussions at system-wide and local faculty committees.

SC issues are being discussed at senate and at faculty councils. There is interest in SC issues from the office of research services. The university is a leader in knowledge mobilization, which includes dissemination as part of its strategy.

Symposia & Open Access Week events.

To clarify the above, the university Libraries created the fund for open access publishing. The Libraries have for two consecutive years funded an alternate textbook project whereby faculty receive incentives/support for using open access educational resources in order to avoid requiring commercial textbooks for particular courses.

Please describe the nature of the SC resolution. N=13

Calls upon authors to consider the pricing and policies of the journals where they publish/edit/review and to post their work whenever possible into the IR.

Encourages open access when doesn't conflict with advancement of faculty member; requests establishment of digital repository (done); calls for review by Faculty Senate Council in three years.

Faculty senate endorsed the CIC Statement on Publishing Agreements

Libraries faculty: calls on them to negotiate rights to deposit their works locally and make articles openly available. Waiver available if rights cannot be obtained.

OA policy under discussion by university senate.

Our faculty policy is more than a resolution — it is a permission-based policy that grants the university license to openly share the faculty's scholarly articles.

Passed unanimously by our faculty senate in April 2009, the resolution calls on faculty to be aware of journal pricing and publisher policies, publish in moderately-priced and/or open access journals, deposit their work in repositories, etc.; calls on the Libraries to facilitate these efforts by providing journal pricing information and developing repository services; and calls on the administration to provide the Libraries with funds for these things.

Pending, not free to discuss at the moment.

Senate SC resolutions were in support of rights retention, e.g., SPARC publishing contract copyright addenda.

Support author's rights.

The resolution was a faculty senate affirmation of support for the CIC Provosts' Statement on Author Rights.

The university senate has endorsed signing the Berlin Declaration and also charged the university libraries committee to draft an open access policy.

University SC resolution is pending; expect adoption for most, if not all campuses.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

29. Please enter any additional information that may assist the authors' understanding of your library's organization of scholarly communication services. N=15

Advocacy, education, and service provision aimed at promoting positive change in scholarly communication have been integrated into the work of nearly every division of the Libraries from IT to tech services to research and education services. The unit that provides publishing and repository services is entirely dedicated to service delivery but many other elements of promoting change — from offering copyright services, to our faculty engagement program, providing IT

support, and managing the web site — also devote substantial resources to this purpose. The embedded nature of this embrace of change is perhaps best illustrated by the recent decision by the Libraries' faculty to impose a public access mandate upon their own scholarship and research communication. This commitment to walking the walk ourselves perhaps reflects a different philosophy than that of SC led by one or a few.

Following the adoption of a faculty open access policy in 2009, the Libraries' SC role expanded from a single position dedicated to providing education and raising awareness, to a much broader effort involving an array of existing staff whose priorities were adjusted to allow for implementing and supporting the open access policy. During and following an overall Libraries' reorganization in 2010, the organization of scholarly communication services was adapted to accommodate this expanded involvement and the increasingly high profile of the effort.

Library faculty have passed a resolution in support of open access publishing within their discipline.

Our institution is very disinclined towards resolutions/mandates/policies so it is unlikely to ever pass any kind of open access policy. Faculty are allowed to determine their own positions. Some faculty are very interested in open access but many are not and consequently our support of SC is more focused on what faculty express as their needs rather than trying to push a particular agenda.

Our local efforts center on the work of the Endowed Chair for Scholarly Communication who maintains a large portfolio of scholarly communication issues within and beyond the local institution. The endowed chair is actively involved in national associations and legal conversations about the scope of copyright in the modern age, and its relationship and influence on the scholarly communication system. The chair funding exists in recognition of the central roles that libraries must serve in the information age. The data gathering and curation initiatives have made the conversation much more complex to the extent that the range of stakeholders enlarged exponentially and to the extent that data holds a multiplicity of meaning across the university culture and beyond among data driven technology systems and cultures. The key among these increasingly diverse activities under the scholarly communication umbrella is education and consensus understanding of the nature of problems and how to best address them in resource poor environments and at a fundamentally local level.

Responsibilities diffused through several library units. Services, however, are concentrated in Scholarly Communication Center, especially as they relate to the institutional repository (RUCore), ETDs & data management (RURsearch). Foster Center at the Douglass Library provides means of developing scholarly media. Committee on Scholarly Communication is developing policy and processes in all areas of SC.

The SC initiatives of the institution have mainly been undertaken and accomplished by the Libraries, in some cases working with specific units or departments on campus (adding materials to the IR). This year we hope to engage faculties so that Senate will sign the COPE compact. Also working with research services to look at the implementation of ORCID.

The Libraries lack sufficient human resources to mount the types of extensive SC initiatives seen elsewhere that would encompass many or most of the activities noted elsewhere. Our faculty appear relatively cool to the idea of open access, in part due to increasing emphasis over the past decade on publishing in high impact journals for P&T and faculty merit. P&T policies and practices here are relatively conservative and not amenable with the broad goals of SC although some senior faculty are sympathetic. We have therefore done little in the SC area compared with others. We have found it more beneficial and rewarding to focus our energy on an alternate textbook project that helps to promote within the university and to external audiences the idea of openly shared learning content.

There is also a scholarly communications committee at our institution. Although primary responsibility rests with the center director, the SCC also plays an important role in educating library staff on SC issues, and advising the library administration on key SC issues.

We are weaving SC, GIS, data curation into each subject librarian's responsibilities, with point persons whose jobs are to be expert in each of these topics.

We could and would do more with more staff. All work has been undertaken voluntarily and without additional recompense or reduction of other responsibilities.

We have not completed this survey because we are in transition as a result of the scholarly communication librarian position being vacant at the moment. A review is currently underway in advance of posting the scholarly communication position.

We have relied on committees to advance some specific SC initiatives. For example, the Research Data Management Services Team assisted the Digital Collections Curator in rolling out information and services to promote compliance with NSF Data Management policy in 2011.

We now provide more specific and in-depth copyright consultation services to faculty and departments within the Libraries.

With a new director, existing services have been evaluated; new projects and services are being pushed aggressively to accompany the opening of a major new library facility on the university's Centennial Campus.

RESPONDING INSTITUTIONS

University at Albany, SUNY
University of Alberta
University of Arizona
Arizona State University
Boston University
Brigham Young University
Brown University
University of Calgary
University of California, Irvine
University of California, Los Angeles
University of Chicago
University of Colorado at Boulder
Colorado State University
University of Connecticut
Dartmouth College
Duke University
University of Florida
Georgetown University
University of Georgia
Georgia Institute of Technology
University of Illinois at Chicago
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Indiana University Bloomington
University of Iowa
Iowa State University
Johns Hopkins University
Kent State University
University of Kentucky
Library of Congress
Louisiana State University
University of Louisville
University of Manitoba
University of Massachusetts, Amherst
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
University of Miami
University of Nebraska—Lincoln
University of New Mexico
New York University
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
North Carolina State University
Northwestern University
Ohio University
Ohio State University
Oklahoma State University
University of Oregon
University of Ottawa
Pennsylvania State University
Purdue University
Rutgers University
Southern Illinois University Carbondale
Syracuse University
Temple University
University of Tennessee
Texas A&M University
Texas Tech University
Vanderbilt University
University of Virginia
University of Washington
Washington University in St. Louis
University of Western Ontario
York University