

COPPUL Scholarly Communications Working Group
<http://www.coppul.ca/scholarlycommunications>
Report for the Spring 2017 COPPUL Directors Meeting

Background

The COPPUL Scholarly Communications Working Group (SCWG) was endorsed as a standing committee of COPPUL in March 2012, and has been fully operating since September 2012. SCWG met four times by Skype since the group's last report to COPPUL Directors, which was presented at the Fall 2016 COPPUL Directors Meeting (September 15).

Membership change

The Working Group is in transition. Carmen Kazakoff Lane (Brandon University) joined the Working Group in the fall. DeDe Dawson, Patty Gallilee, and Robert Tiessen all had terms that expired in December 2016. Both Patty Gallilee and Robert Tiessen have agreed to temporarily stay through April 2017. Robert Tiessen is also currently serving as interim Chair. Robyn Hall has agreed to take over as Chair at the end of April 2017.

Activities Since the Last Report

Open Access Week Speaker Funding

Sub-Committee of Patty Gallilee, Kathy Gaynor, and DeDe Dawson

We received two applications, assessed them using the rubric, and unanimously agreed that both should receive \$1000 in funding. To view recordings of these talks, visit:

<https://coppulscwg.wordpress.com/resources/webinar-archive>

Some details on the applications:

1. Joint application from BC Research Libraries Group
Speaker: Rick Anderson
Title: What Do We Want? (We're Not Sure!) When Do We Want It? (Hard to Say!):
Reconciling the Needs of Analysis and Advocacy in Scholarly-Communication Reform
Date: Oct 25, 2016
Description: Reforming scholarly communication is a tough job, made tougher by factors that include the lack of unanimity among stakeholders as to what reform should look like (or whether it's needed at all); the wide variety of needs and interests among the system's stakeholders; the structural complexity of the system itself; the lack of unanimity as to what "open access" means; the heavy weight of inertia in academic practice; and the high level of emotion that inevitably accompanies discussion of these issues. The difficulty and complexity of the reform project suggest that analysis is needed, but the moral and emotional weight of the issues involved naturally lead us in the direction of advocacy instead—and advocacy and analysis are, unfortunately, natural enemies. In this session we will review salient aspects of the scholarly-communication landscape that make reform particularly challenging, some principles for addressing those challenges, and some possible mechanisms for applying those principles.

2. University of Lethbridge

Speaker: Gerald Beasley (+panel)

Title: Open Access Publishing at the University

Date: Oct 27, 2016

Description: We are planning to have a talk, which will be webcast and archived, as well as a panel discussion with our invited guest speaker (Gerald Beasley) and some local researchers and librarians. The talk will be based on Mr. Beasley's experience in Concordia University's successful policy for green open access publishing of all work by their researchers, as well as his evolving thoughts on open access in the university context.

We agreed that both applications were strong for different reasons. The BC application has an internationally important speaker on a unique topic that would be of interest to COPPUL libraries and beyond. The topic is theoretical and will promote discussion – moving the conversation forward. While the Lethbridge application is on a topic that has been much discussed, but its strength is having a regionally important speaker that will focus the discussion on local (and national) issues/perspectives highly relevant to COPPUL libraries. This topic is much more practical and will be useful locally/regionally.

Study of copyright practices in Canadian institutional repositories

Attached is a one page summary of survey results on Canadian institutional repository (IR) copyright practices collected as part of an ongoing study that Patty Gallilee, Robyn Hall and Robert Tiessen are working on. Plans are in place to complete a content analysis of Canadian IRs shortly to go with these survey results, and to disseminate complete findings via presentation and/or publication in the coming months.

COPPUL Digital Preservation Network

The COPPUL Scholarly Communications Group welcomes collaborative, preservation and scholarly communications opportunities created with the ongoing development of the COPPUL Digital Preservation Network. It is envisioned that this network will enable all libraries to participate in the preservation of not only institutional assets but potentially national assets, such as government data, at a time when public information faces real threats from either political actors or data erosion.

Summary of Survey results: Copyright Practices in Canadian IRs

During spring 2016 a survey on Institutional Repositories (IRs) was sent to the IR contact/manager of 47 Canadian academic libraries. The survey focused on copyright management practices and the online archiving of peer-reviewed journal literature in Canadian IRs. We received 18 responses. The following briefly summarizes the results of the survey. Detailed results will be presented at library conferences and/or published in library and information science literature, and will help inform repository staffing, workflows, best practices, and methods of outreach to faculty and students at Canadian colleges, polytechnics, and universities.

General Information:

- A majority of survey respondents worked at comprehensive and medical doctoral universities. The FTE enrollment at respondents' institutions ranged from 4K-80K.
- IRs managed by respondents have been in operation an average of 7 years, with most using either DSpace or Digital Commons IR platforms.
- Repositories are staffed largely by librarians and library technicians and technical support staff, each devoting a small part of their work time to maintaining the IR.

Practices Around Article Deposit and Copyright Management

- Many respondents were unable to report how many post-prints and final versions of articles were in their IRs; this information is not typically tracked.
- Most repositories offered both self- and mediated deposit options with mediated deposit slightly higher in usage. It was noted that self-deposit can result in low-uptake, problems with entered metadata, and required support, while mediated deposit maintains quality but requires staff time securing permissions and uploading content.
- Most respondents did not have an OA mandate in place at their institution, nor do they track compliance with research funder or institutional mandates.
- SHERPA/RoMEO and publisher websites were noted as the main source for verifying publisher agreements when posting to the IR, but both could be improved in terms of up-to-date content and clarity of information provided.
- Most ensure that any specific Creative Commons licenses attached to works are recorded in IR's metadata.
- A majority of respondents reported that their IR software allows for managing embargo periods. Most responded that they rely on the authors to provide this information. Only a few indicated that they check every submission for compliance with embargoes.

Promotion

- Respondents have engaged in a variety of activities to promote deposit in IRs including workshops, presentations, website and social media promotion, and CV drives. Workshops and email solicitations for content have proved least effective.
- In terms of promoting the Tri-Council Open Access Policy on Publications announced in early 2015, several mentioned working with their office of research services, and doing presentations, dept. meeting visits, workshops, info on Library websites, flyers, blogs, and articles.