Survey results from COPPUL Libraries

COPPUL SCHOLARLY COMMUNICATION WORKGROUP

March 5, 2013

REPORT ON A SURVEY: **Determining the Scholarly Communication Landscape among COPPUL Libraries**
During November of 2012 a survey on scholarly communication was done among COPPUL libraries. The purpose of the survey was to inform both the educational efforts of COPPUL with regard to scholarly communication as well as the agenda of a proposed meeting of scholarly communication practitioners in COPPUL libraries. Such a community of practice (COP) meeting is being planned for 2013.

The survey was done online with SurveyMonkey http://www.surveymonkey.com . The link to the questionnaire was distributed to the COPPUL library directors by the COPPUL Executive Director via e-mail. A response was received from 22 of the 24 COPPUL libraries.
The following table reflects the answers to questions designed to provide an indication of where COPPUL libraries generally are at as far as scholarly communication is concerned.

	Yes %	No %	No, but planned in the next 12 months %
Have held outreach events for faculty on scholarly communication topics	85	5	10
Have held outreach events for students on scholarly communication topics	50	40	10
Have held education events for library staff on scholarly communication topics	63.2	26.3	10.5
Include scholarly, vacation topics in information literacy instruction sessions for students	57.9	36.8	5.3
Have a library web presence on scholarly communication topics aimed at campus community	78.9	15.8	5.3
Job descriptions for library staff include scholarly communication duties	47.4	47.4	5.3
Have assigned library staff members to be responsible for scholarly communication activities	63.2	36.8	0
Have a library committee on scholarly communication that includes library staff only	26.3	63.2	10.5
Have a library committee on scholarly communication that includes other campus stakeholders (i.e. faculty, editors, University press, research office)	15.8	68.4	15.8
Offer services such as copyright, author rights, and/or open access mandates compliance advising	78.9	10.5	10.5
Have an institutional repository	55	20	25
Have a fund to pay author fees for open access Journal publishing	22.2	72.2	5.6
Library serves as publisher for new models of scholarly communication (e journals, etc.)	45	30	25
Discussions with faculty leadership regarding an open access resolution for my campus	57.9	31 .6	10.5
Have an interest in open source learning material	80	10	10

The answers to the six open-ended questions are summarized below:

1. List here other issues with which your library is engaged with regards to scholarly communication.

Items listed in response to this question included: copyright, publishing open access journals, book publishing, data repositories, electronic theses and dissertations.

2. What other means would be helpful to you for increasing your awareness or enabling you to speak about the issues?
Responses to this question included: supporting hosting open access events, information on how to demonstrate to the community the impact of open access, archived scholarly communication lectures, knowledge about activities and initiatives at other COPPUL libraries, a collegial forum for information sharing on scholarly communication, a list or bulletin board on scholarly communication.

3. Do you have an open access policy/main mandate/statement at your institution? Please provide details.
Only 4 respondents gave a positive answer on this question.

4. Do you have a particular strength/initiative/project at your institution related to scholarly communication that you would be interested in taking the lead with for informing/educating other COPPUL institutions about? Please provide details.
Responses included: institutional repository development, establishing a copyright office, Open Journal Systems, Open Conference Systems, Open Monographs Press, digitization of art material

5. What role do you see for COPPUL in scholarly communication? Please list the top 3 to 5 things that come to mind.
Most of the respondents (14/16 who answered this question) saw an educational/support role for COPPUL. The sharing of best practices, workshops, webinars and even providing educational material for both librarians and faculty were some of the specific items mentioned. Some saw a coordination and preservation (linked with Digitization and LOCKSS) role for COPPUL and even negotiating author's fees on behalf of COPPUL libraries.

6. Any other comments you'd care to include?
Some expressed gratitude for the opportunity to participate in the survey.