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Educational Transformation
Broaden access to higher education, improve student outcomes, and control costs

Libraries & Scholarly Communication
Effective and sustainable systems for the creation, discovery, dissemination, and preservation of scholarship
LIBRARIES & SCHOLARLY COMMUNICATION

Effective and sustainable systems for the creation, discovery, dissemination, and preservation of scholarship

Strengthening Services & Spaces

- The Ithaka S+R Faculty Survey and The Ithaka S+R Library Survey
- Surveys of student and faculty member practices and needs at individual universities
- Collaborative examinations of research practices and support needs by field
- Anthropological consulting to improve teaching, learning, and space planning

Research Agenda

- Discovery & Access
- Library organizational structures
- The changing monograph
- Staff diversity
## Participants

### United States – Universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>American University</th>
<th>Mississippi State University</th>
<th>University of Dayton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auburn University</td>
<td>Montana State University</td>
<td>University of Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baylor University</td>
<td>Princeton University</td>
<td>University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Polytechnic State University</td>
<td>Rice University</td>
<td>University of Iowa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie Mellon University</td>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University</td>
<td>University of North Carolina – Chapel Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of William &amp; Mary</td>
<td>Tulane University</td>
<td>University of Pittsburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DePaul University</td>
<td>University of California – Davis</td>
<td>University of South Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke University</td>
<td>University of California – Los Angeles</td>
<td>University of Southern California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard University</td>
<td>University of California – San Diego</td>
<td>University of Texas San Antonio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University</td>
<td>University of California – Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Virginia Commonwealth University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa State University</td>
<td>University of Central Florida</td>
<td>University of Chicago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana State University</td>
<td>University of Chicago</td>
<td>Washington University – St. Louis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marquette University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PARTICIPANTS

Australia
Curtin University
University of Melbourne
University of New South Wales
University of Queensland
University of Sydney
University of Western Australia

New Zealand
Auckland University of Technology

Canada
McMaster University
Memorial University of Newfoundland
Ryerson University
York University
University of Alberta
University of Guelph
Université de Montréal
University of New Brunswick
University of Ottawa
University of Windsor

Hong Kong
Chinese University
Lingnan University
University of Hong Kong
University of Science and Technology
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Role of the library</th>
<th>Scholarly comms</th>
<th>Undergrad instruction</th>
<th>Student research skills</th>
<th>Discovery</th>
<th>Data mgmt / preservation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNI</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa State</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Iowa</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OBJECTIVE

• Focused on faculty practices and needs, not on the library

• To provide an evidence basis for service development and strategic planning

• Not evaluative
SURVEYS

• Provide broad view of a population in a structured way

• Ready comparison with similar populations

• Opportunity to track trends over time

• Not exploratory or open-ended
IMPACT OF ASSESSMENT

• Too often assessment is conducted but not acted upon

• Action must be calibrated

• Sometimes there are clear directions forward

• In other cases, patterns may suggest areas where additional study or outreach is needed
Dissemination
“How important is it to you that your research reaches each of the following possible audiences?”

- Scholars in my specific subdiscipline or field of research
- Scholars in my discipline but outside of my specific subdiscipline or field of research
- Professionals outside of academia in areas related to my research interests
- Scholars outside my discipline
- The general public beyond the scholarly and associated professional community
- Undergraduate students
Audiences for your research

- My subdiscipline
- My discipline
- Professionals outside
- Scholars outside my
- The general public
- Undergraduate

Bar chart showing percentages for each audience group.
“When it comes to influencing your decisions about journals in which to publish an article of yours, how important to you is each of the following characteristics?”

- The journal’s area of coverage is close to my immediate area of research
- The journal has a high impact factor
- The current issues of the journal are circulated widely, and are well read by scholars in your field
- The journal permits scholars to publish for free
- If accepted, the journal will publish my article quickly
- The journal is highly selective
- Measures have been taken to ensure the protection and safeguarding of content for the long term
- The journal makes its articles freely available online
- The journal is accessible to developing nations
Selecting a journal for your article

- Close to my area of research
- High impact factor
- Circulated widely / well
- Publish for free
- Will publish quickly
- Highly selective
- Protection and safeguarding for the long term
- Articles freely available online
- Accessible to developing nations
“Thinking back to the last scholarly article or monograph that you published, **how valuable to you were the activities performed by your publisher** in each of the following aspects of this process?”

- Managing the **peer review** process to provide high-quality feedback to *vet* and improve your work
- Associating your work with a **reputable brand** that signals its quality
- Placing your article in a **high-visibility publication** or channel
- Managing the **peer review** process to ensure your scholarship is released as quickly as possible
- Providing professional **copy-editing and lay-out** of your work
Importance of publisher activities

- Peer review / vet and improve your work
- Brand that signals quality
- High-visibility publication or channel
- Peer review / as quickly as possible
- Copy editing and layout
“How valuable do you find support from your college or university library, scholarly society, university press, or another service provider for each of the following aspects of the publication process, or how valuable would you find it if this support was offered to you?”

- Managing a public webpage for me that lists links to my recent scholarly outputs, provides information on my areas of research and teaching, and provides contact information for me
- Helping me to assess the impact of my work following its publication
- Helping me determine where to publish a given work to maximize its impact
- Making a version of my research outputs freely available online in addition to the formally published version
- Helping me understand and negotiate favorable publication contracts
Publishing support activities

- Managing my public web presence
- Helping me assess the impact of my work
- Helping me determine where to publish

![Bar chart showing distribution of support activities across humanities, social sciences, and sciences]
Publishing support activities

- Making a version of my research outputs freely available
- Helping me understand and negotiate favorable publication contracts
METHODOLOGY AND DEMOGRAPHICS
METHODOLOGY

Collaboration
» Surveyed faculty members in parallel in the spring
» Response rates varied from 27-29% for all three schools

Interpreting results
1. Questions from the Ithaka S+R US Faculty Survey 2012: peer comparisons from Carnegie class: research university - very high research activity (R1)
2. On a 10-point scale, selections of 8, 9, and 10 are considered “strong”
Much more as a researcher than as a teacher
Somewhat more as a researcher than as a teacher
About equally as a researcher and a teacher
Somewhat more as a teacher than as a researcher
Much more as a teacher than as a researcher
Much more as a researcher than as a teacher
Somewhat more as a researcher than as a teacher
About equally as a researcher and a teacher
Somewhat more as a teacher than as a researcher
Much more as a teacher than as a researcher
Much more as a researcher than as a teacher
Somewhat more as a researcher than as a teacher
About equally as a researcher and a teacher
Somewhat more as a teacher than as a researcher
Much more as a teacher than as a researcher
SCHOLARLY COMMUNICATION
“How would you rate your personal understanding of your institution’s policy or stance on publishing journal articles via a freely available repository?” UNI

Response scale:
6 point scale, 6 = “Have a very good understanding” and 1 = “Do not understand at all”; Percent of respondents selecting 5 – 6, by discipline

- Very Good
- Somewhat
- Not At All

- 59%
- 34%
- 7%
“How would you rate your personal understanding of your institution’s policy or stance on publishing journal articles via a freely available repository?” Iowa State

Response scale:
6 point scale, 6 = “Have a very good understanding” and 1 = “Do not understand at all”; Percent of respondents selecting 5 – 6, by discipline

- Very Good
- Somewhat
- Not At All
“How would you rate your personal understanding of your institution’s policy or stance on publishing journal articles via a freely available repository?”

Response scale:
6 point scale, 6 = “Have a very good understanding” and 1 = “Do not understand at all”; Percent of respondents selecting 5 – 6, by discipline

- Very Good
- Somewhat
- Not At All

- 8%
- 32%
- 60%
“To what extent do you support or oppose your institution or university system requiring that each of the following types of scholarly research outputs be made freely available online (i.e., via an open access repository or database)?” Iowa State

Response scale: 6 point scale, 6 = “Highly support” and 1 = “Highly oppose”; Percent of respondents selecting 5-6, by discipline
“To what extent do you support or oppose your institution or university system requiring that each of the following types of scholarly research outputs be made freely available online (i.e., via an open access repository or database)?”

### Response scale:
6 point scale, 6 = “Highly support” and 1 = “Highly oppose”; Percent of respondents selecting 5-6, by discipline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Scholarly Output</th>
<th>Arts &amp; Sciences</th>
<th>Health Sciences</th>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Engineering</th>
<th>Other Professions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peer-reviewed journal articles or conference proceedings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-prints of peer-reviewed journal articles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working papers or draft manuscripts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“To what extent do you support or oppose your institution or university system requiring that each of the following types of scholarly research outputs be made freely available online (i.e., via an open access repository or database)?” UNI

Response scale:
6 point scale, 6 = “Highly support” and 1 = “Highly oppose”; Percent of respondents selecting 5-6, by discipline.
“Are any of the following types of your scholarly research available online for free (such as via your personal webpage or an open access repository)?”

Percent of respondents selecting “yes,” by discipline
“Are any of the following types of your scholarly research available online for free (such as via your personal webpage or an open access repository)?”

**Iowa State**

Percent of respondents selecting “yes,” by discipline
“Are any of the following types of your scholarly research available online for free (such as via your personal webpage or an open access repository)?”

Percent of respondents selecting “yes,” by discipline
“How useful is it to you personally that your college or university provides each of the services listed below? If one or more services are not currently provided, please indicate how useful it would be to you personally if your college or university provided the service(s).”

- Consultation on or review of author agreement terms
- Advice about intellectual property or author’s rights issues (such as retaining copyrights for your...)
- Data management, preservation, or storage planning
- Online guides or tutorials about copyright or intellectual property issues
- Assistance with depositing your scholarly research in eScholarship or an open access disciplinary...
- Workshops or seminars on copyright or intellectual property issues tailored for your department or field
- Advice about open access publishing options tailored for your department or field
- Assistance with obtaining permission(s) to use copyrighted works for instructional purposes
- Identifying publishers that are willing to comply with open access policies mandated by your institution...
“How useful is it to you personally that your college or university provides each of the services listed below? If one or more services are not currently provided, please indicate how useful it would be to you personally if your college or university provided the service(s).”

Data management and preservation

Percent of respondents selecting “very useful” or “somewhat useful,” by discipline
Local surveys and workshops:
www.sr.ithaka.org/local-surveys

Reports and issue briefs:
www.sr.ithaka.org