"The Structure of Scholarly Communications within Academic Libraries"
Wm. Joseph Thomas, thomasw@ecu.edu
Head of Collection Development, Joyner Library, East Carolina University

Abstract: Academic libraries often define their administrative structure according to services they offer, including research services, acquisitions, cataloging and metadata, and so on. Scholarly Communications is something of a moving target, though. How are Scholarly Communications positions defined, what duties do they often include, and how do they fit within the library's administrative structure? Some of the first positions devoted to Scholarly Communications required JD's and focused on Author's Rights, copyright and fair use. Yet other positions recently advertised group Scholarly Communications librarians within Digital Scholarship units, which not only create and maintain institutional repositories, they may also publish electronic journals and/or offer services related to data curation. A brief review of the findings recently published in a SPEC Kit, which focuses on ARL Libraries, begins this article. The main intention, though, is to provide a wider context of scholarly communication activities across a variety of academic libraries. To do that, a survey of non-ARL Libraries was administered, reviewing their relevant positions and library organization, and the variety of scholarly communication services they offer. Lastly, a set of scholarly communication core services is proposed.

Introduction:

In November 2012, the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) published SPEC Kit 332, *The Organization of Scholarly Communication Services.* This SPEC Kit reported the results of a survey of ARL members and gathered together a variety of sample documents, including position descriptions, committee charges, organization charts, Web pages and brochures designed to market scholarly communications services, assessment tools, and texts of open access policies and resolutions. The survey was designed to determine "how research institutions are currently organizing staff to support scholarly communication services, and whether their organizational structures have changed since 2007" (p. 11).

What do we mean by *scholarly communications* and who responded? Radom, Feltner-Reichert, and Stringer-Stanback used this definition provided by the Scholarly Communications Group from Washington University in St. Louis: "the creation, transformation, dissemination, and preservation of knowledge related to teaching, research, and scholarly endeavors." There were 61 responses to the survey (for a return rate of 48%). Of these 46 were from institutions categorized by the Carnegie Classification as RU/VH (Research University, very high research activity). There were 8 institutions with Carnegie Class RUH (Research Universities, high research activity), 6 Canadian ARL members, and the Library of Congress. Two of the institutions were considered medium sized; all others were large. Three quarters of the respondents were public.

The topic is important across all academic libraries, though, so a similar survey was designed, focusing on the other members of the UNC system and libraries of various sizes across the country. Librarians from 162 schools were invited to take the survey, including schools from the following basic Carnegie Classifications: RU/VH, RUH, DRU, Master's, and Baccalaureate. Representatives from 64 schools started

the survey, but three did not complete it, for a return rate of 38%. There are only 21 RU/VH schools not members of ARL; all were invited and 15 responded. There are 86 RUH schools not members of ARL. Of those, 76 were invited and 21 did answer the survey. There are 87 DRU (Doctoral/Research University) schools; 43 were invited but only six responded to the survey. The relatively low number of responses from RUH and DRU schools means that this is still an important pool of libraries to study. The 14 Master's schools responding to the survey were all from North Carolina—seven are public and seven are private. All eight Baccalaureate schools are from NC, two public and six private. The author's institution is East Carolina University, a member of the University of North Carolina system with a basic Carnegie Classification of DRU.

The survey focused on the following characteristics: leadership of scholarly communications, administrative structure and date of most recent change, outreach and educational activities, hosting and managing digital content, digital scholarship and other services. In addition, this presentation for the North Carolina Serials Conference communicated potential for growth in scholarly communications programs in the state through shared support in expertise and shared support for technical infrastructure. Finally, the concept of Scholarly Communications Core Services was introduced.

Leadership of Scholarly Communication:

Within ARL libraries, the SPEC Kit reports, a single librarian often leads scholarly communication efforts (17 responses). Most of these librarians are department heads or assistant directors, and many have the term "scholarly communications" in their titles. Eight of the 17 single librarian leaders have special training, generally either law degrees or other specific training for copyright. Nine of these 17 devote half of their time or less to scholarly communications (SC) duties. Nine of them have direct reports ranging from .75 FTE to 6 FTE. Other support for SC activities comes from committee members and other librarians. The next most likely leader of scholarly communications efforts is a library unit (14 responses). Many have "scholarly communication" in the title; other terms include "digital initiatives/services/curation" and publishing. Half of these groups have had special training (law degrees and copyright courses). There were 13 responses that "Two or More Librarians" lead SC efforts. Position titles included the terms scholarly communications, copyright, and digital initiatives. A majority of SC leader-librarians report to directors and associate directors. Eight of the 13 had received special training (mostly JD or copyright courses), and 10 of them have direct support. Leadership by a library committee garnered nine responses. The members of these committees are from variety of departments across the library, and the groups average eight members. Lastly, there were three responses that SC efforts were not led by "any single person or group."

My survey results revealed a different pattern: scholarly communications activities were much more likely to be led by a single person. Library leadership by a single person accounted for 39 of the 61 responses to this question. Leadership by two or more people, 19 responses; there was only one SC department, and two responses were that there was no SC leadership within the library. Separately there was a question about a scholarly communications committee, because such committees can exist

alongside clearly established leaders. Three quarters of the responses (47) were "no." There were 10 "yes" responses for committees made up of librarians only (some are institutional repository working groups or open access committees); there were only five SC committees with librarians and other faculty. Group size is generally less than 10 members: five groups report 5 or fewer members; seven groups number 6 to 10 members, and three groups have more than 10 members. These SC committees most often report to the library administrator (12 of the 15), while 2 report to Faculty Senates, and 1 reports to the SC Librarian.

Administrative changes to support SC work were significant among Association of Research Libraries members: 39 of 54 respondents (72%) experienced some sort of change since 2007. The majority of these (24) created at least one new position; 16 created a new department. Formal assessments include annual reports and performance reviews, a few surveys to faculty, and review of statistics (like number of downloads from institutional repositories). Demonstrable outcomes include an increase in faculty self-archiving, publishing in open access (OA) journals, and support for OA policies.

The change rate for non-ARL libraries was almost as high: 66% of respondents had changed a position to lead SC initiatives, and most of those changes occurred in 2011 or later. The titles for librarians leading SC efforts reveal a range of departmental affiliations. For the 54 libraries reporting titles, most are administrative or have the term "scholarly communication" in the title (12). Another dozen refer to the director of the library and a half dozen were assistant or associate directors. Ten have the term "reference" or "research" in the title, and other terms included in position titles were Collection Development, Digital Collections, and Systems. While the 12 library directors report to the Provost, the majority of other respondents report to the director or AD (35), and another five report to a department head. Staffing support, where it exists, is generally parts of people's time, in particular, liaisons and those doing work on an IR (metadata, systems, programming). Assessment is varied and still in its infancy. Only some respondents are counting things, mostly the number of items added to the repository, while others are counting number of attendees at events. A few are recording other measures, such as tracking recipients of OA publishing fund grants, but most are concentrating on building programs and on creating support across campus (for instance, faculty backing an OA policy).

Scholarly Communications Services: Outreach and Education

Scholarly communications services may be generally divided between outreach and educational activities and those services related to hosting and managing digital content. All 56 ARL libraries answering the questions about outreach and education offer services related to authors' rights, and all but one consult with faculty on SC issues. Most consult with graduate students (53) and most advise authors on meeting funding mandates (50). Funding requirements consultations and authors' rights discussions (which inevitably include copyright) are also seen as offered elsewhere on campus, most likely a research office and university legal counsel—suggesting partnerships for the libraries. A large number of ARL libraries, 52 of them, also plan campus-wide events; 46 consult with undergrads about SC issues; and 38 prepare SC-related documents for faculty discussion. It is important to note that the

SPEC Kit survey permitted librarians to mark that the service was provided both by the library and in another unit on campus, while my survey did not.

For the non-ARL libraries, authors' rights education is still a significant activity: 40 of 60 respondents are engaged in it, across a variety of school types. There are 36 libraries that advise authors on how to make their research open access, and as might be expected, there is a high degree of overlap between schools offering both services. Only 32 libraries plan group events related to scholarly communications. Sample group events include recent presentations to faculty on journal publishing in OA and traditional publishers, and Open Access Week talks. Only 28 of 60 schools advise researchers on their data management plans—but 20 of these 28 also engage in data management activities. Advising graduate students about electronic theses and dissertations (ETDs) takes place at 29 schools; 10 other schools said this activity is done by another unit, most likely the graduate school or faculty advisors.

Schools of varying sizes are indeed participating in scholarly communications activities, just at rates that differ from those by ARLs. Libraries should look for potential partners within their institutions in order to increase the range and audience for their SC efforts. For several of these outreach and educational activities, the graduate school, university research office, and/or university legal offices make natural partners.

<Insert figure 1: Outreach and Educational Activities>

Scholarly Communications Services: Hosting and Managing Digital Content

There were 56 responses to questions about hosting and managing digital content recorded in the SPEC Kit. The number of libraries offering each service is somewhat lower than the outreach and education services, though. Highest numbers are for supporting campus ETDs (53 of 56), providing an IR (51), data management (49) and digitization (48). More of these activities are also provided by other campus units. Identifying those other units and clarifying whether the library should be involved or in what way would be very important.

Libraries that I surveyed are also engaged in hosting and managing digital content, and the two services most often offered are the provision of an IR and digitization. Note that the IR and digitization are not offered elsewhere on campus, and that digitization (which includes everything from scanning old college yearbooks to participating in Hathi Trust) is the most offered service (54 of 61 responses). IRs are offered by 43 schools across the span of Carnegie Classes, but in decreasing frequency: only two Baccalaureate schools have one, and another indicated that they are planning for one. In contrast, only two RU/VH schools reported that they did **not** have an IR. A little over half as many libraries (23) have begun publishing journals compared to the ARL's, but there were two Master's colleges and a DRU in addition to the RU/VH and RUH schools. A few more libraries report involvement with data management (27), and these also included schools from across a variety of Carnegie Classes. What campus partners are available here, for example, to publish e-journals? Campus IT, various departments on campus? Maybe even if another unit is already providing the basic service, the library can add value

to those e-journals with services related to indexing, registering for ISSNs, crafting a preservation plan, etc.

<Insert Figure Two: Hosting and Managing Digital Content>

Scholarly Communications Services: Other Digital Publishing and Support

The SPEC Kit survey combined Digital Humanities, E-Science, and "e-scholarship initiatives" without defining any of these three. A large number of the 54 responses (47) indicated support, and 31 noted other campus units also offering support. This number compares well with number of libraries offering an IR and data management. There were 43 libraries that said they are working with faculty to develop new forms of publishing, and 20 schools noted that other units on campus are doing this too. There are 41 libraries publishing e-journals, and 18 who said that other units are providing this service. Only 18 of 55 respondents indicated the library administers an OA publishing fund, and 2 said that other units offer such a fund. Who paid page charges or other publishing fees in past? Likely a research office or dean's office paid these fees, and maybe these offices would make good partners for a campus OA fund.

Non-ARL library support for new forms of publication included smaller numbers than ARL schools (21 compared to 43), but these were spread across RU/VH, RUH, DRU, and Masters schools. The surveyed schools also were less likely to offer an Open Access Publishing fund—only 12 out of 60 respondents (all RU/VH or RUH)—although other schools indicated that they are looking for opportunities to offer a fund. This compares to 18 ARL schools offering an OA fund. Other services mentioned related to reserves, e-reserves, and fair use consultations, new faculty orientations and graduate student orientations. One library director talked about watching NIH grant-funded research projects through the campus Office of Sponsored Programs process and tracking Public Access Policy compliance. In all of these activities too are potential campus partners, including campus research and legal offices.

Potential for Growth:

Exploring options and planning growth in scholarly communication will be easier if libraries can take advantage of shared support for expertise and shared support for technical infrastructure. Shared support for expertise for North Carolina libraries includes several web resources, a working group, and a new resource person. Web resources highlighted were ACRL's Scholarly Communication Toolkit and the ARL's "Developing a Scholarly Communication Program in Your Library." Recently formed by the University Library Advisory Council (ULAC) formed a Scholarly Communication Working Group, and charged it with investigating OA publishing and archiving resources available to member institutions of the University of North Carolina. The new resource person is the Visiting Program Officer for Scholarly Communication, for the Association of Southeastern Research Libraries: Christine Fruin. Ms. Fruin is the Scholarly Communication Librarian for the University of Florida, and in her capacity as VPO will work with SC and OA leaders within ASERL on a series of articles in order to highlight SC work done in our

region and to identify common themes and best practices. These are only some of the external expert sources available to libraries. In addition to other external experts, libraries should seek expertise in partners such as the university legal counsel, research office, and/or graduate school.

Shared support for technical infrastructure presupposes libraries working together on any of several different software packages designed to offer the following services: institutional repositories, e-journal publishing, and data management. There are several well-known institutional repository software options, including DSpace and bepress. At least two regional consortia also offer shared repositories using DSpace: LASR (Liberal Arts Shared Repository) and the NITLE Network (National Institute for Technology in Liberal Education). UNC Greensboro has also created an IR system (NCDOCKS) that is currently shared by seven UNC system schools. Open Journal Systems is one of the best known software packages for publishing e-journals, and several UNC schools are already utilizing it. A shared OJS would defray costs for other schools. Some libraries publish e-journals in their DSpace repositories, and bepress can also host e-journals. Data storage and management is an important and growing need, so libraries are scrambling to evaluate what they can provide. DSpace can store data, as can DataVerse and Project REDCap, and there are other free repository software packages, but libraries must be careful, because this software is "free" as in "free puppies."

Reflections:

The scholarly communications landscape has changed rapidly in the last few years, and the pace of change continues to increase. Within the past few weeks, there has been a flurry of activity: ASERL announced the VPO, ULAC created their task force, an OA fund was initiated at Northern Illinois, and positions have been posted at Virginia Commonwealth University, Butler University, Montana State University, and others.

Can libraries avoid being left out of the loop? More space for working in the scholarly communications arena will definitely be opened up by the recent Office of Science and Technology Policy directive for more agencies to make their funded publications OA and better manage the underlying data. Libraries must ask themselves what services to offer, strategically and sustainably, while the library community at large should also consider how to bridge gaps in service across such a wide variety of library sizes.

A basic takeaway from the survey data is that schools of all sizes are already offering scholarly communications services, so any of our libraries can engage in this work. The libraries still have to decide carefully what services to offer, and who their partners should be. Perhaps a set of Scholarly Communication Core Services could offer direction for planning training, bridging gaps across institutions of varying sizes, and lead to effective assessment of scholarly communications programs.

Scholarly Communication Core Services:

One of the first questions to address when considering a set of core services for scholarly communications is whether they would be program oriented or whether they would be written as librarian competencies. After all, one possibility for describing a set of core services is to consider SC as a program. ACRL has Guidelines for Instruction Programs in Academic Libraries that might serve as a good model. These Guidelines address such functions as program design, support, key components of advanced programs, and benchmarks.

There might be more flexibility, though, in concentrating on librarian competencies. These newly-developed competencies could stand alone like the Information Literacy Competency Standards, or librarians could recommend that SC competencies be integrated into other competency standards. And there are certainly lots of competency sets out there: RUSA's Professional Competencies for Reference and User Services Libraries has a very good structure; NASIG lists draft competencies for Electronic Resources Librarianship; there are competencies for art librarians, music librarians, and medical librarians, among others.

Consider the following proposal for Scholarly Communication Core Services. Related to each broad topic, librarians will:

- Open Access:
    - Help authors make their works open access
    - Understand variety of publishing models

- Copyright and Publishing Agreements:
    - Help patrons use copyrighted materials fairly and legally
    - Consult with authors on their publishing agreements

- Research Support:
    - Help users evaluate OA resources among their lit reviews
    - Help authors comply with funding mandates

In order to meet the goal to help authors make their works open access, librarians will have to be familiar with a variety of publishing models and a variety of types of open access. This competency would include the librarian being able to deposit a permissible copy of a work into an appropriate repository. (See S. Potvin, 2013, p. 70.) This repository might be an IR, a data repository, PubMed Central, or a subject repository.

Copyright and publishing agreements are critical features of the scholarly communication landscape, so understanding them must be a basic competency among librarians doing SC work. Consistent among comments in my survey and on the SPEC Kit survey were remarks about the library's role as a resource for the use of copyrighted materials—reserves were mentioned a lot, and digitization of physical formats (like VHS), but coursepacks are another area where the library's licenses can make a big difference to students. Working with authors to understand their publishing agreements and to retain

the rights they want to keep is an important proactive service that will have a direct impact downstream on the availability of research for future library users.

Research support services refer to a wide range of library users, from students needing resources to write their papers to faculty conducting a literature review for a grant. Complying with funding mandates will create more demands on librarians as the funding mandates increase. Librarian help writing a successful data management plans might be one indicator of success, or the verification of Public Access Policy compliance.

Overall, these Scholarly Communication Core Services are generally framed so that any member of the library can offer them. They are also intended to be flexible, to address variances of need whether the audience member is a student, faculty member, or other library user. Initially, at least, the Core Services would focus on outreach and educational objectives, since such activities could precede the technological infrastructure necessary for hosting and managing digital content. Feedback received during the North Carolina Serials Conference was generally positive, with encouragement to focus on consulting and advocacy roles, to be respectful of different approaches to scholarly communication issues required by disciplinary differences, and to be sure that scholarly communication expertise is disseminated throughout the organization rather than concentrated only in one person.

Conclusion:

Librarians from a wide variety of schools were surveyed to discover their scholarly communication leadership, administrative structure, and services offered. Outreach and educational activities most offered include authors' rights and open access, and digitization and hosting the IR top the list of digital content services. These results compare favorably to the types of activities offered by ARL members, although not at the same rate of adoption. In addition to suggesting potential for growth through shared expertise, the author also encourages librarians to consider implementing a set of Scholarly Communications Core Services because they might provide useful benchmarks against which to plan and evaluate locally offered services.

Since the North Carolina Serials Conference in mid-March 2013, two publications and a presentation reveal widespread interest in incorporating scholarly communications educational activities into information literacy. ACRL's *Intersections of Scholarly Communication and Information Literacy* (2013), and *Common Ground at the Nexus of Information Literacy and Scholarly Communication* (S. Davis-Kahl and M. K. Hensley, eds., 2013) were both published, and Davis-Kahl, Kim Duckett, Julia Gelfand, and Cathy Palmer presented "Information Literacy & Scholarly Communication: Mutually Exclusive or Naturally Symbiotic?" to the ACRL conference in Indianapolis (2013). Incorporating SC activities into information literacy will provide excellent benchmarks for engaging students. Hopefully while this effort is underway, librarians will come up with strategies for defining SC competencies with respect to faculty members, researchers complying with mandates, and other campus partners. Librarians might also consider whether there are other preexisting competencies into which SC could be incorporated.

References:

Association of College and Research Libraries. (2013). *Intersections of scholarly communication and information literacy: Creating strategic collaborations for a changing academic environment*. Chicago, IL: Association of College and Research Libraries. Retrieved from http://acrl.ala.org/intersections/.

Davis-Kahl, S., Duckett, K., Gelfand, J., and C. Palmer. (2013). *Information Literacy & Scholarly Communication: Mutually Exclusive or Naturally Symbiotic?* Paper presented at the Association of College & Research Libraries Conference, Indianapolis, IN. Apr. 2013. Retrieved from http://works.bepress.com/stephanie_davis_kahl/37/.

Davis-Kahl, S., & Hensley, M. K. (2013). *Common ground at the nexus of information literacy and scholarly communication*. Chicago: Association of College and Research Libraries, a division of the American Library Association.

Potvin, S. (2013). The Principal and the Pragmatist: On Conflict and Coalescence for Librarian Engagement with Open Access Initiatives. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, *39*(1), 75–67. doi:10.1016/j.acalib.2012.11.002

Radom, R., Feltner-Reichert, M., and K. Stringer-Stanback. (2012). *Organization of Scholarly Communication Resources*, SPEC Kit 332. Washington, DC: Association of Research Libraries.

Thomas, W. J. (2013). *The Structure of Scholarly Communications within Academic Libraries*. Paper presented at the 22nd North Carolina Serials Conference, Chapel Hill, NC. Mar. 2013. Retrieved from http://thescholarship.ecu.edu/handle/10342/4120.