Recasting the Role of Comprehensive University Libraries: Starting Points for Educating Librarians on the Issues of Scholarly Communication and Institutional Repositories

Sarah Beaubien, Linda Masselink, and Jodi Tyron

Abstract

The benefits derived from implementing an institutional repository (i.e. providing access to an institution's scholarly output, helping to brand an institution and its constituents, and expanding the role of the library in the academy) are significant for all types of academic institutions. Comprehensive universities have particular challenges that must be overcome when implementing an institutional repository. One way to meet these challenges is by developing a model for institutional repository sustainability that leverages the strengths of liaison librarians. Ensuring that liaison librarians are educated about scholarly communication issues should be one of the first steps. This paper discusses Grand Valley State University Libraries' program to educate library faculty on these issues, as the library implements an institutional repository. The paper stresses the importance of tailoring educational programs to meet the specific needs of liaison librarians.

History of Institutional Repositories

Clifford Lynch defines an institutional repository as, "a set of services that a university offers to the members of its community for the management and dissemination of digital materials created by the institution and its community members. It is most essentially an organizational commitment to the stewardship of these digital materials, including long-term preservation,… organization, and access or distribution."[1] Institutional repositories were initially developed in research institutions to capture the large amount of scholarly output being created within their communities—everything from peer-reviewed publications to gray literature (i.e. photographs, white papers, theses, etc.). Prominent institutions partnered with programmers and software companies to create systems that facilitate the storage of these materials. The software was mostly open source, but the expense involved in programming, training, marketing, and recruiting content largely precluded all but research libraries from reaping the benefits that an institutional repository has to offer.

The percentage of established institutional repositories at research institutions has historically exceeded those found at other types of institutions. Clearly this paradigm is changing as comprehensive and lib-

Sarah Beaubien is Arts & Humanities Librarian at Grand Valley State University, e–mail: beaubisa@gvsu.edu; Linda Masselink is Senior Librarian and Liaison to Seidman College of Business at Grand Valley State University, e–mail: masselil@gvsu.edu; Jodi Tyron is Health Sciences Librarian at Grand Valley State University, e–mail: tyronj@gvsu.edu

eral arts colleges and universities increasingly engage in scholarly communication activities and implement institutional repositories. The initial results of these initiatives illustrate that an institutional repository can be a driving force for all kinds of institutions and their libraries. An institutional repository provides access to an institution's scholarly output, helps to brand an institution and its constituents, and expands the role of the library in the academy. We assert that the principles that make development of an institutional repository a good investment for research libraries hold true for all other colleges and universities.

Institutional Repositories and Comprehensive Universities

According to the Carnegie Foundations classification system, comprehensive universities are "institutions [that] typically offer a wide range of baccalaureate programs and…are committed to graduate education through the master's degree."[2] The benefits derived by research institutions from the development of an institutional repository are equally valuable for comprehensive universities. However, comprehensive universities have unique characteristics that must be addressed when an institutional repository is implemented.

Comprehensive universities find themselves in the unenviable position of emulating the standard research and publication models of larger institutions as they simultaneously strive to achieve the excellence in teaching modeled by liberal arts colleges.[3] Wright, et al. describes comprehensive universities as being "the greediest institutions of all" in terms of the demands they put on faculty time (e.g. teaching, research, advising, service, funding, etc.)[4] Moreover, newer faculty, who more than likely trained at larger institutions to be researchers, are often frustrated to find themselves in institutions where there is both an expectation to publish research and to provide excellent teaching.[5] As Henderson and Buchanan assert, "Comprehensive universities often struggle with their institutional identities."[6] Finally, comprehensive universities are often at a disadvantage in terms of the resources needed not only for the production of research, but also the funding necessary to implement and maintain a successful institutional repository. There is a difference of scale that must be addressed when an institutional repository is implemented at a comprehensive university.

Faced with these challenges, most librarians at non-research institutions would concede that an institutional repository is a nice (but not essential) addition to a library's services. We would argue that the significance of implementing an institutional repository at a comprehensive university is far greater. Implementing an institutional repository allows the library an expanded role of service to an academic community in three ways:

1.   By capturing and increasing access to the scholarly and creative output of an institution's scholars,

2.   By supplying an additional opportunity to brand the university, library, faculty and students,

3.   And by reinforcing the library as strategically relevant to the institution's mission of fostering scholarship.

As more out-of-the-box software becomes available and as the technical costs to implement an institutional repository decrease, comprehensive and liberal arts colleges and universities will be able to reap these benefits for themselves.

The Benefits of Developing an Institutional Repository

Capturing and Increasing Access to Scholarly and Creative Output

All universities are employed in the creation of knowledge—including comprehensive universities. Similar to research institutions, a significant percentage of faculty at many comprehensive institutions are not yet tenured and are active in both their own scholarship as well as involved in student scholarship. While much of their output is being published in traditional venues, such as journals and monographs, some of it (e.g. data sets, student/faculty research, creative works, etc.) may not be preserved or potentially viewed by a larger audience. One important function of an institutional repository is to capture this scholarly and creative output in order to provide access to information that might not otherwise be available.

We assert that an institutional repository does more than just provide the possibility of access to this information; it actually increases access and visibility for a university. Lawrence is often credited with being the first to demonstrate the correlation between open access and the number of times a work is cited; others have replicated his findings.[7] Because comprehensive universities often do not have the same opportunities

for exposure as research institutions, this increased access to a comprehensive university's scholarship and creative output is even more important than it is for larger research institutions.

Branding: Marketing the University and its Constituents

Branding is a strategic issue for universities. Research institutions brand themselves through their grant awards and high profile scholars, but comprehensive universities often do not have this advantage, at least on such a large scale. Because teaching at comprehensive universities tends to be emphasized over research, scholarly outputs at comprehensive universities as a whole tend to be smaller in number and in impact factor than outputs from prestigious institutions. Nonetheless, these outputs are relevant adding tremendous value to the overall body of knowledge. Beyond the peer-reviewed literature, some comprehensive universities also look for ways to brand themselves that moves beyond the traditional scholarly publication model and "legitimize[s] new ways to disseminate information that could break the grip of refereed publication."[8] An institutional repository has the potential to increase the University's exposure in the larger world of scholarly communication.

Branding is an issue among faculty and students as well. The repository can serve as a vehicle for participating in the larger community of research. The access and exposure that an institutional repository provides allows the library to brand faculty output and showcases their excellence. Additionally, faculty at teaching universities tend to collaborate often with students on their research which can lead to a greater emphasis on student scholarship. One thing that may be unique to these non-research universities is their willingness to showcase student scholarship in institutional repositories, allowing students to brand their own work. In this way, the institutional repository becomes a recruitment tool for born digital graduate students and faculty members who are looking for ways to digitally brand themselves as they prepare for PhD programs and as they market themselves to employers.

Redefining the Role of the Library

As traditional expectations for the academic library foster ongoing examination of our relevance in today's academy, an institutional repository can become a highly visible statement about the library's deepening engagement in scholarly communication issues on the campus. An institutional repository can help expand the library's role by redefining the library as a strategically relevant entity within the university. It does so by positioning the library as a leader in something the campus values, namely, scholarship. As more scholarship is showcased online, universities need a means to make their work readily available. Add to that the potential of showcasing a library's special collections, and the library can provide the university a powerful and effective marketing tool with impact both on its own constituents and on the larger scholarly community.

Challenges of Implementing an Institutional Repository

Two opposing pressures exist for comprehensive universities as they implement an institutional repository. The library may be expected to provide more services and offer more support in terms of faculty submissions, metadata assignment, etc. At the same time, comprehensive universities may not have the resources, expertise or budget necessary to provide such staff and services. Moreover, librarians at the typical academic library find themselves in much the same position as their faculty, with a workload stressed by the demands of teaching, publishing, and service, making it necessary to approach the implementation, maintenance, and support of an institutional repository as a team. We believe that a model can be developed that draws its momentum from relationships established by liaison librarians to sustain institutional repositories. This model would address not only issues of scarce resources at non-research institutions, but would also build a larger pool of expertise.

One of the first steps towards working together is to ensure that team members have a common understanding of the core concepts of scholarly communication. Grand Valley State University (GVSU) developed a program to educate library faculty on issues of scholarly communication to facilitate the development and implementation of our institutional repository. Liaison librarians need to be informed and comfortable in promoting the institutional repository in order to help meet the needs of the faculty.

Developing a Scholarly Communication Education Program

Grand Valley State University is a comprehensive university located in Allendale, Michigan. Established in

1960, GVSU is a growing institution of nearly 24,000 students. The main campus hosts the liberal arts programs. In 2000, GVSU opened a campus in downtown Grand Rapids, approximately 12 miles east of Allendale, to offer graduate and professional programs. In 2004, a health sciences facility was added to the downtown campus. At each campus, libraries serve the diverse programs and unique student and faculty populations. GVSU Libraries employ twenty-four librarians, eighteen of whom liaise with academic departments and programs.

A GVSU library contingent traveled to Chicago to attend the ARL/ACRL Regional Institute on Scholarly Communication in December 2007.[9] Having just received approval to fund an institutional repository, University Libraries were beginning to develop a process for storing and sharing access to University scholarly works. Our concerns included exploring technical challenges, selecting a vendor, and strategizing ways to establish alliances for populating our repository, ScholarWorks@GVSU.[10]

An ad hoc committee was formed to examine these issues; the committee was made up of representatives from the original contingent and also included two liaison librarians with an interest in the project. None of the committee members had extensive experience with institutional repositories. We realized early on that there would be a need to educate not only the members of the committee but also the rest of the liaison library faculty. It was imperative that all librarians become confident in communicating with University faculty to solicit participation in our project, in particular, liaison librarians who had already successfully integrated themselves within departmental disciplines. Our model for sustaining ScholarWorks@GVSU would rely heavily on the team efforts of this group. To facilitate this, three librarians from the committee volunteered to coordinate a series of educational meetings for library faculty. The group consisted of one senior librarian, who had attended the Institute on Scholarly Communication, and two assistant librarians, who previously completed graduate work related to institutional repository implementation and research.

A series of discussion sessions was designed using the ARL Brown-Bag Discussion Guide, "Issues in Scholarly Communication" as a springboard.[11] The ARL lunch series covered six sessions on topics impacting scholarly communication: talking to and forming partnerships with faculty, access to publicly funded research, author rights, changing role of scholarly societies and peer review. Like the ARL program, our focus was, "creating common ground and providing a foundation for the conversation" about scholarly communication and our institutional repository.[12] To address the unique characteristics of our University (e.g. our multiple locations, etc.), we determined a more tailored approach would best meet our needs. Conversations with the Director of Research and Instruction Services and the Dean about the need for scholarly communication education as well as an informal survey of colleagues revealed that our liaison librarians had varying levels of knowledge and experience.

The four-part series of discussions focused on communication with faculty, author rights and our role as liaison librarians in the scholarly communication process. Like the ARL program, we highlighted SPARC as well as the Create Change and Alma Swan websites.[13] Additional resource ideas came from the Institute on Scholarly Communication, a literature review, and experiences of the librarians designing the education sessions. The Libraries were also fortunate to have a Dean well versed in scholarly communication who presented in conjunction with one of the sessions. She was able to respond to questions and share her experiences in talking to faculty.

Session 1: Introduction to ScholarWorks@GVSU

Prior to the first meeting, a list of readings was sent to University liaison librarians covering very basic to advanced topics regarding institutional repositories and issues of scholarly communication. Participants were required to read two introductory articles and encouraged to select one or more articles from a list of seven other targeted readings. (See Appendix 1 for a list of readings and session outlines.)

The goal of this initial session was to provide attendees with an overview of the issues surrounding scholarly communication, to demonstrate and provide background on our own institutional repository, and to outline the focus of the upcoming sessions. A number of issues surrounding institutional repositories and scholarly communication were briefly introduced including: faculty benefits, discoverability of content, technical aspects, self-archiving, author rights, and so on. We used a short video as a means

of introducing these topics and facilitating discussion, which centered on our libraries' goals for the repository and included some question and answer time for participants.

Session 2: Scholarly Communication and our Role as Liaisons

The purpose of the second session was to discuss approaches that liaison librarians can take to engage faculty in informed conversations about open access and issues of scholarly communication. Two guiding principles for this session were the importance of understanding scholarly communication in the disciplines and effectively communicating with faculty in liaison areas regarding the value of contributing to ScholarWorks@GVSU.

Prior to the session, liaison librarians were encouraged to become familiar with open access trends and publications by reviewing open access publishing models in their liaison areas. The session, a large group discussion, included participants reporting on open access trends in their disciplines, the importance of understanding faculty needs and publishing behaviors, and identifying that faculty may perceive the value of repositories differently than librarians, which increases the need to couch conversations in language that resonates with faculty. Considering faculty needs and scholarly communication behaviors when embarking on a project of this scale is essential. It is not enough that librarians are enthusiastic about open access and their institutional repository. The repository must meet a need for faculty in order to pique and sustain their interest in the project.

To encourage session participants to explore a definition of scholarly communication that moves beyond the traditional publishing model, we shared Suzanne Thorin's explanation:

> [S]cholarly communication [includes] three distinct aspects: 1) the process of conducting research, developing ideas, and communicating informally with other scholars and scientists; 2) the process of preparing, shaping, and communicating to a group of colleagues what will become formal research results; and 3) the ultimate formal product that is distributed to libraries and others in print or electronically.[14]

This expanded definition of scholarly communication allows for the discussion not only of traditional research publications but also theses, music, art, and portfolios, blogs, listservs, white papers and conference presentations, as well as the processes inherent in scholarly communication.

Session 3: Outreach Ideas and Author Rights

The objectives of the third session were to increase awareness of the developmental and contributing factors of the current crisis in publishing scholarly content, to explore avenues for outreach to the university community, and to examine some of the tools and resources involved in author rights management. In order to introduce some of the complexities of scholarly communication issues, the Dean of University Libraries presented "Scholarly Publishing: A System in Crisis," providing extensive background on the unsustainable publishing environment.[15]

Scholarly communication is at the core of academic libraries, and librarians are uniquely positioned to advocate for changes to the conventional publishing model. Due to the rising costs associated with traditional journals, librarians are increasingly engaged in many areas of the open access movement. It is imperative that librarians become familiar with historical and emerging publishing practices in order to communicate comfortably and effectively with faculty and other researchers about these matters. Whether or not an institution has a designated person or department with expertise in scholarly communication, all librarians need to create a personal toolkit and familiarize themselves with these issues.

Another way in which academic libraries can respond to changes in scholarly publishing and the implementation of an institutional repository is by expanding outreach efforts to the university community. In addition to academic departments, colleges and universities have other organizations or units that produce scholarly content, such as student and/or faculty publications and affiliated research institutes. Often, these entities create, store and manage their own scholarly output and are likely to be receptive to the increased exposure and permanence that an institutional repository offers. Additionally, librarians can look for opportunities to use existing services and events as networking tools to increase awareness of and participation in the institutional repository.

Author rights management pervades all aspects of scholarly communication. We argue that educating faculty about their inherent rights as authors and the options for rights transfer that are available to them should be a priority for liaison librarians. Examining the SPARC addendum to publishing agreements, sample types of author rights transfer agreements and Creative Commons licensing agreements can help prepare liaisons to speak to their faculty and open the door to content recruitment for the institutional repository.[16] By taking the lead with initiatives like institutional repositories, librarians can help create a more sustainable scholarly publishing paradigm.

Session 4: Developing Stakeholder Relationships with the University: Where Do We Go from Here?

The final session centered on developing stakeholder relationships within the university. The Dean of University Libraries and the Director of Research and Instructional Services spoke about the relationships that had already been fostered with various university representatives in support of ScholarWorks@GVSU. The session had two goals: to educate librarians concerning existing university support for the project and to model effective outreach. Sharing stories about the development of existing and emerging relationships gives concrete examples of effective outreach activities and can illustrate how existing liaison activities are aligned with the goals of the repository.

The practical work that liaisons are currently doing is the foundation for garnering support for the institutional repository. Liaisons already engage in conversations with faculty on a regular basis, and we must learn to recognize the opportunities within those conversations to speak about issues of scholarly communication. Engaging in disciplinary conversation allows us to learn how those in the fields in which we liaise are engaging with one another. Liaisons must recognize that these conversations are opportunities to think about and advocate for scholarly communication issues. To illustrate the point, three liaison librarians shared their recent experiences visiting faculty in an effort to enlist support and content for the institutional repository. Faculty were overwhelmingly supportive in their response to these visits, and the initial conversation often led to a deeper discussion of scholarly communications issues. (Julie Garrison, pers. comm.)

Finally, the Dean shared some of her experiences championing for open access and reform in scholarly communication to an audience who was often far from receptive. Her conversations with University faculty and administrators as well as publishing executives were at times frustrating and at times led to honest and thoughtful debate about the expectations of librarians and the realities that faculty find themselves in as they work within the traditional publish-or-perish model. As we begin conversations with the University community to inform faculty and promote ScholarWorks@GVSU, we will certainly have some of the same experiences: moments of frustration, embarrassment, apathy, disinterest, and rejection interspersed with moments of excitement and acceptance. The point to remember is that we are working towards a cultural shift in thinking—a gradual process. "We can't go out on a crusade. But we can teach ourselves to be very smart about the issues and to wait for opportunities to share what we know about the scholarly communication world and the way it is changing. We need to have the confidence to wait and prepare." (Lee Van Orsdel, pers. comm.) Acceptance and participation will happen gradually; in the meantime, liaisons must listen to what others are saying about their experiences with scholarly communication and be prepared for the opportunities to offer information and support.

Discussion

Our initial perceptions of liaison librarians' familiarity with issues of scholarly communication and institutional repositories proved correct; there was indeed a wide spectrum of comfort level with key concepts. Several participants had no formal introduction to our repository and needed to be brought up to speed on the project. Wherever possible, we used discussion to bridge the gap between those with little experience with scholarly communication issues and those who were more versed on the topic.

When asked to define scholarly communication, our colleagues gave a wide range of examples including dissemination of research through journals and books, theses, music, art, and portfolios. Participants also mentioned items that illuminate research from the back end: blogs, listservs, white papers and conference presentations. The definition developed by our group encompassed not only the end product but also the processes characteristic of scholarly communica-

tion. This illustrates one of the complexities of scholarly communication; publication can take myriad forms and librarians are well suited to recognize connections.

Throughout the sessions, discussion about open access publications underscored the importance of attaining discipline-specific knowledge for attendees who were surprised by the quantity and quality of open access journals in their liaison areas. Participants indicated an interest in learning more about the process of scholarly communication in their liaison areas, and group discussion unearthed several ideas to do so including mining articles written by faculty and announced in GVSU newsletters; speaking with Deans, department heads and/or research directors to learn about ongoing departmental projects; visiting social networking sites (i.e. blogs, listservs, etc.) relevant to specific disciplines; and attending disciplinary conferences and events.

There were many questions and concerns about the role liaisons would play in promoting ScholarWorks@GVSU and recruiting content from faculty. There emerged a natural apprehension that the project would lead to increased workload and an insecurity about confidently representing the interests of the library to the rest of the university community. The sessions provided library administration an opportunity to assuage fears. It is important that liaison librarians find a balance and set realistic limits in developing expertise and tailoring learning to issues in liaison areas. In addition to balancing workload, we maintain the necessity of a team approach to support one another through the process of institutional repository implementation and continued sustainability.

One of the most efficient ways to begin developing outreach activities is to examine how the library currently markets itself to its community. Participants explored options for revising existing programs so that they promote the institutional repository. For example, Grand Valley State University Libraries host an annual Author Recognition Reception to honor and recognize the publishing efforts of our faculty. This elegant social gathering allows time for faculty to converse with other faculty, librarians, and administrators; a key focus is reflection on the scholarly assets of our University. This event, which already engages the library with faculty, could easily be transformed into a venue to promote Scholarworks@GVSU, as

it provides an excellent way to explore the publications of faculty in various disciplines. The opportunity to connect with faculty about their publishing highlights scholarship and keeps the library in the center of the academic community. Other ideas for outreach generated by the group include showcasing ScholarWorks@GVSU at new faculty orientations, conducting open access publishing and institutional repository workshops, and celebrating Open Access Day.

Our sessions concluded with participants demonstrating a greater confidence in their role in the scholarly communication process. However, they acknowledged that participating in this arena requires ongoing cultivation of skills and expertise. Each librarian must build a personal toolkit of websites, blogs and information that can be easily accessed for continued learning and about scholarly communication issues. We presented a library guide on scholarly communication prepared by Ryan DeCoster, an Information Science student at University of Wisconsin—Milwaukee interning at GVSU.[17] The guide serves as an initial resource for librarians and their faculty by providing links to other repositories, information on licenses and publishing, relevant articles, websites and journals.

Assessment

At the conclusion of the series, a survey was sent to participants via Survey Monkey®. (See Appendix 2.) The purpose of the survey was to measure the effectiveness of our sessions and to gauge participants' knowledge of scholarly communication issues prior to and after attending the sessions. Additionally, we hoped to gather information to assist with the planning of future programs. A majority of participants indicated a lack of confidence in their knowledge of scholarly communication issues prior to attending the session (61.6%). A majority of participants indicated an increased level of confidence in their knowledge of scholarly communication issues as a result of their participation (92.3%).

Participants were asked to rate their comfort level regarding a list of scholarly communication issues, concepts and tools after session attendance. Respondents were most comfortable with the concepts of open access, author rights, addendum to copyright agreements, Creative Commons, and pre- and post-prints. According to one librarian, "[The] discussion

of authorship rights was the most useful. Since I have little experience with publishing, it was good to see what author agreements might look like." Respondents were least comfortable with using the SPARC and Sherpa/Romeo resources. The concept that librarians struggled with most was the publication process for their discipline areas.

Respondents commented that they would have liked more time for the sessions and more discussion among attendees. Respondents were appreciative of the tools and resources presented in the sessions, small group discussions, and the presentation by the Dean. Respondents requested further help with learning about the research process in specific disciplines. Said one, "I need some help organizing all of the main concepts into a presentation for faculty, including [an] elevator speech…" Attendees expressed the desire to continue conversations about scholarly communication issues. As one participant noted, "It would be nice to see this continued. Now that everyone is on the same page, it would provide a chance to take these discussions to a higher level."

Conclusion

Though successful institutional repositories have largely arisen within the realm of research institutions, the benefits of implementing and maintaining an institutional repository are equally valuable for comprehensive universities. These benefits include a means to capture and provide access to the creative output of an institution's scholars, a method of branding the university and its constituents, and a way to redefine the library as strategically relevant by focusing on scholarship.

We contend that a team approach is the most valuable model for implementing and sustaining an institutional repository at a comprehensive university. The first step towards working together is to ensure that team members have a common understanding of the core concepts of scholarly communication. A systematic program tailored to the specific needs of ones staff to educate library faculty on issues of scholarly communication should be developed to meet the unique needs of one's institution.

The series served not only to educate one another on the issues surrounding the implementation of an institutional repository, but also served as a catalyst for engaging and exciting librarians as we move forward with this project. Our goal of providing liaison

librarians with a foundation upon which to build was realized despite our initially varying levels of familiarity with aspects of scholarly communication. Apparent successes thus far include the many conversations that were started in our academic community, liaison librarians' heightened awareness of scholarly communication issues, and a commitment to identify and recruit content for ScholarWorks@GVSU. The long-term success of our repository will rely on liaison librarians continuing to learn and converse with one another about these issues as they begin delivering informed messages to faculty.

Acknowledgements

Notes

1. Clifford A. Lynch, "Institutional Repositories: Essential Infrastructure for Scholarship in the Digital Age," *ARL: A Bimonthly Report on Research Library Issues and Actions from ARL, CNI and SPARC,* 226 (2003), http://www.arl.org/resources/pubs/br/br226/br226ir.shtml.

2. Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, *A Classification of Institutions of Higher Education* (Menlo Park, CA: Carnegie Foundation, 2001).

3. Bruce B. Henderson and William D. Kane, "Caught in the Middle: Faculty and Institutional Status and Quality in State Comprehensive Universities," *Higher Education* 22, (1991): 339-350; Mary C. Wright and others, "Greedy Institutions: The Importance of Institutional Context for Teaching in Higher Education," *Teaching Sociology* 32, April (2004): 144-159.

4. Mary C. Wright and others, "Greedy Institutions: The Importance of Institutional Context for Teaching in Higher Education," *Teaching Sociology* 32, April (2004): 149.

5. Ibid., 147.

6. Bruce B. Henderson and Heidi E. Buchanan, "The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning: A Special Niche for Faculty at Comprehensive Universities?," *Research in Higher Education* 48, no. 5 (2006): 523-543, http://www.springerlink.com/.

7. Steve Lawrence, "Free Online Availability Substan-

tially Increases a Paper's Impact," *Nature* 411, (2001): 521; http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v411/n6837/full/411521a0.html; Steven Harnad and Tim Brody, "Comparing the Impact of Open Access (OA) vs. Non-OA Articles in the Same Journals," *D-Lib Magazine* 10, no. 6 (2004), http://www.dlib.org/dlib/june04/harnad/06harnad.html.

8. Bruce B. Henderson and Heidi E. Buchanan, "The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning: A Special Niche for Faculty at Comprehensive Universities?," *Research in Higher Education* 48, no. 5 (2006): 523-543, http://www.springerlink.com/.

9. CARLI: Consortium of Academic and Research Libraries in Illinois, "*ACRL/ARL Regional Institute on Scholarly Communication,"* http://www.carli.illinois.edu/institute07.html

10. ScholarWorks@GVSU, http://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/

11. Association of Research Libraries, *Brown Bag Discussion Guide Series: Issues in Scholarly Communication,* http://www.arl.org/sc/brownbag/.

12. Ibid.

13. The Scholarly Publishing & Academic Research Coalition, *SPARC,* http://www.arl.org/sparc/; Create Change, *Shouldn't the Way We Share Research be as Advanced as the Internet?,* http://www.createchange.org/; Alma Swan, *Key Perspectives: Consultants in Scholarly Communication,* http://www.keyperspectives.co.uk/aboutus/aswan.html.

14. Suzanne E. Thorin, "Global Changes in Scholarly Communication," in *Computer Supported Cooperative Work,* ed. Hsianghoo Steve Ching and Paul W. T. Poon and Carmel McNaught (Netherlands: Springer, 2006), 221-240, http://www.springerlink.com/.

15. Lee Van Orsdel, "Scholarly Publishing: A System in Crisis," (presentation, Grand Valley State University, Allendale, MI, November 13, 2008).

16. Creative Commons, http://creativecommons.org/

17. Scholarly Communication, http://libguides.gvsu.edu/ScholarlyCommunication

Appendix 1

Prior to Session 1
Required reading:
Bailey, Charles W., Jr. 2008. "Institutional Repositories, Tout de Suite." *Digital Scholarship*, www.digital-scholar-ship.org/ts/irtoutsuite.pdf.
Foster, Nancy F., and Susan Gibbons. 2005. "Understanding Faculty to Improve Content Recruitment for Institutional Repositories." *D–Lib Magazine* 11, (1) www.dlib.org/dlib/january05/01foster.html.

Select 1 or more article(s) from the following list to read:
Bailey, Charles W., Jr. 2005. "The Role of Reference Librarians in Institutional Repositories." *Reference Services Review* 33, (3): 259-67.
Bell, Suzanne, Nancy F. Foster, and Susan Gibbons. 2005. "Reference Librarians and the Success of Institutional Repositories." *Reference Services Review* 33, (3): 283-90.
Fyffe, Richard, and Scott Walter. 2005. "Building a New Future: 'Preparing Future Faculty' and 'Responsible Conduct of Research' Programs as a Venue for Scholarly Communication Discussions." *C&RL News* 66, (9): 654-656+.
Johnson, Richard K. 2002. "Institutional Repositories: Partnering with Faculty to Enhance Scholarly Communication." *D–Lib Magazine* 8, (11).
Lawrence, Steve. 2001. "Free Online Availability Substantially Increases a Paper's Impact." *Nature* 411, : 521.
VanOrsdel, Lee C. 2007. "The State of Scholarly Communications: An Environmental Scan of Emerging Issues, Pitfalls, and Possibilities." *The Serials Librarian* 52, (1/2): 191-209.
Walters, Tyler O. 2007. "Reinventing the Library - How Repositories are Causing Librarians to Rethink their Professional Roles." *Libraries and the Academy* 7, (2): 213-25.
Welborn, Aaron. "Open or Shut? The Question of Public Access." *Off the Shelf Washington University Libraries* (Spring 2008), http://library.wustl.edu/offtheshelf/OTSspr08.pdf

Session 1: *Introduction to ScholarWorks @GVSU*
Objectives: Provide an overview of issues surrounding scholarly communication; demonstrate our repository; share the schedule of dates and topics for this series.
ScholarWorks@GVSU, http://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/

Questions:　　　What is an institutional repository?

　　　　　　　　Why would we want to implement one?

View video clip: University of Toronto, T-space Guided Tour
　　　　　　　　http://tspace.library.utoronto.ca/policies/marketing.jsp

Demonstration of ScholarWorks@GVSU.edu
　　　　　　　　What we are using to populate our institutional repository?

Q and A from assigned reading in preparation for this session

What is coming in this series?

　　　　　　　　Is there anything liaisons would like the planning group to emphasize?

Prior to session 2:
Look at open access journals in specific liaison discipline in DOAJ. The purpose of this exercise is to facilitate discussion about trends and issues in open access publishing. DOAJ: Directory of Open Access Journals, http://www.doaj.org/

Session 2: *Scholarly communication and our role as liaisons*
Objectives: Begin conversations about talking to liaison faculty on issues of scholarly communication and open access.

Define scholarly communication: ask for ideas from colleagues

Share definition from Suzanne Thorin in her article "Global Changes in Scholarly Communication". This paper was presented at e-Workshops on Scholarly Communication in the Digital Era, August 11-24, 2003 at Feng Chia University, Taichung, China.

> "When looking closely at the term scholarly communication, it has a somewhat broader meaning than publication, as it also includes the processes by which scholars communicate with one another as they create new knowledge and by which they measure its worth with colleagues prior to making a formal article available to the broader community. For the purposes of this paper we are dividing the scholarly communication process into three distinct aspects: 1) the process of conducting research, developing ideas, and communicating informally with other scholars and scientists; 2) the process of preparing, shaping, and communicating to a group of colleagues what will become formal research results; and 3) the ultimate formal product that is distributed to libraries and others in print or electronically."

Show ScholarWorks@GVSU and point out policies and FAQ documentation.

Questions for discussion:
You were asked to locate an open access journal in your liaison area(s). What, if anything, did your findings tell you about trends and issues in scholarly communication in your disciplines?

One of the most significant aspects in our role as liaisons is an understanding of scholarly communication in our liaison areas. In your group, explore some ideas for learning about the processes and issues of scholarly communication in your disciplines.

What are some approaches you could take to promote ScholarWorks@GVSU to your faculty?

How might the discussion above influence the language you use when speaking with faculty about ScholarWorks@GVSU?

Session 3: *Outreach ideas and author rights*
Objectives: Discuss developmental and contributing factors of the crisis in publishing scholarly content; explore outreach options to engage faculty in our IR; learn about author rights issues.
Dean Van Orsdel presentation: "Scholarly Publishing: A System in Crisis"

Distribute index cards for participants to write any questions they may have on anything covered in the sessions so far.

Begin discussion of ways to communicate and connect with our faculty using examples from pre-existing programs where we could focus on institutional repositories.

Questions for small groups:
What existing library programs/services might be used to promote ScholarWorks@GVSU or connect with faculty about their publishing?

What ideas do you have for new programs/services that could create more outreach opportunities?

Record responses from small group reports of discussions.

Author rights
SPARC: what is it?

What has SPARC done that can help us?

Show SPARC video on Author Rights
Association of College and Research Libraries, ARL, SPARC, "Author Rights," http://blip.tv/file/743274/

Share SPARC publications: Author Rights
           Know Your Copy Rights
           Addendum to Publication Agreement

The Scholarly Publishing & Academic Research Coalition, *SPARC*, http://www.arl.org/sparc/

Discuss copyright law and show examples of author rights agreements. Show SHERPA/RoMEO website and discuss significance of this site.

SHERPA/RoMEO, "Publisher Copyright Policies & Self-Archiving," http://www.sherpa.ac.uk/romeo/

Prior to session 4:
View video about Creative Commons
Creative Commons, "Get Creative," (http://mirrors.creativecommons.org/getcreative/)

View first section of the tutorial "Publish, Not Perish"
University of Colorado Libraries, "Publish, Not Perish: The Art & Craft of Publishing in Scholarly Journals," http://www.publishnotperish.org/

Session 4: ***Developing stakeholder relationships with the University: Where do we go from here?***
Objectives: assess expectations in developing stakeholder relationships; what are our next steps as liaison librarians for scholarly communication at GVSU?

Address the following questions from the previous session:
Could we have a designated librarian who could be a point person for copyright issues? Or maybe a LibGuide page?

Let's say a faculty member wants to have something put in the IR. What are the next steps?

If an article has been published, is it possible to go back to the publisher and request permission to put it in the IR?

Could we discuss pre-prints/post-prints and how to get them from faculty? Show explanation of pre-prints/post-prints found at the SHERPA/RoMEO cite.

Developing relationships with faculty: Dean Van Orsdel

Developing relationships and the role of the liaison librarian: Director of Research and Instructional Services

What next? Present online library guide on scholarly communication prepared by Ryan DeCoster, student intern, http://libguides.gvsu.edu/ScholarlyCommunication.

Inform participants to look for online survey to evaluate scholarly communication sessions

Appendix 2

Scholarly Communication Survey

1. Introduction

During the 2008 Fall semester, four sessions were scheduled to give library faculty the opportunity to discuss issues of scholarly communication. The purpose of these sessions was to inform and generate discussion about what we are trying to accomplish here at GVSU and how we can deliver informed messages to our faculty in regards to ScholarWorks@GVSU.

2. Question 1

1. I attended the following scholarly communication sessions (please check all that apply):

- [ ] Session #1: Introduction to Scholarly Communication and ScholarWorks@GVSU
- [ ] Session #2: Scholarly Communication and Our Role as Librarians
- [ ] Session #3: Outreach Ideas and Author Rights
- [ ] Session #4: Developing Stakeholder Relationships with the University: Where Do We Go from Here?
- [ ] I did not attend any sessions

3. Question 1: Part 2

1. I did not attend the scholarly communications sessions for the following reasons (please check all that apply):

- [ ] Scheduling conflicts
- [ ] Not interested in topic
- [ ] Not relevant to my position
- [ ] Already knowledgeable about topic
- [ ] Other (please specify)

4. Questions 2 and 3

1. Prior to attending these sessions, I was confident in my knowledge of scholarly communication issues:

- ( ) Strongly disagree
- ( ) Disagree
- ( ) Neither agree nor disagree
- ( ) Agree
- ( ) Strongly Agree

Scholarly Communication Survey

2. As a result of these sessions, I am more confident in my knowledge of scholarly communication issues:

○ Strongly disagree

○ Disagree

○ Neither agree nor disagree

○ Agree

○ Strongly Agree

5. Question 4

1. When it comes to the following issues, concepts and/or tools, I am:

	Not at all comfortable	Somewhat uncomfortable	Neither comfortable nor uncomfortable	Somewhat comfortable	Very comfortable
Author rights	○	○	○	○	○
Open access	○	○	○	○	○
SPARC	○	○	○	○	○
Sherpa/Romeo	○	○	○	○	○
Addendum to publication agreements	○	○	○	○	○
Creative Commons	○	○	○	○	○
Pre-prints and post-prints	○	○	○	○	○
Publication process for my discipline area(s)	○	○	○	○	○

6. Questions 5, 6 and 7

1. What was the least helpful aspect of our scholarly communication sessions?

2. What was the most helpful aspect of our scholarly communication sessions?

3. I still have questions about:

7. Thank you for completing our survey!

We appreciate your feedback on this important issue. If you have additional questions or comments, please feel free to contact Sarah Beaubien, Linda Masselink, or Jodi Tyron.