

SUMMARY OF THE OCTOBER 9, 2009 SCHOLARLY COMMUNICATION SYMPOSIUM EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSE

Twenty-seven questionnaires were submitted. While only twelve gave their names and email addresses, those that did represent a group that want to be actively involved in many aspects of scholarly communication issues.

In general, respondents were very positive about the symposium, mainly remarking on the diversity of views and expertise. Some cited Shulenburg's and Greenburg's remarks as impressive and even more cited the reactors' panel as the most interesting part of the event. Several mention the good organization of the symposium, with one remarking the organization was "stellar."

In response to the question "What would you like to know more about?", twelve said developing modes of academic recognition for new forms of scholarship and my rights as an author. This was followed closely by 11 who were interested in developing an open access mandate for Rutgers. 9 wanted to know more about how Rutgers could become more effective in the dissemination of scholarly content and publishing an open access journal, while 8 wanted to know more about depositing their publications in RUcore. 2 were interested in archiving their data sets. In the category of other areas that were of interest to them, the following was said:

- Stability of websites (presumably regarding archiving or preserving website content)
- Needed changes in promotion and tenure and recognition of scholarly content in new forms of dissemination
- Importance of depositing publications in established subject repositories

The responses regarding where to inform others about scholarly communications, the clear winner was departmental meetings (16). 11 suggested university/library websites, and 9 thought future symposia and articles in university publications, such as Rutgers Magazine, HR Weekly and Weekly Focus. One thought direct mailings of postcards to faculty would be useful. Related to reaching out to faculty some suggested "faculty focus groups," more faculty panel discussions, and direct contact with those at Rutgers already active in electronic dissemination. Graduate students could be informed at graduate student orientation and meeting with the graduate student association. Other suggestions included working with the Center for Teaching Advancement and Assessment Research and placing information on the front page of Sakai.

A variety of suggestions were offered regarding what groups should be apprised of these issues. Graduate students were most often mentioned (6). 2 thought undergraduates. Others included:

- Incoming faculty
- Postdocs

- Dean's Council
- Board of Governors
- Anyone associated with promotion and tenure review
- Faculty Councils
- AAUP
- Science labs , research centers
- Extension advisory groups (public citizens)

(It is interesting than no one mentioned the university senate)

General Comments of note:

- RUcore was frequently mentioned but it is below the radar. Need faculty focus groups to demonstrate/explicate.
- Need direct interaction with the “doers” already involved in these issues.
- RUL should be a leader and have an annual conference on these issues as well a smaller events dealing with sub-topics throughout the year.
- Need to bring commercial publishers for a forum.
- Get students, especially graduate students involved.

The results of the symposium questionnaire clearly identify areas where we can follow up on. We need to work with faculty in their departments to inform them of scholarly communications issues, open access, and the role RUcore can play.

Specific areas of broad interest are pursuing an open access mandate, author's rights, and academic recognition for new forms of scholarship. Each issue may be approached differently.

I think we have identified enough people who would support a university open access mandate to begin discussions with them. Rhonda Marker and I are beginning a first draft of such a mandate for people to react to. We will slowly build up understanding and support though our departmental approach and through more specific faculty focus groups that could span several departments.

The questions about academic recognition in the new environment should be pursued by a faculty committee appointed by V.P.s Furmanski and Pazanni.

Authors' rights could be approached most effectively in departmental settings.

All of this could be supported by broader communications efforts through university/library websites and publications. Also, presentations to faculty councils, Dean's council, and ultimately to the Board of Governors could be made.

In the case when we have identified people with specific interests in archiving data sets and in publishing open access journals, library liaison should reach out to them.

Among the reactor panel, lists of attendees, and those identified in the questionnaires, we will have a large potential group who want to hear more and who may be willing to pursue these efforts further.