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About the Project

- In August 2019 California State University, Sacramento and San Jose State University were awarded an IMLS National Forum Grant to identify standards and best practices in evaluating scholarly communication programs at M1 Carnegie-classified public universities.

- **Focus Groups**
  Focus groups with scholarly communication practitioners held

- **Spring 2020**
  - **Campus Stakeholder Interviews**
    Interviews with campus stakeholders (those involved in the research process)

- **May 4-5, 2020**
  - **Scholarly Communication Assessment Forum**
    Scholarly Communication Assessment Forum held virtually

- **December 2021**
  - **Dissemination of White Paper and Rubrics**
    Distribute finalized white paper with accompanying rubrics

This project was made possible in part by the Institute of Museum and Library Services (LG-35-19-0066-19).
Focus Groups

- Fall 2019, 3 focus groups were held (1 in-person and 2 virtual) consisting of 20 scholarly communication and assessment librarians.
- Facilitator employed scripted questions and a survey to gather data on which scholarly communication services are most widely implemented at M1 public universities and how those services should be assessed.
- Survey prompted participants to list library services offered to support each of 5 stages in the research lifecycle, categorize level of development of service and whether service was supported by a single person or team.
17 participants or 85% indicated one or more library programs or services in support of the planning stage.

Examples:
- Citation manager assistance
- Data workshops
- Repository identification
- Funding opportunities identification

Tallies may exceed the number of participants, as participants were encouraged to comprehensively list their current services or programs that support each element of the research lifecycle stage.
Project Management Stage

**Count of Library Programs / Services Supporting the Project Management Stage with Respective Stages of Development**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage of Development</th>
<th>Count of Programs / Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data Set Metadata</td>
<td>3 (Established), 1 (Developing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Stewardship</td>
<td>4 (Established), 4 (Developing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis Support</td>
<td>1 (Established), 0 (Developing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Visualization</td>
<td>0 (Established), 0 (Developing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Data</td>
<td>1 (Established), 0 (Developing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics and Compliance</td>
<td>3 (Established), 1 (Developing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Management</td>
<td>0 (Established), 0 (Developing)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Examples:**
- Peer research consultations for data
- Data analysis support, including Dedoose
- Data visualization guides
- Cataloging services
- Librarians on IRB committees

Tallies may exceed the number of participants, as participants were encouraged to comprehensively list their current services or programs that support each element of the research lifecycle stage.

14 participants or 70%
Publishing and Presenting Stage

18 participants or 90%

Examples:
- Open access funds to cover article publishing charges (APCs)
- Open access outreach and education
- Author rights workshops
- Predatory publishing workshops
- Copyright and fair use workshops

Tallies may exceed the number of participants, as participants were encouraged to comprehensively list their current services or programs that support each element of the research lifecycle stage.
Preserving and Disseminating Stage

19 participants or 95%

Examples:
- Institutional repository services
- Data repository services
- Digital archives
- Registration of DOIs through Crossref

Tallies may exceed the number of participants, as participants were encouraged to comprehensively list their current services or programs that support each element of the research lifecycle stage.
Prestige, Impact, and Discovery Stage

14 participants or 70%

Examples:
- LibGuides on traditional and alternative metrics
- Institutional repository reports for individual authors and campus stakeholders
- Author branding / online identity support

Tallies may exceed the number of participants, as participants were encouraged to comprehensively list their current services or programs that support each element of the research lifecycle stage.
Focus Group Questions

- How are the library’s scholarly communication programs and services supporting your campus’ goals?

- (Lack of) awareness of library services and programs
- Varying needs and responses from faculty and campus stakeholders, and potential mismatch between what the library could provide datawise
- Barriers to doing more included limited time, money, and staffing
Focus Group Questions

- Do your library’s assessment efforts address scholarly communication?

  - Consensus that this was an area for improvement and growth
  - Scholarly communication activities are diffuse and disparate
    - Difficult to collect and to consistently measure
    - Staffing models add complexity
Focus Group Questions

- What are the metrics for success of your scholarly communication services?

  - Workshop attendance
  - Number of consultations
  - Usage data from IR platforms
  - Impact is difficult to measure because of its indirect nature; inability to analyze cause and effect
  - Clear from discussions that each institution approached scholarly communication differently
Scholarly Communication Assessment Forum

Guided questions elicited the general themes under which the forum was organized:

- Building Awareness of Faculty Scholarship
- Measuring Embeddedness in the Institution
- Integration in the Curriculum
- Perspectives from Faculty Stakeholders
- Perspectives from Campus Stakeholders
- Multifaceted Assessment of Scholarly Communication
- Going Beyond Impact Factor
- Metrics and Rubrics Creation
M1s need to be flexible based off their local context
# Rubric Development - Internal Lens

## SCAF Planning Stage Rubric

The Planning Stage of the SCAF Rubric refers to the period of planning a research project. Services that may be offered within this stage include literature review, collaboration, citation management, ethics and compliance, data management planning, and grant planning. Defining local services within this rubric that align with the spirit of the planning stage is highly encouraged. At the bottom an additional box is provided to add additional services or services that are unique to your campus. You may also add appropriate rubric measures of success.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research step</th>
<th>Established</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Beginning</th>
<th>Considering</th>
<th>Not Appropriate</th>
<th>Potential Measures of Success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Literature review</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature review consultations, workshops, etc. occur frequently with robust staffing, documentation, outreach, and procedures. Stakeholders on campus use the service frequently.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Literature review consultations, workshops, etc. occur and staffing, documentation, outreach, or procedures exist to help with demand. Staffing is in place to offer assistance.</td>
<td>Demand for literature review consultations, workshops, etc. exists and the library has offered assistance on an ad hoc basis. Personnel have not offered service, but may consider offering in the future.</td>
<td>Service may be offered elsewhere (consortially or another dept) or no demand exists.</td>
<td>Examples: Quantity of consultations, workshops; workshop attendance; time spent; audience served; quality of review; usage of online resources or LibGuides</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration tools</td>
<td></td>
<td>Library organizes frequent outreach on usage of collaboration tool(s) and/or collaborative space may exist in the library. Robust staffing, documentation, outreach, and procedures exist. Stakeholders on campus use the service frequently.</td>
<td>Library or campus may subscribe to or host collaboration tools and library has provided assistance with tools. Collaborative space may exist on campus. Staffing is in place to offer assistance.</td>
<td>Demand for library-supported collaboration tools exists. Library is researching potential tools to provide or has provided assistance on an ad hoc basis. Personnel have not offered service, but may consider offering in the future.</td>
<td>Service may be offered elsewhere (consortially or another dept) or no demand exists.</td>
<td>Examples: Usage of collaboration tools; quantity of consultations or workshops; workshop attendance; audience served; usage of online resources or LibGuides; networking events hosted; collaborative space usage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation management consultations, workshops, etc. occur frequently with robust staffing.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Citation management consultations, workshops, etc. occur and staffing, documentation, outreach.</td>
<td>Demand for citation management consultations, workshops, etc.</td>
<td>Personnel have not offered service, but may</td>
<td>Service may be offered elsewhere (consortially or another dept) or no demand exists.</td>
<td>Examples: How many/which citation managers are offered/linked; usage statistics of citation managers; quantity of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Rubric Development - External Lens

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Emphasis</th>
<th>Established</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Beginning</th>
<th>Considering</th>
<th>Not Appropriate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Repository Management</strong></td>
<td>Adoption of the institutional repository across the campus is mandated or is well-used across departments and programs. Statistics show increasing downloads and pageviews. Outreach and instruction campaigns occur frequently and a team of people are assigned to managing the functions of the institutional repository. The campus is committed to funding the software or resources necessary to maintain the repository.</td>
<td>An institutional repository exists, certain faculty or programs are depositing content, and usage statistics are generated. Technical skills are adequate to maintain the repository. Outreach and instruction campaigns occur and at least one combined equivalent of one person assigned to managing the functions of the institutional repository. The library is committed to funding the software or resources necessary to maintain the repository.</td>
<td>Personnel has conducted training on trends in institutional repository management, the skill sets, and potential staffing required for such work.</td>
<td>Personnel is aware of trends in institutional repository management, the skill sets, and potential staffing required for such work.</td>
<td>Library has no background knowledge or technical skills to address this area of emphasis. Service may be offered elsewhere (consortially or another dept) or no demand exists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Publishing Services</strong></td>
<td>The library hosts campus publications and/or provides consultations and workshops on author rights and where to publish frequently. Outreach and instruction campaigns occur frequently and at least one full-time person is assigned to</td>
<td>The library may host or advise on hosting for campus publications, and/or provide consultations or workshops on author rights or where to publish. Technical skills are adequate to maintain the publishing services. Outreach and instruction campaigns occur and at</td>
<td>Personnel has conducted training on trends in library publishing services or developed technical skills to support a service. Plans for outreach and instruction have begun.</td>
<td>Personnel is aware of trends in institutional repository management, the skill sets, and potential staffing required for such work.</td>
<td>Library has no background knowledge or technical skills to address this area of emphasis. Service may be offered elsewhere (consortially or another dept) or no demand exists.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next steps
Learn More about Our Project

- Scholarly Communication Assessment Forum | Sac State Library (csus.edu)
- December 2021 - White paper with accompanying rubrics will be distributed