Trends in Education and Research: Developing Skills and Communication across Europe

Conclusions and Recommendations

UNICA SEMINAR
University of Helsinki, May 18-19, 2006

1. Summary

On the 18th and 19th May 2006, the UNICA network organisation held its third seminar on library related issues entitled *Trends in Education and Research: Developing Skills and Communication across Europe*. Hosted by the University of Helsinki and chaired by Prof. Markku Löytönen, Vice Dean of the Faculty of Science at the University of Helsinki, the seminar was attended by 45 head librarians and academic decision makers from 18 UNICA member universities.

The two previous seminars, held in Madrid in 2002 and in Vienna in 2004, dealt with scholarly communication issues; their conclusions and recommendations were disseminated towards the academic authorities of the UNICA universities and towards the European Union Commission.

The 2006 seminar aimed to address two topics related to scholarly information: the role for libraries in the Bologna context, and the current trends in scholarly communication.
The first day was devoted to "**the Bologna Process: the Role for Libraries in the Strategic Outreach of European Universities**". Michael Worton, Vice-Provost (Academic and International) at UCL (University College London), addressed the challenges for universities and their libraries in achieving the Bologna objectives; he underlined a vital role for libraries, notably in providing advice on modes of information delivery, in negotiating new funding models, in developing users' skills, in working with increased student mobility, and in achieving pan-European co-ordination. Arthur Mettinger, Vice-Rector at the University of Vienna and President of UNICA, presented the **aims and achievements of UNICA working groups**: the *Bologna Laboratory* which provides a platform for member institutions to exchange ideas and good practices related to the Bologna process implementation; the *European Campus*, a new UNICA initiative, which aims to foster mobility across member universities; it is expected to lead to agreements on quality standards among UNICA universities, including libraries. Hannele Niemi, Vice-Rector at the University of Helsinki, explained that university libraries were actively engaged in the reform of degree structures within the **Bologna process implementation in Finland**. This provided the opportunity to **integrate information literacy**[1] as part of academic studies and to develop a joint information literacy curriculum in the universities of Finland. Libraries, established as "learning centres", have been in charge of its practical implementation. Mrs Niemi insisted on the necessity of cooperation with teachers in defining the relevant modules; she also called for co-operation between universities. The next two speakers, Cristóbal Pasadas and Christina Tovoté, provided an **overview of information literacy developments in Europe and worldwide**. They presented on the various regional, European and international organisations dealing with information literacy issues and their achievements, notably in raising awareness about the education/information divide (i.e. not only "digital"), and recognising information literacy as a key competence for lifelong learning. They also pointed to challenges, such as partnerships with faculty, the training of trainers, the assessment and certification of achievements, and the opportunity presented by the Bologna process for the integration of information literacy into the curriculum.

The second day of the seminar discussed "**Current Trends in Scholarly Communication**", providing an overview of open access initiatives in Europe and addressing economic and policy issues for research funders. David Prosser underlined the two **complementary strategies of providing open access to research results**: **self-archiving**, i.e. deposit by authors of their articles in open electronic archives, and **open access journals**, which do not charge subscriptions for access. He evoked the

---

[1] Information literacy is the ability to search for, critically evaluate and creatively use information and turn it into knowledge.

increasing number of declarations and policies supporting open access, issued by universities, research centres and funding bodies, such as the UK Wellcome Trust and the US National Institutes of Health, and underlined the benefits of open access for all stakeholders involved in research. The two directories described by Lars Björnshauge contribute to making open access scholarly content easier to find, read, use and cite: the *Directory of Open Access Journals* (DOAJ) records more than 2200 peer-reviewed journals in all domains and languages, 600 of which are searchable at the article level; the *Directory of Open Access Repositories* (OpenDOAR) currently describes the contents and provides access to 380 repositories, subject- and institutionally-based. It provides a tool for researchers to access articles, for funders to monitor the visibility and use of their research outputs, and for aggregated service providers. Antonio Fantoni further stressed the **strategic outreach of open access repositories for universities** and the need of incentives for scientists to self-archive their papers. The **economics of open access publishing** were addressed by Bo-Christer Björk; he examined the different business models used for disseminating research articles, the different types of costs related to publications and the actors incurring them. He proposed a framework for the evaluation of the global economic affects of open access over the full life-cycle of the use of the published information. He also underlined the necessity of rethinking the allocation of funding when setting up a "level playing field" for the business models to be tested. Robert Terry adopted a **funder's perspective on open access,** considering that part of the research funders' mission is to ensure the widest-possible dissemination and unrestricted access to the research they fund. The Wellcome Trust has indeed defined its open access policy – mandating, as a condition of funding, that a copy of any original research paper published in a peer-reviewed journal be deposited into PubMed Central. The European Commission, by way of Nicole Dewandre, expressed its **concerns about scientific publication markets**, following the results of the study it had commissioned on the subject; she called upon all actors to express their views regarding the recommendations contained in this report, which could then lead to policy discussion and accompanying measures within the Seventh Framework Programme and within the Digital Libraries support programme.

The final session was followed by a panel discussion during which the speakers and the participants expressed their support for the recommendations contained in the study commissioned by EC DG-Research. Their comments were sent to the EC in terms of UNICA's contribution to the debate (see annex).

On each day, there was a 50-minute discussion in three parallel working groups providing a think tank on questions and aspects related to the topics addressed during the session. The outcomes of these discussions are accounted for in the conclusions below.

2. Conclusions

The Bologna Process is well established at an academic and administrative level, but issues for libraries are not yet identified. There was a recognition that the **role of libraries in the Bologna context needs to be further supported, underlined and developed**. The discussions focussed on **information literacy (IL) as a key element for education and research in the Bologna process context**. The availability through the internet of massive quantities of information, much of it of questionable quality, calls for education in IL: society will benefit if the ability to evaluate information is nurtured at all learning stages from the earliest years. Although a lot is happening across Europe, the importance of IL and its outcomes are not yet widely disseminated and accepted by academic and library staff in general; libraries need to clearly **define and promote the concept**. The Bologna process provides the opportunity to **integrate IL programmes into the curriculum**, following the lead of the Nordic countries for instance. Different levels of skills are recognised and existing standards provide a framework on which to build collaboration with teachers. **IL programmes need to be designed around pedagogical purposes and outcomes**, as much as around search techniques or retrieval processes. They have to be adapted to the diversity of learners and include mechanisms for the evaluation and measurement of learning outcomes. Libraries have a role to play in **supporting IL as a life-long learning skill**, especially with regard to the "employability" aspect of the Bologna process. Best practices should be widely disseminated among libraries, and LIBER was felt to be an appropriate organisation for coordinating information exchange. Communication between libraries and universities appears more difficult; in this respect UNICA could play a role in providing a platform for exchange between librarians and university officers, especially with curriculum and Bologna process coordinators, in order to raise awareness about IL issues.

On the second day, the conferences and the discussions brought a useful insight into the evolution of **scholarly communication,** and more particularly into the **role of research institutions and funders** in this changing context. Some major research funding organisations (US, UK, Germany) are setting the scene by requiring or mandating deposit of research papers in open access archives. However **at institutional level, mandates need to sit within a strategy** and fit into a global process setting up the infrastructure. This includes repository building, ease of use, service provision, copyright advice, benefits to researchers, incentives etc. Organisational problems are encountered within the institutions with respect to the creator of the repositories (faculty, department, library) and the **overlapping of tasks between library, IT and research administration departments**. A bottom-up approach in **coordinating collaboration between departments** provides complementary support to a top-down strategy. As for subject-based repositories, they offer the advantage of gaining the support and confidence of the academic community more easily. The issues for **repositories** are **to be "granular",** i.e. tailored to allow different views of their contents for different uses and purposes, and **to be connected**, in a trans-institutional, and possibly a trans-national perspective. It was agreed that repositories do provide useful tools for promoting research output at institutional, national and European levels. There will be a role for the EU in supporting this vision, if the status quo in the current publication markets is recognised by the European Commission not to be an option.

3. Recommendations

UNICA member universities are encouraged to:

Regarding information literacy issues:
- Pay attention to **information literacy competency as a key element in education, research and life-long learning**.
- Develop information literacy programmes primarily with reference to learners' needs and the related **pedagogical purposes** and outcomes.
- Engage in research as to how the efficacy of information literacy learning programmes can be measured.

Regarding scholarly communication issues:
- Actively **contribute to the debate** by responding to the EC consultation on the study of scientific publication markets.
- Exchange information and experience and **share best practices in building and using repositories**, possibly through the framework provided by the OpenDOAR platform.

The **UNICA organisation** is encouraged to:

Regarding information literacy issues:
- **Raise awareness about information literacy issues in UNICA universities**, outside libraries, especially among curriculum and Bologna process coordinators, for instance by providing a framework for **discussion between the UNICA Library Group and the Bologna Lab**.

Regarding scholarly communication issues:
- Examine the opportunity for the UNICA Board to **sign the Berlin Declaration**.
- Respond to the **EC consultation** on the study of scientific publication markets, and urge UNICA member universities to react as well.

Following this last recommendation, the UNICA organisation has responded to the EC consultation to support the study's recommendations. Their comments are provided in the Annex below .

The UNICA network organisation will **disseminate the conclusions and the recommendations of the seminar** to the academic authorities in UNICA universities and to the Commission of the European Union. The member universities are invited to disseminate the conclusions in their own countries to other universities and to national government and public research funding bodies.

The speakers' abstracts and presentations are available on the UNICA website:
http://www.ulb.ac.be/unica/sem-scholar.html

Annexes:
- UNICA Comments on the EC-DG Research "Study on the economic and technical evolution of the scientific publication markets in Europe". May 2006.
- Institutional repositories development in 18 UNICA universities. May 2006.

Reported by Françoise Vandooren
(Université Libre de Bruxelles)
on behalf of the UNICA Library Seminar Programme Committee

Réseau des Universités
des Capitales de l'Europe

UNICA

Network of Universities
from the Capitals of Europe

The Network of Universities from the Capitals of Europe
UNICA
Library Seminar, Helsinki 18 – 19 May, 2006

Comments on the EC-DG Research
"Study on the Economic and Technical Evolution of the Scientific
Publication Markets in Europe"

The participants of the UNICA network, meeting at the UNICA Library Seminar at the University of Helsinki, 18-19 May 2006, would like to express their support for the Recommendations contained in the report. We would like to make the following points.

Recommendation A1:

The importance of publishing research results <u>immediately</u> should be emphasized. If embargo periods as long as 24 months begin to be widely used, this will certainly delay scholarly communication. In many sciences, even 6 months is a very long time. The impact of a publication made openly accessible 6 months after it was published may be notably smaller than an openly accessible work which is available immediately.

Mandating deposit is difficult, but not impossible. It is not the first step for universities, which need to put incentives in place, as the benefits to researchers need to be clear. Libraries must have explicit marketing strategies, and universities should target opinion leaders to advance this matter in the scholarly community. Any repository infrastructure must be easy to use, and libraries must provide help in depositing and in copyright advice.

Recommendation A2:

The hands of librarians are tied because of 'big deals', which allow little room for non-traditional costs. It would be difficult to identify sums in existing library budgets which could be allocated to experimental Business Models in situations where the 'library pays' or 'reader pays'. In library budgets, there should be an allocation for the costs of the dissemination of research results. These costs could be alleviated by consortial or international arrangements, but it would be better if additional funding could be made available to facilitate this experimentation.

Recommendation A4:

Long-term preservation solutions vary between countries. University libraries are willing to have an active role in long-term preservation, as they often have much more extensive collections of electronic resources than national libraries. JSTOR-like solutions should be made openly accessible. In long-term archiving, the not-for-profit solutions should be preferred over for-profit solutions.

Recommendation B3:

The question of how to improve access to publications in Social Sciences and the Humanities (SSH) has to be addressed. The specificity of SSH publishing must be stressed, i.e. publications in small language area, most of them still in print, lack of visibility, need to access also primary sources and need to link them with annotations (articles, chapters of books etc. eg. model of the genome database). EC funding would be welcome to help the transition of these publications to electronic and move to an open access model.

Paul Ayris
Chair, UNICA Library Seminar Organizing Committee
Meeting at the University of Helsinki, 18-19 May 2006

Institutional repositories in some UNICA universities

Based on data collected in the UNICA seminar, Helsinki, May 2006.

Institution	Phase			
	Working	In progress	Planned	Comments
Amsterdam, University	x			
Brussels, Université Libre		x		
Brussels, Vrije Universiteit		x		
Cyprus, University			x	subject-based working, institutional planned
Dublin, University College		x		
Granada, University	x			
Helsinki, Hanken (Swedish School of Economics) (non UNICA member)		*x*		
Helsinki, University	x	x	x	4 campus / faculty repositories + E-theses repository
Lausanne, University		x		in pilot phase
London, University College	x			
Lund, University (non UNICA member)	*x*			
Madrid, Universidad Complutense		x		
Paris, Université Pierre-et-Marie-Curie (Paris 6)				
Paris, Université Sorbonne Nouvelle (Paris 3)			x	joint project between 3 univ. libraries
Prague, Charles University	x			Medical faculty only
Rome, Università "La Sapienza"	x			
Tallinn, University		x		pilot project
Vienna, University		x		to be launched in autumn
Vilnius, University		x		
Zagreb, University, Medical School		x		
Total	**7**	**10**	**4**	