UK Council of Research Repositories

UKCoRR Membership Survey 2012

Evaluating Membership Priorities

Yvonne C. Budden, Chair, UKCoRR
11/5/2012

UKCoRR Membership Survey

Yvonne C. Budden, Chair, UKCoRR

This report details the results of the UK Council of Research Repositories (UKCoRR) Membership Survey that ran on the UKCORR-DISCUSSION@jiscmail.ac.uk list during July 2012. The survey's purpose was to gain a comprehensive viewpoint from the membership on the direction of travel for the group and to feed into planning for the next committee cycle. It was also the second consecutive year that the survey had been run with the membership so a view on how member's views and attitudes had changed over the year was also to be expected.

The questions asked where based on the experience gained by the committee from the previous year's survey and expanded as necessary. The survey took place in the final months of the proceeding Chair[1]'s term in office and were analysed by the current Chair. The survey ran, as before on the mailing list and was promoted via various social media channels, the questions themselves can be found in Appendix B of the report.

1. Survey Sample

1.1 Region of respondents

In total we received 91 responses to the survey, which represents 34% of the current membership. This also represents an increase of 4% in the response rate on the previous year. This continues to be an excellent response rate and as such we can consider the results to be broadly representative of the views of the organisation.

Table 1: Respondents by Home Region

	Total Membership	Survey Respondents	Representation of Region in Survey (%)
England	226	80	35.4
Scotland	32	9	28.1
Wales	8	1	12.5
N. Ireland	3	1	33.3

Home region here is determined by the address of the individual's institution. Appendix A, lists the institution of those respondents who provided this information.

1.2 Department Base of Repositories

Table 2: Departmental Base of Respondent

	No. of Respondents	Percentage of total (%)
Library	79	86.8
Academic Department/School	2	2.2
Central Admin/Management	2	2.2
IT Services	2	2.2
Research Support	2	2.2
Graduate Office	1	1.1
Project Unit (e.g. RSP)	2	2.2

---

[1] Gaz Johnson, Leicester University

| Other | 3 | [Not listed as responses coded above] |

As expected there is little change here from the previous year's survey, with the majority of respondents based in the Library. Some respondents reported being are based on more than one department, thus accounting for the higher number of responses than respondents. One respondent chose not to respond to this question.

As the Library continues to be the central 'home' base for repositories we continue to see the effect of this on the issues effecting the UKCoRR membership.

On the 'Other' category we saw the following responses:

- But paid for by IT Services
- Library and IT Services under one admin unit. 2nd report line to the research office
- Across both Library and IT (Information Services)

2. UKCoRR Activities

The first substantive question focussed on the range of activities undertaken by UKCoRR and the where the main focus of the organisation should lie. Respondents chose as many of the options as they wished in this section.

Table 3: Key UKCoRR Activities

	No. of Respondents	% of Respondents
Facilitating exchange of best repository practice (events, discussion, blog)	79	86.8
Advocacy/representation of repository worker community's interests	75	82.4
Lobbying scholarly publishing sector stakeholders (e.g. publishers, CRIS providers)	57	62.6
Lobbying senior institutional stakeholders (e.g. ProVCs, Registrars, Research Leads)	48	52.7
Conducting research into OA activity	47	51.6
Developing collaborative/partnership relationships with external bodies (e.g. ARMA, DRF etc)	47	51.6
Publication of briefing papers and/or position statements	42	46.2
Governance and strategic planning for UKCoRR	39	42.9
Seeking funding for more formal activities and development	28	30.8
Developing a formal CPD (continuing professional development) programme?	26	28.6
Membership review (ensuring membership remains as per UKCoRR remit)	21	23.1
Membership recruitment (expanding representation)	19	20.9
Didn't answer	5	5.5
Other	3	3.3

As was seen in the previous year's survey the membership is strongly in favour of the range of experience sharing activities through the range of mediums as currently undertaken. Other areas strongly supported include advocacy specifically on the views of repository workers rather than on open access more generally. Efforts to influence the thinking of other scholarly communication stakeholders are bound to hold especial weight following the changes that have been seen in the UK scholarly communications landscape in the last twelve months.

Reasonable support was also behind the lobbying on senior institutional stakeholders; additionally one of the 'other' options included this suggestion:

> "Not directly lobbying senior internal stakeholders but providing repository workers with templates to more effectively lobby internally."

Reasonable support was also behind the development of position papers and statements as well as further research into OA activity. Limited support was given for membership recruitment and CPD activities by UKCoRR directly.

Other suggestions included:

- Doing whatever it takes to ensure that the next Finch committee will ask U[K]CORR's chair to be a member.
- promoting open access, eg to academics and general public/media etc.

3. UKCoRR Organisational Liaison

Awareness of UKCoRR beyond repository circles continues to be an area of development, as the impact of the organisation outside of these circles continues to be limited. Efforts in this area have been focused over the past year on the virtual environment, with developments to the website and the continued efforts of the committee and other members involved in responding to developments and announcements by various bodies throughout the year.

For this question respondents were asked about the groups they felt it was most importat for UKCoRR to be linked to, respondents chose as many options as they wished.

Table 4: Organisations and Liaison

	No. of Respondents	% of Respondents
RSP (Repositories Support Project)	74	81.3
The JISC	73	80.2
COAR (Confederation of Open Access Repositories)	66	72.5
Research Funding Bodies (RCUK, Wellcome etc)	62	68.1
DCC (Digital Curation Centre)	60	65.9
ARMA (Association for Research Managers and Administrators)	54	59.3
UK RepositoryNet +	50	54.9
CILIP (Chartered Institute of Information Professionals)	48	52.7
Software vendors (repository e.g. EPrints, DuraSpace)	48	52.7

SCONUL (Society of College, National and University Libraries)	44	48.4
SPARC/Europe	44	48.4
Software vendors (research management systems/CRIS, e.g. Atira, Symplectic)	44	48.4
ALPSP (Association of Learned and Professional Society Publishers)	36	39.6
Specific "Big" Publishers (e.g. Elsevier, Springer etc)	30	33.0
Governmental depts (e.g. Business Innovation and Skills)	28	30.8
STM Association (International Association of Scientific, Technical & Medical Publishers)	20	22.0
Did not reply	10	11.0
Other	3	3.3

Once again this question had a strong response from the membership for this kind of relationship building activity and emphasises the importance of this activity for future committee and organisational activity.

Once again the two strongest links UKCoRR currently enjoys, with JISC and the RSP were highly rated, but the percentage of respondents favouring the link with the RSP has dropped slightly since last year's survey. This year's responses also saw a growing recognition of the importance of links with other Repository specific bodies, such as the Confederation of Open Access Repositories (COAR), perhaps in light of the discussions around membership to this body at the last Member's meeting. Other bodies highlighted by the survey, including funding bodies and the DCC, can be shown to reflect the current key issues in the repository community. Another key result is the further fall of the publisher's bodies, last year accounting for around 50-55% of responses, here slipping to around 35%.

Other suggestions received were:

- Anyone who would benefit from a uk-wide vision on Repositories (technical or otherwise)
- Not effing publishers. Not "support projects" like RSP or RepNet+
- Might be useful to think about archivists as IRs expand into digital preservation areas?

4. UKCoRR Communication Routes

Here respondents were asked to consider a range of communication routes, both those currently used as well as those we might wish to use. The respondents were then asked to indicate their preference of communication route and allowed to select as many responses as applied.

In Table 5 the results are listed in order of 'preferred' communication route and the results given as percentage of respondents.

Table 5: Communication Routes

	Prefer (%)	Acceptable (%)	Not preferred (%)	N/A (%)
Mailing list (UKCORR-DISCUSSION)	80.2	8.8	1.1	0.0
Electronic Newsletter (monthly email)	47.3	35.2	5.5	0.0

Blog	28.6	41.8	16.5	1.1
Webinar	20.9	50.5	14.3	0.0
In-person (face-to-face)	19.8	45.1	13.2	3.3
Twitter (UKCoRR@Twitter)	15.4	37.4	29.7	0.0
Telephone conference	4.4	27.5	48.4	2.2
FaceBook	1.1	15.4	65.9	4.4
Google+	1.1	12.1	63.7	5.5
LinkedIn	1.1	23.1	52.7	4.4
Pintrest	1.1	7.7	61.5	14.3
Second Life	0.0	1.1	70.3	13.2

Here there is an overwhelming preference for the mailing list that was the original basis of UKCoRR as well as rising support for a monthly electronic newsletter. Interestingly there was little support from the respondents for some of the social media tools we might have chosen to use, Second Life and FaceBook ranking as the highest 'not-preferred' methods. Other acceptable methods highlighted included webinar's, the blog and in person communication. The UKCoRR Twitter account was seen as an acceptable means of communication but was not seen as a preferred form of communication.

An additional comment highlighted concerns about a move to social media as UKCoRR's primary means of communication due to restrictions on the use of social media sites at their institution.

5. UKCoRR Meetings and Events

5.1 Meeting Programme

Respondents here were asked to consider if the standard format annual/biannual member's meetings continue to meet their needs in terms of face-to-face communication. Respondents could, once again choose as many options as applied and as such the percentage represents each option's popularity.

Table 6: Meetings and Events

	No. of Respondents	% of Respondents
Annual/biannual day long UKCoRR membership only events	69	75.8
Workshops and seminars at other OA conferences or meetings	62	68.1
Online webinars	53	58.2
Regional/local smaller events (roadshow)	43	47.3
Online discussion groups	35	38.5
Workshops and seminars at conferences or meetings outside the OA sector	31	34.1
Other	4	4.4

Strong support is continued here for the annual/biannual day long membership events, with a suggestion of opening them to a wider audience, as well as workshops and seminars at Open Access specific conferences and meetings. Moderate support is shown here for online webinars and regional meetings of some kind with webinars seeing a surge of support from last year's survey. Both of these areas bear investigation in the future.

Other options suggested were:

- Working with RSP on events?
- Annual UKCORR conference?
- Not sure if regional events are a UKCoRR activity in themselves, but maybe UKCoRR can stimulate them
- Like the annual/biannual events, but could they be open maybe?

5.2 Future Meeting Themes

The repository landscape has always been one of the most dynamic and rapidly changing of any of the information disciplines and this year has certainly been no exception. The UKCoRR meetings have always had a strong focus on the challenges facing the UKCoRR membership at the time of the meeting and in sharing experiences between members. Suggestions for themes for future meetings gained moderate engagement from the responders with 33 choosing to make suggestions. The free text responses to this question are illustrated below (for the purposes of clarity I have removed the words IR, repository, repositories and UKCoRR):

Figure 1: Meeting Topic Comments

Produced by Wordle.net

Current 'hot topics' featured strongly in the suggestions for future meetings, including research data management, reactions to the Finch report, best practice sharing, copyright and metadata. But it is worth noting that the survey ran before the RCUK released their policy. Broadly speaking the topic suggestions fall into the following categories:

Table 7: Future meeting topics from textual analysis

	No. of Comments
Advocacy (internal and external), promotion and author engagement	13
Data repositories and RDM	9
Reactions to Finch and Open Access	9
CRISes	6

Technical issues	6
Process, workflows and policy	5
Horizon scanning and future trends	5
The REF process	5
Metadata	5
Copyright and IPR	4
Metrics and statistics	4
Professional issues and CPD	4
E-Theses	3
Other	2
Mandates	0

A complete breakdown of these topics and associated comments can be found in Appendix C. Here again we can see 'advocacy' as a clear favourite along with reactions to the changes following the Finch report and research data management. Technical issues (particularly linked data), the REF process and metadata (particularly metadata for interoperability) come in just behind the relationships between repositories and CRIS systems. CPD was also highlighted by some respondents as well as issues specifically concerning electronic theses. Interestingly this year the issue of mandates did not come up in any of the comments.

Due to the reduced response rate to this question; just over a third of respondents answered, the responses can only be used as an indicative response from the membership.

6. Other comments

This section allowed respondents to add anything they wished to their responses to the survey so far. Consequentially comments were on a wide variety of topics but this year all seemed to highlight one area in particular; the role and structure of UKCoRR.

There was a real sense on the comments of the value people found in their membership of UKCoRR and a sense that the membership wanted to retain the things that make UKCoRR unique. A sense that as the open access environment was changing all around us that UKCoRR was a valuable resource in both dealing with the changes and in making known the opinions of the community to other stakeholders. There was also concern over the long term future of the RSP another valuable resource. A full transcript of the additional comments can be found in Appendix D.

7. Discussion

The membership survey once again gives the committee and the membership more widely a view of the priorities and thinking of the membership of UKCoRR.

Advocacy was very strongly highlighted as the key role for the organisation; this is perhaps not surprising given the opinions of ill-informed dismissal of the role of repositories by the authors of the Finch report. Particularly key was felt to be advocacy for the interests of the repository worker's community, an area that is under represented in the publicity and discussions on open access more generally. The idea of UKCoRR developing template lobbying documents is an interesting one and may tie in with the existing material made available by the RSP. Advocacy at OA/Repository conferences and eventsbegun this year with a number of items from the committee and members at

the Open Repositories 2012 Conference in July and will hopefully continue as efforts to raise the profile of UKCoRR continue.

Limited support for membership drives continues which may be a symptom of the fact that the respondents feel that the current membership represents the lion's share of the UK repository community already. However with the role of repositories diversifying all the time into new (and not so new) areas such as research data, OERs and digitised archives and special collections material it may be worth considering reaching out to these communities in the future as well. All this, bearing in mind that the size of the organisation will have an effect on its ability to lobby external stakeholders.

Lobbying of external stakeholders, remains as was mentioned in the previous report, a difficult proposition for a body that relies on volunteers and has no capital funding in place. This is a strongly favoured position and a unique selling point for the organisation but can restrict the level of activity we are capable of undertaking. Some of the burden of advocacy for the repository community has fallen on the JISC funded Repositories Support Project, but with funding for this unsure for future years how much of this do the membership wish for UKCoRR to continue with and how will UKCoRR have to change to take this activity into account?

Links with external bodies continues to be an area of interest, with additional calls to link particularly with COAR, Research Funders, DCC and ARMA. Part and parcel with this again the issue of funding and UKCoRR's independence, COAR for example requires a yearly subscription to be paid which would additionally bind us to their policies. Is this the direction we want UKCoRR to develop or are there other possibilities for links with COAR going forward that do not have these conditions, something for us to investigate.

The membership find the methods of communication used by UKCoRR to be acceptable, with due caution on the use of social media as a communication method. Additionally there seems to be interest in the use of webinars which is something that can be investigated in light of the growing number of options available to us. This may help us to reach a larger number of members than the traditional annual meetings, especially as there was a stronger call for the use of webinars as events than as a means of communication. A possibility may be to investigate linking geographically disparate meetings via video conferencing facilities.

The diverse range of suggestions for topics for future meetings provides us with a very rich range of options to look at for future event planning. A good response was made on the issue of beginning a range of local/regional events and investigations are already underway on starting planning for such events. Obviously local/regional events have many advantages in terms of ease of attendance but should feed into not detract from the work of the organisation as a whole. The needs of UKCoRR members will also have to be balanced against the role of other bodies in this area, particularly the RSP and their relative funding situations. Interest in UKCoRR taking a role in CPD was not seen as a key activity for the organisation but did feature in a number of the later suggestions.

The environment in what UKCoRR is operating is changing all the time and UKCoRR has to be reactive to this change as well as ensure that as a member led, democratic body that there is an explicit mandate from the membership for any changes that are put in place.

8. Recommendations

- To continue to conduct an annual membership survey, moderated by the Chair, along the lines of the one detailed above to inform the future development activity by the committee. Questions should continue to be phrased to take into account current events.
- Work should be continued by the External Liaison Officer investigating closer links to the organisations identified as priorities above. Any proposals for working links will be reviewed by the committee and put to a membership vote if the committee deems this step necessary.
- Current communication channels should be maintained, with the additional possibility of investigating local/regional events or webinars.
- To solicit reaction from the membership on this report for further discussion and to garner further insight into the views of the membership using the mailing list and other communication channels.
- To consider carefully the role of UKCoRR in the event of RSP services being reduced or withdrawn, and to examine what is realistically achievable within the current structure.
- To maintain that any consideration of a fee structure should only be explored if demand for activities or outputs from membership exceed those currently achievable by the Committee and if the issues around creating and managing it can be overcome.
- To consider that revisions to current membership validity is not something that is strongly desired by the majority of the membership.
- To share the results of this work with the membership openly, and hopefully prompt further discussions on the mailing list.

9. Acknowledgements

The Chair would like to note thanks to the preceding Chair, Gaz Johnson, on whose work this report is based. Thanks are also noted and recorded to the all member of the committee, past and present for their efforts towards the development of UKCoRR as well as all the members who took the time to complete the survey.

Appendix A: Institutions in Survey Sample

Optional question with 44 responses.

- City University London
- Coventry university
- Cranfield University
- Glyndwr university
- Heriot-Watt University
- Imperial College London
- Institute of Development Studies
- Kingston University
- Lancaster University
- Leeds
- Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine
- London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine
- Loughborough University
- NERC (x2)
- Oxford Brookes University
- Queen Mary, University of London
- The Open University
- UKOLN, University of Bath
- University of Abertay
- University of Bath
- university of Birmingham
- University of Bolton
- University of East London
- University of Edinburgh
- University of Glasgow (x2)
- University of Hull
- University of Leeds
- University of Lincoln (x2)
- University of Nottingham
- University of Reading
- University of Southampton (x3)
- University of St Andrews (x2)
- University of Sussex (x2)
- University of the West of England (x2)
- University of Warwick
- University of York
- Did not respond (47)

Appendix B: Survey Questions and Options

1. **Please indicate your region:**
   a. England
   b. Scotland
   c. Wales
   d. N. Ireland
   e. Other

2. **Within which department or section are you based?**
   a. Academic Department/School
   b. Central Administration/Institutional Management
   c. Graduate Office/School
   d. IT Services
   e. Library
   f. Project Unit (e.g. RSP)
   g. Research Support
   h. Other

3. **What activities should UKCoRR focus on as an organisation?**
   a. Advocacy/representation of repository worker community's interests
   b. Conducting research into OA activity
   c. Developing a formal CPD (continuing professional development) programme?
   d. Developing collaborative/partnership relationships with external bodies (e.g. ARMA, DRF etc)
   e. Facilitating exchange of best repository practice (events, discussion, blog)
   f. Governance and strategic planning for UKCoRR
   g. Lobbying scholarly publishing sector stakeholders (e.g. publishers, CRIS providers)
   h. Lobbying senior institutional stakeholders (e.g. ProVCs, Registrars, Research Leads)
   i. Membership recruitment (expanding representation)
   j. Membership review (ensuring membership remains as per UKCoRR remit)
   k. Publication of briefing papers and/or position statements
   l. Seeking funding for more formal activities and development
   m. Other (please specify)

4. **Which organisations or bodies should UKCoRR seek to be in liaison with?**
   a. ARMA (Association for Research Managers and Administrators)
   b. ALPSP (Association of Learned and Professional Society Publishers)
   c. COAR (Confederation of Open Access Repositories)
   d. CILIP (Chartered Institute of Information Professionals)
   e. DCC (Digital Curation Centre)
   f. Governmental depts (e.g. Business Innovation and Skills)
   g. Research Funding Bodies (RCUK, Wellcome etc)
   h. The JISC
   i. RSP (Repositories Support Project)
   j. SCONUL (Society of College, National and University Libraries)
   k. SPARC/Europe

    l.   Specific "Big" Publishers (e.g. Elsevier, Springer etc)

    m. Software vendors (repository e.g. EPrints, DuraSpace)

    n.   Software vendors (research management systems/CRIS, e.g. Atira, Symplectic)

    o.   STM Association (International Association of Scientific, Technical & Medical Publishers)

    p.   UK RepositoryNet +

    q.   Other (please specify)

5. What communication and interaction routes do you prefer UKCoRR news and announcements to come through?

    a.   Blog

    b.   Electronic Newsletter (monthly email)

    c.   FaceBook

    d.   Google+

    e.   In-person (face-to-face)

    f.   LinkedIn

    g.   Mailing list (UKCORR-DISCUSSION)

    h.   Pintrest

    i.   Second Life

    j.   Telephone conference

    k.   Twitter (UKCoRR@Twitter)

    l.   Webbinar

6. What kind of meetings and events would you like UKCoRR to organise or facilitate?

    a.   Annual/biannual day long UKCoRR membership only events

    b.   Workshops and seminars at other OA conferences or meetings

    c.   Workshops and seminars at conferences or meetings outside the OA sector

    d.   Online webinars

    e.   Online discussion groups

    f.   Regional/local smaller events (roadshow)

    g.   Other

7. What themes or topics should future events cover?

8. Any other comments?

9. Please indicate your organisation (optional)

Appendix C: Future Meeting Topics Comments

Divided broadly by area:

Process, workflows and policy

- Sharing best practice in repository administration
- Additional 'repository team' services eg journal hosting
- Editorial policies
- Pragmatic 'how-to's
- best practice

Advocacy (internal and external), promotion and author engagement

- How to forge links with your research office
- Advocacy
- Advocacy, adding value
- advocacy
- Advocacy
- Repository case studies; innovative uses of repositories; evidence of value of repositories
- Academic buy-in
- Ongoing events on advocacy are always helpful.
- Case studies
- Cultural change
- advocacy ; liason with publishers
- updates on UKCoRR discussions with other organisations - i.e. how UKCoRR is being heard and how it can influence
- Relationship with publishers for IR managers

Copyright and IPR

- copyright
- copyright
- best practice re copyright (day to day, on the ground)
- copyright

CRISes

- relationship of repositories with other institutional systems - e.g. CRIS
- Repositories and CRIS
- Dealing with research info management & CRIS
- CRIS & repository interactions - how are institutions handling this?
- Cris
- CRIS / Repository inter-relationships

Horizon scanning and future trends

- UKCORR as leaders of new scholarly practice, vs UKCORR as defender of publishing industry
- The continued value of repositories in changing OA landscape (move to gold OA, use of CRIS etc)
- Scenario planning for repositories e.g. if there is a shift to gold, greater diversity of e-content, repositories as publishing platforms, linking with data
- Can an IR be a digital archive? (pressure in some areas for the IR to be a preservation tool, so looking at the good, the bad & the practical in this area)
- Open scholarship

The REF process

- tie in with REF and funder requirements
- REF
- REF & reporting
- REF2014 support groups
- REF

Metrics and statistics

- best way to use google analytics for repositories
- Statistics - getting stats from the IR
- Bibliometrics
- Metrics

Professional issues and CPD

- professional development for repo managers
- Staffing models for repository services: staff numbers, types of roles, location within the institution, making a business case for staffing
- Professional development for part-time IR staff
- Development of individuals in UKCoRR to strengthen their skills and promote the role of the repository manager as a significant role within University research management.

Data repositories and RDM

- Research data management
- Data management
- Research Data Management
- Repositories and research data
- Dealing with research data
- Perhaps Research data management
- open data
- Research data management
- Data management and open access

Mandates

Reactions to Finch and Open Access

- Strategies for primarily metadata only repositories to respond to recent OA policies/statements and the like
- Advocacy in light of Finch Gold agenda
- responses to Finch
- role of institutional repositories (esp. since this was a Finch recommendation)
- open access developments e.g. Finch
- Events covering recent topics would be good - e.g. something focusing around the Finch report and implications of this?
- It would be good to get some of the OA-commenting academics post-Finch to come and give their perspectives. Examples would be Mike Taylor, Stephen Curry, Bjoern Brems.
- Focus on the changing OA landscape, esp. reactions to Finch and how to manage expectations in the changed, post Finch landscape
- Finch, RCUK, EU polices and their implications

Metadata

- best practice (metadata)
- metadata
- metadata and open access
- Making sure we're all playing nicely with each other (e.g. best-practices for metadata).
- building up cataloging standards (how do you deal with a translation of a work by your academic, how do you deal with patents, what do you link to)

E-Theses

- Etheses (this came up at the LEAP meeting in June)
- EThOS
- Theses and their specific issues

Technical issues

- Renewing the repository platform (are repository managers reviewing their platform, as you might do with any commercial system every few years?)
- Linked data and how repositories can take advantage of this
- Search engine optimisation
- linked data?
- Demos/showcases of interesting things repositories have been doing
- Development of repositories for RDF and linked data

Other

- Support for new repositories
- perhaps something for people working specifically with hosted software

Appendix D: Full list of 'other' comments

- as usual, UKCoRR is invaluable for exchanging and supporting repo people and am really glad it exists, since this year has seen such a great deal of publicity around open access maybe good to coordinate a nationwide event on open access to really take advantage and throw weight behind open access, repositories and green oa
- Difficult decision to make stay small, no requirement for much funding or increase in size and require funding, membership fee. Assocciate with ARMA rather than CILIP???
- I really value the UKCoRR mailing list, it provides a way of keeping up and gathering evidence of what others are doing and why they are doing it (etheses policies spring to mind). Please note that we are not permitted to be on social media sites during the working day, so a move to Facebook/Twitter would cause a problem for me. Blogs are okay as I set up the RSS feeds into Outlook.
- Keep up the good work!
- None.
- Not sure what the future of RSP is - but if the repository world was to lose that resource, we may need to re-think the role and funding of UKCoRR so that it could pick up some of those functions.
- Post-Finch we need a higher profile for UKCoRR.
- The relative 'closed' nature of the group makes it an extremely valuable way to exchange information in confidence with a knowledgeable community. For example discussions of internal policies, reference to 'what went wrong' etc that may not be possible in a wider arena. For this reason it might be difficult for UKCoRR to form any relationship with eg a single publisher.
- UKCoRR and its committee should be congratulated for their efforts
- UKCORR discussion list is an excellent source of information.
- UKCoRR is a great resource to have - long may it continue and thrive!
- We should keep focussed on our core identity and core strengths: there are many organisations now promoting/investigating Open Access - but none others that actually represent repository staff.
- Would not like to see UKCoRR change too much