Advancing the Dissemination and Preservation of Community-Based Research Products in Institutional Repositories
Promouvoir la diffusion et la préservation des produits de la recherche communautaire dans les dépôts institutionnels

Robyn Hall

Résumé de l'article

La recherche communautaire est souvent le fruit d'un partenariat entre les communautés et les chercheurs universitaires afin d'aborder des enjeux et des problèmes soulevés par la communauté. Une grande partie de ce travail se traduit par l'élaboration en collaboration de documents diversifiés, accessibles au public, qui visent à informer les politiques publiques, à renforcer les propositions de financement, à soutenir les objectifs des membres de la communauté et à faire progresser le changement social. Cet article rend compte d'une récente étude multiméthode explorant le rôle des dépôts institutionnels dans la diffusion et la préservation de ces produits de recherche communautaires, en s'appuyant sur les perspectives, les expériences et les motivations des universitaires impliqués dans ces travaux. Les entretiens avec les membres du corps professoral et les administrateurs universitaires des établissements postsecondaires canadiens révèlent une méconnaissance généralisée de la manière dont les services de dépôt institutionnel peuvent accroître l'impact et la portée des travaux publics générés par ces collaborations. De plus, un sondage auprès des bibliothécaires canadiens responsables pour la communication savante montre que les bibliothèques ne semblent pas promouvoir suffisamment ces services auprès des membres du corps professoral et des administrateurs engagés dans la recherche communautaire. En s'appuyant sur les contributions des participants à la recherche, cet article suggère des moyens par lesquels les bibliothèques universitaires peuvent étendre leurs stratégies de sensibilisation afin de combler le fossé observé entre les services de dépôt et la diffusion et la préservation des produits de la recherche communautaire. Ce faisant, elles peuvent faire progresser l'engagement institutionnel généralisé en faveur de l'engagement communautaire et des pratiques de science ouverte au profit du bien public.

Advancing the Dissemination and Preservation of Community-Based Research Products in Institutional Repositories

Promouvoir la diffusion et la préservation des produits de la recherche communautaire dans les dépôts institutionnels

Robyn Hall
Scholarly Communications Librarian
MacEwan University
hallr27@macewan.ca

Abstract / Résumé

Community-based research often involves communities working in partnership with academic researchers to address issues and problems that the community has raised. Much of this work results in the collaborative development of diverse, publicly available materials that strive to inform public policy, strengthen funding proposals, support community members' goals, and advance social change. This article reports on a recent multimethod study exploring the role of institutional repositories in disseminating and preserving these community-based research products, informed by the perspectives, experiences, and motivations of academics involved in this work. Interviews with faculty members and university administrators at Canadian post-secondary institutions suggest a widespread lack of awareness about how institutional repository services can leverage the impact and reach of public-facing work generated through these collaborations. Furthermore, a survey of Canadian scholarly communications librarians indicates that libraries do limited outreach to promote these services to faculty members and administrators engaged in community-based research. Using input from research participants, this article suggests ways that academic libraries can extend outreach strategies to bridge this observed gap between repository services and the dissemination and preservation of community-based research products. Doing so can

advance widespread institutional commitments to community engagement and open science practices to benefit the public good.

La recherche communautaire est souvent le fruit d'un partenariat entre les communautés et les chercheurs universitaires afin d'aborder des enjeux et des problèmes soulevés par la communauté. Une grande partie de ce travail se traduit par l'élaboration en collaboration de documents diversifiés, accessibles au public, qui visent à informer les politiques publiques, à renforcer les propositions de financement, à soutenir les objectifs des membres de la communauté et à faire progresser le changement social. Cet article rend compte d'une récente étude multiméthode explorant le rôle des dépôts institutionnels dans la diffusion et la préservation de ces produits de recherche communautaires, en s'appuyant sur les perspectives, les expériences et les motivations des universitaires impliqués dans ces travaux. Les entretiens avec les membres du corps professoral et les administrateurs universitaires des établissements postsecondaires canadiens révèlent une méconnaissance généralisée de la manière dont les services de dépôt institutionnel peuvent accroître l'impact et la portée des travaux publics générés par ces collaborations. De plus, un sondage auprès des bibliothécaires canadiens responsables pour la communication savante montre que les bibliothèques ne semblent pas promouvoir suffisamment ces services auprès des membres du corps professoral et des administrateurs engagés dans la recherche communautaire. En s'appuyant sur les contributions des participants à la recherche, cet article suggère des moyens par lesquels les bibliothèques universitaires peuvent étendre leurs stratégies de sensibilisation afin de combler le fossé observé entre les services de dépôt et la diffusion et la préservation des produits de la recherche communautaire. Ce faisant, elles peuvent faire progresser l'engagement institutionnel généralisé en faveur de l'engagement communautaire et des pratiques de science ouverte au profit du bien public.

Keywords / Mots-clés

community-based research, scholarly communications, institutional repositories, library outreach, open science, knowledge democracy; recherche communautaire, communication savante, dépôts institutionnels, sensibilisation, science ouverte, démocratie du savoir

Introduction

Community-based research involves "research that is conducted *with* and *for*, not *on*, members of a community" (Strand et al., 2003, p. xx). In higher education, reciprocal partnerships between community partners and university researchers guide this approach to address problems, issues, and concerns identified by the community. Under the auspices of widespread commitments to community engagement, universities have grown services and support to foster this area of scholarship across Canada. Several universities have created centres and institutes supporting community-university research partnerships. Moreover, 36 academic institutions nationwide are members of Community-Based Research Canada (CBRC), a non-profit focused on professional development, networking, and bridging research capacities (CBRC, 2024).

A further indicator of growth in this area is the recent announcement of a uniquely Canadian Carnegie Community Engagement Classification (Simon Fraser University, n.d.) that post-secondary institutions can apply to in order to recognize and strengthen their community engagement efforts.

Against a backdrop of wide-ranging and expanding emphasis on community-university research partnerships, Canadian academic libraries are engaged in supporting this work. For instance, it is not uncommon for academic libraries to provide community members with on-campus access to collections and research support. Notably, a group of libraries in British Columbia provides unrestricted access to subscription-based scholarly publications and research help to staff of non-profit and charitable organizations in the region through the Community Scholars Program (De Forest, 2023). Meanwhile, librarians at the University of British Columbia are involved in the Downtown Eastside Research Access Portal (https://dtesresearchaccess.ubc.ca), which focuses on making academic research and community-generated information on Vancouver's Downtown Eastside more openly accessible online (University of British Columbia, 2020). However, additional examples of Canadian academic libraries helping to facilitate the sharing and preservation of research materials generated by community-based research projects are limited.

Recognizing that there is an opportunity for academic libraries to do more to advance the dissemination and preservation of community-based research products, this article reports on a research project that sought to gain an understanding of potential future synergies between institutional repository services capable of hosting, sharing, tracking, and digitally preserving research products offered by academic libraries and the work of those engaged in community-based research projects on university campuses. Data collection occurred over the fall of 2022 and winter of 2023. Interviews with faculty members engaged in community-based research and working at universities across Canada suggest a widespread lack of awareness of repository services that could benefit the impact and reach of their work. Meanwhile, interviews with university administrators who support community-university partnerships reveal unrecognized opportunities for deeper collaboration with libraries through these services. This multimethod study also involved surveying librarians in positions intersecting with scholarly communications, including institutional repository services. Responses to this survey corroborate the findings from interviews, with respondents reporting that institutional repository service providers are undertaking minimal outreach activities that target community-based researchers and relevant administrative units on their campuses.

Informed by the experiences, concerns, and ideas shared by research participants, this article suggests ways that librarians providing institutional repository services can extend their outreach activities to engage more directly with those conducting and supporting community-based research at their institutions. Doing so can strengthen widespread institutional commitments to community engagement. Simultaneously, it can advance academic libraries' ongoing efforts to support open science practices to make research more widely available to the public.

Literature review

The following literature review summarizes scholarship exploring the role of institutional repositories in disseminating and preserving community-based research products. It begins by situating these products—many of which fall outside of traditional peer-reviewed publishing venues—within the context of academia. It goes on to discuss literature calling on community-based researchers to adopt open access dissemination practices to serve the public good where appropriate, providing limited examples of how institutional repository services are engaging in this area. The final section points to research demonstrating an overall lack of awareness of repository services among academics working in North American universities and summarizes outreach activities suggested in the literature. A comparison of how the needs of those who conduct community-based research might differ from those working in other areas of academia and a review of literature exploring public use of openly shared scholarship in institutional repositories and elsewhere are beyond the scope of this paper. Instead, the focus is on illustrating an underlying need for more research exploring the experiences and perspectives of individuals engaged in community-based research on university campuses to meaningfully inform how institutional repository services may advance the dissemination and preservation of diverse works arising from these projects in meaningful and productive ways.

Situating Community-Based Research Products in Academia

Widely cited literature going back more than forty years has influenced university commitments to community engagement efforts across North America (see, for instance, Bok, 1982; Boyer, 1990, 1996). Scholarship on how the growth of community-based research has factored into this evolution is well-documented (Beaulieu et al., 2018; Fitzgerald et al., 2010; Hall, 2009; Strand et al., 2003). "Community-based research" is used here as an umbrella term covering a range of likeminded approaches, including community engaged research and community-based participatory research, among others (Etmanski et al., 2014), each sharing a focus on community members working in reciprocal and collaborative partnerships with university researchers to benefit the community. Projects that follow this approach tend to lead to diverse research products co-created by academics and community partners that strive to ensure scholarly and community-level impact. Calleson et al. (2005) group these products into three categories: peer-reviewed articles that seek to share research findings and lessons learned with other researchers; applied products informed by community and academic expertise that communities can make direct use of, such as policy briefs and toolkits; and community dissemination products that provide opportunities for reflection and critique within and external to a project team, such as videos and photovoice exhibits. In the absence of a common term used to encompass these varied forms of research outputs, "community-based research products" is used in this article to describe works that integrate the expertise and knowledge of both academics and community members to meet the needs of community in various ways.

Several articles have grappled with how to fairly evaluate and assess the many community-based research products that often fall outside of peer-reviewed publications

in academic reward systems, mainly tenure and promotion. This includes consideration of alternative peer-review models that draw upon community expertise (Jordan et al., 2011; Jordan, 2010), suggested indicators of excellence (Elliott, 2017; Janzen et al., 2016), and structural and cultural changes to processes within higher education (Katwyk & Case, 2016; O'Meara, 2010). This body of work suggests that community-based researchers working in academia are often faced with additional challenges communicating the impact and value of their scholarship compared to those who disseminate their research in traditional academic publishing venues like scholarly journals and books.

Supporters of the open science movement have argued that making research publicly available can increase research impact and recognition, allowing more people to engage with a scholar's work (for instance, Baldwin, 2023; McKiernan et al., 2016; Suber, 2012). Calls to specifically make community-based research products publicly available to enhance exposure to this work for academic credit are uncommon. One explanation for this omission is that community-based dissemination strategies strive to include full community participation and require the permission of the community; instead of broad dissemination, the main priority is giving the research back to the community in ways that directly meet its needs (Koster et al., 2012). These strategies strive to avoid what scholars increasingly recognize as ongoing harms done to subjects of research from marginalized populations often at the centre of community-based research, who are frequently overstudied, misrepresented, and whose pain is commodified for scholarly impact (Gaudry, 2011; Tuck & Yang, 2014).

Discussions among community-based researchers about the value of sharing community-based research products in open access venues are perhaps justifiably limited, considering how this may not benefit the community. When determining dissemination venues, Koster et al. (2012) advise that "any research conducted within a community (Indigenous in particular, but other communities as well), regardless of its purpose and methodology, should respect the community by informing them, seeking their permission, and returning research results" (p. 208). When considering the role of institutional repositories in disseminating and preserving community-based research products, it is essential to acknowledge that these platforms may not be an appropriate option for all projects. However, evidence suggests that there are cases where the public dissemination and preservation of these works can serve both academic and community interests.

Considering the Role of Institutional Repositories

Considering the compatibility of open science and community-based research dissemination strategies, Abbott and Tiffen (2019) point out that "both practices share a common goal in progressing traditional modes of research and academic practice to more directly apply the fruits of scholarship to pressing social, economic, and health issues beyond the walls of academia" (p. 4). To that end, related works by Chan et al. (2020) and Hall and Tandon (2017) have called for a decolonial approach to open science for and with communities—one that goes beyond making research results open access to other researchers around the world to one that also focuses on the relevance

of research to social movements and civil society organizations and that is inclusive of the knowledge and systems of thought of the many groups that have been marginalized and excluded from dominant Western approaches to science. What they describe here is a call for knowledge democracy, a concept that "is about intentionally linking values of justice, fairness and action to the process of using knowledge" (Hall & Tandon, 2017, p. 13). While the authors do not address institutional repositories directly, this raises questions about how academics and community partners might use these platforms to share and leverage a broader diversity of scholarship often excluded from mainstream academic publishing models (Library Publishing Coalition Research Committee, 2020). This discussion also lends itself to considering institutional repositories' role in an emergent movement calling for citation justice, which recognizes that knowledge produced by members of marginalized groups, within and outside of academia, is often absent from conventional academic texts and the social influence that they carry with them (Chakravartty et al., 2018; Coalter, 2023).

The library and information science literature on how researchers use institutional repository platforms to disseminate and preserve the diverse forms of knowledge from community-based research projects is sparse. However, a few works do raise their potential. As Lynch (2003) described decades ago, these platforms represent a means through which scholars can share knowledge in innovative and creative ways to advance teaching, learning, and communicating scholarship while recognizing universities' responsibility as stewards of scholarship shared with and for the public. Furthermore, he argued that the preservation offered by repositories provides legitimacy, contributing these works to the scholarly record and ensuring their importance in later scholarship. He also predicted that future repositories containing community works "may in fact be another case of a concept developed within higher education moving more broadly into our society" (p. 336). More recently, a few articles have explored this move towards hosting community-based research products in institutional repositories, substantiating many of Lynch's prognostications. For instance, both Moore et al. (2020) and Makula (2019) discuss examples of libraries working with other units on campus to collect content arising from community-university partnerships, including, for instance, information bulletins, oral histories, audio of poetry readings, non-profit reports, and photographic exhibits. Jointly, these works suggest that institutional repositories should become more adaptable and flexible within their local contexts and act as a bridge between the university and the outside world, thus helping to ensure the permanence of these works and their ability to contribute to public discourse.

A further contribution to emerging discussions about the role of institutional repositories is a recent study by Bradley (2021), which explored the dissemination venues used by 24 community-based research units at Canadian universities to share research products from 525 projects. Roughly one-third of these materials, most of which were reports, were available in institutional repositories, with another third available on unit websites. Several other works were made public through third-party or standalone project websites. While demonstrating the frequent public sharing of these outputs, this study also illustrates inconsistent dissemination practices that could impact discovery and long-term access to much of this content. Overall, the literature related here raises

considerations about institutional repositories' role in community-based research practices. It also raises questions about how these services could be more broadly promoted, and potentially adjusted, to serve those engaged in conducting community-based research.

Outreach Strategies for Institutional Repository Services

As the previous discussions demonstrate, making community-based research products openly available in institutional repositories may not always be an ethical and appropriate practice. However, it is an underutilized option for the many projects that do disseminate their results to the public (Bradley, 2021; Chen et al., 2010). Institutional repositories can provide these works with several potential benefits, including long-term digital preservation, stable hyperlinks, broader discovery through search engines, and the ability to track usage metrics to help assess and communicate impact in applications for funding, tenure, and promotion. For this to happen, however, community-based research teams must know about these options when considering dissemination strategies.

Several recent studies acknowledge that there is an overall lack of awareness of institutional repository services among university faculty members working in North American universities (see for instance Doro, 2021; Lambaria, 2020; Tmava, 2022). Much of this work recommends common strategies such as creating greater awareness about the purpose of these services through workshops and direct communications to faculty, highlighting benefits relevant to those in specific disciplines and local contexts, addressing copyright concerns, and making deposit processes easier. Specific to community-based research projects, Makula (2019) suggests seeking out existing relationships between the community and the institution, meeting with those involved to learn about their projects, and then, if appropriate, working with them to develop processes for collecting, sharing, and promoting this material in the repository. Qualitative research drawing directly from the experiences, perspectives, and motivations of those engaged in community-based research on university campuses and those involved in the provision of repository services is a noticeable research gap that can provide further insight into how to bridge these two areas and more fully realize the potential that repositories hold for the dissemination and preservation of community-based research products.

Methodology

The researcher adopted a multimethod approach that employed a convergent design, meaning different methods were used concurrently to gather and analyze data prior to the interpretation of findings (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011), to better understand current and potential synergies between those working on and supporting community-based research projects and librarians engaged in providing scholarly communications services. This approach included conducting semi-structured interviews with faculty members involved in community-university research partnerships and collaborations, university administrators supporting these activities, and a survey of librarians.

Semi-structured interviews aimed to understand participants' subjective experiences, perspectives, and needs. Interviews included a mix of closed- and open-ended questions that allowed the researcher to obtain consistent and comparative data while also being able to probe more deeply when participants raised relevant points. Interview questions concerned faculty members' and administrators' thoughts on dissemination and knowledge mobilization strategies and their perspectives on relevant university and library services (see Appendix A: Interview Schedule – Researchers; Appendix B: Interview Schedule – Administrators).

The survey aimed to reach a large population of scholarly communications librarians to gather supplementary insight into how academic libraries support community-based researchers and whether this is a priority. Survey questions posed to librarians included open- and closed-ended exploratory questions seeking to gain a better understanding of existing efforts to support community-based research, perspectives on ways to expand these activities, and whether this was a priority (see Appendix C: Survey Questions – Librarians).

Participant Recruitment

Research participants were selected based on predetermined criteria using purposive sampling, a non-probabilistic technique for identifying a representative cross-section of the population in roles relevant to the exploratory objectives of this study (Battaglia, 2008). Participants were identified by searching professional profiles on 46 English-language, publicly funded Canadian university websites manually compiled by the researcher. Only institutions with scholarly communications librarians and services, including an institutional repository service, were included in this sample. Faculty members selected for interviews included people working in tenured or tenure-track roles at these institutions who had engaged in the public dissemination of works arising from a community partnership in the past five years (since 2017, roughly). University administrators invited to participate held positions supporting community-university research at the universities sampled; this included a range of directors, managers, and coordinators of community-based and community-engaged research centres and offices. Librarians held roles supporting scholarly communications at these universities, including publishing support and institutional repository services.

Data Collection and Analysis

Data collection occurred between November 2022 and February 2023. After obtaining research ethics approval, the researcher emailed 43 faculty members and 20 university administrators, inviting them to participate in interviews of no more than 60 minutes by phone or Zoom based on their preference. These invitations resulted in 17 interviews with faculty and six with administrators. Most of the faculty agreeing to interviews identified as women of white European ancestry who work in disciplinary areas of community health and social sciences at universities across Canada, including British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Ontario, New Brunswick, and Nova Scotia. Table 1 summarizes their professional titles at the time of being interviewed and the types of institutions where they work. Administrators who agreed to participate reflected similar

demographics; additional details are being withheld to protect participant identities given the small population size.

Table 1

Attributes of interviewed faculty members (n = 17)

Professional Title	*n*	Percentage
Assistant Professor	8	41%
Associate Professor	5	35%
Full Professor	4	24%

Type of institution of employment	*n*	Percentage
Primarily undergraduate institution	6	35%
Comprehensive institution (offers a mix of graduate and undergraduate programs)	6	35%
Medical/doctoral institution (research-intensive with PhD programs, medical school)	5	29%

Seventy librarians with responsibilities in scholarly communications received the survey accompanying this study by email using the Qualtrics Survey Tool. Responses were collected from November 15 - December 15, 2022. While the response rate was low, 23% (N = 16), this survey was not intended to be representative but exploratory, and the responses received rendered valuable insights towards this study. Respondents mostly identified as female and of white European descent working primarily in medical/ doctoral (n = 8) and comprehensive universities (n = 7), with one working at a primarily undergraduate institution. Years of experience working in areas relevant to scholarly communications ranged from one to five (n = 5), five to ten (n=9), and ten to twenty (n = 2). Sixty-nine percent (n = 11) reported that institutional repository services were included in their job duties alongside other relevant areas of scholarly communications (see Table 2).

Table 2

Areas of scholarly communications included in librarians' job responsibilities (N = 16)

Job Responsibility	*n*	Percentage
Institutional repository services	11	69%
Data repository services	6	38%
Copyright services	4	25%
Providing guidance on publishing options	13	81%
Providing guidance on knowledge mobilization	9	56%
Providing guidance on usage metrics and impact	9	56%

After completing interviews with 23 faculty members and university administrators in total, responses reached data saturation, revealing several common issues and perspectives raised by participants. The researcher transcribed interview recordings and deidentified the data of participants wishing to remain anonymous. Each interviewee had at least two weeks to review their transcript and make any necessary adjustments. Interview transcripts and survey responses were then uploaded to NVivo data analysis software. Thematic analysis of this data involved inductive coding, applying descriptive and in vivo codes to each data set separately, and then subsuming these into broader codes that were further grouped into general categories. This process revealed common themes and insights shared by participants, leading to a better understanding of the role institutional repositories currently play, and could play, in disseminating and preserving community-based research products. Quotes from interviews shared in this article are attributed to pseudonyms, while survey participants are unnamed since their responses were aggregated, with any identifying information removed.

Results and Discussion

A Diversity of Ephemeral Riches

The faculty members who participated in this study reported producing a wide range of public-facing online research products created with and for their community partners. The intentions behind making these works public ranged from wanting to inform public policy, strengthen funding proposals with available evidence, support community members' goals, foster connections within the community, and advance social change. Faculty mentioned articles, reports, and plain language summaries as their most common method of dissemination. Creative mediums included videos, photos of physical art pieces, digital stories combining multimedia elements, and photovoice exhibits where individuals share photos alongside written narratives in response to a research question. Faculty also mentioned working with community partners to run webinars, participate in podcasts, and contribute to creating infographics.

At the outset of a project and throughout its duration, community partners were almost always directly engaged in decision-making processes around how these works would be shared, guided by research ethics guidelines, the needs of the community, and, when working with Indigenous communities, First Nations principles of ownership, control, access, and possession, or OCAP (First Nations Information Governance Centre, 2023). Most research products made available to the public online were shared through social media platforms, at community events, on standalone websites created and maintained by the research team, or on community partners' websites.

Decisions about disseminating online materials reflected a commitment to making works available immediately to a broad audience. Still, they did not typically include considerations around long-term digital preservation, being able to collect usage metrics, or providing users with descriptive metadata or copyright and reuse information. Apart from peer-reviewed research articles arising from these projects, at no point did any faculty talk about considering depositing any of the community-based research products they had produced in their university's institutional repository, and only a few participants shared experiences of placing their works in any other repository or archive that would provide users with sustained access. While several participants noted that librarians routinely contacted them requesting copies of their scholarly articles, they did not request other types of research. "That's something I have never really thought about" and "that's never been presented to me as an option" were sentiments heard repeatedly from faculty member participants.

Perceived Benefits and Drawbacks of Institutional Repository Services

Most responses from those interviewed reflected a combination of optimism and hesitation when asked whether they would consider depositing their community-based research products in an institutional repository. Their optimism was shaped by the perceived benefits that a repository could bring in terms of extending the lifespan, reach, and impact of their work. On a practical level, a few faculty shared their frustration when community-based research products created by others were either not made available online or were posted to the Internet only to disappear later. As one faculty member, Stacey, remarked, "If I had a dollar for every single time I said to someone, 'Well, where's that report?'" Similarly, an administrator, Anna, reflected, "I honestly, really worry about the future access of information… there's all this really good work that's being done in community that so often is never even put on a website." To that end, she and others reflected on how the limited availability of these works can lead to duplication of effort and a misuse of resources, with university researchers approaching the same community groups for information or inviting them to engage in projects that may already be underway or that have already taken place. Several interviewees raised a related problem: not prioritizing the creation of a historical record of these projects, particularly those involving underprivileged and marginalized communities, makes it difficult for researchers to learn from those who came before them. As one administrator, Joan, put it:

> People will need and deserve to see how it went, or where it came from, or what others have done. I mean, I've learned so much by just looking at how other

people carry out their lives and work, so why would we not want to keep the breadcrumbs for other people to look at and learn from? And I also think, in the spirit of critique, they're going to see what we did that we actually had no clue about, or they're going to see where harms were done that we're not aware of at this point.

Along with recognizing the value of access to research and digital preservation that institutional repositories can provide, a few faculty reflected on how usage and citation metrics affiliated with their works would be helpful when reporting research impact in tenure and promotion applications. Others noted that such metrics could also be helpful to community partners seeking to demonstrate the impact of their research to stakeholders and funders. One administrator, Nathan, discovered that community partners he engaged with had accessed information previously deposited in his university's institutional repository, noting that it contained valuable local knowledge not published elsewhere that was useful to them when working on grants and reports.

While administrators and most faculty members saw the value in depositing a range of works from community-based research projects in institutional repositories, some faculty expressed hesitation. Some had a perception that institutional repositories only made their content available to others within their institutions and would, therefore, not have any value to the broader community, signaling a failure on librarians' part to promote these platforms as supporting open access to research and the discovery of content online. Others pointed out that institutional repository platforms are not user-friendly interfaces their community partners would want to engage with. A few interviewees also reflected on how they had partnered with university services in the past, albeit not libraries, to host their work only to find that it was later taken down without notice, leaving them with a preference to maintain their own websites. The faculty member named Stacey also spoke directly about not wanting to share aspects of the community-based research projects she was involved in because "First Nations data has been used against people," serving as a reminder that open access platforms are not always an appropriate venue for sharing research.

Several faculty members explained that finding time to prioritize making things available in an institutional repository was one of their main barriers. As a faculty member named Jean explained,

> There's so many things we have to do. It all gets downloaded onto us, and universities are trying to work on a shoestring. Like honestly, this sounds like one more thing I have to do. And like, we're all exhausted, we're all tapped out. I spend hours fighting with the university to let me do my work. The idea of learning what institutional repository policies are and how to make them work for me is exhausting. I'm just like, "Yep… nope, I don't have time or space for that."

It's important to note that a few of the librarians surveyed as part of this research shared similar concerns. Some librarians reported having experiences liaising with faculty members engaged in community-based research. However, these interactions were

typically few and far between due to other priorities and limited time and resources. As one librarian shared:

> The one concern I have about doing this work is that in an era of austerity and shrinking budgets, it's always risky to start doing more/different work as it usually requires giving something else up. Given that academic libraries' primary user group is students, we'd have to think carefully about what supporting CBR [community-based research] might look like and how that might disadvantage our core group of users.

While some librarians expressed concerns about scope creep and limited resources, many others expressed that there was value in prioritizing outreach to faculty members who do community-based research and making more of their works available in institutional repositories. In total, 81% of those surveyed confirmed that they were interested in supporting this work as part of their role. Reasons given included: leveraging institutional commitments to community engagement and the library's responsibility to support the work of all researchers on their campus; being able to put non-traditional and creative works "on the record" to inform future scholarship and demonstrate research impact; and supporting the direct and meaningful social impact this work can have. As one librarian respondent expressed while reflecting on the value of making a diversity of research outputs more openly available to others,

> Providing support to these kinds of projects will help ensure that the outputs are available over time to both community members and to researchers building on this work in the future. I don't think that we should treat them as separate or "other" when compared to traditional research. We should just find ways to account for them within a broader understanding of what constitutes "research."

Given that institutional repository services operate to serve entire campuses of students and faculty, often with limitations on time and staffing expressed by survey respondents, it is essential to consider ways to promote and offer these services that can have the greatest possible return on investment. Hearing from faculty members engaged in community-based research and administrators supporting their work can help librarians determine ways to prioritize different outreach strategies.

Outreach Strategies

Academic libraries tend to rely on practical outreach activities that can reach many users at once, including newsletters and one-size-fits-all workshops. Overwhelmingly, the faculty members and university administrators who participated in this study expressed that they did not pay much attention to newsletters received by email, nor did they have time to attend workshops; those who did attend such sessions found that they did not meet their specific needs and they did not find that it was a good use of their time. Instead, they offered a range of other strategies for librarians to consider to encourage faculty to deposit community-based research products in institutional repositories.

Mediated deposit

Several faculty members said they would need regular prompting to deposit their community-based research products in the institutional repository and assistance with the deposits. A few faculty noted that their repositories regularly request their peer-reviewed journal articles and provide mediated services to deposit open access versions of these works on their behalf. Librarians could extend these services to collect and deposit other forms of research, with specific requests going out to faculty identified as engaged in community-based research. Administrators expressed the same desire for such a service, given that many community-based research centres and units produce research products of their own.

Direct outreach

Many faculty members in this study had little to no direct contact with librarians at their institutions. As one newer faculty member, Rachel, explained, "Especially when folks come in, it would be great to have someone from the library reach out and just share what's available." Another faculty member, Jackie, shared, "I would love my own person to talk to… who would look at my context, because always if there's a webinar for everybody, I have to figure out what they're saying and how I apply within that." Most academic libraries across Canada have subject librarians designated to work directly with faculty in academic departments in this manner, but the comments expressed here indicate that librarians in such roles could potentially be doing more to promote repository services to the faculty they liaise with while also working with librarians who oversee institutional repository services to help ensure that these services are meeting the needs of the faculty in their areas. The same could be said for administrators, several of whom expressed an interest in having a librarian assigned to their centre or unit to liaise with them more directly and regularly about ways that the library could support their work.

Department meetings

Nearly everyone interviewed for this study said attending faculty department meetings was the best way to promote library services. While this could be a time-consuming endeavour for a single librarian managing an institutional repository service, it reveals another way that those engaged with these services could collaborate more closely with subject librarians who often do attend and present at these meetings for the areas they liaise with.

Communities of practice

While workshops were not a popular option among faculty members, a few expressed a desire for their universities to offer a community of practice for community-based researchers that the library could organize or participate in. This would allow the faculty to network and learn from others engaged in community-based research on their campuses, share their practice and experiences, and contribute locally to advancing this area of scholarship. Such meetups could provide a forum for librarians to share

information about relevant services, including institutional repository services, while developing two-way relationships with faculty and learning more about their wants and needs alongside those of their community partners.

Faculty-librarian collaborations

Several faculty members noted how helpful it would be to engage with a librarian at the beginning of a research project to plan dissemination strategies, while others expressed an interest in bringing a librarian on board as part of a research team. In these instances, faculty acknowledged librarians' expertise in understanding effective knowledge mobilization and dissemination practices, as well as the role many have as faculty researchers themselves. While this suggestion may not be practical or possible in every instance, it is something to consider for academic librarians who have expertise in scholarly communications and who are looking to expand their research programs in collaboration with faculty on their campuses.

Share and discuss evolving discovery and preservation options

During interviews, a few faculty members said they would like one platform where they could easily share and locate both scholarly and non-scholarly materials arising from community-based research projects to inform and advance their research. Work towards more interconnected, "next generation" repository infrastructure could serve this need through aggregated discovery of content—see, for instance, the work of the Confederation of Open Access Repositories (https://coar-repositories.org) who have made it their mission to support collaboration among a global network of repositories, and Scholaris (https://scholaris.ca), a Canadian shared repository service with plans to eventually create a discovery layer for its hosted content. Across Canada, librarians involved in these initiatives have a role to play to ensure these platforms prioritize the preservation and discovery of non-traditional scholarship of enduring value generated by those on their campuses alongside more common peer-reviewed, academic works.

Similarly, a few faculty suggested that libraries create separate repositories dedicated to community-based research in specific regions to attract, showcase, and preserve these works. The Downtown Eastside Research Access Portal (https://dtesresearchaccess.ubc.ca), developed as part of the Making Research Accessible initiative at the University of British Columbia, presents a valuable case study for achieving this. This online portal provides the public with a searchable database of research products created with and for the local community, and many of these works are also deposited in the university's institutional repository (McCauley & Towle, 2022; O'Brien et al., 2022; University of British Columbia, 2020). Institutions wishing to develop similar approaches that have the resources to do so have an opportunity to shape the creation of user-friendly research portals with and for community alongside their existing repository services.

An additional, practical, and easily implemented option for sharing community-based research products, similarly pointed out by Bradley (2021), is for librarians to encourage those engaged in community-based research on their campuses to deposit their works

in institutional repositories and then link to these works or embed them on the existing websites and social media platforms where they are often already being shared and showcased. This way, work is shared in the online spaces where researchers and community members are already engaging while still benefitting from the long-term preservation, permanent links, descriptive metadata, usage metrics, and amplified discovery of content through Internet search engines and evolving aggregated platforms that institutional repositories can provide now and into the future.

Limitations and Areas for Future Research

The limitations of this study point towards areas for future research. Several additional perspectives could provide insight into what academic libraries' roles are and could be in the future to support researchers in disseminating and preserving community-based research products. The perspectives of community partners and how they see the use of institutional repositories as beneficial or problematic to the intended outcomes of the projects they work on alongside faculty members are of foremost importance. While the faculty members and administrators who participated in this study surmised that institutional repositories could provide their partners with opportunities to demonstrate impact to stakeholders and funders while also reaching a broader audience, further investigation is needed to understand how to promote and shape these services in ways that are most useful to those community partners engaged in this work. Additionally, a few academic libraries in Canada have created librarian positions focused on supporting community engagement on their campuses. How do individuals in these roles, alongside subject librarians, see themselves supporting institutional repository outreach efforts with their scholarly communications colleagues?

Given the low response rate to the survey used in this study, future research should also focus on learning more about the perspectives and practices of scholarly communications librarians, especially as community engagement continues to grow on university campuses alongside the publishing, repository, and digital preservation services they commonly oversee. This study also indicated that more work could be done to explore researcher and librarian perspectives on depositing data from community-based research projects in data repositories. Despite recent efforts by funding agencies to require research data management practices that prioritize data preservation, including the Tri-Agency in Canada (Government of Canada, 2021), this topic was not on the radar of many of those interviewed in this study. There is also much that academic librarians can learn from public libraries that work with community partners to make primary source materials created by the community available to the public, as well as from local archives, many of which have a long history of archiving and exhibiting these works.

Conclusion

The Association of Research Libraries recently released a report discussing ways academic libraries can accelerate the social impact of research, focusing on open science and community engagement (Ruttenberg et al., 2022). In it, the authors note:

As educators and stewards of the scholarly and scientific record, research libraries have a significant interest in accelerating open research and scholarship within their institutions, and are ideally situated to support the institutional mission to serve the public and their communities. (p. 2)

This report does not explicitly detail how academic libraries can support disseminating and preserving community-based research products in institutional repositories. However, it does reveal a growing recognition of the shared aims of many librarians and researchers, which are to democratize knowledge and make research products more openly available to benefit both scholarly and community impact. This is particularly salient concerning the perspectives shared by faculty members and university administrators involved in this study. Most expressed the importance of sharing community-based research products openly online, when appropriate, to extend the reach and potential impact of this work to benefit their community partners, their own scholarship, other researchers, and the public more generally. Yet most also revealed that common dissemination strategies employed by community-based research teams often fail to consider ways to ensure long-term digital preservation, means of enhancing discovery of online content, and ways to track usage and engagement. At the conclusion of several interviews, participants said they would be contacting their librarians to discuss how their individual institutions' repository services might help provide value to their current practices.

Over the course of conducting research for this article, it was clear that shaping and promoting institutional repository services to help extend the reach and potential impact of the diversity of works arising from community-based research projects is not a significant focus in Canada or elsewhere. Academic libraries have a key role to play in fostering community engagement initiatives on their campuses by ensuring long-term access to the wealth of information coming out of community-based research projects, and this is an area where libraries can demonstrate their value in supporting research that directly impacts the communities that universities serve. Extending institutional repository services would not require an upheaval of existing services. Most libraries already have staff expertise and digital infrastructure to host community-based research products alongside other forms of research. Moreso, academic libraries need to rethink and reimagine their priorities and outreach strategies to engage more with community-based researchers on their campuses to ensure that these researchers are aware of these services and understand their benefits while at the same time developing processes to allow them to deposit works, where appropriate, as easily as possible.

References

Abbott, S. W., & Tiffen, B. (2019). Democratising the knowledge commons: The shared goals of open and community-engaged scholarship. *Gateways: International Journal of Community Research and Engagement*, *12*(2), 1–18.

Battaglia, M. P. (2008). Purposive sample. In P. J. Lavrakas (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of survey research methods* (p. 645). Sage Publications.

Baldwin, P. (2023). *Athena unbound: Why and how scholarly knowledge should be free for all*. MIT Press.

Beaulieu, M., Breton, M., & Brousselle, A. (2018). Conceptualizing 20 years of engaged scholarship: A scoping review. *PLoS ONE*, *13*(2), 1-17.

Bok, D. C. (1982). *Beyond the ivory tower: Social responsibilities of the modern university*. Harvard University Press.

Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Jossey-Bass.

Boyer, E. L. (1996). The scholarship of engagement. *Bulletin of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences*, *49*(7), 18–33.

Bradley, C. (2021). The role of institutional repositories in the dissemination and impact of community-based research. *Evidence Based Library and Information Practice*, *16*(3), 18–31.

Calleson, D. C., Jordan, C., & Seifer, S. D. (2005). Community-engaged scholarship: Is faculty work in communities a true academic enterprise? *Academic Medicine*, *80*(4), 317–321.

Chakravartty, P., Kuo, R., Grubbs, V., & McIlwain, C. (2018). #CommunicationSoWhite. *Journal of Communication*, *68*(2), 254–266.

Chan, L., Hall, B., Piron, F., Tandon, R., & Williams, L. (2020). *Open science beyond open access: For and with communities, a step towards the decolonization of knowledge*. The Canadian Commission for UNESCO.

Chen, P. G., Diaz, N., Lucas, G., & Rosenthal, M. S. (2010). Dissemination of results in community-based participatory research. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, *39*(4), 372–378.

Coalter, J. H. (2023). Citation power: Overcoming marginalization one citation at a time. In N. S. Mani, M. A. Cawley, & E. P. Jones (Eds.), *Perspectives on justice, equity, diversity, and inclusion in libraries* (pp. 62–77). IGI Global.

Community-Based Research Canada. (2024). *Institutional members*. CBRCanada.

Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2011). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications.

De Forest, H. (2023). *Community Scholars Program*. Simon Fraser University Library.

Doro, N. (2021). "The IR is a nice thing but...": Attitudes and perceptions of the institutional repository. *Canadian Journal of Academic Librarianship*, *7*, 1–30.

Elliott, P. W. (2017). Claiming space for square pegs: Community-engaged communication scholarship and faculty assessment policies. *Canadian Journal of Communication*, *42*(1), 19–32.

Etmanski, C., Dawson, T., & Hall, B. L. (2014). Introduction. In C. Etmanski, B. L. Hall, & T. Dawson (Eds.), *Learning and teaching community-based research: Linking pedagogy to practice* (pp. 3–24). University of Toronto Press.

First Nations Information Governance Centre. (2023). *The First Nations principles of OCAP*. The First Nations Information Governance Centre.

Fitzgerald, H. E., Burack, C., & Seifer, S. D. (Eds.). (2010). *Handbook of engaged scholarship: Contemporary landscapes, future directions: Vol. 1: Institutional Change*. Michigan State University Press.

Gaudry, A. J. P. (2011). Insurgent research. *Wicazo Sa Review*, *26*(1), 113–136.

Hall, B. L. (2009). Higher education, community engagement, and the public good: Building the future of continuing education in Canada. *Canadian Journal of University Continuing Education*, *35*(1), 11-23.

Hall, B. L., & Tandon, R. (2017). Decolonization of knowledge, epistemicide, participatory research and higher education. *Research for All*, *1*(1), 6–19.

Janzen, R., Ochocka, J., & Stobbe, A. (2016). Towards a theory of change for community-based research projects. *Engaged Scholar Journal: Community-Engaged Research, Teaching, and Learning*, *2*(2), 44-64.

Jordan, C. (2010). Redefining peer review and products of engaged scholarship. In H. E. Fitzgerald, C. Burack, & S. D. Seifer (Eds.), *Handbook of engaged scholarship: Contemporary landscapes, future directions: Vol. 1: Institutional change* (pp. 295–306). Michigan State University Press.

Jordan, C., Seifer, S. D., Gelmon, S. B., Ryan, K., & McGinley, P. (2011). CES4Health.info: An online tool for peer reviewed publication and dissemination of diverse products of community-engaged scholarship. *Progress in Community Health Partnerships: Research, Education, and Action*, *5*(2), 189–199.

Katwyk, T. V., & Case, R. A. (2016). From suspicion and accommodation to structural transformation: Enhanced scholarship through enhanced community-university

relations. *Engaged Scholar Journal: Community-Engaged Research, Teaching, and Learning*, *2*(2), 25-43.

Koster, R., Baccar, K., & Lemelin, R. H. (2012). Moving from research ON, to research WITH and FOR Indigenous communities: A critical reflection on community-based participatory research. *The Canadian Geographer*, *56*(2), 195–210.

Lambaria, K. (2020). Considering creative activity in institutional repositories: An exploration of faculty perceptions. *Journal of Librarianship and Scholarly Communication*, *8*(1), 1-20.

Library Publishing Coalition Research Committee. (2020). *Library publishing research agenda.* Educopia Institute.

Lynch, C. A. (2003). Institutional repositories: Essential infrastructure for scholarship in the digital age. *Portal: Libraries and the Academy*, *3*(2), 327–336.

Makula, A. Y. (2019). "Institutional" repositories, redefined: Reflecting institutional commitments to community engagement. *Against the Grain*, *31*(5), 40–41.

McCauley, A., & Towle, A. (2022). The making research accessible initiative: A case study in community engagement and collaboration. *Partnership: The Canadian Journal of Library and Information Practice and Research*, *17*(1), 1-31.

McKiernan, E. C., Bourne, P. E., Brown, C. T., Buck, S., Kenall, A., Lin, J., McDougall, D., Nosek, B. A., Ram, K., Soderberg, C. K., Spies, J. R., Thaney, K., Updegrove, A., Woo, K. H., & Yarkoni, T. (2016). How open science helps researchers succeed. *ELife*, *5*, 1-19.

Moore, E. A., Collins, V. M., & Johnston, L. R. (2020). Institutional repositories for public engagement: Creating a common good model for an engaged campus. *Journal of Library Outreach and Engagement*, *1*(1), 116–129.

O'Brien, H. L., Forest, H. D., McCauley, A., Sinammon, L. S., & Smythe, S. (2022). Reconfiguring knowledge ecosystems: Librarians and adult literacy educators in knowledge exchange work. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, *26*(2), 29-46.

O'Meara, K. (2010). Rewarding multiple forms of scholarship: Promotion and tenure. In H. E. Fitzgerald, C. Burack, & S. D. Seifer (Eds.), *Handbook of engaged scholarship: Contemporary landscapes, future directions: Vol. 1: Institutional change* (pp. 271–294). Michigan State University Press.

Ruttenberg, J., Taylor, S., Vandegrift, M., & Hudson Vitale, C. (2022). *Accelerating social impact research: Libraries at the intersection of openness and community-engaged scholarship*. Association of Research Libraries.

Simon Fraser University. (n.d.). *About the Canadian pilot cohort*.

Strand, K. J., Cutforth, N., Stoecker, R., Marullo, S., & Donohue, P. (2003). *Community-based research and higher education: Principles and practices*. Jossey-Bass.

Suber, P. (2012). *Open access*. MIT Press.

Tmava, A. M. (2022). Faculty perceptions of open access repositories: A qualitative analysis. *New Review of Academic Librarianship*, *29*(2), 123–151.

Tuck, E., & Yang, K. W. (2014). R-words: Refusing research. In D. Paris & M. T. Winn (Eds.), *Humanizing research: Decolonizing qualitative inquiry with youth and communities* (pp. 223–248). Sage Publications.

University of British Columbia. (2020). Downtown Eastside Research Access Portal (DTES RAP) Collection Curatorial Statement.

Appendix A: Interview Schedule – Researchers

Dissemination/Knowledge Mobilization Strategies

1. Do you consider your research with community members *community-based research,* or is there another term that better describes your approach? How do you personally define this term?

2. Focusing on the last 5-6 years, how have you shared research results with community? What formats has it taken?

    a. Did you involve community partners in deciding upon dissemination venues? If so, how?

    b. Did the intended audience engage with this work in meaningful ways? How do you assess that kind of impact?

3. The following questions apply to non-traditional research outputs shared online, if applicable.

    a. *Copyright:* What sorts of copyright statements, if any, were placed on the works that you disseminated online? How was this decided?

    b. *Digital preservation:* Were any steps taken to ensure this work will remain online for future use by others?

        i. In your opinion, does long-term digital preservation of this work matter?

    c. *Metrics:* Have you collected usage data for this work (i.e., view and download counts)?

        i. Do you consider this type of data useful? Why or why not?

4. What advice would you give an early career researcher doing community-based/engaged research who wants to communicate the positive impacts of non-traditional research outputs when applying for tenure or promotion?

University/Library Services Experience and Perspectives

5. To your knowledge, what services and supports are available on your campus to support faculty conducting research with community?

6. What experience do you have engaging with academic library services for help with community-based/engaged research?

Probe: Have you approached a librarian for assistance with copyright, knowledge mobilization strategies, repositories, digital preservation, data sharing?

7. Are there ways that your institution, including the library and librarians, could do more to support faculty engaged in community-based/engaged research?

8. Are there ways that your institution, including the library and librarians, could do more to support community partners engaged in community-based/engaged research?

9. Do you have any advice on strategies that could be used to promote relevant library services and supports?

Student Engagement

10. If applicable, tell me how you have involved students in research with community.

    a. How, if at all, have these initiatives involved the library or librarians?

11. Are there ways that your institution, including the library and librarians, could do more to support students engaged in community-based/engaged research?

Professional & Demographic Information

- Professional rank & title:

- Academic discipline: Community Health / Social Sciences / Environmental Studies / Social Work / Urban Planning / Cultural Studies / Other / N/A

- Years in current position:

- Age (approx.):

- To which gender identity do you most identify?

- How would you best describe your ethnic background?

Appendix B: Interview Schedule – Administrators

Institutional Support for Community-Based Research

1. How do you define community-based research in your own words?

Alternate question depending on administrative focus: How do you differentiate between community-*based* research and community-*engaged* research or scholarship?

2. Do you perceive that community-based/engaged research is a priority at the institution where you work?

3. Briefly, tell me about your role and the services your centre/office offers faculty and students conducting research with community.

4. To the best of your knowledge, what services are available to community-based/engaged researchers through your university's library?

   a. Has your area ever collaborated with the library?

   b. Are there ways you could collaborate with the library but haven't?

      Probe: Have you worked with them to archive or share resources? Is that a priority?

5. In your opinion, are the services and supports at your institution meeting the needs of researchers and students working in this area?

   a. How could services be improved?

6. Are there ways that the library and librarians at your institution could do more to support faculty and students engaged in community-based/engaged research?

   a. Are there ways that the library could do more to support community partners?

   b. Do you have any advice on strategies that could be used to promote library services that support community-based/engaged research at your institution?

Dissemination/Knowledge Mobilization Strategies

7. What general tips and advice would you give a faculty member strategizing how they will disseminate findings from a research project with a community partner?

8. What advice would you give an early career researcher doing community-based/engaged research who wants to communicate the impacts of non-traditional research outputs when applying for tenure or promotion?

9. Does your centre/office track any metrics to help articulate the impact (or ongoing successes) of projects you support?

10. Do you think ensuring the long-term digital preservation of non-traditional research outputs resulting from community-based/engaged research co-authored/created by faculty, community, and students is important? Why or why not?

Professional & Demographic Information

- Professional title:

- Years in current position:

- Age (approx.):

- To which gender identity do you most identify?

- How would you best describe your ethnic background?

Appendix C: Survey Questions – Librarians

1. How do you identify in terms of gender? *

    o Female

    o Male

    o Transgender female

    o Transgender male

    o Gender non-conforming

    o Not listed

    o Prefer not to say

2. Which of the following best describes your ethnic background? Check all that apply. *

    □ Arab (Saudi Arabian, Palestinian, Iraqi, etc.)

    □ Black/African/Caribbean

    □ Indigenous (Inuit/First Nations/Métis)

    □ Latin American (Costa Rican, Guatemalan, Brazilian, Colombian, etc.)

- ☐ South Asian (East Indian, Sri Lankan, etc.)

- ☐ Southeast Asian (e.g., Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Vietnamese, Cambodian, Filipino, etc.)

- ☐ West Asian (Iranian, Afghani, etc.)

- ☐ White/European

- ☐ Prefer not to say

- ☐ Other (please specify):

3. Describe the type of institution where you work: *

- ○ Medical Doctoral University (research-intensive with PhD programs, medical school)

- ○ Comprehensive University (offers a mix of graduate and undergraduate programs)

- ○ Primarily Undergraduate University

- ○ Prefer not to say

- ○ Other (please specify):

4. Which areas related to scholarly communications are included in your job responsibilities? Check all that apply. *

- ☐ Institutional repository services

- ☐ Data repository services

- ☐ Online hosting and publishing services (e.g., Open Journal Systems, Omeka, Pressbooks)

- ☐ Copyright services

- ☐ Providing guidance on publishing options

- ☐ Providing guidance on knowledge mobilization

- ☐ Providing guidance on usage metrics and impact

- ☐ Prefer not to say

- ☐ Other (please specify):

5. How many years have you worked in a position supporting areas relevant to scholarly communications? *

   o 1-5

   o 5-10

   o 10-20

   o 25+

   o Not applicable

Prior to answering the questions below, review the following terms:

Community-based research: An approach to research driven by a community's needs and actively involves its members in all aspects of the research process. It often results in non-traditional research outputs.

Non-traditional research outputs: Products of research that advance knowledge but are not disseminated through conventional academic publishers and are not necessarily aimed at an academic audience. This includes things like reports, policy briefs, photographic exhibits, and video productions.

6. On a scale of 0 to 100 (100 being "strongly agree"), how much do you agree with the following statements about community-based research:

   o It is important to the vision, mission, and values communicated by leadership at my university. [insert 0-100 slider]

   o The Library provides adequate support to faculty conducting work in this area. [insert 0-100 slider]

   o Other areas of my university (e.g., the research office) provide adequate support to faculty conducting work in this area. [insert 0-100 slider]

   o It is an area I am interested in supporting as part of my professional role. [insert 0-100 slider]

7. To the best of your knowledge, which library services have been accessed by faculty disseminating non-traditional research outputs resulting from community-based research at your institution since 2017?

Options: Accessed | Not accessed/Not sure | Not an available service

   □ Institutional repository services

   □ Data repository services

- ☐ Journal publishing services (e.g., Open Journal Systems)

- ☐ Book publishing services (e.g., Pressbooks)

- ☐ Digital exhibit hosting services (e.g., Omeka)

- ☐ Space in the library for in-person events or exhibits

- ☐ Copyright services

- ☐ Web archiving (e.g., Archive-It)

- ☐ Publishing guidance

- ☐ Knowledge mobilization guidance

- ☐ Help with usage metrics and assessing impact

8. Do you think it is important that academic libraries devote resources to help share and preserve non-traditional research outputs resulting from community-based research? Why or why not?

9. Are there ways that your library and your university could be doing more to support community-based research, including support for faculty, community partners, and students engaged in this work? Please explain.

10. Final question. Is there anything else you would like to share on this topic?