

Notes on ARL E-science Working Group Survey

Note: 52 member libraries provided usable responses. 41 member libraries indicated some e-science support in place or planned at their institutions.

Institution-level activity

- About three quarters of respondents have or are planning infrastructure for e-science support (36% have, 42% planning)
 - Most with or planning for e-science support are using a hybrid of institution-wide efforts and support from individual units (59%). Another 27% are relying on individual units to develop policy and provide infrastructure. Only 10% are primarily acting institution-wide.
 - Institution-wide groups almost always include IT staff, library staff, and faculty and researchers, most include office of research staff too.
 - About half report designated unit or units provide *data curation* support. There aren't any predominating patterns in who is responsible. Often some group or collaboration, often some library role.
- 40% report some institutional assessment of data resources and needs.
- Sole reliance on centralized data centers is rare (only 1 institution). Most use a combination of central and distributed centers (53%) but many (44%) have only distributed data centers.
- Few support digital lab notebook applications (5), but most libraries (58%) were unsure whether such applications are supported or not.

External funding

- Sixteen members reported institutional involvement in an NSF DataNet proposal although a few (3) didn't know. All but one of the respondents whose institutions had been involved reported that the proposal involved the library.
- Thirteen members reported that they were participants on other e-science-related grant applications.

Library-provided support

- Most respondents indicating institutional activity said their library was involved with e-science support (72% of the 36 libraries answering).
- Typically either a group or some combination of a group/department and/or a designated lead individual are responsible. The groups report to AUL-level leaders, staff responsible for digital services programs, or science librarians.
- Most libraries (86%) collaborate with other units to provide support. Partners include campus IT, departments or schools, various institutes and centers, offices of research.
- The service suite usually includes providing help with finding & using available infrastructure, finding relevant data, developing data management plans, and developing tools.
- Most respondents rely on individual discipline librarians or staff (86%) to provide reference/consultation services, but most also have dedicated data librarians (69%).
- Eight members report web sites to provide information and two are planning such sites.
- Eight members report offering training to researchers on data management.
- Slightly more than half of the libraries reporting library services include e-science policy issues in their outreach programs.
- Most (64%) report the library maintains technology infrastructure to support e-science.

Notes on ARL E-science Working Group Survey

- Members are using diverse strategies to develop staff capacities to support e-science.
 - Most are reassigning existing staff (62%)
 - Most have hired (42%) or plan to hire (39%) staff with e-science expertise.
 - A few commented that they are building e-science support responsibilities into liaison roles generally.
 - 62 positions were described:
 - 90% were permanent positions
 - Only 2 positions were graduate students, 2 others were temporary, and 2 were listed as grant-funded.
 - 8% didn't indicate degree state or did it ambiguously. 70% has a library or info sci degree, 10% had only a discipline PhD, 6% had only a disciplinary masters, 6% had only a disciplinary bachelors. 32% had disciplinary degrees. 15% had both library and disciplinary degrees.
 - Nearly all libraries are providing some kind of support for staff to develop skills (89%) with support for staff to attend conferences and meetings being most common (92%), in-house presentations also widely used (60%). Support to take coursework is more limited (25%), but many support staff attendance at off-site training workshops (52%).
 - Seven are working with an I School or other academic program to create curricula providing e-science skills.

Multi-institutional collaborations on e-science support

- About half of respondents are at institutions collaborating with other institutions (46%). Where this is occurring, most involve the library (13 total).

Pressure Points

- A wide range of pressure points were cited. Common categories included: organizational factors, resource limitations, lack of knowledge, collaboration challenges, and changing expectations of research funders.
 - Organizational factors cited included factors at the institutional level or in the institutional environment and library factors. Some of the more frequent kinds of factors cited included low recognition of the importance of e-science support, turf issues, and a lack of structures to effectively address e-science issues.
 - Resource issues cited most frequently were the lack of needed staff and staff with appropriate expertise. Lack of technology infrastructure, constrained budgets, and general resource limitations were also regularly mentioned.

Information Exchange

- There is great interest among the members in participating in information exchange although readiness to contribute is considerably more limited. 90% of respondents want such an exchange, but only 31% of respondents (15) institutions thought they were ready to actively contribute.
- A wide variety of web sites and documents were provided by survey respondents – enough to create a well-stocked resource site.
- Ideas for information exchange included best practices, planning support (documents, environmental scans), discussion of engaging digital humanities, awareness of other organizations' work, and ideas for outreach.