

ERIC Town Hall – Proposed Changes to ERIC’s Peer Review Policy

Speaker Notes and Discussion

Slide 1

Hi everyone. Just letting you know that we’re about to get started.

Slide 2

Good afternoon. My name is Fern Frusti, and I am the ERIC Collection Development Lead. I would like to begin first by thanking you all for taking time out of your busy schedule to join us today to talk about the proposed updates to the ERIC Peer Review Policy.

As we begin, I’d like to take care of a few housekeeping items. We will be muting everyone so we do not get feedback from your phones, but we do want your participation today. We are very interested in receiving your comments and questions that may come to mind during the presentation. To submit them to us, please type in the Chat text box in the right-hand column at any time. If the text box is not open on your screen, click the Chat icon, located in the upper right portion of your screen, to open it. Be sure to send your chat message to “All Panelists” which is the default in the Chat panel.

We will be monitoring your input throughout the webinar and will respond to as many questions as possible at the end of the presentation.

Also, we will be putting up a few polling questions during the webinar, primarily to gain an understanding of our audience and your thoughts about the topics under discussion.

Slide 3

So, to begin, you should be seeing a polling question in the right-hand column along with some optional responses. At any time you can start answering the polling questions. If any of you do not see the poll, would you please send a message through our Chat feature and our technical support representative will help you.

Responding to these questions is completely voluntary. You are not required to submit an answer but, if you do wish to respond, please select the answer and then click the “Submit” button that’s located at the bottom of the polling screen. It is very important that you click “Submit” or we will not receive your answer. The polls are timed to remain active for one minute, so please enter and submit your responses shortly after each polling screen appears.

Slide 4

Lastly, we are recording this session and a few weeks after the Town Hall we will post it as a video on YouTube. We will also post the slides on the ERIC multimedia page and send everyone who registered an email letting them know that the slides and the video are available.

Okay, I’m just checking the polling results. The time limit is up and it looks like we are primarily a group of librarians with some researchers and a few others that have marked “Other.” Thank you very much for participating.

September 15, 2015

Slide 5

Erin Pollard, the Project Officer for ERIC, will be speaking with you shortly.

I am going to begin by reviewing today's agenda and sharing some background information.

Slide 6

Now you should be seeing another polling question. Before reviewing today's agenda, we invite you to answer the polling question about the version of ERIC that you use. Do you use the free version provided at eric.ed.gov or a vendor-provided version? While both versions contain the same records, there are some differences, and so knowing this background will help us to provide the best answers to your questions.

Okay - we are getting the responses in. It looks like we are primarily using vendor-supplied versions. Again, thank you very much for responding to the polling question.

Slide 7

Our meeting today will begin with some background information about the ERIC Peer Review Policy. We'll talk about why we're considering a change at this time, review the proposed policy, and discuss the impact of the change. Then we will share a summary of the feedback that we've received from users since June, and open the floor for your comments and questions.

Just a reminder, we will be monitoring the Chat feature throughout the presentation. You can submit your comments at any time, and then we will review them and discuss them during the Question and Answer time.

Slide 8

The Peer Review Policy is one selection criteria of the ERIC Selection Policy. The Selection Policy states broad collection goals and defines the standards and criteria required for a journal or a center, agency, or individual materials to be indexed in the ERIC digital library.

The current Peer Review Policy states which content can be flagged as peer reviewed and how this status is determined. You can find the complete Selection Policy by using the "Selection Policy" link at the bottom of any ERIC website page, and then click the PDF link to view or download the document.

Slide 9

Since ERIC was founded over 50 years ago, it has been unique in that it indexes both journal articles and grey literature, such as government documents, conference papers, and reports.

Slide 10

ERIC began adding the peer-review indicator to new journal article records and work published by the Institute of Education Sciences in 2004. In 2012, ERIC updated the peer-review indicator on journal records published since 1966. In 2013, we started adding this indicator for grantee funded journal manuscripts.

Over the years, we have made these enhancements to indicate to users what content has gone through a peer-review process. We are proposing to further extend this flag to grey literature sources with a proven peer-review process.

September 15, 2015

I would now like to turn the presentation over to Erin Pollard to talk about why we're considering the change to the policy, and what it will mean to users.

Slide 11

Thanks Fern. So to begin, why are we proposing this change? Let's begin by talking about where we are today. As Fern described, ERIC currently extends the peer-review flag to some types of records and not others. This is creating user confusion. We want to provide the most complete and accurate information possible, so we looked at ways to clarify this.

Slide 12

As Fern mentioned, the publications that IES funds under contract, such as the Condition of Education and reports from the What Works Clearinghouse and the Regional Educational Laboratories, are peer-reviewed through a process managed by IES, and then IES publishes the product.

Slide 13

These documents go through a rigorous peer-review process, as required under law, and are marked as peer reviewed in our collection. Many of these publications go through multiple rounds of peer review. For example, reports published by the Regional Educational Laboratory program, or REL reports, have the initial proposal for each study peer reviewed. Then the authors work with a technical working group of experts in the field as they conduct the study and develop the report. Finally, the final report goes through a rigorous peer-review process with multiple reviewers.

Similarly, evaluation reports also go through a rigorous process. The authors will work with a technical working group as the study is being conducted, and then the final reports will go through a double-blind peer-review process with multiple reviewers.

Slide 14

Additionally, all peer-reviewed work that IES funds under grant is required to be submitted to ERIC. This material is marked as peer reviewed. The majority of these documents are final, peer-reviewed manuscripts of journal articles. So these publications actually go through two layers of peer review. The first is a peer review of the grant application. This is conducted by IES, through the same office that coordinates peer review for contract funded evaluations. The second layer of review happens for the article. This is conducted by the journal according to the journal procedures.

Slide 15

However, there are also a handful of other publications marked as peer reviewed that are not grantee submissions. These are reports that were funded under IES contract and were peer reviewed, as was required by law. However, for a variety of reasons, they were not published by IES. They are high-quality work and work that is of interest to our users. ERIC has marked these documents as peer reviewed as required by our legislative mandate.

While there are only a handful of records like this we expect more in the future, and they do cause confusion. We wanted to update the Selection Policy to reflect why these records contain the peer-reviewed flag.

Slide 16

Additionally, we know there is work published in non-journal sources outside of IES that is also peer reviewed. For example, we have seen conference papers, like this one published by the Australian Teacher Education Association. On the front page of the document it states that the abstract and full paper are blind peer reviewed. We think it is confusing to have a paper like this that clearly identifies itself as peer reviewed, but did not receive the peer-reviewed flag.

Slide 17

Finally, when we look to add new sources to our collection, we give preference to sources that publish peer-reviewed content because we believe that users find great value in these materials. By extending our definition of peer review, we will be able to expand this priority to the highest quality grey literature material that our users most want to use.

Slide 18

Our proposed change would clarify some processes that we already have in place. It would add a definition of what peer-review processes ERIC accepts for the indicator on ERIC records, so users would have a clear expectation of the types of material that they are receiving. ERIC would recognize two types of peer review – blind peer review and expert peer review. We feel like they both have an important place in the review process and would be happy to discuss why in the Q&A session.

Slide 19

We also want to expand this indicator to other approved grey literature sources that have a peer-review process. To be clear, we aren't extending this flag to all grey literature sources, just to those with a peer-review process that meets our criteria. The proposed language makes clear how we would assign peer review to records.

For journals, we would continue to assign peer review at the journal level and apply the flag to all records created for the source. For non-journal materials, we would either assign peer review for all records or for a specific series, such as conference papers.

Slide 20

For content submitted through the Online Submission System, the policy explains the current policy which allows peer-reviewed grantee content to be flagged as peer reviewed. Instead, we propose expanding the policy to all submitted work if the person submitting the content can demonstrate that their manuscript has been peer reviewed. This indicator would only be added if the individual submits a URL to the publisher's page outlining the peer-review process.

Slide 21

To learn more and to read the full proposed policy, please go to the ERIC home page and click "Learn more."

Slide 22

To give a sense of scale -- what will be the impact of these changes? We forecast that initially we may be able to add the peer-review indicator to approximately 100 grey literature records per year. The majority of these will be conference papers and government-funded reports. As our process of identifying sources that produce peer-reviewed content matures, we expect this number to grow.

September 15, 2015

We expect this new policy to have a broader implication. ERIC will continue to build upon its tradition of high-quality grey literature and elevate the status of grey literature in the field. During a review cycle, if we find that a grey literature source has a peer-review process, they would receive the same collection priority as peer-reviewed journals.

Slide 23

So now that we have reviewed the proposed changes, we want to stop for a minute to see what you think. As of today, are you in favor of the change or are you opposed? We'll let you know the results in just a minute.

As a reminder, while we still have time to submit results, please make sure you hit the "Submit" button to lock in your answer. We're not going to be able to move on the screen until people hit the "Submit" button.

As we're waiting for the last couple results to trickle in, right now, it looks like about half of our users are in favor of the proposed change, about a third are not sure, and there's a strong ten percent that are not in favor, and we are really looking forward to hearing your reasons why.

What we're going to do next is share some of the input we received from our call for feedback that went out in early June as a way of framing a robust discussion.

Slide 24

We put a broad call for feedback out in June. In addition, I presented on the proposed changes at the Special Libraries Association, also known as SLA, and the American Library Association, or ALA, annual meetings this summer. The responses we've received have been overwhelmingly positive.

One aspect of note is that we had a diverse group of respondents giving feedback, including education researchers, professors, and academic and other librarians. However, we didn't hear from a very large number of day-to-day users, or users in general. We only heard from 27 individuals in total, and none of those users were students or day-to-day ERIC users.

So we cannot assume that the feedback we heard was representative of everyone's concern. We would like to review the feedback that we have received, and we would like to hear from you today.

Slide 25

To begin, most of the comments submitted to us since June have welcomed the change, and the quotes you see here are fairly representative of what the majority of input said. The first two comments indicate that this is a "welcome policy shift" and "a much-needed change that is long overdue." The third comment provides a specific example of how the policy change will be helpful, citing conference papers as a category of materials that are difficult to assess in terms of quality. This user believes that the peer-review flag would be helpful and useful in helping them identify high-quality conference papers.

Slide 26

Similar to the last comment, here's another comment we received also citing the importance of high-quality conference papers to research. This says:

September 15, 2015

“Most definitely revise the ERIC Peer Review Policy. . . It is very beneficial to my research. Peer reviewed conference papers, specifically those from the American Education Research Association, are very important to fields of inquiry that change quickly. My current example is state academic accountability for schools. State accountability is changing so quickly, I need the most current research available. It is often conference papers. Professional associations like AERA use a rigorous peer review system. Such literature should be considered peer-reviewed.”

However, not everyone has the same feelings. The next comment says, “I’ve seen conference papers, depending on the conference, [that are] very poorly done.” Comments such as this raise concerns about the quality of some conference papers.

Slide 27

This leads us to our next question. And this states: “Would it be helpful to know if a conference paper has been peer reviewed?” We want to know if you agree with this, and if you think it’s helpful for these to be marked peer reviewed, and we’re going to share the results with you momentarily.

Okay, it looks like we heard back from a number of people, and right now eighty-eight percent of the people say yes, it would be helpful. So this is something good to know, that knowing these papers are peer reviewed will be helpful.

To answer a question that came in during the poll, they asked “Did we do any presentations or get feedback from AERA?” We did not, simply because the ERIC team did not attend AERA this year. However, we have reached out to the education research community in a variety of ways and have been in touch with AERA directly about this proposed change, but it was with AERA staff as opposed to a presentation at the annual conference.

Slide 28

To move on, another comment brought up the issue that this would challenge current perceptions that the peer-review process for grey literature is not as rigorous as for journals. This comment says “Whenever I talk to a class about doing research at [my university] I always include a discussion about the peer-review process and try and include the professor in those discussions. Every time the professor, no matter which professor it is, describes grey literature as not being peer reviewed. . . I noticed that the APA’s database of grey literature, PsycEXTRA, removes the “peer reviewed only” option when searching that database. I believe that many grey literature publications are rigorously peer reviewed so ultimately I am in favor of your proposed policy. . . But I do think it will challenge some researcher’s perceptions of what is peer reviewed. Perhaps this is a good thing.”

Slide 29

This leads us to our next question: “Do you believe the peer-review process is different for grey literature than it is for journals?”

While you’re voting, we have heard this feedback a lot through various audiences, and especially for IES published reports. In our experience, the quality of the peer-review process for journals varies quite a bit, as does the quality of the peer-review process for non-journals. After we get the results from the poll, we will discuss this more.

It looks like we have a different poll question up than what is on the slide, so what we’re going to do is we are going to open up a new poll. So let’s close this one. If you haven’t hit “Submit,” please hit

September 15, 2015

“Submit” so we can move on. Okay, so we’re just waiting for the last person to hit “Submit” and then we’re going to move on to the correct poll. Sorry about this.

Okay, so here’s the poll: “Do you believe the peer-review process is different for grey literature than it is for journals?”

And as these responses are coming in, we’re starting to see some really good questions and comments coming in from users. And please continue to submit them. We’re going to just go through a couple other things and then we’re going to open up a discussion, but we think that the questions we’ve gotten so far, hopefully, will start a really good discussion.

It looks like everyone has finished voting, and our responses are interesting. One third of users say that they do believe the process is different, but about two-thirds of users are unsure. So we’ll get more into this in a minute.

Slide 30

We’ve received comments challenging whether grey literature is important enough, or can really be considered high-quality enough, to warrant peer-review status. And this comment struck us – it says: “Why would I care if an organization’s internal report is peer-reviewed? . . . It seems as if [ERIC wants] to promote a subset of this literature as being more valuable. The notion is laudable, but using peer review as the criterion seems dubious.”

There also seems to be some concern that ERIC might flag materials based on type, such as conference papers, reports, etc., rather than on evidence of a peer-review process. That is not what we are proposing to do. The publisher must provide adequate evidence before the indicator would be added to the record.

Slide 31

We also have received suggestions for changing the Online Submission System. The comment we received was, “We may want to change the policy to be that authors revise their work based on peer review. Otherwise it is a low bar and we may get a lot of shlock. Why are we treating grantees and contractors differently than the public in the online submission system?” So the first part of this comment refers to making authors revise their work based on comments from peer review. While this sounds like a good idea, there is no way for ERIC to ensure this. ERIC is not conducting the peer-review process. Additionally, it is possible that an author has an outstanding first draft and that it needs no edits. This would be amazing and something that I have never seen in working with IES publications, or in publishing journals, but it is theoretically possible.

Secondly, it asks why we treat contractors and grantees differently, with the assumption that we are treating them easier than we are treating the general public. The reason for this is that contractors are going through an IES managed review process. We are aware they are meeting a standard considerably higher than the bar set for other non-journal sources, and by putting in their contract number in the Online Submission System we can verify the peer-review process that that article or report went through, that they are meeting the letter of law that their work is peer reviewed. For most of the contract-funded work submitted through the Online Submission System, contractors are required to submit their acceptance to ERIC and an outline of their peer-review process as a condition of payment

for their work. This verification happens, but it is behind the scenes and happens down the hall, outside of ERIC.

For grantees, the system is also different because they work closely with us and our legislation requires them to submit peer-reviewed work to ERIC. When they submit their work to ERIC, they use their grant number to verify that their work was peer reviewed, as is required under law. Then, similarly under contracts, we verify the peer-review process on the back end, outside of the work of ERIC. Our grantees have to submit their ERIC IDs to their grant officers as part of their annual assessment.

Slide 32

Now we're going to move on to the next question, and this should be: "Should reports from organizations that have a peer-review process be flagged peer reviewed?" This gets into the issue of rigor and fairness. We at ERIC may not be familiar with the quality of the peer-review process of that organization. However, it is important to note that ERIC doesn't evaluate how rigorous journal peer-review processes are, this is the same kind of policy.

We've opened up polling here, and if you just want to take a second to vote on that.

Okay, so this is the poll you might have seen earlier and I think many of you may have voted earlier in this one and, in that case, we had a mixed bag of results. What we're going to do is close this poll and move on to the next question.

Slide 33

I know that some of you not only use ERIC but also teach it to others, and we have received some feedback related to student use of ERIC that we would like to share. Most of this input was not that the grey literature content shouldn't be tagged as peer reviewed. Rather there are concerns that users who want to find only peer-reviewed journal articles would have to know that their filtered "peer reviewed only" search will also include grey literature.

This has been a large area of concern. Something that has frequently been suggested is to have a way to only search for peer-reviewed journals. This option is currently available in ERIC by selecting "Peer Reviewed" and then selecting "Journal Articles" as the publication type. And we are exploring an easier way to do this, but there are a lot of issues that come up. For example, is a final peer-reviewed manuscript a journal article? It may be verbatim the same text, but it's not a journal article.

Slide 34

This leads us to poll 7, which should be open on your screen now. "Do you believe that this change will lead to user confusion, especially among students?" It is important to note a few things as you answer. We, as IES and ERIC, have to make sure that information is broadly available. It isn't our role to create requirements that students must use peer-reviewed journal articles, or to have an opinion on that requirement. So while we recognize this as a valid area of concern, it really isn't our role, and we just want to make sure that is out there.

Let's wait for the results of the poll. It looks like the majority of users are finished. Some people are still taking the poll, but we have a mixed bag. Half of people think that this change will lead to more user confusion, and about a quarter do not believe it will lead to confusion, and about a quarter are not sure. We're going to consider that. The other weight that we're considering is that by making a "peer-reviewed journals only" flag, we're going to be filtering out all of the high quality work published by IES,

the parent organization of ERIC. This work is relevant, readable, and goes through a peer-review process that is more rigorous than many journals. We believe this information is valuable and want to make sure that it is accessed by as many of our users as possible. Filtering out these documents would also go against the goals set forth in our Selection Policy. So it's a tough thing for us to balance.

Slide 35

Now we're going to summarize the feedback that we received from users. What we have is the majority of responses have been overwhelmingly positive. We've heard that while the change will challenge current perceptions about peer-reviewed content, it will be beneficial to know if conference papers and reports have been peer reviewed. And it echoes what we've heard today.

And we've heard concerns about the change, especially those that it may cause confusion for students searching for peer-reviewed only journal articles, and that's something that we saw echoed quite a bit in your poll results.

Slide 36

We think this is going to be a great change. We realize there may be unintended consequences such as greater user confusion. Today we would like to offer you another opportunity to express your thoughts and concerns about the changes proposed. We will consider all feedback as we revise the proposed policy.

Do you have any thoughts or concerns that have not been covered so far? Do you agree or disagree with other comments we've received? Or do you have questions about the policy? If so, please use the Chat feature to share your questions and comments to all panelists.

Slide 37

Now we are going to go through comments that were just submitted.

Comment 1

My major concern with conference papers is that frequently it is the proposal that is reviewed, not the actual paper. I agree that there are times when the final paper is very poorly done.

Response 1

Yes, we have also seen those concerns. We are not interested in peer-reviewed proposals, we are interested in peer-reviewed papers. A peer-reviewed proposal only is not going to get a peer-reviewed flag in ERIC. That is something that we are not considering.

Comment 2

If a paper listed in ERIC is NOT listed as peer reviewed, does that mean that it is not peer reviewed or that it is not known if it is peer reviewed?

Response 2

It means that it is not known if it is peer reviewed, because while we ask users to submit this information, we're going to ask publishers to submit this information, it's never possible to have a complete record. And we've seen this for our journal articles as well, so this is not really going to be a change.

September 15, 2015

Comment 3

Why don't you consider open peer review?

Response 3

I think we would need to hear a little more about what you mean by open peer review. Please put your comments in so we can talk about it. As we consider review processes, one thing is that you normally revise your paper based off of peer review and some of the open peer-review work that I have seen, you constantly edit so we need a version of record. But that is something that, if you write in a little more, we would be happy to talk about it a little bit more.

Comment 4

I already have a lot of concern about the process for journals being really varied --I'm even more concerned about the process for grey literature.

Response 4

We just got back a clarification on the open peer review. The definition that the person wrote was that it's where the authors know the reviewers and the reviewers know the authors. And if you look at our definition of peer review, of the ways that we'll allow, we're not requiring blind peer review. So this could happen under the expert peer reviews. While you can't just have Joe Shmoe or your mom or your best friend review this, that isn't truly an expert review, there are times when we need an expert peer review. And you may know the person, because there may only be one person who is a good reviewer for that one particular article, and I can think of some examples of that of work published by IES. But to get back to the comment raised about the process being varied – yes, as someone who's reviewed all of the journal submissions that go into ERIC as we've reviewed the Selection Policy, I can say they really are varied. As with the non-journals. I would say that generally we do see more variance in the journals than in the non-journals, but this is something where there is going to be variance. But we recognize that concern.

Comment 5

My nagging question is that if, as a librarian and researcher, it is difficult for me to be familiar with conferences and grey literature and their peer-review standards, how would ERIC staff make this determination? What will be "sufficient" or "adequate" proof of peer-review?

Response 5

What we would do is the same process that we use for journals. And that would be that you would have to have a page that outlines what your peer-review process is, and that page should be publically available. There are times when it's not, but we expect it to be publically available and talk about what this process is. And if it meets the definition on our page, then we accept it. It's important to note that we get that the process is varied, but this will be the same thing as journals.

And just to add, I think we can expect to find that proof either on the website for say an association for conference papers, or it sometimes might be right on the publication, which is what we've been finding.

Comment 6

If you're going to add these materials, please create a filter so we can filter them out easily. Our students also must use peer-reviewed journals.

Response 6

This is something that we have heard and heard and heard again, and we want to do it, and we want to do it right, but we also have to meet the balance of the fact that the peer-review policies are policies set forth by IES, and by doing this, we would effectively be filtering out all of our work. But it is something that we are considering. Something that struck us is that the overwhelmingly majority of users on the call today are not using the free eric.ed.gov site, so this is something that you may find in a vendor provider – and that is something that we have no control over. That might be a good avenue to try to get that information. But on the public site, we are trying to strike a balance that also meets the priorities of our office and our authorizing legislation because we want ERIC to continue to exist. One of the ways that we have to do this is that we are required to highlight our materials.

Comment 7

We could also be in a situation where a student is confident the materials they retrieve are peer reviewed, whereas their professor insists they are not.

Response 7

Yes, that is a real concern. And that is a case where, first of all it's not the government's job to tell the professors how to teach, which I think everybody's probably grateful for, and this is going to challenge some of the ways that people think about peer review. And professors may need to think how they assign some of their standards. But we do need to be mindful of these documents, like the one we showed from the Australian Teacher Education Association, that are peer reviewed. The work published by IES is peer reviewed and is regularly used and regularly cited, so we don't want to provide inaccurate information to users as well.

Comment 8

Why not two ways to limit a search: one for peer-reviewed articles and one for peer-reviewed literature (journal articles, conference papers, and other)?

Response 8

I think that is really helpful that you could do that in multiple ways. That would take away some of the simplicity of the design of the website, and we are going to run into some data quality issues, but that is something that is possible. It is also something that is possible for if the majority of your students if you are teaching using a vendor site. This may be available from a vendor. So when we're trying to balance, we're making all that data publically available. And we're prioritizing our resources for how to do the updates to the site. If your students aren't using the free site, they could very easily have that button in an EBSCO or ProQuest (I'm not familiar if they do or don't), but that could be a way that they could access it. We are also exploring ways to put it on our free site while meeting our goals, but when we spend time doing that, it means that we are unable to do some of the other priorities that get asked about all the time, like adding a link to holdings, or other interesting fun features that are on their way.

Comment 9

Any time you increase the options for users, you increase the potential for confusion. Nevertheless, this provides valuable options for more sophisticated users. Perhaps this can be addressed by search interfaces designed for different audiences.

September 15, 2015

Response 9

Yes, and so search interfaces for different audiences - this is one of the things that we've heard about over the past few years. One is advanced search, one is different portals, such as you see on some websites – I am a researcher, I am a student. We have found that people are really, really turned off to role-based navigation, where I am a student, I am a researcher. It's surprising the visceral reactions we've heard from this when we did some user testing. The other thing is to create the multiple portals – ERIC is paid for out of taxpayer dollars, so while it's a great idea that means we're taking money out of other things, like building new records and making more information available. I think that is a great idea, and something that we can definitely look into, but we want to balance what is the most important thing for users – getting the data out in a timely fashion, or keeping the look of the website up to date. And we're keeping a list of all these suggestions to try to figure out what we can implement and how. There is a balance that we just want to be mindful of and we want to make sure we're expressing that to you.

Comment 10

Can you display slide 18 again at the end of the session? I wanted to look at the definition of Expert Review again.

Response 10

Sure. We go to slide 18 and what this says is Expert Peer Review is content that is reviewed by internal or external reviewers, and the author's identity may or may not be known to the reviewer. And this gets into the comments we got earlier, where there's a paper that I'm thinking of where there's literally only two people in the world who could've written this type of paper. And one was going to be the reviewer and one was going to be the author. It's a small world, it's a niche field. There are times when you're going to need to know the audience, but you also need an expert to review this. This is different than a technical working group kind of style, where it is a formal review with comments, but we do think that this is an important kind of process to recognize.

Comment 11

I support the idea of being able to filter by both type of publication and peer review. When I speak to classes I distinguish between the types of literature they can see and talk about the value of reports and so on. Giving the users the option to limit by these categories offers greater flexibility.

Response 11

That's great! And we currently have that option available on the site so we're happy that you like that.

Okay – are there any other questions?

It looks like we have gone through all of them. So we're going to just hold on for a minute and while we're waiting to see if there are any other questions or concerns, we also are going to open up the floor to other ERIC questions and concerns that are outside the scope of this.

So we don't see anything coming in so we're going to move on, but if something comes up, feel free to add it.

Slide 38

Now we're going to go to our final polling question. And what this says is "Given what we've discussed, do you now agree with the proposed change?" And separate to this, and you can answer it in the

September 15, 2015

comments as well if you want to give us more detail and feedback, was this webinar format effective in explaining the proposed change? We are hoping that it is informative, and greatly appreciate your participation!

As of now, it looks like the majority of users, about two-thirds, agree with the proposed change. However, there are still some that don't and that's great. Getting more into your working feedback, there's about thirty percent that are unsure. And we expect this. This is something that we are looking to change, but we are talking about 100 records possibly in the course of a year. And to give you a sense of scale, we publish 4,000 records a month, so this is going to be a very, very small portion of our possible collection.

If you have questions or thoughts after this, please email us at ERICRequests@ed.gov.

Slide 39

Our next step is to review all of the feedback that we've received, including your comments and questions today, together with input from the Collection Advisory Group that is meeting in October. We expect that an updated policy will be posted on ERIC in January 2016. We will make that available on our website and announce it via newsflash and our social media accounts. If you are not on our newsflash and social media accounts, please e-mail us at ERICRequests@ed.gov and we will send you that information.

Slide 40

Thank you so much for attending this webinar. Please look for the slides and archive of this webinar to be posted in a few weeks at eric.ed.gov/?multimedia, or use the "multimedia" link at the bottom of the ERIC home page. As soon as these are out, we will send you all an e-mail to let you know that you can download these. Thank you!