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Institutional Repository Definitions: Implications for Repository Management

In contrast to discipline-specific repositories and subject-oriented or thematic digital libraries, institutional repositories capture the original research and other intellectual property generated by an institution's constituent population active in many fields. Defined in this way, institutional repositories represent an historical and tangible embodiment of the intellectual life and output of an institution. And, to the extent that institutional affiliation itself serves as the primary qualitative filter, this repository becomes a significant indicator of the institution's academic quality.

In my view, a university-based institutional repository is a set of services that a university offers to the members of its community for the management and dissemination of digital materials created by the institution and its community members. It is most essentially an organizational commitment to the stewardship of these digital materials, including long-term preservation where appropriate, as well as organization and access or distribution. ..., an effective institutional repository of necessity represents a collaboration among librarians, information technologists, archives and records managers, faculty, and university administrators and policymakers.

IR at Liverpool and IR Definitions

• Content Policy - All disciplines articles, theses, working papers, conference papers included. No data, no learning materials.

• Build linkages with librarians, information technologists, archives and records managers, faculty, and university administrators and policymakers.

• Organisational Stewardship - Full-time staff, E-Theses Mandate implemented, Top-level buy-in for institutional repository.

• Indicator of academic quality.
Repository Management at Liverpool: Core Lessons

• Developing an IR from scratch

• Embedding an IR in the research management processes.

• Managing content after it has been deposited in the IR

• Integrating an IR into the research management systems and business processes of an institution
Getting Started: Project History

- Recommendation was made to the Information Services Committee and Research committee by the University Librarian

- Approval provided for University to fund hardware, staff and other miscellaneous costs

- Top-level buy-in achieved to establish IR

- Vision needed to be shared with majority of academics

- Eprints software selected but not installed
OBJECTIVES

• Build an IR which would provide increased access and visibility to the research outputs of the University of Liverpool (UoL) worldwide.

• Provide a means of showcasing the research outputs of UoL in order to enhance its prestige and increase the citation rate of UoL staff.

• Provide a one-stop shop for all to access the research output of Liverpool.
Project Scope

Limitations
- Management of Eprints
- No theses
- No teaching and learning materials
- No data

Early Challenges
- What is the role of the IR?
  - Fulfil the publications database role or only open access to full-text work?
    - Risks associated with each approach?
- Pilot or University-wide Approach
The Advocacy Challenge

How do we engage academics so that they are willing to deposit content in an IR?

What do we know?
Low self-archiving, deposit by IR staff on behalf of academics, low percentage of university research,

Should we only use the current approaches to advocacy or should we try to build on the experience of other IR’s?

Current Approaches:
Enlist support of subject librarians, make presentations to various meetings and departments, 1-1 meetings, proactive identification of content
Engagement of Academics

• Build Library Support
  • University Librarian support utilised
  • Core senior library stakeholders engaged in initial start up approach
  • Subject librarians had a stake in development of IR

• Encouragement of Academic Involvement
  • Single marketing message - Call for Expressions of Interest in the IR Pilot issued to Heads of Departments
  • Advocacy occurred as Call for Expressions of Interest document circulated
    • Presentations to ISC (Faculty and Department)
    • Subject Librarians followed up with emails to Heads of Department and Library Representatives
    • 1-1 meetings held to share the vision and solicit pilot departments
    • Presentations held in Departments – departmental research committee, staff meetings
Embedding the IR: Issues Reviewed

• Do scholarly communication practices need to be taken into account when developing an advocacy approach?

• What type of deposit model/s should we promote during advocacy to academics?

• How can the advocacy approach be used to imbed the IR in to departmental research management processes?

• Are there other issues that could inform our advocacy approach e.g. ability to reuse information, administrative issues?
Partnership Approach

What is the Partnership Approach?

Engaging the direct support of academics to build an IR by establishing a partnership with an academic unit so that:

- Academics take part-ownership of making decisions about how the IR will function in their academic unit.
- The IR is embedded in to the research management processes of an academic unit and the university

Approach acknowledges that academic disciplines have different scholarly communication practices and that this should inform how the IR is implemented.
Building Partnerships with Academic Units

- Academic Representatives selected by HoD
- Deposit method
- Types of content
- Research Management
- Processes
- Open Access
- Peer Reviewed
- Communication

Commit to working with us for 6 months

Negotiate a Partnership Policy

Advocacy

Partnership Policy Document
Lessons Learned – Building the partnership

Building the Partnership
• HoD support valuable
• Academic Representatives usually a senior academic with connection to Research Committee
• Research Committee support valuable for success
• Share the vision with academics and clarify issues early
• Encourage communication (email etc.) about the departments implementation of the IR to be shared with academics by the Academic Representative or the designate of the Academic Unit. Embeds deposit into research management processes.
• Encourage processes and procedures for deposit to be established which match research management processes of academic units
• IR implementation is a cultural change in scholarly communication
• Build a team spirit between IR team and Academic Unit team implementing IR
Lessons Learned – Strategic approach

Partnership Policies

- Three deposit models emerged
  - Self-archiving
  - Multi-repository
  - Editor

- Academics valued the partnership approach
  - Catered to the needs of different disciplines
  - Gave academics a stake in the IR
  - Improved the ability of the Academic Unit to manage Research
  - Made them more aware of the changes in the scholarly communication process

- IR management
  - Provides a framework in a voluntary or mandated deposit environment for engaging academics and building systems for acquiring content and embedding research management processes
Managing Deposits

- Managing Quality Assurance – Tracking and resolving issues IPR management
- Developing IR policies and procedures
- Developing communication policies
Integration into research systems and business processes

- User appears to access a single system
- Single deposit, multiple use
- IR to assist in satisfying REF requirements
- Collaboration, partnerships, and buy-in from a range of stakeholders
- Key to moving from project to library/University service
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