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Overview

- Early attempts to herd faculty
- Those that got away
- Other ranchers’ round-ups
- Future attempts to herd faculty
Sep–Oct 2003: Engage the Herd

• Librarians contact academic departments
  – Introduce concepts, services & benefits of IR
  – Solicit feedback to gauge faculty issues & interest
  – Inquire about content & user requirements

• Outcome
  – 10 departments responded
  – 14 content types recommended
  – 4 minimum requirements
Do we need an **institutional repository**?

- **What is an IR?**
  - System to store, organize, preserve, & provide access to scholarly (digital) information
  - **Institutionally** defined, cumulative & perpetual, open & interoperable
  - Increase visibility of **institution**
  - Increase use of faculty work

- **Why might we need one?**
  - Crisis in scholarly communication
  - Innovative work not valued
  - Lost resources
Nov 2003: Start to Move the Herd

• What would it take?
  – Commitment, collaboration, standards & policies
  – Easy submission & permission to self-archive

• Proposed next steps – contingent on interest
  – Educate faculty & evaluate software
  – Conduct needs assessment

• Handouts
  – PowerPoint slides
  – ARL “jaws of death” graph
  – Data on open archives practices & concerns

Provost’s Council
The Dominant Cat

• Outcomes – department head response
  – Interested, some enthusiasm
  – Concern: easy submission
  – Approve conducting an assessment
  – Report to provost in 18 months

• Provost’s instructions
  – DO NOT propose creating an IR
  – Engage discussion
  – Assess level of interest
  – Identify costs & concerns

First sign that we might have burst the lead cat’s bubble of security & entered his flight zone.
Jan 2004: Camp

- Need enterprise system that integrates content management, search, & collaboration
- Need vision, definition, & policies for IR
- Need broad data gathering
  - Other institutions
  - Newspaper article
  - Faculty Senate
  - Open Town Meeting
  - No survey

Two people can move a large herd more efficiently than one.
Mar 2004: The Next Round Up

**Do we need an institutional repository?**

- **What is an IR & why should you care?**
  - Store, organize, preserve, & provide access to scholarly content
  - **Institutionally** defined, cumulative & perpetual, open & interoperable
  - Increase visibility of institution & use of faculty work

- **What would it take?**
  - Commitment, collaboration, standards & policies
  - Easy submission & permission to self-archive

- **Address crisis in scholarly communication**
- Increase use & impact of faculty work
- Encourage work of innovative faculty

---

Talk about taking them to new pasture.

---

Exec. Committee
Full Faculty Senate
Mar 2004: Talk to Gain Trust

- Barriers to success
  - Long-term preservation of multimedia
  - Persuading faculty & acquiring permission
  - Current faculty & publishing behavior
    - 88% of faculty use open archives
    - 58% of faculty self-archive
    - 55% of publishers allow self-archiving
    - Others will permit if asked

- Current & next steps
  - Needs assessment
  - Software evaluation
  - Open Town Meeting

Herds will move miles up steep mountains & through cold streams to get to the next pasture.
Mar 2004: Talk Honestly

• What would it cost?
  – **Start up:** $10,000–$50,000 for servers & storage
  – Operating: $285,000 annually
    • **ONLY NEW $$** = full–time programmer @ $70,000
    • Existing staff can digitize materials, convert files, provide system management, training & support; design metadata & interfaces – maybe service fees

• Handouts
  – PowerPoint slides
  – *Faculty / staff newspaper article*

*Cats have an incredible sense of smell. Here’s where they might have first sniffed the scent of competition for provost dollars.*
Mar 2004: Beware of Mood Swings

- Outcomes
  - Resistance, curiosity, interest

- Concerns
  - Cost
  - Copyright
  - Scholarly communication

- Senate will co-sponsor Open Town Meeting
- Keep Senate informed

Though a solitary species, cats can & do live in groups, where they are subject to territorial & protective aggression.
Apr 2004: Large Herd, Long Trail

• Open town meeting
  – Background, interests, definition, benefits, software, costs, work, barriers, self–archiving
  – **Who should steward assets?** **What priority?**
  – Handouts: PowerPoint slides

• Outcomes
  – Poor attendance & varying level of interest
  – **Concerns**
    • Innovative work
    • Images & multimedia
  – Need 5 year vision of IR
Jul–Aug 2004: Camp

• No enterprise system meets our needs
• Tactical plans must align with strategic plans
• IR division of labor
  – Computing Services: software & infrastructure
  – Libraries: info architecture, metadata, & support
• Pilot repository 2005–06
  – Focus couple departments
• Need engaging vision
Aug 2004–present: On the Trail Again

• Campus–wide Web Forum
  – Content management system
    • Assess campus needs
    • Prepare user requirements
    • Evaluate software
    • Recommend solution
  – Search – ditto
  – Infrastructure
  – Standards & practices
  – Marketing
Oct 2004: On the Trail with Cliff Lynch

Discussion with invited faculty

- Focus on services, not control
- Invest wisely & meet real needs

Outcome
  - Clarified understanding of challenges & financial impact of strategic decisions
  - Concerns
    - Rights & copyright infringement
    - Standards & interoperability
    - Purpose, functionality, & relationship between IR, content management, & course management
Jan 2005: Chuck Wagon Gets Away

• Request $90,000 for IR in 2005–06
  – $20,000 for servers & storage
  – $70,000 for permanent, full-time programmer

• Outcome: Provost says “No”
  – No faculty problems would be addressed by an IR
  – No faculty are requesting an IR

• Decide to pilot IR
  with existing resources

Dominant cats prefer not to confront subordinate cats
Other Ranchers’ Round-Ups

• IR success = content searched & cited

• Current IRs are small, cost per item is large
  – Average 1,250 documents
  – Large IR (4000 documents): $71 per doc per year

• Benefits & services of IR are not aligned with faculty needs
The Mind Set of the Herd

• Concerned about
  – Copyright, contractual agreements, & access
  – Time required to self-archive

• Need support for how they find, use, organize, create, & disseminate digital scholarship
  – Tools for authoring, collaborating, & managing content & access
  – Seamless submission
  – Stewardship & preservation
Speak the Language of the Herd

• Address their concerns without jargon
  – “You maintain ownership,” “No worries about backups,” “Easier than maintaining a web site,” “It’s like Google,” “No broken URLs”

• Talk about creating personal repositories & empowering scholarly communities
  – Showcase them & their research
  – Enable them to create & name collections
Debunk Myth of Self–Archiving

- **Perception**: burden outweighs the benefit
- **Reality**: active researchers spend 40 minutes a year entering metadata
  - Median per article: 5 minutes, 37 seconds
  - Average per article: 10 minutes, 40 seconds
  - Time shrinks as user deposits more material
  - 20% authors have problems depositing 1st article
  - 9% have problems with subsequent deposits
- **ROI**: 200% increase in citations
Provide Incentives

- Emphasize *faculty* own & control content
- Enable easy deposit & access
- Provide & promote useful services
  - “Tell a colleague,” “Notify me,” “Paper of the day”
  - Browse by collection, department, center, etc.
  - Statistics for authors & departments
  - Security, backups, & preservation
  - Version tracking & linking
  - Full text searching

*Cats can hear 3 times better, see 10 times better, & smell 14 times better than mere humans.*
2005–06: Tactical Pilot IR

- Vision, requirements, workflow, & business model
- Demonstrate DSpace + content
  - 1500+ Carnegie Mellon technical reports
  - Documents from any faculty
  - Probably experiment with e–portfolios
- Strategies
  - Raise awareness: 36% are unaware of self–archiving
  - Tie development to needs & wants of early adopters
  - Target retiring faculty, faculty with “green” publications, & open–access friendly constituencies

Herds will follow much more readily & eagerly than they will drive, with a lot less energy expended.
2006–07: Strategic Production IR

• Garner institutional support
  – **Mission** to steward intellectual assets
  – **Policy** of self–archiving
  – **Practice** of faculty reward system
    • Acknowledge self–archiving
    • Reward innovative work

• Enterprise software?
The best way to move a herd is patiently & slowly. If they move too slowly, get closer, but beware of entering their flight zone.
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