


6-1-2005

# Pastures of Persuasion: Herding Faculty for an Institutional Repository

Denise Troll Covey

*Carnegie Mellon University*, [troll@andrew.cmu.edu](mailto:troll@andrew.cmu.edu)

Follow this and additional works at: [http://repository.cmu.edu/lib\\_science](http://repository.cmu.edu/lib_science)

 Part of the [Library and Information Science Commons](#), and the [Other Social and Behavioral Sciences Commons](#)

---

## Published In

American Library Association Conference.

This Conference Proceeding is brought to you for free and open access by the University Libraries at Research Showcase @ CMU. It has been accepted for inclusion in University Libraries by an authorized administrator of Research Showcase @ CMU. For more information, please contact [research-showcase@andrew.cmu.edu](mailto:research-showcase@andrew.cmu.edu).

# Pastures of Persuasion: Herding Faculty for an Institutional Repository



Denise Troll Covey

Principal Librarian for Special Projects, Carnegie Mellon

ALA Conference – Chicago, ILL – June 2005

# 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





# Nov 2003: Start to Move the Herd

## ***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



**Provost's Council**



# 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 h
  - Interested, some enthusias
  - **Concern: easy submission**
  - Approve conducting an ass
  - Report to provost in 18 mor
- 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 handles content management, search, and reporting
- Need vision, definition, & plan
- 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.



**Computing Services**





# 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 digital content
- **Institutionally** defined, cumulative & persistent
- Increase visibility of **institution** & use of its content

Talk about taking them  
to new pasture.

- What would it take?

- Comm
- Easy s

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

**Exec. Committee**  
**Full Faculty Senate**



# Mar 2004: Talk to Gain Trust

- Barriers to success

- Long-term preservation of
- Persuading faculty & acquisition
- Current faculty & publishing
  - 88% of faculty use open arch
  - 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, provide system management, design metadata & interface
- 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



**Computing Services**

# 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
- 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 &
- 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 faculty
  - Documents from any faculty
  - Probably experiment with e-portals
- 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?





# Thank you!

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



**Denise Troll Covey**  
Principal Librarian for Special Projects  
Carnegie Mellon  
[troll@andrew.cmu.edu](mailto:troll@andrew.cmu.edu)