BUILDING THE MEASURING STICK

A model for continuous review and improvement of Institutional Repository policies
Institutional Repository at the University of Florida (IR@UF)

- Rolled out in 2006
- Policies set in 2006
- New IR Manager in 2013
  - Time to review the policies
- Uses SobekCM platform
- Contains >99,000 titles
IDENTIFYING WHAT YOU DON’T KNOW
Looking for gaps

- Current practices and policies
- Questions from users
- Literature review to get ideas on key policy areas
- Upcoming projects and long-term goals
What are current best practices?

Evaluating the landscape of peer institutions

- Identify peer institutions
  - RCM peer list
  - ARL list

- Search websites for policy info

- Create questions where fewer than 5 sites addressed a policy

- Ask peers questions via email

25 institutions
8 questions
15 (of 25) Replied
Used website review and email responses to create questions and standard answers

- basic demographics (4 questions)
- administration of the IR (4 - 5 questions)
- submission process and policies (7 questions)
- IR collections (4 questions)
- Other IR policies, including policies surrounding Electronic Theses and Dissertations (ETDs) (9 - 10 questions)
Qualtrics Survey – Revise & Reissue

- **May – Sept. 2016** – Update survey based on scholarly communications community feedback; added 3 questions to determine scope of IRs at participating institutions

- **Oct. 2016** – Send final survey out via 6 academic listservs

Total of 94 respondents:
- 67 US institutions
- 7 International institutions
- 20 Unspecified
Identifying Trends – Brief Overview

- Most common platforms were Digital Commons (47%); DSpace (34%)
- IR administered by library at all responding institutions;
  - 4% share administration with another department
- Most allow submissions from Faculty Members (95%) and Graduate Students (92%)
  - Others also allow submissions from: Staff; Undergrad students; Emeritus Faculty; Researchers affiliated with institution (65-89%)
- IR Manager / Repository Curator is the gatekeeper for materials going into IR in most institutions (79%)
- Most include collections for Theses and Dissertations (87%) and Departmental based collections (82%)
RELEVANCE OF SURVEY RESULTS
Local Relevance

Based on the survey results, UF libraries are:

- Establishing a formal review process of Institutional Repository policies
- Restructuring the hierarchy of the IR collections
- Updating metadata options for our self-submittal tool
- Finishing comparison of our policies vs. best practices as identified by the survey
Relevance to the Field

- Community currently reevaluating of the purpose of Institutional Repositories
  - *Did they fail or are they just different from how they were first envisioned*
- Common standards and practices
- Building of community (IR Managers Forum)
- Newcomers to offering IR services
Relevance to the Field

- No real policy surveys of Institutional Repositories before
- Conversations around establishing IRs are dated
- New conversations center around the role of IRs - the growth experienced can be reflected in current policies
- Survey instrument enhanced by community support
- Template for other institutions undertaking similar policy review
- Springboard for future research into correlations between IR policies and platforms
Resources

- Institutional Repository Policy Survey
  http://ufdc.ufl.edu/AA00039807

- There’s a Policy for That? Results from an informal survey of Institutional Repository practices
  http://ufdc.ufl.edu/IR00007436 (poster)
  http://ufdc.ufl.edu/IR00007430 (presentation)

- Identifying Policy Trends  http://ufdc.ufl.edu/IR00009690

- Mapping the Landscape of ETDs in IRs: Results from the Institutional Repository Policy Survey
  http://ufdc.ufl.edu/IR00010029