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What is an institutional repository?
- “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”

Why an IR? – QUEprints vision statement
- To create and establish an electronic system that captures, preserves and communicates, the intellectual output of Cranfield’s faculty and researchers, Cranfield QUEprints will facilitate the distribution of Cranfield’s digital works over the web through a search and retrieval system and it will preserve these digital works over the long term.
- It will provide access to the digital work of the whole institution through one interface
- The aim is to increase visibility and impact of the Universities’ research output, in relation specifically to e-prints, e-theses, technical reports and working papers.
- The E-prints will be stored in a central archive with properly managed backups, and permanent links. Potential users everywhere will be able to access, search and retrieve this research output far more effectively than at present.

Immediate aims
- ‘Unplanned’ IR development
- E-theses – where to put them?
- How (not) to select software
  - VTech
  - GNU e-prints
  - DSpace
- Why ‘QUEprints’?
Initial content

- Theses
- CVs
- Working papers
- Technical reports
- Not learning objects (photos, graphs, models etc)
- Not administrative information
- Acquiring research output

Archiving/self-archiving

- ‘Those institutions that are involved appear to be having difficulty in getting academics to contribute, perhaps because they are putting insufficient effort into the process, but also, perhaps, because the whole idea of self-archiving in institutional archives is based upon false assumptions about the behaviour of academic authors’

Prof T.D. Wilson, CILIP Update, April 2006

Advocacy

- Getting ‘stuff’
  - ArXiv
  - Academic workflow
  - Institutional v disciplinary

Pre/post prints

- Not self-archiving, but rather ‘managed archiving’
- Elsevier – RoMEO green
  - Request articles
- Blackwell
  - Request articles
- Targeted ‘important’ authors
- Developed relationships with our Schools to send material
- SCOPUS alerts

Advocacy (2)

- Cranfield advocacy
  - Internally published articles
    - Perspectives
    - FYI
  - Presentations
    - Faculty Boards
    - Research Committees
  - Meetings with senior staff
- Advocacy for Library staff – internal training (OA context)
Support of student research and nothing more. 

What are the benefits of an open repository system? 

Cranfield QUEprints: rate of population Oct 03-Jan 07
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Management of Repository

- Driven by Library
- Strategy group
- Now Reports to e-policy committee

How is QUEprints staffed?

- No extra staff
- Re-positioning of current staff
  - Inter-library loans
  - Serials check-in
- Technical staff
  - Expertise developed on previous projects
- Strategy group
  - Members of management team, Systems Librarian, operational staff
Usage stats (Feb 21st 2007)

- Items viewed: 621,783
- Bitstream views: 590,652
- Average views per item: 500
- Items available: 1247

Other policies

- Community/collection arrangement
- Subject indexing
  - Is it worth it?
  - Who does it?
Other policies
- Community/collection arrangement
- Subject indexing
- Deleting/withdrawing
- Licensing
- Preservation
- Quality

Survey
- Watson, Sarah. An investigation into the publishing behaviours, attitudes and motivations of academic authors at Cranfield University. (Masters dissertation) London: City University, 2006

Survey - Hierarchy organisation
- Over 50% said Research Group
- Over 40% said Subject and Author
- ’Groups tend to change their name’
- ’I wouldn’t want it organised in such a way that they need to know our internal organisation to find information’
- ‘through the same structure as the organisation’
- ’The media might do a search on School, but other academics would search by subject or author’

Survey – self-archiving
- ’there’s quite a lot of hassle involved in sending stuff to QUEprints’
- ’I’d quite like the fairies to come along and do it all for me’
- ‘time is the biggest concern’
- ’I think the current system certainly works well…I’d be a bit reluctant to do it myself’
- ’I’d prefer the library staff to do it’
- ’That sounds like more work than I want to get involved with’
- ’Anyone other than me… given the choice, library staff’

Self-archiving
- Flexible deposit methods
- Interest from academic staff
- New workflows in preparation
Summary

- Started off as pilot service – soon became production
- Policies on the hoof
- IR within current structure
- IR within current budget
- Inexpensive
- Primary aim – to make research available
- 1247 items & growing
- Next stages
  - more ‘stuff’
  - More integration with University services
  - Looking at other repository solutions

Thanks for listening!

Questions?

http://dspace.lib.cranfield.ac.uk
s.bevan@cranfield.ac.uk