Introduction
Many UK Universities – including 17 of the 19 Russell Group institutions - have created “Institutional Repositories”; these repositories provided free internet access to full text research outputs. The development of a network of repositories was recommended by the House of Commons Science and Technology Committee. Research Councils UK have produced a draft statement encouraging researchers to deposit in institutional repositories.
http://www.rcuk.ac.uk/access/index.asp

Q1. What is the White Rose repository?
➢ http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/
➢ A shared institutional repository for Leeds, Sheffield and York Universities
➢ An online database of published, peer-reviewed papers written by White Rose academics.

Q2. Why might I be interested in the repository?
Two main reasons:
• a wider audience for your work
• potentially, increased citation impact (there is increasing evidence, across a range of disciplines, that placing a paper on open access is likely to boost the number of times it is cited by others)

Q3. Who can use the repository?
Staff (or postgraduate students) from Leeds, Sheffield or York can deposit published research. Anyone, anywhere in the world can access the research. There is no need to register or log-in – the whole idea of the repository is to make the research as visible and readily available as possible.

Q4. How is research deposited?
It is straightforward to register on the repository and add papers to it. However, before spending time depositing items, it is advisable to seek advice from the Repository Officer – particularly regarding copyright.

Alternatively, the Repository Officer offers a mediated service. Any academic interested in adding their work to the repository is encouraged to email r.e.proudfoot@leeds.ac.uk with a list of their publications.

Q5. Why peer-reviewed papers?
The repository could hold all sorts of items; for the time being, the main emphasis is on peer-reviewed research because:
➢ the main focus of the Open Access movement is to improve access to academic research which is given away and peer-reviewed for free, but then held behind a subscription barrier
➢ investigative work into journal publishers’ policies has led to the creation of the RoMEO database – a summary of the usual permissions granted under publishers’ copyright transfer agreements: (http://www.sherpa.ac.uk/romeo.php)

Q6. What about book chapters?
The inclusion of book chapters depends on whether copyright has been transferred to the publisher and the details of any copyright agreement signed with the publisher.

Q7. What about copyright?
Many publishers allow journal articles to be added to a repository. Check the terms of any copyright transfer agreement; some rights are often retained by the author, including the right to post an electronic copy of the work on the web. Some publishers specify an embargo period before the work can be posted. Others specify that the final PDF of the work, including the publisher’s layout and final copy editing cannot be used - but that the “author’s version” may be posted in the repository.

Q8. What is the “author’s version?”
This is the final, peer-reviewed text, as accepted for publication, but without the journal’s final copy editing and production. Essentially, the “author version” is supplementary to the final published work; it’s a
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dissemination version to draw attention to your research. Details of how to obtain the final, published work are given where possible.

Q9. What do publishers think of all this?
Reactions have been mixed but, on the whole, positive. There is evidence that papers placed on open access are cited more frequently. We also provide a link to the journal web site from the repository – so the repository can help to boost the journal’s impact factor and publicise the journal to a wider audience. Some publishers consider self-archiving a reasonable right to grant back to authors.

Book chapters are more complex – but, for example, we have secured permissions from an Archaeology publisher to add chapters more than four years old. Other repositories report successes with out of print material.

Q10. How does the repository differ from the ULPD?
ULPD holds bibliographic details, not full text. A link between the two systems is being developed. We do not want staff to have to input the same data twice; it is likely the repository will import records from ULPD.

Q11. If articles are easily available, won’t plagiarism be made easier?
In fact, plagiarism is potentially diminished as a problem. Plagiarism is far easier to detect if the original, date-stamped material is freely accessible to all.

Q12. Isn’t the repository more relevant for science subjects, rather than arts subjects?
Certainly much of the drive towards open access has centred around scientific disciplines. However, institutional repositories aim to reflect the whole output of the institution. Arts materials in the repository are well accessed: for example, one Archaeology paper added in Sept 05 has already been downloaded 300 times.

Q13. Who is accessing the repository?
The repository reaches a global audience – we have accesses from well over 100 countries. Anyone with an internet connection can access the material. Many of our accesses come through Google and other internet search engines.

Since September 2004, we have registered 75,000 full text downloads and over 300,000 hits on the site.

Case Study
Malcolm Heath, Classics
Papers in the repository: 21
Downloads to date: over 2,600

“As a researcher, I depend on access to information and ideas, and I want to make the information and ideas that I produce accessible to others in turn; I see institutional repositories as an efficient way of exploiting the potential of new technologies to speed up and extend the range of this exchange.”

Professor Heath has linked to the repository from his own web page. Thus, his papers are found by searchers using internet search engines - but also by researchers looking at his publication list.

See: http://www.leeds.ac.uk/classics/heath/heath.html #Publications

Q14. Where can I find more information?
The repository FAQ section from http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/
The White Rose Repository Officer – Rachel Proudfoot – r.e.proudfoot@leeds.ac.uk
0113 343 7067
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The White Rose Consortium ePrints Repository was created as part of the national SHERPA project:
Repository URL - eprints.whiterose.ac.uk
SHERPA Project URL - www.sherpa.ac.uk