Increasing uptake at St Andrews – strategies for developing the research repository

Jackie Proven[1], Repository Support Officer and Janet Aucock[2], Repository Manager

University of St Andrews Library

Introduction

This paper describes the repository services that have been developed at the University of St Andrews and our aim to maximise the benefits of a full text open access repository. We describe how we have supported the strategic aims of the University and worked to embed repository services into centralised research information management, while recognising the culture and practice of researchers at St Andrews.

Background

The University of St Andrews research repository has gone through a number of development phases since its pilot in 2002. From 2006 the main driver was to increase the accessibility of the University's research outputs, and the primary focus was a service to support the deposit of electronic PhD theses. Janet Aucock described our repository service in SCONUL Focus[1], concluding that its success came as a result of key partnerships between relevant agencies in the University.

The Library repository also established close links with the University's 'Research Expertise Database'. This held metadata for research publications and provided research staff profiles. During RAE 2008 Library and repository staff became involved with processes to manage research outputs.

The development of close working relationships and a shared vision to integrate systems, data and processes intensified over time. The next phase was the procurement of a new Current Research Information System (CRIS) that could fit with our infrastructure and extend our vision. In 2010 we implemented Pure[2] – a CRIS with the ability to describe all aspects of our research activity, expose data in flexible ways and provide a workflow to pass full text research outputs to our repository, now called Research@StAndrews:FullText[3].

Our PURE implementation has created a core support team of staff from the Research Policy Office, Library and Business Improvements/IT. We are keen to present a joined-up approach to our research community, with coordinated outreach activities. These include joint information sessions covering Research Assessment (REF) drivers, the practical benefits of PURE to individual researchers and the opportunities for open access.

---

[1] Email: jep10@st-andrews.ac.uk
[2] Email: ja@st-andrews.ac.uk

Strategies for increasing repository content

We describe below a number of factors which have a positive influence on our repository development.

Do you need a CRIS and a repository?

The CRIS tender process prompted us to re-examine our infrastructure, and for us the reasons to keep a separate (but integrated) repository platform were clear. This choice may not suit every institutional structure and may be influenced by existing systems and workflows, but it does seem to satisfy a wide spectrum of research data management needs. It facilitates ownership of different parts of the research story and allows particular expertise to be targeted at specific aspects of the service. For example we can direct Library skills to maximise discovery and delivery of full text and Research Policy Office skills to research assessment needs. At the same time both CRIS and Repository together satisfy the needs of individual researchers.

The specific advantages of a CRIS

At the 2009 euroCRIS conference held in St Andrews, we posed the question "Does a CRIS mean that you will necessarily get more full text?"[4]

PURE is the primary driver for collecting bibliographic metadata. The fully integrated repository becomes a layer, avoiding the competitive nature of collecting similar data. Repository staff in the library can monitor the research outputs added to Pure as researchers update their publication lists, contacting people who are engaging with the system. The rich metadata allows us to target research outputs that might be suitable for adding full text. The fact we can see complete profiles helps us spot active researchers and make links with events and projects.

Building on this strategy to find academic 'champions' and provide exemplars, we also looked to external sources of data including outputs of the MERIT project[5].

Using MERIT metadata

MERIT originally aimed to make the full text of all RAE2008 submissions available to the public but was unable to complete this aspect of the project. However a considerable amount of metadata was collected and has been made available in a searchable database. The fact that the metadata has been enhanced with publisher details and the main copyright conditions from SHERPA/RoMEO[6] means it has proved to be a valuable resource. The database can be easily searched and downloaded for further analysis, and you can then target content in various ways. For example the results can be filtered by version to find articles that allow Publisher's PDF in a repository. We check RoMEO for latest policy wording and then email authors with an advocacy message about open access and offer to deposit these outputs on their behalf. At the same time we suggest they deposit author versions of their more recent publications, which means they just add the file to the metadata already in PURE.

While it's possible to find this data in other ways, the MERIT database is a nice tidy solution. Starting with RAE2008 data provides confidence when viewing your repository as a showcase. Working with a batch of outputs from one publisher certainly speeds up the copyright-checking part of the deposit process.

Library support services

Actual staff on the ground devoting substantial time to interaction with researchers is crucial. As well as drawing on existing knowledge and experience of Library staff, a new Library post was created with the specific remit to support the PURE/repository integration and associated activities. Library staff can emphasise full text and can support open access initiatives. We can offer added services such as digital preservation and usage statistics. Being active in the wider repository community, we can maintain an outward view on best practice and can facilitate optimum discovery of research publications with our knowledge of repository aggregators and discovery services. At the same time the support network in the Library itself, especially teamwork with Academic Liaison Librarians has substantial advantages for institutional communication about research support.

Open Access funding

The University has obligations to its funders who increasingly require research outputs to be made publicly available[7]. The Repository Support Officer provides help in accessing funding streams such as a dedicated Wellcome Trust award, as well as supporting the "self-archiving" route to open access.

Scholarly communication

As a research-intensive university we need to be ready to adjust to new methods of scholarly communication. Promotion of the repository can raise awareness amongst our academics of the issues around copyright and full text dissemination, and influence attitudes towards open access. We have enhanced information on our library web pages, set up a blog, created leaflets and kept academic staff informed of the potential citation advantage of open access[8].

Open Journal Systems (OJS) and additional repository content

The repository has a flexible content policy to store material that may not originate in the CRIS, therefore can accept content from other sources. We are running a pilot project using OJS to support journals run by University departments, some primarily coordinated by the postgraduate community. This content can sit alongside research outputs in the repository to give a wider picture of scholarly activity.

E-theses

Our institutional e-theses mandate continues to provide a current stream of content. We have Open Access sponsor membership of EThOS and benefit from regular retrospective digitisation requests for pre 2007 theses. This increase in content for our own repository is driven by external researcher requests and by internal requests for theses which are heavily used, or which illustrate research strengths in particular disciplines. To maximise discovery of our theses we have retrospectively created metadata for our print theses and ensured that it is in our local catalogue, as well as COPAC and Worldcat.

Conclusion

The University is committed to making our research outputs available to a wider audience, and we have described some strategies that support this aim by increasing our repository's open access content. The visibility of data in PURE and the REF driver encourages researchers to populate their profile and in turn helps our advocacy efforts. In the past year, which has seen the full introduction

of PURE and the appointment of a full time member of Repository staff, we have seen a significant increase in full text deposits. Between June and December 2010 our total content grew by 52%. As we build relationships we can see a change in culture including a growing acceptance of open access. As well as increasing content, our repository work is proving to be a valuable way to maintain dialogue with our researchers and improve our research support services.

Our way forward is to continue to improve our repository content and research support both in terms of quantity and quality and to embed our services within the research community of the University.

[1] Aucock, J. 2009. Developing the Digital Research Repository at the University of St Andrews. *SCONUL Focus* 46. Available at http://www.sconul.ac.uk/publications/newsletter/46/12.pdf

[2] About PURE: http://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/staff/research/pure

[3] Research@StAndrews:FullText: http://research-repository.st-andrews.ac.uk/

[4] Aucock, J. 2009. Digital research repository and CRIS integration. euroCRIS conference, St Andrews, November 11-13, 2009. Available at http://hdl.handle.net/10023/785

[5] MERIT project website https://www.jisc-collections.ac.uk/Project-Merit/

[6] Sherpa/RoMEO database http://www.sherpa.ac.uk/romeo/

[7] Library website - Information about funder mandates http://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/library/information/furtherhelp/researchsupport/researchoutputs/

[8] For a recent review of the literature on citation advantage see: Wagner, A. B. 2010. Open Access citation advantage: an annotated bibliography. *Issues in Science and Technology Librarianship*, Winter 2010. Available at http://www.istl.org/10-winter/article2.html

Further reading

Library roles in repository and research support:

Palmer, Carole L., Teffeau, Lauren C. and Newton, Mark P. (2008). *Identifying factors of success in CIC Institutional Repository development*. University of Illinois. Center for Informatics Research in Science and Scholarship. Retrieved from https://www.ideals.illinois.edu/handle/2142/8981

Walters, T. O. (2007). Reinventing the library: How repositories are causing librarians to rethink their professional roles. *Portal: Libraries and the Academy, 7*(2), 213-225. Retrieved from http://smartech.gatech.edu/handle/1853/14421

The role of the repository:

Crow, R. (2002). *The case for institutional repositories: A SPARC position paper.* http://www.arl.org/sparc/repositories/readings.html

Lynch, C.A. (2003) Institutional repositories: essential infrastructure for scholarship in the digital age. *ARL Bimonthly Report*, 226, pp.1-7 http://www.arl.org/resources/pubs/br/br226/br226ir.shtml