

## DRWG Membership

Celia Bakke (San Jose), Karen Brodsky (Sonoma), Keven Jeffery (San Diego, Interim Chair), Brian Kennelly (San Luis Obispo, Teaching Faculty), Franz Kurfess (San Luis Obispo, Teaching Faculty), Marvin Pollard (Chancellor's Office), Adolfo Prieto (Fullerton), Marisa Ramirez (San Luis Obispo), Jeremy Shellhase (Humboldt) and Joel West (San Jose, Teaching Faculty)

## Charge

The RWG shall meet virtually upon a regular schedule to provide the libraries of the CSU with a document outlining the best practices and technical standards they might use in building, sustaining and integrating digital repositories into the academic fabric of our campuses:

1. Define scope and purpose of CSU digital repositories;
2. Identify emerging technical standards, metadata standards and basic platform requirements for digital repositories irrespective of repository software;
3. Provide pointers to the most useful types of digital content libraries might pursue, collect and collate in building their repositories (e.g. ETDs, campus e-journals, faculty publications, special collections, etc.);
4. Identify workable service models for ease of content deposit (e.g. by teaching faculty) and access methods irrespective of platform;
5. Examine the documented barriers to digital repository adoption; provide best practices for ameliorating these barriers, encouraging use and wider contribution to digital repositories;
6. Describe the benefits and the challenges of a common CSU repository vs. stand-alone repositories;
7. Describe ways how digital content in one repository of potential utility to the entire CSU can optimally be harvested by sister campuses irrespective of platform;
8. Describe the basic personnel requirements for repository implementation, management and maintenance; and
9. Describe successful methods for marketing of digital repository services.

## Committee Discussion

### Case Studies (attached)

- Humboldt
- San Diego
- San Luis Obispo
- Sonoma

### Metadata Standards

Institutions should be encouraged to embrace existing metadata standards (e.g. Dublin Core, ETD-MS, OAI-PMH). Using established standards will allow the exchange and harvesting of data between repository software suites and to collective repositories, such as the California Digital Library, and will allow collections to be included in library discovery layer interfaces.

### Technology Standards

The CSU, as a system, should not be overly concerned with recommending technology standards for individual campus repository projects. Technical standards will depend on the repository solution chosen by the individual campuses. The Chancellor's Office (CO) provides a valuable technical support service by offering a hosted repository option, currently Dspace, for use by any interested campus. The amount of local campus control over each Dspace instance however, especially in terms of migrating data into and

out of the hosted option, should be increased. Ensuring local control would guarantee that the CO does not become a technical bottleneck when campuses seek to move data.

### Types of Content

While the type of content being collected in a campus digital repository will depend on campus needs and the personnel available for the project, the following are potential entry points for a campus beginning a repository project.

#### ***University Produced Content***

Archiving institutionally produced content (e.g. newsletters, magazines and press releases) is an easy option for a campus beginning a repository project. This type of content often fills an archival need and there are rarely copyright issues associated.

#### ***University Theses***

University theses are also a potential entry point for a campus into a digital repository project. While theses collection projects have hurdles, such as copyright clearance, there may be opportunities to obtain the document in PDF format from the print publisher. It may also be possible to entice the student author to upload his/her document to the repository instead of providing the library with a second print copy, as done at Humboldt, for example. Individual campuses may also be open to requiring that students provide their theses in digital-only format, as is the case at San Diego.

#### ***Possible Content Types\****

- Abstracts
- Alumni publications
- Annual reports
- Architectural plans
- Campus periodicals
- Campus photographs
- Conference proceedings
- eBooks
- Finding aids
- Grant reports
- Images of campus
- Internship reports
- Master plans
- Master's theses
- Peer-reviewed journal articles
- Poems
- Posters
- PowerPoint presentations
- Press releases
- Research from campus institutes and centers
- Senior projects
- Speeches
- Staff publications
- Undergraduate essays
- WASC reports

\*Compiled by Cal Poly San Luis Obispo

### Collection Models

#### ***Library Submission Model***

In this instance the library obtains and posts the documents without assistance or overt involvement of the author. This is the process used at San Diego where theses are obtained from the publisher and deposited in the digital repository by the library. This is also the process used at Humboldt where some content, such as lectures, are obtained and posted to the repository by the library.

#### ***Author Submission Model***

In this instance the author uploads his/her document to the repository and gives permission for it to be hosted publicly. This is the process used in Humboldt where all materials entering the repository are uploaded by authors with little mediation from the library.

### ***Hybrid Model***

In this instance the author submits his/her document to the repository and the library clears copyright and ensures the institution has the right to publish the document. This is the process used at San Luis Obispo, where some entities are involved in self-submission while other contributions, such as faculty peer-reviewed publications, are uploaded by the library. Sonoma faculty publications are self-submitted and the library staff handle the rights management.

### **Access Models**

#### ***Restricted Access***

The access to content can be restricted to institutional affiliates, on site users, subjected to a time-based access embargo or placed in a dark archive. Restricted access models may be desirable when there are issues posed by making the content public.

#### ***Open Access***

With open access models there are no restrictions placed on the access to, or downloading of, repository documents.

### **Barriers**

Potential obstacles to repository projects include the obvious, such as technological and personnel limitations, and copyright restrictions. Other obstacles faced by CSU projects have included the unwillingness by potential authors to share original work. This reluctance is sometimes due to the fact that the repository might be an incomplete representation of their work. It might also be the case that there are implications to the early release of research that may be published later in the scholarly literature. These obstacles could be overcome by projects such as CSU Fresno, which would show a more complete bibliography for faculty, and the use of a time embargo for some documents entering the digital repository.

### **Personnel Requirements**

The success of a digital repository project is often directly proportional to the resources invested in the project. Technical hurdles might be lessened using the CSU hosted option, but there is still a significant workload in terms of managing the repository, processing documents, clearing copyright, performing outreach to authors and curating the collection. Existing library faculty and staff can perform some of this work, as seen at Humboldt, SDSU and Sonoma. But larger projects require dedicated staff, as seen at San Luis Obispo.

### **Marketing**

Marketing is an integral activity to ensuring the success of an institutional repository. Marketing initiatives can include outreach to departments and faculty, recruiting faculty advocates and showing value by communicating usage statistics to authors. In order to show use it is also beneficial for repository collections to be discoverable through search engines like Google and through metadata harvesting and discovery tools, such as OAIster and the California Digital Repository.