Chapter Council Presents Sharing Roundtables

MLA Annual Meeting
San Antonio, TX
Monday, May 16, 2005

Tables 9A/9B: Digital Depositories

Facilitators: Maggie Winebrugh-Freed (University of Southern California-Los Angeles) and Nighat Ispahany (Columbia University)

Recorders: Craig Elam (University of North Texas Health Science Center) and Ramune Kubilius (Northwestern University, Galter Health Sciences Library)

Participants: Rebecca Chapman (Midwestern University); Joan Marcotte Gregory (University of Utah); Mary Hope (Academy of Health Sciences-Ft. Sam Houston); Victor Jenkinson (University of South Carolina); Ada M. Selzer (University of Mississippi); Mary Elizabeth Youngkin (University of Utah).

Since Table 9B had only three people, it merged with Table 9A for discussion. Attendees described their interest and experience with digital depositories, the software used, and current developments about which they knew.

The terms, institutional repositories and digital depositories, were used interchangeably.

Experiences and ideas shared:

Mary Hope – uses Voyager ENcompass (*http://encompass.endinfosys.com/)* to manage nine repositories, including digitizing a journal and collection of masters' theses in PDF format.

Joan Gregory and Mary Youngkin– the health sciences library is beginning to experiment with CONTENTdm *(http://www.contentdm.com/),* the same software used by the main university library. They plan to house faculty curriculum presentations, final manuscripts of articles deposited by campus authors, and accessory laboratory and statistical data. Plans are in place to provide add-on value to PubMed Central submissions *(http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/).*

Rebecca Chapman – is currently using E-reserves and is interested in learning more about repository programs.

Ada Selzer – organized a meeting on creating a digital repository on campus between the library, Information Technology, and Biomedical Communications departments. The impetus for this was the desire to archive digital information created by the university, since much print and digital locally produced information was already lost.

Ramune Kubilius – indicated that if anyone takes the lead in starting an institutional repository, it will most likely be the Information Technology and university library on the main

campus. The health sciences library (and medical school) would definitely want to be "at the table". Attended a presentation at the Charleston Conference that featured the UMI Digital Commons product that some institutions are using for managing institutional repositories of dissertations and other publications (*http://www.umi.com/proquest/digitalcommons/)*.

Nighat Ispahany – created content for a "Pathophysiology Toolkit" which featured an EBM component. The toolkit has been incorporated into the Dental School's curriculum through "CourseWorks", an online course management system. The Web template for the toolkit was created by Kathren Torraca, Web Librarian at Columbia's Health Sciences Library.

Victor Jenkinson – recommended that developers of repositories be cautious due to the need for quality policies and guidelines for submissions. He has seen many product demonstrations and stated that repositories in general and DSpace *(http://www.dspace.org)* in particular, seem to be more prevalent in Europe than in the US.

Craig Elam – was interested in learning about repositories and how to promote interest in them among the faculty and collaborate with other units on campus, such as IT and biomedical communications.

Other issues and concerns discussed:

What is a digital repository and what is in it? The repository ideally captures an institution's scholarly (publishing) output. This can range from digital media, such as streaming video, to documents, such as article manuscripts, associated spreadsheets and databases, and dissertations, and digital images. Common questions on campuses include: how is it different from the course management system or the integrated library system?

How and why would you start a repository initiative? The impetus is often the fact that no one on campus is archiving. First, you need to determine what to archive and why faculty would want to contribute to a repository. It would be best to start with a small, interested unit or department and identify one person, such as the departmental secretary/assistant, to be responsible for soliciting and collecting contributed content. Having the faculty be responsible for the input of the metadata was not felt to be a viable method. Rather, have the library provide data entry and retrieval vocabulary as a service. Rights management statements are essential.

Why is special repository software required, as opposed to conventional Integrated Library Systems? The answers given referred to the restricted searching capabilities of most ILS OPACs, the desirability of using open source software which could prove less expensive, non-proprietary, and more rapidly developed as needs expand or change, than ILS systems, and the ability of repository software to allow OAI harvesters to gather information.

Additionally:

- There may be a need for separate secure or restricted material from open access items. Open access could/should be retrieved in a "google" type search, and advanced search should be able to limit to a particular server.
- Copyright permissions can be a problem for article manuscripts and dissertations.

- Libraries may feel or experience a "competition" by campus IT units for control of the institutional repository program. (Most participants' libraries were in the early stages of exploration or implementation.)
- Institutional repositories may face "competition" from those of faculty members' professional societies, although ideally they should be able to deposit to both.
- Digital depository use statistics and reports are desirable, but not yet currently available in those systems familiar to the participants.

Informational Web sites mentioned or printouts shared:

- Attendees were referred to publisher listings in Project RoMEO *(http://www.lboro.ac.uk/departments/ls/disresearch/romeo/)* and the SHERPA Web site *(http://www.sherpa.ac.uk/*). Especially useful is the section: Publisher copyright policies & self-archiving *(http://www.sherpa.ac.uk/romeo.php)*.
- Greenstone Digital Library Software *(http://www.greenstone.org/cgi-bin/library)*
- DSpace Federation *(http://www.dspace.org)*
- Trusted Digital Repositories- Attributes and Responsibilities: an RLG-OCLC Report (2002) *(http://www.rlg.org/longterm/repositories.pdf)*
- The British Columbia Digital Library, Digital Library Construction Tools: Software *(http://bcdlib.tc.ca/tools-software.html)*
- A December 2004 ALA Midwinter LITA Regional Institute's materials on institutional repositories are available at: *http://docushare.lib.rochester.edu/docushare/dsweb/View/Collection-2193/*
- D-Lib Magazine, *January 2005, article entitled: "Understanding Faculty to Improve Content Recruitment for Institutional Repositories"* *(*http://www.dlib.org/dlib/january05/foster/01foster.html*)*