

Chapter Title: Creating the IR Culture

Chapter Author(s): Anne Langley and Yuan Li

Book Title: Making Institutional Repositories Work

Book Editor(s): Burton B. Callicott, David Scherer, Andrew Wesolek

Published by: Purdue University Press. (2016)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt1wf4drg.25>

---

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://about.jstor.org/terms>



This book is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>. Funding is provided by Knowledge Unlatched.



JSTOR

*Purdue University Press* is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Making Institutional Repositories Work*

# **Part 5**

## **INSTITUTIONAL REPOSITORIES IN PRACTICE: CASE STUDIES**



# 17 | Creating the IR Culture

*Anne Langley and Yuan Li*

This case study maps out the path we took to raise awareness of and support for an institutional repository at Princeton University. The creation of our institutional repository culture is a little different because before any repository work had been done, the open access policy was passed unanimously by the faculty. This is not the typical path for creation of an IR culture. Once the policy was passed, university partners in the library and the Office of Information Technology (OIT) collaborated to build a scholarly communications program, which included design and creation of the institutional repository. A librarian and a digital information architect (OIT) proposed a recommended path, specifying staffing, infrastructure, and legal requirements. The recommendation document was unanimously supported by administrators from the libraries and OIT and text from the recommendation was used to request funding from a university priorities committee. Based on the recommendations, a scholarly communications (SC) librarian and a digital repository programmer were hired; a working group was formed to design the repository workflow; and through collaboration with many university partners, outreach and education ventures are under way to increase campus awareness of the policy and the upcoming repository.

## **BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF INSTITUTION**

Princeton University is one of the oldest institutions of higher learning in North America. Established in 1746, Princeton has a student body of 7,910: 5,244 undergraduates and 2,666 graduate students (2013–2014). It offers

instruction in the humanities, social sciences, natural sciences, and engineering. Though it does not have medical, law, education, divinity, or business schools, it offers professional degrees through the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, the School of Engineering and Applied Science, the School of Architecture, and the Bendheim Center for Finance. In spring 2014, there were 1,175 full-time, part-time, and visiting faculty in 34 academic departments.

The Princeton University Library (PUL) and the Office of Information Technology (OIT) have a long history of working together. Though the digital information architect is based in OIT, a large majority of his projects are with library partners, most recently with university archives in providing a repository for electronic theses (including senior theses) and dissertations. There is a formal university committee on library and computing, and interoffice and departmental collaboration is encouraged and supported throughout the university.

### **Timeline of Open Access and Scholarly Communication Related Events**

**Late 2010**—Dean of the faculty appoints ad-hoc faculty committee (includes the University Librarian) to study the question of open access (OA) to faculty publications.

**March 2011**—Ad-hoc committee adopts OA policy and writes report to explain the issues and interpret the policy.

**September 19, 2011**—Princeton faculty pass the OA policy.

**October 2011**—Princeton joins Coalition for Open Access Policy Institutions (COAPI); librarian assigned to scholarly communication planning attends COAPI meeting in Washington, DC.

**November 2011**—Library, dean of faculty, and OIT administrators meet to discuss policy implementation—the librarian and digital information architect (DIA) are charged with investigating options and writing a proposal for implementation.

**May 2012**—Librarian and DIA submit OA Policy Implementation Recommendation report.

**Fall 2012**—Library application to university funding committee for SC librarian in FY2013.

**January 2013**—University funding committee approves new SC librarian; provost funds new software developer (OIT) for three-year term position; DIA given title of associate director of Academic Technology Services, librarian named director of Scholarly Communications.

**July 2013**—Funds released for both new positions.

**Summer 2013**—Position descriptions finalized; search committees formed.

**Fall 2013**—Active searches for SC librarian and software developer.

**December 2013**—Software developer position is filled.

**Winter 2014**—SC librarian accepts position to begin April 21.

**Spring 2014**—Formation of the Princeton Open Access Repository Implementation Working Group (POARIWG) and the Scholarly Communications Outreach group; SC librarian begins meeting with subject liaisons.

**Summer 2014**—Design of the workflow is well under way, and plans for outreach are begun; SC librarian continues to meet with subject liaisons; the director and SC librarian write white paper for university provost on scholarly communication issues and open access.

**Fall 2014**—OA Week group formed and funding obtained for various OA Week activities; SC brochure designed; SC Office logo designed; SC website created and launched; POARIWG gains additional members in the areas of preservation and digital archives.

## **CAMPUS CONVERSATIONS—AD-HOC COMMITTEE AND OA POLICY ADOPTION**

In late 2010, the dean of the faculty appointed an ad-hoc faculty committee, comprising professors from all the divisions of the university, to study the question of open access for faculty publications. The committee met several times in February and March 2011 and adopted a policy and report by unanimous vote. The policy was brought to the fall 2011 faculty meeting and passed by unanimous vote. Shortly after the policy was passed, the university librarian contacted Anne Langley, head librarian of Science and Technology libraries, whose job description included the responsibility to “advance campus conversations about scholarly communication and e-science, working collaboratively with other Princeton librarians, the University’s Office of Information Technology, the Office of the Dean for Research, and special campus

research centers such as the Princeton Institute for Computational Science and Engineering.” Langley was asked to investigate what it would take to put the OA policy in place and to serve as the point person for the project.

## INVESTIGATION OF POLICY IMPLEMENTATION

Langley was put in touch with colleagues at MIT to learn more about their OA policy and institutional repository. From MIT colleagues, Langley learned about an upcoming meeting of the Coalition of Open Access Policy Institutions (COAPI). COAPI brings together representatives from North American institutions with established faculty OA policies and those in the process of developing such policies. It was formed to share information and experiences and to illuminate opportunities for moving faculty-led open access forward at member institutions and advocating for open access nationally and internationally. Princeton asked to join COAPI, and Langley attended the October COAPI meeting. The meeting fortuitously focused on requirements for building a repository, and Langley came back armed with a solid understanding of what Princeton needed to implement the policy and establish a repository.

Shortly after returning from the COAPI meeting, Langley reported what she learned to administrators from the library, OIT, and the office of the dean of the faculty. At this meeting, Langley accepted the responsibility, with Mark Ratliff, the digital information architect, of investigating and recommending how to proceed. They were assigned a project manager, set up regular meetings, and created a project plan.

They established the following goals and assumptions to guide the approach they would propose in the recommendation document:

### Goals

- To collect in the repository all Princeton University faculty journal articles and conference papers published since the Open Access Policy was passed on September 19, 2011. Approximately 1,200 faculty in 34 departments generate 4,000 scholarly articles each year. This number is derived from searches in Web of Science and SCOPUS for Princeton authors. In SCOPUS, the average for each year is about 3,500, and Web of Science was in the same ballpark. The total number of articles is expected to be

greater, however, because these databases don't thoroughly index humanities publications.

- To minimize the amount of extra work that the Open Access Policy imposes on faculty.
- To enhance access to content held in the repository by making the content easily discoverable and downloadable.

### **Assumptions**

- A new full-time position will be created to support Scholarly Communications.
- The library is the service owner and will manage promotion and submission.
- OIT will be an active partner and lead in technology and technical support.
- Existing staff in the library and in OIT will be assigned new responsibilities to support the acquisitions workflow.

For this last assumption, they suggested inserting the required tasks into existing staff workflows, both in the library and OIT, with oversight and coordination by the Scholarly Communications librarian in concert with Mark Ratliff.

### **MOVING FORWARD WITH RECOMMENDATIONS: GETTING FUNDING, BUILDING TEAMS, SETTING UP PROCESSES, AND MAKING ALLIES**

For the first four months of 2012, Langley and Ratliff met with stakeholders on campus, staff at peer institutions that have implemented similar OA policies, faculty on the initial Open Access Policy ad-hoc committee, vendors offering technology solutions, library staff, and OIT staff. They solicited ideas from peers in higher education who are members of COAPI. They synthesized their findings and created implementation recommendations in the areas of legal requirements, operational services, functional requirements, and technical requirements.

After the recommendations were submitted, the university librarian and the CIO took the recommendations higher up in the organization to



seek the necessary funding. In fall 2012, modified language from the recommendation report was used to apply for funding from a university committee called PRICOM, or the Priorities Committee, which is a committee of the Council of the Princeton University Community and advises the university president. The committee makes recommendations regarding the following year's operating budget. The provost chairs the committee, which also includes the dean of the faculty, the executive vice president, the treasurer, six faculty members, four undergraduates, two graduate students, and one member from one of the other groups represented on the council.

In January 2013, PRICOM approved funding, to begin in FY2014, to hire a Scholarly Communications librarian, and the provost designated separate funds for a software developer to design the ingest workflow for a three-year period. Money was set aside for the purchase of proprietary software that might be necessary for some portion of the workflow.

Once funding was released in July 2013, Langley and Ratliff wrote job descriptions and ads, formed search committees, and got the searches under way. Interviews were held for both positions in the fall of 2013, and by December the software developer position was filled; the developer began work right away. Hiring an SC librarian took a bit longer. Yuan Li accepted the SC librarian position in early 2014, and she began work in April 2014.

## EARLY STAGES OF IMPLEMENTATION

Implementation began by focusing on three distinct areas: building formal and informal teams, designing the repository workflows, and making the Scholarly Communications Office and its services known to campus. With two new hires in place, the administrative bodies were created. In the library, the Scholarly Communications Office was created to implement the OA policy and to develop the accompanying Scholarly Communications services. The Scholarly Communications Office consists of the director (Langley), the Scholarly Communications librarian (Li), and the E-Science librarian (Willow Dressel), who is in charge of building the data management program. In the Office of Information Technology, there is the formal team consisting of the associate director for Academic Services (Ratliff), who is also the digital repository architect, and the software developer. Informally, there are three groups: an outreach planning group, a repository implementation

working group, and a steering committee to guide and manage the work of the repository implementation working group.

### **Formation of the Repository Implementation Working Group**

The Princeton Open Access Repository Implementation Working Group (POARIWG) has members from OIT, including the software developer and the associate director for Academic Technology; and members from various units of the library, including subject liaisons, cataloging and metadata librarians, a digital initiatives analyst, the E-Science librarian, the Scholarly Communications librarian, and the director of Scholarly Communications. The group was charged with designing and creating an ingest workflow process for the repository. Because it is a large group, the members wanted to ensure productive meetings so they created a steering committee. This committee meets five days before each POARIWG biweekly meeting to plan the agenda and work of the larger group.

POARIWG has been working diligently to identify workflow and system requirements for the repository. Langley and Ratliff have met with a variety of vendors who may be able to provide information to populate the repository ingest system, and they are working with colleagues at MIT to find areas where they can collaborate on workflow design. Li has served as a consultant during the software development process, solidifying the collaborative nature of the repository design.

### **Making Our Presence Known on Campus**

Subject liaisons in the library are responsible for informing and promoting scholarly communication issues to campus scholars, including the university's OA policy for faculty research, so it was important to include them in the early culture-building work. Shortly after she began working at Princeton, Li started to meet individually with subject liaisons in the library to inform them of the plan and the progress that the Scholarly Communications team has made; to learn how well they understand open access and scholarly communication issues; to assess their interest in helping with campus outreach; and to learn about their expectations for the repository. This process took place in late spring and through the summer. By meeting with the liaisons, Li accomplished a variety of important things: she learned which liaisons were proponents of OA and, from that group, who would be willing

to help with early outreach; she learned who needed more convincing and more time to process their new responsibilities; and she discovered names of faculty she could count on to be OA advocates.

In addition to meeting with individual subject liaisons, Li and Langley have made presentations to department head meetings and the Library Managers Group. A presentation to all library staff is scheduled in the late fall. Beyond the library, Li also met with various campus partners to create awareness of the OA program's presence and services, including the associate dean for Research, the general counsel for Copyright, the associate dean for the Digital Humanities Center, and the coordinator of the McGraw Center for Teaching and Learning. In early fall, Li gave a presentation about open access as part of the McGraw Center Productive Scholars Series. The session drew a full house and was a good start in terms of outreach to campus.

While the SC outreach team were developing outreach plans and making progress, the university librarian asked Li and Langley to write a short white paper on the economic drivers of open access for the provost to get him up to speed on the new program, and to prepare him for a fall meeting with other provosts. They had to craft a careful message that was informative and concise. It was a great opportunity to teach the university administration about the issues and our work. Completed in mid-August, the white paper was well received by the provost.

Another opportunity to make our presence known on campus and promote OA was 2014 OA Week, planned and organized by the 2014 OA Week Planning Group. We decided to focus on raising awareness in the library before doing systematic outreach to faculty. However, we set up an OA Week information table in the campus center to get a feel for where and how to do more outreach in the future, and also decided to organize an event for graduate students later in the fall, since OA Week fell during mid-term exams.

## CONCLUSION

Creating our IR culture required building a strong base of support among allies from many areas of the university, primarily within the libraries and information technology; because so many areas of the university are affected, partners from all parts of the institution must be discovered and recruited. We needed to be able to tell the story of OA and describe the roles

all allies must play in disseminating scholarly communication in a variety of ways, being very careful to shape our message to fit the audience. We asked: What are their motivations? What's in it for them? Why is it in their best interest, and/or in the best interest of the institution? Allies also want to see that we have invested time and effort into our program. There is a fine balance between building a program and recruiting allies. Culture creation is primarily about having a clear message and finding the most productive ways to share it.

