

University Library
UBIR Administration

University of Bolton

Year 2008

The University of Bolton Institutional
Repository progress report November
2008

Sarah E. Taylor
University of Bolton, s.e.taylor@bolton.ac.uk

This paper is posted at UBIR: University of Bolton Institutional Repository, and has not been amended or copyedited in any way.

<http://digitalcommons.bolton.ac.uk/ubiradmin/7>



Project Document Cover Sheet

Project Information			
Project Acronym	UBIR		
Project Title	The University of Bolton Institutional Repository		
Start Date	April 2007	End Date	March 2009
Lead Institution	The University of Bolton		
Project Director	Dr. Peter Marsh		
Project Manager & contact details	Sarah Taylor s.e.taylor@bolton.ac.uk Tel. 01204 903099 Fax. 01204 903166	Eagle Library The University of Bolton Deane Road Bolton BL3 5AB	
Partner Institutions			
Project Web URL	http://digitalcommons.bolton.ac.uk/		
Programme Name (and number)	JISC Capital Programme: Strand D (Illa): Repository Start-up Projects		
Programme Manager	Andrew McGregor		

Document Name			
Document Title	Progress Report		
Reporting Period	May 2008 – November 2008		
Author(s) & project role	Sarah Taylor, Project Manager		
Date	21 November 2008	Filename	Progress_report_November_2008
URL	http://digitalcommons.bolton.ac.uk/ubiradmin/7		
Access	<input type="checkbox"/> Project and JISC internal		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General dissemination

Document History		
Version	Date	Comments
1.0	21.11.08	



Project Name	UBIR: University of Bolton Institutional Repository, University of Bolton
Project Website	http://digitalcommons.bolton.ac.uk/
Report compiled by	Sarah Taylor
Reporting period	May-Nov 2008

Section One: Summary

The previous Project Manager left at the end April 2008; a new Project Manager was appointed in September 2008. The last progress report acknowledged that the departure of the then Project Manager may result in a serious risk being imposed upon the project, but did not anticipate any slippage. Although the delay in appointment of a new Project Manager has resulted in some necessary alterations to the basic timescale of a number of milestones, there has not been any significant danger to the project.

The reporting period in question has concentrated on consideration of a number of policy points, in particular the inclusion of metadata-only records. Including metadata-only records is advantageous in a number of ways, principally that the “quick fix” of increasing content can demonstrate that a repository is active, possibly fostering greater author buy-in. However, this approach can only be deemed a success if full-text follows at a later date and therefore, as stated by the previous report, the original policy of including full-text only will be adhered to for the foreseeable future. Moreover, consultation with key researchers within the university has revealed an enthusiasm for full-text only. This enthusiasm, which will play an important part in the affecting of cultural change with in the university, can only serve to reinforce, rather than hamper, the success of the project.

Section Two: Activities and Progress

Note that workpackage numbers in this section correspond with the revised workpackages outlined in the October 2007 progress report.

WORKPACKAGE 5:

- 30. *Write briefing paper to all staff on benefits of IR – **Completed***
- 32. *Adoption of SHERPA guidance on advocating the use of repositories – **Completed***

WORKPACKAGE 5

- 29. *Population of IR*

As outlined by the previous report, the UBIR Team continues to search departmental and personal web pages to identify potential content. In addition, the Team continues to work with authors and publishers to ensure that any submission backlog remains at a minimum.

In addition, as outlined in Section 5, it is hoped to make further use of RAE papers and work is under way to ensure that copyright conditions on the papers in question are met.

- 31. *Write and agree communications and promotional strategy*

This is in progress. A proposed strategy has been formulated and will be further developed to ensure that any such strategy meets the aims of the project. As outlined by the previous report, it is well known that a 'one size fits all' approach. Furthermore, it should be recognised that a valid approach to advocacy is the "top down, bottom up" approach, whereby all staff are targeted. It is important that involvement in UBIR is extended to all levels of staff; indeed a meeting with a key academic within a research department uncovered a real desire among research students to have their research available in the public domain. Although the previous report notes that briefing papers can address the need for communication in part, it is important that any promotional strategy aims for inclusiveness and fluidity.

A further part of the promotion and advocacy of UBIR is the raising of the profile of the repository. UBIR has now been registered with OAlster, the cross-searching repository harvesting initiative based at the University of Michigan as well as ROAR. In the first few weeks after registration with both of these services, full-text downloads increased by well over 100, thus demonstrating that presence equals promotion. This figure has since increased by well over 1,000.

Also underway is the placing of links to the repository at appropriate points on the University of Bolton website. Members of Research Committee have been asked to take this forward, to be supported by the Project Manager.

- 34. *Adopt practical assistance and advice from the Repository Support Project*

Delayed. Work to establish a European Digital Commons User Group has been underway during the current reporting period. Contact has been made with a number of institutions, although it is likely the formation of such a group will be delayed due to the possibility that one of the potential members may be reviewing their choice of repository solution.

- 35. *Run staff focus groups as appropriate*

The focus group to target the English, Film and Media and Creative Writing research group the School of Arts, Media and Education took place in the Summer of 2008.

Contact has been made with a number of key research staff and meetings have been held. These meetings have provided excellent momentum for the project by establishing needs and the way in which actions can be brought to fruition.

- 36. *Identify 'pockets of research' within the university*

The UBIR Team has used electronic databases such as Scopus to identify prolific researchers within the university. Such authors will be contacted. It is hoped that contacting authors directly in this way will yield

significant content. It is hoped that by making use of these pockets of research, UBIR will truly demonstrate that the scope of the project far exceeds the demands of the RAE.

37. Embed into Research Committee meetings etc. – Due Mar 09

The Project Manager has been invited to a meeting of the Research Committee to re-start the work done in this area by the previous Project Manager.

WORKPACKAGE 6

42. Affect culture change within the university

Delayed due to departure of Project Manager. During the present reporting period, no such dialogue regarding mandatory submission of research has occurred.

Section Three: Institutional & Project Partner Issues

Graham Stone left the University of Bolton at the end of April 2008. The new Project Manager has been in post since 8 September 2008. As detailed in the previous report, administration of the project has been continued by Tracey Gill under the direction of Professor Rob Campbell, Director of Professional Research Development. The interim measure ensured that the project has maintained momentum and progress in the four months between the departure of the previous Project Manager and the appointment of the new one.

Section Four: Outputs and Deliverables

See <http://digitalcommons.bolton.ac.uk/>, in particular the FAQs at <http://digitalcommons.bolton.ac.uk/faq.html>
See also Section 8 of this report.

Section Five: Outcomes and Lessons Learned

The previous report noted that the project could have fitted in better with the university calendar. An emerging thought is that while this could be the case, there are pressures on potential depositors throughout the academic year, so a better solution could be a year-round, varied approach to advocacy. For example, while one might assume that the summer months would not be an appropriate time to engage in promotional activities, in reality this is a part of the academic year when potential depositors may have more time to devote to matters such as UBIR.

An initial driver for the success of UBIR was the RAE. Although it has been documented that the RAE created a suitable enthusiasm among researchers and academics about the role and purpose of UBIR, it has come to light that there has been a certain amount of confusion as to the extent of this role. For the purposes of the RAE, papers were gathered from schools and departments. Many of these papers were publisher versions: as one might expect it was therefore not possible to include these full-text papers. The confusion has arisen as a number of authors were not aware that submission of the paper copies to the previous Project Manager did not necessarily mean that the papers would be included in UBIR. Furthermore, the apparent emphasis on RAE submissions had meant that a number of authors were not aware that the scope of the reached further than the RAE. Lessons learned from this could be articulated thus:

- That the RAE, while a relevant driver given the 'forced' nature of research collection, should not be seen as the only motivation for involvement in repositories such as UBIR;
- Authors perhaps needed to be made aware of the issues surrounding copyright as it may have been possible to submit full-text had the author versions been available;
- That UBIR has a life beyond the RAE.

A further lesson that is emerging is the issues surrounding the use of hosted software. UBIR uses Digital Commons, one of a select number of hosted repository solutions. Many aspects of the software are controlled by Digital Commons, whose concerns are often software-led, which means that aspects of negotiating change have been somewhat protracted. However, change is necessary if UBIR is to develop and meet the needs of the community that it aims to serve. Therefore, one might consider that the following lessons and outcomes are emerging:

- Communication between client and supplier is essential;

- The articulation of needs must be as clear as possible;
- Hosted repository solutions come with a wide range of benefits, principally technical expertise and hosting of the actual products. However, there are disadvantages, the most potentially damaging ones being having to rely on a third party, and the limitations of that third party, to provide a repository solution that best fits the needs of the institution.

Section Six: Evaluation

The following items are of note for this reporting period:

- Negotiations are underway with Digital Commons for further customisation of the repository. So far, this includes better linkage from the repository back to the University of Bolton website. It is hoped that these negotiations will also result in customised metadata, as at present the fields available in the submission form do not allow for any sort of detail to be recorded. It is hoped that not only will the addition of these fields enrich the metadata, but it will also assist all those involved in the submission of research to the repository.
- As well as a mail shot to current academics, a mail shot has also been sent to all research students to identify further pockets of content. Conversation with an academic in one of the departments has revealed that research students are likely to be keen on submitting research as they will be able to see the potential benefits of getting their research out in a public arena.

Section Seven: Dissemination

Since the last reporting period, it has been decided that an official launch during the next reporting period may not be appropriate. In many ways, a soft launch can be as successful as a more formal launch, as such a launch will allow the repository to speak for itself and become slowly embedded in university culture. To that end, the soft launch of UBIR will continue thus:

- Inclusion of links to UBIR at every available opportunity on the University of Bolton website;
- UBIR has been registered with both OAISter and ROAR, both of which will serve to widen access to the repository and the research held within;
- A major focus for the next reporting period will be to increase content. Increased content heightens visibility of the repository, and allows potential depositors to see exactly what they may be getting involved with.

It is still intended to include a feature in the University of Bolton magazine, The Bolt, as well as features in the university's weekly All Staff Bulletin to aim for wider dissemination of UBIR.

Section Eight: Risks, Issues and Challenges

As reported in Sections 1 and 3, the departure of the previous Project Manager posed a significant risk to the project. Due to this change in personnel, some milestones have had to be delayed.

The previous report identified that one potential risk is the fact that academics do not, as a general rule, keep hold of copies of their own versions of research. This means that a number of papers have been received that the UBIR Team will not be able to make use of. This could be seen as one of the risks of not including metadata-only records within the repository. However, as this is a problem that affects many, many repositories, it could be seen not as a risk but as a challenge, one that fits in with one of the major intended outcomes of the project: to affect culture change within the university.

A further challenge for the repository will be the possibly adoption of the 'editor model' as described in the previous report. However, implementation of such a model poses a risk that suitable administrative assistants may not be able to be found in each department. The editor model has been very successfully implemented at the University of Liverpool, so knowledge is available to overcome this risk should the editor model be followed at the University of Bolton.

One crucial challenge will be the achievement of critical mass, which will rely on the risks and issues identified being addressed.

Section Nine: Collaboration and Support
<p>As outlined in Section 2, the formation of a European Digital Commons User Group may be subject to delay. However, given the geographic location of Digital Commons, a User Group is still considered to be useful, so it is hoped that this will gain ground during the next reporting period.</p> <p>One suggestion for an area of further training and support is the working towards metadata standards for repositories.</p>
Section Ten: Financial Statement
<p>See table given at the end of this report and Appendix 1.</p>
Section Eleven: Next Steps
<p>WORKPACKAGE 1</p> <p>7. <i>Programme meeting</i> An objective for the next reporting period – on schedule</p> <p>9. <i>Deadline for final project reports</i> An objective for the next reporting period – on schedule</p> <p>10. <i>Project close</i> An objective for the next reporting period – on schedule</p> <p>WORKPACKAGE 5</p> <p>31. <i>Write and agree communications and promotional strategy</i> Work continues in this area; see Section 2.</p> <p>34. <i>Adopt practical assistance and advice from the Repository Support Project (RSP)</i> It is hoped that with the assistance of the RSP, the next reporting period will see the formation of a European User Group for Digital Commons.</p> <p>35. <i>Run staff focus groups as appropriate</i> Staff focus groups will not only be a mechanism for more content, but also will allow concerns such as copyright and the practicalities of submitting work to be addressed. It is therefore intended that staff focus groups will be arranged as appropriate.</p> <p>36. <i>Identify 'pockets of research' within the University</i> Having identified such pockets, the UBIR Team will make direct contact with the authors in question.</p> <p>37. <i>Embed into Research Committee meetings, etc.</i> As described in Section 2, the invitation of the Project Manager to a Research Committee meeting will ensure that the process of embedding UBIR into the culture of the university continues. The Director of Research and Enterprise has made a commitment to ensuring that these invitations will be forthcoming, and will also invite the project manager to speak at. As described by the previous report, avenues of part ownership on the part of academics will be explored in the next reporting period. Linked to this will be the possibly exploration of the 'editor model' as ownership of the repository by academics and implementation of an editor model are very closely related.</p> <p>38. <i>Undertake review of other university policies regarding the mandatory electronic submission of theses</i> In relation to the addition of theses to the IR, the following points need to be addressed in the next reporting period:</p>

- PDF/A needs to be investigated as a possible replacement to PDF documents
- Publisher policies need to be checked, for example, the American Chemical Society state that if a thesis is ‘published’ via an IR it cannot be published as a journal article at a later date
- Guidance on Creative Commons licences for these submissions should be investigated
- Author copyright issues must be addressed within the University submission procedures

39. *Publish new university policy of the mandatory electronic submission of theses*

Formulation of policy will need to consider the following points:

- Format for theses;
- Publisher policy relating to ‘publication’ of theses in institutional repositories;
- Author copyright issues including the Creative Commons licence.

In addition, any future policy on mandatory electronic submission of theses will need to take into account that the University of Bolton has become a Level 2 Associate Member of EThOS. Indeed, EThOS membership may drive this particular task.

42. *Affect culture change within the University*

Work should continue to ensure that authors cease to rely solely on the publisher PDF as the only record of their research; a major cultural change will be the drive to ensure that the author post-print is retained. Driving this particular change can also be seen as a lesson that is emerging; see Section 5.

A further way in which UBIR can contribute to the changing landscape of scholarly communication is to ensure that policies encompass all aspects of the submission process, and therefore the following will be addressed during the next reporting period:

- Submission/cataloguing guidelines. This document will allow the embedding of UBIR into library procedure as well as contributing to any future ‘editor model’ arrangements;
- Copyright policy, i.e. dealing with copyright and publishers.

In addition, as stated in the previous report, the Project Manager will get involved with the University E-Strategy following discussions with academics in the Institute for Education Cybernetics at the University of Bolton.

43. *Promote and support a ‘research-informed teaching environment’ due March 2009*

The promotion and support of a ‘research-informed teaching environment’ will require similar steps to those outlined above as it ostensibly part of the whole notion of affecting cultural change within the university. A focus for the next reporting period will be to investigate and review other universities’ activities within this area.

44. *Increase marketing opportunities for the university*

A number of other institutions are using repositories not as a showcase for research – itself a marketing tool – but also as a way to market the university as a whole. The next reporting period will undertake to review the following:

- The ways in which other repositories are marketing their institutions;
- Benefits to the institution and to the repository
- Capabilities of the Digital Commons software;

Total Grant	£30,000	Duration of project	April 2007 to March 2009
Reporting Period	May 2008 to November 2008		

Budget Headings	Total budget allocated	Expenditure this reporting period	Total expenditure to date	Further information
Staff	£39,471	£2,868	£5,619 - Please refer to the claim form completed for this period, which outlines the information.	Please see the claim form completed for this period, which outlines the information.
Travel & Subsistence	£1,100	£56	Previous expenditure: £86 + £114 = £200	Original project application had no monies for T & S. Vired monies from other non pay categories to fund T & S.
Equipment	£14,971	£7,897	£10,683	Overspend – vired monies from dissemination and other to pay for.
Dissemination activities	£414	£0	£0	Original project application had £1,200 for dissemination activities. Vired monies to T & S and Equipment.
Evaluation activities	£0	£0	£0	
Other (please specify)	£400	£149	£40	

Checklist:

Before you return this report:

- Ensure that your project webpage on the JISC site is up to date and contains the correct information. Attach details of any required amendments to this report. Project webpages can be found from: <http://www.jisc.ac.uk/whatwedo/projects.aspx>
- If there have been any changes to the original project plan and/or work packages, ensure that amended copies of the relevant sections of your project plan are attached to this report.

Appendix 1



JISC Project Progress Reports Budget Template

Directly Incurred Staff	Current Year November 07 To Date April 2008			
	Carry Forward (A)	Year Budget (B)	Actual Expenditure (C)	Variance ((A)+(B))-(C)
Post, Grade & % FTE	£-	£-	£-	£-
Etc. Project Manager	£6,572	£10,722	£0	£17,294
Etc.	£-	£-	£-	£-
Total Directly Incurred Staff (A)	£6,572	£10,722	£0	£17,294
Non-Staff				
Travel and expenses	£1,100	£-	£114	£986
Hardware/software	£4,288	£-	£0	£4,288
Dissemination	£414	£-	£0	£414
Evaluation	£-	£-	£-	£-
Other	£360	£-	£0	£360
Total Directly Incurred Non-Staff (B)	£6,162	£-	£114	£6,048
Directly Incurred Total (A+B=C) (C)	£12,734	£10,722	£114	£23,342
Directly Allocated				
Staff	£1,180	£3,050	£0	£4,230
Estates	£72	£155	£0	£227
Other	£-	£-	£-	£-
Directly Allocated Total (D)	£1,252	£3,205	£0	£4,457
Indirect Costs (E)	£692	£1,500	£0	£2,192
Total Project Cost (C+D+E)	£14,678	£15,427	£114	£29,991
Funds Received from JISC	£8,750	£6,250	£-	£15,000
Institutional Contributions	£4,049	£23,679	£4,604	£23,124

Nature of Institutional Contributions

Directly Incurred Staff				
Post, Grade & % FTE	£	£23,679	£	£23,124
Project Manager – 0.40% approx	0	Combined for	1884	Combined for
Admin – 0.40% approx	4,049	both.	2,720	both.
Directly Incurred Non Staff				
Hardware/Software etc.	£-	£-	£-	£-
Directly Allocated				
Staff, Estates etc.	£-	£-	£-	£-
Indirect Costs				
Indirect Costs	£-	£-	£-	£-
Total Institutional Contributions	£4049	£23,679	£4,604	£23,124
		Combined for both.		Combined for both.