OAI3 - CERN Institutional Repositories and Practical Advocacy

Bill Hubbard

SHERPA Project Manager

University of Nottingham

SHERPA

SHERPA -

△ Securing a Hybrid Environment for Research Preservation and Access

△ funding: JISC (FAIR programme) and CURL

△ duration: 3 years, November 2002 – November 2005

SHERPA

△ development partner institutions

– Nottingham (lead), Leeds, Sheffield, York, Edinburgh, Glasgow, Oxford, British Library and AHDS

△ associate partner institutions

– Birkbeck College, Birmingham, Bristol, Cambridge, Durham, Imperial College, Kings College, Newcastle, Royal Holloway, School of Oriental and African Studies, University College London

SHERPA

Institutional Repositories

△ e-Prints as research outputs

△ hold multiple subjects

△ part of institutional information service

△ long-term existence

△ . . . implications of these choices for advocacy

Implications and issues

△ research cultures vary across subject-disciplines

△ integrated into institutional information service

△ repositories have a public face and responsibilities

△ long term preservation commitments

SHERP△

Differentiate stakeholders

△ three internal constituencies

– academics, administrators, librarians

△ four external constituencies

– funding agencies, publishers, media, public

SHERP

Academics

△ as producers
  – disseminate material
  – get recognition

△ as consumers
  – find material
  – get ready access

△ as individuals
  – they do not want more work
  – things work ok

△ involves cultural change . . .

SHERP△

Administrators

△ inward management

   – practical issues of information service

   – ownership of IPR

   – exposing and recording activities

△ outward presentation

   – who represents research?

   – legal liabilities

   – new possibilities as a public face

SHERPA

Librarians & information professionals

△ concerns of curation

– long-term preservation, long-term commitment

△ additional work!

– creating, populating, advocating repositories

△ impact on serials

– prices, changes

SHERPA

External constituencies

- △ funding agencies
- △ publishers
- △ media
- △ public consumers

SHERP△

Academics and cultural change

△ things seem ok . . .

△ affects working habits and reward structures

△ centrally-driven initiatives vs. local developments

△ monoscopic analysis is not enough . . .

△ when to push and when to stop

△ what makes cultural change?

SHERP△

Choices and possible paths

- △ academic-archiving vs. mediation
- △ back-catalogue vs. future output
- △ academic's web-page
- △ departmental web-page
- △ . . . the emergent repository

SHERPA

SHERPA - progress

△ repositories set up in each partner institution

△ test papers being added

△ negotiations with publishers

△ discussions on preservation of eprints

△ work on IPR and deposit licences

△ advocacy campaigns starting

△ sharing experiences and formulating strategies

SHERP

Summary

△ identify stakeholders

△ identify their needs and viewpoints

△ differentiate potentials, goals, returns

△ differentiate change

– upgrading, process and cultural

△ support needs, appeal to aspirations

SHERP

http://www.sherpa.ac.uk

bill.hubbard@nottingham.ac.uk

Process of adoption

△ Awareness

△ Action

△ Engagement

△ Integration

△ Sustenance and development

SHERPA

why "*institutional*"?

△ institutions have centralised resources:

  – to subsidise repository start up

  – to support repositories with technical / organisational infrastructures

  – to deal effectively with preservation issues over the long term

△ institutions get benefits:

  – raising profile and prestige of institution

  – managing institutional information assets

  – encourages an institutional identity in intellectual output

SHERP