

Catalogue and Index

Editorial

June 2012, Issue 167

Those of us who don't work in academic institutions might find repositories a bit of an unknown entity. In this issue we hope to solve your dilemma – we give you everything you always wanted to know about repositories but were afraid to ask. We start with articles by Gareth Johnson and Jackie Wickham that provide some background information, and follow up with more personal articles from a variety of practitioners that give a flavour of what it's like managing a repository, dealing with classification problems, and moving from cataloguing into repository management. We hope these will answer most of your questions. Finally, we include a review of a seminar and a book review.

Cathy Broad

library@ethicalsoc.org.uk

Heather Jardine

heatherjardine402@hotmail.com



Contents

2-4 UKCoRR – At the Heart of the UK Open Access Repository Landscape *by* Gareth J Johnson

5-8 The Repositories Support Project *by* Jackie Wickham

9-15 Managing a Creative Arts Institutional Repository *by* Anne Spalding

16-19 Repository metadata for diverse collections *by* Alex Clarke and Anna Lawson

20-23 Cataloguing, classification and the University of Northampton Institutional Repository *by* Janet Milner

24-27 Implementing a Current Research Information System (CRIS) with an existing Institutional Repository (IR) *by* Dominic Tate

28-32 Why not send a cataloguer? *by* Janet Aucock

33-34 Reviews

Implementing a Current Research Information System (CRIS) with an existing Institutional Repository (IR): a Brief Overview

Dominic Tate, Repository & Digital Assets Manager, Royal Holloway, University of London

Background to Open Access at Royal Holloway

[Royal Holloway, University of London](#) is part of the federal University of London system, and is one of the [1994 Group](#) of “smaller, research intensive” universities. The College has been involved in activities relating to open access for some time now. The Library Service has been part of the [SHERPA-LEAP](#) consortium since its inception in February 2004.

Membership of LEAP meant that Royal Holloway was able to benefit from an [EPrints](#) repository hosted by UCL as part of a subsidiary project. At the end of the term the repository was moved back into Royal Holloway’s own infrastructure and hosting was taken over by Royal Holloway’s own IT department, who opted to use [Equella](#) software.

The College has also adopted a firm stance from a policy point of view, with the adoption of two institutional policies designed to ensure the widest possible dissemination of its research outputs. The first was the [Open Access Publications Policy](#), which requires all staff to make their research outputs available in an open access format wherever it is possible to do so (using the [repository](#) as a platform), which was implemented to be effective from October 2010 onwards.

To complement this, Research Council also approved a new [E-Thesis Submission Policy](#), which requires all new PhD theses to be made available on an open access basis wherever possible. Students can request access restrictions on their theses of up to two, three or five years, depending on circumstances.

The Open Access Publication Policy and the E-Thesis Submission Policy are both institutional policies, rather than library policies, and although the Library Service has led the move towards open access, the College has benefitted from high-level institutional support for all these open access initiatives, which has certainly eased their implementation. However, in spite of ongoing advocacy activities undertaken by the library’s Digital Collections & Research Information Team, the academic reception has been mixed, with some academic departments displaying little motivation for open access.

Implementing a Current Research Information System (CRIS) – The Library Perspective

In 2010, Royal Holloway acquired and deployed a brand new Current Research Information System (CRIS), using [Pure](#) software, which is a product of a Danish company, Atira. Whereas the implementation of the open access repository was a matter for library and IT staff to handle, rolling out Pure was very much a College-wide initiative.

The procurement process involved a number of senior members of staff including the Vice-Principal for Research, Enterprise & Communications, the Director of Strategy and the Head of Research & Enterprise.

Pure was purchased with a number of objectives in mind. The most pressing was to have a means of handling the College's submission for the forthcoming [Research Excellence Framework](#) (REF) in 2014. Beyond that, Pure will provide a platform to gather, process and (where appropriate) make available information relating to the research activities undertaken within the College.

It was always the intention that Pure should link to the existing open access repository, and that it should provide a single interface by which academics could submit versions of their research papers for research management/REF purposes, and to make a version available on an open access basis.

In addition to the main Pure product, Royal Holloway opted for the [Pure Portal](#), which would display research information via web pages designed to match the latest College style sheets. Pure, and the new portal web pages were deployed at around the same time as the new-look College website was rolled out. Initially, staff in the IT, Research & Enterprise and Library Services helped to manually upload staff publications to the system, and all academic colleagues were offered the opportunity to submit publication lists to be uploaded to the new-look pages. This offer came with a deadline, after which, academic colleagues would be expected to maintain their own profiles and to keep their own publications and personal details up to date.

Linking CRIS and Repository – Workflow Considerations

Like most research information systems, Pure comes with a workflow that is designed to allow system administrators to check, or 'validate' material submitted to the system before it goes live. At Royal Holloway, it was decided not to use the workflow for two reasons. Firstly, it was felt to be important that, for colleagues to engage with the system, they should be able to see changes they make to their web pages instantly rather than having to wait for new documents to be checked by an administrator (as in the typical repository-style workflow). Secondly, at the point of roll-out, there was not the staffing resource available to carry out such checking adequately.

A connection was specified that would take full-text documents submitted to Pure and transfer them to the existing Equella repository for accessibility and preservation. It had been decided to continue to use Equella as the document store for the repository as it provided a good fit with Equella continuing to be used as the main platform for digital content within Royal Holloway. Upon deployment of this connector, full text content that had previously been added to Pure was transferred to the repository.

The Academic Perspective

Academic colleagues have generally adapted well to using Pure to maintain their profiles and publications lists. Of course, they have provided a wealth of feedback during the testing phases and since the system went live. They generally find Pure easy to use which reduces the burden on the administration, which is shared between IT, Research & Enterprise and Library Services.

Generally, academic colleagues are keen to engage with the system as it is their means of maintaining information about their publications and research activities on their College web pages. Since the

implementation of the connection to the repository, this has caused some problems for the library, as academics occasionally try to add a publisher's PDF to their website where the publisher's permissions do not allow this. Library staff regularly check newly submitted documents and will endeavour to replace these with preprints or postprints if publishers permit.

Without a doubt, using Pure has hugely increased interest in open access and deposits to the repository. This is for a number of reasons. Firstly, Pure does much more for them than the repository ever did; it handles complex information about grants, projects, outputs, impacts, students, and projects, with publications being just one of many types of data.

Secondly, many academics want to make publications available via their web pages, so the provision of a single point of upload to the repository that matches this makes things very easy.

Finally, even for those few academic colleagues who have not added much content to Pure, they are now being asked to do so as part of Royal Holloway's preparations for the forthcoming REF. Essentially, publications need to be added to Pure in order to form part of the REF submission.

Cataloguing Considerations

Equella is used to support a number of collections across various departments at Royal Holloway, but only two of these collections are administered by the library – [Royal Holloway Research Online](#) (the open access repository) and a separate, closed collection to hold past exam papers, which is only available on campus, or off-campus using a staff or student login.

In common with most UK repositories, the library has never created separate library catalogue records for electronic items held in its open access repository. One key aim is to make the repository's contents widely available via open access, so Google becomes the primary route to discovery. Of course, it is also important to ensure that staff and students of the College have access to its own research outputs, especially where the library does not have a current subscription to that content.

The Library Service is in the process of implementing a new "[Library Search](#)" service, which is made up of a [VuFind](#) front end on top of [Summon](#). It was decided at an early stage that this service should search the open access and exam paper collections in Equella, as well as the library catalogue ([Ex Libris Aleph](#)) and that of the College Archives ([Axiell's CALM](#)).

Summon makes use of [OAI-PMH](#) (Open Archives Initiatives Protocol for Metadata Harvesting) feeds from the Equella repository to surface records about its contents.

This has worked very well so far, and this automation between the two systems has made it very easy for library staff to change repository contents and to see these changes reflected in Library Search immediately.

Until 2011, the library held print copies of exam papers in stock, which of course required catalogue records to be created in Aleph. During the first year of the withdrawal of the print stock, catalogue records were maintained in Aleph, pointing to the electronic copy in Equella. This proved to be costly, time-consuming and difficult to maintain, so it has been decided that for the 2012-2013 academic year, the library will remove exam paper catalogue records from Aleph and rely on other means for discovery. Students at Royal Holloway make use of the [Moodle](#) Virtual Learning Environment (VLE), so as long as each course unit within Moodle provides a link to the relevant exam paper in Equella, this will provide the best route of access for students. In addition to this, discovery is via links from the library homepage, and, of course, Library Search.

Conclusions

The implementation of Pure in conjunction with Equella has been a lengthy but worthwhile exercise, as it has increased the number of deposits in the repository as well as the rate of deposit. It has provided a better user experience for the academic and enables us to link publication to research projects, funding and impacts as well as to staff and students.