

Fall November 8, 2010

Perceptions of Developing Trends in Repositories (2010)

Perceptions of Developing Trends in Repositories

Survey Results for The SPARC Digital Repositories Meeting 2010

Baltimore, MD November 8th-9th, 2010

Brought to you by bepress/Digital Commons (<http://www.bepress.com/ir/>)

We asked SPARC attendees to respond to a dozen questions that explored IR trends in university libraries. These questions are identical to the ones we asked during the 2008 "Perceptions of Developing Trends in Repositories" survey, which we distributed at SPARC 2008. As before, we provided links to real life examples that best represented each trend.

We are happy to report that over 70 SPARC attendees took part in the survey. Thanks to all who responded! The breadth of feedback is a testament to the wonderful group that SPARC has brought together.

The results are divided into two sections. Pages 2-5 provide a summary of our survey data and page 6 provides links to the sites that we used as examples. Please send any questions or feedback to: Matt Dewalt – (510) 665-1200 x168 – mdewalt@bepress.com.

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 United States License. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/us/> or send a letter to Creative Commons, 171 Second Street, Suite 300, San Francisco, California, 94105, USA.

Section 1: Integrating new types of material into the IR

Question #1: Do you believe that showcasing student research in the IR will become a growing trend in the following year?

| Answer Options | Response Percent |
|----------------|------------------|
| Very likely | 40.5% |
| Likely | 45.9% |
| Unlikely | 6.8% |
| Not at all | 1.4% |
| Not sure | 5.4% |

n=74

Question #2: Here are some specific ways student research is being showcased in an IR. Please indicate how likely you think it is for each of these novel approaches to develop into a significant trend. (10 being most likely)

| Answer Options | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | Rating Average |
|--|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----------------|
| Electronic theses and dissertations (Example from the University of South Carolina) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 14 | 44 | 9.4 |
| Honors theses/projects by department (Example from Macalester College) | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 15 | 15 | 11 | 24 | 8.3 |
| Undergraduate faculty-reviewed journal (Example from Utah State University) | 0 | 2 | 7 | 3 | 12 | 9 | 11 | 7 | 8 | 10 | 6.6 |
| Undergraduate peer-reviewed journals (Example from Illinois Wesleyan University) | 5 | 1 | 1 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 8 | 9 | 4 | 12 | 6.4 |

Question #3: Do you believe that using the IR to archive and disseminate non-academic content will become a growing trend in the following year?

| Answer Options | Response Percent |
|----------------|------------------|
| Very likely | 12.7% |
| Likely | 43.7% |
| Unlikely | 19.7% |
| Not at all | 2.8% |
| Not sure | 21.1% |

n=71

Question #4: Some institutions house non-academic content in the IR. Please indicate how likely you think it is for each of the following approaches to become a trend. (10 being most likely)

| Answer Options | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | Rating Average |
|--|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|---|----|----------------|
| Alumni newsletters and magazines (Example from the University of Maryland School of Law) | 3 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 12 | 6 | 17 | 14 | 3 | 6 | 6.3 |
| Planning and development documents (Example from California Polytechnic State University) | 5 | 3 | 1 | 6 | 14 | 12 | 10 | 12 | 5 | 3 | 5.9 |
| Enrollment data, projections and reports (Example from The University of Tennessee) | 4 | 4 | 1 | 9 | 16 | 11 | 10 | 7 | 6 | 2 | 5.7 |

Section 2: Tying the IR into a wider publishing strategy

Question #5: Do you believe that publishing original faculty works in the IR will become a top trend in 2009?

| Answer Options | Response Percent |
|----------------|------------------|
| Very likely | 18.1% |
| Likely | 50.0% |
| Unlikely | 23.6% |
| Not at all | 1.4% |
| Not sure | 6.9% |

n=72

Question #6: The IR has been used to electronically publish original academic content that frequently lacks a home elsewhere. Please indicate how likely you think it is that each of the following publishing approaches will become a significant trend in the following year. (10 being most likely)

| Answer Options | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | Rating Average |
|--|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----------------|
| Conferences, symposia and colloquia (Example from LibTech Conference) | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 7 | 18 | 16 | 17 | 8.1 |
| eJournals (born-digital) (Example from the University of Massachusetts, Amherst) | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 12 | 16 | 10 | 20 | 7.9 |
| Print journals transitioning to digital publication (Example from McMaster University) | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 1 | 16 | 18 | 7 | 15 | 7.5 |
| Books and University Press publications (Example from The Purdue University Press) | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 11 | 11 | 9 | 12 | 7 | 13 | 7.0 |

Section 3: Using the IR to serve faculty's needs

Question #7: Do you believe that offering value-added services to faculty and administrators will become a necessity for IR success?

| Answer Options | Response Percent |
|--------------------|------------------|
| Very likely | 67.6% |
| Likely | 28.2% |
| Unlikely | 2.8% |
| Not at all | 0.0% |
| Not sure | 1.4% |

n=71

Question #8: Libraries are engaging stakeholders with the IR by providing a variety of value-added services. Please indicate how likely you think it is that each of the following approaches will become a significant trend in value-added services. (10 being most likely)

| Answer Options | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | Rating Average |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----------------|
| Mediated deposits (to IR and/or to PubMed Central) | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 6 | 13 | 14 | 26 | 8.5 |
| Copyright checking and negotiating agreements | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 12 | 22 | 21 | 8.4 |
| ePortfolios/personal publication pages (Example from Boise State University) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 12 | 19 | 13 | 13 | 7.9 |
| Reporting tools for faculty and administrators | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 7 | 14 | 11 | 24 | 8.0 |
| Publishing services (marketing support, obtaining ISSN, etc.) | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 9 | 10 | 17 | 9 | 14 | 7.4 |
| Peer review software | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 14 | 11 | 15 | 12 | 8 | 7.4 |

Section 4: Determining what types of content can go into the IR

Question #9: Do you believe that the mission of the IR will be extended to include capturing community-based content created by both institutionally-affiliated and –unaffiliated scholars?

| Answer Options | Response Percent |
|----------------|------------------|
| Very likely | 11.6% |
| Likely | 43.5% |
| Unlikely | 23.2% |
| Not at all | 4.3% |
| Not sure | 17.4% |

n=69

Question #10: Some IRs are beginning to capture community-based content, often created by faculty off-campus, or by unaffiliated scholars who belong to the larger research community. Please indicate how likely you think it is that IRs will begin to capture the following types of content. (10 being most likely)

| Answer Options | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | Rating Average |
|---|---|---|---|---|----|---|----|----|----|----|----------------|
| Commencement addresses, lectures and papers by non-affiliated scholars made on campus (Example from The University of Georgia School of Law) | 4 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 6 | 9 | 21 | 8 | 7 | 7.0 |
| A collection of research created by institutionally-affiliated and -unaffiliated scholars (i.e. subject archive) (Example from Cornell University ILR School) | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 9 | 8 | 10 | 15 | 11 | 7 | 7.0 |
| Collaborating with regional agencies/not-for-profits to create content (Example from The University of Massachusetts, Amherst Cranberry Station) | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 7 | 13 | 22 | 4 | 5 | 6.9 |
| Non-academic faculty output created off-campus (Example from Georgetown University School of Law) | 3 | 4 | 6 | 7 | 11 | 9 | 10 | 12 | 2 | 2 | 5.6 |

Question #11: What platform do you use?

| Answer Options | Response Percent |
|------------------------|------------------|
| DSpace | 37.1% |
| Digital Commons | 46.8% |
| Fedora | 14.5% |
| EPrints | 1.6% |

n=62

Question #11: How long has your IR been adding content?

| Answer Options | Response Percent |
|--------------------------|------------------|
| Less than 6 months | 9.0% |
| 6-18 months | 19.4% |
| 18 months-3 years | 29.9% |
| More than 3 years | 41.8% |

n=67

Question #12: Please indicate the degree to which you would rate your IR a success.

| Answer Options | Response Percent |
|-----------------------------|------------------|
| 1 (Not a success) | 3.0% |
| 2 | 0.0% |
| 3 | 7.5% |
| 4 | 3.0% |
| 5 | 20.9% |
| 6 | 14.9% |
| 7 | 16.4% |
| 8 | 20.9% |
| 9 | 4.5% |
| 10 (Unquestionable success) | 9.0% |

n=89

Links Featured in This Survey

Section 1: Integrating new types of material into the IR

Question #2: Student research

- Undergraduate peer-reviewed journals ([Example from Illinois Wesleyan University](#)) - <http://digitalcommons.iwu.edu/respublica/>
- Undergraduate faculty-reviewed journal ([Example from Utah State University](#)) - <http://digitalcommons.usu.edu/imwjjournal/>
- Honors theses/projects by department ([Example from Macalester College](#)) - http://digitalcommons.macalester.edu/ling_honors/
- Electronic theses and dissertations ([Example from the University of South Carolina](#)) - <http://scholarcommons.sc.edu/etd/>

Question #4: Non-academic content

- Alumni newsletters and magazines ([Example from the University of Maryland School of Law](#)) - <http://digitalcommons.law.umaryland.edu/jd/>
- Planning and development documents ([Example from California Polytechnic State University](#)) - <http://digitalcommons.calpoly.edu/fpcp/>
- Enrollment data, projections and reports ([Example from The University of Tennessee](#)) - http://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_libannrep/

Section 2: Tying the IR into a wider publishing strategy

Question #6: Original academic content

- Print journals transitioning to digital publication ([Example from McMaster University](#)) - <http://digitalcommons.mcmaster.ca/russelljournal/>
- eJournals (born-digital) ([Example from the University of Massachusetts, Amherst](#)) - <http://scholarworks.umass.edu/heliotropia/>
- Conferences, symposia and colloquia ([Example from the LibTech Conference](#)) - http://digitalcommons.macalester.edu/libtech_conf
- Books and University Press publications ([Example from the Purdue University Press](#)) - http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/press_ebooks/18/

Section 3: Using the IR to serve faculty's needs

Question #8: Value-added services

- ePortfolios/personal publication pages ([Example from Boise State University](#)) - http://scholarworks.boisestate.edu/sw_gallery.html

Section 4: Determining what types of content can go into the IR

Question #10: Community-based content

- Collaborating with regional agencies/not-for-profits to create content ([Example from The University of Massachusetts, Amherst Cranberry Station](#)) - <http://scholarworks.umass.edu/cranberry/>
- A collection of research created by institutionally-affiliated and -unaffiliated scholars (i.e. subject archive) ([Example from Cornell University ILR School](#)) - <http://digitalcommons.ilr.cornell.edu/>
- Non-academic faculty output created off-campus ([Example from Georgetown University School of Law](#)) - <http://scholarship.law.georgetown.edu/conq/>
- Commencement addresses, lectures and papers by non-affiliated scholars made on campus ([Example from The University of Georgia School of Law](#)) - http://digitalcommons.law.uga.edu/lectures_pre_arch_lec/