Identifying Policy Trends: Institutional Repository Policy Survey Results

Background

Created in 2006, the Institutional Repository at the University of Florida (IR@UF) has grown in both size and scope. In 2016 the IR Manager set out to review the existing IR policies at UF and complete an environmental scan of peer institutions to determine best practices in order to recommend policy revisions.

July – Oct. 2015 – review peer institution IR websites; formulate survey questions
April 2016 – Send Pilot survey to 26 institutions; 16 (61%) responded
May – Sept. 2016 – Update survey based on feedback from peers, add 3 questions to determine scope of IRs at participating institutions
Oct. 2016 – Send final survey out via 6 academic list-servs; 76 respondents

Total of 94 respondents:
- 67 US institutions
- 7 International institutions
- 20 Unspecified

Demographics

What platform/technology do you use for your IR?

- ScholarlyCommons 2%
- Epion 1%
- Other – please explain 12%
- Digital Commons 47%
- CONTENTdm 2%
- DSpace 34%
- Open Repository 0%
- Other: please explain 0%
- InDora 2%
- ScholarlyCommons + Other 2%
- Other: please explain 1%

IR Administration

Which department/administers the IR at your institution?

68 respondents

- 100% are administered by the library, with 4% sharing administration with another department

Which entity set the initial policies when your IR was established?

68 respondents

- Department 23%
- Individual 21%
- Community set its own policies 4%
- Multiple 4%

Which entity is in charge of IR policy revision/keep?

68 respondents

- Department 46%
- Community set its own policies 4%
- State committees 3%
- Advisory/Steering Committee 40%

Other IR Policies

Theses and Dissertations

89% of respondents accept ETDs
83% include digitized from print theses and dissertations
87% have a separate collection for ETDs

Metadata

What metadata is available for items in your IR, and how is it collected/assigned?

- Provided by Submitter – Required: Title, Author, Date
- Provided by Submitter – Strongly Preferred: Abstract
- Provided by Submitter – Optional: Citation, Other Version, Peer Review, Publication Status, Sponsorship/Funding, Temporal Coverage, Spatial Coverage, URL to related items*, Language*, Number (hierarchy info)*, Comments*
- Added by Staff: Subject Keywords, Type/Format, Rights, Identifiers (e.g. DOI, ARK, etc), URI to related items*, Language*, Number (hierarchy info)*
- Collection varies by institution: Subject Keywords, Contributors, Publisher
- System does not support: Comments*

Submission Policies

Who can contribute materials to the IR?

65 respondents

- 95% - Faculty
- 92% - Graduate Students
- 83% - Staff
- 74% - Researchers affiliated with the institution
- 71% - Undergraduate Students
- 69% - Emeritus Faculty

Collection Policies

What types of content are housed in your IR?

Responses weighted based on number of institutions that include a particular type of material in their IR

- 28% indicate that 10% of materials to their IR
- 28% indicate that 20% of materials to their IR
- 22% indicate that 10% of materials to their IR
- 17% indicate that 0% of materials to their IR