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These are the points that we’re going to briefly touch on.
This is our site which we’ve named Scholars’ Bank.
We started out with a very typical vision for our repository, the same vision that is hard
coded into the DSpace software: that we would be archiving faculty work that they would
submit themselves.

Although we haven’t abandoned this vision, we have modified and expanded it quite a lot
and that is where the University of Oregon has found success.
Challenges

- Cultural
  - Faculty Time
  - Intellectual Property Concerns
  - Authenticity of Submissions
  - Limitations of the vision
- Technical
  - Submission model
  - Metadata
  - Version control and revision
  - User Interface

The challenges listed here are the same that many others have spoken about in the past few years, so we won’t belabor them.
In the first 8 months that Scholars’ Bank existed (May-December 2003), we had succeeded in acquiring only 93 items. 12% of those were from the library, in the form of library staff articles or presentations or finding aids.

11% were faculty items from a faculty member who was the spouse of one of the IR group members.

5% were faculty and student papers from the School of Planning, Public Policy, and Management.

The vast majority were Economic department working papers, after we secured permission from the editor to harvest the backfile of papers from the departmental website.

After 8 months of extensive work talking to individual faculty members trying to interest them in the archive and getting at best a lukewarm response and almost no follow through from those faculty who did express an interest, we realized that something had to change, if we wanted to create a viable and useful repository.
Rethinking and Restructuring

- Expand definition of “Scholarly output”
  - Faculty output
  - Individual and group work (journals)
  - Library collections
  - Electronic records of the University
  - Finding aids
  - Articles, presentations, etc.
  - Campus publications
  - Newsletters
  - Planning documents
  - Student works
  - Theses and dissertations
  - Special projects
  - Research interest groups
  - Miscellaneous

Our definition has expanded so that materials deposited in the archive are either themselves scholarly or else support the University’s scholarly mission. That has enabled us to go after a broader range of content, much of which would not otherwise be archived – or not effectively and reliably archived.

We came to realize that it is not a panacea for the scholarly communication crisis but could become a part of a new model.
Scholars’ Bank now has over 800 items in it, and the breakdown of the types of material in it looks very different from the way we expected it to look when we got started.

We have quite a variety of content and we’ll go into more detail on some of it.
In addition to seeking out the output of individual faculty members, such as articles, we have also acquired entire journals edited by our faculty.

There are some challenges we have faced in acquiring entire journal issues, rather than selected articles, some of which relate to the original software design. We have developed workarounds related to ingest, metadata, and display in order to accommodate this kind of content.
UO, like MIT, Rochester, and some others, have begun to create individual collections for faculty members.
We have established Electronic Records as a sub-community under the broader community of Special Collections and University Archives.

An increasingly large problem looming on the horizon for universities of every size is the management of their born-digital historical records. University Archivists and Records Managers are all struggling with issues of what to keep, how to keep it safe and secure, and how to make it accessible. At the UO we’ve decided to use our IR as part of our evolving plan to manage the University’s electronic records.
While an institutional repository is not the final answer to electronic records management it provides an option that can be used almost off the shelf.

In using DSpace, we are able to preserve the hierarchical nature of the arrangement of our documents, based on the functions and organizations of the university.

Another appeal of the IR environment was the fact that the University Archives was able to participate in a larger project, rather than the usual route of planning, creating, and maintaining their own stand alone system.

**Challenges:**

The original software design expects all files connected with an item to be ingested at the same time. We’ve had to develop a workaround for this to handle these particular types of records. The submission template also presented some challenges which the latest release should help us address.
We have begun to archive many campus publications. The editors of this publication wanted it to appear under its own name and not under the name of the sponsoring department. So the community/collection model sometimes forces us to feign a hierarchy that doesn’t exist. This is not the only case in our archive where the community and collection name are identical or nearly so.
Although we are still battling with our Graduate School to get their endorsement for archiving Theses and Dissertations in Scholars’ Bank, we have had a lot of success with individual departments or programs who want to archive honors theses or terminal projects in the repository.
This collection archives the research papers for a particular Honors College class. It is connected to an archive of the digitized primary source materials that the students used for their research. This is a unique collaboration that has tied us in to the instructional programs of the campus in unique ways.
This is another unique student collection where the library has established a competitive undergraduate research award, the recipients of which are expected to archive their winning research in the archive. We hope to begin influencing the next generation of faculty to consider such archives as a normal part of their professional lives.

We’re also working with a sponsor to establish something comparable for faculty.
As we’ve adapted our vision to fit our reality, we’ve modified much of our policy framework.

We’ll only briefly touch on some of these issues where we’ve had to rethink our policy framework.
Since well **over 95% of the current content was added by library staff** with the authors’ permission, we’ve developed some workarounds to the default submission process which attaches a license file.

- When we handle the submission for an author, we get **email or paper agreement to the license which then convert to a text file that we link to the submission in the archive**.

This view from within the administrative structure for a particular submission show top license file automatically generated by the system when the item was submitted second license file contains the converted text file,  

- labor-intensive, but we consider this important step until the software develops to be more accommodating for different submission models
As we’ve expanded beyond items created and submitted directly by individual faculty, we’ve had to make decisions about the depth of indexing or metadata we will supply (as in the case of article titles within an archived issue of a journal), as well as how to apply metadata to get separately archived journal issues to display logically within the DSpace framework.

This varies from publication to publication, depending on community desires.
As we’ve rethought our model, we’ve had to modify and expand our local contextual wrapper for the IR.
One of the things we do is try to point out why the IR is beneficial for them. This page is addressed to faculty. We also have one for students.
We still try to educate them about the issues and let them see that this is part of a growing international movement.
These are some of the areas where we’ve been doing work. We’ve had good success when our library subject specialists have taken the lead in getting a discussion of Scholars’ Bank on departmental agendas.
One of our Ph.D. candidates submitted her dissertation herself, in spite of lack of support from the Grad School. A few weeks later, a journal editor was searching Google for information on her topic, found her submission in Scholars’ Bank, contacted her and asked her to write an article based on her research. She has done up a testimonial which we now have added as part of our context for the archive.
We also catalog journal titles and selected monographs deposited in the IR and we link to the SB version from the library catalog.
Make Connections Beyond Campus

We register the IR in appropriate registries, such as OAIIster and the Institutional Archives Registry.

This screen shows a Scholars’ Bank item retrieved through OAIster, where we’ve registered the archive.
As of June 30, 2005, there were 838 items in Scholars’ Bank. This chart shows that the greatest number of submissions has occurred in the past six months, reflecting our expanded vision for the archive and the various strategies we have developed.

Contributions to Scholars' Bank have increased 255% over what had been submitted in the previous 18 months. Hits against the archive have increased 224% in the same time period, with searchers coming in from all over the world.
We have achieved what we have to date by being creative, flexible, and by thinking broadly.

Are we changing scholarly communication?

we haven’t ignited a revolution within the faculty yet but they are beginning to see the IR’s potential

Discussions are starting to occur in some academic departments about allowing works deposited in such archives to count towards tenure and promotion.

There is still substantial resistance among the old guard campus administrators and change is happening slowly.

However, we are expanding access to grey literature and under-collected research and primary source materials.

Our IR complements rather than supplants the traditional publishing model
These are some of the strategies we will be following to further grow and develop the archive.
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