

- Q1** When did your university launch its institutional repository (IR)?  
**Q2** What IR software package(s) have you implemented?  
**Q3** Estimate the total number of documents that are published in your IR.  
**Q4** Estimate the total number of individual contributors (eg. authors) whose documents have been deposited in your IR.

		Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
CDU	Director Library & Information Access	Jan-08#	Fedora	0	0
CQU	Electronic Services Librarian	Nov-06	Fedora (and VTLS Vital)	700	765
CSU	Director Development	Dec-2007#	DigiTool (Ex Libris)	0	0
Griffith	Griffith Research Online Project Manager	Jan-07	Dspace	649 full text files; 12,000 metadata-only records	500 (of the 649)
JCU	Manager, Information Resources	Aug-06	GNU Eprints	927	1500
QUT	eResearch Access Coordinator	Nov-03	GNU Eprints	6826 records (6068 documents) - 5123 (75%) records have an open access fulltext document attached. 945 (14%) records have a restricted-access fulltext document attached (due to post-publication embargo or pending publisher permission). 758 (11%) records have no documents attached	5238 authors. Note: 1184 QUT authors have registered as depositors. Many of the papers in the repository
Swinburne	Content Management Librarian	Early 2006*	Fedora. We will be combining Fedora (repository layer software) with VTLS' VITAL software (access layer). In addition, we are also using Dspace for image management: <a href="http://images.swinburne.edu.au">http://images.swinburne.edu.au</a>	5600 records of which 10% also include an accompanying (and publicly available) full-text file.	Approximately 600 Swinburne authors have documents in the IR however we don't have all their output - just works published between 2000-2006.
UMelb	Director, Information Management	Aug-02	GNU Eprints, currently migrating to DigiTool (ExLibris)	1802	unable to tell as we are in the middle of the migration process
USC	RUBRIC Coordinator	Nov-07#	Fedora	400 Citation Records, 20 Full Text objects	300
USQ	Manager, Strategic Planning & Development, USQ ePrints	Jul-05	GNU Eprints	2087 live items; another 521 in various stages of deposit but not yet live	269 depositors; c. 1650 individual authors represented
UTS	Research and Policy Officer	2004	Dspace. Fedora is being used for the RQF only.	330	320

**Notes:**

\*Although Swinburne has had an operational repository for 18 months they have not yet officially launched as they're waiting on the next release of the VITAL software (3.1) which promises to offer a lot more functionality and hopefully a better user experience.

# Expected launch date

**Q5 Estimate the total staffing level (FTE - Full-time Equivalent) directly associated with maintaining and promoting your IR. (Include Library and IT-related staff.)**

<b>CDU</b>	1xHEW7 estimate
<b>CQU</b>	approx. 4-5 FTE on a regular basis (Systems Manager, Technical Services Manager, Office of Researcher staff member, Administrative roles, Research Librarian &
<b>CSU</b>	Running as a project with fluctuating hours of input by project team members. Unsure of final support numbers until it comes out of project mode.
<b>Griffith</b>	5 full-time Digital Repository (DR) staff, including 1 Project Manager, 1 DR Officer and 3 DR Assistants. Note: Griffith does not have a separate "Library" as such. The DR staff are in a totally different area, so most references in your survey to "library" are not applicable for us
<b>JCU</b>	LIBRARIAN (0.5 FTE) - Co-ordinate and manage day-to-day activities of the IR, including responding to enquiries; oversee metadata creation and standards; ensure copyright compliance of all records, including contacting the University Copyright Officer to clarify issues when necessary. LIBRARY ASSISTANT (0.4 FTE) - Administer and process research publications and theses in the repository, ensuring documents comply with copyright requirements; ensure metadata elements provided by non-thesis authors are correct; create metadata elements for thesis deposits. IT Officer - Support provided on an 'as needs' basis
<b>QUT</b>	Library staff: Coordination and development: 1 FTE level 8 (.85 of level 8 eResearch Access Coordinator plus .15 of level 8 Library Systems Manager) .15 FTE level 9 (Library Resource Services Manager) Processing deposits: 1 FTE level 4 LRS Library Assistant. Systems administration: .2 of a Level 6 Library Computer Systems Officer (maintenance) 1 FTE level 6 Library Computer Systems Officer (development - installing new software, migrating data etc). Promotion: 1 FTE level 6/7 Liaison Librarian (estimate - all liaison librarians spend a small portion of time promoting the repository to their liaison community)
<b>Swinburne</b>	Content Management Librarian @ 0.4 (HEW 6), Assistant Content Management Librarian @ 1.0 (HEW 5), Systems staff 0.2
<b>UMelb</b>	1 x Hew 8 - Digital Repositories coordinator, 1 x Hew 8 Digtol Coordinator x 25 % particuarly during the migration process, should reduce once migration is completed, 1 x HEW 6 cataloguer x 20%, 1 x HEW 5 100% (made up of a few staff not one full time person) these people check data and authorise the deposit make it accessible, 1 x HEW 4 x 50% Copyright - specifically publisher permissions. This has been intensive for the past 8 months as we build up a permissions database. We are looking forward to OAKList! Support from Manager of Copyright Office has been significant over last 6 months (perhaps 20%) during development of deposit and permissions processes and documentation of the new system, but should diminish once new system is in place. There has also been support from Legal Services in drafting deposit agreements, etc. IT support was minimal with eprints, but there has been more IT support provided during the migration process
<b>USC</b>	1.5 X HEW8 FTE. 0.5 X HEW5 PTE.
<b>USQ</b>	Co-ordinator: Level 9 @c. .5 ; Overall leadership and management, planning and coordination ; manages relationships with depositors, Library, Research Office, ICT ; some marketing , some Editing, RQF liaison; Cataloguer/Editor: Level 5 @ 1.0; IT Programmer/Analyst: Level 7 @.6
<b>UTS</b>	Approximately 1 FTE in total. We have level 8 people from IT, marketing and research areas doing the bulk of the work.

**Q6** Estimate what percentage (%) of the documents that are included in your IR fall into the following categories. Please provide any comments you can on the proportion of document types in your IR. eg. if you are unable to ascertain fairly accurate data, do you or your input staff have a "gut feeling" on the main types of documents your IR includes?

	Preprints of published articles	Postprints of published articles	Conference Papers	Technical Reports, Manuals	Working Papers, Discussion Papers	Book Chapters	Mono graphs	Software	Video files	Audio files	Course/ Teaching materials	Other (Theses etc)
CDU												
CQU		36	45		1	13	3					2
CSU												
Griffith		60	40									
JCU	1.3	65.3	6	2	0.2	5.7	1.4		0.1	0.1		17.9
QUT	<1	60	30	<1	4	4	<1					
Swinburne		10	10	40	40							
UMelb		23	16	0.33	17	5	1.38					37.29
USC		70	15			10						5
USQ	4	45	30	2	2	2						15
UTS		10	20		20		5			5		40

#### Comments

CQU	Note: Respondant answered 35% "Journal articles" under Other, but this is reflected in Postprints of published articles, as per definitions
CSU	journal articles and conference papers.
JCU	"Other" includes theses; exhibitions; MS powerpoint files; brochures
QUT	The figures above relate to records with documents attached. Excluded from the calculations were the 758 records which contain bibliographic details and, in most cases, linked access to the fulltext on the publisher's website - but have no documents attached. Most of these 758 bibliographic records (a mix of journal articles, books and book chapters) have been deposited for the RQF. Restricted access PDF files (published version) will be attached later for RQF assessors.
Swinburne	Please note that the above is a estimate of the content made publicly available only. Where we do find a copies of a publishers' PDF, we will store however they will be suppressed from public view and only available to repository staff and RQF Assessors. This will be in line with publishers (and their associated entities) who have allowed the use of research outputs for the RQF.
UMelb	"Other" was not completed by respondent, but answers did not total 100%.
USC	At the moment, our repository only includes DEST HERDC data and assorted images. We will soon be populating further with theses and image collections and datasets.
USQ	"Other" includes ~100 Theses (ADT and other)and ~300 4th year Engineering projects.
UTS	"Other" includes Theses

**Q7** Choose which situation best describes the deposit process for your IR.

<b>CDU</b>	Process is yet to be determined.
<b>CQU</b>	Contributors usually deposit their own work, but may seek assistance from IR staff.
<b>CSU</b>	Contributors must deposit their own work.
<b>Griffith</b>	Contributors first have to have entered publication details in the University's Research Administration system, usually as part of the annual DEST HERDC survey or for RQF or for annual performance appraisal. They upload a file -via that system- to go to the IR, where the corresponding metadata record already exists. All files are scrutinised by IR staff in a 'Workbench' area. The spread is about 50 / 50 between contributors who upload files with no assistance and those who request some assistance.
<b>JCU</b>	Contributors usually deposit their own work, but may seek assistance from IR staff.
<b>QUT</b>	It is University policy that authors should deposit their own work and most of the documents in our repository have been deposited by one of the paper's authors. In preparation for the RQF, some academic departments have delegated the task to research assistants or to administrative staff. This tends to result in only bibliographic details being deposited as only the authors have access to the postprint version that can be made open access. A few liaison librarians have deposited some documents on behalf of senior academics but they are encouraged to provide hands-on training or to sit with individual depositors and talk them through the process rather than deposit work for them. IR staff may deposit documents emailed as attachments by the author where there have been problems with a deposit. This is the exception rather than the rule.
<b>Swinburne</b>	IR staff deposit all works at this stage, but it is anticipated that contributors will be allowed to self-archive once the system is more established.
<b>UMelb</b>	Contributors usually deposit their own work, but may seek assistance from IR staff.
<b>USC</b>	IR staff deposit all works.
<b>USQ</b>	Contributors usually deposit their own work, but may seek assistance from IR staff.
<b>UTS</b>	Contributors usually seek assistance from IR staff.

Q8	Does your university require the contributor to sign (or click to agree) a deposit agreement which does the following:	CQU	CSU	Griffith	JCU	QUT	Swin	UMelb	USC	USQ	UTS
		Grants the University a non-exclusive licence to include the work in the IR.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes
Grants a particular end-user licence (eg. Creative Commons, statements saying all works can be used for non-commercial uses only, etc).	Yes							Yes	Yes		Yes
Declares that the work is non-infringing of the works of other.	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes			Yes	Yes	Yes	
Declares that they (the contributor) has obtained any necessary permissions.			Yes	Yes				Yes	Yes		Yes
Indemnifies the University for any copyright infringement, defamation, etc.	Yes		Yes							Yes	
No deposit agreement.							Yes				

**Comments:**

<b>CDU</b>	Nothing in place as yet
<b>CQU</b>	The contributor is the sole author or has the authority to make the submission
<b>QUT</b>	It is University policy that authors should deposit their own work and most of the documents in our repository have been deposited by one of the paper's authors. In preparation for the RQF, some academic departments have delegated the task to research assistants or to administrative staff. This tends to result in only bibliographic details being deposited as only the authors have access to the postprint version that can be made open access. A few liaison librarians have deposited some documents on behalf of senior academics but they are encouraged to provide hands-on training or to sit with individual depositors and talk them through the process rather than deposit work for them. IR staff may deposit documents emailed as attachments by the author where there have been problems with a deposit. This is the exception rather than the rule.
<b>Swinburne</b>	Our deposit agreement is a "work in progress".
<b>UMelb</b>	This information is based upon the new deposit agreement that will come into place when the repository is migrated to the Digitool platform. We do have an end-user licence that covers all items in the repository, but may extend this in the future to accommodate a Creative Commons option if this is desired by depositor. A decision was made to investigate a CC option once the new platform is functional and stable. The depositor is required to obtain permissions for embedded 3rd party works included in their work. However the Copyright Office manages publisher permissions and keeps a central database for this purpose. Depositors are required to warrant that their work does not, to the best of their knowledge, include material that is defamatory, false and misleading, unlawful, etc...
<b>USQ</b>	We are just about to change our deposit agreement to remove the indemnity requirement.

**Q9** Choose which situation best describes the copyright permission process for your IR.

	CDU	CQU	CSU	Griffith	JCU	QUT	Swin	UMelb	USC	USQ	UTS
Contributors must obtain any necessary permissions prior to deposit.								Yes			
Contributors usually obtain any necessary permissions prior to deposit, but may seek assistance from IR staff.								Yes			Yes
Contributors usually seek assistance from IR staff to obtain any necessary permissions prior to deposit.											
IR staff obtain any necessary permissions to deposit work at this stage, but it is anticipated that contributors will be required to obtain permissions themselves once the system is more established.					Yes						
IR staff obtain any necessary permissions to deposit works.		Yes	Yes	Yes			Yes		Yes	Yes	
Process is yet to be determined.	Yes										

**Comments:**

<b>QUT</b>	When the repository was first launched, depositors were asked to obtain any necessary permissions PRIOR to deposit but this proved to be an insurmountable obstacle for most. We discovered that most authors would like the IR to assist with the rights-checking and permission-requesting. We found that the most sustainable workflow for 'requesting' this assistance was to allow the authors to deposit the documents into the repository - on the understanding that IR staff would undertake the necessary checks and permission-requests before communicating the work to the public. Most journals allow authors to disseminate their own version of the work so we encourage academics to deposit the postprint version of every journal article they get published. IR staff check their publisher's policy and set an appropriate access level. If the publisher's policy cannot be determined via the SHERPA list, the journal's website or our own database of negotiated permissions, IR staff contact the publisher to request clarification of rights and, if necessary, permission to include the work in our open access repository. For conference papers, IR staff check the deposited paper and the conference website for copyright information. If we discover that authors were required to transfer copyright or the proceedings have been published by a commercial publisher, a permission request is sent. For books and book chapters, the default action is to lock down the fulltext (if deposited). If the book has been published by a university press or small publisher, IR staff provide the depositing author with an email permission request that they can forward to their publisher. We have found that book publishers tend to respond more positively to requests from authors. If the author later forwards a copy of the permission to IR staff, open access to the fulltext will be enabled. However, our authors generally only deposit the bibliographic details of their books. Note: When we migrate to ARROW, we will be revising the deposit agreement to reflect this workflow.
<b>Swinburne</b>	We will check publisher policies and contact publishers to clarify policies if necessary, but to date we have not taken the approach of checking permissions for individual papers. Is this question also about third party copyright? If so we assume that the publishers have done all the third party copyright permissions, etc.
<b>UMelb</b>	Contributors are required to seek permissions for 3rd party works that are included in their work. However guidance about the permissions process can be sought from the Copyright Office. Where works have already been published, the Copyright Office handles publisher permissions on behalf of contributors and maintains a central database for this purpose.
<b>USQ</b>	IR staff generally obtain permissions, but contributors sometimes do it themselves prior to deposit or during the deposit/editorial process (which is good if it happens!)

Q10	Which of the following types of work do you accept (or plan to accept) in your IR, without seeking explicit permission direct from publishers:	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K
	Book Chapters – under Part VB.											
	Published articles - under Part VB.											
	<b>Preprints of published articles where self-archiving is:</b>											
	allowed in the author's contract with the publisher.	Yes			Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes
	allowed under the publisher's stated policy.	Yes			Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes
	not mentioned in the author's contract or in the publisher's policy.											
	forbidden in the author's contract or publisher's policy.											
	<b>Postprints of published articles where self-archiving is:</b>											
	allowed in the author's contract with the publisher.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	allowed under the publisher's stated policy.	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	not mentioned in the author's contract or in the publisher's policy.				Yes							
	forbidden in the author's contract or publisher's policy.											

**Please provide any comments you have regarding your reasons why or why not?**

IR staff may negotiate with publishers if the publishers have not made their policy on inclusion in open access institutional repositories known. This will be done on a case-by-case basis.

We do not upload any files unless we are sure of the publisher's policy

In the future we may accept works under Part VB for the IR - to date we generally do not as we link to the published version in vendor databases. In the future, we will investigate whether or not to seek permission for published articles where self-archiving is not mentioned in the publisher's policy. An exception to the above selections is publications that are part of the RQF assessment. We accept full-text publications which do not meet publishers' usual requirements, but are allowed for the purpose of RQF following negotiations between DEST and the major publishers. Only the metadata for these publications is made publicly available, with full-text access presently restricted to repository administrators. Following a software upgrade, full-text access will be extended to the RQF review panels as per DEST requirements.

Acceptance of a preprint or postprint that is not mentioned in the author's contract or policy would be reviewed on a case by case basis. It may depend upon the nature of the agreement with the publisher. If we were in any doubt, we would ask for permission as this would give us clarity with that publisher. This publisher's response would be centrally stored for future reference.

Post-prints: if self-archiving is not mentioned, we don't ever accept journal papers, but do accept conference papers (too hard to obtain permission). Don't rely on VB for book chapters and articles. We prefer not to accept pre-prints (and if we do, usually for a specific reason of the depositor, and we try hard to replace it with a post-print as soon as possible)

Where the publisher's policy is unknown, the work will be accepted in the repository but access to the full text will be restricted until rights have been clarified or permission has been received. In the meantime, the metadata (including the bibliographic details) is made openly accessible. Where self-archiving is expressly forbidden, the full text file is kept in the repository but locked down. When we move to ARROW, all the restricted files will be hidden.

<b>Q11. What do you understand to be the main benefits or advantages of Open Access?</b>
Information is freely available and easily accessible thereby enabling the results of research to be more quickly available
Enhanced scholarly communication, opportunities for researchers to share research outcomes and to collaborate on future research.; Increased citation rates; Promotion and wider exposure of the institution's research output; Highlights the institution's research strengths.
Not paying duplicate amounts for the intellectual output of the university (ie. the university pays academics to conduct research, then the Library pays to get access to materials published by that academic).
The benefits which you have listed in your Q15
wide dissemination, increased access, increased impact for individual researchers and the University, increased citation rates
Immediate and unrestricted access; Removal of price barriers; Research impact (likely to have more accesses, citations, etc.)
ENHANCED DISSEMINATION OF RESEARCH.
Increased exposure of academics' work and therefore of the University; more secure and permanent storage of academic papers; places pressure on publishers to keep prices reasonable; making available scholarly or other material that otherwise would not be electronically accessible.
Increased access to scholarly research without expensive subscription fees
Open access increases the visibility and accessibility of a work. The absence of access barriers maximises the number of people who can read the work. More readers means more potential citations. Open access means that research results are exposed to the scrutiny of the entire peer group population - not just the subset that can afford to pay for access. This is good for science. Open access also benefits practitioners who would not otherwise have access to the latest research literature in their field - this is good for society and produces a better return on investment for publicly-funded research.



<b>Q12. What do you understand to be the main weaknesses or disadvantages of Open Access?</b>
Not yet recognised, at least by DEST, as a legitimate way of publishing research output
Publisher attitudes to OA archiving when there is little flexibility to negotiate; Resistance by researchers to voluntarily archive their research. Would limit the content and comprehensiveness of the repository as the showplace of the
Open access isn't necessarily seen by the academic community as being high quality, also there are no royalties for
In the case of fee-based open-access journals, authors either need to have a sponsor (such as a funder or employer) to pay on their behalf, or personally pay the publication fee. Concern about ability to establish an economically sustainable open access publishing system. Increases administrative burden on authors, sometimes having to lodge papers with multiple
There is the risk that Open Access may reduce the ability of researchers to find quality research due to the limitations of current search tools. Distribution of research outputs in unfamiliar models (e.g. institution based repositories rather than subject focused print or electronic journals) may also impede a researcher's ability to find quality research articles. There can also be a perceived 'credibility' factor for works made available via Open Access, a perception that because access is free that they lack quality or are not as important as works available from commercial publishers. Therefore the risk is that authors will not self-deposit - this is also a risk because of the university promotion system based on research published in select commercial journals, eg Nature. One of the major risks to Open Access is copyright restrictions and author/publisher
Fear in relation to impact on publishing through scholarly societies
Quality control, version management.
Time-consuming; problem of publishers not allowing published formatted version of paper to be displayed; It's basically doubling-up on access.
Infancy and problems associated with new ventures, particularly copyright and the potential risk of harm to the University
As far as I am concerned, there are no disadvantages to open access per se. The transition period, in which sustainable alternatives to the reader-pays business model must be trialled and tested, is likely to be quite unsettling. Academic authors are often unaware that there may be a down-side to giving a profit-driven publisher all their rights in the work in exchange for the publisher's services. Publishers do provide valuable services and deserve to be paid for them. The problem facing the open access movement is the lack of agreement within the academic community about which services are

**Q13. What role do you think IRs and Libraries have in promoting Open Access as a means of disseminating scholarly communication?**

Encourage academics to use Open Access to make their work available

This is a significant role. The Open Access IR, if properly constructed, populated and governed becomes the primary collection of an institution's research contribution over a period of time. Open Access on its own is not enough with the library's role being to ensure that the content of the repository is organised consistently and is discoverable. The IR is in effect another collection and as such leverages the information management skills of the library staff. Libraries can further promote the IR within and externally to the university through the library website and through the catalogue.

Essential role. It's a logical extension of current responsibilities which Faculty Librarians have. our DR Team allocates considerable time to this activity.

Academic libraries have a key role in promoting Open Access because the preservation and provision of access to scholarly communication is their raison d'etre. Ideally IRs are/will be established as a collaboration between libraries and other stakeholders e.g. researchers and IT departments. Librarians are also trained to facilitate a user's access to information, either by assisting or training the user.

Management of IR , and education of staff

Including open access journals in their collections and catalogues thereby making them more visible and more accessible;  
Developing and maintaining institutional repositories.

Educational role

Absolutely critical.

This is a logical 'next step' in the academic library's role to gather, store and disseminate information. Libraries can manage the infrastructure in support of open access and e publishing and provide advice to facilitate access to content.

For open access to become a viable and sustainable basis for scholarly communication, authors, publishers, funders (including the authors' institutions) and libraries will all have to start pulling in the same direction. At the moment, this is not the case. The funders will need to provide carrots (reward authors who make open access choices - which is not the case at the moment) as well as sticks (mandates). The involvement of libraries in the establishment and management of IRs gives them a terrific opportunity to take a leadership role in facilitating a transition to open access. This will involve advocacy for open open access - helping authors to understand the issues and so they can make informed choices. Libraries should also be lobbying their own institutions and research funding bodies to reward authors for making open access choices. Libraries could also take a proactive approach to the establishment of open access publishing initiatives at their own institution.

<b>Q14. Describe what impact there has been on your IR implementation plans (and content levels) following DEST's decision to mandate IRs to enable peer review under the Research Quality Framework (RQF)?</b>
The availability of funding has enabled us to recruit to a position to establish and develop IR - unable to do so otherwise. Has also highlighted the issue of OA at senior levels of the University.
The University was already committed to building an IR however the DEST mandate has fast-tracked this process. The RQF mandate means we are now building two streams in the IR, the Open Access stream and a closed access instance to accommodate the RQF specifications.
More emphasis has been placed on increasing staffing. [University] applied for and has been granted ASHER money to assist in this. It was not planned to input older data into the IR at this stage, however this is now a requirement for the RQF process. There will also be a need to make some technical developments to allow RQF assessors the ability to view full-text documents that are not publicly available.
Not a lot. Our IR content is currently limited to already published content
The RQF has been a driving force in the establishment and implementation of our IR. We will be using the ASHER funding to set up a dark archive as required by the DEST technical specifications. Right now our IR is more Open Access with links to publisher databases for the published full-text.
Using tools such as Web of Science and Scopus, we have had to compare information held in our repository to determine if there are any missing records for probable RQF researchers; Substantially cleaned up our metadata (in particular, formation of author names); Had to build access controls into the VITAL software so that research outputs can be restricted to DEST Assessors only; Had to unwillingly expose our repository before software is fully stable, usable etc.
A key driver
Our IR was up and running prior to RQF. It has encouraged deposit by academics and created a far greater awareness of the IR and of value of open access.
RQF has forced things to move in directions we might not otherwise have taken - eg installing Fedora as a separate IR for the RQF material. The RQF has also provided an imperative for the IR implementation and development; RQF has increased awareness of the role of IR in the university.
DEST's decision to mandate the use of IRs for storing and delivering research outputs for the RQF has resulted in a large increase in the number of bibliographic records in our IR (deposited by admin staff) but, at this stage, it has not increased the rate at which 'open access' documents are being deposited. While the RQF specifications allow the use of the postprint (peer-reviewed corrected drafts), most institutions want to use the copy-edited published version for the RQF. At this stage, very few publishers allow open access to this version. By the time the next round of RQF happens, a larger proportion of journals may be open access in which case, the version used for assessment can also be open access. However, the ASHER funding will allow us to develop our IR in ways that would not otherwise have been possible. Because of the RQF, every university in Australia will have an IR. This is a positive step as all university-based authors in Australia will have an IR into which they can deposit their postprint if wish to do so, or if they are mandated to do so by the ARC or NHMRC.

Q15	How important would you rate the following potential benefits of an IR to your institution?	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	AVG
		a. A boost to your institution's prestige	4	5	5	4	5	4	5	5	4	5	5
b. Better services to your institution's learning & research community	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	5	4	4	5	4.64	
c. New services to learning communities beyond your institution	3	5	4	NA	5	5	2	4	4	4	4	4.00	
d. Maintaining control over your institution's intellectual property	4	4	4	4	5	3	5	5	5	NA	5	4.40	
e. Capturing the intellectual capital of your institution	5	5	4	5	NA	5	5	5	5	5	5	4.90	
f. Contributing to the reform of the entire enterprise of scholarly communication and publishing	5	5	NA	4	4	5	5	5	4	5	5	4.70	
g. A reduction in the amount of time between discovery and dissemination of research findings to scholarly communities	5	4	NA	3	4	5	4	5	4	5	5	4.40	
h. An increase in citation counts to your institution's intellectual output	5	5	5	3	5	5	4	5	5	4	5	4.64	
i. Exposing your institution's intellectual output to Australia and overseas who would not otherwise have access to it	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	4.91	
j. An increase in the accessibility to knowledge assets such as numeric, video, audio, and multimedia datasets	5	5	4	2	4	4	4	4	4	NA	4	4.00	
k. Providing maximal access to the results of publicly funded research	5	5	4	3	4	5	5	5	4	4	5	4.45	
l. A solution to the problem of preserving your institution's intellectual output	5	4	4	4	5	4	5	5	5	4	5	4.55	
m. An increase in your library's role as a viable partner in the research enterprise	5	5	3	5	5	5	4	5	5	NA	5	4.70	
n. Reducing user dependence on your library's print collection	3	4	NA	2	4	1	3	3	2	3	4	2.90	
o. Long-time preservation of your institution's digital output	4	4	4	4	5	3	5	5	5	4	5	4.36	

**Other**

Increase potential for research collaboration. Provide web usage statistics as a adjunct to traditonal citation impact.

Q16	When planning for an IR, what did you think would be the most important reasons why members of your institution's learning community would contribute to the IR?	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	AVG
		a. To boost the particular academic's prestige	DK	5	5	5	5	4	4	5	5	4	5
b. To boost your institution's prestige	3	5	5	4	4	2	4	5	4	2	5	3.91	
c. To contribute to the reform of scholarly communication and publishing	2	5	NA	4	3	2	4	4	4	1	4	3.30	
d. To reduce the amount of time between discovery and dissemination of research findings to scholarly communities	5	5	NA	3	5	4	4	4	4	4	5	4.30	
e. To increase citation counts to the particular academic's output	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	3	5	4.73	
f. To increase citation counts to your institution's intellectual output	3	5	5	4	4	4	5	5	4	2	5	4.18	
g. To encourage others to provide open access to their intellectual output	3	5	NA	3	4	2	4	3	5	1	4	3.40	
h. To expose the particular scholar's intellectual output to researchers in Australia and overseas who would not otherwise have access to it	4	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	4.73	
i. To expose your institution's intellectual output to researchers in Australia and overseas who would not otherwise have access to it	4	5	5	4	4	4	4		4	1	5	4.00	
j. To place the burden of preservation on the IR instead of on each academic	4	4	NA	5	5	4	4	DK	4	3	4	4.11	
k. To increase the accessibility to knowledge assets such as numeric, video, audio, and multimedia datasets	3	4	4	3	5	3	3	DK	4	NA	4	3.67	
l. To maximise access to the results of publicly funded research	3	5	4	1	4	3	4	4	2	1	4	3.18	
m. To solve the problem of preserving the institution's intellectual output	3	4	4	5	4	2	4	4	4	2	3	3.55	
n. To increase the library's role as a viable partner in the research enterprise	2	5	NA	3	3	3	3	3	5	NA	3	3.33	
o. To reduce user dependence on your library's print collection	2	4	NA	2	3	3	3	3	2	1	4	2.70	

Other

Q17	How would you assess your methods for recruiting content for your IR?	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	AVG
	a. Volunteer contributions	4	1	4	4	4	5	NA	NA	3	4	2	3.44
	b. Publicity about the IR in campus newspapers	4	NA	4	4	4	5	NA	NA	NA	1	3	3.57
	c. Presentations by staff responsible for the IR at departmental and faculty meetings	4	4	4	3	NA	5	NA	NA	NA	4	4	4.00
	d. Personal visits by staff responsible for the IR to faculty and administrators	4	NA	4	5	NA	5	NA	NA	4	4	4	4.29
	e. Staff responsible for the IR working one on one with early adopters	4	4	4	4	5	5	NA	NA	4	5	4	4.33
	f. Word-of-mouth from early adopters to their colleagues in the faculty and staff ranks	4	NA	4	5	5	5	NA	NA	DK	4	4	4.43
	g. Publicising the IR during reference interactions in libraries and archives	4	NA	NA	2	NA	4	NA	NA	NA	DK	4	3.50
	h. Systematic review of faculty, staff, centre, and departmental web sites for potential contributors by staff responsible for the IR	4	NA	4	3	NA	4	NA	NA	4	2	NA	3.50
	i. Institution-wide mandates regarding mandatory contribution of certain material types	5	NA	NA	5	NA	5	NA	NA	5	1	5	4.33

#### Other

Public support for repository by senior research management staff was very important and successful. The mandated deposit for the RQF didn't hurt either! We had a ADT thesis mandate from 2002, which was completely accepted by academics and p/g students and helped acceptance of other scholarly output into the IR.

<b>Q18 Please describe what content recruitment methods you have employed for your IR?</b>
planned recruitment policy is to capture research content as a mandatory part of the researchers' annual HERDC reporting. This should ensure a growing body of content from 2007 onwards. Researchers will have the option to voluntarily archive previous reseach output at any time.
Academics/researchers were required to submit DEST submissions via the IR. To support this, sessions were held in the library to demonstrate/promote the IR. Liaison librarians also heavily promoted submission to academics in their areas.
1. Initially do presentations at faculty, school, department and research centre meetings. 2. Identify every publisher who allows publisher PDFs, determine which author (if any) publish in that journal, and then contact authors inviting them to upload file. (Note: most successful of all methods) 3. Identify University publications (e.g. online & print journals) --including conferences--, request permission to upload files into the IR, and then contact authors for their files 4. Personally contact any University author who uploads a file (refer answer to Q7) to see if they would be interested in adding more content for their other publications. Note: They may have uploaded a record and flagged it to go to the IR by mistake, thinking instead that they were uploading it for RQF Top4 or performance appraisal. We use that opportunity to see whether they have a version we can use in the IR 5. Work with another staff member (Research Publications Survey Officer - RPSO) responsible for "verifying" data for publications currently being entered into Research Admin system (refer Q7 answer). University now does DEST HERDC survey verification year-round. The RPSO promotes the IR in her activities (group and one-on-one) and also lets the IR staff know of academics who are currently entering substantial publications data.
It is mandatory for PhD and Masters Research students to deposit an electronic copy of their thesis. It is not yet a University policy for researchers to deposit their papers, although it is mandatory that nominated researchers deposit their 4 'best papers' as part of the RQF. The RQF process has raised the profile of the institutional repository. The impetus to deposit papers as part of the RQF process has exposed researchers to the repository and so they now deposit additional publications, beyond what is necessary for the RQF process.
Given the infancy of our software, we have only really worked with one research centre (social sciences) and have used them as a "pilot" for content recruitment, etc. IR staff have given presentations to ISR and personally visited a few of their researchers regarding content. We have also been working with a semi-retired researcher in an attempt to capture all their research output before they fully retire; this is something that we plan on doing for all retiring our researchers.
Every method we could think of, simultaneously!
It is University policy that copies of all research articles should be located in the IR. The policy applies to 'give away' literature eg journal articles, conference papers and some reports. As the author is not being paid for their contribution, it is generally possible for the author to retain the right to self-archive the postprint. The policy helps our authors explain why they need to retain this right. It also helps IR staff when they contact publishers to request permission. Other content recruitment strategies include, brochures, presentations at school staff meeting, hands-on workshops run by liaison librarians, cultivation of 'champions' who are likely to influence colleagues, articles in campus newspapers congratulating academics who have accrued high download counts, congratulatory emails are also sent to the academics themselves with a CC to their Head of school and, sometimes, the Dean.

**Q19 To what extent do you think the following are likely to inhibit your ability to deploy a successful IR?**

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	AVG
a. Making members of your learning community aware of the IR	4	NA	2	3	4	1	1	2	4	4	4	2.90
b. Contributors' lack of knowledge about how they can benefit from IRs	4	3	4	3	4	5	5	4	4	4	4	4.00
c. Encouraging academics to submit content to the IR	4	3	2	4	5	1	1	4	4	4	4	3.27
d. Convincing academics that the IR will not adversely affect the current publishing model	4	3	5	1	5	3	1	4	1	4	5	3.27
e. Absence of campus-wide mandates regarding mandatory contribution of certain material types	5	5	1	2	5	NA	4	NA	NA	3	4	3.63
f. Contributors' concerns about the difficulty using the IR system to contribute content to the IR	4	NA	2	4	5	5	5	4	4	4	4	4.10
g. Inability of contributors to formulate quality metadata	2	NA	1	2	4	3	2	NA	1	2	2	2.11
h. Contributors' concerns about their intellectual property rights (Copyright) for digital materials (eg. concern about open access)	3	4	4	4	5	5	2	4	2	4	5	3.82
i. Concerns about intellectual property owned by third parties (ie. getting Copyright clearance)	4	5	4	2	5	5	5	4	2	4	5	4.09
j. Inadequacy of the IR system's digital preservation capabilities	3	2	2	1	3	2	3	DK	3	2	2	2.30
k. Difficulties in long-term preservation of digital files	3	2	2	1	3	2	3	4	DK	2	2	2.40
l. Lack of on campus technical expertise in IR systems	5	2	4	2	3	3	5	3	2	1	3	3.00
m. Supporting all ongoing costs of an operational IR	5	2	2	3	4	2	5	3	4	4	3	3.36
n. Competing for resources with other priorities, projects, and initiatives	5	2	2	4	5	4	5	4	4	4	4	3.91

Other



<b>Q20. Please describe what you consider to be the biggest constraints facing your university in its implementation of its IR, and its ability to recruit content to it?</b>
Staff resources and expertise to establish the IR. Time constraints for researchers. Ability of the University to fund the ongoing maintenance and development once the ASHER funds run out.
Completing and meeting DEST RQF requirements in the timeframe. Final specifications for submission and technical specifications have not been released at time of writing. Availability of additional technical resources if they are needed to fine tune RQF requirements. These resources are fully committed within the institution and it may be difficult to resource external resources at short notice. Policy for mandatory submission of HERDC research objects is still making its way through the approvals process, if not approved or diluted recruitment of content may be more difficult.
Long-term funding and staffing resources. In particular, the lack of specialised staff (eg. technical staff) available in the long-term.
Academics' and researchers' concern about copyright / licensing + their tendency not to retain their author's postprint version. In short, changing the culture
Populating the Repository: need to motivate time-poor researchers to self-deposit and inform researchers about the benefits of open access Copyright: researchers are reluctant to and/or are not aware of the option to deposit pre-print versions of their manuscripts and many of the journals that researchers prefer to publish in do not allow deposit of post-print or publisher versions in institutional repositories
At the moment it is the delay in migrating to our new software as it is slowing things down. The need for more staff to go out and speak to academics and researchers about the IR and how it can benefit them, we have found in cases where we have been to visit the faculty or Dept we have an increased rate in deposits to
Copyright and intellectual property issues; Unstable software and lack of a decent user interface - researchers prefer to see software before handing over any content.
In regards to full-text, adhering to set copyright requirements and locating copies of author post peer review pre-publication versions of research output
Staff resourcing. I'd also like to put non-standard materials into the IR but some others are reluctant.
Time, resources and a clear mandate/and or support from senior University personnel
Everbody is so busy and time-poor. Unless academics are rewarded for open access choices (self-archiving and/or publishing in open access journals), it will not be a high-priority.
<b>Further comments</b>
RQF has confused academics because of DESTs insistance on combining open access and closed access purposes. IRs are NOT actually necessary to do the RQF! We implemented our IR on a 'why-not try it' basis and I consider it's been a big success.... but it won't run itself, it needs constant work.