

Institutional Repository Project

Steering Group Meeting Minutes (unconfirmed)Friday 29th February 2008, 10 am – 12 pm

Present Carole Goble (Chair, CG), Phil Butler (PB), Lorraine Beard (LB), Alan Dickson (AD), Nick Higham (NH), Ivan Leudar (IL), Vic Lyte (VL), Andrew Walsh (AW), Steve Milner (SM), Pedro Mendes (PM)

Invited Nilani Ganeshwaran, Scott Taylor

Filename IRProject_SteeringGroupMinutes_Meeting2008-02-29_v1-0

Enquiries Dr Phil Butler, Tel: x51514, Email: p.butler@manchester.ac.uk

1. Apologies

None

2. Minutes and actions from last meeting

ACTION 12: STANDING ITEM - Marketing and communications representative to be invited to appropriate future Steering Group meetings

ACTION 14: STANDING ITEM – Steering Group and Implementation Team to continually assess project priorities and deliverables against benefits

Professor Philip Withers was willing to bring his knowledge of scholarly publishing in the engineering to the Project and would join the Steering Group. This left representation from the performance arts. PB noted that his efforts had not yielded any leads in this area.

ACTION 15: SM to enquire about a representative from the performance arts

The group confirmed the minutes accurately reflected the meeting outcomes. Members requested a copy of the meeting documentation 'a few days' prior to the next meeting.

3. Highlight report

PB summarised the highlight report. Related agenda items were raised and discussed accordingly (see below).

4. Business case and full costs (capital and on-costs)

PB outlined the works done up to date to support development of a business case with scale-up and on-costs. This was being prepared to go to the Universities Senior Executive Team on March 18th. Deadline for completion was March 11th.

PB outlined a provisional hardware specification that had been developed to inform scale-up and recurrent costs. The Group asked what the storage capacity of the repository would be for accommodating audio/visual files. PB noted that this needs to be factored into the hardware specification along with growth calculations. Storage was not unlimited and policies need to be established to accommodate hardware/financial limitations. The Group noted that specifications need to accommodate periods of peak usage e.g. researcher wins a Nobel Prize.

PB outlined the preferred software solution (Fedora-Commons), the choice of which was based on initial investigations and site visits (Oxford University and Imperial). Key drivers for this recommendation were scalability and potential to store different types of content in the future. The Group agreed that the Institutional Repository should accommodate other materials in the future and not be limited to content already identified within the Project scope. Future content could include teaching/learning objects, experimental data and institutional records. CG was keen that we foster an informal relationship with Oxford – sharing of code, roadmap of developments...etc.

PB also noted that the business case will describe support models, including staffing of a 'scholarly publishing support function'. This function would provide support on wider issues such as open access,

copyright and citation metrics. The Group agreed we should push for funds to support such a model while emphasising overall cost savings. The Group suggested the business case should indicate that staff costs for such a function might be recovered by secondment or redeployment rather than new posts.

The Group agreed that some lobbying of SET members prior to the meeting may help the case.

ACTION 16: PB to distribute draft business case and full costs week commencing 3rd March

ACTION 17: CG and PB to discuss strategy with regards lobbying SET members.

ACTION 18: Group to provide feedback on draft business case

5. Electronic Theses and Dissertations (ETDs)

The Group ratified recommendations of the discussion paper "Towards electronic theses and dissertations". The Group agreed that Professor Nigel Vincent, as the sponsor for this work, should join the Steering Group.

ACTION 19: PB to take recommendations forward, communicate with Professor Nigel Vincent and invite him to the next Steering Group meeting

6. Research Information Project

PB demonstrated the Research Information Project and its outcomes. The Group discussed the relationship of the RIP to the Institutional Repository Project. RIP had identified around 45,000 publication records stored in current Faculty systems. The IR will need to accommodate this backlog of records.

The Group noted that there were significant gaps in the data and efforts will be required to cleanse that that does exist. Furthermore, the Group noted that in certain disciplines there was little academic trust in existing processes for managing this data. As a consequence, efforts will be required to win 'hearts and minds' in these areas.

The Group discussed which records to focus efforts on with regards to obtaining full text articles for this backlog. PB demonstrated the current distribution of publications by author. The Group felt that any prioritisation by author could be divisive. The Group recommended we analysed publications by Journal with the idea we take into account the publishers copyright. The Group asked what policies other institutional repositories adopt.

ACTION 20: PB to analyse publications data by journal and investigate policies of other Institutional Repositories

7. Early adopters

PB outlined an issue that had arisen with NCESS. NCESS had requested the IR supports publications authored by individuals not directly affiliated with the University of Manchester. This was because NCESS is inter-university centre and needs a mechanism to manage all research outputs of the centre (not just those authored by University researchers). The Steering Group agreed that this was a suitable use for the IR but this type of usage should be monitored and managed by a member of the University.

ACTION 21: PB to report back to NCESS

PB discussed a request from Manchester University Press (MUP) to use the IR to store 3,500 open access books. The Group agreed that MUP should be an early adopter. However, resource limitations may mean MUP requirements will need to be prioritised and some additional financial support may be required. Further detailed discussions with MUP are necessary. The Steering Group asked what fraction of the MUP content derives from the University of Manchester.

ACTION 22: PB to report back to MUP and open further discussions

The Group approved Deansgate John Rylands Library (JRUL) special collection images and Manchester Business School (MBS) working papers as early adopters.

ACTION 23: PB to report back to JRUL and MBS and discuss details

8. Date of next meeting

The Steering Group agreed a date of Friday 11th April, 10am – 12pm for the next meeting and “Institutional Repository Policies” as the topic for discussion.