Today we’ll like to give you a brief overview of the University’s Institutional Repository Project.
Act I
Before I consider some of the why, what and when questions, it's worth stating what we need from you.

This is very simple, we need YOUR continued support and commitment.

We appreciate you have already committed resource and effort to this project, however without your continued commitment and support, including additional financial resource, we won't be able to achieve what I'm about to talk about.
So what is this Project all about?
Fundamentally its about Manchester 2015 and ensuring the University becomes one of the top 25 research led university’s in the world.
We – you – need to monitor & manage …

I believe it's fair to say, that to achieve this YOU need to monitor and manage the University's research performance.

This includes
- having an appreciation of your Faculty's research outputs,
- knowing who is producing what,
- understanding where work is being published,
- anticipating what impact research will have,
- and, as consequence, trying to determine where strengths and weaknesses are.
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- 8th overall

Unfortunately 2007 metrics suggest that we aren’t doing as well in this area as we might expect or hope for.

In October, the Guardian Newspaper higher education section published predictions for RAE2008. Overall we did well and were ranked 8th out of 136 UK institutions considered.
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- 8th overall
- 32nd for research impact

However, we ranked 32nd for the ‘research impact’ metric which is a measure of the amount of citations received by a university’s research articles in peer-reviewed journals.
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- UCL
  - 4th overall, 8th for research impact
- Glasgow
  - 9th overall, 13th for research impact
- Southampton
  - 11th overall, 29th for research impact

This is particularly unimpressive when you view the rankings of other Russell Group universities.

- UCL was ranked 4th overall and 8th in impact.
- Glasgow was ranked 9th overall and 13th in impact.
- Southampton was ranked 11th overall and 29th in impact.

I don’t want to labour this point, but it is worth saying that similar trends are visible in the 2007 Academic Rankings of World Universities and the 2007 Times Higher Education Supplement World University Rankings.

So how will an institutional repository help with this potential problem?
What is an Institutional Repository?

• An online locus for collecting, preserving, and disseminating, in digital form, the intellectual assets of the research institution

• A place to store scholarly work - preprints, postprints, theses, dissertations, grey literature, conference presentation slide sets, podcasts, technical reports ...

• A repository of outputs

• A registry to published works

The four main objectives for having an institutional repository are:

- to create global visibility for an institution's scholarly research;
- to collect content in a single location;
- to provide open access to institutional research output by self-archiving it;
- to store and preserve other institutional digital assets, including unpublished or otherwise easily lost ("grey") literature (e.g., theses or technical reports).

The origin of the notion of an "institutional repository" (IR) are twofold:

- IRs are partly linked to the notion of digital interoperability, which is in turn linked to the Open Archives Initiative (OAI) and its Open Archives Initiative Protocol for Metadata Harvesting (OAI-PMH). The OAI in turn had its roots in the notion of a "Universal Preprint Service," since superseded by the open access movement.
- IRs are partly linked to the notion of a digital library -- i.e., collecting, housing, classifying, cataloguing, curating, preserving, and providing access to digital content, analogous with the library's conventional function of collecting, housing classifying, curating, preserving and providing access to analog content.

There is a mashup indicating the worldwide locations of open access digital repositories. This project is called Repository 66 and is based on data provided by ROAR and the OpenDOAR service developed by the SHERPA (organisation). Data from this service indicates that currently (late 2007) the most popular IR software platforms are Eprints, Dspace, and Bepress.
An institutional repository will do the same for scholarly work as email has done for messages

Put simply, an institutional repository will do the same for scholarly work as email has done for messages.

- It will enable individuals to easily disseminate their research outputs and others to easily access them
- It will provide a place for individuals to store their scholarly work
- It will help you, individual researchers and organisations to manage and monitor their intellectual assets
- It will preserve electronic materials for posterity

Of course as with email there can be disadvantages and risks with all this.
Who personally benefits?

- Academics – make life easier, not harder – from PhD to Prof
- Research managers
- Librarians

It want to ensure the repository services directly benefit individuals involved in research, including

- Academic staff, whether they be established Professors, young lecturers, postdoctoral researchers and PhD students
- Research managers, including yourselves
- Librarians and other support staff who are involved in the curation and preservation of scholarly work
Who has got one?

• Most of our rival institutions internationally

• Presumed to exist by funding councils

• Who will not have one?

Most of our international rivals already have repository services

For example of the 20 Russell Group, we are one of four that have yet to establish an institutional repository

Research Councils now presume institutions have a repository and are making decisions based on this presumption e.g. AHRC

More importantly what would be the impact of not having a repository? Its highly likely that any such institution would stand out, for the wrong reasons.
There are risks … many are myths

An institutional repository DOES NOT mean

• open access

However many of the perceived risks are infact myths. For example

Having an institutional repository DOES NOT mean

-Open access to all research
There are risks … many are myths

An institutional repository DOES NOT mean

• open access
• less peer review

It DOES NOT mean the end to peer review
There are risks … many are myths

An institutional repository DOES NOT mean

- open access
- less peer review
- more plagiarism

It DOES NOT mean more plagiarism
There are risks … many are myths

An institutional repository DOES NOT mean

- open access
- less peer review
- more plagiarism
- piracy

It DOES NOT mean more individuals or the university have to infringe publishers copyright.
There are risks … many are myths

An institutional repository DOES NOT mean

- open access
- less peer review
- more plagiarism
- piracy
- fewer learned societies

It DOES NOT mean the end to learned societies
There are risks … many are myths

An institutional repository DOES NOT mean

- open access
- less peer review
- more plagiarism
- piracy
- fewer learned societies
- more SPAM

And it DOES NOT mean more SPAM

And others …
Act II, Scene 1
So if a repository doesn't mean these things, WHAT are we trying to deliver with this Project.

Importantly the repository isn’t just some technology, a database and a website, it’s a set of services, it’s cultural awareness and a way of working.

Overall our objective is to establishing sustainable Institutional Repository services for the University. To achieve this we have identified 5 key deliverables

Deliverables are …
Five project deliverables

Its MORE than a database and a website

1. awareness

Stakeholder engagement and awareness
Five project deliverables

Its MORE than a database and a website

1. awareness
2. support network

a repository support network of individuals who assist in the submission of content, its curation and preservation,
Five project deliverables

Its MORE than a database and a website

1. awareness
2. support network
3. technology

a set of simple to use technologies
Five project deliverables

It's MORE than a database and a website

1. awareness
2. support network
3. technology
4. sustainability

A governance and sustainability plan
Five project deliverables

It's MORE than a database and a website

1. awareness
2. support network
3. technology
4. sustainability
5. content

And finally a repository with a significant amount of content
Act II, Scene 2
How are we going to achieve these deliverables. Well we’ve identified five main phases of work.

Start-up is establish the project structures and interfaces with other services.
Five phases of work

Month

1-2 start up
3-8 pilot
9-14 scale up
15-21 review/enhance
22-24 handover

The pilot phase aims to establish some working models, capture user expectations and obstacles, and provide materials we can use for subsequent advocacy efforts.
Five phases of work

Month
- 1-2 start up
- 3-8 pilot
- 9-14 scale up
- 15-21 review/enhance
- 22-24 handover

The scale-up phase will essential move pilot services to full production services. At this point we expect to communicate too all university researchers and get them to engage with the services offered.
Five phases of work

Month
- 1-2 start up
- 3-8 pilot
- 9-14 scale up
- 15-21 review/enhance
- 22-24 handover

The review/enhance phase will determine if working practices are operating effectively and enhance them accordingly.
Five phases of work

Month
1-2  start up
3-8  pilot
9-14 scale up
15-21 review/enhance
22-24 handover

The handover phase will tidy up any loose ends and ensure our sustainability plans are in place.
Act II, Scene 3
So where are we. Well the Institutional Repository Project has definitely left the launch pad.
Strong leadership and management team

We’ve have strong leadership with a committed academic sponsor and experienced project manager
Convened steering group

We have convened a steering group with professorial representatives from across the university and other key stakeholder groups
We’ve appointed an implementation team of three full-time individuals (including myself/Phil)
Confirmed some early adopters

We’ve confirmed some early adopters, including the National Centre for eSocial Sciences and members of the School of Computer Sciences.
We’ve started to identify obstacles and are beginning to deal with them.

In particular we have engaged

- with graduate administrators on the challenges of storing and managing electronic theses and dissertations
- with research business managers to discuss issues around how best to support academic staff
- with IT Services to examine infrastructure requirements

At this stage it’s worth mentioning one particularly significant obstacle that we will face in the coming months …
More financial support will be required

... scale-up from pilot to production services, we will need more financial support. As a consequence we intend to put a case to the PRC and/or the IT Strategy Board.

If we can overcome these obstacles WILL an institutional repository improve Manchester's research citations and impact?
Southampton University – ranked 25th in the World, 3rd in the UK

Well Southampton think it has for them?

The most striking evidence for this is Southampton’s rank in the league of Google citations or G-factpr. This is essentially an indicator of how often content on their website gets linked to and hence cited by other websites.

In this respect, Southampton are 25th in the world and 3rd in the UK.

Southampton put this down in part to the existence of its Institutional Repository, which has grown in the last 4 years to hold around 30,000 records, 25% of which are freely accessible full text versions of research articles.

Essentially, by providing a place for individuals to manage and disseminate their scholarly work and a place where others can easily access that work, Southampton University has increased the likely that that work is cited.
Act III
This Project requires your support and commitment

It won’t without your continued support and commitment.
Make sure we improve the visibility and impact of ALL our intellectual assets

With your support we should be able to make Manchester’s repository services like ‘email for scholarly work’ and as a consequence improve the visibility and impact of all our intellectual assets.
Manchester 2015

Goal Two – World Class Research

And then you can confidently tick Goal Two of Manchester 2015
Questions

www.manchester.ac.uk/institutionalrepositoryproject

And let’s finish there … questions?