

Institutional Repositories in New Zealand

Rowena Cullen
Brenda Chawner

April 2008



New Zealand IR context

- Lagged behind other countries in establishing IRs
- National Library sponsored *Institutional Repositories for the Research Sector: Feasibility Study* in 2005, followed by a workshop
- CONZUL forums in 2006 and 2007
- TEC funding opportunity in 2006
- Some individual initiatives, such as the University of Otago Business School (started in late 2005)



IR Projects in New Zealand

IRA (Institutional Repositories Aotearoa)

Auckland, Canterbury, and Victoria Universities

coda, An Institutional Repository for the New Zealand ITP Sector

Manukau, NorthTec, UCOL, Unitec, Whitireia Polytechs

OARiNZ

Christchurch, Nelson/Marlborough, Terawhiti, Bay of Plenty, Northland, Waikato, Wellington, Waiariki Polytechs, long with Otago and Lincoln Universities and the National Library

LCoNZ

AUT, Waikato, Victoria and Otago Universities

– ADT Australasian Digital Theses Program

AUT, Lincoln, Massey, Auckland, Waikato, Canterbury, and Otago Universities

KRIS (Kiwi Research Information Service) – formerly NRDS content harvester



Build the Knowledge Base project

- Sub-contracted by Christchurch Polytech to VUW research team, as part of OARiNZ project (TEC funded, assisted by National Library)
- Wiki Knowledge Base (<http://www.oarinz.ac.nz/oarinzwiki/>)
 - History of OA movement
 - New Zealand repositories
 - Implementation issues (incl key issues of advocacy and management)
 - Evaluation
 - Copyright and IP (incl 3rd party copyright)
 - Best practices
- Case studies



Case studies

- University of Auckland (AU)
- Auckland University of Technology (AUT)
- Manukau Institute of Technology (MIT)
- Unitec
- University of Canterbury (CU)
- Christchurch Polytechnic Institute of Technology (CPIT)
- University of Otago (OU)

- Interviews covered
 - Institutional context
 - IR project
 - Staffing
 - Promotional activities
 - Achievements
 - Challenges
 - Future plans



Findings

- Range of projects: 2 in IRA, 2 in coda, 2 in OARiNZ (OU not active), 1 in LCoNZ
- Institutions vary greatly in size, library budget, research orientation of academic staff, goals of repository
- Great variety of models, approaches, all were in early stages (oldest is Otago Business School - started late 2005. Only IR not based in Library at this point)
- Within a consortium, individual institutions made own choices about content, categories, scope
- Motivation mixed – e.g. OA ideals, part of global university activity, promotion of individual research and increased citation rates, enhance institution's reputation



Content and metadata

- Content ranges from
 - theses only (AUT),
 - mixture of theses and research outputs
 - Auckland pre- and post-prints, theses, images
 - research outputs only (Canterbury—theses in ADT)
- Not all confined to published, peer-reviewed items
 - Some include metadata only entries
 - Some include teaching objects and/or audiovisual materials (mainly polytechs)
- Metadata is one area of standardisation, because of KRIS
 - Use of Marsden Field of Research Fund categories (23 high level categories, heavily weighted to science and medicine)
 - Looking at Australian and New Zealand Standard Research Classification (ANZSRC) as a replacement for Marsden



Policy and management

- No common approach to budgeting or staffing - IRA and OARiNZ financed project staff, but this has now come to an end
- Larger institutions more likely to have dedicated staff, funded within library budget
- Smaller institutions added duties to those of existing staff
- Approaches to key decisions on issues such as legal framework (theses), workflow and self-submission, IP (espec 3rd party copyright) varied
- Software choices: dSpace, EPrints, Digital Commons, ADT (dependent on external funding, concerns about future needs, migration, collaborations)



Marketing and promotion

- Auckland and AUT initially focused on theses, and used legal structures to encourage deposit
- Canterbury and Victoria formed an alliance with their Research Office
- Polytechnics took a similar approach (new to the national research evaluation system PBRF)
- Strategies used:
 - institutional champions
 - providing personal researcher pages
 - Institutional structures: Academic Board meetings for approval, then faculties, schools, departments for promotion
 - existing mandatory procedures (e.g. annual reporting mechanisms)
 - basic approach was to persuade academics that exposure was in their interests



Successes reported

- Every IR has some content (quantity varies from >200 to < 2000 (universities), polytechnics much lower, averaging < 20)
- Content is downloaded (Otago Business School high – due to longevity, and key papers on IR)
- Had secured initial funding
- Building expertise
- Project structures promoted collaboration between institutions
- Policy frameworks set in place
- Workflows established
- KRIS harvesting in place, providing another access point



Challenges reported

- Strong resistance from users
- Copyright and version control – education for researchers needed
- Lack of ongoing senior management support
- Collaboration could be problematic, focused on individual consortia, not IR sector as a whole
- Commercial software companies provide inadequate support
- Concern about whether mandatory deposit possible, or desirable
- NZ publishers lack appropriate copyright policy to support deposit of author copy
- Quality control and staff training
- Thesaurus provides limited subject access (Marsden subject codes based on discipline)
- Conflict between institutional and departmental IRs



Issues emerging so far (work in progress)

- Diversity of approaches, collaborations – is a national approach needed?
- Some institutions belonged to several consortia, but these are not all long-term solutions
- Future funding insecure unless part of library budget
- Content is growing slowly, and totals are well below other international institutions
- Over-reliance on PBRF as motivator
- Lack of focused marketing and support for academics
- Lack of clarity over scope, version, and quality control
- Lack of clarity/ownership of IP between institutions
- Sustainability: funding, staffing, technology, migration
- Policy alignment between different projects



Future research

- Complete portfolio of case studies
- National survey of academics
 - Motivators and barriers to deposit
 - Factors influencing their use
 - Citation patterns
 - Impact on research output
 - Changing modes of scholarly communication, such as inclusion of Web 2.0 features
- Updating Knowledge Base wiki
 - with further literature searching, highlighting emerging issues
 - encourage contributions from NZ IR community



Questions?

