

**Responses to Informal Survey of DSpace General List, January 4, 2005**  
*compiled by Carol Hixson, Head, Metadata and Digital Library Services, University of Oregon  
Libraries*

**1) How many people at your institution are involved with the planning and implementation of your institutional repository? (with or without FTE)**

**2) What is the background of the people involved?**

**2a) From within the library, what departments/units are represented? (reference, collection development, systems, cataloging, special collections, documents, administration, etc.)**

**Library A:**

2 people are involved, about 0.5 FTE at this point

One is a systems librarian and the other is Associate Chief Librarian, Head of Analysis.

**Library B:**

We have a library institutional repository management team. Consists of the following library staff:

2 engineering librarians (our initial development is with engineering school content, so they serve as liaisons to that school)

Director of Public Services (administrative oversight and input, PR)

Digital Projects Librarian (IT specialist)

Digital Library Planner (IT specialist)

Head of Electronic Acquisitions (contract and copyright issues)

Cataloger (metadata issues)

**Library C:**

9 people are directly involved with planning and implementation. About

12 others are involved in other capacities (tech consultants, task force members, administrators, etc.)

In terms of FTE, here's a rough breakdown:

quasi-project manager: .75 FTE

Grad School rep: .50

SysAdmin .05

Developer .10

Librarians .10

Others too small to estimate

Manager: reference librarian, webmaster

Grad School rep: administrator

SysAdmin and Developer: computer science, IT  
Librarians: cataloging  
Others: administrators, IT, computer science, librarianship

administration, cataloging, IT, reference, special collections/archives

### **Library D: Planning:**

We had an implementation planning team that met for 6 months prior to our launch. This team was chaired by the Associate Director for Collection Services. Others on the team were:

Associate Director for Technology

Head of Cataloging

Head of Archives

Head of Document Services (a unit that has digitized theses and has distributed MIT technical reports)

Faculty Liaison for DSpace (sci-tech librarian background)

System Manager for DSpace

Head of one of the Public Services Units

Head of Library Systems

A representative from Information Services & Technology - the only non-library member

This team regularly consulted with a group of librarians representing the disciplines of the early adopter communities in DSpace.

We also had a faculty advisory board from the beginning of DSpace development, consisting of 6 faculty members from various disciplines.

At the end of the 6 months a management recommendation was made which resulted in our implementation model:

### Implementers:

\* Product Manager - part time - Associate Director for Technology

\* DSpace User Support Manager - full time (includes marketing, community set-up, training)

\* DSpace System Manager - full time (includes system & hardware support, batch loading, running statistics programs, some programming)

### Advisors:

\* Faculty Advisory Board continues

\* Policy Advisory Committee - composed of:

Associate Director for Technology

Associate Director for Collection Services

Associate Director for Public Services

Assistant Director for Administration (used to be head of Document Services)

Head of Archives

Head, Collection Development

Head of Library Systems  
One Public Services librarian - head of one of our libraries  
Faculty Liaison (now called User Support Manager)  
Representative from MIT Press - from outside of MIT Libraries  
Representative from Information Services & Technology - from outside of MIT Libraries

A few months ago we changed the full time DSpace System Manager position so that it is now spread over several people working in the library systems office. One person maintains the system, hardware and running statistics programs, one does batch loading, one does programming changes and one does crosswalk work when necessary. We're evaluating this model now.

**Library E:**

Currently 8 people have some responsibility for the implementation of the IR on our campus, although there are others with more tertiary involvement: e.g. University Librarian and Subject Librarians promote IR to constituencies.

Technical Services: 3  
Systems: 1  
Admin: 1  
Reference: 1  
Collection Development: 1  
Archives: 1

**Library F: University of Oregon:**

- *Head, Metadata and Digital Library Services (MDLS)*
- Head, Catalog Management and Enrichment Team, MDLS
- *Director, Center for Educational Technologies*
- *Head, Reference & Research Services (RRS)*
- *University Historian and Archivist, Special Collections & University Archives*
- Social Sciences Librarian, RRS
- occasional assistance from individual subject librarians in identifying possible communities and collections and arranging meetings to discuss the service
- harvesting work being done by staff members of MDLS

The people whose positions are listed above are part of our Institutional Repository Group. This was the group that was charged to investigate the feasibility of an IR and implement it, if possible. The four positions in italics were original group members. The other two have been added since the beginning of the project. Another original member, the Map Librarian, resigned to take another position elsewhere. This group now functions as the Steering Committee for the IR, discussing issues over email and meeting no more than once a month face-to-face.

In terms of FTE, the Head of MDLS is now spending about 25% of her time on the IR. Most of this time is spent contacting and meeting with faculty and campus groups to discuss the IR and its utility for them. She also spends time setting up communities and collections, drafting supporting documentation for the campus, devising workflows for harvesting specific content, and training MDLS staff in harvesting and description of individual items.

Next in terms of FTE for a single individual would be the Head of the Catalog Management and Enrichment Team, spending about 5-10% of his time on it. His role is largely technical, being the person who troubleshoots and solves problems with and implements new versions of the software and the server.

The next biggest chunk of time is the work of several staff members of MDLS who are helping to harvest content that has been identified for the IR. That accounts for perhaps half of one FTE for the time being, with the expectation that this work will become incidental once backfiles of content have been acquired.

Other group members spend a few hours a month discussing or working on IR issues, with occasional spurts of increased activity as they get more actively involved in working with different target communities.

**2b) From outside the library, what departments/units are represented? (campus computing, academic departments, campus administration, etc.)**

**Library A:**

No one outside of the library is currently involved.

**Library B:**

Not officially on the above implementation committee, but we have had numerous conversations with engineering school administrators (deans and dept. chairs), engineering school academic computing dept., departmental administrative assistants, and faculty.

**Library C:**

computing, Graduate School

**Library E:**

At this time, no one from outside the library is yet involved in the implementation and planning of our IR.

**Library F: University of Oregon:**

At this time, no one from outside the library is involved, except to provide guidance and feedback on how communities and collections are established and to give permission for the harvesting of appropriate content. We hope at some point to establish an Advisory Board that will consist of library staff and faculty.