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Using a Distributed Deposit Program to Populate an Institutional Repository and Foster Open Access Advocacy with Library and Administrative Staff

Colin B. Lukens, Senior Repository Manager, Harvard Library Office for Scholarly Communication, colin_lukens@harvard.edu

NUTRITION INFORMATION
This recipe bakes a diverse network of library and academic staff who can facilitate deposits through an institutional repository (IR), increasing the size of its collection, improving its metadata, and assuring greater licensing compliance. It will build a program that more efficiently facilitates deposits to an IR and creates scholarly communication and open access advocates in library and administrative staff. This network speaks to the power and benefits of open access and addresses questions and issues in scholarly communication.

Presented here are the step-by-step instructions used by the Harvard Library Office for Scholarly Communication (OSC) for their IR distributed deposit program. Staff at the OSC alone would find it difficult to deposit the full scholastic output of the institution into DASH, the university's IR, as mandated by the faculty-voted open access policies at Harvard’s nine decentralized schools (as well as policies at a number of centers and programs). The OSC needed a creative solution to fulfill its mission, honor the policies, and increase awareness; the collaborative federated program known as the DASH Distributed Deposit program, or D3 for short, was conceived, piloted, and adopted. D3 features three cohorts of helpers: depositors, catalogers, and licensors. Baking in this additional layer of involvement within the library and administrative staff creates a community of advocates for scholarly communication, open access, and the repository.

In addition to IR benefits, each of the three program roles is given a specific voice on campus. The depositor can speak to authors or scholars in their collecting area about the benefits of open access journals or help interpret an author's IR download and article feedback metrics. The cataloger may speak to others in their area about the importance of open and structured metadata or better authority records for IRs. The licenser can take their repository-related licensing knowledge to authors who are signing publishing contracts or are confused about what works they can post to their own scholarly website.

LEARNING OUTCOMES
Use of a distributed deposit program will result in the following:
• A larger and more diverse set of works deposited to an IR or open access repository
• A more collaborative environment that brings together diverse skill sets and expertise from subject experts, metadata creators, and licensing experts
• A more knowledgeable library staff to advocate for open access and scholarly communication

NUMBER SERVED
• This recipe is flexible; it can be scaled to fit an institution’s staffing model and resources.

COOKING TIME
• Rising time (pilot): 6 months
• Official program: until well done

DIETARY GUIDELINES
The D3 program at the Harvard Library is informed by the following local and non-local frameworks:
• The Harvard Library Value Statement on Access: “Champion Access — We enhance access to information and advance inclusive models of scholarly communication” (Harvard Library, 2020).
• The Confederation of Open Access
Repositories (COAR) Next Generation Repositories Objective: “To help transform the scholarly communication system by emphasizing the benefits of collective, open and distributed management, open content, uniform behaviours, real-time dissemination, and collective innovation” (Confederation of Open Access Repositories, 2018).

The D3 program fits within the following local initiatives:

- Harvard Library copyright first responders (CFRs). CFRs support the work of the university by providing services that help advance teaching, learning, and scholarship through community engagement with copyright. Embedded in each library, archival repository, or department, CFRs develop information expertise, create a collaborative network of support among their peers involved with copyright issues both locally and across the library, and serve as a resource for the Harvard community by answering copyright questions and sharing critical knowledge (Harvard Library Office for Scholarly Communication, 2018).

- Open access liaisons. OA liaisons positioned throughout the Harvard Library provide support to schools and research centers that have adopted open access policies and assist faculty with questions about the policy and its implementation (Harvard Library Office for Scholarly Communication, 2018).

- Existing staffing operations. The D3 program leveraged existing staff operations in the OSC and Information and Technical Services divisions.

**INGREDIENTS & EQUIPMENT**

- An IR or OA repository
- Repository manager, digital collections manager, or scholarly communication librarian
- Depositor(s)
- Cataloger(s)
- Licenser(s)

**PREPARATION**

- **Mise en place.** Before beginning, look at the ingredients carefully to determine an adaptation that best fits the institution. Examine what ingredients, from both personnel and technical perspectives, would be needed to achieve a distributed workflow. On the personnel side, leverage existing operational and programmatic frameworks, including subject librarians, faculty assistants, and department administrators. This allows the division of the three core repository workflow functions into their own group. Update the repository with communication tools (such as workflow flags used to identify issues with a record that need resolution) to accommodate a larger and more diverse group of helpers.

- **Test batch.** Make a small batch first. A successful, time-limited pilot serves as proof-of-concept to get administrative support, identifies potential workflow and communication issues, and provides an opportunity to develop and fine-tune documentation.

- **Outreach and recruitment.** Use the success of the test batch to recruit new participants for a scaled-up, formal program. Approach library administrators, area managers, and local communities of practice to outline the program and its benefits. Detail the various role responsibilities and expected time commitments so that volunteers can gain permission from managers. Hold informational sessions with potential catalogers and visit academic departments to recruit for the depositor role.

- **Administrative support.** With a successful operating pilot and a number of new participants, seek administrative support to cement the distributed deposit program as the official repository workflow process.

- **Initial training.** Hold initial training sessions to prepare volunteers to perform their roles. This presents an opportunity to gather feedback on documentation and training pedagogy. In each session, outline the duties, provide instruction on workflows, and review workflow documentation.
COOKING METHOD
This is how the different ingredients work together to make a record available in an IR using a distributed deposit program:

1. A depositor, tasked with monitoring a certain discipline, department, school, lab, or faculty member(s), discovers that a new work has been published. They deposit the work to the IR on behalf of the author or ask the author to submit it.

2. Once a work is submitted, a cataloger takes over, selecting the record for metadata review. They add, verify, and enhance metadata that arrived with the submission via the depositor. As part of this process, the cataloger identifies any issues with the record using a series of workflow flags. Once the metadata review is complete and any/all flags are resolved, the work is approved and sent to the licensing review.

3. The licenser picks up the cataloged record. Using a licensing decision tree, they examine the record for a number of factors to determine the appropriate IR license. These factors include the version of the work deposited, date of publication, genre of work, and if the depositing author falls under an institutional or individual open access policy. If the licenser finds no additional issues with the record, an appropriate license is selected and the licenser archives the work in the IR.

4. The repository manager oversees the work of participants in the distributed deposit program and resolves any records left with outstanding workflow flags.

ALLERGY WARNING
A distributed deposit program takes a lot of time to create, recruit, and manage. Depending on the size of the group, it can be hard to find a time for everyone to meet together or by role. Participants are often volunteers and may need managerial support to take on additional work responsibilities.

Modifications might need to be made because resources in schools, areas, and programs differ. At smaller schools or programs, one person may serve in more than one role—for example, as both depositor and licensor. Others may prefer to have the repository manager or scholarly communication staff serve as licenser.

CHEF’S NOTES
• **Program name.** One specific exercise that proved valuable during the pilot at Harvard was deciding on a program name. During our initial outreach, the OSC solicited feedback on name ideas and invited participants or potential participants to submit ideas. This activity helped drive interest and attention to the program. Some suggested program names were playful, like CHACHA (Concerted Harvard Action to Collect Harvard Articles), EGAD (Efficient Gathering of Articles for DASH), and FIRE (Filling the Repository); others were administrative, like COAST (Coordinated OA Subject Teams), OA CADRE (OA Catalogers, Depositors, and Copyright First Responders), and, of course, D3 (Distributed DASH Deposits).

• **Depositors.** Subject librarians, department administrators, and faculty assistants find new scholarly articles in their institution’s respective subject areas and submit these works to the IR. Depositors try to ensure the right version of a work is being submitted (often in collaboration with licensors), seek agreements on deposit or licensing authorization forms (if necessary), and provide information about ORCIDs. By having a group of university administrative and library staff participate in the deposit process on behalf of authors, the IR receives a greater and more diverse cache of works. A dedicated group of in-the-know helpers working with faculty, students, and staff on research projects and updating scholarly or department web pages are on the front lines of newly published research. Depending on the size of the institution, it may be difficult for a sole repository manager or library division to track and deposit all (or even a portion) of the works created. Additionally, a citation index service or an institution’s faculty activity reporting may not assist deposits or identify what is eligible. These services can be expensive, inaccurate, or not comprehensive.

• **Catalogers.** Library catalogers or metadata specialists add, verify, and enhance metadata to all records during the post-submission workflow. Catalogers flag submissions for errors or blockers.

• **Licensers.** This group includes trained
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copyright experts within the library who assign repository-based licenses for submissions in their area, program, or school and determine whether the institution has permission to make submissions open access.

• **Workflow tags.** During a recent repository upgrade to DSpace 6, the OSC was able to include automated functionality to create discrete workflow steps, permissions, and flags in an effort to adapt DASH to the D3 landscape. Workflow steps allow records to pass through stages where multiple D3 groups have permission to act on a record. When a D3 participant logs into DASH and navigates to a workflow overview screen, they will see only the records for which they are responsible, both related to their role in D3 and the community or area they represent. This new workflow functionality also has flags, which identify any issues a record may have that prevent it from being archived in the repository. When records are flagged, DASH automatically places that record in a corresponding “bucket”; a record could have more than one flag and live in many buckets at once. A record can only advance to the next step in the workflow when all flags are resolved. For example, if a cataloger notices missing descriptive information in the submission, the record gets flagged and does not move to the licensing workflow step. When a depositor logs into the DASH workflow, they see the flagged record and can review the deposit, consulting the author as needed. Another scenario might see the licensor determine a work cannot be made available in DASH because the version deposited is the publisher’s copyrighted version of record; if a manuscript were provided instead, DASH could make this work available under an institutional open access policy. The licensor can flag that work, providing the message to a depositor that the author be contacted for a manuscript version. With these tools, it is easier to train new D3 participants, as DASH processes are consistent, more user-friendly, and limited by role.

• **Training.** The D3 program has a number of ongoing training and networking events that provide education and skill shares around the DASH workflow, licensing, and outreach methods. These meetings also cover current activities, both on and off campus, in scholarly communication and open access, and provide D3 participants the knowledge to speak to those around them about the benefits of open access and DASH.

• **Kudos.** The D3 project pilot and implementation is indebted to Ann Whiteside, librarian and assistant dean for information services at the Harvard Graduate School of Design, and Peter Suber, director of the Harvard Library Office for Scholarly Communication, for their original concepts of a distributed deposit model at Harvard.

**ADDITIONAL RESOURCES**


