Collecting Campus Culture: Collaborations and Collisions

Meg Miner, Stephanie Davis-Kahl

Collecting Campus Culture: Collaborations and Collisions

Meg Miner *University Archivist & Special Collections Librarian, Illinois Wesleyan University*

Stephanie Davis-Kahl *Scholarly Communications Librarian, Illinois Wesleyan University*

Abstract

From the 2007 implementation of Illinois Wesleyan University's institutional repository (IR), an archivist and special collections librarian and a scholarly communications librarian have worked on its development and expansion from each position's unique perspective. They have found themselves united on some fronts, but divided at times on big picture questions such as the definition of campus culture and the extent to which the IR should contain products of that culture, how best to describe and structure collections, and who should be responsible for certain collections. Through regular dialogue on these concerns and efforts to understand each other's perspective, the colleagues' joint interest in promoting and preserving a broad history of campus culture is being achieved. Examples of how these issues are navigated, recommendations for realizing similar outcomes, and insights into the work remaining are provided.

INTRODUCTION

In 2004, during strategic planning, The Ames Library at Illinois Wesleyan University identified two initiatives as vital for carrying forward the Library's services to and support for the University:

- Work with campus groups to create and provide access to university-wide digital collections;

- Serve as a Digital Institutional Repository for research projects.

These two initiatives merged as a result of the capabilities of the platform selected for the repository: Digital Commons. A team within the library formed to develop the repository and two librarians in the group began adapting the repository for their areas of responsibility: Scholarly Communications and University Archives. As both librarians' work progressed within their respective collection areas and as the repository evolved, they realized that the ease with which collections can be created and accessed in this platform provided collaborative opportunities beyond the initiatives' original intent. They also realized that in order to collaborate effectively and collegially, each librarian would need to be clear in communicating their positions on key issues and in establishing shared goals for the repository.

This paper presents three questions which the University Archivist and Scholarly Communications Librarian sought to answer: what materials to include, how to describe materials, and who bears responsibility for specific repository collections. Insights into both librarians' repository work from their different perspectives are shared here, as are recommendations for others wishing to collaborate on repository development. Ultimately, this paper is an introduction to the process of collaboration, which we view as iterative and instructive to our overall purpose as stewards of our institutional heritage in its many forms. An outcome of this work is an understanding of the need for increased communication

and cooperation between the University Archivist and Scholarly Communications Librarian.

LITERATURE REVIEW

In laying out his expansive view on institutional repositories, Clifford Lynch (2003) asserted that a collaborative curation effort is necessary for "mature and fully realized" repositories that contain products of both individual and institutional work, including "records of events and performance and of the ongoing intellectual life of the institution" (p. 2). Calls for cooperation across all levels of institutions, and across academic and administrative units alike, are found in the literature from that point forward. Nevertheless, reports of archivists and scholarly communications librarians or repository managers actually collaborating on repository development and curation are not often present. The authors of the present work sought evidence of collaborative models in the literature throughout the period of 2000-2012. As faculty at an undergraduate liberal arts institution classified as S4/HR (small four-year, highly residential) by the Carnegie Foundation, we were particularly interested in finding evidence of similar collaborative efforts being conducted among peer institutions.

Thus far, it seems that large institutions are leading the way in reporting on archivists' involvement in repository development. For example, Georgia Institute of Technology's archivist collaborates with its repository manager in providing electronic publications and traditional archival materials now available in digital format (Walters, 2007).[1] Rice, Tufts, and Northeastern Universities, private research institutions, all have ongoing efforts with members from both Digital Initiatives and Archives units (Watterworth, 2009). In fact, the archivists at Tufts and Northeastern University each had leadership roles in these efforts and also wrote about their experiences (Chavez, et al., 2007; Sauer, 2009).

In a conference presentation on repository development, Scholarly Communications Librarian Michelle Armstrong and archivist Julia Stringfellow also noted engagement at large schools. Of the universities they highlighted, only two—the University of Utah and their own Boise State University—operate repositories that contain both scholarly works and archival material published by the institutions themselves (2011). In Utah's case, the bulk of the archives' digital presence is held in The Internet Archive's Archive-It portal[2] with repository content including only a few archival collections. Boise State's institutional repository holds a range of archival material, but information on the purpose, process and collection strategies for this material is not disclosed.[3]

Echoes of Lynch's call for "fully realized" (2003, p. 2) repositories are present in these institutional examples and in articles specifying the need for involving archivists and their particular skill and knowledge set in the development of repositories. Doug Bicknese (2004) states that "[a]rchivists' experience in selecting records of enduring value" (p. 88) is an argument in favor of seeking their help. In a later report, the findings of a 2006 *Census* of four-year college and university repository content[4] were analyzed by a team of investigators at University of Michigan (Yakel, Soo, Jean, Markey, & Kim, 2008). Archivists represented a small percentage (3%) of the 446 respondents, however, they and other respondents reported archivists' involvement in repository work from pilot testing through implementation stages (p. 330-33), including the identification of content (p. 347). Yakel et al. (2008) also found that much of the archival content being included in repositories was digitized material, rather than born-digital, and that repository architecture lacked the ability to relate data in a way that reflects its hierarchical relationship to other records of the institution. To address this issue, Yakel's group recommended that archivists play a role in developing repository systems that have the ability to provide this kind of context (p. 347).

In a 2009 article advocating for archivists' involvement in the scholarly communications mission of repositories, Tufts University Archivist Anne Sauer posits that archivists typically direct their attention to "unique materials" (p. 53) and may not see published scholarship as needing the same level of care. Sauer offers insights into specific ways in which archivists can contribute to and benefit from engagement with the repository, particularly in relation to capturing and managing "gray literature…reports, proceedings, white papers, etc. that currently proliferate on research center Web sites and faculty Web pages" (p. 56). A recent argument (Paulus, 2011) favors archivists and librarians influencing the process of creating digital materials. In this curatorial model "libraries and archives can reposition themselves more aggressively within the archival cycle and evolve their institutions to support new forms of communication" (p. 948). This renewed call for

traditional record keepers to become shapers of the records themselves reiterates points made by Clifford Lynch in 2003, and reflects the increasing interest in libraries taking an active role in publishing[5], a potential shared interest for archivists and scholarly communications librarians. Similarly, a brief opinion piece on the need for collaborative curation of digital data notes that archivists often must "balance the stewardship and protection of collections with the pragmatics of managing an ever-growing corpus of paper and electronic information" and that librarians can aid the effort by acting as advocates among the departmental faculty (Ramírez, 2011, p. 22).

While the existing literature addresses advocacy for cooperative ventures, there is little evidence of actual collaboration within repositories that encompass both scholarly communications and historical records, and we found no reports of such efforts at smaller institutions. This paper offers tangible evidence of our collaboration and, we hope, illustrates both the challenges and possibilities we discovered in the first four years of developing our "fully realized" repository.

BACKGROUND

In late 2007, Illinois Wesleyan University subscribed to Berkeley Electronic Press's (bepress) Digital Commons with the intent of building an institutional repository that would support the growing needs of both the scholarly communications and the records management initiatives on campus. At the outset, the repository was seen as a means of documenting the outcomes of research and creative efforts of students, staff, and faculty, and of addressing the need for storing and accessing born-digital records of the institution. We also saw the repository as an avenue for increasing student, staff, and faculty awareness of their self-archiving rights as authors, and for increasing the library's visibility as a partner in the scholarly communications process. The University Archivist and Scholarly Communications Librarian agree wholeheartedly on these broad goals.

The University Librarian, Library Technology Director, Reserves and Digital Projects Coordinator, Scholarly Communications Librarian, and University Archivist came together as a working group to establish the principles that would guide the initiative and to select initial content to populate the repository. The group believed that showcasing certain content would enhance the interest

of campus constituencies in open access initiatives and illustrate alternatives to the kinds of dissemination taking place on campus Web pages. During conversations with campus administration regarding the repository, student scholarship and creative works garnered the most positive reaction and the most interest for the first wave of building repository collections. Faculty scholarship and creative activity were also identified as a key content area, but enthusiasm was much higher for student works because of their potential to promote the university's educational mission and programs in a manner that could personalize the experience for students. Based on this information, we decided to focus our efforts to work with schools, departments, and programs to identify and collect student scholarship and creative work rather than focusing solely on faculty and staff scholarship. The group also affirmed the importance of collecting and organizing the online records of the institution as a priority, specifically, campus governance documents such as minutes from the monthly all-faculty meetings.

Deciding upon these two broad areas of focus for collections helped clarify responsibilities for the repository and for scholarly communications initiatives in general. The Scholarly Communications Librarian oversees and develops collections of student and faculty scholarship. She also supervises the Reserves and Digital Projects Coordinator, a staff member who is responsible for scanning, text-rendering with OCR, formatting audio/visual files, and tracking faculty publication permissions. The University Archivist administers repository collections of institutional governance and history and supervises student assistants who scan and OCR documents when needed, create transcripts, and upload to the repository. An advisory board made up of students, faculty and staff was established to define new collection possibilities and to serve as a sounding board for the library where the repository is concerned. The library, the Mellon Center for Faculty and Curriculum Development, the Office of the Provost, and the Office of the President provide funding for the repository.

Guidelines for repository submissions and policies addressing a range of issues such as author rights and content withdrawal requests were approved in 2009. Additionally, the University Archivist developed a digital collection creation and preservation policy for archival material which was approved by Ames Library Faculty and the Library Advisory Committee in 2011.[6]

These statements serve to document our services and responsibilities and provide reference points when engaging contributors and users on what they may expect of the repository and other digital initiatives.

DEFINING CAMPUS CULTURE

During the initial development of our repository program's goals and policies, we were steadfast in our desire for the repository collections to reflect the identity and culture of our institution. George Kuh and Elizabeth Whitt (1988), in the often-cited T*he Invisible Tapestry*, define institutional culture as

> [T]he collective, mutually shaping patterns of norms, values, practices, beliefs, and assumptions that guide the behavior of individuals and groups in an institute of higher education and provide a frame of reference within which to interpret the meaning of events and actions on and off campus (p. 12-13).

An important element in articulating *our* institutional culture was a Campus Identity Study conducted by university administration in 2006—after the library had completed its own strategic planning, but before we implemented Digital Commons. During a focus group of faculty, the phrase "intellectually vibrant community" was used by one of the participants. That phrase resonated with us, and was adopted as a guiding principle when identifying repository collections that will showcase our community and creating policies that will help us achieve that goal. Our approach reflects the assertion in Raym Crow's (2002) report, *The Case for Institutional Repositories*:

> In contrast to discipline-specific repositories and subject-oriented or thematic digital libraries, institutional repositories capture the original research and other intellectual property generated by an institution's constituent population active in many fields. Defined in this way, institutional repositories represent an historical and tangible embodiment of the intellectual life and output of an institution. And, to the extent that institutional affiliation itself serves as the primary qualitative filter, this repository becomes a significant indicator of the institution's academic quality (p. 16-17).

The connection to our repository is clear: the repository serves to collect in and extend out the artifacts of the "intellectual life" and academic mission of the university, primarily the scholarly and creative work of our students, but also of our faculty and staff. We have anecdotal evidence from Admissions staff and faculty search committees that Digital Commons @ IWU has become an important resource for demonstrating the quality of work that our students produce during their academic careers and the role faculty play in fostering that work.

This promotion of our "intellectually vibrant community" through the repository is an extension of our campus' cultural history, throughout which there has been a clear and articulated value not only for supporting and encouraging student research,[7] but also for sharing and disseminating the products of that research, as evidenced by our robust peer-reviewed student journal collection,[8] our Honors Research program,[9] and the John Wesley Powell Undergraduate Research Conference.[10] Including these repository collections provides an avenue for discussions about what constitutes excellence in undergraduate research as well as a means to educate students about their role as copyright holders of their own work—conversations which both further contribute to our campus culture.

Preservation of and access to the intellectual efforts of our communities are also long-held archival practices. While there is no single, overriding definition that archivists use, elements of campus culture articulated in professional archives sources "give priority to official records and publications...[that] document administrative, faculty, student, and external involvement…."[11] and include "M.A. and Honors theses and dissertations."[12] Our archives contains records that demonstrate involvement in these areas—minutes of formal organizations, task force reports and administrative policies and theses from relevant points in time—from our earliest days.

Establishing a repository that provides access to these organizational records as well as evidence of student and faculty intellectual life places our vision of capturing culture in sync with the repository composition Lynch called for in 2003. The following sections report on selected experiences of implementing our repository from both the archival and the scholarly communications perspectives. These examples illustrate the issues we encountered in working through our philosophical and functional differences.

CAPTURING CULTURE: FROM RECORDS TO STUDENT WORK

Case Study: University Archives

The archives' involvement in the repository began due to the increasing realization that records with archival value were being posted to the University's Web pages and third-party sites. In the years preceding implementation of the repository, the archivist noted a trend of campus offices and organizations overwriting or removing their permanent records without considering the impact on their historical record. Therefore, the archivist places the highest priority on outreach to committees and groups that post permanent records solely online such as Student Senate, Staff Council, and the Provost's Office (for Faculty Meeting Minutes).

Facing the challenge of educating record creators on the benefits of long term repository storage over Web page posting is imperative; making use of the records' electronic form is common sense. Digital Commons meets many of our archival records' needs for stable storage and searchable access, but casual users of the system still view it as a Web site that can easily be changed. Our policies specify a "no overwrite" approach for permanent records even though it is technologically possible to remove one document and replace it with a revised document of the same event. Updated documents are added as new files instead and appear on a list of titles that is visible to all under headings related to the office or function of their creators.

One example of this policy in action is found in our student governance records. The Student Senate revised its constitution in 2011 and rather than overwriting the 2008 version in the repository, both versions are included.[13] The group can now point from their Web site to the most current constitution with its link from the repository, but access to the previous version is also maintained for future research. We address concerns about outdated policies being retrieved in search results by inserting metadata at the individual record level; cross references refer to the next new version from the old, and from the new version back to the previous one, thus reducing the possibility of confusing superseded content for current documents.

The ability to *limit* access to key documents increases the possibilities for more content to be included in our collections. In the case of our Faculty Meeting Minutes, the repository's collection is searchable and visible to anyone anywhere, but full text downloads are possible only through campus logins or IPs; all other users are limited to a brief metadata record for each document. This decision to restrict access to the full text was made in consultation with the repository's Advisory Committee who did not think our governance deliberations should be viewable to everyone on the open Web, but who acknowledged the benefits of having the minutes in a central, searchable storage point, rather than existing as single PDFs available only on the campus intranet. Retaining and allowing access to all versions of these documents also supports traditional archival practice: evidence of institutional progress relies on the ability to study successive iterations of records, such as reports and policies, and meeting minutes that reflect decision-making processes (see examples linked from endnote 12). The ability to restrict general access but to provide search capabilities and 24/7 full text access to authenticated users of our Meeting Minutes is immensely popular with faculty and administrators who are interested in discussions leading to past decisions. In addition to being useful for governance research, faculty using this collection began to see new possibilities for the repository in other areas, such as the Teaching Awards collection, which was suggested by a faculty member and will be further described later in this paper.

Besides organizational and departmental records, our repository also contains a collection of oral histories. Our University Archives holds recordings on a variety of media dating from 1949, but the previous collection practices have not been consistent and interview permissions forms were not used until the current archivist began a concentrated effort in 2009. We take the view described by William Maher (1992), who states that after archival programs are established, "Failing to consider oral history puts the program at risk of leaving an incomplete documentary record" (p. 331). Once underappreciated or ignored, the presence of oral histories is now commonplace in archival collections. In 2002, Ellen Swain provided a detailed history of this gradual acceptance. Later, in a 2008 update, Swain surveyed the literature and found archivists struggling with increased user demands for access to recordings online, not just transcripts; pressures from institutional review boards; and implications in copyright for distribution on the

Web. The oral history program[14] at Illinois Wesleyan today contains voices that help fill a gap in our cultural record and includes alumni views on campus diversity and student life as well as faculty and staff perspectives from transitional eras on our campus. We responded to the demand for online access Swain mentioned, and interview subjects are made aware of our plans to host complete audio recordings online along with transcripts and "then and now" photographs. We have not judged this program to fall under the purview of the IRB but we address concerns about intellectual control by having each person sign a campus legal counsel-approved permission form at the time of interview. Interviewees retain control over the recording until after they review and approve the final transcript.

It should be noted that the University Archives began exhibiting digitized materials from selected collections online in 1999, nearly a decade prior to the establishment of our repository. To date, several historical periodicals produced by students and administrative units as well as photographs and other records scanned for research requests reside primarily in CONTENTdm collections.[15] However, including the oral histories in our repository, rather than with existing online archival collections, made more sense as Digital Commons offers the ability to embed media players for content held on streaming servers and also to present transcripts and photographs associated with the same interview in one item record. The archives' student assistants create transcripts for all oral history recordings that we place in the repository, and transcripts allow us to take advantage of search engine indexing in order to increase access to the collection.

Case Study: Scholarly Communications and Student Work

Whereas the archives works to capture the historical context of campus life, the focus for scholarly communications is on using faculty, staff, and student scholarship and creative work in the repository to reflect our "intellectually vibrant community." This is at times overwhelming due to the number of opportunities for creating collections, especially for student work. As we discussed how best to represent student work, we quickly realized that the process of conducting and creating undergraduate research is a tremendously validating experience for our students; oftentimes, the end product is a culmination of at least a year's worth of collaboration with a faculty member. With the repository, we can capitalize on that validation. By committing to permanently retain their work in our repository, we demonstrate how much the institution values the students' work. Anecdotally, we know students enjoy and appreciate having their work accessible in the repository; students report using the links to their work on resumes, CVs, and even on their Facebook sites. Featuring student work in the repository also has value to our Admissions and Alumni Relations staff, who routinely use repository content to demonstrate the close connection between research and student life at the university.

Thanks to existing print collection of Honors projects, student journals, and undergraduate research conference programs, we had a plethora of material to work with immediately after our bepress implementation in December 2007. Our initial challenge was to efficiently and effectively digitize the "low-hanging fruit" that was already readily accessible. Another advantage of using our existing collections was that a majority of the material was text (except for journal covers and illustrations in Honors projects) and therefore easy to provide instructions for scanning. Assistants in the Archives and in our Reserves and Digital Projects Coordinator's office worked to scan and OCR Honors projects and the programs for the research conference. We were also able to download many of the articles from our student journals from their departmental websites. Within six months of implementation, all issues of our student journals were posted in the repository, and about 80% of Honors projects were uploaded as well. In the case of digitized content drawn from archival holdings, we consulted our campus legal counsel and determined individual pursuit of permissions was not necessary. Our reasoning is that these works were published and/or deposited in publicly accessible collections by the authors with no access restrictions. However, as mentioned earlier, our policies do explicitly address withdrawal appeals (see endnote 6 link to "Withdrawal and Access Restrictions Policies"), and we are committed to addressing our community's concerns if they arise.

While digitizing Honors projects and capturing student journal content was relatively simple, the John Wesley Powell Undergraduate Research Conference, which began in 1990, proved to be a greater challenge. Historically, our archives only retained the printed conference programs which contain abstracts. Although processes for scanning

and uploading text are straightforward, we encountered a bigger question: how to continue developing the conference collection in a way that would extend the life of the conference, communicate the energy and vitality of the event, and adequately represent the different disciplines contributing to the conference? First, we decided to imitate the structure of a professional conference as closely as possible in the repository environment. In addition to posting the conference programs as one publication, we also used the *event community* structure in bepress to break a single publication into individual presentations, grouping them into conference tracks by type and time. This approach improves the visibility of each abstract, and allows the reader to view the variety of presentations without having to download an entire program. Second, we began a campaign in 2008 to collect as much full text from the students as possible. Each year the number of full text documents we receive increases, so progress is being made slowly but surely in this area. A huge step forward for collecting content was when the campus purchased a poster printer for the library, expressly for use by students presenting posters at the undergraduate research conference. At the close of the conference, we collect all the poster files printed at the library and upload them into the conference collection. An unresolved issue in this process is how to collect our non-exclusive license agreement. We use a few different methods to collect the form: emailing students directly, asking them to fill out the form when they drop off and/or pick up their poster, or following up with them at the conference itself. We have also contacted individual professors for assistance when we know they have students who are presenting. Finally, we are working with the 2013 conference planning committee to devise a system within bepress to combine registration and submission of abstracts, full text, and the license agreement.

Beyond the undergraduate research conference, another ongoing challenge is how to keep building collections that show other types of student work. Possibilities on the horizon include creating collections for award-winning student fiction and poetry readings; developing a site for our Action Research Center, a campus unit that pairs community groups with student interns; building a site for our creative arts journal, *Tributaries*; and capturing presentations that our students give at professional conferences in their disciplines.

HOW BEST TO DESCRIBE AND STRUCTURE

Case Study: University Archives

In addition to ensuring the authenticity of records, securing them in a way that preserves the *context*, or external structure (Pearce-Moses, 2012), for the records' relationship to each other and to the institution as a whole is a fundamental principle of archival practice. Answers to institutional research questions are often only arrived at after looking at more than one area of the institution's documentary history. Research in archival records often succeeds due to archivists' familiarity with their collections. Personal knowledge of structural and functional changes at the institution allows archivists to guide researchers to related content based on their specific needs. Understanding the structure of the institution and the connections among campus units is necessary to fully comprehend those changes. In practical terms, archivists become gatekeepers to on-site visitors in order to make the context of holdings clear.

When people come to institutional records in a repository through a search engine, making them aware of these changes and other information that might answer their questions is possible through notes and cross-referencing at the individual record and series levels (see endnote 12). And yet, professional standards traditionally have not recommended describing physical archives to the item level. Sometimes series level identification is sufficient in a print collection and often an individual folder can be described at a sub-series level even if it contains several individual records. Because all digital objects require individual descriptions, the high-touch digital world means archivists' processing practices must undergo a culture shift. Describing and cross-referencing Illinois Wesleyan University's institutional records in the repository are areas that need further attention. The time and knowledge needed to make these connections is significant and must be weighed against competing needs.

Case Study: Scholarly Communications

The matter of highly developed metadata structures for student and faculty work has also been an ongoing conversation, and one that has been dwarfed by the need to develop new collections of interest. We have done very little to customize the baseline metadata provided by

Digital Commons, including a well-developed taxonomy of academic disciplines, given that our text documents are full text searchable and that for a time, our ingest rate was high enough to warrant a basic level and nothing more. Nevertheless, with more images and video added each year, we recognize the need for developing additional metadata structures for media objects. We envision a three-part process: actively listening to the creators of our art and music content to understand how they describe their work, looking to established metadata structures, and then distilling the two into a more robust structure that works for our needs and within our Digital Commons implementation.

In addition, improving the descriptive information for our collections is key to their enduring access. As the case study for archives stated, when users find our repository through a search engine, it is vital that they understand the context of the information they have found. We are increasingly aware of the need to more fully develop our descriptive information, such as detailed introductions to each collection, statements about the history or significance of a student journal, etc., in order to complement and build upon the search engine optimization already present in the Digital Commons platform. Significant workloads for both the University Archivist and the Scholarly Communications Librarian, and the lack of a resident metadata expert, contribute to our low metadata activity. We have discussed creating an internship or practicum to address this need, as well as the possibility of our current Technical Services staff helping to resolve these issues.

DEFINING RESPONSIBILITIES FOR REPOSITORY COLLECTIONS

Case Study: University Archives

Following the model set by groups who were already posting permanent records on their Web pages, it seemed logical for the archivist to provide administrators' privileges to groups hosted in the repository. However, convincing organizational officers and committees to upload content as they create it, or to keep up with their posting throughout staffing changes, has been difficult.

Student Senate serves as an example of this issue. The officer charged with recording and posting minutes changes annually. After an initial workflow was agreed to

in 2010, the next year's officer declined to continue the practice and reverted to a campus Web page with PDFs linked to their campus server space. Alternately, some groups or offices may see the benefit of contributing to the repository but not be willing to take on responsibilities for upkeep. This was the case for the staff member tasked with maintaining several faculty governance Web pages. Our process for capturing these records is for the archivist to confirm that final versions of Faculty Meeting Minutes are posted, and then archives students download them from the University's server and upload them to the repository.

We now host repository communities for nine committees involved in faculty, staff, and student governance but can report only one complete success in the area of creator-contributed content: our Staff Council. Only this group has taken responsibility for securing their documents in the repository and for making appropriate changes to their Web site on the University's server.[16] Other contributors prefer the service model described above with Faculty Meeting Minutes. The archivist creates the cross-referencing and other descriptive information and continuously engages with group and committee members to ensure content is captured.

Regardless of the workflow, frequent contact with contributors and quality control checks are necessary to ensure that documents are being uploaded to the correct part of the repository and that they match the title for the item being ingested. It is all too easy to browse to and click on the wrong file. Verifying the accurate ingest and description in the repository of born-digital institutional records is a responsibility that does and should reside with the archives, not solely with the creators.

Case Study: Scholarly Communications

We quickly realized that for research, scholarship and creative activity, a service model of the library uploading and describing materials—rather than asking faculty and students to upload their own work—would be our best path of success and growth in content. Work by Dorothea Salo (2008) and Nancy Foster and Susan Gibbons (2005) helped to solidify our intent to centralize responsibilities for repository development. Designating one person (the Scholarly Communications Librarian) to be responsible for the repository and its services signals the library's intent to fully support the repository, follows the library's

common practice for leadership of major initiatives and services, and helps keep outreach and education messages consistent. Nevertheless, even as we invested leadership in one position, we acknowledged that the repository would serve different purposes for different people, on campus (faculty, students, etc.) and within the library (Archives, liaison librarians).

For the most part, the Archivist and Scholarly Communications Librarian have been able to establish separate lines of responsibility for their broad areas of collections, but there have been a few cases of joint responsibility. One example is the creation of a collection featuring speeches by the recipients of the Kemp Foundation Award for Teaching Excellence, an annual award given to a faculty member. The speeches are given during the annual Honors Convocation, an event that represents the beginning of Commencement season, with announcements of academic honors and students wearing academic regalia for the first time. As a campus event, it is part of a long tradition of Convocations, and in that light, falls into the Archivist's realm. However, the main part of the event is the speech by faculty, reflecting on teaching and learning, which falls into the realm of the Scholarly Communications Librarian. Speech texts had been deposited in the archives periodically in the past, but no systematic collection process was in place. Now, through several conversations between both librarians as well as the Digital Projects Coordinator (who reports to the Scholarly Communications Librarian), a structure for all key events on campus was created in the repository, along with clear policies on what documents and media were to be included, as well as who would collect, scan, and upload the documents. Both text and video are available for recent Honors Convocations; the Scholarly Communications Librarian collects text and the video is available from our University Communications office. Both the librarian and the archivist collect programs with the names of the students honored for their achievements, with one copy going into the Archives and the other copy used for scanning and uploading into the repository. The Digital Projects Coordinator and her student workers scan and upload these documents. Digitizing past recordings created in different formats is a possible project for the future.

LESSONS LEARNED: COLLABORATIONS AND COLLISIONS

In general, the Scholarly Communications Librarian leads outreach efforts for scholarship and creative works and the University Archivist pursues records of organizational units. The success of our collaboration, however, has evolved from our shared view on the long-term need for access to excellent student work (i.e., Honors works and our series of undergraduate peer-reviewed journals). These are series of records that have been valued and retained for historical purposes throughout Illinois Wesleyan University's history. Our work in converting print copies of student peer-reviewed journals for the repository won praise from a variety of campus constituencies, including two we had not initially thought to be audiences for the repository: Admissions and Advancement. In the third year of our repository's implementation, most students, faculty advisors, and the Associate Provost responsible for the program welcomed our implementation of electronic Honors theses deposits. Digitization work in the archives paved the way to these early successes and is now often sustained and supported by the Digital Projects Coordinator. In addition, the Scholarly Communications Librarian works closely with departments who are engaged in publishing student journals to provide education around author's rights and open access, so the repository has opened the door for expanding our educative role on campus.

Even with a shared value for student work, the issue of selectivity is one in which our views diverge. For example, the undergraduate research conference, which is in its twenty-third year, includes live performances of student compositions and presentations of art in addition to poster presentations and oral presentations. It made sense to use the repository as a venue to showcase the art presentations and the performances of original compositions, elements of our culture that have not consistently been collected in the past. In 2008, we began to videotape both the performances and art presentations in order to stream them from the repository using Vimeo, a host for the native video files. However, by collecting the various products, especially the media products, we have created a digital preservation challenge. Even though our policies clearly support the inclusion of media formats in the repository, our internal support for digital preservation is still under development and thus, tenuous. At the same time, we have increased the quantity of student scholarship

that we are capturing significantly since many more students participate in the John Wesley Powell Research Conference than in the Honors or peer-reviewed journal programs. Research conference students are not required to deposit their works, as Research Honors students are, but many have elected to do so. In simple terms of digital objects to track and maintain over time, this increase also presents a preservation challenge for our future.

From the archivist's point of view, the volatile nature of technological progress offers risks to long term access that are difficult to anticipate, especially with a variety of digital media formats. Archivists have a duty to care for records "forever," and taking responsibility for most of the students' research conference output every year and for the foreseeable future seems daunting. Additionally, the practice of archival *appraisal*, defined by Richard Pearce-Moses (2012) as "the process of determining whether records and other materials have permanent (archival) value" involves evaluating accessions on a number of factors including the "intrinsic value" of records as well as the "costs to preserve them" over time (Notes section, para. 1 and 2). The archivist acknowledges the benefits for our students and our institution in being able to celebrate our students' research and creative activities; nevertheless, keeping everything for the long term seems counter to the spirit of deliberate appraisal for which archivists are usually responsible.

On the other hand, from the Scholarly Communications point of view, the repository is the perfect place to highlight the different types of work that our students and faculty are doing in their classrooms, labs and studios. Robert Spindler (2008) said, in describing work being done through the Guggenheim Museum's arts collections,[17] "These multimedia products demand that archivists revisit their perceptions of the fixity of documents and their mixed nature creates substantial new challenges for long-term preservation" (p. 61). Digital preservation may be a challenge, but we cannot ignore the opportunities to connect with students, regardless of the format of their discipline, and collect the output of their work. Also, including non-text works (i.e., images, videos, audio, scores, etc.), helps to build appreciation of the creative work, especially in areas in which text is not the primary mode of communication.

For the Scholarly Communications Librarian, the student research conference is a near-perfect educative

moment about extending the reach of one's work for students. In terms of the symbolism of the event itself, it is a culmination of deep student-faculty collaboration over a period of years, and it is often students' first experience presenting to a group unfamiliar with their work. Although the archives and the library are not actively engaged in appraising what students present at the research conference, the faculty mentors of student projects and departments are, and so we depend on their discipline's standards to guide collections of student work.

Preserving student work has not been the only catalyst for a collision of perspectives; collecting individual faculty work is also a point of discussion. Ultimately, the archivist's priorities in gathering permanent records has differed from the kinds of faculty content being sought for scholarly communications initiatives for two main reasons: 1) Web-based records have been seen as being more at risk than works faculty are publishing, and 2) the archives' existing collection policy statements indicate it will hold individuals' works only on a selective basis. To date, our archives' holdings have heavily favored aggregate records of the University as a corporation and the output of student organizations. Secondary sources document the creative and scholarly output of faculty members in our community for much of our history. Passive acceptance, rather than active pursuit, of such works was common practice until the advent of the library's scholarly communications initiatives.

As part of this 'pursuit' of faculty scholarship, the Scholarly Communications Librarian, learning from the experiences of Royster (2008), Salo (2008), and Foster and Gibbons (2005), recognized that beginning with a mediated deposit model would help develop agreement and active participation and has been approaching individual faculty and departments with the offer to build collections for their research and creative activity. Since the repository's implementation, faculty and staff participation has been growing steadily each year, in part due to targeted outreach and in part due to referrals from other faculty members. A recently drafted Scholarly Communications plan outlines a number of strategies for formalizing outreach and collection building of faculty work, including advocating for an open access policy.

Finally, the University Archivist has also been reluctant to embrace the repository as a home for digital collections that are accessible in other software platforms. To date,

these legacy collections are stable and accessible as they are, but we risk confusion among users as to what kind of content can be found in the different platforms. However, we know that no one system will ever fulfill all of our needs; the Scholarly Communications Librarian views the repository as a hub as well as a permanent place for intellectual and creative work, bringing together various content for ease of access, discovery and value added functionality (i.e., using Vimeo to host videos and embedding the video within the item record in the repository). The archivist agrees these aspects will benefit our repository now and will continue to serve our institution long after we are gone. However, administering connections—through metadata or otherwise—between a variety of platforms and with content being hosted in different places, including some that are out of our custody in third party sites, presents challenges in terms of securing our collections and maintaining intellectual control. One area in which both librarians agree is that more work on understanding our users' perspectives on such fragmentation, as well as their needs and uses of the repository, should be initiated.

OUR NEXT STEPS AND ADVICE FOR OTHERS

The University Archivist and the Scholarly Communications Librarian believe that the best approach to working through these differences is through frequent meetings that enhance communication across the two approaches. Each brings their own professional tradition and each believes strongly in the importance of providing a holistic view of the University's scholarly and creative products and organizational records. In the process of collaborating on this paper, the authors realized that sharing knowledge and news often occur ad hoc, and that regularly scheduling meetings will create formal opportunities for sharing information, gathering feedback, and preventing potential conflicts.

Policy documents provide a foundation for our collection efforts, but are viewed as a starting point and not an end point. We have found that the best avenue to responsible repository development is to continually revisit the policies to reflect new types of content and address archival challenges as they emerge. Being attuned to each other's professional practices and concerns can enrich the repository, both in terms of content and in terms of long-term stewardship. As we go forward in developing and collecting for the repository, returning

to our foundational documents and reviewing previously established plans are key elements in maintaining the collaborative nature of the repository and for achieving our mutually-agreed upon goals. Seminal archival texts (Boles, 2005; Maher, 1992; Samuels, 1992) emphasize an analysis of the institution's needs and available resources before developing collection strategies, and awareness of recurring campus priority discussions increases our responsiveness to external pressures. Recently, during our annual all-faculty retreat, recruitment and retention of students was the focus. Each campus unit was called on to generate ideas of how they can and do contribute to the ongoing effort of attracting and retaining quality students; for the library, featuring student work in the repository is one way we communicate the value of student research to both prospective students and their parents.

The work ahead of us includes an assessment of the way our content is used and perceived on campus, an analysis of our workflows, working with campus allies to identify new users, and more actively sharing our successes with others. New strategic planning work taking place in our library and projected to take place on our campus is an opportunity for making sure the goals of the repository are represented, and ensuring that our goals are in alignment with new strategic plan initiatives. We must be alert to any changes in the larger organization's purposes or functions that can benefit from the repository's purposes, and we must be ready to embrace new avenues that could aid in the repository's growth. We also plan to connect with graduate students in library and information science programs. By exploring internships or other mentoring opportunities, we believe we can offer practical work experiences that will benefit our future colleagues and will help distribute our own workload in the short term.

We recommend several strategies that we believe are fundamental for successful repository collaborations:

- Establish policies for selection, removal, ownership, responsibilities—authors', the repository's and the institution's—to support it all;

- Identify workflows, including assigning responsibilities for specific content;

- Agree to discuss changes or additions among the repository administrative group before implementing new initiatives;

- Understand that sometimes the parts of the repository we feel are important may not have the same level of priority for others at the same time; and

- Acknowledge a mutual respect for different viewpoints.

CONCLUSION

Fundamentally, the University Archives is responsible for offering access to records that are authentic, conveying relationships among organizational units, and ensuring preservation of collections for future use. Part of the archivist's work includes educating campus members on their vital role in securing historical records. Scholarly communications efforts are ultimately larger than the repository, with education and outreach around copyright, authors' rights and open access, but the repository is a vital and exciting part of the whole picture. From both an archival and a scholarly communications perspective, the benefits of collecting different products of campus culture in the repository seem clear: our documentary heritage is authentic and secure, and the ease of access and searchability of our institution's creative, intellectual, and historical works satisfy the expectations of today's researchers.

Our individual and collaborative actions bring us in closer contact with creators and contributors of the works we collect, and forge bonds between the wider campus and the professional principles of both the University's archives and scholarly communications initiatives. Engaging in conversations and outreach are never-ending opportunities for promoting the beliefs of our shared profession: that the products of the work being done in our community are important not just for the sake of immediate needs but also for the impact the work will have on a future we will never see. Repositories require us to be grounded in our principles, mindful of researchers' needs for the present and in the future, and open to the possibility of reaching new audiences. Through our collaboration, we plan to put that vision into action.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

ENDNOTES

[1] The complete SMARTech policy statement is available at http://smartech.gatech.edu/policy. Accessed April 27, 2012.

[2] The University of Utah's repository is available at http://uspace.utah.edu, and their Archive-It collection is available at http://www.lib.utah.edu/collections/university-of-utah-web-archive.php. Accessed August 26, 2012.

[3] A description of the purpose and services for Boise State University's repository is available at http://scholarworks.boisestate.edu/about.html. Accessed August 26, 2012.

[4] The full census, including the research design is available, with the preliminary report from Markey, K., St. Jean, B., Soo, Y. R., Yakel, E., Kim, J., & Yong-Mi K. (2007). Nationwide census of institutional repositories preliminary findings. *JODI: Journal of Digital Information*, *8*(2). Retrieved April 27, 2012, from http://journals.tdl.org/jodi/article/view/194/170.

[5] A recently released report on the topic of library publishing services was completed by Mullins, J. L., Murray-Rust, C., Ogburn, J. L., Crow, R., Ivins, O., Mower, A., Nesdill, D., Newton, M., Speer, J., & Watkinson, C. (2012). *Library Publishing Services: Strategies for Success: Final Research Report* (March 2012). Retrieved August 28, 2012, from Purdue University Press e-books website: http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/purduepress_ebooks/24.

[6] Policies and guidelines are available as follows: Submission guidelines for faculty http://digitalcommons.iwu.edu/faculty_guidelines.pdf, students http://digitalcommons.iwu.edu/student_guidelines.pdf, and University records http://digitalcommons.iwu.edu/university_guidelines.pdf. Accessed June 6, 2012.

See also Withdrawal and Access Restrictions Policies at http://digitalcommons.iwu.edu/faq.html#faq-9 and http://digitalcommons.iwu.edu/faq.html#faq-8, and a statement on digitizing and preserving archival materials at http://www.iwu.edu/library/information/Digital_collections.pdf. Accessed June 6, 2012.

[7] Statements about our institutional emphasis on undergraduate research are available at http://www.iwu.edu/research/ and http://

www.iwu.edu/selfstudy/iwu_nca_selfstudy_final_06_27_2012.pdf, pages 173-177. Accessed July 20, 2012.

[8]Titles of peer reviewed publications are available at http://digitalcommons.iwu.edu/peer_review_list.html. Accessed July 9, 2012.

[9]There is no single link to a collection of Honors research; these works are associated with the department that awarded them Honors status. For example, see the arrangement under the Psychology Department at http://digitalcommons.iwu.edu/psych. Accessed July 9, 2012.

[10]Access to the annual John Wesley Powell Research Conference is available at http://digitalcommons.iwu.edu/jwprc/. Accessed July 9, 2012.

[11]See Acquisitions section of Core Archival Functions http://www2.archivists.org/node/14804. Accessed June 6, 2012.

[12]See Appendix I: Types of Academic Records, Guidelines for College and University Archives http://www2.archivists.org/node/14807. Accessed June 6, 2012.

[13]See http://digitalcommons.iwu.edu/sen_docs for the entire list of Senate policy documents. The two constitutions available in that list were published in the years 2011 and 2008. The individual documents in our governance communities are restricted to campus personnel, but the metadata is publicly available and may be viewed for illustrative purposes as follows: item level information (http://digitalcommons.iwu.edu/cupp_docs/5/) and organizational relationship information for series (http://digitalcommons.iwu.edu/facgov_meet/) and for community levels (http://digitalcommons.iwu.edu/facgov/). Accessed April 27, 2012.

[14]See http://digitalcommons.iwu.edu/oralhistory. Accessed July 30, 2012.

[15]A portal to these collections and to communities in our repository is available at http://libguides.iwu.edu/iwuhistory. Accessed July 30, 2012.

[16]Staff Council's homepage is available at http://www.iwu.edu/facresources/council/. Accessed June 6, 2012.

[17]The Variable Media Network is examining different ways to preserve art that is created in a variety of formats; see http://variablemedia.net/e/index.html. Accessed August 1, 2012.

REFERENCES

Armstrong, M., & Stringfellow, J. (2011). No fees required: Opening access to university content. *Idaho Librarian*, *61*(1), 1-3.

Bicknese, D. (2004). Institutional repositories and the institution's repository: What is the role of university archives with an institution's on-line digital repository? *Archival Issues*, *28*(2), 81-93. Boles, F. (2005). Developing a collecting policy. *Selecting & Appraising Archives & Manuscripts* (pp. 64-73). Chicago: Society of American Archivists.

Chavez, R., Crane, G., Sauer, A., Babeu, A., Packel, A., & Weaver, G. (2007). Services make the repository. J*ournal of Digital Information*, *8*(2). Retrieved from http://journals.tdl.org/jodi/article/view/195/179

Crow, R. (2002). *The case for institutional repositories: A SPARC position paper*. Washington, DC: The Scholarly Publishing & Academic Resources Coalition. Retrieved from http://www.arl.org/sparc/bm~doc/ir_final_release_102-2.pdf

Foster, N. F. & Gibbons, S. (2005). Understanding faculty to improve content recruitment for institutional repositories. *D-Lib Magazine*, *11*(1). http://dx.doi.org/10.1045/january2005-foster

Kuh, G. D., & Whitt, E. J. (1988). *The invisible tapestry: Culture in American colleges and universities* (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 1). Washington, DC: Association for the Study of Higher Education.

Lynch, C. A. (2003). Institutional repositories: Essential infrastructure for scholarship in the digital age. *ARL: A Bimonthly Report on Research Library Issues & Actions*, *226*, 1-7.

Maher, W. J. (1992). Documentation policies. *The Management of College and University Archives* (pp. 53-57). Metuchen, NJ: Society of American Archivists and The Scarecrow Press.

Paulus Jr., M. J. (2011). Reconceptualizing academic libraries and archives in the digital age. *Portal: Libraries and the Academy*, *11*(4), 939-13. http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/pla.2011.0037

Pearce-Moses, R. (2012). Appraisal. *A Glossary of Archival and Records Terminology*. Chicago: Society of American Archivists. Retrieved from http://www2.archivists.org/glossary/terms/a/appraisal

Pearce-Moses, R. (2012). Context. *A Glossary of Archival and Records Terminology*. Chicago: Society of American Archivists. Retrieved from http://www2.archivists.org/glossary/terms/c/context

Ramírez, M. L. (2011). Whose role is it anyway?: A library practitioner's appraisal of the digital data deluge. *Bulletin of the American Society for Information Science & Technology*, *37*(5), 21-23.

Royster, P. (2008, June). *How to fill your institutional repository: Or, practical lessons I learned by doing.* Paper presented at the American Library Association Convention, Anaheim, California. Retrieved from http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/library_talks/40/

Salo, D. (2008). Innkeeper at the roach motel. *Library Trends*, *57*(2), 98-123. http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/lib.0.0031

Samuels, H. W. (1992). Institutional documentation plan. *Varsity Letters: Documenting Modern Colleges and Universities* (pp. 253-68). Metuchen, NJ: Society of American Archivists and The Scarecrow Press.

Sauer, A. (2009). Why archivists should be leaders in scholarly communication. *Journal of Archival Organization*, *7*(1-2), 51-57. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15332740902897444

Spindler, R. P. (2008). Electronic publishing and institutional memory. In C. J. Prom and E. D. Swain (Eds.), *College and University Archives: Readings in Theory and Practice* (pp. 53-68). Chicago: Society of American Archivists.

Swain, E. D. (2008). Afterward: Reflections on oral history in academia in the digital age. In C. J. Prom and E. D. Swain (Eds.), *College and University Archives: Readings in Theory and Practice* (pp. 85-95). Chicago: Society of American Archivists.

Swain, E. D. (2002). Remembering Alma Mater: Oral history and the documentation of student culture. *Archival Issues*, *26*(2), 129-143. Retrieved from http://digital.library.wisc.edu/1793/45994

Walters, T. O. (2007). Reinventing the library how repositories are causing librarians to rethink the repository professional roles. *Portal: Libraries and the Academy*, *7*(2), 213-12. http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/pla.2007.0023

Watterworth, M. (2009). Planting seeds for a successful institutional repository: Role of the archivist as manager, designer, and policymaker. *Journal of Archival Organization*, *7*(1), 24-32. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15332740902892544

Yakel, E., Soo, Y. R., Jean, B. S., Markey, K., & Kim, J. (2008). Institutional repositories and the institutional repository: College and university archives and special collections in an era of change. *American Archivist*, *71*(2), 323-349.

CORRESPONDING AUTHOR

Meg Miner
University Archivist & Special Collections Librarian
The Ames Library

Illinois Wesleyan University
1312 Park Street
Bloomington, IL 61701

mminer@iwu.edu