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SHERPA -

△ Securing a Hybrid Environment for Research Preservation and Access
△ funding: JISC (FAIR programme) and CURL
△ duration: 3 years, November 2002 – November 2005
SHERPA

△ development partner institutions
  – Nottingham (lead), Leeds, Sheffield, York, Edinburgh, Glasgow, Oxford, British Library and AHDS

△ associate partner institutions
  – Birkbeck College, Birmingham, Bristol, Cambridge, Durham, Imperial College, Kings College, Newcastle, Royal Holloway, School of Oriental and African Studies, University College London
Institutional Repositories

- e-Prints as research outputs
- hold multiple subjects
- part of institutional information service
- long-term existence
- . . . implications of these choices for advocacy
Implications and issues

- research cultures vary across subject-disciplines
- integrated into institutional information service
- repositories have a public face and responsibilities
- long term preservation commitments
Differentiate stakeholders

△ three internal constituencies
  – academics, administrators, librarians

△ four external constituencies
  – funding agencies, publishers, media, public
Academics

△ as producers
  – disseminate material
  – get recognition

△ as consumers
  – find material
  – get ready access

△ as individuals
  – they do not want more work
  – things work ok

△ involves cultural change . . .
Administrators

△ inward management
  – practical issues of information service
  – ownership of IPR
  – exposing and recording activities

△ outward presentation
  – who represents research?
  – legal liabilities
  – new possibilities as a public face
Librarians & information professionals

- concerns of curation
  - long-term preservation, long-term commitment
- additional work!
  - creating, populating, advocating repositories
- impact on serials
  - prices, changes
External constituencies

- funding agencies
- publishers
- media
- public consumers
Academics and cultural change

△ things seem ok . . .
△ affects working habits and reward structures
△ centrally-driven initiatives vs. local developments
△ monoscopic analysis is not enough . . .
△ when to push and when to stop
△ what makes cultural change?
Choices and possible paths

△ academic-archiving vs. mediation
△ back-catalogue vs. future output
△ academic’s web-page
△ departmental web-page
△ . . . the emergent repository
SHERPA - progress

△ repositories set up in each partner institution
△ test papers being added
△ negotiations with publishers
△ discussions on preservation of eprints
△ work on IPR and deposit licences
△ advocacy campaigns starting
△ sharing experiences and formulating strategies
Summary

- identify stakeholders
- identify their needs and viewpoints
- differentiate potentials, goals, returns
- differentiate change
  - upgrading, process and cultural
- support needs, appeal to aspirations
Process of adoption

△ Awareness
△ Action
△ Engagement
△ Integration
△ Sustenance and development
why “institutional”? 

△ institutions have centralised resources: 
  – to subsidise repository start up 
  – to support repositories with technical / organisational infrastructures 
  – to deal effectively with preservation issues over the long term 

△ institutions get benefits: 
  – raising profile and prestige of institution 
  – managing institutional information assets 
  – encourages an institutional identity in intellectual output