Good Afternoon, My name is David Scherer and I am the Scholarly Repository Specialist and manager of the Purdue e-Pubs repository at Purdue University in West Lafayette, Indiana. Along with my colleagues Lisa Zilinski and Paul Bracke I will be discussing our paper, “Assessing Data Linking in Transportation Technical Reports, A Framework for Assessment of Institutional Repositories and Data.”
So First we will begin with an Introduction to why a framework for repository assessment is not only important, but necessary. [NEXT SLIDE]
Assessment is an important component of offering information services. This also includes repository services. [click]

Currently, assessment has been focused on value to individuals versus overall benefits to organizational stakeholders and consumers. [click]

At the dawn of the era of IRs, Crow posited that the value proposition of IRS was that they are key in developing a new paradigm of scholarly publishing and they could enhance institutional visibility and prestige. [click]

But what other ways could IRs provide value to stakeholders? [click]

In the past decade there has been much research on the evaluation and assessment of repositories, including several tools for assessment. These tools have allowed for assessment of IRS, but they have not assessed the impact and value the repositories have on different stakeholders [NEXT SLIDE]
So now let's look into three distinct areas of focus that provide a background for our study.

[NEXT SLIDE]
The first are of focus we had was on the value and impact of repositories.

Burns, Lana, and Bud outlined in their 2013 article in D-Lib Magazine that both a set of propositions about the value of repositories and cost-metrics to demonstrate this value. According to them, the value of repositories is derived from: (a) establishing capacity for libraries to participate in system of scholarly communication; (b) acceptance and use of repositories, both from the perspective of authors and consumers; (c) discoverability of content; and (d) impact on reputation of larger institutions. Cost per visit, search, and download were then proposed as value metrics [click]

Cullen and Chawner (2010) described the inherent conflicts between various repository stakeholders, especially in regards to faculty researchers. They noted that although there may be conflict between the needs of researchers and their institution, the value of the repository for both parties laid in the capabilities of the repository and repository services that lessened or eliminated the barriers of usage and deposit by providing enhanced scholarly communication services that could fill the gaps in the more historically established scholarly communication systems. [click]

Although it is noted that repositories carry a level of value for authors and stakeholders, it has been more problematic to assess their impact. [click]

Several others have noted that a novel usage of repositories has been through library publishing services and activities which have furthered the impact and value of the
repository and its services. [NEXT SLIDE]
The second area we looked into was the Organizational Value and Impact of Repositories.

We found several researchers that noted the importance of situating the assessment of IRS within a broader institutional context [click]

Additionally, there are a multitude of changing contexts within higher education that should be taken into account when considering the value of IRs, or other library services for that matter, for stakeholders. [click]

For example, Maria Casella suggests that the internal value proposition of the balanced scorecard (BSC) perspective translated from traditional library performance could be utilized to determine the alignment of the repository the institutional mission and goals. Casella also elaborated that several performance indicators could also be further utilized to assess internal and external values from the perspectives of users, additional internal perspectives, and financial perspectives. [click]

Yet still, strategically it’s important for those of us in charge of implementing the IR and repository services to understand and ask, “What do we wish to gain from the repository and the services they offer?” [NEXT SLIDE]
So the purpose of our project will be to develop a framework for the assessment of institutional repositories. [NEXT SLIDE]
There are two primary outputs of this project [click]
The first output will be A framework for assessing value and impact of repositories, including organizational and administrative impact, and performance indicators [click]

and

The second will be Instruments that can measure the impact to stakeholders, including the library and partner organizations of leveraging institutional repositories.[click]

The framework will be evaluated and refined by assessing the repository collaborations between the Purdue Libraries, the Purdue Joint Transportation Research Program (JTRP), and later confirmed in a more generalizable manner through assessments in other contexts. [NEXT SLIDE]
This project will build from a preliminary framework, as depicted in assessment matrix, taking a holistic view of the value of IRs to a range of institutional stakeholders. Performance indicators and assessment instruments will be developed to enable the evaluation of the IR from the viewpoints of each group. The preliminary stakeholder groups are: researchers, research centers, departments and colleges, the library, and university administration. For each of these groups, both scholarly and administrative value will be assessed. Although, in the preliminary matrix, most of the types of value cut across all stakeholder groups, it is expected that differentiation in interests among stakeholder groups will emerge and the assessment framework will become substantially more nuanced. [NEXT SLIDE]
Although this paper proposes a view of IR assessment that takes into account both scholarly and administrative values of IR programs, the research context of IRs dictates that scholarly value must remain primary. [click]

In a college or university context, impacts on academic prestige will be core to the ways in which value will be measured, and one could view the potential contributions of IRs to this end in several ways. [click]

Current Models for assessing IRs that focus on scholarly value, however, do not fully demonstrate the impacts of IRs on stakeholders. [click]

In an era of constrained budgets for higher education and libraries on a global level, budgetary impacts are critical. It is important for libraries, for example, to be able to demonstrate that they are offering repository services in a cost-effective and trustworthy manner, and that the returns to investments in repositories are accrued at a level acceptable both to library and university administrations.[click]

There are ways in which individuals or units within an institution of higher education can demonstrate organizational centrality and alignment with institutional mission through documentation of IR activities. For example, IRs present a way for libraries to demonstrate stronger connections to the campus research enterprise. They may provide other opportunities for academic units to demonstrate centrality - through maximization of unit prestige, or alignment with emerging academic concerns such as interdisciplinarity.
[NEXT SLIDE]
So now let’s look at putting the framework into practice [NEXT SLIDE]
The collaboration between the Purdue University Libraries and JTRP was a logical choice for evaluating and refining the assessment framework. There are a number of stakeholders involved in the collaboration, including Libraries faculty and staff, research center administration and researchers, and civil engineering faculty. In reviewing the literature, we did not find any current assessment method that would allow us to measure the impact or value of the relationship between the library and the research center. Our goal is to develop a model for assessing stakeholder value through developing criteria and processes for assessing the work done in constructing the repository systems for the Joint Transportation Research Program (JTRP). [NEXT SLIDE]
The impact of this collaboration was demonstrated using COUNTER-compliant usage statistics that show the 1,500 technical reports published in e-Pubs were downloaded over 844,000 times between 2006 and thus far this year. In 2012 alone, the reports were downloaded over 190,000 times, increasing about 10% per month and this rate has continued to remain around 10%. [NEXT SLIDE]
In 2013, we expanded this partnership to include the publication of data sets in the Purdue University Research Repository (PURR), Purdue’s data repository. The Libraries led the collaboration to incorporate the publication and linking of research data sets to the corresponding technical reports by developing a comprehensive workflow. This workflow combined the JTRP technical report publication workflow with the PURR data set publication workflow. We were able to create points of cross-repository communication and interaction, which assisted the authors, editor, and repository managers in coordinating the final publications. [NEXT SLIDE]
As you can see from these screen shots of Purdue e-Pubs and PURR, The DOIs of the datasets were linked and published in the metadata and on the cover page of the technical report while the technical report DOI was published in the metadata and landing page each of the corresponding data set publications. [NEXT SLIDE]
The JTRP assessment pilot consists of two phases:

1. Employing a grounded theory approach to further develop a model of stakeholder value in IRs
2. Prioritizing the development of assessment instruments

Developing and piloting a prioritized list of assessment instruments with the Purdue Joint Transportation Research Program (JTRP)

The JTRP assessment pilot consist of two phases, which will represent first stages in fully developing the proposed assessment framework. [click]

The first phase will employ a grounded theory approach to further developing a model of stakeholder value in IRs. [click]

Following the interview process, a prioritized list of assessment instruments will be developed and piloted with JTRP stakeholders. [click]

On a practical level, this will ultimately result in an assessment report for the use of JTRP and Libraries staff. On a theoretical level, this will provide a suite of assessment instruments validated in a single case that can be tested and generalized through further applications at Purdue and other institutions. [NEXT SLIDE]
This concludes my presentation. Thank you very much for your time. If anyone has any questions please feel free to contact myself or my co-authors via email, or feel free to reach out to us via twitter. Thank you [End]
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