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Presentation by C. Jeffrey Belliston at
Institutional Repositories: Disseminating, Promoting, and Preserving Scholarship
held at Utah State University
Logan, Utah on 30 September 2009
ir versus IR

**ir**
- Faculty scholarship
- Student publications
- Software used to support such materials

**IR**
- ir materials
- University records
- Campus-based journals
- Digitized library collections
- 1, or more likely, multiple software platforms to support materials
[SLIDE 2] More than once in my own library I have referred to the Institutional Repository, or “big IR”, as differentiated from the institutional repository, or “little ir.” For me, the little ir is that specific portion of the big IR that is designed to collect faculty scholarship that is published elsewhere. It may include student works as well. Sometimes it also refers to the software used to support this type of material.

To me, the big IR is the sum of what the institution wants to preserve and make available to a wider constituency. It includes the little ir materials along with university records, journal publications from the campus, digitized special collections materials, and possibly other things.

The big IR may be facilitated by a single software platform. However, it’s more likely that it will be supported by multiple platforms (each doing one or more things well) since my experience tells me that it’s exceedingly rare to have one software package do everything you need it to do. In the case of BYU, we are using multiple software platforms for the big IR. These have included DSpace, CONTENTdm and Open Journal Systems or OJS. We’ve actively investigated Equella, Luna Insight, and iTunesU as well. Last year, we moved the little ir collections from DSpace to CONTENTdm and we have recently concluded that neither Equella nor Luna Insight will serve our patrons’ needs. That leaves us with two platforms at the moment: CONTENTdm and OJS.
BYU IR Software - CONTENTdm

- ScholarsArchive (ir materials)
- ETD collection
- Digitized library collections
- Experimenting with as preservation repository
- Back files of some campus-based journals (currently)
CONTENTdm is used for our little ir materials (what we refer to as ScholarsArchive), for our ETD collection (which, historically, has not been part of the little ir), and for our digitized special collections. We’ve also been experimenting with CONTENTdm as the preservation repository for university records and other materials (especially born-digital materials) requiring long term retention.

A number of years ago, the library began hosting the digitized back files of several campus-based journal publications in CONTENTdm. A little over two years ago, Mark Belk, the editor of the Western North American Naturalist whose backfile we were hosting, approached Randy Olsen, our University Librarian with a problem. Mark explained that in his role as editor he was drowning in e-mails and things were falling through the cracks. He was receiving so many submissions that had to be routed to associate editors or sent out for review to multiple reviewers, etc. that he simply couldn’t keep track of it any longer. Randy tasked me to investigate options. This investigation was made considerably easier by work done by Mark Czyzk from Johns Hopkins.
BYU IR Software – Open Journal Systems

- Currently published journals
  - Produced at BYU
  - Edited by BYU faculty or staff
- Back files of journals currently hosted on CONTENTdm
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The investigation led to the selection of OJS as the platform for the hosting of the Lee Library’s publishing services. We are currently authorized to use OJS for journals published at BYU as well as journals not published at the university but edited by a faculty or staff member.
OJS at Present

Available Now

- **Western North American Naturalist** (current)
  - Back file (1990-2005) migrated from CONTENTdm
  - 6 issues published (4 from start to finish) using OJS editorial workflow capabilities
  - Remainder of back file (1939-1989 and 2006-2007) uploaded to OJS
- Monographs of the *Western North American Naturalist* (current)
  - Back file uploaded
  - Future publication using OJS
- *Great Basin Naturalist Memoirs* (closed)
  - Back file uploaded
- *Brigham Young University Science Bulletin – Biological Series* (closed)
  - Back file uploaded
- *Issues in Religion and Psychotherapy* (current)
  - Back file uploaded
  - Submissions for next issue being actively received and managed through OJS

Available in Future

- **Definitely**
  - Maxwell Institute publications
    - *Journal of the Book of Mormon and Restoration Scripture*
      - Both HTML and PDF formats
    - 4 other Maxwell Institute periodicals
  - *BYU Studies*
  - All other publications currently hosted in CONTENTdm
    - Some closed
    - Some still actively being published
- **Hopefully**
  - Other faculty or faculty-edited publications we become aware of
  - Student journals
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[SLIDE 5] A quick overview of where we are in hosting journals is in order. The *Western North American Naturalist* has now published 6 issues using OJS. They had already received the manuscripts for the first 2 of these issues but have received and processed the submissions for the most recent 4 issues through the OJS interface. In addition, we have migrated the backfile of *WNAN* and its predecessor publication, the *Great Basin Naturalist*, previously hosted on CONTENTdm to OJS. That previously hosted back file only extended back to volume 50 published in 1990. In June of this year, we completed the migration of the remainder of the back file covering 1939 to 1989 so there is now a complete run of the journal on OJS.

*WNAN*’s sister publication, Monographs of the *Western North American Naturalist*, consists of articles worthy of publication but too lengthy for the mother journal. Monographs had two predecessor publications, the *Great Basin Naturalist Memoirs* and the *Brigham Young University Science Bulletin – Biological Series*. In July and August, we migrated the back files of these three publications to OJS and future issues of the Monographs will be published using OJS.

Given our authorization to work with any publication produced at BYU or edited by a BYU faculty member, we are actively working with additional journals though only one other journal is currently visible publicly. This journal, *Issues in Religion and Psychotherapy* (formerly the *AMCAP Journal*) is the principal publication of the Association of Mormon Counselors and Psychotherapists. The entire back file of this journal is now available through OJS and submissions are actively being received. The next issues of the journal will be published using OJS.

The library has never hosted the publications of the Neal A. Maxwell Institute for Religious Scholarship. They have been hosted by the Institute itself. By the end of the year, the
Institute’s flagship publication, *Journal of the Book of Mormon and Restoration Scripture*, will be hosted on OJS in both PDF and HTML formats—a first for our OJS installation. We are also actively working with *BYU Studies*—probably the best known BYU publication. The editorial staff at *BYU Studies* is in the process of creating abstracts for articles that were published without them. When they have completed these, the back file will be migrated from CONTENTdm to OJS and *BYU Studies* will begin the process of accepting manuscripts and using OJS for future publication.
The “Bad”

- Not enough programmers to support variations in editorial processes
- Not enough web design resources to take full advantage of look and feel customization capabilities
- The odd, interesting glitch here and there
I was invited to share “the good, the bad, and the fun” about our project with OJS. Since I prefer to get the negative over with first, I’ll do it as “the bad, the good, and the fun.”

**Bad**

The OJS software can be modified. Given that OJS is open source (meaning that it is “free like a puppy” to use a favorite phrase of my boss), the program code can be modified to meet particular editorial workflow needs. Why do I list this in the “bad” section? I do so because of resource constraints. Modifying open source code through custom programming means that any modifications have to be reapplied after every upgrade of the software unless those modifications are made part of the base code. Doing the initial modifications as well as the reapplication after upgrades requires a programmer. Our library has gifted programmers who can do this. However, we don’t have enough of them to be able to support this kind of customization so those who use our services accept OJS as is. While the base code is very good, I have learned that there is considerable variety in editorial processes—not all of which OJS can mimic. This has required some adjustments on the part of the journals using it.

The look and feel of OJS can also be customized. While some of the look and feel customization can be done through the programmed capability of the software, other customizations rely on more extensive web design and programming skills. Such skills may or may not be present with the journal staff. I don’t possess such skills though I’ve been learning some. While customization is not bad per se, I’d like to be able to offer more help than is presently possible.

Finally, there have been a few (very few gratefully) glitches. This is, after all, software and computers we’re talking about so, I guess some glitches are to be expected. As an example,
just recently, the description of a journal and associated links would show up in Firefox and Safari, but not in IE. I tried a number of things and succeeded in getting the description to show but the links were still missing. It took a number of interactions with the OJS support folks to figure out that, in the setup, the copy and paste that the editor had done had introduced some Microsoft-specific coding that caused the problem. Once this coding was removed, the problem was solved. I can’t resist commenting on the irony of Microsoft-specific coding causing a problem with Microsoft’s browser.
The “Good”

- OJS software ...
  - is well-architected
  - is well-documented
  - has been easy to support and maintain
  - is easy to learn
    - for library staff and
    - for editors
- Working with editors
- OJS presents journal content better and more elegantly than CONTENTdm
- Look and feel customization capabilities allow for projection of journal personality
As to the good of OJS, I can mention several things. First, the software itself is well-architected and well-documented. I believe our technical folks would agree with me that OJS has been easy to install and maintain and that it has required very little of their time. The vast majority of time that has been spent on OJS by technical staff has been in writing and supporting a utility to get metadata (whether output from CONTENTdm or provided from some other source) into the proper XML format for the import of back issues into OJS.

Because it is well-architected and well-documented, OJS has been easy to learn to use for both me and the editors. Speaking of editors, working with them has been one of the best parts of this venture. They have invariably been nice and pleasant to work with. And, as I’ve done so, I have come to have a much better appreciation of the publishing process. Though not an editor myself, I’ve become more adept at speaking their language and of knowing what questions to ask. I’m a better consultant now than I was when we began this process.

I was recently asked why we would migrate back file content from CONTENTdm to OJS for journals that are no longer being published. The principles of not fragmenting content types and of using each repository software to do what it does best underlay my answer that OJS will present the content better than it is presented in CONTENTdm. These journals, as with journals currently being published, will look like journals with distinct article divisions. This must also be listed in the good category.

Finally, I mentioned OJS’s customization capabilities above in the bad area. They must also be mentioned as part of what’s good. Journals have personalities. They shouldn’t look like each other so it’s good that the software can help to project that personality even as it does what it does best—present journal content.
Customization Examples
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Here are two examples of a customized OJS interface. They are quite different from each other as well as quite different from the more generic, or what I call “vanilla,” sites currently being hosted at BYU.
The “Fun”

- Seeing content already online presented to its best advantage
- Seeing additional content come online
- Getting e-mails or calls from excited editors
- Seeing OJS content integrated into ScholarSearch
- Exporting holdings information for URL resolver software
- Make content available to Google Scholar
- Learning new things
So what’s fun about OJS and our foray into electronic journal publishing? Quite a few things, actually. It’s been enjoyable to see content that was already online but not presented to its best advantage move to a platform where it is better presented. It’s been fun to get e-mails or phone calls from journal editors who are excited to have received their first submission via the software, or to tell me that they’re getting more submissions than they previously have, or that their workflow is easier and more manageable than before.

The Lee Library is using Ex Libris’ Primo software to provide a more Google-like search experience which we call ScholarSearch. It’s been fun to watch this journal content be incorporated into Primo for our own patrons. It’s also been fun to export holdings information for use in standard link resolver applications to widen the exposure of the titles being supported and making the content available to Google Scholar.

Seeing a complete back run of an existing journal come online feels really good. For someone like me, who likes to learn new things, learning a variety of things that I otherwise probably wouldn’t have known has also been decidedly fun.