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Development, experiences and lessons learnt.

This paper presents a brief history of our institutional repository at the University of Surrey. We discuss cultural, administrative and practical issues encountered from the set-up of the pilot repository to the transition into a fully working service. We are now completing the second year of running the repository and are very keen to share experiences with managers from other institutions. The first part of the paper gives a rather detailed description of our first year feasibility study. We hope that such level of detail will help repository managers that are at the initial stages of developing a repository. The second part discusses the current state of our developing repository service, highlighting our main achievements to date and discussing the challenges ahead.

A. The first year: SSOL as a pilot.

Surrey Scholarship OnLine (SSOL) began in January 2005\(^1\) as a one-year pilot project. The purpose of the study was to look into the feasibility of developing an open access repository of the University of Surrey staff’s publications. Our main aim was to look at the various issues (cultural, administrative, legal, practical, financial) unique to each institution—and often within each Faculty or even research area—to shape the repository’s nature, purposes, and mission, and to make specific recommendations on the basis of our findings. For example, should the repository be 100% open access or could it contain restricted access materials? Were we to be limited to peer-reviewed research only? Would we include full-text only or would we also accept metadata-only submissions? Were there any other functions that the repository could serve (i.e. double as a publications database) to support existing practices around the University? We felt that questions of this nature would have to be answered if we were to develop a service relevant to the University’s culture, goals and strategies.

First year management plan.
The first year of the repository’s life was funded as a feasibility project, run by a full-time Project Officer and managed by the E-Resources Manager with input from a steering group comprising Library and Research Office managers, and Faculty representatives. The project’s budget also allowed for IT resources to set up a demonstrator repository.

Reviewing publication and dissemination practices around the University.
As a first step towards identifying cultural differences across the University, we studied the websites of individual Schools, Departments and research groups to examine and compare their publication and research dissemination practices. Our findings very much supported a pattern observed in similar reviews\(^2\), namely that research outputs and the way they are produced and disseminated vary widely across disciplines.

\(^1\) The project started in January 2005 as a one-year pilot study. Staffing problems throughout 2006 slowed down the progress of the repository; however, since March 2007 we have made considerable progress in turning a demonstrator repository into a working service.

\(^2\) See, for example, Hey, Jessie M.N. (2004) An environmental assessment of research publication activity and related factors impacting the development of an Institutional e-Print Repository at the University of Southampton, Southampton, UK, University of Southampton, 19pp. (TARDis Project Report, D 3.1.2)
There were discipline differences in the kinds of research output and the way in which publications were reported. Although we will not elaborate on the details of these differences here, we mention a couple of examples highlighting the wide range of issues a University repository service may be required to cover. In the Arts and Humanities for example, books, book chapters and conference papers accounted for up to 70% of a Department’s research output. In Sociology and Psychology there was also a fair amount of journal articles. Other types of publication included compositions, performances and linguistic databases. If these materials were to be considered for the repository, particular attention would need to be given to copyright, policy issues and technical/financial issues, especially for the support of multimedia.

In the sciences and engineering, on the other hand, the most common types of research output are journal articles and peer-reviewed conference proceedings. Discipline differences also existed in the ways research/academic units or individual authors chose to publicise their research. All Faculties showed a trend towards maintaining online publications lists; however, these were not comprehensive or up-to-date. Self-archiving was a rare practice, evident in the Physical Sciences only. Around 15%-20% of individual authors in those disciplines provided full text to some of their papers on their personal web pages. However, this was not done systematically. Links to publisher’ sites and links to open-access PDFs were used interchangeably; many links to full text were broken; some versions violated copyright; and there was no clear indication of the peer review status of papers. It was obvious that whole academic units as well as individual authors could benefit from a centralised service providing archiving guidance and copyright support.

The overview of the School/Department web sites gave us some directions for our advocacy work, and pointed to potential functions that the repository should serve. The next step was to talk or write to academics to initiate discussions that would complement our findings.

Lesson learnt: early ‘intelligence work’ helped us understand the research cultures that may coexist of a particular institution and tailor the repository to these – often diverse – cultures.

Initial discussions.

We approached a number of academics from different Faculties to explain the rationale for establishing an open access repository. Our emphasis was always on the benefits of open access, rather than on additional administrative benefits of repositories. We also stressed our wish to include full-text only, while keeping an open mind to suggestions that the repository should double as a publications database.

Initial approach was via email. We sent an information leaflet to a number of academics across campus. This triggered a number of responses (estimated response rate of about 50-60%) which started discussions either via e-mail or face-to-face meetings with individuals and whole research groups. We were also invited to research committees to present the case in more detail.

Initial responses were mixed and depended on research discipline, but were positive overall. The main concerns/objections voiced depended on the research culture of the academics concerned. For example, authors from the Arts and Humanities were more likely to object about copyright issues and plagiarism, whereas authors from Physical Sciences and Engineering were generally more enthusiastic and more aware of open access benefits.

Talking to academics early on helped us to become aware of open access issues from their point of view. This helped us formulate more specific questions that we
worked into a structured survey (see below). We were also able to identify a number of ‘early adopters’ willing to contribute papers to the pilot repository.

**Shaping the nature and goals of SSOL: author survey.**

In April 2005, the link to an online survey was sent by e-mail to all members of academic and research staff, to find out about their opinions on a number of issues related to self-archiving and open-access repositories. The survey also served as advocacy material to provide information on the initiative, and as a recruitment tool to identify ‘early adopters’ for the project. The full details and findings of the questionnaire are available on request. Below we summarise the main findings from the 84 academics who responded to the questionnaire (9% response rate).

**Summary of results from author survey**

| **Self-archiving.** About 30% of the respondents mentioned self-archiving their papers. It was obvious, however, that some respondents misunderstood the meaning of ‘self-archiving’, possibly defining it as the listing of publications without open access to full text. Interestingly, 68% of the respondents agreed to start self-archiving in the repository, which means that at least 38% of them were willing to adopt it as a new practice. |
| **Perceived benefits of the repository.** The most important benefits for authors were the increased visibility, accessibility and impact of research. Other uses, such as including supplementary materials and preserving the papers were considered less important, but not negligible. Further administrative advantages included the marketing power of repositories and their uses as management tools to manage the RAE and maintain CVs and reading lists for students. |
| **Concerns about institutional repositories.** Concerns about copyright violation, loss of ownership of the work, and use of author-prepared versions appeared to be most important, followed by reservations about quality control and added workload. |
| **Motivating authors to use the repository.** Respondents would be more willing to submit papers if copyright issues were cleared, and if there were clear distinctions between peer-reviewed and non-reviewed material and between author-prepared and final versions. Other important factors included a well-defined workflow that would not allocate too many additional tasks to the authors themselves, and security control that would guard against misuse of the papers. |
| **Repository content.** The types of material to be submitted reflected previously observed discipline differences in publication practices. Besides refereed journal articles, there were also requests to submit conference papers, especially refereed proceedings. Opinion on including working papers, preprints, posters, and the text of invited talks and presentations was split. The potential intellectual property issues of yet unpublished, but commercially valuable literature was also pointed out. |
| **The versions issue.** Although most respondents were happy to contribute the final, published version of their papers, there were several objections to using author-prepared postprints: for example, authors stated that they did not keep their accepted draft, that they would find the process time-consuming, or they believed that there are major differences between author-prepared and published versions, which questioned the citeability of those versions. This, as will be discussed later, is a central issue in the population of repositories. It became apparent the versions problem would need to be addressed in different ways in various departments, and that a radical culture change seemed necessary (i.e. encouraging authors to start keeping or clearly dating their own versions). |
| **Workflow.** About half of the authors were most willing to submit the correct versions of their papers directly. Copyright management and metadata submission were not popular tasks among authors. Overall, not a very high proportion of respondents would be happy to allocate time and effort in putting their papers online. **Functionality.** Repository features most popular with respondents included author browsing and searching functions, copyright metadata and active links to publishers’ sites, and a peer-review flag. Links to personal or departmental pages were also considered useful. Interestingly, citation/impact factor rates were not considered as important information. |

On the whole, the survey helped us explore opinions on the repository initiative at an early stage when we did not yet have a demonstrator service. This enabled us to identify about 50 early contributors; anticipate and plan for several practical, policy
and cultural issues; and increase awareness about our project. The issues of copyright and quality control were the most frequently arising both in meetings and through the survey, and these required particular attention.

**Lesson learnt:** an author survey early on in repository development is both an advocacy tool and a way to identify key issues to be addressed.

**A pilot repository.**

Guided by feedback from our authors, research committees and the results from our survey, we began the setup of a pilot repository that would enable us to demonstrate its uses around the University. We also wanted the repository to have enough content to attract interest and allow the testing of different workflow models (i.e. author self-deposit versus mediated deposit).

To decide on a particular platform to support the repository we reviewed repository software available at the time. A number of factors guided our decision: our budget, our technical knowledge and access to IT expertise within the University, and our ideas of the basic functions that the repository should serve – user-friendly interface, metadata support and interoperability considered to be the most important factors. We also wanted a platform that would allow us to build and populate a repository with relative ease, so that we could begin to demonstrate and test different uses fairly quickly.

After careful consideration we opted for the commercial product *Digital Commons* (by ProQuest, now owned by BePress). There was an attractive introductory price (around £5000 for 1000 records in the first year) that allowed us to set up our communities and collections and start populating the repository within two weeks from subscription. Although we do not evaluate the site in this report, we are keen to discuss its advantages and disadvantages with other repository administrators.

**Lessons learnt:**

- For fast, effortless, and financially transparent repository set-up, a commercial product may be a good solution. However, the choice of platform will depend on the needs of the repository and the resources available at the time.

- It is important to regularly review all the available products as the functions required from the repository are bound to change over its development.

**Populating the pilot repository.**

Initial repository population was done: (1) by seeking already available content and importing it into SSOL; (2) by contacting authors directly to ask for appropriate versions of their papers and (3) by advocating the case to whole academic units to establish a more systematic way of acquiring content.

We first sought available content from authors that self-archived their work already. We also went over authors' publication lists, taken from authors' websites, provided by departmental information officers, or compiled from databases such as the Web of Knowledge. From those lists we posted any papers for which the publisher's policy allowed us to use the published PDF (the percentage of these papers typically ranges from 0-5% in the Arts, Human Sciences and Biomedical Sciences to over 80% in Mathematics and Physical Sciences). We then checked publishers' policies to see what percentage of the remaining papers could be posted if we could get hold of authors' post-prints. This percentage ranged from 70-95%, a high number that should, but did not, convince authors to start keeping and using postprints.
Within 3 months of setting up the repository we had about 250 papers available for download. Not all academic units were represented at that stage, as initial contributions came from a limited number of early adopters. Still, we made sure that we had contributions from a wide range of academic units (5 out of 8 Schools were represented). A populated demonstrator repository helped us plan our advocacy, targeted both at individual authors and senior management.

Lessons learnt:

☑ It is important to include material from as many academic units as possible from early on, to stimulate engagement. However, naturally there will be ‘early adopters’ and ‘late followers’ and it would be dispiriting at this stage to try and include them all.

☑ There will always be complaints that the repository is not comprehensive. One way round this is to explain that not all publications can be freely accessible, and include links to authors’ comprehensive publication lists (assuming these exist!).

Advocacy.

Bottom-up advocacy involved frequent communication with individual authors via meetings, e-mails, information leaflets and presentations. We attended departmental and research committee meetings to promote the principle of open access and the functions of the repository. Advocacy at this level helped promote interest in the

Top-down advocacy involved presenting the case of Surrey Scholarship OnLine to the University Research Committee (UREC), attended by Deans of Faculty and Deans of Research from all faculties, with a view to drafting a formal self-archiving policy. Our case was helped by the Wellcome Trust and RCUK position statements in support of open access. The case was well-received and in November 2005, towards the end of the one-year project, the University Executive Board accepted an official policy requiring authors to deposit the full text of their peer-reviewed journal articles and conference proceedings to Surrey Scholarship OnLine. Although the policy was, on paper, mandatory, it was evident that more work needed to be done on implementing and refining the recommendations at Faculty level. However, the policy was a big step towards formal endorsement of open access. It helped us make our business case for the following two years and proved a useful starting point for further advocacy.

Lessons learnt:

☑ Key advocacy points to repeat over and over again: (1) users do not have to even know that the repository exists: they can capture full text from the repository as easily as via a Google search. (2) Author-only versions are perfectly acceptable. They will always be accompanied by a link to the publisher’s version (this reassures authors). (3) Providing an abstract-only record does not constitute open access.

☑ The above have to be repeated thousands of times for the message to sink in, and even then a change of practice is not guaranteed!

☑ It is essential to listen to authors’ point of view, especially when it comes to keeping and submitting author-prepared versions. This is an alien practice in many disciplines, which will take time to be adopted. We also learnt to understand that sometimes author postprints do differ substantially from the published version (especially if they include raw data appendices, graphs and images) and authors may have to put extra effort in updating these versions.
Managing the pilot repository: clarifying the goals and functions of SSOL.
Day-to-day management of the pilot repository gave us some insight into legal, technical, and administrative issues that were important for the future development of the repository as a service. Over the course of the feasibility study we became aware of increasingly complex copyright, metadata and technical issues; we drafted and put in place a deposit licence for authors; we identified the major factors impeding policy development and repository population; we tried and evaluated a couple of different workflow models (library-mediated and a hybrid library/department –mediated model); and we started thinking of preservation and sustainability issues. At the end of the pilot study, we were able to provide a set of recommendations that guided the transition from pilot to service. An outline of these recommendations can be seen below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The role of SSOL: recommendations for further development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Repository mission:</strong> to promote and support <em>open access to the full text of peer-reviewed literature</em> produced by University of Surrey authors. At the same time, to allow enough flexibility to reconsider and expand this role to accommodate the changing organisational culture and publication practices of the University of Surrey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The business case:</strong> The demonstrator repository should be further supported and developed into a sustainable fully working service. This should include planning and budgeting for a repository management and adequate technical and financial resources to support the service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key elements in supporting open access to full text:</strong> support of culture change to increase the use of author-prepared versions; quality control procedures to allow the inclusion of non-refereed research if desired; distinction between refereed and non-refereed records in the repository; copyright awareness; exclusion of metadata-only records.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Linking to a comprehensive University publications database.</strong> Given the inconsistent nature of locally-held publication lists, the University appeared in need of a comprehensive and centralised publications database. Links to and from SSOL should be explored.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Customisation and enhancement of existing repository software.</strong> A number of enhancements to the Digital Commons software were suggested. These referred to the flexibility of changing communities/collections structure to reflect restructuring of the University’s organisation; improvement of authentication/registration procedures; metadata enhancement; improvement of the administrator sites; enhanced import of records; and more detailed usage statistics.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

End of pilot year: major achievements and challenges.
At the end of our feasibility study we had:

1. A fully working repository with contributions from 5 out of 8 academic units and around 250 full-text, peer-reviewed records.
2. A University policy stating the rationale and principles of the repository and requiring (but not in practice mandating) the deposit of peer-reviewed publications.
3. A detailed final report with recommendations for further development and good practice.
4. Established contacts with authors and Faculty representatives.
5. A basic workflow model based on mediated deposit, and a promising workflow model involving self-deposit and the involvement of departmental administrators (Department of Mathematics).

At the same time, we were also aware of several gaps that would need to be addressed while attempting transition to a service phase:

1. About half of the records in the repository came from the Department of Mathematics, which was a good case of an early adopter. Authors in this
department were already using preprints and postprints in their work. Most of the remaining records were publishers’ versions (APS, IEEE) for which we did not have to advocate deposit of author-prepared versions. While this helped us populate the repository, we felt that a lot more work needed to be done to capture postprints of newly accepted or published papers.

2. Library-mediated deposit would require either additional staff to do the deposit, or a technical feature allowing batch uploading of several records at once. Our tested workflow was very simple but did not anticipate future increased rates of deposit.

3. We did not address other types of material, especially books and book chapters that constitute a substantial part of published research in the Arts, Humanities and Business Studies.

4. Despite a plethora of e-mails, promotion leaflets, presentations and informal discussions, many academics remained unaware of the repository and its role.

5. Our main advocacy argument revolved around the principles of open access but did not elaborate on the importance of usage statistics and increased research impact. We decided to use usage statistics in the next phase to attract more interest and support.

**Overall lessons learnt.**

- A pilot study is the best way to explore issues that will guide decisions related to repository development and policy making.

- At the same time, a pilot study should produce tangible outcomes (i.e. formal institutional support, a working repository) to gain further support and make a business case for the future.

B. The second year: from pilot repository to repository service.

The first phase of SSOL ended in early 2006. However, owing to staffing problems that could not be covered, the second phase only started in early 2007. Thus, there was a one-year gap during which very little progress was made. The return of SSOL (with two part-time officers making up one full-time position) in 2007 was marked with a formal launch of the service to rekindle interest.

**SSOL: current situation.**

**Advocacy 1: reviving interest in SSOL.**

SSOL was launched as a service in May 2007. The launch event, attended by representatives from all Faculties, revived interest in self-archiving issues and stimulated discussion. We soon followed this up with a series of information sheets targeted to specific Schools. We also circulate regular newsletters that focus on various aspects of open access and self-archiving. To date we have sent round three newsletters (one on general open access issues, one on copyright, and one on usage statistics.

A discussion paper was also circulated to Heads of faculties and individual Departments to restart a discussion of the University self-archiving policy. We aimed to get a _mandate_ in place for every individual Faculty. Individual mandates should allow policy refinement tailored to the publication practices and research...
management practices of specific departments. A local mandate would also mean better control of the content and submission procedures, especially if research administrators or information officers became part of the SSOL submission workflow.

Unfortunately, two major events that took up a lot of the authors’ time for several months delayed progress on the mandates. First, the University went through a series of changes that resulted in restructuring into from eight Schools into four main Faculties. This created new priorities for research committees and senior management. Second, research committees, administrators and individual authors allocated a lot of their time to submissions for the RAE. We were advised to wait until after the end of the RAE.

**Populating the repository.**
While senior level advocacy was on hold, we decided to continue populating the repository with papers sourced from individual authors. The Departments of Mathematics and Computing also contributed publications lists along with postprints. We increased the content of the repository to 500+ papers, all of which are freely accessible and all of which contain full text.

**A new use for the repository.**
At the same time, the repository was used for RAE submissions. This opened possibilities for testing the repository as a publications management tool for future submissions. We took note of enhancements that should be made to the repository to allow support of hidden material and additional metadata fields.

---

**Some practical tips learnt.**
- Advocacy materials should be kept short and concise (unlike this paper!). The longer the document, the less likely it is to be read, no matter how interesting it is.
- New developments at national and international level attract attention, especially if they affect funded researchers.
- People are more likely to read an e-mail if the information is in the body of the message. We found that we got far fewer responses when we gave the information in an attachment. A punchy e-mail title also helps.
- When deposit of papers is Library-mediated, a lot of the repository manager’s time is taken up by data entry. We find that it is difficult to keep up with the increasing amount of papers to be uploaded. We are considering various solutions to this: appointing an assistant, doing batch uploading of many items, and preparing the ground for self-deposit in the future. We do encourage self-deposit if authors are happy to do this. However, at this stage we do a lot of the work ourselves.

---

**Advocacy 2. Working towards Faculty mandates.** At the end of restructuring and RAE, we were able to start discussing individual policies with Research Committees in individual Schools. We approached the Deans of Faculty and Associate Deans of Research in each of the four new Faculties: Arts and Human Sciences, Engineering
and Physical Sciences, Management and Law, and Health and Medical Sciences. Our aims were to:

1. Develop a mandate requiring authors to deposit all their peer-reviewed papers to SSOL as soon as possible after acceptance by the journal.
2. Allow enough flexibility within each academic unit to decide inclusion of other materials of interest to them (preprints, working papers, book chapters, conference presentations, software and data sets).
3. Suggest a workflow model suitable for every Faculty and consider the involvement of Information Officers (in most cases, newly appointed by the Faculty).
4. Work towards procedures that ensure accurate and timely reporting of newly accepted papers.
5. Discuss and help formulate submission rules and internal quality control procedures, to allow Faculties control over the submission of non-refereed materials.
6. Provide information on copyright and allay concerns about copyright and additional workload.

To date, we have achieved established mandates in two out of four Faculties (Arts & Human Sciences and Management & Law) with the two remaining mandates currently being discussed and negotiated. At the same time, we are working towards more informal policies in individual Departments (e.g. the Surrey Morphology Group in Linguistics and the Departments of Computing and Mathematics) to speed up implementation of mandates at local level.

**A full-text repository or a hybrid publications database/full text repository?**

Over our mandate discussions, one topic of great interest to authors is frequently mentioned and negotiated: Faculty senior management as well as authors are keen to use SSOL as a comprehensive publications database that makes all their research visible through a single interface. Senior Faculty management also see SSOL as the obvious management tool for the next REF.

We have thought about a transition to a publications database function very thoroughly and have decided that SSOL should be used for open access to full text only. Although we are aware of the need for a comprehensive publications database at the University of Surrey, we think that SSOL would veer off its goal if it were to comprise publications records only. We have therefore decided to develop a publications database that will run in parallel with, but independently from SSOL. This publications database will be developed and managed independently but there will be links with SSOL.

There is always the argument that allowing authors to submit metadata-only records to SSOL may act as an incentive for them eventually to provide full text. Having reviewed other repositories that contain metadata-only records (with normally no more than 20-30% full text) we do not think this is the case. There is always the danger that SSOL will become an open-access duplicate of the Web of Science. If end users are not able to access the full text freely for most of the SSOL content, we feel we have not achieved our goal.

Explaining this rationale while negotiating with Faculties has proved time-consuming and often frustrating, but we hope that having two linked repositories supporting different functions is the best solution for our Faculties.
Lessons learnt.

- Including Faculty Information Officers in the submission workflow allows more Faculties better control over every step of the submission, including reporting and monitoring of research activity.

- Involving Information Officers will need training – we are planning this for the next months.

- We have found that involving liaison librarians in advocacy and policy-making is helpful, especially if they already have established contacts within the Faculty.

- Established mandates are certainly an achievement, but they are only the beginning: we need to make sure that all authors within each Faculty have adequate information and support about the mandate, and that we have enough planning and resources to implement it.

- The more progress we make, the more aware we become of the need of extra staff to support data entry, copyright management and advocacy.

- We should always be flexible enough to adapt SSOL to the organisational needs of the University. However, we remain purist with respect to full text and open access, opting for a separate publications database for metadata-only records. Time will show whether this decision is sensible or not—we may well learn a lesson from this! —but we are confident that, with our new mandates in place, we will acquire enough content to justify a 100% full-text repository.

Evaluation of SSOL: achievements and challenges ahead.

**Meeting our goals.** Measuring a repository’s success can be problematic. Ultimately, the repository is successful if it is doing efficiently what it is set to do. In our case, SSOL is among the few that provide 100% free access to full text, thus serving our major goal to increase visibility, lift barriers and facilitate access and the content of the academic staff’s research. By choosing not to use SSOL as a publications database we are making a conscious distinction between information about research at Surrey (which can be accessed via Google Scholar, the Web of Science and other databases) and effective and timely scholarly communication which is what we aim to achieve.

Proud as we are of our progress within a relatively short time – a respectable number of full-text papers (530 to date), new Faculty mandates in place, a University self-archiving policy and a detailed business and workflow plan for the next months – we have several challenges ahead.

**Usage.** We should be able to demonstrate success and use those measures of success as an advocacy tool. The SSOL platform allows us access to basic information on download statistics which we send to authors regularly. We have found that authors find download statistics very encouraging – in some cases they are, indeed, quite impressive⁴. For this reason we would like these statistics to be more detailed to allow us to demonstrate success in more sophisticated ways. We are currently discussing this with BePress to enhance this feature of the repository.

**Repositories by the numbers, author/deposit distributions and author engagement.** Mere numbers of records in the repository do not constitute success. As a starting point they are encouraging, as we have gathered and uploaded over

---

⁴ Most recent download statistics and other SSOL statistics available on request.
500 articles within a relatively short time. We also have a backlog of over 500 more papers to upload in the coming months. We have found that the more populated and visible the repository, the more interested authors are to contribute papers – the ‘if you build it, they will come principle’ actually works. On the other hand, we would like a more widespread author-depositor distribution to demonstrate successful staff engagement\(^5\). Although every Faculty is now represented, there is a bias towards the Faculty of Engineering and Physical Sciences, with more than 60% of the papers coming from authors in that Faculty.

Library-mediated deposit with, to date, no implementation of an organised inflow of records from Faculties (with the exception of the Department of Mathematics) also means that we do not have regular and widespread deposit; rather, we have bursts of deposit activity reflecting the fact that we mediate the uploading of a large number of papers at certain intervals.

**Content.** About 35% of SSOL papers are publishers’ versions. To populate the repository quickly, we have given priority to papers from journals where the publisher allows the final published PDF to be used. This is an easy way of capturing material, but does not address the problem of capturing postprints at the time of acceptance or shortly after publication. Where we do have preprints or postprints, they come from authors that have a long practice of using and circulating their own versions. The real challenge ahead is, therefore, to guide and encourage a change of practice where authors start seeing the value of postprints and are happy to submit them to SSOL. This seems more straightforward than it actually is. We need stronger advocacy and embedding this practice with authors’ existing publication practices to achieve this.

We have also included a number of older papers (going back up to 15 years) on authors’ request. Our priority from now on, however, should be to capture new papers accepted for publication. This would also help us meet the requirements of funding councils.

Our goals for the next phase of SSOL are summarised below:

---

Our challenges ahead

• To work with Faculties to implement the recently established mandates. To test and set up appropriate workflow models suitable for each Faculty. To embed self-archiving of author-prepared versions within the current practices that researchers follow, with the help of trained research administrators.
• To further increase the content of SSOL, capturing recently accepted papers and ensuring widespread engagement from all Faculties.
• To achieve functional links with the developing University publications database, to ensure both comprehensive coverage of the University’s research activity and increased visibility and impact of this research.
• To strengthen our advocacy so that individual authors (and not just research committees) are engaged in SSOL
• To review the functionality of our software and make improvements.
• To review the goals of SSOL to adapt to the University’s research culture (i.e. we are considering including theses).

We hope that this case report will be of interest and help to other repository administrators. We are very happy to provide more information and help.

Christine Daoutis
Project Officer
Surrey Scholarship OnLine
http://epubs.surrey.ac.uk
c.daoutis@surrey.ac.uk