

Bowling Green State University
ScholarWorks@BGSU

University Libraries Faculty Publications

University Libraries

2014

Student Scholarship in Institutional Repositories

Elizabeth Hertenstein
Bowling Green State University, eherten@bgsu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.bgsu.edu/ul_pub



Part of the [Library and Information Science Commons](#)

Repository Citation

Hertenstein, Elizabeth, "Student Scholarship in Institutional Repositories" (2014). *University Libraries Faculty Publications*. 27.

https://scholarworks.bgsu.edu/ul_pub/27

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the University Libraries at ScholarWorks@BGSU. It has been accepted for inclusion in University Libraries Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@BGSU.

Student Scholarship in Institutional Repositories

Elizabeth Hertenstein

Hertenstein, E. (2014). Student Scholarship in Institutional Repositories. *Journal of Librarianship and Scholarly Communication* 2(3):eP1135. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7710/2162-3309.1135>

© 2014 by the author(s). This open access article is distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution License, which allows unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, providing the original author and source are credited.

JLSC is a quarterly journal sponsored and published by Pacific University Library | ISSN 2162-3309 | <http://jlsc-pub.org>

Student Scholarship in Institutional Repositories

Elizabeth Hertenstein *Cataloger & Metadata Librarian, Bowling Green State University*

Abstract

INTRODUCTION Research on institutional repositories (IR) has primarily focused on issues related to faculty scholarship. Thus far, little has been written on issues related to student scholarship. This lack is problematic for planners developing or extending their IR content who may be considering adding student scholarship. **METHODS** A 23-question survey of library professionals was conducted to explore size of institution, existence of an IR, IR software packages utilized, individuals involved in system management, levels of support for inclusion of student work in IRs, types of student work included, and workflow submission policies. **RESULTS** The findings present an environmental scan of the current state of student scholarship within IRs. Findings suggest that most libraries, regardless of size, are archiving a variety of student-generated content including honors projects, capstone papers, conference papers, multi-media projects, and student research papers. The survey results also indicate that libraries are spearheading the administration of IRs, but other campus departments may also be involved. Both undergraduate and graduate students were equally represented in IRs. Practical procedures for uploading student scholarship were also addressed in the survey and include submission processes, faculty involvement, and workflow logistics. **DISCUSSION** The inclusion of student scholarship in IRs is becoming the norm. Student-created content is expanding from the traditional, ETDs, to more varied materials including capstone projects, peer-reviewed articles, and multi-media projects. This situation underscores that IR administrators need to be prepared to create policies and procedures for diverse materials and students, especially related to embargoes and the actual submission process. To continue to ensure the quality of their IR, administrators should look to faculty to endorse student content. **CONCLUSION** IR administrators should consider including student scholarship along with faculty scholarship in their repositories.

Implications for Practice:

- This article will give IR planners and developers more information about the current state of student scholarship within IRs.
- Based on this data, IR planners and developers should feel more confident in adding student scholarship to their IRs.
- IR planners and developers can anticipate the types of students and content they may wish to include in their IRs.
- These findings can inform IR planners and developers as they develop workflows and policies for student scholarship.

Received: 02/16/2014 Accepted: 09/08/2014



© 2014 Hertenstein. This open access article is distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 Unported License, which allows unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

INTRODUCTION

Institutional repositories (IR) are a treasure trove of scholarship. This popular method for colleges and universities to promote faculty research is increasingly being extended to include student work. Issues related to faculty scholarship in IRs are well documented. However, few studies have examined the state of student content in IRs. While there is universal acceptance for promoting faculty scholarship, opinion varies concerning the inclusion of student work and the types of student work that may be considered rigorous enough for posting in IRs. This question is especially important for planners developing or extending their IR content.

The types of student work found in IRs has historically included electronic theses or dissertations (ETDs) and until recent resistance from professional organizations such as the American Historical Association (AHA Today, 2003), posting this form of student research has been considered the standard way to highlight student produced content. However, with the open access movement and new university initiatives to highlight locally produced scholarship, the issue of including both ETDs and other forms of student work in IRs has again become a topic of interest.

A reflection of this interest is seen in the 2006 publication of an Association of Research Libraries (ARL) SPEC Kit on institutional repositories that briefly highlighted the current state of the inclusion of student work. The SPEC Kit survey found that 39% of responding institutions had student-produced documents in their IR and 47% of institutions were interested in including student scholarship in future IR endeavors (Association of Research Libraries, 2006, p. 67). No subsequent ARL SPEC Kit has been devoted to this topic. Given the continued interest in this subject, the author conducted a survey of library professionals to produce a snapshot of current practices.

The goal of this study is to examine student scholarship in IRs to determine if past practices are consistent with current trends. The subjects addressed by the study are:

- the legitimacy of posting student created content in IRs;
- the expansion of student content beyond ETDs;

- policies associated with adding student work to IRs, including the potential for different policies for varying types of content or level of student; and
- the role faculty and administrators play in the inclusion of student material in IRs, along with perceived attitudes of IR administrators.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Taking an environmental scan of the posting of student content is a common theme in the IR library literature; multiple articles have addressed this issue. Most examine what types of institutions post student scholarship and the impact that the size of institution has on the inclusion of this material (Markey et al., 2008; Xia & Opperman, 2009). Institutions are usually described by the highest level of degree conferred, beginning with baccalaureate (undergraduate) degree-granting institutions, followed by those granting master's degrees, and finally institutions conferring doctoral degrees and involved in post-doctoral education. For baccalaureate and master's degree granting institutions, undergraduate research in the IR "makes up nearly half of all [student and faculty] submissions" (Xia & Opperman, 2009, pg. 12). Baccalaureate degree granting institutions are also more likely to include teaching materials in their IR, compared to master's degree or doctoral degree granting institutions (Xia & Opperman, 2009, pg. 12; Markey et al., 2008, pg. 171). These findings underscore two points: size of institution should be taken into account when reviewing data on student scholarship and master's degree granting institutions may be of more value for researchers interested in extrapolating trends for undergraduate research in IRs because they are more likely to post these types of materials. Doctoral degree granting institutions, with their greater emphasis on faculty research and publication, appear most likely to emphasize faculty submissions in the IR over that of students.

A general discussion of procedures for including student work can be found in Nolan and Costanza (2006) and Pickton and McKnight (2007), who both address the concerns facing administrators responsible for IR content relating to posting of student work and the issues involved. These issues include creating specific guidelines for purpose, scope and format of IRs and standards for academic submissions.

The library literature also explores specific types of student projects posted in IRs. These articles offer institutions a primer in developing and coordinating the posting of student work. Most useful are the practical descriptions of procedures and policies for specialized materials to ensure efficient workflows and quality of submissions (Anderson, Arndell, & Christiansen, 2009; Royster, 2008). Further examples of unique student projects are found at institutions such as SUNY Buffalo, which created SUNYport, a space for student resumes and portfolios with the goal that “students and employers can benefit from this service and that students will appreciate the advantages of open access publishing” (University of Buffalo Libraries, 2012). The University of Texas also expanded their student content to include materials other than ETDs, including student-run journals and research articles (University of Texas Libraries, n.d.).

Beyond these examples of unique types of student content, the largest portion of the literature focuses on the most common form of posted student work, electronic theses and dissertations (ETDs). Research shows that posting ETDs is increasingly mandatory for graduation (Dawrs, 2012). However, the posting of ETDs has created controversy among some student authors, faculty, and professional organizations who are concerned with permitting open access to research findings that student authors may wish to rework and publish later in more traditional form as an article or book. To address this consideration, Howard (2011) examines how institutions are implementing policies and procedures to embargo ETD content to address concerns students may have to protect the content of their research.

Yet these policies and procedures are still not considered enough by some. In 2013, the American Historical Association (AHA) released a statement challenging the idea that immediate availability of student ETDs in IRs was in the best interest of students (AHA Today, 2013). Hawkins et al. (2013) also raised the issue of mandatory publishing of ETDs and offered the recommendation to librarians that permanent embargoes be the default with an opt-in procedure to allow posting of ETDs only if the student requested it. One recommendation states “ETDs should be permanently embargoed by default, and students should not need anyone’s permission to embargo their work” (Hawkins et al, 2013, pg. 38). These recommendations are in direct conflict with the trend by

degree-granting institutions to require online publication of theses or dissertations as a prerequisite for graduation.

In contrast to the concerns and recommendations mentioned above, numerous articles were written questioning the wisdom of the AHA discouraging students from openly posting their material in IRs. These authors believed posting of ETDs was of greater value to the academic community and the student authors than suppressing their work from public view and access (Bell, 2013; Fister, 2013; Jaschik, 2013a; Jaschik 2013b; Koh, 2013; Patton, 2013a; Patton, 2013b). The AHA’s (2013) and Hawkins, et al (2013) recommendations on ETDs demonstrate that regardless of recent surveys and articles supporting open access, the topic of student generated scholarship in IRs is still a very real issue in need of ongoing examination.

METHODS

A review of the library literature demonstrates there is interest in the topic of posting and sharing student scholarship, but the literature is less clear about the current trends in the representation of student work within institutional repositories. To address this issue, an environmental survey was conducted between May 8 and June 7, 2013. The survey was posted first to the OhioLINK Libraries List-Serv and then to the ACRL Scholarly Communication List-Serv. The original goal of this survey was to query schools in Ohio about their IRs and student content. The survey was then expanded to include a broader sample of libraries nationwide. To obtain the national sample, the ACRL Scholarly Communications List-Serv was chosen because of its roughly 1,200 subscribers and because it is one of the most general list-servs devoted to the issue of scholarly communication.

The survey consisted of 21 general and 2 logic questions, offering both multiple choice and fill-in options. The number of respondents varies from question to question because some respondents left questions blank. Questions were organized into three sections: identifying institutional repositories; logistics in posting student scholarship; and issues involved in archiving student work. The survey was approved by the Bowling Green State University Human Subjects Review Board (number 403741-2). A total of 44 respondents completed the survey.

RESULTS


Demographic questions were asked including: whether the institution has an IR, size of institution, type of platform used to host the IR, and people involved in administering the IR. Thirty-six respondents (82%) indicated their institutions had operating IRs. Of the remaining eight institutions, 4 indicated they were in the process of developing IRs, and 4 indicated they did not have IRs and were not planning on developing any. Colleges of all sizes are represented in the survey responses, as can be seen in the chart of student FTEs (Figure 1). The software package most commonly used was Dspace (43%), and the least commonly used was ContentDM. Only one institution had custom-created software. Departments or units most actively involved in administering IRs included the library or information technology services (17%, N=36, n=6). Some respondents made reference to other units involved in some aspect of administering the IR, including the College of Arts and Sciences, College of Marketing and Communication, Graduate College, and Student Affairs, Honors College, and Business College.

What Types of Student Scholarship are Being Posted in IRs?

Student-produced content is posted in 92% (N=36, n=33) of functioning IRs in responding institutions. Further, of the four institutions still in the process of developing IRs, two confirmed intentions to include student work, one was unsure, and only one does not plan to include this type of material.

Respondents were asked to identify the academic level of student participants in their IR (multiple answers were allowed): both graduate work and undergraduate work were posted by 83% (N=33, n=27) of those responding. A marked decrease was shown for post-graduate students, who were posted in only 39% (n=13) of respondents' IRs. Participants were also asked about non-affiliated student content. This content might appear through lecture series, workshops, panels, or other mechanisms. Only one respondent indicated that the library currently accepted material from outside students, which in this case consisted of contributions to a student-run journal.

Figure 1. Respondents by FTE Student Enrollment



Another respondent commented that the possibility had been considered when writing library policies: “We have considered student conference papers and would allow [outside material].”


A question was asked about the type of student content currently posted to the IR; multiple answers were allowed. This was based on the assumption, as noted in the literature, that student work other than ETDs was being solicited for inclusion by some institutions. Electronic theses and dissertations were the most common form of student scholarship, represented in 85% (N=33, n=28) of IRs. Other types of materials included honors projects 64% (n=21), peer-reviewed journal articles 64% (n=21), conference papers 45% (n=15), and student research papers. Although ETDs were frequently included, capstone projects, often in the form of a senior year paper, report, presentation, or performance required for graduation, were included in fewer IRs 58% (n=19). Because capstone projects vary from department to department, their collection for posting in the IR presents more complications than ETDs, which tend to have more

uniform procedures for collection across departments. However, this is a category that IR administrators may wish to examine if their goal is to expand high quality student content in the IR.

Other types of scholarship included student research papers, which were divided between those associated with a specific course 39% (N=33, n=13) and papers that were not specifically course-related 33% (n=11). Multi-media projects, including art exhibitions, were included in 36% (n=12) of IRs, and visual or performing arts projects, including electronic manifestations of music scores and compositions, were included by 30% (n=10) of institutions responding. Respondents also reported additional types of content not listed in the survey question. These included data sets, maps, photographs, award-winning student papers, conference posters, and undergraduate research projects (Figure 2).

These findings are consistent with those reported by Pickton and McKnight (2007). They found that ETDs were the most popular form of student-created content

Figure 2. Types of Student Scholarship in IRs



posted, but other forms of student projects such as co-authored works, grey literature, and peer-reviewed, published material were also common content. Overall, institutions are encouraging the posting of student work in IRs. Although faculty scholarship was the first content solicited for IRs, that is changing. As one respondent noted, “Little has been done to solicit student work, but that is becoming a larger priority.”

Student Content: Policies and Procedures

To better understand how student scholarship made its way into the IR, practical procedures were examined in three areas: content solicitation, uploading procedures, and access to materials.


Some content was solicited from students on a voluntary basis, but other times posting student material to IRs was mandatory. The majority (79%, N=29, n=23) of student submissions was voluntary. When asked to elaborate on this one participant stated: “We leave it up to the department to decide if submission to the IR is mandatory.” This sentiment was also shared by another responder who stated, “Our system is a distributed one, so research units and departments use it however is appropriate for their programs. For instance, one unit requires undergraduates to post their final projects; another unit requires doctoral students to post their dissertations when they’re done. Not all units do either of these.” Another participant stated that, “Research Day poster presentations we ask for as part of participation—[it is] harder to mandate.” Only six respondents indicated that student submissions were not voluntary. Of those institutions that required some type of mandatory submissions, 48% (N=29, n=14) were required for students to graduate, and 22% (N=27, n=6) were required for participation in other activities including conference presentations or class projects. A respondent elaborated on mandatory submissions for other activities by saying, “Students are required to submit their Honors papers unless their faculty advisory signs a permission request notifying us that the paper will not be deposited.” However, another respondent did acknowledge sometimes soliciting materials voluntarily posed difficulties by saying, “some students with faculty authors on their work are concerned that publishers will not want their work once deposited in open access.” This was echoed by another respondent who said faculty and students were “... [worried] placing their work in [the]

institutional repository will diminish their chances of getting published.”

ETDs were an often-cited example of work that had to be submitted as a prerequisite for graduation. Respondents were given the opportunity to elaborate on this topic: “PhD and Master’s students have to submit their thesis or dissertation to the repository. All other student submissions are voluntary,” and “Submissions are sometimes voluntary; ETD submission is required.” These comments support the findings by Dawrs (2012) and Hawkins et al. (2013) that inclusion of ETDs in an IR in recent years is required for graduation.

Institutions set up a variety of policies to handle the diverse population of students and materials submitted to IRs. Twelve respondents reported using the same submission process for all student populations. Thirteen of those surveyed responded that they sometimes use the same submission process, while only three reported using a different submission process for different categories of students. In regard to the actual loading of submissions into the IR, a majority (74%, N=31, n=23) of respondents did not allow students to directly upload/post their own materials (Figure 3, following page). Regardless of how student scholarship is uploaded, a majority (56%, N=27, n=15) of respondents required their students to always authenticate themselves during the submission process, while 22% (n=6) of institutions only sometimes required students to authenticate, and 22% (n=6) never required students to authenticate. Comments supplied by the respondents helped to explain the different procedures. One institution reported submission policies that differed depending on the status of the author and type of content. For example, graduating students submitted an ETD application that was then reviewed by the appropriate graduate school dean’s office. The ETD was released to the library after the graduation date. In the case of peer-reviewed articles, authors could submit their work via self-deposit applications that library staff reviewed for adherence to publication policies and for metadata quality control. For undergraduate research papers, the professor or instructor would submit the paper for inclusion in the IR after confirming that it was of sufficient scholarly and research quality. In all of these cases, the authors agreed to a non-exclusive license with appropriate embargo options indicated for ETDs or peer-reviewed journal articles. Another respondent wrote, “ETD submission is a student submission process;

Figure 3. Submission Policies



all other contributions to the IR are mediated by the Digital Librarian.” These examples highlight the need for clear policies and procedures to be written by the library in advance of inclusion of student work in the IR. Different types of materials require different levels or types of review to ensure not only the level of content quality in the IR, but also that issues such as requirements related to embargoing of previously published articles and copyright are understood and observed.

A question related to the submission process was the frequency of loads of student-generated content to the IR. Fifty-six percent of respondents (N=32, n=18) reported multiple loads of content per semester/quarter; 25% (n=8) reported loading student content at least once per semester/quarter; 6% (n=2) loaded content at least once per calendar or academic year; and 13% (n=4) added student content less than once per year.

Access to materials was examined through questions involving embargoes, withdrawals, and the issue of plagiarism. The idea of an embargo is that content added

to the IR has a set time limit during which access is denied to users, although it can be viewed by library personnel for administrative purposes. Content may be embargoed for a variety of reasons, but the most common is to allow time for a student to rework a thesis or dissertation into publishable form as a book or article, or to honor an agreement with the publisher to not make a published work available for free until after it has been available for sale for a reasonable period of time.

A majority (55%, N=33, n=18) of participants allowed students to make the decision to limit access or embargo their scholarship. Twenty-four percent of respondents had institutional policies that determined whether authors could limit access to their work. Twenty-one percent did not allow students to place access limits or embargo the materials they posted in the IR. According to additional comments made by respondents, the most common item to be embargoed was ETDs. Comments were also made that teaching faculty were sometimes involved in the decision as to whether a student’s work should be embargoed.

Not only was the ability to embargo material examined, but so was the ability to remove student submissions at a later date. Fifty percent of respondents (N=32, n=16) indicated procedures were in place that allowed students to remove scholarship if certain conditions were met; thirty-eight percent (n=12) allowed students to remove submissions without having to meet any specific conditions or criteria. A minority of institutions, 13% (n=4), never allowed their students to remove submissions. Respondents were given the opportunity to offer qualitative comments on this question. Relevant comments included that this practice “happens, but rarely;” that removal is only considered for a compelling reason; and that the administration would have to be involved. One comment specifically on ETDs indicated the Office of Graduate Studies must approve the removal of the submission, and retrospectively digitized theses can be removed.

A related issue was the concern that access can lead to materials being plagiarized. The issue of plagiarism is often cited as an important reason why students are hesitant to post their material in IRs or as a justification for embargoing material. This idea was reaffirmed in a respondent’s comment that, “[Students] worried other people will copy their work...” Plagiarism was also examined. A majority (81%, N=31, n=25) of respondents never experienced issues involving plagiarism of student scholarship within their IRs. Only 19% (n=6) of those responding had any issues regarding plagiarism, and the cases were rare, typically one per year. One respondent commented that plagiarism occurred only once in the history of their IR which began in 2004.

Faculty and Administrator Roles in Student Content in IRs

Faculty were found to play a large role in adding student content to IRs. Some faculty were reported as being active in identifying and selecting materials to be added, but others were more likely to not support the addition of student content in IRs. Of those responding to the question of faculty role in adding student work to the IR, 65% (N=31, n=20) always required faculty to approve student material before submission. A much smaller percentage (29%, n=9) indicated faculty approval was sometimes required, while only 6% (n=2) indicated it was never required. Twelve respondents detailed the role faculty had in soliciting student content. Five addressed the point that faculty made specific recommendations

about what student content should be added or had departmental policies requiring certain types of student content to be added to the IR. One individual surveyed said, “Our coverage of undergrad courses is limited. [It] depends mainly on the teaching faculty approaching us about adding their students’ coursework.” Faculty also play a role in potential embargo periods: “Our theses and dissertations have potential for [a] 10 year embargo, which some students select on the advice of their faculty advisors. We need to spend more time/attention on this matter.” These responses accentuate the importance of the role faculty can play in the successful selection, approval, and dissemination of student scholarship within IRs.

Nearly 69% (N=32, n=22) of librarian respondents held the perception that teaching faculty were supportive of including student work in IRs, while 16% (n=5) indicated that they were unsure or did not know faculty attitudes. Faculty were perceived to be the only constituent group resistant to including student materials within IRs (16%, n=5). One reason may be an extension of the attitude, “Some departments do not support submission of their students’ theses.” This opinion may refer to faculty’s fear for their students’ future publishing opportunities. This is supported by articles from the literature review.

Institutional buy-in can also have an effect on the volume of student submissions to the IR. A majority of respondents, 56.3% (N=32, n=18), cited a lack of institutional buy-in as one reason for lack of submissions. Respondents also commented that some departments were not interested in participating or promises were made by a department to participate but the hoped-for activity never occurred. Another commenter, describing how an administrator can have a negative effect on IR initiatives, reported: “We are limited by the Dean of Graduate Studies who does not support electronic anything.” Other comments related to institutional support included issues of outreach necessary to educate developing departments and new administrators in the importance of the IR. An example of this can be found in the comment that content was, “often submitted by Program Coordinator positions which turn over frequently thus [there is] no tracking over time.”

Perceived Views of Student Participants

The survey dealt with questions of support and perceived content provider satisfaction of students. Graduate students were perceived to have the most support for

posting student materials within IRs (82%, N=27, n=22). Respondents' perceptions of undergraduate student (71%, N=31, n=22) support of student scholarship in IRs was also very high. Although no respondents listed opposition among these groups, over a quarter of respondents reported that they did not know their students' opinions (Figure 4). Respondents were asked if they had received any negative feedback from student authors; only 27.3% (N=33, n=9) had. One respondent explained "some ETD authors have concerns about plagiarism." Another respondent spoke to the ambivalent attitude of some students before they became aware of the benefits of including their work in an IR. "Once when we put something up by mistake [an author gave negative feedback]; but later when they wanted it up for an interview's sake, they asked for it reinstated!" Another commenter said, "Some students do not understand the license and think we are taking their copyright--once [it is] explained they are usually happy."


Most respondents' comments indicated general student satisfaction. One representative comment was that, "on the whole, we get great feedback about student content in our IR, from both faculty and students." Finally, one commenter underscored why student satisfaction is important to the future of IRs:

Students are eager to publish and have work online much more so than entrenched faculty. I have come to the realization that educating the students who 'will become' faculty is the better route than soliciting faculty contributions.

DISCUSSION

Much of the survey data reaffirms recent findings in the library literature on student scholarship in IRs. There is consensus that student generated content is seen as a legitimate form of content for IRs regardless of

Figure 4. Perceptions of Support for Student Scholarship in IRs



institutional size and that the posting of student materials can be beneficial to IRs. This is supported by qualitative data (comments) that indicate students are excited and eager to participate in IRs and that student scholarship may be a way to advertise IR services and platforms to faculty members. Qualitative comments also suggest that adding student scholarship may be a way to reach future scholars and convince current scholars of the benefits of IRs. This conclusion is supported by Pickton and McKnight's research (2007). Based on these findings, planners and implementers of IRs should seriously consider adding or expanding student scholarship in their IRs.

Our findings also reaffirmed that ETDs are still the most commonly published form of student created content being posted in IRs. But, institutions are also seeking out alternative student created content. As exemplified in the literature, many institutions are participating in a variety of projects that highlight student content on a departmental or project level. Using data from this survey, IR administrators should consider pursuing honors projects, capstone projects and peer-reviewed journal articles to increase student content.

As shown in the ARL SPEC Kit on institutional repositories, a majority of institutions have some sort of policy or procedures for the uploading of materials to IRs. These findings were also confirmed by the responders to this survey. The majority of respondents either always or sometimes used the same policies and procedures for diverse student populations and projects. These policies and procedures included: not allowing students to upload their own content, frequency of loads multiple times per semester, and some form of quality control. Therefore, library IR administrators should be prepared to upload student content themselves multiple times a semester and have some mechanism to ensure the quality of student content.

What has not been discussed in recent library literature, but was raised by the survey, is the need to have special policies and procedures for posting ETDs. This recommendation is based on responses that most exceptions to policies and procedures were made for ETDs. Examples of exceptions made to policies for ETDs include embargo policies, withdrawal policies, and policies to prevent the potential plagiarism of posted material. For recommendations about specific policies for ETDs in IRs, administrators

may wish to examine Hawkins et al. (2013). To a lesser extent IR administrators may also want to create policies and procedures for the posting of non-affiliated student content, especially for student journals or conferences.

Faculty play an important role in IRs, and administrators should be aware of this role. Faculty can be relied upon to ensure the quality of submissions, which was also confirmed in Pickton and McKnight (2007), who found that some IRs would only accept student material if it was co-authored or approved by an academic or faculty member. Relying on faculty involvement may also be beneficial to temper some faculty concerns about the inclusion of student materials in IRs. This is especially important given the findings that faculty are perceived as the only stakeholder group likely to resist including student scholarship within IRs. Further discussion about faculty support should underscore institutional size and effect of faculty support. This survey found that of those respondents who had met faculty resistance were more likely to be at a larger institution. University administrators also play a role in recruiting for content through their support and it is recommended that IR administrators seek the support of university administrators to grow IRs. Policies that encourage faculty and departmental or university administrator participation should be encouraged.

Finally, the survey provides some perceived insight into student submitters' attitudes toward posting their materials. Both qualitative and quantitative data found that students, once the benefits were explained to them, were interested in posting their material online. Given that most submissions were voluntary, students have shown themselves willing to submit materials without being mandated to do so. These findings are supported by Markey et al. (2008) who found that undergraduates at baccalaureate and master's-degree granting institutions were just as likely as faculty members to post their materials.

In addition to the limited number of responses, the primary limitation of this survey is that it was posted on two library list-servs. By only surveying librarians, the results present a library-centric approach to student publications in IRs. No students were polled to obtain their opinion or give examples of their experience. Respondents' replies to student and faculty attitudes were therefore limited to the librarians' personal experiences

working with those groups. The findings provide a snapshot of the level of inclusion of student work in IRs at various types of institutions and offer some interesting insights into current practice as well as topics for future research and discussion.

CONCLUSION

Including student content within IRs is increasing as a priority for academic institutions of all sizes and types. The library literature has identified many concerns students, faculty, and administrators may have with posting student content online. The findings of this survey add to current library literature, highlighting the trend to include more student scholarship in IRs. ETDs are still the most commonly posted form of student content, but other student-generated content is being added as well, including honors projects, capstone projects, and peer-reviewed journal articles. Because of the diversity of student content, library IR administrators are creating a variety of policies and procedures to gather, process, and post content. Most policies and procedures have been created to deal with ETDs, but library IR administrators should be prepared to deal with a cornucopia of new student content. Faculty, students, and departmental and university administrators also play a role in the identification and posting of student content. Faculty act as a means of quality control and are able to suggest appropriate student content for inclusion and guide the student through the benefits of posting content in the IR.

Library IR administrators should expect to receive a variety of student content in the future and be aware that multiple policies and procedures may be needed to address the variety of content they receive, focusing first on the most common form of student work posted, the electronic thesis and dissertation. Finally, library IR administrators should court not only students, but faculty and departmental and university administrators when considering posting student content in their IR.

This survey suggests areas in which further research would be of value, especially on the topic of ETDs. One topic of interest would be to compare IR submission policies for faculty and student work. Administrators may also wish to explore what happens to student scholarship after a student graduates. This question is especially important for individuals who may want to pursue a careers in academia. Institutions will need to be prepared to address student participants' desire to remove their content at

a later date. Finally, what is the frequency with which student scholarship in the IR is used or cited and by whom is it used?

Ultimately, the findings in the survey support the premise that inclusion of student scholarship in IRs is a growth area for academic institutions and libraries. The addition of student scholarship to IRs should be monitored in the library literature in coming years to evaluate its expansion and use over time.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This survey was designed with the help of Liz Tousey.

REFERENCES

- American Historical Association. (2013). American Historical Association statement on policies regarding the embargoing of completed history PhD dissertations. *AHA Today*. Retrieved from <http://blog.historians.org/2013/07/american-historical-association-statement-on-policiesregarding-the-embargoing-of-completed-history-phd-dissertations/>
- Anderson, R., Arndell, M., & Christensen, S. (2009). Architecture studio archive: A case study in the comprehensive digital capture and repository of student design work as an aid to teaching, research, and accreditation. *Australian Academic & Research Libraries*, 40(4), 286-304. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00048623.2009.10721418>
- Association of Research Libraries. (2006). *Institutional Repositories*. (Spec Kit no. 292). Washington D.C.: Association of Research Libraries.
- Bell, D. A. (2013, August 7). An embargo on dissertations will not solve the bigger problem. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/blogs/conversation/2013/08/07/an-embargo-on-dissertations-will-not-solve-the-bigger-problem/>
- Dawrs, S. (2012). Virtually there: Open access and the online growth of Pacific dissertations and theses. *The Contemporary Pacific*, 24(2), 348-357. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/cp.2012.0038>
- Fister, B. (2013, July 24). The AHA asks "What about the children." *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from <http://www.insidehighered.com/blogs/library-babel-fish/aha-asks-what-about-children>

- Hawkins, A. R., Kimball, M. A., & Ives, M. (2013). Mandatory open access publishing for electronic theses and dissertations: Ethics and enthusiasm. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 39(1), 32-60. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2012.12.003>
- Howard, J. (2011, April 3). The road from dissertation to book has a new pothole: The internet. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/article/The-Road-From-Dissertation-to/126977/>
- Koh, A. (2013, July 26). Publishing your dissertation online: What's a new Ph.D. to do? *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/blogs/profhacker/publishing-dissertation-online/51361>
- Jaschik, S. (2013a, July 24). Embargoes for dissertations. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from <http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2013/07/24/historians-association-faces-criticism-proposal-embargo-dissertations>
- Jaschik, S. (2013b, December 18). Another push for embargoes. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from <http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2013/12/18/second-history-group-backs-idea-embargoes-dissertations>
- Markey, K., St. Jean, B., Soo, Y. R. & Yakel, E. (2008). Institutional repositories: The experience of master's and baccalaureate institutions. *portal: Libraries and the Academy*, 8(2), 157-173. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/pla.2008.0022>
- Nolan, C. W. & Costanza, J. (2006). Promoting and archiving student work through an institutional repository: Trinity University, LASR, and the Digital Commons. *Serials Review*, 32(2), 92-98. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00987913.2006.10765038>
- Patton, S. (2013a, July 24). Scholarly group seeks up to 6-Year embargoes on digital dissertations. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/article/Scholarly-Group-Seeks-Up-to/140515/>
- Patton, S. (2013b, July 30). Embargoes can go only so far to help new Ph.D's get published, experts say. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/article/Embargoes-Can-Go-Only-So-Far/140603/>
- Pickton, M. & McKnight, C. (2007). Is there a role for research students in an institutional repository? Some repository manager's views. *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science*, 39(3), 153-161. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0961000607080418>
- Royster, P. (2008). Publishing original content in an institutional repository. *Serials Review*, 34(1), 27-30. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00987913.2008.10765148>
- University of Buffalo Libraries. (2012). SUNYport: e-Portfolios for SUNY students. Retrieved from <https://ubir.buffalo.edu/xmlui/handle/10477/13252>
- University of Texas Libraries. (n.d.). Digital Repository. Retrieved from <http://repositories.lib.utexas.edu/>
- Xia, J. & Opperman, D. B. (2009). Current Trends in institutional repositories for institutions offering master's and baccalaureate degrees. *Serials Review*, 36(1), 10-18. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.serrev.2009.10.003>

CORRESPONDING AUTHOR

Elizabeth Hertenstein
Cataloger and Metadata Librarian

University Libraries
Bowling Green State University
1001 East Wooster
Bowling Green, Ohio 43403

eherten@bgsu.edu