



## Strathprints Institutional Repository

Birrell, Duncan and Dunsire, Gordon and Menzies, Kathleen and , JISC Scholarly Communications Working Group (SCG) (Funder) (2009) *OCRIS: online catalogue and repository interoperability study. Final report.* [Report]

Strathprints is designed to allow users to access the research output of the University of Strathclyde. Copyright © and Moral Rights for the papers on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. You may not engage in further distribution of the material for any profitmaking activities or any commercial gain. You may freely distribute both the url (<http://strathprints.strath.ac.uk/>) and the content of this paper for research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge.

Any correspondence concerning this service should be sent to Strathprints administrator: <mailto:strathprints@strath.ac.uk>



## **Online Catalogue and Repository Interoperability Study (OCRIS)**

Appendice 1 to OCRIS Final Report

***OCRIS Questionnaires and Guidance***

Duncan Birrell, Gordon Dunsire and Kathleen Menzies



**JISC**

Centre for Digital Library Research, University of Strathclyde  
September 2009

## OCRIS Questionnaires and Guidance

### Introduction

Workpackage 1 of the OCRIS project involved the preparation and dissemination of 3 online web questionnaires.

These comprised web-forms (at User Interface level) and a Microsoft Access Database (as the "back-end"), designed and implemented by the Principal Investigator, hosted internally at the CDLR and administered by the project team.

The answers recorded in the database allowed OCRIS to address the aims of the project and undertake analyses from a solid evidential basis. It was also useful to compare answers gathered with the findings of extensive desk research undertaken within other workpackages.

Using internet-based desk research, drawing on existing knowledge of and contacts within UK HEIs and using the Registry of Open Access Repositories (ROAR), the Directory of Open Access Repositories (OpenDOAR), the *JISC & SCONUL Library Management Systems Study*<sup>1</sup> and The University of Illinois OAI-PMH Data Provider Registry, information was compiled to help construct questions. Where helpful this data was pre-loaded into the questionnaire to make the process of answering less time-consuming for respondents.

The questionnaire asked about services offered by (or planned for) library systems - this was based largely on the ontology proposed in Swan and Awre's 2006 report, *Linking UK Repositories*<sup>2</sup>.

While this list was not entirely applicable to LMSs, devising a distinct list for LMSs of equivalent granularity would have required a separate scoping exercise and utilised time and resources beyond those the brief 3 month project could supply. Furthermore, it would have introduced a level of incompatibility at the data analysis stage which could have compromised project findings. The guidance notes were used to explain why the list had been chosen.

While the questionnaires for IRs and LMSs were largely similar, the one designed for administrative staff had, by necessity, to be quite distinct given the wide ranging, non-library nature of the systems coming under the umbrella of "administrative". Further, the unfamiliarity of the OCRIS team with technical details of administrative systems and the likelihood that that stakeholder group would have less time (or inclination) to participate, deterred production of an overly-long or complex form.

In this, only 8 (rather than 15) questions were asked, focussed on key points such as whether the systems supported Open Standards or interoperated with any library systems.

A mailing list was constructed with the email addresses of 1149 Systems Librarians, Repository Managers, Bibliographic Services staff, Finance, Research Co-ordination, HR and Information Systems and Services departments. 262 individuals were contacted regarding the IR questionnaire; 280 regarding the LMS/OPAC questionnaire; 599 the Administrative Systems questionnaire and 8 additional contacts from AHDS and SHERPA LEAP.

A major risk of the workpackage was that there would be a low response rate to the questionnaire, especially given the time of year (summer vacation) during which it was administered. Although the response from the IR community was satisfactory (41 percent), responses coming from the other two groups were less so (LMS, 18.2 percent; administrative systems, 8.2).

---

<sup>1</sup> JISC and SCONUL. (2008). 'Appendix II – Vendor Profiles'. In *JISC & SCONUL Library Management Systems Study. An Evaluation and horizon scan of the current library management systems and related systems landscape for UK higher education*. Compiled by Sero Consulting Ltd., Glenaffric Ltd., and Ken Chad Consulting Ltd. pp.120-156. Online at: [www.jisc.ac.uk/media/documents/programmes/resourcediscovery/lmsstudy.pdf](http://www.jisc.ac.uk/media/documents/programmes/resourcediscovery/lmsstudy.pdf) [Accessed 06 August 2009].

<sup>2</sup> Swan, A. and Awre, C. (2006). *Linking UK Repositories: Technical and organisational models to support user-oriented services across institutional and other digital repositories*. Online at: [http://ie-repository.jisc.ac.uk/10/1/Linking\\_UK\\_repositories\\_report.pdf](http://ie-repository.jisc.ac.uk/10/1/Linking_UK_repositories_report.pdf). [Accessed 6th September, 2009].

## Questionnaire on Institutional Repository Services

*This is the survey for managers of Institutional Repositories.*

Please use the Guidance on completing the survey for help. This will open in a separate browser window for ready reference. Or click on the (?) link beside each question for guidance on that section.

Information already gathered from other sources<sup>3</sup>

(?) Name of IR

(?) URL of IR

(?) IR software

(?) Metadata formats supported are indicated by √

- context\_object
- DC qualified
- DC simple
- dcde2aleph
- DIDL
- imsmid
- in-house

- MARC
- METS
- MODS
- Not known
- o-ex
- Other
- primo\_dc

- RDF
- rfc1807
- SWAP
- uketd\_dc
- UK-LOM
- VRA4

(?) Please correct errors or provide further information here

Administration

(?) Who is responsible for administering the IR?

-  Library

---

<sup>3</sup> Information gathered through desk research was pre-loaded into the fields for these questions as appropriate to each institution.

- ☐ Jointly with the Library
- ☐ Other department
- ☐ External agent

#### Collaboration

(?) Is the IR a member of a consortium?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ Pending
- ☐ No
- ☐ Not known

#### Scope

(?) What may be included in the IR?

- ☐ Abstract
- ☐ Archival material
- ☐ Book
- ☐ Book item
- ☐ Book review
- ☐ Conference item
- ☐ Conference paper
- ☐ Conference poster
- ☐ Journal article
- ☐ Journal item
- ☐ Learning object
- ☐ News item
- ☐ Other
- ☐ Patent
- ☐ Report
- ☐ Research dataset
- ☐ Scholarly text
- ☐ Student coursework

- ☐ Submitted journal article
- ☐ Thesis or dissertation
- ☐ Website content
- ☐ Working or discussion paper

(?) Do you plan to extend the scope?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☒ Not known

(?) Do you plan to implement additional IRs with different scope?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☒ Not known

#### Metadata

(?) Is metadata mediated or controlled by IR staff?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ Partially
- ☐ No
- ☒ Not known

(?) What metadata content standards are used?

- ☐ AACR/RDA
- ☐ EThOS/uketd\_dc
- ☐ ISAD(G)
- ☐ ISBD
- ☐ Other DC AP
- ☐ primo\_dc
- ☐ SWAP
- ☐ UK-LOM

- ☐ VR4A
- ☐ In-house
- ☐ Other
- ☐ Not known

(?) What authority-controlled personal/corporate names are used?

- ☐ ISAAR(CPF)
- ☐ Library of Congress
- ☐ OCLC
- ☐ VIAF
- ☐ In-house
- ☐ Other
- ☐ None
- ☐ Not known

(?) What authority-controlled subjects are used?

- ☐ DDC
- ☐ JACS
- ☐ LCC
- ☐ LCSH
- ☐ MeSH
- ☐ UDC
- ☐ In-house
- ☐ Other
- ☐ None
- ☐ Not known

(?) Is metadata duplicated with the library OPAC?

- ☐ Yes (100%)
- ☐ Over 50%
- ☐ Less than 10%
- ☐ No

- ☐ Not known

Interoperability (sharing data at machine to machine level)

(?) Does the IR export metadata in OAI-PMH?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ Pending
- ☐ No
- ☐ Not known

(?) Does the IR interoperate with the Library Management System/OPAC?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ Pending
- ☐ No
- ☐ Not known

(?) Does your IR interoperate (current or pending) with any of the following internal systems?

- ☐ Course Administration
- ☐ Electronic Resources Management
- ☐ Enterprise
- ☐ Finance
- ☐ Human Resources
- ☐ Research Administration Departments
- ☐ Research Assessment Systems
- ☐ Serials Management System
- ☐ Virtual Learning Environment
- ☐ Virtual Research Environment
- ☐ Other

Functions and services

(?) What resource discovery improvement tools are in place or pending?

- ☐ Metasearch/Linking



- ☐ Software as a Service (SOAS)
- ☐ Vertical searching
- ☐ Web service/API
- ☐ Other

(?) Services supported by the IR

Service	Current Pending	
<i>Aggregator Level</i>		
Automated metadata creation and enhancement	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Manual metadata creation and enhancement	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Verification of content (e.g. document format/layout/other standards-compliance)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Verification of metadata	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Verification of the digital object itself	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Data Source Level</i>		
Collaborative or cross-Institutional Repositories at international level	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Collaborative or cross-Institutional Repositories at national level	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Format specific repositories gathering primary content	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Interim repositories for authors with no institutional repository	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Media-specific repositories gathering primary content	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Subject specific repositories gathering primary content	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Ingest Level</i>		
Digitisation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Providing advice on IPR	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Providing advice on Open Access	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Providing technical help	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Repository construction or hosting	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Output Level</i>		
Access and authentication	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Bridging and mapping	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Citation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Meta-analysis	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other statistics services (e.g. subject coverage; number of authors)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlay journal	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Preservation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Publishing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reporting for specific administrative department (e.g. R&I)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reporting for use by IR Manager and associated staff	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Research and quality assessment (other than REF)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Research Excellence Framework (REF)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Seeking submissions from staff/students not currently included in scope	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Technology transfer/business advice	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Usage statistics	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
And finally		
(?) Additional comments		

---

## Guidance for Questionnaire on Institutional Repositories

### Guidance on completing the survey on Institutional Repository Services

Please contact the project team with any queries or comments.

#### Information already gathered from other sources

##### Name of IR

The name of the Institutional Repository, as displayed on the interface or introductory web page.

##### URL of IR

The electronic location of the Institutional Repository.

##### IR software

The software package used for the Institutional Repository.

Metadata formats supported are indicated by ✓

The metadata formats supported by the Institutional Repository, including formats that can be exported, are ticked.

Enter any additions or deletions in the Corrections/comments box.

Options include:

- *context\_object*: A metadata format that represents an Entity that is referenced in a networked environment, along with Entities that constitute the context in which the Referent is referenced.

- *DC qualified*: Dublin core (qualified). Including any modification of simple DC not given as an option: use uketd\_dc, primo\_dc, SWAP, and UK-LOM as appropriate.
- *DC simple*: Dublin core (simple). Including oai\_dc.
- *DIDL*: Digital item declaration language. An XML dialect standardised in the MPEG-21 standard, aimed at defining an open framework for multimedia applications (specifically, a means of protecting rights and permissions).
- *imsmd*: IMS Global Consortium standard for IMS learning resources.
- *in-house*: Local format, including customised database.
- *MARC*: Machine-readable cataloguing. Including UKMARC, UNIMARC, MARC21, MARCXML.
- *METS*: Metadata encoding and transport schema.
- *MODS*: Metadata object description schema. A schema for a bibliographic element set that may be used for a variety of purposes, and particularly for library applications.
- *o-ex*: XML Schema of the Open digital rights language. An open standard for rights expressions, intended to provide flexible and interoperable mechanisms to support the use of digital content across sectors and communities.
- *primo\_dc*: The Dublin core application profile used by the Primo package.
- *RDF*: Resource description framework. A general-purpose language for representing information on the web, using subject-predicate-object expressions (triples) wherein the subject is a URI or a blank node denoting a resource.
- *rfc1807*: This RFC defines a format for bibliographic records describing technical reports.
- *SWAP*: A Dublin Core Application Profile for describing scholarly works (eprints) held in institutional repositories. Formerly known as the Eprints Application Profile.
- *uketd\_dc*: UK Electronic Theses and Dissertations Dublin Core. Developed for EThOS. A Qualified DC application XML Schema (based on Dublin Core with some EThOS specific added terms).
- *UK-LOM*: The UK LOM Core is an application profile of the IEEE LOM that has been optimised for use within the context of UK education.
- *VRA4*: VRA Core 4.0 is a data standard for the cultural heritage community. It consists of a metadata element set as well as an initial blueprint of how those elements can be hierarchically structured.

Please correct errors or provide further information here

Enter any corrections or additions to this information, or any comments deemed to be useful.

There is no limit to what can be entered, and a scroll-bar will appear when the box fills up.

## **Administration**

### **Who is responsible for administering the IR?**

What department, unit, etc. is responsible for administering the Institutional Repository?

Select *Other department* if the repository is administered without the formal collaboration of the library.

## **Collaboration**

### **Is the IR a member of a consortium?**

Does the Institutional Repository contribute to metadata aggregation by a specific consortium?

Select *Pending* if this is planned but not yet implemented.

## **Scope**

### **What may be included in the IR?**

What categories of materials and resources are included in the Institutional Repository?

Select all that apply.

Options include:

- *Abstract*: A summary or abstract of a journal or book item, or book.
- *Archival material*: Material created for institutional administrative and management purposes. Includes publicity material such as photographs and graphics, and material pertaining to the history of the institution.
- *Book*: A non-serial publication that is complete in one volume or a designated finite number of volumes. In physical form, a book is a collection of sheets of paper, parchment or other material bound together along one edge within covers. Books are often identified with an ISBN.
- *Book item*: A defined chapter or section of a book, usually with a separate title or number.
- *Book review*: A review of a book.
- *Conference item*: A contribution to a conference, workshop or other event. Where the contribution is a paper or poster, use Conference Paper or Conference Poster as appropriate.
- *Conference paper*: A paper submitted and/or presented at a conference, workshop or other event.
- *Conference poster*: A poster submitted and/or presented at a conference, workshop or other event.
- *Journal article*: An article or paper published in a journal. For pre- and post-prints, use Submitted Journal Article. For book reviews, use Book Review. For news items use News Item. For other types of contribution use Journal Item.
- *Journal item*: A contribution to a journal, other than an article, e.g. an editorial, conference report, debate, letter or response. Where the contribution is an article, use Journal Article.
- *Learning object*: An item created by institutional staff for use in teaching.
- *News item*: A news item.
- *Other*: Any material not categorised by another option.
- *Patent*: A patent or patent application.
- *Report*: A research, statistical or technical report issued by an institution, agency, government body or other organisation.
- *Research dataset*: A set of data gathered during research and subsequently processed for research outputs.

- *Scholarly text*: A scholarly text that is primarily words for reading. Where the text is one of the more specific types listed here, use the more specific term.
- *Student coursework*: Material created by a student during the course of their studies.
- *Submitted journal article*: The author's original manuscript as submitted to and/or accepted by a journal. In the terminology recommended by the [Sherpa project], a submission prior to peer review is a preprint; a submission after peer review is a postprint. Therefore, a Submitted Journal Article can be either a preprint or a postprint. For the version of the article published by the journal, use Journal Article.
- *Thesis or dissertation*: A thesis or dissertation submitted in completion of a course of study at an institution of higher education.
- *Website content*: Material created for institutional websites. For institutional archival material, use Archival material.
- *Working or discussion paper*: A working or discussion paper circulated publicly or among a group of peers. Certain disciplines, for example economics, issue working papers in series. Working or discussion papers may form the basis for a Journal Article or Conference Paper.

Note: the categories are taken from the Scholarly Works Application Profile (SWAP) eprints type vocabulary, with some additions.

**Do you plan to extend the scope?**

Are there plans to extend the scope of the Institutional Repository to additional categories of material in the future?

**Do you plan to implement additional IRs with different scope?**

Are there plans to implement separate Institutional Repositories for additional categories of material in the future?

**Metadata**

Metadata is data that describes other data. For example, a library catalogue record is metadata, because it describes a book, etc. which contains other data.

**Is metadata mediated or controlled by IR staff?**

Do staff of the administrative agent enter or amend the metadata in the Institutional Repository on behalf of depositors?

**What metadata content standards are used?**

What standards governing the content of Institutional Repository metadata are used, irrespective of the metadata format?

Select all that apply.

Select *in-house* if a local standard is used, or a standard that has been heavily customised.

**What authority-controlled personal/corporate names are used?**

What standardised, controlled forms of personal and corporate names are used?

Select all that apply.

Options include:

- *In-house*: Local authority file.

- *ISAAR(CPF)*: International Standard Archival Authority Record. For Corporate Bodies, Persons and Families
- *Library of Congress*: Library of Congress Name Authority File.
- *OCLC*: OCLC Online Computer Library Center.
- *Other*: Authority file other than LCNAF, ISAAR(CPF), OCLC, VIAF, or local/in-house.
- *VIAF*: Virtual International Authority File.

**What authority-controlled subjects are used?**

What standardised, controlled forms of subject topics or classifications are used?

Select all that apply.

Options include:

- *DDC*: Dewey Decimal Classification.
- *In-house*: Local subject vocabulary.
- *JACS*: Joint Academic Coding System.
- *LCC*: Library of Congress Classification.
- *LCSH*: Library of Congress Subject Headings.
- *MeSH*: Medical Subject Headings.
- *Other*: Subject or classification authority file other than DDC, LCSH, or UDC.
- *UDC*: Universal Decimal Classification.

**Is metadata duplicated with the library OPAC?**

Is metadata for materials in the Institutional Repository duplicated in the library OPAC, even in a different format?

Select the option that gives the best indication of overlap, even if it is a guesstimate.

**Interoperability (sharing data at machine to machine level)**

Generally, interoperability refers to how well two or more systems work together to achieve a common goal; for the purposes of OCRIS this means direct processing by one automated system or sub-system, of data provided by another. This will usually be assisted by the use of standards and standard protocols.

**Does the IR export metadata in OAI-PMH?**

Does the Institutional Repository expose its metadata for remote harvesting using the Open Archives Initiative Protocol for Metadata Harvesting?

Select *Pending* if this is planned but not yet implemented.

**Does the IR interoperate with the Library Management System/OPAC?**

Does the Institutional Repository exchange data with the Library Management System catalogue or OPAC using machine-to-machine protocols?

Select *Pending* if this is planned but not yet implemented.

**Does your IR interoperate (current or pending) with any of the following internal systems?**

Does the Institutional Repository exchange data with any of the listed systems using machine-to-machine protocols, or is this planned but not yet implemented?

Select all that apply, whether current or pending.

### **Functions and services**

#### **What resource discovery improvement tools are in place or pending?**

Is the Institutional Repository integrated or interfaced with any of the listed tools, or is this planned but not yet implemented?

Select all that apply, whether current or pending.

#### **Services supported by the IR**

Does the Institutional Repository support any of the listed services?

Use the *Current* column if the service is already supported.

Use the *Pending* column if service support is planned, but not yet implemented.

The ontology of services used in this questionnaire is derived from the model proposed by Alma Swan and Chris Awre (2006) in their report Linking UK repositories: Technical and organisational models to support user-oriented services across institutional and other digital repositories. The list is reproduced by kind permission of the authors.

### **And finally**

#### **Additional comments**

Enter any comments or clarifications about the information entered in this survey, or any additional information deemed to be useful.

There is no limit to what can be entered, and a scroll-bar will appear when the box fills up.

## Questionnaire on Library Management System/OPAC Services

*This is the survey for managers of Library Management Systems/Online Public Access Catalogues.*

(?) Please use the Guidance on completing the survey for help. This will open in a separate browser window for ready reference. Or click on the (?) link beside each question for guidance on that section.

Information already gathered from other sources<sup>4</sup>

- (?) Name of OPAC service
- (?) URL of OPAC
- (?) OPAC software
- (?) LMS software

(?) Please correct errors or provide further information here

Collaboration

(?) Does the catalogue contribute metadata to any of these Union catalogues?

- ☐ Archives Hub
- ☐ CAIRNS
- ☐ COPAC
- ☐ InforM25
- ☐ RLUK Database
- ☐ Talis Base
- ☐ WorldCat
- ☐ Other

Scope

(?) Which of these scholarly materials, often found in Institutional Repositories, might also be present in the OPAC?

- ☐ Abstract
- ☐ Archival material
- ☐ Book

---

<sup>4</sup> Information gathered through desk research was pre-loaded into the fields for these questions as appropriate to each institution.



- ☐ Book item
- ☐ Book review
- ☐ Conference item
- ☐ Conference paper
- ☐ Conference poster
  
- ☐ Journal article
- ☐ Journal item
- ☐ Learning object
- ☐ News item
- ☐ Other
- ☐ Patent
- ☐ Report
- ☐ Research dataset
  
- ☐ Scholarly text
- ☐ Student coursework
- ☐ Submitted journal article
- ☐ Thesis or dissertation
- ☐ Website content
- ☐ Working or discussion paper

(?) Do you plan to extend the scope?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☒ Not known

(?) Do you plan to implement additional OPACs with different scope?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☒ Not known

Metadata

(?) What metadata formats are used?

- ☐ context\_object
- ☐ DC qualified
- ☐ DC simple
- ☐ dcde2aleph
- ☐ DIDL
- ☐ imsmd
- ☐ MARC
  
- ☐ METS
- ☐ MODS
- ☐ o-ex
- ☐ primo\_dc
- ☐ RDF
- ☐ rfc1807
- ☐ SWAP
  
- ☐ uketd\_dc
- ☐ UK-LOM
- ☐ VRA4
- ☐ in-house
- ☐ Other
- ☐ Not known

(?) What metadata content standards are used?

- ☐ AACR/RDA
- ☐ EThOS/uketd\_dc
- ☐ ISAD(G)
- ☐ ISBD
  
- ☐ Other DC AP
- ☐ primo\_dc

- ☐ SWAP
- ☐ UK-LOM
- ☐ VR4A
- ☐ In-house
- ☐ Other
- ☐ Not known

(?) What authority-controlled personal/corporate names are used?

- ☐ ISAAR(CPF)
- ☐ Library of Congress
- ☐ OCLC
- ☐ VIAF
- ☐ In-house
- ☐ Other
- ☐ None
- ☐ Not known

(?) What authority-controlled subjects are used?

- ☐ DDC
- ☐ JACS
- ☐ LCC
- ☐ LCSH
- ☐ MeSH
- ☐ UDC
- ☐ In-house
- ☐ Other
- ☐ None
- ☐ Not known

(?) Is metadata duplicated with the Institutional Repository?

- ☒ Yes (100%)

- ☐ Over 50%
- ☐ Less than 10%
- ☐ No
- ☐ Not known

Interoperability (sharing data at machine to machine level)  
(?) Does the LMS/OPAC export metadata in OAI-PMH?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ Pending
- ☐ No
- ☐ Not known

(?) Does the system interoperate with the Institutional Repository?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ Pending
- ☐ No
- ☐ Not known

(?) Does your LMS/OPAC interoperate (current or pending) with any of the following internal systems?

- ☐ Course Administration
- ☐ Electronic Resources Management
- ☐ Enterprise
- ☐ Finance
- ☐ Human Resources
- ☐ Research Administration Departments
- ☐ Research Assessment Systems
- ☐ Serials Management System
- ☐ Virtual Learning Environment
- ☐ Virtual Research Environment
- ☐ Other

## Functions and services

(?) What resource discovery improvement tools or services are in place or pending?

- ☐ Metasearch/Linking
- ☐ Software as a Service (SOAS)
- ☐ Vertical searching
- ☐ Web service/API
- ☐ Other

(?) Services supported by the LMS/OPAC

Service	Current	Pending
<i>Aggregator Level</i>		
Automated metadata creation and enhancement	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Manual metadata creation and enhancement	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Verification of content (e.g. document format/layout/other standards-compliance)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Verification of metadata	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Verification of the digital object itself	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Data Source Level</i>		
Collaborative or cross-Institutional Repositories at international level	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Collaborative or cross-Institutional Repositories at national level	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Format specific repositories gathering primary content	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Interim repositories for authors with no institutional repository	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Media-specific repositories gathering primary content	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Subject specific repositories gathering primary content	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Ingest Level</i>		
Digitisation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Providing advice on IPR	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Providing advice on Open Access	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Providing technical help	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Repository construction or hosting	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Output Level</i>		

Access and authentication	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Bridging and mapping	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Citation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Meta-analysis	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other statistics services (e.g. subject coverage; number of authors)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlay journal	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Preservation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Publishing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reporting for specific administrative department (e.g. R&I)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reporting for use by IR Manager and associated staff	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Research and quality assessment (other than REF)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Research Excellence Framework (REF)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Seeking submissions from staff/students not currently included in scope	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Technology transfer/business advice	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Usage statistics	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
And finally		
(?) Additional comments		

## Guidance for Questionnaire on Library Management Systems

### Guidance on completing the survey on Library Management System/OPAC Services

Please contact the project team with any queries or comments.

#### Information already gathered from other sources

##### Name of OPAC service

The name of the online public access catalogue, as displayed on the interface or introductory web page. Note that OCRIS is using "OPAC" as a generic term for any web-accessible interface for resource discovery and retrieval of the library's information resources.

##### URL of OPAC

The electronic location of the online public access catalogue.

##### OPAC software

The software package used for the online public access catalogue.

##### LMS software

The software package used for the Library Management System.

Please correct errors or provide further information here

Enter any corrections or additions to this information, or any comments deemed to be useful.

There is no limit to what can be entered, and a scroll-bar will appear when the box fills up.

### **Collaboration**

#### **Does the catalogue contribute metadata to any of these Union catalogues?**

Does the Library catalogue contribute to metadata aggregation (union catalogue) by a specific consortium?

Select all that apply.

Options include:

- *Archives Hub*: Union catalogue of archives and manuscript collections of HE institutions in the UK.
- *CAIRNS*: Cooperative Information Network for Scotland. Distributed union catalogue of libraries in Scotland.
- *COPAC*: Union catalogue of members of RLUK. Formerly the CURL OPAC.
- *InforM25*: Distributed union catalogue of members of the M25 consortium.
- *RLUK Database*: Union catalogue for RLUK members.
- *Talis Base*: Union catalogue of Talis members.
- *WorldCat*: Union catalogue of holdings of members of OCLC and users of Connexion.

### **Scope**

#### **Which of these scholarly materials, often found in Institutional Repositories, might also be present in the OPAC?**

What categories of materials and resources, commonly deposited in Institutional Repositories, are also included in the OPAC?

For example, printed theses may be deposited in the Library and described in the OPAC, while electronic theses may be deposited in the Institutional Repository.

The options presented are primarily based on Institutional Repository environments; OCRIS is not attempting to gather information about all the types of material held in the library, but only those that are also commonly deposited in repositories. This is why some item types (such as Audio File or Map) common to OPACs, are not included here.

Select all that apply.

Options include:

- *Abstract*: A summary or abstract of a journal or book item, or book.
- *Archival material*: Material created for institutional administrative and management purposes. Includes publicity material such as photographs and graphics, and material pertaining to the history of the institution.
- *Book*: A non-serial publication that is complete in one volume or a designated finite number of volumes. In physical form, a book is a collection of sheets of paper, parchment or other material bound together along one edge within covers. Books are often identified with an ISBN.

- *Book item*: A defined chapter or section of a book, usually with a separate title or number.
- *Book review*: A review of a book.
- *Conference item*: A contribution to a conference, workshop or other event. Where the contribution is a paper or poster, use Conference Paper or Conference Poster as appropriate.
- *Conference paper*: A paper submitted and/or presented at a conference, workshop or other event.
- *Conference poster*: A poster submitted and/or presented at a conference, workshop or other event.
- *Journal article*: An article or paper published in a journal. For pre- and post-prints, use Submitted Journal Article. For book reviews, use Book Review. For news items use News Item. For other types of contribution use Journal Item.
- *Journal item*: A contribution to a journal, other than an article, e.g. an editorial, conference report, debate, letter or response. Where the contribution is an article, use Journal Article.
- *Learning object*: An item created by institutional staff for use in teaching.
- *News item*: A news item.
- *Other*: Any material not categorised by another option.
- *Patent*: A patent or patent application.
- *Report*: A research, statistical or technical report issued by an institution, agency, government body or other organisation.
- *Research dataset*: A set of data gathered during research and subsequently processed for research outputs.
- *Scholarly text*: A scholarly text that is primarily words for reading. Where the text is one of the more specific types listed here, use the more specific term.
- *Student coursework*: Material created by a student during the course of their studies.
- *Submitted journal article*: The author's original manuscript as submitted to and/or accepted by a journal. In the terminology recommended by the [Sherpa project], a submission prior to peer review is a preprint; a submission after peer review is a postprint. Therefore, a Submitted Journal Article can be either a preprint or a postprint. For the version of the article published by the journal, use Journal Article.
- *Thesis or dissertation*: A thesis or dissertation submitted in completion of a course of study at an institution of higher education.
- *Website content*: Material created for institutional websites. For institutional archival material, use Archival material.
- *Working or discussion paper*: A working or discussion paper circulated publicly or among a group of peers. Certain disciplines, for example economics, issue working papers in series. Working or discussion papers may form the basis for a Journal Article or Conference Paper.

Note: the categories are taken from the Scholarly Works Application Profile (SWAP) eprints type vocabulary, with some additions.

**Do you plan to extend the scope?**



Are there plans to extend the scope of the OPAC to additional categories of material in the future?

**Do you plan to implement additional OPACs with different scope?**

Are there plans to implement separate online catalogues for additional categories of material in the future?

**Metadata**

Metadata is data that describes other data. For example, a library catalogue record is metadata, because it describes a book, etc. which contains other data.

**What metadata formats are used?**

The metadata formats supported by the Library Management System catalogue or OPAC, including formats that can be exported.

Select all that apply.

Options include:

- *context\_object*: A metadata format that represents an Entity that is referenced in a networked environment, along with Entities that constitute the context in which the Referent is referenced.
- *DC qualified*: Dublin core (qualified). Including any modification of simple DC not given as an option: use uketd\_dc, primo\_dc, SWAP, and UK-LOM as appropriate.
- *DC simple*: Dublin core (simple). Including oai\_dc.
- *DIDL*: Digital item declaration language. An XML dialect standardised in the MPEG-21 standard, aimed at defining an open framework for multimedia applications (specifically, a means of protecting rights and permissions).
- *imsmd*: IMS Global Consortium standard for IMS learning resources.
- *in-house*: Local format, including customised database.
- *MARC*: Machine-readable cataloguing. Including UKMARC, UNIMARC, MARC21, MARCXML.
- *METS*: Metadata encoding and transport schema.
- *MODS*: Metadata object description schema. A schema for a bibliographic element set that may be used for a variety of purposes, and particularly for library applications.
- *o-ex*: XML Schema of the Open digital rights language. An open standard for rights expressions, intended to provide flexible and interoperable mechanisms to support the use of digital content across sectors and communities.
- *primo\_dc*: The Dublin core application profile used by the Primo package.
- *RDF*: Resource description framework. A general-purpose language for representing information on the web, using subject-predicate-object expressions (triples) wherein the subject is a URI or a blank node denoting a resource.
- *rfc1807*: This RFC defines a format for bibliographic records describing technical reports.
- *SWAP*: A Dublin Core Application Profile for describing scholarly works (eprints) held in institutional repositories. Formerly known as the Eprints Application Profile.

- *uketd\_dc*: UK Electronic Theses and Dissertations Dublin Core. Developed for EThOS. A Qualified DC application XML Schema (based on Dublin Core with some EThOS specific added terms).
- *UK-LOM*: The UK LOM Core is an application profile of the IEEE LOM that has been optimised for use within the context of UK education.
- *VRA4*: VRA Core 4.0 is a data standard for the cultural heritage community. It consists of a metadata element set as well as an initial blueprint of how those elements can be hierarchically structured.

**What metadata content standards are used?**

What standards governing the *content* of library catalogue metadata are used, irrespective of the metadata format?

Select all that apply.

Select *in-house* if a local standard is used, or a standard that has been heavily customised.

**What authority-controlled personal/corporate names are used?**

What standardised, controlled forms of personal and corporate names are used?

Select all that apply.

Options include:

- *In-house*: Local authority file.
- *ISAAR(CPF)*: International Standard Archival Authority Record. For Corporate Bodies, Persons and Families
- *Library of Congress*: Library of Congress Name Authority File.
- *OCLC*: OCLC Online Computer Library Center.
- *Other*: Authority file other than LCNAF, ISAAR(CPF), OCLC, VIAF, or local/in-house.
- *VIAF*: Virtual International Authority File.

**What authority-controlled subjects are used?**

What standardised, controlled forms of subject topics or classifications are used?

Select all that apply.

Options include:

- *DDC*: Dewey Decimal Classification.
- *In-house*: Local subject vocabulary.
- *JACS*: Joint Academic Coding System.
- *LCC*: Library of Congress Classification.
- *LCSH*: Library of Congress Subject Headings.
- *MeSH*: Medical Subject Headings.
- *Other*: Subject or classification authority file other than DDC, LCSH, or UDC.
- *UDC*: Universal Decimal Classification.

**Is metadata duplicated with the Institutional Repository?**

Is metadata for materials in the Library OPAC duplicated in the Institutional Repository, even in a different format?

Select the option that gives the best indication of overlap, even if it is a guesstimate.

**Interoperability (sharing data at machine to machine level)**

Generally, interoperability refers to how well two or more systems work together to achieve a common goal; for the purposes of OCRIS this means direct processing by one automated system or sub-system, of data provided by another. This will usually be assisted by the use of standards and standard protocols.

**Does the LMS/OPAC export metadata in OAI-PMH?**

Does the Library catalogue or OPAC expose its metadata for remote harvesting using the Open Archives Initiative Protocol for Metadata Harvesting?

Select *Pending* if this is planned but not yet implemented.

**Does the system interoperate with the Institutional Repository?**

Does the Library Management System catalogue or OPAC exchange data with the Institutional Repository using machine-to-machine protocols?

Select *Pending* if this is planned but not yet implemented.

**Does your LMS/OPAC interoperate (current or pending) with any of the following internal systems?**

Does the Library Management System catalogue or OPAC exchange data with any of the listed systems using machine-to-machine protocols, or is this planned but not yet implemented?

Select all that apply, whether current or pending.

**Functions and services**

What resource discovery improvement tools or services are in place or pending?

Is the Library Management System catalogue or OPAC integrated or interfaced with any of the listed tools, or is this planned but not yet implemented?

Select all that apply, whether current or pending.

**Services supported by the LMS/OPAC**

Does the Library Management System support any of the listed services?

Use the *Current* column if the service is already supported.

Use the *Pending* column if service support is planned, but not yet implemented.

The ontology of services used in this questionnaire is derived from the model proposed by Alma Swan and Chris Awre (2006) in their report Linking UK repositories: Technical and organisational models to support user-oriented services across institutional and other digital repositories. The list is reproduced by kind permission of the authors.

**And finally**

**Additional comments**

Enter any comments or clarifications about the information entered in this survey, or any additional information deemed to be useful.

There is no limit to what can be entered, and a scroll-bar will appear when the box fills up.

## Questionnaire on Administration Services

*This is the survey for managers of University administration systems.*

(?) Please use the Guidance on completing the survey for help. This will open in a separate browser window for ready reference. Or click on the (?) link beside each question for guidance on that section.

### Administration

(?) Administrative department/function

- ☐ Senior management
- ☐ Finance
- ☐ Information systems and services
- ☐ Internal audit
  
- ☐ Personnel and human resources
- ☐ Quality assurance
- ☐ Research assessment
- ☐ Research support
  
- ☐ Technical support
- ☒ Other

(?) Is this function supported by an automated information system?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☒ Not known

(?) What type of software is used?

- ☐ In-house
- ☐ Open-source
- ☐ Proprietary
- ☐ Other
- ☐ Don't know

#### Metadata

(?) Does the metadata use open standards?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☒ Not known

#### Interoperability (sharing data at machine to machine level)

(?) Does the system interoperate with the Library Management System/OPAC?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ Pending
- ☐ No
- ☒ Not known

(?) Does the system interoperate with the Institutional Repository?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ Pending
- ☐ No
- ☒ Not known

(?) Does the system interoperate (current or pending) with any of the following internal systems?

- ☐ Course Administration
- ☐ Electronic Resources Management
- ☐ Enterprise
- ☐ Finance
  
- ☐ Human Resources
- ☐ Research Administration Departments
- ☐ Research Assessment Systems
- ☐ Serials Management System
  
- ☐ Virtual Learning Environment
- ☐ Virtual Research Environment
- ☐ Other

(?) Could interoperability between internal systems be usefully improved?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☒ Not known

And finally

(?) Additional comments

---

## **Guidance for Questionnaire on Administrative Services**

### **Guidance on completing the questionnaire on Administration Services**

#### **Administration**

##### **Administrative department/function**

For what area of administration is the completed questionnaire being submitted?  
Select the administrative department or general function from the list.

##### **Is this function supported by an automated information system?**

Does the department or function use an automated system dedicated to supporting its information management requirements? The system may be off-the-shelf, for example, the PROACTIS purchasing system, AltaHR, SITS Student Administration, etc., or developed in-house.

##### **What type of software is used?**

What is the general source of the software used in the automated system, if any?

Select *Proprietary* if the software is subject to stringent restrictions in its modification or redistribution, as is the case with most software sourced from a commercial vendor.

Select *Open source* if the software is generally not subject to significant restrictions in its modification or redistribution. Open source software is usually obtained free of charge from its developer, even if it has subsequently been customised.

Select *In-house* if the software has been developed from scratch within the institution.

#### **Metadata**

Metadata is data that describes other data. For example, a library catalogue record is metadata, because it describes a book, etc. which contains other data (text and illustrations). Another example is a data dictionary which describes the structure and content of a database.

##### **Does the metadata use open standards?**

Are any openly-published (publicly available) standards used for the format or content of metadata in the system? The cost of obtaining such standards is irrelevant for this question.

**Interoperability (sharing data at machine to machine level)**

Generally, interoperability refers to how well two or more systems work together to achieve a common goal; for the purposes of OCRIS this means direct processing by one automated system or sub-system, of data provided by another. This will usually be assisted by the use of standards and standard protocols.

**Does the system interoperate with the Library Management System/OPAC?**

Does the administrative system exchange data with the Library Management System using machine-to-machine protocols?

Select *Pending* if this is planned but not yet implemented.

**Does the system interoperate with the Institutional Repository?**

Does the administrative system exchange data with the Institutional Repository using machine-to-machine protocols?

Select *Pending* if this is planned but not yet implemented.

**Does the system interoperate (current or pending) with any of the following internal systems?**

Does the Institutional Repository exchange data with any of the listed systems using machine-to-machine protocols, or is this planned but not yet implemented?

Select all that apply, whether current or pending.

**Could interoperability between internal systems be usefully improved?**

Would further improvement between administrative systems, the Library, and the Institutional Repository be beneficial?

**And finally**

**Additional comments**

Enter any comments or clarifications about the information entered in this survey, or any additional information deemed to be useful.

There is no limit to what can be entered, and a scroll-bar will appear when the box fills up.