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Summary

Beginning in December 2013, the DuraSpace not-for-profit organization began collaborating with The Bishoff Group in order to gain a better understanding of the status of digital content creation, management, and preservation activities underway in the non-ARL academic library community as well as to determine how DuraSpace's open source projects and services could (better) meet the needs of this community. As part of the work, DuraSpace commissioned The Bishoff Group to conduct a Managing Digital Collections Survey of non-ARL academic libraries. The purpose of the survey was to collect information that:

- Determined if non-ARL academic libraries are involved in the management of institutional content, including faculty and student created content, library created/acquired content; and if the repository is locally managed or hosted;
- Identified responders' perceptions about the benefits of an institution repository/digital repository (IR/DR);
- Identified current services used by responders to support their IR/DR initiatives;
- Identified future needs and plans for IR/DR services and software;
- Defined information technology staffing used to support IR/DR;
- Explored responders' commitment to digital preservation; and
- Identified the preservation service/s respondents use and/or are investigating and what prevents them from implementing a preservation program.

The survey was conducted from March 25-April 18, 2014. Respondents included 145 institutions across all types of academic libraries comprising two- and four-year colleges, masters, and doctorate granting universities.
Survey Details

The Bishoff Group developed and conducted the survey with input from DuraSpace staff. The target audience for this survey included non-ARL academic libraries due to the fact that earlier studies, including the Census of Institutional Repositories in the US: MIRACLE Project Research Findings¹, found that few non-ARL institutions had implemented IR/DRs. The survey was sent to the ACRL listservs serving the community colleges, four-year colleges, and universities. In addition, library deans and directors from the 80 Oberlin Group libraries and the 22 University Libraries Group received personalized emails. As a result, 49 out of 80 Oberlin schools responded, a 61% response rate, and 9 out of 22 members of the University Libraries Group responded, a 41% response rate.

Classification of respondents: The survey asked each respondent to choose a Carnegie Classification for their institution. These Classifications include Associate colleges (community/junior colleges); Baccalaureate colleges (four-year colleges); Master's colleges and universities; and Doctorate-granting universities. Further analysis will use the different classifications.

Of the 145 organizations that responded to the survey, 61 (42%) were from Baccalaureate colleges; 34 (23%) respondents each from Master's colleges and universities and Doctorate-granting universities; and 12 (8%) responses from Associate colleges. Deans and Directors were the major respondents at 83 (57%), while 22 (15%) were Assistant Directors. Further, 20 (14%) respondents indicated that they held other positions, including Chief Information Officers or Chief Information Officers/Library Deans.

Results

Digital Content
A significantly large number, 117 (81%), of the respondents reported that they are currently creating and/or acquiring digital content, such as the output of faculty and student research, institutional records, dissertations and theses, and digital library collections. Of the 27 (19%) respondents who indicated that they were not currently creating or collecting digital content, 14 (52%) said that they planned to in the next one to three years, 6 (22%) indicated no, while 7 (26%) did not know. These 13 respondents exited from the survey.

Institutional Repository/Digital Repository Prevalence
Of the organizations that currently have digital content, 94 (72%) have an IR/DR that is either locally managed or hosted, 26 (20%) do not, while 11 (8%) did not know. Across all types of organizations, there is a high level of implementation of IR/DR with 51 Baccalaureate institutions reporting use of an IR/DR. Further, 73 of 102 (72%) respondents indicated that their IR/DR is a hosted service, while 29 (28%) identified that their organization is leveraging a locally managed service.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does your organization have an IR/DR, either a locally managed repository or a repository managed by a third party that hosts your collections?</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>131 (14 skipped)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Benefits of an Institutional Repository/Digital Repository

Respondents were asked to rate the importance of a list of benefits of an IR/DR on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 was not important and 5 was extremely important.

Of the benefits listed as not very important, respondents selected reducing user dependence on library's print collections most often (42%), followed by supporting institution's open access mandate (32%) and providing a platform for library's e-publishing program (24%).

Digital Preservation Policies

Respondents indicated that there is an overall commitment to digital content preservation at their organizations with 66 positive responses (66%). However, 19 (19%) individuals indicated that there is not a commitment to digital preservation at their organization and 15 (15%) did not know. Of 100 respondents, exactly half 50 (50%) indicated that they are actively preserving content while 35 (35%) noted they were planning on implementing a digital preservation program in the future. Ten (10%) and 5 (5%) responded that they are not preserving content or didn’t know, respectively.
When asked what was preventing the implementation of a digital preservation program, the following reasons were identified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is preventing your library from implementing a digital preservation program? (select all that apply)</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of funding</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other priorities</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of technical expertise</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of administrative support</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We don't know where to start</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>52</strong></td>
<td><strong>(93 skipped)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Digital Preservation Practices**

When asked which digital preservation strategies respondents’ libraries have implemented, 66 individuals selected data backup followed by 32 choosing outsourcing to an externally managed preservation repository. Quite a few respondents opted to describe other alternatives in the form of adding a written comment to the survey. These optional responses included: cloud space for limited digital assets, DuraCloud, APTrust, and ResourceSpace.

In regards to funding digital preservation activities, many respondents either chose funding through another line in the regular budget (37 responses) or don’t know (32 responses). Further responses to this inquiry were quite dispersed suggesting that direct funding for preservation activities is not standardized in the non-ARL academic library community.

**Key Findings**

- Non-ARL academic libraries are creating/acquiring digital content
  - 117 of the 145 (81%) respondents report that they are currently creating and/or acquiring digital content, such as the output of faculty and student research, institutional records, dissertations and theses, and digital library collections. Furthermore, 14 of the 27 (52%) respondents who indicated that they were not currently creating or collecting digital content noted that they planned to create or acquire digital content in the next one to three years.
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Implementation of an Institutional Repository/Digital Repository
- 94 of the 145 (65%) respondents have a locally managed or hosted IR/DR. Of those who have not implemented an IR/DR, Associate and Baccalaureate colleges comprised the largest group that had not implemented, with 8 and 10 respondents, respectively.

Hosted versus locally managed IR/DR
- The majority of the IR/DR are using hosted services. Of the respondents, 73 respondents use hosted services, 29 are locally managed.

Digital preservation
- Digital preservation is a priority as respondents indicated that they have a commitment to digital preservation through mission/strategic plans. Further, respondents indicated that they have executed digital preservation programs as demonstrated by implementation of a variety of software/services. However when asked about barriers to implementation of digital preservation policies they identified: lack of funding, other priorities, lack of expertise, lack of administrated support, and not knowing where to start.

Conclusions

DuraSpace commissioned The Bishoff Group to conduct a survey of the non-ARL academic library community in order to better understand the state of digital content management activities underway including the preservation policies and practices and how DuraSpace services could fulfill the needs of this group. Specifically, the DuraSpace services DSpaceDirect and DuraCloud align with the needs identified in the results of this survey. Furthermore, DuraSpace products would be of interest to the non-ARL community in the following ways:

1. DSpaceDirect fills the growing need for software that enables easy management of ever-increasing digital content collections.
2. Both DuraCloud and DSpaceDirect enable institutions to easily get started with a hosted software service, with no need to provision local hardware, software, staff, or other infrastructure nor is there any specific technical skill or expertise required.
3. The DSpaceDirect feature of automatic DuraCloud backups allow institutions to capture, preserve, and provide access to institution's research outputs, in one integrated system.
4. The combination of DSpaceDirect and DuraCloud enables the preservation of digital content in a simple and cost effective manner without the need to provision additional budget for separate software services/platforms performing separate functions.