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Background

Created in 2006, the Institutional Repository at the University of Florida (IR@UF) has grown in both size and scope. In 2016 the IR Manager set out to review the existing IR policies at UF and complete an environmental scan of peer institutions to determine best practices and inform recommendations for policy revisions. This poster highlights survey responses about ETDs and related works, such as supplemental materials and other student terminal projects, within institutional repositories. With over 60 respondents from across the globe, these survey results provide a snapshot of where ETDs fit within IR collections now, and might future trends of where they are headed in the future, as IRs continue to grow and ETDs become more numerous and complex.

Demographics

- Total of 94 respondents:
  - 67 US institutions
  - 7 international institutions
  - 20 unspecified

Policies and Practices

What types of content are housed in your IR?
Responses weighted based on number of institutions that include a particular type of material in their IR

How do you handle supplemental materials for ETDs?

Selected Answers:
- We do not host supplemental materials for ETDs, and do not plan to
- We do not host supplemental materials for ETDs yet
- Supplemental files are part of the same record as the ETD
- Supplemental files are on separate records from the ETD, and are linked in the metadata
- Other - Please describe

When materials have been vetted through a different academic entity prior to submission to the IR (e.g. theses and dissertations vetted through the Graduate School) does that impact policies such as acceptance, making changes, take-down requests, etc.?

Selected Answers:
- No materials in our IR are vetted through different entities
- Vetting entity has final say on policy, regardless of IR policy
- Vetting entity has final say on policy, provided the base IR policies are also met
- IR policies are the final policies for all items
- Other - Please describe

Conference proceedings-79%
ETDs (Electronic Theses and Dissertations)-88%
Digitized theses and/or dissertations-81%
Post-print articles-88%
Technical reports-74%
Lecture / classroom materials-35%
Other-28%
Conference posters-77%
Supplementary materials for articles-44%
Undergraduate course projects-65%
Working papers-65%

How many items are currently in your IR?

- >1,000: 8%
- 1,000-4,999: 22%
- 5,000-9,999: 18%
- 10,000-14,999: 14%
- 15,000-19,999: 4%
- 20,000-24,999: 12%

Largest IR contained 190,000 items

What platform/technology do you use for your IR?

- Digital Commons / bepress: 47%
- CONTENTdm: 2%
- Open Repository: 2%
- Islandora: 3%
- 3% Other - please explain

When was your IR Founded?

- 2003-2005: 4%
- 2006-2007: 6%
- 2008-2009: 15%
- 2010: 20%
- 2011-2012: 20%
- 2013-2014: 15%
- 2015: 10%
- 2016: 8%

Selected Answers: 2 (3% of respondents)

- We do not host theses and dissertations vetted through the Graduate School
- Vetting entity has final say on policy, regardless of IR policy

Who generates the metadata for ETDs? (select all that apply)

- ProQuest: 7%
- Library Unit (Cataloging/Metadata/Discovery Services): 3%
- ETD author: 27%
- Graduate School: 27%
- Other - please describe: 15%

Selected Answers:
- We do not host theses and dissertations vetted through the Graduate School
- Vetting entity has final say on policy, regardless of IR policy

Other - please describe

- Vetting entity has final say on policy, regardless of IR policy
- Please consult with library
- Vetting entity has final say on policy, regardless of IR policies at UF
- Vetting entity has final say on policy, provided that IR policies are also met
- IR policies are the final policies for all items
- Other - please describe

Institutional Repository vs. University Archive

39% of respondents indicate that they have separate digital University Archive
28% indicate the IR acts in the role of the digital University Archive
14% have no digital University Archive

20% other - Selected Answers:
- It is possible that materials are in both collections
- Vetting some archive items but does not serve for research management
- Yes, but the purpose of this is administered by provost
- Genealogy IR, since is separate repository

Selected Answers: 7 (12% of respondents)
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- IR policies are the final policies for all items
- Other - please describe
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