

Introduction

At the request of the Flinders Academic Commons Committee, I have made a brief survey of the institutional repository content policies of other Australian Universities. This was by no means an exhaustive survey, but was intended to compile some background information as a discussion starter for the Committee.

Very few of the Libraries surveyed had formal content policy documents that were linked directly from the repository homepage. For most, the aspects critical to such policies including “who can submit” and “what will be accepted” are covered in FAQ pages. In some cases, policies are virtually identical where universities share the same software (eg Digital Commons) or if they have been part of a repository project (eg ARROW).

A couple of more formal examples of policies are attached, including a model collection policy by Arthur Sale of the University of Tasmania.

Those repositories that have policies or policy-like documents seem to cover many of the same broad areas:

- Who can submit
- What can be submitted
- What can't be submitted
- File formats.

Areas covered as part of policy

Who can submit:

Obvious inclusions are academic staff and postgraduate students, but other policies have also included:

- Undergraduate students
- General Staff
- Co-authors with Institutional Staff
- People affiliated with the University
- Ex staff or students

Some points for consideration:

- Are there any areas of the University where undergraduates are undertaking the kind of work suitable for the repository?
- Is it necessary to include General Staff specifically (to cover material like library professional publications?)

- If ex staff and students are excluded, this would need to be changed should the FAC become a repository for research theses.
- Should this specify that the material must be related to an authors employment at the University?
- Is it worth having a “at the discretion at the governing committee” clause?
- How can the Australian Book Review/Australian Archaeology collections be accommodated by this?

What can be submitted:

Other policies have included:

- Pre-prints
- Working Papers
- Discussion Papers
- Published articles
- Monographs
- Book chapters
- Online journals
- Research reports
- Technical reports
- Inaugural lectures
- Draft conference papers
- Final conference papers
- Conference proceedings
- Conference posters
- Datasets (mostly at ARROW partners, and must accompany papers, articles or reports)
- Manuals or documentation
- Patents
- Theses (postgrad, honours, coursework)
- Newspaper or magazine articles
- Images
- Multimedia objects
- Rich media

Others may not be so specific, but use blanket statements such as

- “total publicly available research and scholarly output of the University”
- “digital content created within or associated with the University of Sydney”
- “collections must be produced, submitted or sponsored by authorised ANU teaching and research areas”
- “any other form of research output which can be technically loaded to the repository”

Some points for consideration

- Is a list of publication types particularly useful, or is a blanket statement better?
- Is it worth having a “at the discretion at the governing committee” clause?
- Should there be a glossary to define terms such as “datasets”?
- How to deal with creative works?
- How can we ensure “quality” when dealing with non-refereed material eg pre-prints?

What can't be submitted

Some policies list:

- Material intended for commercialisation
- Research pubs or collections which contain confidential material
- Research pubs or collections which, if disseminated by the repository would infringe a legal obligation of the University and/or the author/s or the legal rights of the third party.
- University administration reports
- Teaching materials
- Unpublished material

File formats

Some policies list acceptable file formats, the most common being PDF, HTML, Word, ASCII and Postscript.

Other, more general considerations:

Do we need a withdrawal policy? (eg a journal may require withdrawal of an item, or we might want to for legal reasons, or the author may want to..)

Might it be a good idea to frame a general, overarching policy, and then allow submitting ASRIs to set boundaries of their own?

Should a review date be set in to the policy? The FAC is likely to change fairly quickly. A mechanism to review the policy to reflect this change could be a good idea.

See attachments:

[Flinders Academic Commons guidelines for submission](#)

[Arthur Sale's Model collection policy](#)

[USQ ePrints Collection Development Policy](#)

[About the Monash University ARROW Repository](#)