

## Slide 1

This presentation will feature a case study from the implementation of the University's of Oregon's IR. I've been asked to discuss our planning and development, with particular emphasis on rights management and access issues.

The handle you see at the bottom of this screen will take you to this presentation, my references for it, and my notes. The one page handout also gives you that handle.

## Slide 2

My presentation is going to be far less technical than either Denise's or Karen's. I have given a number of presentations about what UO has done with its IR from a lot of different perspectives. We serve as a good case study of how far you can go and how much you can accomplish without having a clear idea of what you're getting into. You can consider us either a positive or negative role model, depending upon your institutional and personal perspective.

A recent online course for digital rights management offered by the Coalition for Networked Information talked about how digital rights have been moving increasingly in favor of the content owners and eroding traditional concepts such as fair use that have so widely benefited educational institutions. In the digital realm, it has become common to encounter restrictive licensing agreements, as well as technologies that prohibit use or repurposing of materials without explicit authorizations. These systems, loosely referred to as DRM (digital rights management) systems, especially when coupled with license agreements, have the ability to control content in ways that have previously been unknown.

DRM bumps up against the whole open-access movement of which institutional repositories are a part. IR software usually provides some mechanism for controlling access to content and for managing license agreements. I'll be discussing these issues in a very general way from the standpoint of the University of Oregon's institutional repository.

### Slide 3 SB home

This is the UO's home page for our institutional repository. We now have about 2500 items in the IR. As we got into this, we didn't have a very clear idea of what managing digital rights meant. Our theoretical understanding of the issues is still evolving and our practices are lagging even farther behind.

### Slide 4 Types of rights

When we talk about digital rights management, that can mean a lot of things. Within the University of Oregon's IR, we deal routinely with these four types. each group also has responsibilities that are tied to their rights.

- Creators' rights – what expectations can and should they have on the access to and use of their work? What responsibilities do they have?
- Publishers' rights – If content in an IR has been previously published or made publicly available before, have creators turned over any of their rights to publishers?

- Does the institution hosting an IR have any rights? It certainly has responsibilities but it may also want to claim certain rights about access to the content in the IR.
- What rights does the user have? Are there different categories of users of content and how will you manage the different types of access and use?

## Slide 5 definition of an IR

The way you answer the questions about the rights and responsibilities of the different groups depends on a lot of factors. One of the key factors is how you define an IR.

Let me just share with you my definition on an IR, which draws heavily on the definition put forward by Cliff Lynch of the Coalition for Networked Information, with some of my personal modifications thrown in.

My personal definition is fairly broad

**[1<sup>st</sup> bullet]** For me, in the broadest sense, an IR is a set of digital collections that capture and preserve the intellectual output of some defined community or group of communities. So far this matches Cliff Lynch's definition.

**[2<sup>nd</sup> bullet]** Within a university setting, Clifford Lynch defines an IR as "a set of services that a university offers to the members of its community for the management and dissemination of digital materials created by the institution and its community members. It is most essentially an organizational commitment to the stewardship of these digital materials, including long-term preservation where appropriate, as well as organization and access or distribution."

If you remove the word "university," Lynch's definition of an IR as a set of services for the management and dissemination of digital

materials created by an institution and its community members is the one that I think is most accurate.

There are many types of institutions, serving a wide array of communities. IRs need not be just for a university community - IRs can serve a great purpose for other types of communities, such as a city or county and serve as a way to collect and make available a wide variety of public information.

**[3<sup>rd</sup> bullet]** Public libraries could go a long way to demonstrating their utility to their communities by developing an IR to collect local government publications, web sites, administrative documents, and the creative output of their citizens.

I would add three more aspects to my personal definition

**[4<sup>th</sup> bullet]** IRs need not exist just to capture electronic versions of formal publications. I see them as complementary to the traditional publication process, not primarily as a competitor

**[5<sup>th</sup> bullet]** and they are not just for faculty.

**[6<sup>th</sup> bullet]** and I think that generally the materials in an IR are openly accessible. That certainly has been our default position for our IR

More recent definitions that I've seen from Cliff have emphasized more of the complementary nature of IRs and the ability to capture a wide range of materials, so my definition is probably pretty close to his at this point.

**[6<sup>th</sup> bullet]** and for me a key aspect is that the materials in an IR should be open access (at least the metadata, if not the actual content)

## Slide 6      Open access

### **Let me just define open access.**

**Open access:** allows all members of society to freely access relevant cultural and scientific achievements, in particular by encouraging the free (online) availability of such information

I took this wording from the Wikipedia in May 2006. The definition for open access now is different and much more restrictive. I prefer this version.

Open access is a significant concept from the standpoint of rights management because it grants extensive rights to the public, to users of content.

## Slide 7      Berlin declaration

If you really want to understand the foundations of open access, you could do a lot worse than studying the Berlin Declaration on Open Access, or look into the work that ARL/SPARC, the Wellcome Trust or other groups have done in this area.

According to this declaration, open access works must satisfy two conditions:

1. The author(s) and right holder(s) of such contributions grant(s) to all users a free, irrevocable, worldwide, right of access to, and a license to copy, use, distribute, transmit and display the work publicly and to make and distribute derivative works, in any digital medium for any responsible purpose, subject to proper attribution of authorship, as well as the right to make small numbers of printed copies for their personal use.
2. A complete version of the work and all supplemental materials, including a copy of the permission as stated above, in an appropriate standard electronic format is deposited in at least one online repository using suitable technical standards that is supported and maintained by an academic institution, scholarly society, government agency, or other well-established organization that seeks to enable open access, unrestricted distribution, inter operability, and long-term archiving.

## Slide 8            Rationale and planning

Since I was also asked to talk to you about our planning and implementation, 'm going to back up and just briefly cover some of the aspects that went into our rationale and planning for Scholars' Bank. These are the key aspects of our process and each one has an impact on the way we manage (or fail to manage) digital rights.

Setting up an IR takes a lot of work and brings with it a variety of expenses.

The UO has had an IR for almost 3 years. We have almost 2500 items in it now.

These are some of the elements that I recommend that you consider in your planning process:

- **[first bullet]** What's your motivation for doing this? Why?
- **[2<sup>nd</sup> bullet]** What's your timeline?
- **[3<sup>rd</sup> bullet]** How will you measure success?
- **[4<sup>th</sup> bullet]** Who will be involved in the planning and implementation?
- **[5<sup>th</sup> bullet]** How flexible is your vision? Will you be willing or able to go with the flow and change as your community suggests new uses for your IR?
- **[6<sup>th</sup> bullet]** **What system will you use?**

## Slide 9          Why establish an IR

There are a lot of different reasons why you might get into an IR. Many of you have probably attended more than one presentation that has gone into the rationale for them in some depth. So I'm not going to belabor these points. These are just some of the reasons why the University of Oregon got into this area about 3 years ago.

- One of the main reasons that libraries initially got involved initially in institutional repositories was because they harbored the hope that they would be able to change scholarly communication. This was once the main motivating factor behind the decision of the University of Oregon (and many academic institutions and consortia around the world) to start an IR. Inherent in this is a belief that it benefits all of us if there is open access to scholarly information. Even though we haven't yet ignited that revolution in the scholarly communication model that we naively hoped we would when we started, we have started a slow fire that has the potential to broaden the definition of scholarly communication.

- Having well-designed IRs can do a lot to increase a university's profile. When an archive is compliant with open archives standards, the materials in it are widely discoverable and people who find an item are led back into an institutional presence in a very effective way.
- IRs can increase access to a wide range of materials that might otherwise be hidden or have very limited access. Both the metadata and the content are discoverable and available.
- IRs can provide an excellent way to highlight an individual's achievement by providing a space for them to collect any of their output to which they have retained copyright and to also cite other restricted access content. It can be an important mechanism for getting buy-in of key stakeholders. It's certainly one of my key marketing tools. I use our IR extensively for highlighting my own work. If you want to promote an IR, demonstrate its utility and your own faith in it by using it.
- As with any kind of digital resource, it is easy to provide access to other web-based resources through an IR. Having connections between the IR and other resources (connections going both ways) is an important way to catch the interest of users who are approaching resources through different avenues and it increases the utility of all the resources.
- IRs, if properly planned and managed, can provide a means for a community to preserve materials that might otherwise be lost or at-risk.
- Although this was not one of our original intentions at UO when we began our IR, we have found that it has greatly increased collaboration between the library and the academic and

administrative units on campus and has also led to more cross-disciplinary collaboration on campus.

#### Slide 10 What's your timeline

As you do planning, one of the factors that should go into the planning is an awareness of your timeline.

#### Slide 11 How will you measure success

Think about how you're going to measure success. These may be some of the factors that you will take into account.

And all of these measures affect the types of permissions you require of submitters and the access you grant to materials

#### Slide 12 How will you measure success

Certainly one measure of success that we have long held in libraries is use of the materials. Scholars' Bank has been visited over 4 million times in the last year. From other statistics we know that files are being opened in over 60% of the cases. A file being opened means that a person is looking at it, so that we know that at least 60% of these 4 million visits were made by people, and not robot harvesters. So for us, a key measure of success is how widely accessible our archive is and how many people – from all over the

world – find and use what we have in it. Unlike a commercial publisher, we are not looking to receive income from our materials (at least, not yet.) Thus, we seldom employ DRM mechanisms to restrict access to the content of our IR. But I'll be getting more into that in a minute.

### Slide 13 Flexible vision

Your vision has great impact on the digital rights associated with the items in your archive.

### Slide 14 Software requirements

Software is going to have a major impact on the way you manage digital rights. When we got into our IR, our understanding of rights and permissions were very simplistic and we didn't have major requirements attached to digital rights.

Some specific aspects related to rights management that you should think about are:

- Flexible system administration
  - by this I mean, is it easy to administer the system or do you have to have programming skills to administer it
- Granular authorizations
  - are you able to give different groups or individuals different levels of access, both from the standpoint of access to materials in the archive, as well as from the standpoint of controlling the way materials are submitted, reviewed, made available for use

- Plug into your local authentication system
  - can it plug into your local LDAP system
- Manage licenses and permissions
  - can it manage licenses and permissions with the degree of flexibility that you need?

## Slide 15 Issues

Many of your policy decisions will affect the management of rights within your repository. One of the first issues is the division of responsibilities and roles.

## Slide 16 Who

Who is going to be involved in your effort. Each of these groups has different needs and requirements and the level of involvement of different groups will affect the way you end up managing digital rights and access to the materials in your IR. Too many groups being involved at a high level could lead to conflicting needs that will be harder to resolve.

## Slide 17 Steering committee

At the UO, our initial group consisted of people from public and technical services and significantly included the University Historian and Archivist, who also happens to have her law degree. Being able to call on her expertise as a lawyer and university archivist was an important first step in developing a framework for managing digital

rights for the IR. We'll take a look at our standard permission form shortly.

## Slide 18 issues

The structure and definition of the archive will have a profound impact on access and rights management.

## Slide 19 Definition

These are some of the issues we had to consider in reaching our definition of an IR.

All of these affect the way that rights are managed. For instance, if the target community of users is the world, then you will naturally want the most open type of access possible. If the target community is a particular institution, or specific group within the institution or a discipline-centered group, then you might want to consider limiting access to materials just to authorized members of that group. If your archive has a mixed definition, you will need flexibility in how you manage access to the materials.

## Slide 20 UO's Definition

This then is UO's current definition of our IR. I want to emphasize "current" because our definition has changed substantially from what

we started with and our campus is continually pushing us to expand our definition.

- Target community - Somehow affiliated with university
- Type of collections or materials accepted - Academic content, or in support of the academic mission
- Submission model – self (author) or mediated submission – meaning authors or their designated rep can submit materials themselves or we, the library, will do it for them – this has major implications for managing rights.
- Institutional commitment - Cumulative and perpetual – something that would continue to grow and that we have made an institutional commitment to preserve and make perpetually available
- Rules for different groups – lifetime commitment to faculty, but not students or staff
- Restrictions on use – Free and open access to the materials, non-commercial
- Type of access – Interoperable, harvestable metadata (compliant with OAI-PMH), registered with numerous registries and harvesters

## Slide 21 Types of collections

The types of materials you decide to collect and the way you ingest them will have an impact on the rights and permissions you build into and provide with your archive. These are some of the types of materials that we have in our repository. Each type of collection brings different rights and responsibilities. Many collections fall into more than one category. In a minute I'll be showing you some examples and discuss some of the rights issues, challenges, and our local solutions.

## Slide 22 Issues

The services you decide to provide with your IR also affect the way you manage rights.

## Slide 23 How much service

There are many subsidiary services that you might provide in an IR. These are only some that affect the way you manage rights and permissions.

For instance, if you handle submissions on behalf of content owners, you add another layer to the permission process. If you plan to convert all files to a limited subset of file types as materials are brought into the archive, you need to obtain explicit permission to do so. If you plan to digitize hard copy, it can be more challenging to investigate permissions for making materials available freely on the web. We have encountered situations where departments had obtained permission to make photocopies of materials and give them away – does that translate into being able to make them available electronically? We have tended usually to err on the side of caution.

## Slide 24 services for different users

You may decide that you will offer different services for different groups of users. We do, in terms of the types of materials we accept, the access that different groups have to materials, and how much long-term support we provide.

## Slide 25 Permission issues for different users

We have different rules for students and faculty that affect the way we manage their rights. We're more cautious with students, both in terms of what we will do for them and also in terms of protecting their rights. For instance, we are careful to state in our IR's documentation that we follow FERPA principles, even though they may not be really directly applicable to the content of the IR. Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) (20 U.S.C. § 1232g; 34 CFR Part 99) is a Federal law that protects the privacy of student education records. The law applies to all schools that receive funds under an applicable program of the U.S. Department of Education. Student work from current or past terms is protected under federal law and university policy.

We also have different sets of rules for internal and external users.

## Slide 26 Issues

Who controls the content once it's submitted. This is a major rights issue.

- Who sets the standards for the content?
- What type of material is acceptable?
- Who owns the content once deposited?
- Will you restrict access to any content?

## Slide 27 Type of content accepted

One of our givens is that we accept only material that is the intellectual property of the creator. That means that authors, editors, etc. must assume responsibility for determining if they have the right to make the content freely and openly available in the archive. A large part of what we do is try to educate users about their rights and responsibilities. They usually are either terrified of violating copyright, afraid that someone else will violate theirs if they put their work in the archive and make it freely available, or they have been routinely – albeit unintentionally – violating copyright for years by posting their published work on open web sites without first determining that they had the right to do so.

## Slide 28 Type of content

This is an example of a publication that we have been digitizing. We are not digitizing the full run of back issues because we are not certain that the materials are in the public domain and we don't have the time or staff to investigate it. We do push the limits somewhat, but we try to manage our risks.

## Slide 29 Disclaimers

One way that we try to manage our risks is that we sometimes put up disclaimers on collection pages to address the fact that we are making a good-faith effort to respect the rights of copyright holders. We also make it clear that we are willing to remove content. We have been advised that this is a good step to take. We are counting on receiving a "take down notice" before any legal action might be taken. So far, no publisher has even contacted us and asked us to remove content.

### Slide 30 type of content

Different types of content come with different use and access restrictions. Before we make streaming video content available, everyone pictured in the video must sign a waiver indicating their willingness to have the content appear openly on the web. This is a routine part of the filming process that is under the control of the UO libraries, since it is our Media Services department that films lectures and meetings held on our campus. We have also sought permissions for making things available in our IR after the event.

### Slide 31 what happens when someone leaves

This is one of the areas where we have different rules for students and faculty. Faculty may continue to submit materials even after they leave the University. So far, however, we do not offer the same service to students. We also do not take content down after someone leaves – the intention is for this to be a longterm archive. If we had an author who really wanted to have their content removed when leaving the UO, we would try to dissuade them. But ultimately, we would waive our right to retain it (which they signed over to us on deposit) and release them.

### Slide 32 Commercial use

If you decide to make materials available for purchase, your license agreements with content creators will need to reflect that. MIT is one IR that does sell access to some of its content. The UO so far does not do this.

## Slide 33 Issues

The policies that you set up for submitting materials and withdrawing them have a profound impact on your rights management structure. Some of the sub-issues that come under this issue are:

- Will you support Mediated submission or only Author self-submission
- Will you require or provide for some sort of Review of submissions
- Will you allow for files to be Replaced
- And will you allow items to be withdrawn and, if so, under what circumstances

## Slide 34 Policies for submission and withdrawal

We have fairly broad policies in this area, including:

- Every community determines the specific submission policies for its collections
- Someone, whether from the library or the community itself, will revise new submissions to make sure the content is appropriate for the collection where they were submitted
- Authors may submit their own work or they may ask the library for assistance

## Slide 35 Policies for submission and withdrawal

We have reserved some institutional rights, including:

- At beginning, someone from library reviews first few submissions
- Library reserves the right to remove content
- Library reserves the right to change its guidelines

## Slide 36 revision

- Will you permit the replacement or revision of files?
- If so, in what circumstances. We generally do not. We have defined ourselves as a permanent archive. We tell people that substantial revisions should be submitted as new items. We will replace content if the author discovers errors that need to be corrected.

## Slide 37 withdrawal

- What policies will you have for withdrawing content?
- Will you withdraw submissions to your IR?
- If so, in what cases?
- Will you leave any markers or placeholders for that missing content?

This is an example where we did remove content, at the author's insistence. Even though the author did sign a waiver permitting us to

make this content available, we respected the author's wishes and removed it. However, we did leave the metadata for the item and point out that the print version is available for checkout and ILL. This was a case when we gave up our institutional right in favor of the author. Although I tried to dissuade this woman.

## Slide 38 Issues

The metadata can affect the way you manage your rights.

Based in Dublin Core or some other standard

For self-submissions, authors can determine their own metadata, although we do sometimes review and correct or enhance it minimally. We register our archive with various registries such as OIAster and the Directory of Open Access registries so we make sure that the metadata from our archive can be harvested according to the OAI-PMH. So, even if content is not openly available, the metadata for it is.

## Slide 38a Metadata

Metadata plays an extremely important role in managing digital rights. Karen is the real expert in this area, having written about this and given numerous presentations on it. But just to give you a hint of its importance, the descriptive metadata shown here for one of my own works in the IR, provides information about me, the title of my work, the issue date, the handle for citation, as well as some explicit information about a creative commons license I've assigned to this work (more on that to come.)

## Slide 39 Issues: institutional commitment

The institutional commitment gets into issues like:

- Permanence of the archive
- How to guarantee the integrity of the files
- How to guarantee the stability of the archive

## Slide 40 digital preservation

Digital preservation is extremely complicated and the rights and responsibilities are sometimes muddled. On one hand, it's about the files and assuring their basic integrity.

## Slide 41 digital preservation

On the other hand, it's about making sure that materials can be used and read by machines and humans. Digital preservation brings with it enormous responsibilities in the context of an IR and also means that some care must be taken with the way you manage the rights you assert or request in collecting and managing the content.

## Slide 42 TDR

I'll just flash this screen up here to show you the basic infrastructure that you should be working to have in place if you have set up or are planning an IR. If you want more detail, there's a list of references on the web site for this presentation where you can learn more.

### Slide 43 Copyright

There are a wide array of rights issues that come up frequently in our implementation of our IR. These include:

- Do authors have the right to post?
- Will putting it in IR affect later publication?
- Are authors turning over copyright to IR?
- Who gets to use content in the IR?
- What guarantees are there against plagiarism?

### Slide 44 Authors' rights

We try to outline many of the basic issues for our authors. No two people have the same issues or the same concerns and this topic takes the most time on our part as we discuss the archive with potential contributors.

### Slide 45 sherpa

We refer authors to the sherpa site as a starting point for investigating their rights. Maintained by the University of Nottingham in the UK, Sherpa provides some basic information about the policies of many publishers regarding self-archiving. It doesn't substitute, however, for checking with the publisher.

## Slide 46 later pub

Occasionally, graduate students or faculty whose work is appropriate for our IR are afraid to put their work into the archive. I recently had to remove a paper that an honors student had submitted because her major professor convinced her that putting the paper into the archive could hurt her prospects for publishing it later. We believe that these fears are unfounded, for the most part. We have made available a testimonial from one of our graduate students about how putting her work in the archive actually had the opposite affect. A few weeks after putting her dissertation in the archive, she was contacted by the editor of a book who had found her dissertation and her by doing an open search on a topic on Google that led him back to our IR. The editor asked her to write a chapter in his forthcoming book that has since been published and she has been hired as an adjunct professor at the University. She credits our IR with jumpstarting her academic career – and I think she's right.

## Slide 47 non-exclusive

Our standard license is a non-exclusive distribution license.

- The intent of the agreement is to give the Libraries permission to post the material openly on the Web and to take the necessary steps to preserve the material (preserving the material might mean that the files will need to be converted to a different or newer version of a file format if the existing file format or the hardware/software needed to read it becomes obsolete).
- Authors who submit their work to Scholars' Bank retain the copyright to their work, unless they explicitly give it away to a

third party. We do not seek or claim copyright on any of the works submitted to Scholars' Bank.

- A non-exclusive distribution license means that authors may make other copies of their work available on other web sites or through other means without obtaining permission from the Libraries. They may also formally publish their work, in the same form or in a revised form, without obtaining permission from us.
- We charge no fee for the service and collect no revenue from the archive.
- We provide our users access to the text of the standard license on our supporting pages of the archive and also explain to them what it means. I have been contacted by a lawyer at another university wanting permission to use our wording for their license for their IR. You can come to our web site and find this information and are free to adapt it for your own use, if it meets your needs.

## Slide 48 use of content

This is an example of a work where access to the files is restricted. In this case, the original publisher did not grant the author the right to make the content freely available but did give her permission to make it available to students enrolled in her classes. Access to each bitstream is controlled separately. It is also possible to restrict access to the metadata. When an unauthorized person tries to access one of these files they are presented with a login screen. The owner of the content determines who has access to the content and we set up the permissions on their behalf.

## Slide 49 plagiarism

There are beginning to be tools that people can use to help detect plagiarism. I tell people that the risk of their work being plagiarized from the archive is really not much worse than it ever was with print. In fact, because their work receives an automatic date and time stamp in the IR, it is easier to prove that you had a specific idea expressed a certain way at a given time. I try to sell them on the idea that the archive actually provides them greater protection.

## Slide 50 permission for self-submission

The DSpace software that we use for our IR was established with the expectation that authors would be submitting their own content to the archive.

The software attaches the license file that we have set up to the bundle of content that makes up the submission. It lifts the email identification of the submitter and also attaches a date and time stamp. This works great as long as it's the author himself who submits the content to the archive.

## Slide 51 permission file

This is the license agreement that pops up as part of the submission process for our IR. Clicking on the I grant the License button attached the email identifier of the individual doing the submission to the bundle of digital content. The software can handle different licensing agreements for different collections, although we haven't yet implemented that level of granularity.

## Slide 52 categories of submissions

However, in our archive of 2500 items, the content breaks down into these categories of materials. And only 6% of the total content has been added by the content owner himself. 94% of the content has been added by UO library staff on behalf of the content owner.

## Slide 53 mediated submission

This is an example of a mediated submission – one where we added the content on behalf of the content owner.

## Slide 54 online permission form

I have now set up online permission forms that I ask authors (student, faculty, alumni, etc.) to fill out whenever we submit materials on their behalf. This generates an email that we then turn into a text file.

## Slide 55 mediated permission form

We submit that text file as an additional file that is part of the item bundle and then code it so that it does not display to the public – we give it the same coding as the automatically generated permission files.

## Slide 56 campus newsletter

This bi-weekly newsletter was the first publication of this type that we acquired for our IR. It is a mediated submission, meaning that we do the work of submitting it for the content owner. We also harvest it from the open web and stabilize the content of the original html publication in a PDF.

We obtained permission from the editor to set up the collection, harvest the issues when they come out, and stabilize each issue as a PDF with the links working internally within the PDF. We also provide full-text indexing of the files.

In the case of a serial publication, like this, we store this permission file only with the initial issue of the publication, rather than with every single issue. We also maintain a separate spreadsheet where we track the information about the collection with the information about who the community representative or responsible party is.

There are other deeper rights issues when we harvest web-based publications. When we harvest such publications, we try to be careful about the links within the publication and not harvest materials that could be under someone else's copyright. We've made a good-faith effort in this regard and

## Slide 57 disclaimers

As I showed you before, we have been advised that we should state our intention not to violate anyone's copyright.

In actual practice, what this means for this collection is that we are careful not to harvest links in this web-based publication that seem to

be copyright protected sites. If we find that we have inadvertently violated anyone's copyright, we will immediately take the content down. We have also reharvested issues when the original publisher finds that they have inadvertently violated someone's rights.

#### Slide 58 joint authors

This collection contains working papers that have multiple authors. We did not get individual permissions from each author. Instead, we relied on the editor's permission – and the fact that the materials are already freely available in the disciplinary archive, RePEC.

The software expects one author, one submitter. In my own case where I have shared authorship for materials I wanted to place in the archive, I have obtained permission from my joint authors and I keep those permissions in my own files.

#### Slide 59 review

One of the rights we assert with our IR in all cases except a faculty member who wants to handle his own submissions is our right to review and modify the submission. We may modify metadata, or we may migrate the file to a format that we consider more stable, such as moving files from Word to PDF. We won't, however, modify the actual content of a file just because an author later discovers an error. If they want to send us a new file with different content, we will accept it in the case of correcting an error.

## Slide 60 multi-institutional

If you develop an archive that contains content from multiple institutions, such as this one at the University of Barcelona, then the permission and access issues will be that much more complicated.

## Slide 61 all rights reserved

Regarding the use of the material in our archive, the default understanding is that all rights are restricted and that works must be properly cited.

We also put this notice out on our home page for the IR, stating:

Unless otherwise stated, all rights are reserved by the authors and materials in the archive must be properly cited when being referred to by third parties.

## Slide 62 Proper citation

The software builds in this mechanism for telling users how to cite a work from the archive. It only gives this reminder or admonition at the item bundle level, not at the bitstream level. So, there is no guidance provided for how to cite a specific bitstream of an item that consists of multiple files.

## Slide 63 creative commons

The DSpace software supports the use of the Creative Commons license. Creative Commons licenses allow you to choose a variety of options.

## Slide 64 creative commons

This is a particular Creative Commons license. It's the one that I have started to cite for my own works in Scholars' Bank. I simply provide the URL to it until such time as we implement Creative Commons in our IR and we can generate the links automatically at the point of submission.

## Slide 65 document and publicize policies

We try to document our policies and practices, for ourselves and or our users. We usually stay one step ahead of our users, and often end up formalizing a policy after a user query.

I hope this brief discussion of some of the practical rights challenges we've faced in building our IR will be useful to you.

## Slide 66 contact information

This is my contact information. I want to encourage you all to feel free to contact me at any time with any questions you have about any aspect of what I've talked about. The URL will also take you to the full presentation and my notes for it.