MEETING SUMMARY
RULAC Open Access Policy Implementation Working Group
February 26, 2014

Present: L. Mullen and J. Otto (co-chairs), D. Fishman, M. Haverfield, A. Norris, J. Ottomanelli

1. Announcements & updates since last meeting
   - Timeline handout - The Group agreed to change the Hard Launch date from Sept. 1, 2015 to First Day of Class, 2015; L. Mullen and J. Otto will determine the date from forthcoming academic calendar and revise the document (thought to be September 8)
   - User account feature is forthcoming; comments from A. Norris will be forwarded to developers
   - The list of presentations, consultations & events was reviewed; the New York-Area ORCID Meet-Up for Integrators and Potential Integrators (January 16, 2014, Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center) will be added to the list
   - The group discussed ORCID identifiers; most were not familiar with OrcidID
   - List of peer/aspirant and model repositories - working on this; will distribute next time
   - Video RFP - status discussion; distributed RFP
   - List of RUcore enhancements (FYI)
   - Takedown notices (FYI)

2. Questions & decisions for the group
   - Fact sheet (add WG names and timeline; add repository URLs to selected institutions list and revise headings; make it more clear where to go for all the policies; remove http from URLs)
   - J. Kukor hosting Academic Analytics seminar on April 7; A. Norris will check into it and let us know
   - Displays - Working Group recommends:
     - Consider version types in different colors (not consensus?)
     - Remove quotes from articles and put title first
     - Move date up further
     - Remove category and version from brief display (superseding original suggestion to put them on a single line)
     - Remove DOI (it only links to the landing page) and use pdf (icon?) instead
     - Remove category from full record (maybe add different list of terms for full record)
     - Possibly hyperlink authors
   - FAQs - FYI; Group will review to ensure all questions covered; L. Mullen and J. Otto will draft answers for the next meeting
   - ETDs - Group recommends including ETDs, but have the default be no ETDs, and allow people to check a “Include ETDs” box.
- Names - The group discussed the name options offered thus far, and other more abstract names (i.e. not acronyms). Consensus was that SOAR was the clear favorite.

- Cover sheets - Group wants the “Your Story Matters” feature; change labels to “Citation to published version.”

- Presentations and publicity - Targum can be used for publicity down the line. In general, presentations can wait until nearer implementation date; presentations will be more vital, can be more concrete, especially with a site working by Sept. 1. Also, this allows RUL to focus on development. Go through deans to contact chairs. Target big SAS departments like Physics and English. The video should be released more around the time of the soft launch, so there is no real rush there; RFP can go out in May for those students in a job search, and possibly SC&I’s Director of Undergraduate Studies in Journalism & Media Studies could use it as a fall semester project. Inserts may be a possibility, if the website is not finished by the time of video production. Link the video to the fact sheet. At some point, send blanket email to all. The idea of booth shows was discussed briefly.
AGENDA
Open Access Policy Implementation Working Group
Wednesday, February 26, 2014, 2:00 p.m.
University Librarian’s Conference Room, 3rd floor, Alexander Library, CAC, New Brunswick

1. Announcements & updates since last meeting
   Timeline handout
   User account feature forthcoming
   Presentations, consultations & events
   ORCID identifiers
   List of peer/aspirant and model repositories
   Video RFP
   List of RUcore enhancements
   Takedown notices

2. Questions & decisions for the group
   Updated fact sheet; should Working Group member names be added here and on OA policy web page (http://www.libraries.rutgers.edu/researchers/open_access)?
   Proposed/sample displays with questions – feedback requested
   FAQs – feedback requested
   Electronic Theses & Dissertations (ETDs) – should they be included in the open access scholarship portal? Other materials currently subsumed under “Scholarly Materials”/ “Scholarly Collections”? 
   Names for our Open Access Scholarship portal. RUcore will probably remain the name for the University’s repository, as it reflects a broader mission and its uniqueness enables quick discovery in search engines. However, we could give a name for the OA scholarship portal. This will impact the video production, so a decision on the name is a high priority. These are the ones that have been suggested so far:
   - SOAR (Scholarship Online At Rutgers)
   - SCARLET (mySCARLET) - Scholarly, Community, Archive, Repository, Leading, Education, Together
   - SPARK (mySPARK) - Scholarly, Paper, Access, of Rutgers, Knights
   - SOURCE (mySOURCE) - Scholar, Open, Use, Repository, for Communal, Education
   - INSPIRE (myINSPIRE) - Innovative, Networks, of Scholars, and Professionals, Integrated, Repository, Education
   “Please share” feature on cover sheet or webpage to enable sharing of stories on how open access to particular papers has benefited individual users
   Future presentations to schools (or departments) - how to select units moving forward

3. Getting the word out beyond presentations to the academic units
   Booth shows
   Other (webinars, quarterly academic leadership program for chairs, orientations, etc.)
ATTACHMENT 2
Proposed Changes to RUcore Record Displays
## SAMPLE DISPLAYS
### CURRENT RUCORE DISPLAY (BRIEF RECORDS):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Otto, Jane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Created</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Preservation of our audiovisual heritage is critical, and technical metadata is at the heart of any effective preservation program. This paper documents the efforts of Rutgers University Libraries to...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Norris, Andrew N. &amp; Kutsenko, A.A. &amp; Shuvalov, A.L.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Created</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>The matrix sign function is shown to provide a simple and direct method to derive some fundamental results in the theory of surface waves in anisotropic materials. It is used to establish a shortcut...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## PROPOSED RUCORE DISPLAY (BRIEF RECORDS):

http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01639371003757012  
Category: Article, Refereed  
Version: Authors original

http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jmps.2013.06.003  
Category: Article, Refereed  
Version: Version of record

http://dx.doi.org/10.1121/1.3504711  
Category: Article, Refereed  
Version: Accepted manuscript
The matrix sign function for solving surface wave problems in homogeneous and laterally periodic elastic half-spaces

**Description**

**Title** The matrix sign function for solving surface wave problems in homogeneous and laterally periodic elastic half-spaces

**Uniform Title** Wave Motion

**Publisher** Elsevier

**Name** Norris, Andrew (Author), Shuvalov, A.L. (Author), Kutsenko, A. A. (Author)

**Date Created** 2013

**Subject** Matrix sign function, Surface waves

**Extent** 18 p.

**Description** The matrix sign function is shown to provide a simple and direct method to derive some fundamental results in the theory of surface waves in anisotropic materials. It is used to establish a shortcut to the basic formulas of the Barnett-Lothe integral formalism and to obtain an explicit solution of the algebraic matrix Riccati equation for the surface impedance. The matrix sign function allows the Barnett-Lothe formalism to be readily generalized for the problem of finding the surface wave speed in a periodically inhomogeneous half-space with material properties that are independent of depth. No partial wave solutions need to be found; the surface wave dispersion equation is formulated instead in terms of blocks of the matrix sign function of times the Stroh matrix.


**Note** NOTICE: this is the author's version of a work that was accepted for publication in Wave Motion. Changes resulting from the publishing process, such as peer review, editing, corrections, structural formatting, and other quality control mechanisms may not be reflected in this document. Changes may have been made to this work since it was submitted for publication. A definitive version was subsequently published in Wave Motion, Vol. 50, Issue 8 (Dec. 2013), DOI 10.1016/j.wavemoti.2013.03.010.

**Note** DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.wavemoti.2013.03.010 (published version)

**Note** Peer reviewed

**Genre** Article, Refereed

**Persistent URL** http://dx.doi.org/10.7282/T3CF9N25

**Language** English

**Collection** Norris Andrew Collection

**Organization Name** Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey

**Rights** Copyright for scholarly resources published in RUcore is retained by the copyright holder. By virtue of its appearance in this open access medium, you are free to use this resource, with proper attribution, in educational and other non-commercial settings. Other uses, such as reproduction or republication, may require the permission of the copyright holder.

**Category:** Article, Refereed  
**Version:** Version of record

**Abstract:** Effective elastic moduli for 3D solid–solid phononic crystals of arbitrary anisotropy and oblique lattice structure are formulated analytically using the plane-wave expansion (PWE) method and the recently proposed monodromy-matrix (MM) method. The latter approach employs Fourier series in two dimensions with direct numerical integration along the third direction. As a result, the MM method converges much quicker to the exact moduli in comparison with the PWE as the number of Fourier coefficients increases. The MM method yields a more explicit formula than previous results, enabling a closed-form upper bound on the effective Christoffel tensor. The MM approach significantly improves the efficiency and accuracy of evaluating effective wave speeds for high-contrast composites and for configurations of closely spaced inclusions, as demonstrated by three-dimensional examples.

**Subjects:** Effective moduli, Plane-wave expansion, Homogenization, Monodromy matrix,

**Rights:** Copyright for scholarly resources published in RUcore is retained by the copyright holder. By virtue of its appearance in this open access medium, you are free to use this resource, with proper attribution, in educational and other non-commercial settings. Other uses, such as reproduction or republication, may require the permission of the copyright holder.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Developmental changes of expressive language and interactive competences in children with autism</th>
<th>Original Research Article</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Language acquisition in autism spectrum disorders: A developmental review</td>
<td>Review Article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The Oral and Written Language Scales: Is it useful for older children with autism spectrum disorder?</td>
<td>Original Research Article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Linguistic and pragmatic language skills in adults with autism spectrum disorder: A pilot study</td>
<td>Original Research Article</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Research highlights**

- Review language acquisition in ASD, including gaps in the literature.
- Pragmatic deficits are widely acknowledged.
- Phonological, morphological, and syntactic differences are also present.
- Implications for typical language development, and promising future directions.

**Highlights**

- We assessed language comprehension in children with ASD without Intellectual disability.
- Language comprehension was impaired for 36% or more regardless of ASD diagnosis.
- Explained variance of comprehension was 10% for performance and 41% for verbal IQ.
- Results highlight the need for detailed linguistic assessment of children with ASD.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Link to Published Version</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trojan horse eprints</td>
<td>Suber, Peter</td>
<td>(SPARC Open Access Newsletter, 2005)</td>
<td><a href="#">Link</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language, partial truth, and logic</td>
<td>Elgin, Catherine Z.</td>
<td>(Analysis, 2011)</td>
<td><a href="#">Link</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analogy Exercises for Teaching Legal Reasoning</td>
<td>Suber, Peter</td>
<td>(Journal of Law and Education, 1988)</td>
<td><a href="#">Link</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Books and E-Books</td>
<td>Darnton, Robert</td>
<td>(European Review, 2007)</td>
<td><a href="#">Link</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designing Markets For Prediction</td>
<td>Chen, Yiling; Pennock, David M.</td>
<td>(AI Magazine, 2010)</td>
<td><a href="#">Link</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impossible Antecedents and Their Consequences: Some Thirteenth-Century Arabic Discussions</td>
<td>El-Rouayheb, Khaled</td>
<td>(History and Philosophy of Logic, 2009)</td>
<td><a href="#">Link</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ergative Case and the Transitive Subject: A View from Nez Perce</td>
<td>Deal, Amy Rose</td>
<td>(Natural Language and Linguistic Theory, 2010)</td>
<td><a href="#">Link</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An Optimization-Based Framework for Combinatorial Prediction Market Design</td>
<td>Chen, Yiling</td>
<td>(2011-09-12)</td>
<td><a href="#">Link</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. **Unanswered Questions from the Vaccine Injury Compensation Program: A Review of Compensated Cases of Vaccine-Induced Brain Injury**
   - Mary S. Holland, Louis Conte, Robert Krakow, and Lisa Colín
   - NYU School of Law, Independent, Independent and Independent
   - **Date posted:** May 18, 2011
   - **Last revised:** May 23, 2011
   - Accepted Paper Series
   - 86 Downloads

5. **Introduction to Polycentric Political Economy**
   - Peter J. Boettke
   - George Mason University - Department of Economics
   - **Date posted:** January 19, 2010
   - Accepted Paper Series
   - 79 Downloads

6. **On the Robustness of Brain Gain Estimates**
   - *IZA Discussion Paper No. 4293*
   - Michel A. R. Beine, Frédéric Docquier, and Hillel Rapoport
   - University of Luxembourg, Catholic University of Louvain (UCL) and Bar-Ilan University - Department of Economics
   - **Date posted:** July 21, 2009
   - Working Paper Series
   - 76 Downloads

7. **Introduction: Adolescent Medical Decision Making and the Law of the Horse**
   - Amanda C. Pustilnik and Leslie Meltzer Henry
   - University of Maryland Francis King Carey School of Law and
   - **Date posted:** January 16, 2013
   - Accepted Paper Series
   - 61 Downloads


Evaluating Alternative Methods of Soil Erodibility Mapping in the Mediterranean Island of Crete

Christos G. Karydas (karydas@for.auth.gr), Marinos Petriolis (marinos.petriolis@facebook.com) and Ioannis Manakos (manakos@iti.gr)

Additional contact information


Abstract: Soil erodibility is among the trickiest erosion factors to estimate. This is especially true for heterogeneous Mediterranean environments, where reliable and dense soil data are rarely available, and interpolation methods give very low accuracies. Towards estimating soil erodibility, research so far has resulted in several alternatives mainly based on empirical formulas, on physics-based equations or on inference with expertise. The aim of this work was to compare erodibility patterns derived by using the empirical United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) formula and by inference from a geological map in a Mediterranean agricultural site. The Kolymvari area, located in the western part of Crete, an area covered by olive groves and citrus orchards, was selected as the study site for this work. Comparison of the spatial patterns of soil erodibility derived from the two alternatives showed significant differences (i.e., a mean normalized difference value of 0.52), while a test of the "inference" alternative indicated very low accuracies (0.1475 RMS error). A comparison, however, of the spatial patterns of erosion values derived from both alternatives indicated that dissimilarities of the two soil erodibility maps faded out. Moreover, the highly risky areas provided by both alternatives were found to be identical for 83% of the whole study site.

Keywords: soil erodibility; K-factor; USDA formula; Crete; Kolymvari (search for similar items in EconPapers)

JEL-codes: Q1 Q10 Q11 Q12 Q13 Q14 Q15 Q16 Q17 Q18 (search for similar items in EconPapers)

Date: 2013

References: View complete reference list from CitEc

Citations: track citations by RSS feed

Downloads: (external link)

Related works:
This item may be available elsewhere in EconPapers: Search for items with the same title.

Export reference: BibTeX RIS (EndNote, ProCite, RefMan) HTML/Text

ATTACHMENT 3
Questions on Proposed Changes to RUcore Record Displays
PROPOSED CHANGES TO RUCORE DISPLAYS

Brief records (displayed when multiple records are retrieved)

Created standard citation display
Removed thumbnail
Closed up spacing to eliminate white space
Included DOI
Displayed Category*
Displayed version
Will add pdf icon linking directly to the pdf file (doi links to landing page)
Will add checkbox before each entry, to select for print, export, etc.
Want to add ‘link to published version’ link (cf. DASH)

Possible additions/changes (see other samples):

Discuss use of categories listed below (if only used behind the scenes, don’t have to be displayed; imagine each of these in the display)

List title first, with author on separate line at end of citation? (cf. Science Direct) This would make title sort more intuitive

Any suggested changes to font color or size or format (e.g., bold) to emphasize particular elements of display?

*Current category terms (from HR/Form 1)

Dissertation
Book
Bibliography (Book)
Edited Book
Book Chapter
Article, Refereed
Article, Non-refereed
Review
Conference paper or lecture
Other presentation or lecture
Artistic original work
Map
Questionnaire
Other publication
Open Access Policy Frequently Asked Questions

Open Access: What is Open Access? Why pass a policy?

Open Access can be defined as:

The Policy:

1. Where can I get information on the Rutgers Open Access Policy?
   Please go to http://www.libraries.rutgers.edu/researchers/open_access for full information on the policy including all background information about the Senate resolution and the topic of open access.

2. When does the policy go into effect? The Rutgers Open Access Policy is prospective, covers articles covered after the policy goes into effect-taking effect Sept.1, 2015.

3. Who(m) is covered by the policy? Faculty and graduate students are covered by the policy; it is inclusive of all Rutgers scholars.

4. What kind of work is generally covered by the Policy:

5. Does this policy mean that I have to publish in an open access journal, or pay open access fees?

   Depositing your Work in RUcore and making it available on the internet to a worldwide audience:

6. Where can I get information on the Faculty Deposit process?
   Please go to (URL) or email, call (Rhonda?)

7. What kinds of work can I deposit?
   The open access policy has as its focus legal versions of articles, or other scholarly works such as conference proceedings. These legal versions are usually the final author version (post peer review), the preprint versions that are popular in some disciplines, and sometimes even the publisher branded PDF. Deposit of your author version is done at the time of acceptance for publication; you do not need to know what is permissible by your publisher. RUcore staff will research permissions before making the work available. Please deposit your final author version, post peer review, completing the process at the time of final acceptance for publication. This will often be a PDF or Word file, but others are accepted as well. When you sign off on the paper, send a copy to RUcore.

8. When do I need to deposit my work? Deposit your work at the time of acceptance for publication. When you are notified by the publisher/editor that your article has been accepted in final form, deposit it in RUcore. (link here)
9. I have a newer version of a work that is already deposited in RUcore. What should I do?

10. What does my publisher or journal allow me to do? You do not need to research this, but if you would like to know, please search by publisher or journal name in (SHERPA/RoMEO). This simple search will give you an example of what’s possible.

11. What if I have co-authors or my publication has many authors? You may deposit your paper in RUcore as above; you may wish to extend a courtesy of telling your co-authors that you are depositing.

12. What is an “addendum?” Do I need to include an addendum when signing my copyright transfer agreement (CTA)?

13. My publisher mentions needing a “waiver” if I am an affiliate of an open access policy institution. Where can I get this waiver?

14. Can an assistant/proxy deposit my work? Can my department or school deposit for me?

15. Can I deposit my work myself? Yes, just do to the faculty deposit portal of RUcore at:

16. Can I deposit older works (from before the OA Policy); send in my complete CV with older citations? Yes, as long as the version you deposit is an acceptable one (often not the publisher branded PDF). Please deposit final author versions if your publisher does not permit deposit of their branded version. Please direct questions to RUcore at (contact)

17. If my paper is deposited in another repository, such as arXiv or PubMedCentral, can I still deposit in RUcore? Should I? Why would I? Do I still have to deposit.

18. I am being asked about “versions.” Where is a description of the various versions? See: (NISO versions)

19. I published my article in an open access journal. Do I deposit the article in RUcore also, or does publishing in an OA journal cover all the bases?

20. Will all of the versions of the same article remain publicly available? Will there be more than one version of my article?

21. I am not sure what kind of embargo (delay) is supposed to be put on my work? Do I need to specify this?

22. Will searchers be able to ask me for a copy of my temporarily embargoed (delay in access) work?

23. What kind of repository is this/how does the technology work?

24. Will my work be discoverable by search engines such as Google? Others?

25. Can I add a Creative Commons license to my article?

Publishers and the Policy:

26. Do publishers allow me to put my work on the internet?

27. Has harm to publishers been demonstrated from open access policies, or from “green open access?” Will this hurt my publisher?

28. For waivers and addenda requested or required by publishers, see # above

29. Do I need to tell my publisher about RU’s OA Policy?
30. If my publisher tells me that open access is an option, for a fee, can Rutgers pay the fee?

Hybrid, oA fees (questions)

31. What about my books? Do publishers allow me to put my books or book chapters in RUcore?

I have other questions not answered here. Whom can I contact?
ATTACHMENT 5

RUcore Enhancements for OA Policy Implementations

based on RULAC OA Policy Implementation Working Group recommendations
1. RUcore Faculty Deposit Portal & Web Presence

Provide a completely new look, and possibly new name, and web address directly under Rutgers, as follows:

**Rationale:** A revamp of the faculty deposit interface is probably the single most important recommendation. A new look and possibly new brand (within RUcore) would help launch the new policy, and offer an appealing model to expected participants. Removal of libraries from the domain name conveys the idea this is an institutional, not a library, initiative. In general, the website should be modeled on DASH, in terms of content, navigability, browsing, searching, limiting (filtering), and sorting. Faculty insist the interface be top notch; "can't be A-minus; it has to look attractive." Most of the proposed enhancements are standard in many repositories.

Faculty are very keen to have a browse functionality with logical breakdowns so that users aren’t asked to “pull terms out of the air.” This type of easy browsing would also serve other collections; for example, the ETD collection would be well served by the browse by academic unit. This new array of search options should also be much more visible than RUcore's current Search Faculty Collections options.

**STATUS:** Some content developed; those metadata specs required to enable recommended record displays have been written and approved.

1. Revise basic bibliographic record display (individual record, search results, and complete record displays)
   a) Parse journal citation metadata sufficient to configure individual displays, prospectively and retrospectively
   b) Use color, bold, and italics to increase readability of brief record display (cf. DASH)
   c) Revise genre/format terms (e.g., research, journal article, book) and make them more prominent
   d) Prominently display NISO version terms
   e) In the record and results list, add 'Link to Published version'; cf. DASH (and do a search in PubMed Central and use 'Limits' to limit search to author manuscripts. Note how records display in multiple hits list (i.e., Journal title followed by 'author manuscript' with published version on next line).

**Rationale:** Faculty have asked that the display be more readable, feature the most important information most prominently, and look more like a repository and less like a library catalog. It should be more densely packed with familiar displays (i.e. standard citations), less “artsy” and have less white space.

**Status:** Parsing of journal citation metadata (1.a) requires steps (i)-(vi):
   i. Determine how metadata should be parsed. An imperfect but workable solution to parsing journal citation metadata was developed by G. Agnew, approved by the Metadata Working Group, and reviewed by Software Architecture. (The solution allows journal citation displays but is not flexible enough to support export, printing, etc., of citations or bibliographies in multiple standard displays like APA, MLA, Chicago Manual of Style, etc. The ideal solution was deemed prohibitively expensive to implement.) [COMPLETE]
ii. Based on (1), configure the Partner Portal tool (initially, in test) to enable application of the changes. [IN PROCESS]

iii. Manually edit metadata in test records and apply reconfigured display [IN PROCESS]

iv. Configure the Partner Portal tool in production [NOT STARTED]

v. Revise metadata on existing deposits [NOT STARTED]

vi. Configure the portal using the Partner Portal tool [NOT STARTED]

vii. Revise the metadata mapping which occurs when data from the Faculty Deposit form is inherited into the WMS, to ensure proper metadata prospectively; cf. (16) [NOT STARTED; PART OF THE MULTIPLE VERSION SPECIFICATIONS FOR FACULTY DEPOSITS; MAPPING OF VERSION AND JOURNAL CITATION METADATA SCHEDULED FOR RELEASE 7.4]

viii. Revise the Faculty Deposit application profile to document proper metadata input prospectively, given the new mapping [NOT STARTED; PART OF THE MULTIPLE VERSION SPECIFICATIONS FOR FACULTY DEPOSITS; SCHEDULED FOR RELEASE 7.5]

ix. Revise genre/format terms in faculty deposit module (from which metadata in the system is inherited) [NOT STARTED]

x. Configure WMS to support NISO version metadata (cf. Multiple Version Specifications for Faculty Deposits, no. 4) [NOT STARTED; SCHEDULED FOR RELEASE 7.4]

xi. Determine best method, and workflow, to link to published version [NOT STARTED]

2. Enhance Faculty Deposit portal searching and display

   a) Follow DASH model of providing search box (with link to advanced search) with Browse options below; cf. http://dash.harvard.edu/community-list

   b) The link to each type of browse search should open up to the browsable list, with A-Z bar across top; cf. DASH author browse at http://dash.harvard.edu/browse?type=author (however, remove order and Results pulldowns; order should be descending and results should be as many as reasonably possible. Exception: For title browse, present the default brief display, sorted by title; cf. DASH title browse at http://dash.harvard.edu/browse?type=title

   c) Provide the following Browse searches:
      - Authors [not Names]
      - Titles
      - Keywords
      - Schools with Departments (hierarchical; cf. DASH Communities & Collections browse, but instead of subcategories of articles, student papers, etc., the subcategories would be the departments. For schools, enter the name in direct order, e.g., Camden School of Business. In contrast, enter names of department under the significant word, and drop “Department of.” In other words, follow the DASH model for browsing FAS Departments at http://dash.harvard.edu/browse?type=department.
      - Schools
      - Departments
      - By issue date
      - By submit date
      - Most popular [i.e. most downloaded]
      - Recently added [exclude ETDs from this browse, if ETDs are included in the faculty deposit portal]
      - Full text (to include full bib record + actual full text of the article)
      - Author (not name)
      - Title
      - Keyword (not subject)
      - Abstract (not description)
      - Issue Date (lacking issue date, go to create date, copyright date, etc.)
• Submission date
• Department
• School
• Advisor (if ETDs included)
• Committee member (if ETDs included)
• DOI

e) Provide the following limits:
• School or department
• Publication type (dissertations [includes theses], articles, conference proceedings, etc.; should match deposit form list, and in same order)
• Add checkbox: □ include embargoed articles

f) Provide the following sort options:
• Most recent (by default: issue date; lacking issue date, go to create date, copyright date, etc.). Articles should not display in reverse chronological order of input.
• Title
• Relevance (only include if >x number of hits)

**Rationale:** Faculty are clear that without a better search and retrieval interface, comparable to their favored repositories, the system will not be used and their colleagues will not participate.

**Status:** Not started

3. Enhance Faculty Deposit web page content
   a) Logo at upper left
   b) Scope statement at top (in one or two sentences, with ‘more’ link) [cf. http://www.escholarship.org]
   c) Mega-menus in tab format across the top
      • Search & Browse
      • About
      • My account
      • Research Services
      • FAQs (for faculty deposit)
      • Help
      • Deposit your work
   d) Search box, link to advanced search, and browse lists at top of right-hand navigation bar
   e) DEPOSIT YOUR WORK button
   f) A box featuring the policy with ‘Learn more’ link to the OA policy page [cf. center block at http://www.escholarship.org].
   g) Link to videos about open access and the policy [cf. http://www.escholarship.org and http://www.escholarship.org/about_meet_kelty.html]
   h) Social media links
   i) Graphic
   j) Statistics (using graphic evoking global reach) [cf. http://dash.harvard.edu]
   k) Revolving list of recent submissions (“Articles by Rutgers authors”) [exclude ETDs]
   l) Featured works
   m) "This week's most downloaded works" link

**Rationale:** Faculty are clear that without richer content, comparable to their favored repositories, the system will not be used and their colleagues will not participate.
**Status:** Not started, although some content (e.g., About, FAQs, Help, OA policy text is developed and will be provided by the Working Group)

4. Enhance navigation:

- Allow navigation to previous and next record
- Change default number of Results per page to 100 or more, not 10 (this is a simple configuration change)

**Status:** Appears to be complete; navigation to previous/next records is now in place, and default number of search results is configurable

5. Provide a form and process to collect statements about how article was used or how the service is useful (with optional info about user and/or article), for display on web page; cf. DASH.

**Status:** Not started

### 2. Harvesting

Harvard and MIT, among others, regularly harvest from open access repositories; no further permission is required, since the resources are already open access. We need to enable harvesting of records from other open access repositories. It requires more research in some cases, to develop the mechanics of harvesting, for example, working out sorting protocols to facilitate identification of Rutgers content. MIT can provide more counsel in this area.

a) Discuss with MIT, UC, and others
b) Investigate requirements with individual repositories, beginning with arXiv, PubMed, SSRN, etc.
c) Begin implementing, repository by repository

**Rationale:** In presentations to faculty, particularly in disciplines with a strong open access culture, the most frequently asked question is “Why do I have to deposit twice?”

**Status:** This has been discussed with the Harvard Open Access Project, and we were referred for further discussion to MIT.

### 3. Enable dark deposits, including open metadata with dark deposits

**Rationale:** This is in line with Policy Implementation best practices as described by Harvard Open Access Project. Part of the purpose of an institutional repository is to keep a record of institutional scholarship. Support for dark deposits supports the message that faculty should always deposit their new work. Dark deposit allows for immediate deposit, since rights to make articles available can change over time. For seven reasons why repositories should allow dark deposits, see Stuart Shieber, “The importance of dark deposit,” *The Occasional Pamphlet*, March 12, 2011: [http://blogs.law.harvard.edu/pamphlet/2011/03/12/the-importance-of-dark-deposit/](http://blogs.law.harvard.edu/pamphlet/2011/03/12/the-importance-of-dark-deposit/)

**Status:** Not started
4. Enable dynamic bibliography feature

This is the "Dan Fishman proposal," which provides users a simple URL which executes a dynamic search of their articles in RUcore, reported out as an exportable, shareable bibliography.

Rationale: This service offers authors a link to a dynamic bibliography of deposits, which they can post on webpages, on their email signatures, etc. This provides obvious benefits to faculty and an incentive to deposit scholarship. Further, it is a way to draw readers to the repository, which can up its rankings in Google searches.

Status: This was discussed and assignments made at a July, 2012, meeting. Much of the ground work on this has been done, but journal citation metadata must be parsed before programming can be completed.

5. Include cover page with every faculty deposit

Rationale: This identifies the version deposited in the repository, and its relationship to other versions. The existence of multiple versions is one of faculty’s biggest concerns about the policy, and this helps to mitigate that concern.

Status: Cover pages have been drafted and approved. Software Architecture Working Group has approved the specs and assigned this to RUcore Release 7.4. Retrospective addition to existing deposits has not yet been addressed (see 6 below).

6. Retrospectively add cover page and DOI to every existing deposit

Rationale: This identifies the version deposited in the repository, and its relationship to other versions. The existence of multiple versions is one of faculty’s biggest concerns about the policy, and this helps to mitigate that concern.

Status: Not started; no. 8 in the Multiple Version Specifications for Faculty Deposits; scheduled for Release 7.5.

7. Create a reporting mechanism to enable deans to request bibliographies of their schools’ deposits

Rationale: Key to building participation is the idea that deans can promote the work of their schools, and demonstrate to University Administration their schools’ scholarly contributions.

Status: Not started
8. Create a reporting mechanism to track deposits chronologically and by academic unit

**Rationale:** This will enable the Libraries and the University to document measurable outcomes of promoting the Open Access policy and the institutional repository.

**Status:** Unknown; this may already be in place, according to correspondence with Software Architecture Working Group chair, 11/24/13.

9. Implement OrcidIDs

Harvard is about to incorporate the ORCID ID into DASH, and recommends asking for ORCID IDs at the point of ETD submission. Note: this requires coordination with the LDAP database.

**Rationale:** The ORCID ID provides a unique and persistent digital identifier to distinguish an author from every other author, supports automated linkages between authors and their professional activities, and helps to ensure an author or researcher’s work is recognized. Many authors are beginning to register for their unique ORCID identifiers, and the system should be able to accept it. It is important to capture it now, even if the repository can’t do anything with it other than store it and make it searchable. That way, when greater functionality becomes available, the ID is there.

**Status:** Not started

10. Provide notifications

a) to repository staff when an embargo ends (so that postprint can be added to the record for the preprint)
b) to depositor when the deposit is successfully completed
c) to depositor when a newer version has been added
d) to author when his or her work appears as the most downloaded article

**Rationale:** Notifications to depositors increase confidence in the system and build good will, to encourage further deposits.

**Status:** Not started

11. Revise workflows to enable clear linking to the published version’s full citation, with live link to DOI (cf. above under Displays)

Note the required workflow would include notification (to repository staff) of publication, and addition of metadata (DOI, pagination) for an existing deposit.

**Rationale:** The existence of multiple versions is one of faculty’s biggest concerns about the policy, and this helps to mitigate that concern.

**Status:** Not started
12. Provide a “Request a Copy” button and “View all Versions” link

**Rationale:** “The Request a Copy” button allows repository end users to obtain a copy of an article when it has been embargoed or is a dark deposit. The “View all Versions” link generates a display of the complete version history. These two functionalities together form Item (6) in the *Multiple Versions Specification for Faculty Deposits*.

**Status:** Specifications have been drafted and approved; Software Architecture Working Group has assigned these to Release 7.5.

13. Provide a My Account page modeled on arXiv

**Status:** Specs for a My Account functionality were assigned within the Cyberinfrastructure Steering Committee, and drafted by R. Marker and J. Deodato, April, 2013. Unknown if arXiv was reviewed as a model. Listed on RUcore release time as scheduled for Release 7.3 and 7.4 (Jan./Feb. 2014 and Late Spring 2014).

14. Revise Usage Statistics displays

   a) Fix statistics on the ‘Deposit Your Work’ page; they are incomprehensible and are differ significantly from those provided on the individual record display, in terms of number of downloads, and location of downloads
   b) Remove Views statistics and simplify display accordingly
   c) Consider a line graph (with options for cumulative and annual citation statistics) display, such as that provided by Microsoft Academic search.

**Rationale:** This is one of the most important and appreciated of all repository functionalities, according to the literature and responses received in presentations, due to its ability to demonstrate impact for the purpose of promotion and tenure.

**Status:** (1) has been reported as a bug. (2) has been requested and is on the Dec. 10 CSC agenda for discussion. (3) not started.

15. Revise Faculty Deposit form pages

   1. Make it clear that grad students can deposit
   2. See Appendix 1 for other changes

**Rationale:** Although the policies page makes it clear that grad students can deposit, many will never visit that page, and the opening screen for ‘Deposit your work’ says “Rutgers University faculties are invited …”. The inclusion of grad students is an innovative part of our policy so there should be no ambiguity. The deposit form has not been systematically revisited for some time, and could benefit from streamlining.

**Status:** Proposed changes have been drafted, but not yet discussed outside the Working Group.
**16. Revise metadata mapping from the Faculty Deposit application to WMS**

Metadata is mapped from the Faculty Deposit form (completed by depositor) into the WMS, where it is edited for subsequent ingest (with the article itself) into RUcore. Changes to the form will require changes to the mapping, which in turn has repercussions for the Faculty Deposit application profile (see below).

**Rationale:** Accurate mapping from the form to the WMS reduces the amount of metadata keying, to ensure efficient, consistent, accurate metadata.

**Status:** Not started; mapping of version and journal citation metadata scheduled for Release 7.4.

---

**17. Create Faculty Deposit application profile**

**Rationale:** An application profile documenting how metadata should be input helps to ensure metadata is consistent and conforms to recommended displays. The current application profile covers all journal articles, and does not take into account metadata mapped in from the Faculty Deposit form, or other unique characteristics of faculty deposits. It also should be revised in light of requested changes to displays and workflows (see 1.1, 16, etc., above).

**Status:** The current application profile has been reviewed; revision is dependent on changes to the deposit form (see 15 above), and how that maps to WMS (see 16 above). Questions about genre/form terms, and how they appear, both on the form, and in final record displays, are still to be resolved (1.1 above).

---

**18. Flesh out "Open Access Policy" webpage**

Include
- information on policy
- generic presentation
- FAQs about the policy
- updates/progress reports (timeline)
- list of presentations (past and upcoming)
- "Request a presentation" button
- video
- contact info

**Rationale:** Rutgers scholars will want information about the policy before participating.

**Status:** Virtually all content (except the video, scheduled for discussion Dec. 13, 2013) is in place, and ready for discussion with webmaster.
19. **Search engine crawling**

   a) Ensure Rucore is configured to support search engine crawling in accordance with JISC InfoNet recommendations and Google Webmaster Guidelines
   b) Verify search engine crawling is consistently implemented across collections in Google and Google Scholar
   c) Document and convey (to all WMS managers) workflow for ensuring new collections are implemented and configured correctly.

**Rationale:** This ensures that collections are discoverable in Google and Google Scholar.

**Status:** Not started (some of this work has been done, but not systematically).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>20. <strong>Resolve issue of netID requirement for deposit</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Rationale:** Access to the RUcore deposit form requires netID authentication. Not all Rutgers scholars falling under the policy have a netID; therefore they are turned away by the system, or must request manual deposit, which they don’t necessarily know to do.

**Status:** Not started

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>21. <strong>Establish and publicize clear policies re: RUcore staff making deposits required by funders</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Rationale:** RUcore staff have the capability to make funder-required deposits on behalf of authors, but this service has not been formalized or offered.

**Status:** Not started. L. Mullen and J. Otto plan to meet with Y. Zhang and R. Marker to discuss this issue (November 26, 2013).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>22. <strong>Fix existing bugs</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Status:** A list of existing bugs is being compiled. For example, “deposit in process” indicator (circle) goes on indefinitely with no indication the process has been completed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>23. <strong>Add Export Citation feature like that found on publisher platforms</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Rationale:** This is a useful standard feature offered by many repositories.

**Status:** Not started
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>24. Enable marking of records to allow emailing, printing, exporting, etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rationale:</strong> This is a useful standard feature offered by many repositories.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Status:</strong> Not started</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>25. Fix Share feature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rationale:</strong> This feature is glitchy. The format of the emailed record is clunky. Cryptic terminology (&quot;Do Not Track&quot;; &quot;Sign in&quot;) appears, and the Yahoo link is partially covered up with some screen resolutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Status:</strong> Reported via Contact Us but not raised to the level of a bug.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>26. Revise the RUcore home page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Review the page’s organization into &quot;Faculty,&quot; &quot;Search by Collection,&quot; &quot;Collaborations,&quot; and &quot;Search&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Don't rely on mouseover text to define Digital Collections, Scholarly Materials, and Research Data; people don't read it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rationale:</strong> Faculty reports that the organization of the home page into &quot;Faculty,&quot; &quot;Search by Collection,&quot; &quot;Collaborations,&quot; and &quot;Search&quot; is confusing, and information under each is not necessarily appropriate (for example, Deposit your work under Faculty).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Status:</strong> Not started</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>27. Provide a “Submit correction” button</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rationale:</strong> This allows users to submit corrections or add a new version. For example, see DASH’s button to ‘Contact administrator regarding this item (to report mistakes or request changes)’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Status:</strong> Not started</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>28. Ensure PIRUS compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rationale:</strong> Compliance with the (evolving) PIRUS and PIRUS2 standards for sharing traffic data will prevent the dilution of traffic numbers at the several repositories. Cf. Harvard Open Access Project’s “Implementing a Policy” document at <a href="http://cyber.law.harvard.edu/hoap/Implementing_a_policy">http://cyber.law.harvard.edu/hoap/Implementing_a_policy</a>. For more information on PIRUS and PIRUS2 standards, see: <a href="http://www.jisc.ac.uk/whatwedo/programmes/pals3/pirus.aspx">http://www.jisc.ac.uk/whatwedo/programmes/pals3/pirus.aspx</a> and <a href="http://www.cranfieldlibrary.cranfield.ac.uk/pirus2/tiki-index.php">http://www.cranfieldlibrary.cranfield.ac.uk/pirus2/tiki-index.php</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 29. Remove ETDs from Faculty Deposit portal (tentative pending Working Group discussion) |
## Appendix 1. Proposed Changes to Faculty Deposit Form Pages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED REVISION</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Progress bar</th>
<th>Depositing my work</th>
<th>Assign permission/choose account</th>
<th>IP Rights</th>
<th>Description of work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revisit first paragraph: not limited to faculty (use scholars, including grad students); not an invitation (should mention policy). Don't use preserved; mention crawled by google. RUcore staff will research the rights for you.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise and streamline NetID info</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delete first paragraph below the box.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delete last sentence on the page</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise heading (should match link; &quot;Deposit your work&quot;). Is 'deposit' the right word?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove the word 'login' under the heading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revisit wording, esp. change &quot;IP Rights&quot; to &quot;Deposit agreement&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streamline the first paragraph</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delete 2nd paragraph</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change link at bottom to &quot;Continue&quot; or &quot;Next&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise the first paragraph</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revisit title and subtitle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewrite last paragraph (delete first sentence, streamline 3rd sentence etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janice has to supply agreement language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link to FAQs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove titles/subtitles when redundant with progress bar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED REVISION</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Progress bar</th>
<th>Depositing my work</th>
<th>Assign permission/choose account</th>
<th>IP Rights</th>
<th>Description of work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Remove 'refereed' and 'non-refereed' qualifiers from article; this is covered by 'peer reviewed.'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List categories in alphabetical order with 'other' categories at the end.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why separate categories for Book, Bibliography (book), and Edited book</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add box for DOI, in section asking for other journal citation info</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearly state turnaround time (currently it is buried deep within the deposit process) (look at Harvard, CDL, UCSF forms, etc., first)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow attachments from the deposit form, for example, for permissions documented in correspondence (look at Harvard, CDL, UCSF forms, etc., first)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide more info on what happens when depositor chooses an embargo period on the deposit form. Ramifications or required follow-through at embargo expiration aren’t self-evident, and could raise many questions in the mind of the depositor. And what if the publisher asks for 12-month embargo but author is submitting six months in? (look at Harvard, CDL, UCSF forms, etc., first)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2. Summary of Enhancements
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enhancement</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
<th>Release with date</th>
<th>Already scheduled in that release</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCHEDULED RUCORE RELEASE</td>
<td>3/4/2013</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>API for OAI-PMH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHEDULED RUCORE RELEASE</td>
<td>5/22/2013</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>• Install Fedora 3.6.2 on staging&lt;br&gt; • Testing of R7.0 on staging&lt;br&gt; • PHP, service pack and Isilon firmware upgrades&lt;br&gt; • Post-release update of “legacy” objects to sha-256 checksums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHEDULED RUCORE RELEASE</td>
<td>7/31/2013</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>• DOI implementation specification (API spec complete)&lt;br&gt; • UI for landing page (spec complete)&lt;br&gt; • FD features&lt;br&gt; o html upload (spec complete)&lt;br&gt; o Ordering of author names&lt;br&gt; • Djvu java applet for the Yearbook portal&lt;br&gt; • Region added as Hierarchical-Geographical selection in WMS&lt;br&gt; • Post-release updating of legacy objects with DOIs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHEDULED RUCORE RELEASE</td>
<td>9/16/2013</td>
<td>7.2.1</td>
<td>Bugfix release</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHEDULED RUCORE RELEASE</td>
<td>10/24/2013</td>
<td>7.2.2</td>
<td>Yearbook release (provide jpeg page turner)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHEDULED RUCORE RELEASE</td>
<td>11/15/2013</td>
<td>7.2.3</td>
<td>Bugfix release</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.1.a.i-iii Revise record displays in test system, to parse journal citations</td>
<td>12/2/13</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHEDULED RUCORE RELEASE</td>
<td>12/31/2013</td>
<td>7.2.4</td>
<td>Bugfix release for the WMS timeout problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.c. Document and convey (to all WMS managers) workflow for ensuring new collections are implemented and configured correctly.</td>
<td>1/1/2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.1. OA Policy Implementation WG review test displays incorporating parsed journal citation metadata and NISO version terms.</td>
<td>1/31/2014</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Resolve issue of netID requirement for deposit</td>
<td>2/1/2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Establish and publicize clear policies re: RUcore staff making deposits required by funders</td>
<td>2/1/2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Due Date</td>
<td>Version</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHEDULED RUCORE RELEASE</td>
<td>2/28/2014</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• User account specification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Services (analytic, view list, view stats, deposit, notifications/alerts, etc)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Registration – create and edit profiles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Interaction with faculty deposit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Initial community capability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• View List specification (part of user accounts)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Authentication/authorization for user accounts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Optimality (ROA) authentication/authorization to enable upload of resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Update integrity checking/validate object</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use of Clam to virus scan the file system on all servers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Flesh out &quot;Open Access Policy&quot; webpage</td>
<td>4/1/2014</td>
<td>7.4, Late spring, 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Include cover page with every deposit</td>
<td>5/31/14</td>
<td>7.4, Late spring, 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHEDULED RUCORE RELEASE</td>
<td>5/31/2014</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• EADs – ingest and generation of the finding aid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• User Account Features</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission UI and architecture for Optimality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• WMS File handling, validation and metadata extraction (with exif, media tools)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• MP4 container and support for Wowza (incl. an Analytic update)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Threaded discussion for Analytics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Content models – add new ones, update picklist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Versioning (items #3, 4, and 5 from J. Otto specification)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• IP restriction capability (e.g. for limiting ETDs to Rutgers)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Google video sitemap with thumbnails</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Virus scanning for WMS, FD, dlr/EDIT and openETD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Revise Faculty Deposit form pages</td>
<td>6/1/2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHEDULED RUCORE RELEASE</td>
<td>8/31/2014</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.1. Revise bibliographic record displays, including changes to font, revision of genre/format terms, and link to published version</td>
<td>9/1/14</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.1. Send revised bibliographic record displays out for review</td>
<td>9/1/14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.2.a,b,c Provide search box with specified Browse options and A-Z bar</td>
<td>9/1/14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.2.d Provide specified search box pulldowns</td>
<td>9/1/14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.2.e Provide specified search limits</td>
<td>9/1/14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.2.f Provide specified sort options</td>
<td>9/1/14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.3 Enhance Faculty Deposit web page content</td>
<td>9/1/14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Revise metadata mapping from the Faculty Deposit application to WMS</td>
<td>9/1/2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- EADs – WMS automatic ingest of resource objects/creation of DAOs
- WMS – support for external relationships (rels-ext)
- Versioning for articles
- DOIs at the file level
- Faculty service enhancements (dynamic bibliography, stats updates, etc)
- Content models – retroactively update CMs to reflect new list
- RUetd-WMS update
- Schema for technical, source, and rights metadata
- Still images (jpeg2000) in analytics
- Update of discontinued content models to the approved list
- Faceted browsing
- Jpeg 2000 and page turner
- Upgrade of dynamic SOLR indexing using the partner portal code (moved from 7.3)
22. Fix existing bugs. For example, “deposit in process” indicator (circle) goes on indefinitely with no indication the process has been completed. 9/1/2014

1.1 Finalize revised bibliographic record displays for soft rollout 12/31/14

3. Enable dark deposits, including open metadata 12/31/14

4. Enable dynamic bibliography feature 12/31/14

7. Create a reporting mechanism to enable deans to request bibliographies of their schools’ deposits 12/31/14

8. Create a reporting mechanism to track deposits chronologically and by academic unit 12/31/14

9. Implement OrcidIDs 12/31/14

10.a. Provide notifications to repository staff when an embargo ends (so that postprint can be added to the record for the preprint) 12/31/14

10.b. Provide notification to depositor when the deposit is successfully completed 12/31/14

10.c. Provide notifications to depositor when a newer version has been added 12/31/14

10.d. Provide notifications to author when his or her work appears as the most downloaded article 12/31/14

11. Revise workflows to enable clear linking to the published version’s full citation, with live link to DOI (cf. above under Displays) 12/31/14

12. Provide a “Request a Copy” button and “View All Versions” link 12/31/14 7.5, Late summer, 2014

14.a. Fix statistics on the ‘Deposit Your Work’ page; they are incomprehensible and are differ significantly from those provided on the individual record display, in terms of number of downloads, and location of downloads 12/31/14

14.b. Remove Views statistics and simplify display accordingly 12/31/14

14.c. Consider a line graph (with options for cumulative and annual citation statistics) display, such as that provided by Microsoft Academic search. 12/31/14
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19.a. Ensure Rucore is configured to support search engine crawling in accordance with JISC InfoNet recommendations and Google Webmaster Guidelines</td>
<td>12/31/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.b. Verify search engine crawling is consistently implemented across collections in Google and Google Scholar</td>
<td>12/31/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Fix Share feature</td>
<td>12/31/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Revise the RUcore home page</td>
<td>12/31/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Provide a “Submit correction” button</td>
<td>12/31/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Remove ETDs from Faculty Deposit portal (tentative pending Working Group discussion)</td>
<td>12/31/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHEDULED RUCORE RELEASE</td>
<td>12/31/2014</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.5. Provide a form and process to collect statements about how the article was used or how the service is useful</td>
<td>3/1/15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Provide a My Account page modeled on arXiv</td>
<td>3/1/15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Add download citation feature like that found on publisher platforms</td>
<td>3/1/2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Enable marking of records to allow emailing, printing, exporting, etc.</td>
<td>3/1/2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Ensure PIRUS compliance</td>
<td>3/1/2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.a. Harvesting - discuss with MIT, UC, and others (CSC, etc.)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.b. Investigate requirements with individual repositories</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.c. Begin implementing, repository by repository</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Retrospectively add cover page and DOI to every existing deposit</td>
<td>9/31/14</td>
<td>7.5, Late summer, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9/31/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9/31/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- WMS – support for SWORD protocol
- OJS export using SWORD
- OpenETD export using SWORD
- WMS linking to ontologies
- Migrate to Fedora 4.0
Appendix 3. RUcore Release Summary with Target Dates

DRAFT
RUcore Release Summary – Specifications and Target Dates (R7.x)

1. **Release 7.0 – Large Files, Complex Objects, Faculty Deposit (Released, March 4, 2013)**
   Specifications
   - File Configurability - Complete
   - File hierarchy/structural map - Complete
   - Fedora checksums – Complete
   - Background ingest with alerting - Complete
   - Download statistics for the Faculty Portal - Complete
   - Faculty Deposit User Interface (more enhancements) - Complete
   - Complex object User Interface – download zip for object or select files from a directory display(see structural map specification) – Complete
   - API for OAI-PMH

2. **Release 7.1 – Upgrade to Fedora 3.6.2 (Released – May 22, 2013)**
   - Install Fedora 3.6.2 on staging
   - Testing of R7.0 on staging
   - PHP, service pack and Iselon firmware upgrades
   - Post-release update of “legacy” objects to sha-256 checksums

   Specifications
   - mss3 to RUcore migration – complete
   - DOI implementation specification (API spec complete)
   - Dynamic field indexing with SOLR - complete
   - UI for landing page (spec complete)
   - FD features
     - html upload (spec complete)
     - Ordering of author names
   - Djvu java applet for the Yearbook portal
   - Region added as Hierarchical-Geographical selection in WMS
   - Post-release updating of legacy objects with DOIs


   - Provide jpeg page turner


7. **Release 7.2.4 – Bugfix release for the WMS timeout problem**

   Specifications
   - User account specification
     - Services (analytic, view list, view stats, deposit, notifications/alerts, etc)
     - Registration – create and edit profiles
Interaction with faculty deposit
Interaction with faculty deposit
Initial community capability
• View List specification (part of user accounts)
• Authentication/authorization for user accounts
• Optimality (ROA) authentication/authorization to enable upload of resources
• Update integrity checking/validate object
• Use of Clam to virus scan the file system on all servers

9. Release 7.4 – EADs, ROA submission, MP4, Wowza, etc. (Code freeze-Spring, 2014, Release Target – Late Spring)

Specifications
• EADs – ingest and generation of the finding aid
• User Account Features
• Submission UI and architecture for Optimality
• WMS File handling, validation and metadata extraction (with exif, media tools)
• MP4 container and support for Wowza (incl. an Analytic update)
• Threaded discussion for Analytics
• Content models – add new ones, update picklist
• Versioning (items #3, 4, and 5 from J. Otto specification)
• IP restriction capability (e.g. for limiting ETDs to Rutgers)
• Google video sitemap with thumbnails
• Virus scanning for WMS, FD, dlr/EDIT and openETD

10. Release 7.5 – EADs, Versioning, Faceted browsing, jpeg 2000, etc. (Code Freeze Summer, 2014, Release Target – Late Summer)

Specifications
• EADs – WMS automatic ingest of resource objects/creation of DAOs
• WMS – support for external relationships (rels-ext)
• Versioning for articles
• DOIs at the file level
• Faculty service enhancements (dynamic bibliography, stats updates, etc)
• Content models – retroactively update CMs to reflect new list
• RUetd-WMS update
• Schema for technical, source, and rights metadata
• Still images (jpeg2000) in analytics
• Update of discontinued content models to the approved list
• Faceted browsing
• Jpeg 2000 and page turner
• Upgrade of dynamic SOLR indexing using the partner portal code (moved from 7.3)


• WMS – support for SWORD protocol
• OJS export using SWORD
• OpenETD export using SWORD
• WMS linking to ontologies
• Migrate to Fedora 4.0

rcj – 11/07/2013
posted to Sakai Nov. 19, 2013
Appendix 4
Revised Specifications for Browsing, Searching, Limiting, & Sorting (Section 1.2)
(revised sections in **red**)
added January 6, 2014

1. **RUcore Faculty Deposit Portal & Web Presence**

2. Enhance Faculty Deposit portal searching and display
   a) Follow DASH model of providing search box (with link to advanced search) with Browse options below; cf. [http://dash.harvard.edu/community-list](http://dash.harvard.edu/community-list)
   
   b) The link to each type of browse search should open up to the browsable list, with A-Z bar across top; cf. DASH author browse at [http://dash.harvard.edu/browse?type=author](http://dash.harvard.edu/browse?type=author) (however, remove order and Results pulldowns; order should be descending and results should be as many as reasonably possible. Exception: For title browse, present the default brief display, sorted by title; cf. DASH title browse at [http://dash.harvard.edu/browse?type=title](http://dash.harvard.edu/browse?type=title)
   
   c) Provide the following Browse searches with labels as indicated:
      - Authors - *retrieves all mods:name where type=personal and role=author*
      - Titles - *retrieves all mods:title where type=main or type=alternative*
      - Schools, Departments, and Centers (integrated alphabetical list of all; OA Policy Implementation Working Group will propose the vocabulary; Metadata Working Group will determine appropriate MODS element)
      - University organization (hierarchical list of schools, departments and centers; cf. Purdue repository: [http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/communities.html](http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/communities.html); OA Policy Implementation Working Group will propose vocabulary; Metadata Working Group will determine appropriate MODS element)
d) Provide the following search box pulldowns:
   
a. Full record - retrieves all indexed elements in full record
   b. Full text - retrieves all indexed elements in full record and any word from actual full text of article
   c. Author - retrieves all mods:name where type=personal and role=author
   d. Title - retrieves all mods:title where type=main or type=alternative
   e. Subject - retrieves mods:subject (topic, geographic, name)
   f. Abstract - retrieves all mods:abstract where type=abstract
   g. School, Department, Center – MDWG to determine element where these names will appear
   h. DOI – retrieves identifiers MODS:identifier type=doi or

-<mods:extension>
  -<rulib:descriptiveEvent>
    <rulib:type>Citation</rulib:type>
    <rulib:dateTime encoding="w3cdtf">2010</rulib:dateTime>
    -<rulib:associatedObject>
      <rulib:type>Journal</rulib:type>
      <rulib:relationship>Has part</rulib:relationship>
      <rulib:name>Cataloging & Classification Quarterly</rulib:name>
      <rulib:identifier type="volume and issue">48(5)</rulib:identifier>
      <rulib:reference type="doi">http://dx/doi.org/10.1080/0162</rulib:reference>
      <rulib:detail>403-422</rulib:detail>
    </rulib:associatedObject>
  </rulib:descriptiveEvent>
</mods:extension>

e) Provide the following limits:
   
a. Add checkbox: ☐ peer reviewed
   b. Add boxes for date range, preferably as a slider; cf. Searchlight.
      Date range -
      With year dates as pulldowns, including 'present' in the second box

f) Provide the following sort options:
   
a. Date of deposit [display chronologically in descending order] – where is this info? (by default: issue date; lacking issue date, go to create date, copyright date, etc.). Articles should not display in reverse chronological order of input.
   b. Date article created [display chronologically in descending order]
   c. Title
   d. Relevance
ATTACHMENT 6
REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (RFP)
for producing Video Spot for the Rutgers Open Access Policy
REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (RFP)

for producing Video Spot for the Rutgers Open Access Policy

Rutgers University Libraries and the University’s Open Access Policy Implementation Working Group are soliciting proposals for the creative development and production of a high-quality, catchy video spot (approximately two minutes) about the Rutgers Open Access Policy, which is expected to go into effect September 1, 2015.

Open Access means free access via the Internet to peer-reviewed scholarly research. Last fall the University Senate voted yes (in a near-unanimous vote) to an open access policy for Rutgers University.* Under the new policy, Rutgers authors deposit legal copies of scholarly articles into the University’s institutional repository (RUcore), at no cost to them, making scholarship freely accessible to readers and researchers on the Internet.

Open Access at Rutgers showcases all University scholarship in one place, preserves access over time, allows authors to retain rights to their works, and ensures greater visibility and impact for Rutgers research worldwide.

Open access is a hot topic in research universities and this video has the potential for high visibility. If quality of the production warrants, the Libraries may retain a separate team for broadly publicizing the video.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The purpose of the two-minute video is to inform Rutgers faculty and grad students about the policy, why open access is important, and to make a compelling case for these scholars’ participation. The video will serve as an introduction at presentations about the policy, be posted to the web to introduce Rutgers scholars to the idea, and may be publicized internationally as a model promotional tool for the global open access movement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Audience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The target audience is Rutgers scholars, both faculty and graduate students (doctoral and postdoc). Faculty range from assistant professors (often seeking to gain visibility, build their professional reputations, and demonstrate their research is making an impact) to distinguished professors whose reputations are long- and well-established.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Video Content and Style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The final production should be a snappy two-minute video somewhat similar in style to the ObamaCare video here: <a href="http://tinyurl.com/kga9as7">http://tinyurl.com/kga9as7</a> The appeal of this video lies in its ability to distill a complex topic to two minutes with a minimum of talking heads, using graphics, analogies, and some animation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* short clip available
The top three points to make in the video are:

- Share your research on the web far, wide, and fast
- More impact for you; more visibility for Rutgers scholarship
- Join other premier research institutions in the growing global open access movement

The video must reference the fact that implementation is coming soon: September 1, 2015.

Other facts and viewpoints for consideration and possible inclusion:

- See who’s reading your article, view usage statistics, market yourself
- Publish in your favorite journal at no cost to you; share a copy with Rutgers, make international impact.
- Submit your article at point of publication; it’s crawled by Google and readers anywhere find it fast
- Process is free, simple, and easy
- Open Access policies have been implemented at premier research universities like Harvard, MIT, Duke, Princeton, Cal Tech, University of California
- RUcore, the institutional repository, provides permanent links to your articles (DOIs), for posting to Academia, Mendeley, Facebook, LinkedIn, your own website and emails, etc.

Background information about open access and open access policies

- RUcore, the Rutgers institutional repository, is here: [http://rucore.libraries.rutgers.edu](http://rucore.libraries.rutgers.edu).
- More information about the Rutgers open access policy is here: [http://www.libraries.rutgers.edu/researchers/open_access](http://www.libraries.rutgers.edu/researchers/open_access).
- Without open access and open access policies, scholarship is only available to those affiliated with an institution with money to subscribe to the big journals. The life cycle of academic research is this: scholar does the research (for free), writes the paper (for free), finds the publisher, a colleague peer reviews the paper (for free), the scholar signs away the rights to the paper to the journal publisher, and the publisher sells it back to Rutgers at a hefty fee. (See video here: [http://tinyurl.com/jvh89b5](http://tinyurl.com/jvh89b5).) That process works; the policy just asks that the scholar also share a copy with the university.
- Although many Rutgers authors already deposit their work in a subject repository, Rutgers’ institutional repository (RUcore) gathers all Rutgers scholarship, in all disciplines, in one place, allowing Rutgers to be steward of its own scholarship.
- The policy will be prospectively applied (“From now on”—don’t worry about your past works)

† Graphics available
## Required Deliverables

1. **Workback schedule** of dates for all deliverables

2. **Storyboards** to be developed and submitted by the creative team prior to production, and approved by representatives of the University’s Open Access Policy Implementation Working Group.

3. **Rough cut** to be developed and submitted by the creative team, and approved by the representatives of the University’s Open Access Policy Implementation Working Group. At a minimum this would include all images laid end to end over a scratch narration track, with no animation or fx.

4. **Edits** required by the Working Group, up to two rounds without additional charge.

5. **Final production** to be delivered in MP4

The creative team is responsible for the script, storyboards, graphic elements, soundtrack, rights clearances, rough cut, and completed production. Some graphic elements may be available from the Working Group. If narration or other casting is required, the creative team will notify the Working Group; **casting choices are subject to approval by the Working Group.**

We encourage the creative team to ask questions, share useful images and ideas, and collaborate with the Open Access Policy Implementation Working Group.

## Required Proposal Format

The proposal must include at a minimum:

- Treatment or description of approach
- Budget (summary and detail)
- List of key personnel
- Description of experience
- Description of work relevant to this proposal
- Samples of work

## Proposal Submissions and Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Submissions due:</td>
<td>February 17, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews:</td>
<td>Week of February 24, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award date:</td>
<td>March 10, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion date:</td>
<td>June 1, 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Submit Proposal via email to:

- Co-Chairs of the Open Access Policy Implementation Working Group
- Rutgers University Libraries Advisory Committee

Jane Otto
  jiotto@rutgers.edu
  848-445-5950

Laura Bowering Mullen
  lbmullen@rulmail.rutgers.edu
  848-445-3663
Late responses will not be considered.

For Additional Information or Clarification, Contact:

Jane Otto
j jotto@rutgers.edu
848-445-5950

Evaluation of Proposals

The contract will be awarded based on:
- Understanding of project requirements
- Creativity of treatment
- Knowledge of subject matter
- Experience and achievements of members of the creative team
- Ability to provide deliverables to deadline

Contract Award

$20 per hour, not to exceed 25 hours. Bids may not exceed $500.
ATTACHMENT 7
Presentations & Consultations
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRESENTATION</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Libraries liaison brief intro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td></td>
<td>Libraries liaison brief intro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td></td>
<td>Libraries liaison brief intro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUL Faculty</td>
<td>March 9, 2012</td>
<td>presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUL Advisory Committee</td>
<td>March 26, 2012</td>
<td>presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark Faculty Council</td>
<td>April 2, 2012</td>
<td>presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden Faculty of Arts &amp; Sciences and professional schools</td>
<td>April 9, 2012</td>
<td>presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEBS Chairs Council</td>
<td>April 25, 2012</td>
<td>presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVPAA's Council</td>
<td>May 7, 2012</td>
<td>presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Brunswick Faculty Council</td>
<td>May 11, 2012</td>
<td>presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School-New Brunswick Executive Council</td>
<td>May 22, 2012</td>
<td>presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUL Faculty</td>
<td>June 15, 2012</td>
<td>presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Senate</td>
<td>October 19, 2012</td>
<td>presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUL Faculty</td>
<td>October 26, 2012</td>
<td>presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of the Libraries (presentation)</td>
<td>November 28, 2012</td>
<td>presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of the Libraries (poster)</td>
<td>November 28, 2012</td>
<td>presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genetics retreat</td>
<td>May 21, 2013</td>
<td>presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QQML, Rome</td>
<td>June 4, 2013</td>
<td>presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Wood Johnson librarians</td>
<td>September 9, 2013</td>
<td>presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Langley consultation, Princeton/COAPI</td>
<td>October 11, 2013</td>
<td>consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith Library</td>
<td>October 16, 2013</td>
<td>presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Suber, Sue Kriegsman, Emily Kilcer, HOAP, Harvard</td>
<td>October 18, 2013</td>
<td>consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPARC/World Bank</td>
<td>October 21, 2013</td>
<td>event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBHS faculty</td>
<td>October 22, 2013</td>
<td>presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Engineering</td>
<td>October 25, 2013</td>
<td>presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RULAC update</td>
<td>December 11, 2013</td>
<td>presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey Medical School, Newark</td>
<td>December 12, 2013</td>
<td>presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabinet update</td>
<td>October 29, 2013</td>
<td>presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUL Faculty</td>
<td>November 8, 2013</td>
<td>presentation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ATTACHMENT 8
Rutgers OA Policy Printable Factsheet (revised since last meeting)
The Rutgers Open Access Policy

The Rutgers University Senate, on October 19, 2012, overwhelmingly passed a resolution to

“establish, in consultation with University Counsel, a University-wide Open Access policy wherein Rutgers faculty and scholars, including graduate students and postdoctoral researchers, shall provide open access to all works that are produced without expectation of payment, subject to waivers and embargoes upon request by an individual author for a specific work. …”

In practice, this means

Rutgers authors deposit legal copies of scholarly articles into the University’s digital repository (RUcore), at no cost to them, making scholarship freely accessible to readers and researchers on the Internet.

Open Access at Rutgers showcases all University scholarship in one place, preserves access over time, allows authors to retain rights to their works, and ensures greater visibility and impact for Rutgers research worldwide.

Implementation planning by a University-wide team is currently underway

OPEN ACCESS AND THE RUTGERS MISSION

Responsibility of a public research university
Greater visibility for Rutgers scholarship
Facilitates Rutgers strategic goals of greater international impact and collaboration
Builds on earlier Rutgers OA initiatives (Electronic Theses and Dissertations, FRPAA)
Responds to outside funder mandates (e.g., NIH)
Aligns Rutgers with AAU colleague institutions

OPEN ACCESS POLICY AT RUTGERS

- For all Rutgers faculty and scholars
- Scholarly articles (as publisher allows)
- Prospectively applied
- Accommodates disciplinary differences
- Embargoes, opt-outs and waivers for any given article
- Rutgers and authors retain some rights
- Focus on public access for readers/researchers

RUcore, THE RUTGERS REPOSITORY

- Already includes articles, RU dissertations
- Crawled by Google
- Disseminates Rutgers research sooner
- Demonstrates impact through usage data
- Provides permanent links (DOIs) authors can use
- Underlying data can link with publication itself
- Simple and easy for authors
RESOURCES

Open Access Overview - http://www.earlham.edu/~peters/fos/overview.htm
Budapest Open Access Initiative - http://www.budapestopenaccessinitiative.org/
SPARC (Scholarly Publishing & Academic Resources Coalition) on Open Access
http://www.arl.org/sparc/openaccess/index.shtml
ROARMAP (Registry of Open Access Repositories Mandatory Archiving Policies) - http://roarmap.eprints.org
RUcore, the Rutgers institutional repository - http://rucore.libraries.rutgers.edu
RUresearch data portal in RUcore - http://rucore.libraries.rutgers.edu/research
Open Access by Peter Suber (MIT Press) - http://mitpress.mit.edu/books/open-access

Check your journal or publisher’s policies at the SHERPA/RoMEO website:
http://www.sherpa.ac.uk/romeo

SELECTED INSTITUTIONS WITH OPEN ACCESS POLICIES (http://roarmap.eprints.org)

Duke University http://library.duke.edu/openaccess/duke-openaccess-policy.html
Harvard (FAS, Business, Law School, Medical School) http://osc.hul.harvard.edu/policies
Mass. Institute of Technology http://libraries.mit.edu/sites/scholarly/mit-open-access/open-access-at-mit/mit-open-access-policy
Princeton University http://www.princeton.edu/dof/policies/publ/fac/open-access/open-access-policy/
Rice University http://professor.rice.edu/uploadedFiles/Professor/Faculty_Senate/Motion%20open%20access-4%20April%2018%281%29.pdf
Stanford University School of Education http://ed.stanford.edu/faculty-research/open-archive/oapolicy
University of California (entire system) http://osc.universityofcalifornia.edu/openaccesspolicy/OpenAccess_adopted_072413.pdf
University of Kansas http://osc.universityofcalifornia.edu/openaccesspolicy/OpenAccess_adopted_072413.pdf

SENATE RGPEC OPEN ACCESS SUBCOMMITTEE

Jane Otto (Chair), Senator; Media & Music Metadata Librarian, Rutgers University Libraries
Robert M. Goodman, Senator; Executive Dean of Agriculture and Natural Resources; Executive Dean, SEBS;
Executive Director, New Jersey Agricultural Experiment Station
Victor Greenhut, Senator; Professor, Materials Science and Engineering
Jerome J. Kukor, Senator; Professor and Dean, Graduate School – New Brunswick
Laura Bowering Mullen, Co-Chair, RUL Committee on Scholarly Communication; Behavioral Sciences Librarian
John Ottomanelli, Senator; Ph.D. candidate; alumni representative to the Senate

For the full Senate Open Access Subcommittee report, including policy and resolution, go to
http://senate.rutgers.edu/RGPEConS1103onOpenAccessOctober2012.pdf
or go to the Rutgers Open Access Policy website
http://www.libraries.rutgers.edu/researchers/open_access

Questions or comments may be directed to
Jane Otto (jjotto@rulmail.rutgers.edu) or Laura Bowering Mullen (lbmullen@rci.rutgers.edu)
ATTACHMENT 9
was a spreadsheet of all Rutgers Academic Units
ATTACHMENT 10
Timeline (revised since last meeting)
TIMELINE
RUcore Enhancements for Open Access Policy Implementation

- Senate passes Open Access Policy Resolution (October 19, 2012)
- President Barchi signs off (February 19, 2013)
- Dr. Barchi asks Dick Edwards (Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs) to assign the work of developing an implementation plan
- Dr. Edwards asks Ken Breslauer (then Interim Vice President for Research and Economic Development) and Marianne Gaunt to utilize an existing committee
- The Rutgers University Libraries Advisory Committee (RULAC) accepts the charge and assigns the work to the Open Access Policy Implementation Working Group, a subset of RULAC members, plus two graduate students; Laura Mullen and Jane Otto are appointed co-chairs
- Cabinet establishes as a very high priority the RUcore development work required for the Open Access Policy Implementation, with work to be completed by Spring 2015, including user testing along the way of the interface and process. Cabinet recommends that the Open Access Policy Implementation Working Group develop a more detailed list of deliverables up to the Spring 2015 soft launch.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December, 2014</td>
<td>Final report delivered to RULAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty deposit enhancements in place; “All Systems Go”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring, 2015</td>
<td>Soft launch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 1: Encourage participation (start following faculty participation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 2: Expect participation (work with deans)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 1, 2015</td>
<td>Hard launch; Day One (splash day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public launch with press release to outside world</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>