



Kultur Project Plan

Overview of Project

1. Background

Institutional digital repositories have established a significant profile in the pattern of scholarly communication, and are recognised as an integral element of the common information and communications environment. Digital repositories focused at institutional level are proving successful at leveraging access to a range of research and learning outputs beyond the boundaries of traditional publishing, and at providing institutions with a coordinated corporate approach to managing and promoting their digital assets.

Institutional repositories, however, are still very much in a developmental phase with significant issues of open access, metadata, preservation and sustainability still in the process of being charted. There are very different levels of repository take-up and expertise in HE, and significant gaps in terms of the perceived capability of institutional repositories to provide for research output for non-text based outputs. This is in part related to issues of software formatting and access profiling,¹ but if this range of material is going to be made available to the research and learning community, the issues surrounding populating repositories need to be resolved. Evidence still shows that this is the weakest link in the access chain. The arts community lacks a framework of established practice for capturing their artefacts and activities in digital form.

Attention has turned recently to understanding the imbalance in take-up between deposit in science, technology and medicine where the nature of scholarly publication is changing in response to initiatives associated with open access and repositories, and that in the arts and humanities. At the conference *Moving Towards Open Access* at Keble College, Oxford in September 2006, discipline differences formed the backdrop to debates.² On the whole it was believed that academics in the arts might prefer the institutional repository route to exposing research content rather than the open access journal route, but the overall level of deposit was still low, and there were significant barriers, both technical and cultural, to overcome. Possible priorities to be addressed were awareness and understanding, and managing disciplinary differences. Within the arts disciplines interesting issues are emerging including the use of the repository as an alternative to a journal, peer review, and impact on the student and wider communities.

The aim of the KULTUR Consortium is to address these issues within a discipline area particularly underdeveloped for repositories: research output in the creative and applied arts. The core deliverable, a policy and technical framework for creating a multimedia, multifunctional repository, will be applicable both to specialist institutions and departments across the sector, and by extension to potential cross-domain users, museums, galleries and performing arts, with whom there are strong links within these disciplines. The project is focused both at the technical level, primarily through the software configuration and deployment of *EPrints.org*, and at the institutional level by developing

¹ see <http://www.leeds.ac.uk/library/midess/MIDESS%20workpackage%202%20-%20Functional%20and%20Technical%20Requirements%20Specification.pdf>. This reviewed software in terms of ability to handle a variety of file formats, and compatibility with standards such as OAI-PMH and OAI.

² There is a report on the conference at http://www.jisc.ac.uk/events/2006/09/event_oaconf_0906.aspx.

effective practice for managing multimedia deposit, population and advocacy, dissemination and preservation. An important output is the transfer of experience and expertise across the sector, supporting those working in the field to translate their mode of scholarly communication into digital form.

2. Aims and Objectives

The overall aim of the KULTUR Consortium is to create a transferable and sustainable institutional repository model for research output in the creative and applied arts, a discipline area where repository development is so far underdeveloped.

Objectives:

1. Establish a model of shared practice across the sector between a mature repository in the research sector and other HE institutions.
2. Use EPrints software to set up two pilot multimedia, multifunctional repositories for the University of the Arts, London, and the University College for the Creative Arts, which will be made available early on in the project to aid advocacy and provide the basis for metadata analysis.
3. Establish an acceptable use model for rights issues related to artistic and cultural outputs which can be included in institutional repositories.
4. Investigate a metadata, preservation, curation and access framework as an exemplar for managing material in the visual and creative arts compatible with evolving international standard and the work of a national datacentre (the Visual Arts Data Service).
5. Ensure that the repository is effective in reaching out to audiences both within Higher Education and to potential cross-domain users and assess author behaviours in order to develop policies suitable to the management, promotion and populating of the repository.

3. Overall Approach

3.1 Strategy and methodology

Based on the experience of developing the research repository at Southampton,³ the project will create working repositories for the creative and applied arts at the University of Southampton, the University of the Arts London, and the University College for the Creative Arts at Canterbury, Epsom, Farnham, Maidstone and Rochester, whose combined subject interests cover a wide spectrum of cultural outputs.⁴ On the technical side the project will refine the use of software to develop a flexible repository structure by defining specialist metadata and formats for the model of a central repository. The project will then investigate how metadata and distinctive formats required by the discipline can be matched with the concept of a central repository for the creative and applied arts.⁵ This will review existing models and practices for repository structures, and will consider the scalability of the management of complex metadata types in repositories.

³ see Hey, Jessie M N, White, Wendy, Simpson, Pauline, Brown, Mark and Lucas, Natasha (2006) Fast flows the stream: tackling the workflow challenge with the University of Southampton Research Repository. At, *Open Scholarship 2006: New Challenges for Open Access Repositories*, Glasgow, UK, 18-20 October 2006. <http://eprints.soton.ac.uk/41913/>.

⁴ institutional profiles are included as Appendix A.

⁵ this report indicated that was limited in its functionality to manage the deposit of this type of material. The team consider that this is more a reflection of the current users than a limitation on the software itself. EPrints is able to manage multimedia submission, see the Serpent Project at <http://serpent.org/>. The proposed project would develop this in the context of the creative and applied arts.

The project is based on the premise that adoption and deposit by researchers is strengthened when there are distinctive discipline structures and policies. It will explore the extent to which, where there is a different community with different requirements, and a different understanding of their scholarly aims, it is more effective to create separate repositories within an *uber* institutional repository with a collective policy framework. The structure will be organic, with the creation of the metadata and format structure based on expert input from the disciplines. It is designed therefore to be primarily user, rather than technology, led, with user input integrated into existing national and international standards and best practice. The implications for output and access for non-text based material will also be explored.⁶

This approach underpins the core of the proposal, which is to investigate the ways in which institutions, research groups and individual academics working in these areas can be encouraged to create and deposit digital representatives of their work, and to create working repositories as exemplars for the discipline area. By engaging in a collaboration between two specialist institutions working with these disciplines, and a mature repository with a history of successful advocacy, the project can share practice and work through the barriers and incentives for academics to deposit their material.⁷ As the disciplines themselves are by their nature working across sectoral boundaries, this will provide a framework for reviewing cross-sectoral as well as cross-domain boundaries. This cross-domain aspect will be represented at Southampton by internal collaboration with the Hansard Gallery,⁸ and the Winchester Gallery.⁹

Two project officers, one in each partner institution, will lead the advocacy and populating process, developing technical and user profiles in their specialist areas and interacting with the Project Manager and the technical project officer at Southampton. Southampton will act as a development and testing hub. To facilitate early adoption, it is proposed that Southampton will host demonstration repositories for each of the two sites, and allow work locally to focus on analysis and advocacy. At the same time Southampton will further develop the cultural repository at Southampton with input from the galleries and creative arts activity at the Winchester School of Art, a constituent part of the University. As the two institutions build their infrastructure support, responsibility for the repositories will move across.

This approach will provide a three way perspective, underpinned by the broad based knowledge and expertise of the digital environment provided by the Visual Arts Data Service (VADS). VADS will be a project partner, and will contribute expertise in the areas of IPR, image data and metadata standards, knowledge of the needs of the visual arts community, expertise in digital preservation and user interfaces. Through VADS the project will also have a link with practice in using digital visual arts data in digital learning objects, and the harvesting of distributed multimedia resources.

3.2 Issues to be addressed

Advocacy

The project will benefit from interaction with the Leiden University as an associate partner outside the UK. Leiden University will, as associated partner, investigate the ways in which research groups and individual academics working in the Art History Department and the Faculty of Creative and Performing Arts can be encouraged to create and deposit digital representatives of their work. Findings will be analysed and reported to the partners within the project. Over the past 4 years the Open Access Leiden team has gained some insight into drivers for individual academics within the different Faculties as to why to include a repository into their publication culture, or why just not yet. It is recognized that usage of a repository in a discipline's scholarly communication depends heavily, though not exclusively, on the publication culture.

⁶ The JISC funded CLIC project has provided a useful background with a review of institutional and technical barriers owners face in image collection building and indicated the value of national initiatives could help in sharing and embedding the collections within the wider national FE and HE sectors. See <http://www.oucs.ox.ac.uk/ltg/projects/clic/>.

⁷ The University of Southampton completed a major JISC funded advocacy project in 2002-5 see TARDIS <http://tardis.org/>. Work on local advocacy was also carried out by SHERPA Plus <http://www.sherpa.ac.uk/projects/sherpaplus.html>.

⁸ <http://www.hansardgallery.org.uk/>.

⁹ <http://www.hansardgallery.org.uk/haaf/Winchester/Winchester.htm>.

In addition, an environmental study, and an advocacy workshop, involving partners alongside the Arts Institute at Bournemouth and Goldsmiths College, University of London, will address advocacy issues.

Policy Issues

Local policy requirements will be investigated, and the partner institutions will outline submission and content policies for their repositories, determining what kind of material can be submitted and by whom.

Copyright/IPR

A copyright process will be established in collaboration with the partners. This will detail whose responsibility it is to check the copyright of submitted items, and outline the procedures for clearing copyright. The project will also investigate a nuanced copyright/ fair use agreement that would allow users access to certain data without the requirement that the data is made public. In addition, a guidance document explaining copyright issues to repository users will be produced – an output which will be used within the cultural community.

Access Management

Issues of access management will be addressed by outlining user criteria and depositing method. The project will also investigate how best to manage authentication processes and authorial rights, drawing on the experience of developing and managing the research repository at Southampton. The ways in which users access files will also be evaluated as part of the project.

Technical integration

The repositories will have a relationship with each other, and will ultimately be embedded into the technical infrastructure at each host institution. The project will investigate the technical framework required to integrate the repositories into the political, cultural and research environments of the partners.

3.3 Scope

Pilot repositories

The pilot repositories will be set up and hosted at Southampton, while data and management will be developed locally. The repositories will initially be populated from existing data within the institutions, with the intention that they will expand to house new data. An initial scoping study of the creative arts research culture(s) will determine the range of material to be included, which, combined with the pilot repositories, will provide a basis for advocacy within the institutions

Metadata and rights frameworks

Metadata and rights structures relevant for managing artistic and cultural works will be developed and tested. These will determine a best practice method for optimising repository content. The metadata structures will be developed reflecting local policies, and will be reviewed during the software enhancement phase.

Assessment of author behaviours and audience response

The perceptions of the key institutions of the repository will be reviewed in order to assess perceived barriers, and promote strategies to overcome them. The responses of the users of the repository, both within Higher Education and externally, will be reviewed to assess its impact on the artistic and cultural community. User feedback will inform an interface design and usability assessment.

Curation and preservation

A model for long-term data curation and preservation for the repositories will be established in line with current guidelines being developed by the VADS and the Data Curation Centre (DCC), and reflect practical opinions being scoped by JISC preservation standards. This will entail interaction with existing preservation projects, such as PRESERV2 and Sherpa DP. The main focus will be on ensuring that the media used for outputs is defined and registered in the metadata.

3.4 Critical success factors

The project's success is particularly dependent on the following factors:

1. Effective communication between partners and across a dispersed project team
2. Robustness of the technical infrastructure supporting the repositories
3. Successful engagement with the creative arts academic community
4. An accurate environmental assessment, which identifies the main barriers and incentives to the successful population of repositories within these research cultures.
5. The repositories becoming well known and used within research environments and by potential cross-domain users, though links with galleries, museums and the performing arts.
6. The successful deployment of outputs in other environments, including learning and teaching

4. Project Outputs

Tangible deliverables

1. Project management documentation, including detailed work plan, bi-annual progress reports and final report to the JISC, technical report, workflow diagrams, project website, email discussion list and email archive for project staff, signed consortium agreement, dissemination programme, evaluation plan
2. Environmental analysis report
3. Development of repository capabilities, including two pilot repositories for the partner institutions
4. Metadata structure for artistic and cultural outputs
5. A rights framework policy
6. Copyright guidance for users
7. Assessment report on author behaviours and audience responses and a framework for enhancing the repository
8. Advice on the implications for the curation and preservation of artistic and cultural material
9. Advocacy workshop
10. One day activity conference to encourage community awareness of the project
11. Published articles disseminating information on the project and its outputs to the academic and professional communities

Knowledge and experience

- A working model of a sustainable institutional repository for research output in the visual and applied arts providing a framework for effective practice in managing and promoting non-text based research outputs.
- A transferable model of an *uber* repository based on providing flexibility in matching metadata and indexing to discipline needs.
- An application of a model of shared practice across the sector between a mature repository in the research sector and other HE institutions.
- A metadata, preservation and access framework as an exemplar for managing material in the visual and creative arts compatible with evolving international standards and the work of a national datacentre (VADS).

- A framework for cross-sectoral, cross-domain partnership in the visual and creative arts.

5. Project Outcomes

Outcomes for EPrints

EPrints' built-in schema will be enhanced with respect to artistic and cultural outputs

Outcomes for the project partners

Successful academic communication will enable the transfer of experience and expertise across the sector to support those working in the field to translate their mode of scholarly communication into digital form.

The creation of two pilot repositories will enable the partner institutions to retain, manage and promote their research outputs, increasing visibility and impact. The repositories will also facilitate the re-use of deposited materials for new teaching and learning.

Broader outcomes for the creative arts community

As there has been very little development of the Institutional Repository (IR) in the UK HE art and design sector, scoping the nature of an IR in an arts context would bring a number of benefits:

- IR that will be specialising in formats and representing communities that are currently underdeveloped in terms of IR
- A greater understanding of what research outputs constitute within this community of practice, and how they are used and re-used
- Greater acknowledgement and recognition of practice based research outputs
- A greater understanding of the application of metadata to digital objects in art and design
- An exploration of specific rights issues, and possible licences, that apply to the creative arts
- An initial step towards the longer-term preservation of institutional research outputs
- An exploration of the value of linking work in the academic environment to a broader cultural environment

6. Stakeholder Analysis

Stakeholder	Interest / stake	Importance
JISC	Funder, promoter of IRs; Kultur findings of use to future JISC projects	High
University of Southampton	Grant Holder, investment in project and employer of staff. Project will develop the cultural content of Southampton's repository. EPrints software and services will be enhanced with respect to artistic and cultural outputs	High
University of the Arts London	Project Partner, investment in project and employer of project staff. Will benefit from the development of an IR to manage and showcase research and learning materials	High
University College for the Creative	Project Partner, investment in project and	High

Arts at Canterbury, Epsom, Farnham, Maidstone and Rochester	employer of project staff. Will benefit from the development of an IR to manage and showcase research and learning materials	
VADS	Project Partner, important for developing long-term preservation strategy, and for advising on metadata standards and IPR. Some intersection with VADS' work on developing Image and Moving Image Application Profiles.	High
Leiden University	Associate Partner, exchange of experience and knowledge of IR advocacy,	Medium
Researchers	Greater representation of research communities currently underdeveloped in terms of IR. Academics benefiting as most important user group – as depositors and information seekers	High
HE Students	User group – improved access to up-to-date research	Medium
Creative Arts community	User group – improved visibility of research material enhances links with academic community	Medium
AHRC and other funding bodies	Repository increases visibility of publicly funded research, and thus accountability of funding bodies. Repository should be particularly relevant to the new AHRC 'Beyond the Text' programme.	Medium

7. Risk Analysis

Risk	Probability (1-5)	Severity (1-5)	Score (P x S)	Action to Prevent/Manage Risk
Staffing				
Retention	2	3	6	Maintain strong inter-institutional links; integrate activity as far as possible into mainstream developments within institutions.
Skills	2	3	6	Maintain skills profiles and ensure effective recruitment; put in place a training programme for project members and establish external links to buy in skills on a short-term basis.
Organisational				
Project Management	2	5	10	Use expertise in the area to recruit suitable candidates; maintain strong team-working; clear definition of responsibilities; forward monitoring of project plan; regular meetings of Project Management Board.
Budget/schedule overrun	2	3	6	Budget presentation based on realistic assessment of need. Clear breakdown of timescale for each workpackage.
Over-demanding agenda	2	3	6	Careful prioritisation.

Technical				
Technical viability	2	4	8	Existing team and experience; analyse technical options early on in the project; review technical infrastructure options regularly.
Legal				
Copyright issues	3	4	12	Input of VADS in terms of expertise; focused advocacy; technical and policy solutions to manage IPR.
Other				
Advocacy fails	2	2	4	Ensure experience and approach is transferred very early; engage significant stakeholders within institutions; ensure effective communication strategy; work from a user led perspective.
Low response rate to surveys	2	1	2	Ensure user surveys are succinct and carefully targeted for intended audiences; vary mode of collecting responses; time surveys effectively to avoid certain periods (eg start of term for surveys aimed at academics)
Preservation strategy	1	2	2	Expertise and knowledge of VADS, and Soton PRESERV project; scope profile effectively.
Framework fails to meet user perceptions of value	2	3	6	Maintain close relations with intended audiences; ensure adequate skills within the team to provide effective knowledge base for design and monitoring.
Sustainability	2	4	8	Establish initial framework based on realistic appraisal of options; ensure stakeholders are committed to sustainability.

8. Standards

Name of standard or specification	Version	Notes
		Appropriate metadata standards for repository content will be investigated and evaluated as part of the project (Work Package 4). This process will be informed by VADS' work on developing an Images Application Profile and Moving Images Application Profile, due for completion early 2008. Standards under consideration will include Dublin Core for text-based outputs and VRA4 for images
		Appropriate archival and delivery formats for images, sound and film files will be investigated as part of WPs 3 and 4
OAI-PMH		For metadata harvesting
OAI-ORE		For object reuse and interoperability
SWORD		For repository deposit
SWAP		Scholarly Works Application Profile

XHTML		For project website
PDF		For project documentation on website

9. Technical Development

Kultur will adopt relevant technical standards (such as OAI ORE, SWAP and SWORD) in order to improve interoperability between repositories and is committed to the service-oriented approach of the JISC e-Framework for Education and Research. KULTUR development will be carried out mainly by the EPrints team at Southampton who have seven years experience of repository development and several years experience of working with and supporting third party clients. An extra management activity has been identified within Southampton specifically to integrate the technical development and outcomes of Kultur with the parallel development of the EPrints platform and the existing institutional repository.

10. Intellectual Property Rights

This project is part of a continuing exploration of the open source, open access environment. Metadata schema and repository enhancements will be part of EPrints open source software available to the community. As much as possible of the content will be made available as open access.

It is recognised that making material in the creative and applied arts available on open access poses particular issues relating to copyright restrictions. Workpackage 6 will provide an overview of these issues and provide a framework within which the project outcomes will be delivered. Reference will be made to existing practice, including the recent work on access by JISC/SURF.¹⁰ The partners are committed to the repurposing of material held in the repositories for learning and teaching.

Project Resources

11. Project Partners

Partner	Role	Contacts
JISC	Project funder	Andrew McGregor , Programme Manager – a.mcgregor@jisc.ac.uk
University of Southampton	Project lead	Mark Brown , University Librarian and Project Director – mlb@soton.ac.uk Wendy White , Institutional Repository Manager – whw@soton.ac.uk Victoria Sheppard , Project Manager – vms@soton.ac.uk Tim Miles-Board , Technical Project Officer – tmb@ecs.soton.ac.uk Leslie Carr , Eprints Liaison, lac@ecs.soton.ac.uk
University of the Arts London	Primary project partner	Jess Crilly , Learning Resources Manager - j.crilly@arts.ac.uk Pat Christie , Director of Library and Learning Resources, p.christie@arts.ac.uk Sarah Mahurter , Manager of Archives and Special Centre, s.mahurter@arts.ac.uk Shân Wareing , Dean of Learning and Teaching Development, s.wareing@arts.ac.uk

¹⁰ see Copyright management for scholarship SURF/JISC <http://www.surf.nl/copyright/aboutus.php>

		Project Officer - tbc
University College for the Creative Arts at Canterbury , Epsom, Farnham, Maidstone and Rochester	Primary project partner	Rosemary Lynch , Director of Library and Learning Centres - rlynch@ucreative.ac.uk Mike Hibbert , Head of Computing and IT – mhibbert@ucreative.ac.uk Hilarie Graham , Director of Teaching and Learning - hgraham@ucreative.ac.uk Project Officer - tbc
The Visual Arts Data Service (VADS)	Project partner	Mick Eadie , Assistant Director of Service – mick@vads.ahds.ac.uk
Leiden University	Associate partner	tbc

The partners intend to sign the consortium agreement at the next partner meeting, scheduled for the 31st October 2007.

12. Project Management

The project will be managed by a Project Manager based at Southampton, who will cross-manage all of the work packages to ensure the cohesion of the overall project. Each of the Project Officers based at the partner institutions will be responsible for developing the local environment within their institution, and liaising with the EPrints team within the Department of Electronics and Computer Science (ECS). The Project Manager will join the existing Institutional Repository Steering Group at Southampton which meets fortnightly and will liaise regularly with all partners via email, telephone and telephone-conferencing, and by making site visits.

The Project Manager and the three project officers will form the Project Management Group, chaired by the current Institutional Repositories Manager, Wendy White. The Group will meet quarterly, or when necessary.

The Project Director currently chairs the Institutional Repository Steering Group, and will chair the Project Board, which will meet twice a year. The Project Board comprises:

Mark Brown, Project Director
 Jess Crilly, representative from UAL
 Rosemary Lynch, representative from UCCA
 Victoria Sheppard, Project Manager

Project Team:

Role	Role holder	Allocation of time	Responsibilities and reporting
Project Director	Mark Brown	As required	Overall responsibility for the project and its budget, supervision of Project Manager
Institutional Repositories Manager	Wendy White	As required	Chair of Project Management Group. Reports to the Project Director
Project Manager	Victoria Sheppard	1.0	Overall project management and monitoring, liason and coordination with partners, regular reporting, editing of project web site, dissemination programme. Reports to Project Director
2 x Project Officers	tbc	2 x 1.0	Leading a scoping study to develop technical and user profiles, leading the advocacy and population process, participating in the development of appropriate metadata and rights framework.

			Reports to Project Manager.
ECS Technical Project Officer	Tim Miles-Board	1.0	Developing and testing institutional repositories for partners. Reports to Project Manager
Budget Manager	Richard Wake	As required	Management of the budget for the project. Reports to the Project Director.
VADS representative	Mick Eadie	Consultancy	Providing advice on IPR, metadata standards, preservation and curation.

We are in the process of agreeing the configuration of a steering group with the project partners.

13. Programme Support

Where required, we will make use of the JISC Repositories Support Project

14. Budget

See Appendix A. No changes from the proposal.

Detailed Project Planning

15. Workpackages

See appendix B for a description of the work packages.

16. Evaluation Plan

There will be both formative and summative evaluation. Formative evaluation will take place at the end of each of the workpackages to ensure that objectives were met, and any lessons learned incorporated into further work. Summative evaluation will take place at the end of the project as part of the final report.

Timing	Factor to Evaluate	Questions to Address	Method(s)	Measure of Success
Ongoing - formative	Overall implementation of project	Have milestones been met on schedule and to budget? Is project management effective?	Assessed in bi-annual progress reports to JISC; monitoring of progress at project meetings	Workpackages completed on time and to budget; approval of documentation by JISC
Ongoing	Outreach to stakeholders	Are dissemination and advocacy activities targeted appropriately?	Feedback; peer review	
Months 20-24	Impact of IRs within research community	Are the IRs being successfully populated? Are the outputs being used and re-used?	Monitoring number of researchers engaged in deposit, number and variety of items in IRs, and ways in which content is	Meeting quantitative targets

			being used	
Months 22-24 Summative	Overall achievements of project, and its usefulness to wider community	Have the aims and objectives been met? Was the methodology effective? What lessons have we learnt? What are the implications for future work?	JISC final report	Approval of Final Report

17. Quality Plan

There is already a quality assessment process in place for repositories at Southampton, which can be adapted within the partner institutions.

Project management (WP1)					
Output	Quality criteria	QA method(s)	Evidence of compliance	Quality responsibilities	Quality tools (if applicable)
Ongoing	Project outputs delivered on time and fit for purpose; adherence to JISC project management guidelines	Evaluation process; project meetings providing monitoring and feedback	Through regular progress and final evaluation reports delivered to JISC; correspondence with programme manager; outputs completed on time and documentation made available on project website	Project manager, Programme Manager and Project Director.	

Environmental assessment					
Output	Quality criteria	QA method(s)	Evidence of compliance	Quality responsibilities	Quality tools (if applicable)
Months 7-10	Validity; fitness for purpose	Methodology for scoping research community approved by Project Board; draft report circulated to Board for comments	Approval of methodology and applicability of report findings	Partner Project Officers, Project Board	

Development of Institutional Repositories					
Output	Quality criteria	QA method(s)	Evidence of compliance	Quality responsibilities	Quality tools (if applicable)
Months 8-20	Fitness for purpose; compliance with technical standards; usability and accessibility	Monitoring by stakeholders; consultation with and feedback from academic community	Stakeholder approval; population of IR; positive user feedback	Technical Officer, Partner Project Officers, Project Manager (Project Management Group)	

	for target groups				
--	-------------------	--	--	--	--

Output Metadata and rights frameworks developed for artistic and cultural outputs					
Timing	Quality criteria	QA method(s)	Evidence of compliance	Quality responsibilities	Quality tools (if applicable)
Months 9-24	Compliance with formal standards; clear process in place for checking copyright	Consultation on IPR and metadata for images and multimedia; review of rights issues in creative arts.	IPR policy developed and copyright documentation for users in place	VADS and Project Management Group	

Output Framework for enhancing repository					
Timing	Quality criteria	QA method(s)	Evidence of compliance	Quality responsibilities	Quality tools (if applicable)
Months 12-24	Usability and accessibility for target groups	User survey on design, metadata and overall usability aimed at authors as well as multiple audiences; survey of stakeholder institutions and their perceptions of repository	Positive feedback from user surveys; successful population of IRs; breadth of object types held in repository	Feedback from stakeholders. Project management Group. Technical Officer responsible for software enhancement.	

Output Curation and preservation model					
Timing	Quality criteria	QA method(s)	Evidence of compliance	Quality responsibilities	Quality tools (if applicable)
Months 18-24	Conforms to standards of best practice	Consultation on curation and preservation from VADS and JISC-funded projects on preservation	Policies developed and approved	VADS and Project Management Group	

Output Publicity and dissemination					
Timing	Quality criteria	QA method(s)	Evidence of compliance	Quality responsibilities	Quality tools (if applicable)
Ongoing	Publicity material well written and appropriately targeted at relevant audiences	Sustained interaction with different target groups; advice from representatives of these groups regarding style and dissemination	Feedback from users; successful population of IRs and increased user numbers over time (target levels to be decided at midpoint of	Project Management Group and Project Board	

		of publicity material. Draft material approved by Project Board and Steering Group	project)		
--	--	--	----------	--	--

18. Dissemination Plan

Dissemination of progress and evaluations will be through a project website, and series reports. The web site will make available copies of all the project publications, reports and presentations. There will be three reports compiled by the project manager with support from the project officers: 1) An environmental assessment report outlining the key issues for encouraging the deposit of the material 2) A technical report outlining changes in the functionality and metadata structure to accommodate this material and 3) A final report reviewing the project as a whole and the lessons learnt.

Where appropriate the Project Manager and Project Officers will submit papers to open access journals such as *Ariadne*, and make presentations at JISC as well as other meetings and conferences. The work of the project will be acknowledged by submitting these outputs on the repositories at each of the three sites.

Academic input from the disciplines will be reflected in workshops and a one day activity conference to encourage community awareness of the project.

Timing	Dissemination Activity	Audience	Purpose	Key Message
Throughout duration of project	Project website	Multiple – research, library, and general audiences	Raise awareness and provide key information/documents relating to the project	Aims and progress of project
Within months 8-9	Advocacy workshop, involving stakeholders and external arts institutions (including Goldsmiths College and the Arts Institute, Bournemouth)	Specialist - Arts research community	To share knowledge and promote advocacy methods; to publicise the project to other arts institutions	Advocacy of Institutional Repositories
Months 7-10	Environmental report	Stakeholders, arts research community, digitisation community	Raise awareness of the success criteria, and the potential barriers and incentives for the participation of the arts community	Strategy and success criteria of project
Months 12-24	Technical report	Stakeholders, digitisation community	Outline functionality and metadata standards for artistic and cultural outputs	Suitable standards and software for these and future arts repositories
Months 21-24	Final report	JISC, stakeholders, and wider community	Review project and evaluate lessons learnt	Key findings of project
Throughout project	Public JISCMail list (kultur@jisc.ac.uk)	JISC, project team, and wider community	Discuss progress of the project and exchange experience	Project news, discussion, and exchange of experience

Months 12-24	Identifying relevant conferences for presentation	Various, depending on conference – digitisation, research, arts and cultural communities, teaching	Publicise project findings	Progress of project, dissemination of project outcomes and findings
Months 12-24	Publication in relevant journal	Digitisation, arts research, arts and cultural communities, teaching	Publicise project findings	Dissemination of project findings
Final 2 months of project	Day activity conference	Stakeholders, digitisation community, external arts institutions and galleries, teaching community	Raise awareness, launch repositories	Benefits and use of repositories for academic research culture and other arts communities

19. Exit and Sustainability Plans

Project Outputs	Action for Take-up & Embedding	Action for Exit
Two institutional repositories	Advocacy and dissemination activities (see section 18); clear user documentation; technical documentation	Access and maintenance
Metadata lessons	Embedded within IR	
Rights framework	Advocacy and documentation	IPR – processes for the use and re-use of objects in IR documented. Guidelines made available via IR interface
Project management documentation	Core documents archived in JISC records management system. Some documents also made available on project website	Ensuring accessibility of documents and website maintenance. Documents retained on project website for 3 years after project completion
Understanding of what research outputs constitute within this community, and how they are used and re-used	Findings disseminated through article and/or papers in relevant journals and conferences.	Preservation and access – articles/papers made available on project website and deposited in IR

The institutions in the partnership are committed to creating sustainable institutional repositories. Each partner will take responsibility for the long-term sustainability of their repository, but the project will help the partners to assess the best sustainability options. Ongoing communication between core EPrints Services in ECS and Southampton repositories will support the sustainability of the institutional repository at Southampton. Sustainability of the content itself will be addressed in the data curation and preservation work package (WP 9) and will reflect best sector practice as developed in collaboration with VADS. This will reference JISC funded work in repository preservation including PRESERV and SHERPA DP.

Appendixes

Appendix A. Project Budget

Appendix B. Workpackages