Shopping for an IR: The Search, Adoption, and Implementation of the University of Louisiana at Lafayette's Institutional Repository Platform

Zachary G. Stein, University of Louisiana at Lafayette

Abstract

Institutions wishing to disseminate their scholarship on a wide scale have influenced the need for institutional repositories (IR). These repositories provide institutions the opportunity to display and preserve what they have to offer in an open access environment. The University of Louisiana at Lafayette (UL Lafayette) had attempted to adopt an IR for years and finally achieved this goal. Many issues impacted the adoption, including funding, deciding on the appropriate platform solutions, and marketing the need for contributions from faculty and university administration. There is much optimism for the IR, as it is also included in the university's Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) for the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) accreditation to disseminate undergraduate student research. While there is still much more to accomplish, the university's Edith Garland Dupré Library is taking steps to ensure the IR's success. This article will discuss the history of the UL Lafayette's institutional repository adoption, factors that influenced the platform decision, plans for its usage regarding undergraduate research, and anticipated challenges moving forward.

Keywords: institutional repository (IR); Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP); Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS); accreditation

Introduction and Background

The University Archives and Acadiana Manuscripts Collection (UAAMC) is the central hub for the Special Collections department at Edith Garland Dupré Library (Dupré Library), University of Louisiana at Lafayette (UL Lafayette). The University Archives section of UAAMC holds more than 2000 feet of institutional records, while the Acadiana Manuscripts Collection consists of more than 700 individual archival collections. Special Collections also includes the international Ernest J. Gaines Center, which houses the papers of renowned author Ernest J. Gaines, and the Cajun and Creole Music Collection, which houses commercial recordings of various Cajun and Creole musical artists. The focus on south and southwest Louisiana culture and history, especially Acadiana is the common link connecting these sections. The term Acadiana refers to the region heavily populated by Acadians, or French descendants from present-day Nova Scotia and New Brunswick (Acadie), who migrated to Louisiana in the 1750s and 1760s. The Acadians prospered in Louisiana and formed an ethnic identity commonly known as Cajun. Today, Acadiana is a melting pot of various groups of people–Cajun, Creole, African American, Native American, and much more–that takes great pride in the richness and effervescence of its diverse cultures. Many people outside of Louisiana may not be familiar with these unique cultures or have the means to travel to the Pelican State. The advancement of digital technology and preservation provides an opportunity for UAAMC to promote the rich culture of Acadiana, as well as preserve these materials for future generations.

For years, UL Lafayette, like many higher education institutions, has desired an institutional repository (IR) to showcase and promote digital scholarship. UL Lafayette's digital initiatives began to take root in the early 2000s. Around 2004, Special Collections staff posted digitized collections onto the Louisiana Digital Library (LDL), a platform run by a consortium of

Louisiana institutions, including Tulane University, Southern University and Agricultural and Mechanical (A&M) College, Vermilionville Living History Museum, and all the Louisiana State University (LSU) campuses. The LDL runs on Islandora, having previously migrated from the proprietary platform CONTENTdm. LSU Libraries in Baton Rouge currently hosts the LDL and provides each institution with around 500GB of free storage space.

While the LDL was and continues to be a great avenue for displaying digital collections, it proved to be unsuitable for UL Lafayette's IR needs. In addition, liberal arts professors (mainly in the English, History, and Philosophy departments) at UL Lafayette were establishing their own journals and looking for personal digital spaces to make them available. These initiatives fueled support for an IR, which would be managed by UAAMC and act as a wider representation of the university's offerings. Additionally, UL Lafayette's IR provides a great opportunity to showcase undergraduate research, as it is playing a crucial role in the university's Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP). This opportunity helps expand the role IRs play in scholarship, as well further stress the importance of libraries in academic initiatives.

Literature Review

IRs, a growing trend for higher education institutions since the early 2000s, are malleable entities for both services and stakeholders. The IR literature frequently references Lynch (2003), who defines IRs as a "set of services that a university offers to the members of its community for the management and dissemination of digital materials created by the institution and its community members" (p. 328). Marsh (2015) includes a definition that is shorter and simpler: "a mechanism for capturing, archiving, and managing the collective digital research outputs of the institution" (p. 164). These digital materials can include not only research articles from faculty, but also student projects, digitized institutional records, open access journals, data sets, and any

other kind of digital products unique to the institution.

Historically, institutions' libraries and archives have been the primary homes for IRs. Based on their 2006 Census of Institutional Repositories in the United States, Yakel et al. (2008) found that archivists play an increasing role in IR planning and implementation. Their role is certainly prevalent when collecting content and curating digital collections, both of which are vital for allowing IRs to thrive (Yakel et al., 2008). Marsh (2015) even views IRs as "institutional archives" because the research is kept in "one place in perpetuity" in order to "showcase the collective intellectual output of the university" (p. 164).

While libraries and archives play a vital role in managing IRs, Lynch (2003) notes that the deployment and execution act as partnerships between many different parties such as information technologists (IT), faculty, and university administration. Archivists gather and curate appropriate scholarly content, IT and digital librarians disseminate the materials in an openly accessible way, and each of these parties collaborates with their administration to ensure support for the IR's services. In 2010, Amherst College's IR team worked with various library faculty and staff from reference, technical services, and the business office to create researcher pages containing publications and citation data (Li & Billings, 2011). The collaboration resulted in 1,183 researcher pages being generated within only a couple of months (Li & Billings, 2011).

Additionally, stakeholders outside the library play important roles. For example, the Thomas Tredway Library at Augustana College successfully launched their IR by identifying departments that could act as promoters (Ghinazzi & Hanson, 2018). One such department included the college's development office, which wanted to use the IR for archiving the college's alumni magazine (Ghinazzi & Hanson, 2018). This kind of cooperation can help institutions promote their IRs so that their accessibility objectives can be effectively met.

Once institutions choose to adopt, there must be a decision on what content they will collect and how to manage it. Noonan and Chute (2014) note that archivists must keep their IRs' missions in mind to develop sound collecting policies to avoid becoming overwhelmed. Understanding the purpose or role of IRs helps institutions prioritize what content occupies their space. Implementing open access policies is also beneficial, as they provide faculty and students with a road map for what they can submit. Wesolek and Royster (2016) explain that the Harvard model for open access specifies that faculty "grants to the university the nonexclusive right to exercise copyright" (p. 57), which provides them green open access options without losing control of the work. For these purposes, institutions need to develop service definitions with their stakeholders to clearly outline the services their IRs can provide and the content the institutions will accept (Barton & Waters, 2004).

In addition to decisions about policies and content, the institution must decide upon the appropriate digital platform. This can be tricky because institutions need to consider their options based on their resources and funding (Barton & Waters, 2004). There are two major kinds of software models institutions can use: proprietary and open source (Monson, 2017). Each of these have their own strengths and weaknesses, often depending on the type of institution and how well-supported they are (Barton & Waters, 2004). Corbett et al. (2016) outlined two scenarios of institutions that migrated from one kind of platform to another. Virginia Commonwealth University changed from an open source platform to proprietary due to their desire to expand their publishing endeavors and to engage in functions such as "automated author notifications, federated networking of all customer content, and search engine optimization" (Corbett et al., 2016, p. 8). The other scenario involved Northeastern University, which chose to switch from proprietary to open source to give the institution more control over its content and to "meet the

specific needs of local users" (Corbett et al., 2016, p. 11). These decisions can be further complicated depending on the size of the institution. Wu (2015) states that small institutions are at a particular disadvantage because of the lack of resources, staff, and funding, which often forces them to make do with what they have (Wu, 2015). Corbett et al. (2016) note that institutions ultimately must evaluate their needs and assess what kind of situation they are in to choose the most appropriate platform. The right platform depends on what resources are available and how much institutions are willing to invest (Monson, 2017).

Of course, once the IR is implemented, there is the issue of populating it with content. Librarians certainly wish to bring in faculty publications, but this has proven to be quite difficult. Despite the promotion of open access policies and wider exposure, some faculty are still reluctant to deposit their materials (Scherer, 2016). Salo (2008), as mentioned by Scherer (2016), cites many reasons for this, including rights disputes, digital architecture problems, and failing to see the impact. Kim (2011) found, however, that ensuring long-term preservation could help with increasing faculty participation, specifically with regards to institutional and user needs, policies, and thorough business plans. Scherer (2016) further recommends coming up with strategies to promote the IR's commitment to open access and design to make it simple enough for interaction.

Some institutions make up for lack of faculty contributions by also including undergraduate research in IRs. Back in 2012, the University of New Hampshire (UNH) implemented a program to accept undergraduate honors theses into their IR, with 184 theses being deposited by the end of Spring 2014 (Exline, 2016). At the University of Utah (USU), IR patrons downloaded undergraduate research materials more than 18,000 times during a three-year period (Barandiaran et al., 2014). These examples show how undergraduate research can be

quite beneficial for an IR and vice versa. Exline (2016) notes that IRs help undergraduate students "increase exposure of their work", which can consequently enrich their scholarly résumé when applying for jobs or graduate school (p. 4). Rozum and Thoms (2016) noted in a later publication that USU's IR paved the way for outside researchers to provide comments on the available publications, as well as receive funding for projects that give students more support to further their research endeavors.

Description of Implementation

The literature review introduces the kinds of issues UL Lafayette's Special Collections department needed to think about when planning their IR adoption. The following sections discuss the Special Collections department's process for selecting and implementing the platform, and ways the IR is being used for promoting student research.

Institutional Repository Platform Choices

Concerning the selection of the IR platform, several factors came into play. The first was deciding whether to adopt an open-source or proprietary solution. As previously stated, both have their strengths and weaknesses, and the resulting platform depends on institutions' available resources and needs. When UL Lafayette determined the need for an IR, Dupré Library experimented with several pilot projects during the early 2000s. These included DSpace, Omeka, Fedora, and the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation-funded initiative Project Bamboo. Research and trends have shown that larger libraries tend to move towards locally managed open-source platforms, while smaller libraries with limited staff prefer hosted environments (Luther, 2018). Keeping these trends in mind, along with the university's limited resources, staff members, and small IT department, UL Lafayette initially decided upon a hosted solution for both scholarship and digital special collections.

UAAMC began fully investing in its IR initiatives and digital program in 2016 with the creation of a digitization archivist position. Prior guidance on IR platform selections suggests libraries should form a team of library administrators, archivists, and IT specialists who can contribute collective knowledge on operation needs, technological requirements, and cost considerations (Barton & Waters, 2004). In accordance with this suggestion, the digitization archivist formed a Digital Projects Committee made up of librarians and library administrators involved in digital projects. As per Stein et al. (2018), members of the committee included the "head of Special Collections, the assistant dean of Technical Services, the head and archivist of the Ernest J. Gaines Center, the head of the Cajun and Creole Music Collection, the head of Cataloging, the IT coordinator, and the IT systems specialist" (p. 10). This committee, which has since grown to include other librarians (i.e., heads of Reference and User Engagement), was charged with choosing the platform for the IR, and helping Dupré Library move forward with UL Lafayette's digital initiatives (Stein et al., 2018).

In late 2016, Dupré Library decided to investigate Digital Commons from Bepress. Digital Commons is a proprietary platform adopted by more than 500 institutions, many of them universities. According to the Directory of Open Access Repositories (DOAR) from January 21, 2018, Digital Commons was the most widely adopted proprietary platform in North America, making up around 29.1% of the total repositories (Luther, 2018). Digital Commons offered many benefits: unlimited storage and support, easy to use interfaces, and advanced discoverability. Digital Commons also provided opportunities for publishing open access journals and creating faculty profiles via an Expert Gallery Suite[1] that linked to submitted articles.

The digitization archivist researched Bepress's offerings and compared them to other

[1] See Bepress Expert Gallery Suite. https://bepress.com/products/expert-gallery-suite/.

platforms including Eprints, Islandora, and DSpace.[2] In April of 2017, the digitization archivist gave a presentation alongside a Bepress vendor to the university dean's council to show why Digital Commons could be beneficial for UL Lafayette and how it could help with the university's strategic plan. Some focal points included Bepress's quick implementation period, flexible services, and unlimited storage space for scholarship and digital collections. While the dean's council was impressed with the presentation and services, they were ultimately uncomfortable with the price. The annual fee for the service was quite steep, and the desired Expert Gallery Suite for faculty profiles was an extra cost that added to the already high price.

Plans to advance with Bepress stalled after the presentation to the dean's council. The library dean's office eventually decided against adopting Digital Commons after the publishing company Elsevier acquired Bepress in 2017. This rejection forced the digitization archivist to look for another hosted solution, albeit a preferably less expensive one. After some research, the digitization archivist discovered hosting services built on open-source platforms. These were significantly less expensive than using proprietary solutions. Such services included Atmire, Sobek Digital, HykuDirect, and KnowledgeArc. The final selection depended on the most reasonable annual cost, approachable support service, attractive front-end interface, and manageable back-end interface.

Selecting Islandora OnDemand

After much research and interviews with vendors, the digitization archivist narrowed the hosted platform choices down to three and presented them to the Digital Projects Committee. The choices were based on cost, interface flexibility, and the services the vendors provided.

[2] Here is an example of a document that was used to compare institutional repository platforms: Bankier, J. G., & Gleason, K. (2014). Institutional repository software comparison. *Open Access to Scientific Information Knowledge Societies Division, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization*. http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/CI/CI/pdf/news/institutional_repository_software.pdf.

These platforms included Islandora OnDemand, Sobek Digital, and the LDL itself. The committee was not impressed with Sobek Digital's interface. The LDL inspired more discussion, as this would certainly have been an easy and affordable choice. Ultimately, the committee rejected the LDL as well. Not only was it not designed to handle the functions needed for running an IR, such as organizing citations and enhancing discoverability through such platforms as Google Scholar, but issues of hosting also posed a problem. If LSU decided to stop hosting the LDL, UL Lafayette would have to start their search over again.

Eventually, the Digital Projects Committee decided that Islandora OnDemand would be the best fit for the IR. Produced by DiscoveryGarden, Islandora OnDemand is a hosted service that provides a regular Islandora platform. Islandora is made up of a Fedora back-end and a Drupal front-end. The Drupal front-end is especially helpful since the UL Lafayette website is run on Drupal. The head of Special Collections and digitization archivist also had some training with Islandora thanks to experience with the LDL. In addition, many librarians are web ambassadors, meaning they have credentials to update and change certain parts of the library website. The library web ambassadors are familiar with Drupal, which makes working with Islandora easier.

Several other factors placed Islandora OnDemand above the other options. The first was the resources made available through DiscoveryGarden. The hosted platform includes every solution pack and module offered by Islandora. This includes solution packs for uploading various kinds of media, gathering usage data through Google Analytics, and enabling optical character recognition (LYRASIS, n.d.). The Islandora Scholar module supports creating citations, setting embargoes, and making data discoverable through Google Scholar (GitHub, 2019). This way, Dupré Library does not need to download individual modules or keep looking

for new updates. DiscoveryGarden takes care of this, allowing the library to focus on content.

The second reason for choosing Islandora OnDemand was the ease of customization. The support team for DiscoveryGarden sent a design survey containing questions on desired features for the site. These questions related to color and font preferences, branding, prospective users, platforms for accessing the site, and references to sites that reflected the desired designs for the IR. To complete the survey, the Digital Projects Committee met with the associate director of digital communications from the UL Lafayette Communications and Marketing department to make sure the eventual IR design adhered to the university's Web Style Guide.[3] These included approved colors and logos and compliance with Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG).

After the committee completed the survey containing the desired features, DiscoveryGarden created a preliminary design for the site. There were initially problems with the result, including cluttered panels, missing branding icons, and complicated uniform resource locators (URL). Thankfully, Dupré Library's IT systems specialist had the ability to override DiscoveryGarden's CSS style sheet to not only clean up the interface, but to also make it appear more like a UL Lafayette webpage. She set the colors and fonts to match the university's Web Style Guide, reconfigured the panels, and shortened the URLs to readable aliases. This convenience afforded Dupré Library the opportunity to revamp the site without having to depend on the vendor.

The ability to submit content is straightforward. The submitter can choose from different content models, depending on the format of the content. Formats currently available on the IR include PDFs, Internet Archive BookReader, audio, and videos. There is also a content model that allows for ingesting compound objects (e.g., multi-page letters, 3-D objects, etc.)

[3] See University of Louisiana at Lafayette Web Style Guide. https://louisiana.edu/sites/louisiana/files/Web-Style-Guide.pdf.

(LYRASIS, n.d.). Once the content model is selected, the submitter can provide appropriate metadata, which is based on the Metadata Object Description Schema (MODS). Metadata fields are provided by the IR managers (the head of Special Collections and digitization archivist) and based on the fields from the LDL. These include title, personal name(s), abstract, note, subjects (topical, geographic, and temporal), citation, and publisher. After this step, the submitter only needs to upload. They can then manually edit and/or update metadata values in the system, if need be, as well as set any embargoes. Collections are organized in hierarchical categories. For example, the Schools and Colleges section contains collections for all the different colleges including Education, Engineering, and Liberal Arts. Those collections contain sub-collections that represent the different departments within their respective colleges. The organization of the collections is designed to make it easier for the submitters to know where to put their content and for viewers to navigate.

While much of the literature has recommended the library acting as a mediator for submissions, UAAMC decided to have depositors submit on their own with the library aiding when necessary. The main purpose for this decision is based on depositors understanding their scholarship and appropriate metadata better than the librarians. This also allows depositors to interact with the IR and control what they place in there.

DiscoveryGarden's resource availabilities, ease of customization, and straightforward content submission guidelines impressed UAAMC. With Islandora OnDemand currently in place, there are many opportunities for UL Lafayette to make scholarship openly accessible in a simple and attractive fashion.

Plans for Promoting Undergraduate Research

Opportunities for the IR to advance scholarship are not limited to soliciting scholarship

from faculty. Currently, the IR houses publications from the Louisiana Accelerator Center, oral history videos from the College of Education Centennial Showcase, and the Fall 2019 issue of the university magazine *La Louisiane*. Dupré Library's goal moving forward is for the IR to be the epicenter for UL Lafayette's scholarship. This not only includes faculty and graduate research, but also undergraduate research. Therefore, the inclusion of undergraduate research acts as a great opportunity for UL Lafayette, especially with their accreditation review from the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS), which includes implementation of a QEP.

The 2020 QEP is entitled "Advance: Student Research Experience," which focuses on the stimulation and dissemination of undergraduate research. The main objective for students is to complete a Student Research Experience (SRE), which is described as "a sustained effort to apply subject knowledge, skills, and abilities to a project that is valued by the discipline" (University of Louisiana at Lafayette, 2020, p. 1). Each college supplies their own SREs based on the kind of work expected for students to thrive in the discipline; the results are disseminated via such methods as presentations and/or publications (University of Louisiana at Lafayette, 2020). The dissemination of these results will be manifested into a wide variety of forms, including but not limited to articles, poster presentations, audiovisual recordings, and data collections. The IR fits perfectly in this equation, providing an outpost for students to promote their work. With its inclusion in the QEP, the IR will be partially financed from the 2020 Fall Semester through the 2025 Spring Semester.

The IR maintains its original mission of publishing and promoting the UL Lafayette's scholarship, but it will also devote a section specifically to SREs (University of Louisiana at Lafayette, 2020). This approach will keep QEP-related material together to better measure the

results of the QEP. UNH has a similar structure on their Scholars Repository, which is powered by Bepress. They have a separate section on their site devoted to student scholarship, which is divided into several collections (Exline, 2016). One such collection is devoted to undergraduate honors theses, where UNH created a specific collection standard and conducted usability testing to examine how easily students can navigate the IR site and submit content (Exline, 2016). This strategic plan certainly acts as inspiration for UL Lafayette's IR, as it is vital for students to efficiently navigate the site and provide access to their work. There may still be concerns about students having their own IR accounts, since the tremendous number of submitters could overwhelm the IR managers. As more researchers submit to the IR, the IR managers may decide to assign accounts to departments rather than individuals. This could help with managing accounts more efficiently and allowing departmental or administrative staff to act as possible intermediaries for faculty and students.

The IR will also archive the *Advance Journal for Student Research*, a student-edited journal that will feature published articles promoting the SREs (University of Louisiana at Lafayette, 2020). For now, the articles from this journal will be displayed the same way as other IR items. The QEP Development Committee initially hoped the IR could act as a host for the journal, similar to the open access journal services Bepress provides. DiscoveryGarden does not provide open access journal resources, which means Dupré Library would have to add an extra site to the IR, increasing the annual fee. While hosting an open access journal would be ideal, the IR will only be able to archive *Advance Journal for Student Research* for the time being.

In the end, the use of the IR for the QEP acts as a major milestone for UAAMC. Without the IR, UAAMC's role would be limited to simply providing resources. However, the IR has put UAAMC front and center, making it a factor in the UL Lafayette's accreditation efforts. Part of

the SACS requirements states that the library must "provide adequate and appropriate library and learning/information resources, services, and support for its mission" (Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges, 2012, p. 26). This statement refers to the library as a whole, and while the IR would certainly qualify as an information resource or service, its role would normally not be as significant if not included in the QEP. The UAAMC is now a vital part of ensuring the success of the QEP, as the IR will help advance student success in academia.

Challenges

There are still a few challenges that Dupré Library faces with the IR. The first is reaching out to faculty and students to make them aware of the IR's existence. Obviously, the IR will not be populated if people do not know about it. This is a common challenge for institutions. The Learning About Digital Institutional Repositories (LEADIRS) Workbook from MIT provides several helpful suggestions for marketing an IR. One such recommendation is to meet with deans, department heads, and faculty face-to-face or through presentations (Barton & Waters, 2004). Keeping this mind, the head of Special Collections drafted a letter explaining the purpose of the IR and asking faculty to contribute. The head of Special Collections sent the letter to each of the department heads, with many professors expressing interest in contributing. Afterwards, the head of Special Collections requested to meet with department heads when they had meetings with their deans.

While many of these professors expressed being intrigued by the opportunities the IR provides, there are still concerns. One concern that has come up more than once is security and monitoring of content submitted. One worry is that inappropriate materials, inaccurate data, or materials unrelated to scholarship could show up on the IR. This especially poses a potential problem when students post their projects and assignments. It is possible that even with assigned

accounts, irresponsible students or faculty could place items that cast the university in a negative light or spark outrage. To address this concern, the digitization archivist drafted a policy explaining who can submit to the IR, what submissions are acceptable, and how they are monitored.[4]

Another challenge involves the platform itself. The university currently has only 1TB of storage space. IR materials, especially PDF files, are usually small, but the space will eventually run out. This especially poses a problem since the scholarship can include video and audio files, along with UAAMC's digital library collections. Funds play a crucial role as well. For now, Dupré Library is funding the IR; the university will fund around a third of the annual hosting fee when the QEP is put into action (University of Louisiana at Lafayette, 2020). The 1TB of storage is a starting point. While some digital collections are being displayed in the IR, the LDL still acts as the primary digital library. When the IR begins to outgrow its space, Dupré Library will then make plans with university administration to either increase the space or find a new platform. Islandora OnDemand does offer a service for multi-sites, which are separate repositories under one system. Some university organizations, such as the Undergraduate Research Council and the Ernest J. Gaines Center, could benefit from these, as they have expressed desires to have their own spaces within the IR. As stated before, a separate space could be useful for the *Advance Journal for Student Research*, giving itself its own identity while still existing underneath the IR.

A final challenge is a common one for all types of IRs: support. While DiscoveryGarden's support team is attentive, it can be frustrating to get help. The IR managers must submit support tickets and wait in a queue. Each institution only receives 25 support hours each year. In other words, if there is a problem with the site that requires a great number of

[4] See University of Louisiana at Lafayette Institutional Repository Policy. https://ir.louisiana.edu/institutional-repository-policy.

support hours, an institution may have to pay for that extra time or wait a whole year to replenish. So far, there has not been a problem so severe that numerous support hours were required. DiscoveryGarden has been very responsive to Dupré Library's needs, and the queue only acts as a minor irritancy.

Conclusion

The process for selecting and implementing UL Lafayette's IR has been challenging yet rewarding. Dupré Library's UAAMC may be small and with limited resources but choosing a hosted solution has proven to be an efficient and cost-effective way to display the unique scholarship of the faculty and students. The IR is still in its early stages, with only a few faculty members having submitted materials. However, there is much optimism it its growth with the inclusion of the university's QEP. The goal is that the promotion and accessibility of SREs will increase interest in the IR among student researchers, as well as faculty. It may also set a new precedent for how special collections can influence the success of an institution with the help of accreditation. These outcomes can be useful for libraries and archives who have just started the implementation process or are looking for new kinds of materials to populate their IRs.

Looking back, there are several things UAAMC could have done differently. The most important would have been to include more non-librarians in the IR software selection process. Since faculty and students will use the platform, they need to understand how it functions and be comfortable using it. Decisions like these require an open dialogue between everyone who is involved. Once the platform was selected, it would have also behooved UAAMC to discuss policies within the library and with individual colleges. This way, submitters understand what they are contributing to and know what their roles are. The head of Special Collections and digitization archivist have given presentations to departments and colleges showing the benefits

and soliciting contributions. This is helping to spread awareness and act as a resource for curious faculty.

The library staff is also aware that this IR is not necessarily permanent. Considering staff and resource issues, this platform is a starting point for UL Lafayette to run its scholarly communications. There may come a point where Dupré Library will change to a more robust platform, which will provide a chance to apply the above lessons.

Nevertheless, acknowledging these lessons learned will help Dupré Library improve in its IR endeavors. The library knows what steps to take and what challenges to expect. There are no shortages of complications libraries and archives may face when searching, adopting, and implementing a new IR platform, but careful research of platform services and consideration of an institution's needs and available resources act as aids for guidance. More challenges may arise as the IR continues to grow, but UL Lafayette is on the right track to showcase what it has to offer to researchers.

References

Barandiaran, D., Rozum, B., & Thoms, B. (2014). Focusing on student research in the institutional repository: Digitalcommons@USU. *College & Research Libraries News, 75*(10), 546-549. https://doi.org/10.5860/crln.75.10.9209

Barton, M. R., & Waters, M. M. (2004). *Creating an institutional repository: LEADIRS workbook*. MIT Libraries.

Corbett, H., Ghaphery, J., Work, L., & Byrd, S. (2016). Choosing a repository platform: Open source vs. hosted solutions. In B. B. Callicott, D. Sherer, & A. Wesolek (Eds.) *Making institutional repositories work* (pp. 3-14). Purdue University Press.

Exline, E. (2016). Extending the institutional repository to include undergraduate research, *College & Undergraduate Libraries, 23*(1), 16-27. https://doi.org/10.1080/10691316.2014.950782

Ghinazzi, C., & Hanson, M. (2018). Communication is key: Positioning the repository as a cornerstone of campus collaboration. *The Serials Librarian, 74*(1-4), 170-175. https://doi.org/10.1080/0361526x.2018.1427980

GitHub. (2019). *Islandora/islandora_scholar*. https://github.com/Islandora/islandora_scholar.

Li, Y., & Billings, M. S. (2011). Strategies for developing an institutional repository: A case study of ScholarWorks@ UMass Amherst. *Libraries' and Librarians' Publications, 69*. https://surface.syr.edu/sul/69

Luther, J. (2018). *The evolving institutional repository landscape* [White paper]. ACRL/Choice, Taylor & Francis Group. http://choice360.org/librarianship/whitepaper

Lynch, C. A. (2003). Institutional repositories: Essential infrastructure for scholarship in the digital age. *Portal: Libraries and the Academy, 3*(2), 327-336.

https://doi.org/10.1353/pla.2003.0039

LYRASIS. (n.d.). *Solution packs: Islandora documentation - LYRASIS wiki*. https://wiki.lyrasis.org/display/ISLANDORA/Solution+Packs.

Marsh, R. M. (2015). The role of institutional repositories in developing the communication of scholarly research. *OCLC Systems & Services: International Digital Library Perspectives, 31*(4), 163-195. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/OCLC-04-2014-0022

Monson, J. D. (2017). *Getting started with digital collections: Scaling to fit your organization*. ALA Editions, an imprint of the American Library Association.

Noonan, D., & Chute, T (2014). Data curation and the university archives, *The American Archivist, 77*(1), 201-240. https://doi.org/10.17723/aarc.77.1.m49r46526847g587

Salo, D. (2008). Innkeeper at the roach motel. *Library Trends, 57*(2), 98-123. http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/lib.0.0031

Rozum, B., & Thoms, B. (2016). Populating your institutional repository and promoting your students: IRs and undergraduate research. In B. B. Callicott, D. Sherer, & A. Wesolek (Eds.) *Making institutional repositories work* (pp. 311-318). Purdue University Press.

Scherer, D. (2016). Incentivizing them to come: Strategies, tools, and opportunities for marketing an institutional repository. In B. B. Callicott, D. Sherer, & A. Wesolek (Eds.) *Making institutional repositories work* (pp. 150-173). Purdue University Press.

Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges. (2012). *The principles of accreditation: Foundations for quality enhancement*. http://www.sacscoc.org/pdf/2012PrinciplesOfAcreditation.pdf

Stein, Z., Key, C., & Woods, C. K. (2018). Digitization on a budget: Tips and tricks for digital archives and digitization. *Louisiana Libraries, 81*(1), 6-11.

University of Louisiana at Lafayette. (2020). *Advance student research experience: University of Louisiana at Lafayette quality enhancement plan 2020*. https://advance.louisiana.edu/sites/advance/files/UL-Lafayette-QEP-Report-2020.pdf

Wesolek, A., & Royster, P. (2016). Open access policies: Basics and impact on content recruitment. In B. B. Callicott, D. Sherer, & A. Wesolek (Eds.) *Making institutional repositories work* (pp. 55-68). Purdue University Press.

Yakel, E., Rieh, S. Y., St. Jean, B., Markey, K., & Kim, J. (2008). Institutional repositories and the institutional repository: College and university archives and special collections in an era of change. *The American Archivist*, *71*(2), 323-349. https://doi.org/10.17723/aarc.71.2.c7t344q22u736lr2