



Volume 59 | Issue 1

Article 11

2016

Comparing Institutional Repository Software: Pampering Metadata Uploaders

Craighton Hippenhammer
Olivet Nazarene University

The Christian Librarian is the official publication of the Association of Christian Librarians (ACL). To learn more about ACL and its products and services please visit [//www.acl.org/](http://www.acl.org/)

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/tcl>



Part of the [Christianity Commons](#), and the [Library and Information Science Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Hippenhammer, Craighton (2016) "Comparing Institutional Repository Software: Pampering Metadata Uploaders," *The Christian Librarian*: Vol. 59: Iss. 1, Article 11.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.55221/2572-7478.1162>

This General Article is brought to you for free and open access by Digital Commons @ George Fox University. It has been accepted for inclusion in *The Christian Librarian* by an authorized editor of Digital Commons @ George Fox University. For more information, please contact arolfe@georgefox.edu.

Comparing Institutional Repository Software: Pampering Metadata Uploaders



**Craighton Hippenhammer, Digital Initiatives Librarian
Olivet Nazarene University**

ABSTRACT

This article highlights the key concepts of institutional repositories and identifies the strengths of Digital Commons and Wesleyan Holiness Digital Library products. Special attention is given to software structures and features, support systems, and factors that impact quality.

Digital Commons

Digital Commons (DC) is a commercially hosted institutional repository product whose purpose is to host searchable, electronic files, usually faculty scholarship and archival material. It was originally created for the University of California with a customer base of about 400 institutions, mostly U.S. universities, all in English. It has a robust support staff that enables customers to have highly customized sites that work well for them, even though they are based on highly structured templates. Their main competitors are open source options like Dspace and Fedora, which both take intense information technology (IT) development time and ongoing local support. With an open source option, it is very common to feel the need to fight for the IT department's attention, as they focus on an entire campus of needs. With Digital Commons, those concerns go away.

The home page of Digital Commons has a colorful circle that is a graphical representation of the disciplines into which uploaded material has been divided. This is one way content can be browsed, not only in one's own repository, but throughout the repositories of all DC customers.

Digital Commons has a hierarchical internal structure. Documents are filed within scholarship and archival series which are then filed within departments and communities. This structure shows up in document URLs and creates an academic way of browsing. Each document type has its own metadata form that is created to relate to the discipline it is in. So each article, e-journal, book, image gallery and

event form limits its fields to those necessary to its discipline-influenced document type. A book gallery, for example, is unique as it has the capability to make the first page of its PDF into a separate thumbnail and use it to display the cover.

Faculty and students can also browse for topics by department, university center, or program. Subsumed under each department are department-flavored and document-type subcategories helpful for coming across topics through guided serendipity. These are highly configurable; for example, an art gallery painting project by one of our art professors shows an area of a map of California where the retreat site was held. Breadcrumbs (Home > Art Dept > Art Image Galleries > DVP Art Gallery) for these pages are also configurable.

Digital Commons' strengths include metadata upload forms that are configurable and kept simple with no distracting unused fields. Metadata forms tie document type to academic centers and disciplines which keeps the repository academically related. It has a very strong search capability – both Google and local site searches. DC technical staff stay in close touch with Google to make sure metadata field codes are up to date and communicate best with Google technology. DC also has very strong support. It encourages sharing between members and conducts webinars and other training sessions. Members can call and email support with one-day response times. New DC sites can be built within days.

Wesleyan Holiness Digital Library

For the past three years, I have been involved with the creation of a made-from-scratch theological institutional repository (IR), created and supported by the Nazarene Church, the denomination with which my university is related. The repository specifications, design, and ongoing development are being led by a team of 15–20 Nazarene librarians and denominational leaders who meet in person once a year and monthly via conference calls. An open source software developer was hired in the fall of 2012 and they programmed the IR in PHP using the Drupal Content Management System. The IR went live June 2013 at <http://www.whdl.org>, with the name Wesleyan Holiness Digital Library (WHDL).

WHDL is now starting to give birth to university IRs using the same engine; the first went up at MidAmerica Nazarene University in Olathe, Kansas, in April 2015, at <http://repository.mnu.edu/content/mnu-institutional-repository>. The goal is to provide daughter IRs to most of the over fifty Nazarene institutions around the world (as long as they have an adequate infrastructure for the IR to run on) as well as to other protestant denominational universities who are in the same Wesleyan theological strain. The Nazarenes are now looking for denominational partners to join them in this effort.

A key specification desired by this group at the very beginning was that the IR be multilingual, a difficult hurdle to jump, since even Digital Commons cannot yet provide that. To be truly multilingual there must be three areas in the software where the language must be compatible and relate correctly to each other: the documents themselves (the easiest hurdle), the metadata that describes the documents, and the interface that includes the navigational words to get around in the program (also called the site language). WHDL went live with five site languages – English, French, Portuguese, Spanish, and Korean – and has documents up now in 58 different languages. Although this IR is new and still developing, it is amazing that it is so multilingual. The IR highlights this capability with a language drop-down box at the very top of the home page.

IR Comparison

In WHDL the document type is selected first without being attached to a discipline or academic center of study. It has many more document types than Digital Commons has. But Digital Commons' forms are selected by document type tailored by the discipline community with which it is associated. This emphasizes the academic quality and nature of the material.

Digital Commons' website layout is quite configurable within a limited number of strict template formats. DC staff, however, will add fields that no one else has if they are necessary and do not conflict with the structure of the system. Some fields may not be obvious to ask for because they do not come with the default configuration. The peer-reviewed checkbox, for example, is one that is available, but may be suitable for only certain series or galleries. With this, the user must tell them which ones they should be added to.

Digital Commons has no subject fields, but uses keyword fields and discipline fields only. The number of disciplines and sub-disciplines is quite narrow that balances quite nicely with the infinite number of keywords and keyword phrases that can be used. WHDL has been toying with the idea of using subject headings, like Library of Congress. This would be unwise, since it would involve the translation of the subject headings list into exotic languages to keep up the multilingual idea. Translating one to two thousand discipline terms per language, though, is quite attainable.

Having a scholarship domain field based on the Boyer model is unique to Olivet Nazarene University's IR. Ernest Boyer published *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate* in 1990. Boyer's work sought to widen the definition of scholarship beyond just publishing by creating four overlapping dimensions or domains: the scholarship of discovery, the scholarship of integration, the scholarship of application, and the scholarship of teaching. To the Boyer model of four scholarship domains, Olivet added a fifth: the scholarship of faith integration. We just asked Digital Commons support to add that to our metadata forms and they provided that for us.

An embargo period for articles published by publishers means that the article cannot be open access for a certain number of months after it is published. Digital Commons can institute the embargo period field for any series or gallery if the user asks and designates. The user simply types in a date twelve months down the road and a year later the document that was hidden with this function will become available to the web automatically without further effort. Some of these more exotic features may be developed in WHDL, but were not a priority in its early development stages.

Digital Commons automatically creates an OpenURL for previously published articles. You can also attach additional files of any type to the record. These additional files can be designated to be visible or hidden. It is common to attach copyright permission documents in this function and make them invisible but also nearby, associated with the document to which it belongs. DC also has a Creative Commons license field that most universities use, which lets researchers know how and whether they can use the material posted.

WHDL metadata forms are divided into tabs: essential, supplemental, administrative settings, revision information, and flags. Less used fields are on other tabs or tabs that only administrators access. WHDL divides responsibilities into Librarian 1, Librarian 2, and Librarian 3 levels for access privileges. In Digital Commons, access can be restricted to particular series or other document types.

IR Software Quality Factors

The design of the software is the most important quality, especially in designing it for ease of use for those who upload. DC does this by giving the uploader the ability to hide metadata fields that are not needed, the ability to add fields that other universities may not need, and the ability to tailor field options.

Why not allow the option to pick from dropdown lists if the options are known? For example, if the metadata field is “Department,” and all college departments are known, then the software should have all of the department names in a drop-down list readily available for the uploader to select rather than having to type them as free text. If a field entry is the most-often-chosen option, then that entry should be made the default option at the top of the list. If one department publishes a lot more than any other department, then that department option should be selected as the default. That way it does not have to be manually selected, which will save keystrokes and speed up the metadata entering process.

Different document types need different metadata templates. For example, electronic theses and dissertations (ETDs) need mentor name fields, but other document types do not. Books do not need volume and issue fields like journal articles do. If the metadata form expects the uploader to know that and to therefore skip over such

fields, then sites where untrained personnel or volunteers are used are likely to run into trouble because of the unnecessary software structural design problems. No IR should use IT jargon like “node” or direct uploaders to do illogical things or retrieve data from “out on the web.” Newly developed IR software is more likely to have these sorts of problems.

Also, book galleries profit from having the first page of a PDF made into a thumbnail graphic to highlight the book’s cover. The IR software should be able to process PDFs created by word processing software and to display the thumbnails properly as well as those produced by Adobe products. Digital Commons has a problem with this.

Search Functions

The search function in institutional repositories is extremely important. Documents they display must be well searchable by Google and Google Scholar. Metadata field tags must be Google friendly. Most documents in the IR must be scholarly or Google Scholar will not index it. IRs must stay current with Google field and algorithm changes. IR metadata and IR documents must both be searchable and have the capability of using search limits by metadata field and language.

Excellent Support

Every institutional repository should have expert support personnel who can change and tailor the IR software to suit your college/university needs, who can guide you to use the software effectively, who offer webinars and instruction, and who can readily be reached via email and phone. Support should also supply online discussion groups among members, and regularly maintain and upgrade the software, including Google search engine optimization (SEO). †

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Craighton Hippenhammer is the Digital Initiatives Librarian at Olivet Nazarene University. He can be contacted at chhammer@olivet.edu.

REFERENCES

- Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Digital Commons. (n.d.) Retrieved November 4, 2015 from Berkeley Electronic Press website: <http://digitalcommons.bepress.com>
- Digital Commons @ Olivet. (n.d.) Retrieved November 4, 2015 from the Olivet Nazarene University website: <http://digitalcommons.olivet.edu>
- MNU Institutional Repository. (n.d.) Retrieved November 4, 2015 from the MidAmerica Nazarene University website: <http://repository.mnu.edu/content/mnu-institutional-repository>
- Wesleyan Holiness Digital Library. (n.d.) Retrieved November 4, 2015 from the Church of the Nazarene website: <http://whdl.org>