

Each article is copyrighted to its author(s) and all rights are reserved. No part of this publication may be reprinted or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording or any information storage or data retrieval system without prior written permission from the author(s) and full acknowledgement to ALISS.

Editor: Heather Dawson
h.dawson@lse.ac.uk

Published by ALISS.

ALISS QUARTERLY
VOLUME 3 NO.1 OCTOBER 2007

Electronic copyright, IPR and access issues in the emerging electronic landscape

Editorial.....1
Heather Dawson

Lifecycle of a Digital Library document on Forced Migration Online3
Sarah Rhodes, Librarian, Refugee Studies Centre Library, University of Oxford

Irish Studies Online:.....7
A digital library of core resources on for Irish Studies
Norma Menabney Queens University Belfast

Five years on from flying the nest, Heron is still going strong.....12
Helen Bartlett, Copyright Manager, Heron.

Repositories and copyright: major hurdle or minor obstacle?16
Morag Greig, Advocacy Manager (Enlighten), University of Glasgow

O! She doth teach the torches to burn bright:20
How JULIET can help authors and repository advocates.
Jane H Smith, SHERPA Services Development Officer

IPR and multimedia in institutional repositories:24
lessons from the MIDESS project
Lesley Pitman
Librarian and Director of Information Services, UCL School of Slavonic and
East European Studies Library, UCL Library Services.

EDITORIAL

Welcome to the latest edition of ALISS Quarterly. It has been published by ALISS (Association of Librarians and Information Professionals in the Social Sciences).

Learning 2.0: 23 Library things30
Heather Dawson, LSE

Librarians against plagiarism:34
how Imperial College London is using PRS and active learning to combat the cut and paste generation.

Ruth Harrison and Julia Garthwaite,
Liaison Librarians, Imperial College London Library

IBSS Update36

The scene was set by Richard Ebdon, Copyright Officer at the British Library who considered whether copyright and data licensing for electronic resources differs from print. The answer was not unsurprisingly a resounding yes! The paper provided an overview of the history of copyright legislation in the UK and its importance to the British library which acquires over 3 million new items each year. Other issues relating to copyright and intellectual property were covered by the papers *The practicalities of copyright in the online age*. Helen Bartlett Copyright Manager, HERON. And *Irish Studies Online - a digital library of core resources for Irish studies*. QUB. Norma Menabney, Queen University, Belfast.

Which are explored more fully in this issue. In particular the latter, provided a fascinating insight into the issues a Library faced negotiating and working with JSTOR to create an online journal article collection.

Two other papers considered issues relating to copyright and images:

IPR and multimedia in institutional repositories: lessons from the MIDESS project (*Management of Images in a Distributed Environment with Shared Services*) Lesley Pitman Librarian and Director of Information Services, UCL SSEES Library.

Approached the issues from the perspective of a specialist project and is considered in more detail in this journal issue. A more general paper

Rights and responsibilities: Copyright and digital images. Grant Young Technical Research Officer, TASI - Technical Advisory Service for Images

Covered the basic legal issues relating to copyright and visual images, introducing the work and services of TASI. The PowerPoint slides provide lists of key legislation and a useful set of further readings and advice. TASI (the Technical Advisory Service for Images) is a specialist JISC service which is based in the Institute for learning and Research technology at the University of Bristol. Its aim is to support UK HE staff in all aspects of making, managing and using digital images. Its website can be found at <http://www.tasi.ac.uk/> and hosts a number of very helpful sections. This includes a database for finding images online <http://www.tasi.ac.uk/imagesites/> which

highlights some of the most useful free resources. There is also a making images section <http://www.tasi.ac.uk/advice/creating/creating.html> which offers useful advice on what equipment to buy, file resolutions and formats. This ranges from getting the most out of low-end digital cameras as well as more sophisticated image sharing software. A third section covers managing images

<http://www.tasi.ac.uk/advice/delivering/delivering.html> it provides timely advice on metadata and choosing systems to manage large institutional collections of images.

The final section of the website using images

<http://www.tasi.ac.uk/advice/using/using.html> gives tips on how library staff, lecturers and students can use images more effectively in their daily work. It includes an advice section on copyright issues.

<http://www.tasi.ac.uk/advice/managing/copyright.html>

Finally a paper by Ruth Harrison and Julia Garthwaite.

Librarians against plagiarism: how Imperial College London is using PRS and active learning to combat the cut and paste generation.

Considered how Imperial College teaches students how to avoid plagiarism as part of its Information Literacy courses. The reprinted paper in this issue provides basic details about the course and information on how other librarians might obtain a very useful associated DVD for their own use.

In addition to these papers, this issue also contains some materials on libraries and web 2.0 which we hope you will find useful. These include a review of a free online course and an update on the latest news from the Libraries, social software and distance learners (LASSIE) project. Remember that you can keep up to date with ALISS news by subscribing to our free electronic mailing list [LIS_SOCIAL SCIENCE](http://www.jiscmail.ac.uk/lists/LIS-SOCIAL-SCIENCE.html) at <http://www.jiscmail.ac.uk/lists/LIS-SOCIALSCIENCE.html>. Have you seen our new website at: <http://www.alisssnet.org.uk>

The aim is to create an up to date news service for Social Science Librarians. In addition to providing free access to group news and an online archive of papers and presentations from our events; it will also contain a social science news section; spotlighting new developments; websites and publisher news; and an ALISS Recommendations section where we will recommend online articles and offer links to interesting websites and resources which we have found!

We hope you enjoy the issue!

Heather Dawson.
ALISS Secretary

LIFECYCLE OF A DIGITAL LIBRARY DOCUMENT ON FORCED MIGRATION ONLINE (FMO)

Sarah Rhodes

**Librarian, Refugee Studies Centre Library,
University of Oxford**
sarah.rhodes@ouls.ox.ac.uk

Forced Migration Online (FMO) <http://www.forcedmigration.org/> is a Web-based portal dedicated to providing extensive online resources on the situation of forced migration worldwide. It was launched in 2002, is freely available and is used by academics, researchers and students, as well as by policy makers and practitioners. A crucial component of FMO is the Digital Library that comprises over 200,000 pages of mostly unpublished resources on forced migration issues, some of which are rare and unique. The original tranche of 3,000 documents added to the Digital Library was derived from the Refugee Studies Centre Library's grey literature collection. It was with substantial grants from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, and the European Commission (The European Initiative on Democracy and Human Rights) in 1996 that the Digital Library was created.

In addition to the documents from the RSC Library there are also collections of material from other Universities and organisations. These include the Fletcher School and Feinstein Center; Tufts University; the Program on Forced Migration and Public Health, Columbia University; the Czech Helsinki Committee in Prague; and the Forced Migration and Refugee Studies unit at the American University in Cairo. The Digital Library also holds back-runs of five key journals in the field: the Journal of Refugee Studies; Forced Migration Review; International Journal of Refugee Law; Disasters; and International Migration Review.

This article will provide an overview of the processes used by the Digital Library team to add a document to the site. The lifecycle covers initial submission to the uploading of documents for global access.

Defining forced migration:

There is much debate regarding the nature of forced migration but the working definition used to provide a reasonable understanding of the areas covered by FMO and the Digital Library is the one created by the International Association for the Study of Forced Migration (IASFM). Forced migration is seen as:

‘a general term that refers to the movements of refugees and internally displaced people as well as people displaced by natural or environmental disasters, chemical or nuclear disasters, famine or development projects’.

Document submission:

In order to submit a document, be it in hard copy or born digital, the submitter must access the main Digital Library search screen through the FMO homepage at www.forcedmigration.org where there is a link to the submission screen. The cover sheet must be filled in, providing information on the author, title and who owns the copyright. If the document is available electronically it should be sent separately by email or in PDF format. If the document is available on the Internet the url can be provided. When an electronic surrogate is unavailable a hard copy should be sent to the team.

Selection criteria:

Once the document has been received it will be assessed against the FMO selection criteria. A document should fall within the subject definition of forced migration e.g. humanitarian assistance, causes of flight; it should give potential value to the end-user; be authoritative and substantive; and demonstrate original thinking. A document may be declined if it contains sensitive material; is marked as a ‘draft copy’; or is of poor print quality. The Digital Library Collection Management Policy provides more detailed information on these criteria at www.forcedmigration.org/info/dlcmpolicy.htm

Copyright clearance:

All suitable documents must be copyright cleared before they can be added to the Digital Library. If the original submitter is the copyright holder then a Copyright Licence Agreement will be sent for signing. If the submitter does not hold the rights, the copyright holder must then be sought. Two letters to individuals will count as best endeavour if no response has been received, allowing a document to be processed without a signed Licence Agreement. Organisations, however, must release copyright as best endeavour does not apply. An RLG DigiNews feature article on the original copyright clearance process is available at www.rlg.org/preserv/diginews/diginews4-5.html

Metadata creation:

Once copyright has been cleared for a new document metadata is created. All records in the FMO portal have metadata attached. Catalogue records are created in XDirectory from Esprit and detailed templates have been created

for data insertion. Descriptive metadata adhere to Dublin Core while structural metadata comply with METS. The standards used can be found at www.forcedmigration.org/info/dlcataloguide.htm

Controlled vocabularies:

In addition to the input of standard information into the template, metadata also include terms from controlled vocabularies. The vocabularies have been used by the RSC Library for its bibliographic records since the mid-1980s so it was logical to use them for the Digital Library to provide a level of consistency and continuity.

The **Human Rights Information and Documentation Systems (HURIDOCs) Micro-Thesaurus** provides the geographical list used to select the continent, region and country where an event occurred, or from where a person originates. A full listing is available at

www.huridocs.org/tools/micro-thesauri/micro-thesaurus-15

The **International Thesaurus of Refugee Terminology**, created by the UNHCR, lists specialist index terms for the field of forced migration. It is now also on the MARC Code Lists for Relators, Sources, Description Conventions, coded as ITRT and is used for all RSC Library material indexed on OLIS (the University of Oxford's union catalogue) in conjunction with Library of Congress Subject Headings. The thesaurus can be accessed at www.refugeethesaurus.org

Digitisation and uploading documents to the Digital Library:

Once all the relevant Dublin Core elements have been added for the document the metadata is complete. It must then be married up with an electronic version of the document. In the early days of the Digital Library project bulk scanning was done by the Higher Education Digitisation Service (HEDS). Current scanning, however, is now undertaken by the FMO team in-house. Scanned TIFF images or PDF originals are exported to Olive Software's ActivePaper Archive along with their metadata, to produce entries in an XML repository. The ActivePaper software then delivers the content via the Internet, and provides the browsing/searching interface via its web services and search engine. The lifecycle of the document is now complete, and it is fully retrievable through the Digital Library via the FMO portal.

Searching for a document:

Olive's software provides a powerful and flexible tool, allowing searching across a number of collections and journals, and displaying the hits in an integrated list. Despite the complexity behind the scenes, the interface is very user friendly.

There are both simple and advanced search options available. The advanced search screen allows more complex searching, and the ability to use a variety of parameters including specific collections, title, author, subject terms and geographic location. The search results screen provides brief records for each hit. Clicking on the blue link within a record will take the user directly into the document. In a document of any length, the user is taken straight to the relevant section and can see the results at a glance. The original search term is highlighted throughout the document. The item shown on screen will be the scanned image of the original if an electronic surrogate was not available. Clicking on the PDF buttons opens the document as a PDF file and allows the user to print the item more easily.

>Contacting the FMO team:

The FMO team is constantly looking to expand and develop the portal, and welcomes any suggestions for new content or feedback about the site. Feedback forms are provided on the site. The team is also very happy to offer advice on the different aspects of digital library creation on request. Please contact them on fmo@qeh.ox.ac.uk

IRISH STUDIES ONLINE: A DIGITAL LIBRARY OF CORE RESOURCES ON FOR IRISH STUDIES

Norma Menabney Queens University Belfast.

Introduction / Abstract

This paper explains the background of the core resource, the impetus for it and collaboration. It focuses on the business model, agreements and licenses. It outlines the technical challenges and finally the plans for the future of this and other resources.

Queen's University Belfast intends to create a digital library of core e-resources on Ireland. The Irish Studies Collection in JSTOR will be the central part of this. It will include 100 full text Irish related journals, 205 full text monographs and 2,500 manuscript images with detailed metadata.

Background

For some years the Library at Queen's has been seeking ways to address a major lacuna in research resources and basic bibliographic tools for scholars of Irish Studies. Online formats of such resources are enjoyed by scholars in almost every discipline. However should the learned community embrace an Irish slant to their research they must resort, in the main, to days of searching through print indexes at best and runs of journals at worst; a time consuming exercise for any scholar. In addition it can be a costly exercise for those who do not reside near the required collection(s).

Queen's University's Special Collections holds a wealth of materials including rare books, pamphlets, manuscripts, journals and a critical mass of these materials relate to all areas of Irish Studies. For many scholars it is a one stop shop and therein lies the unique value, that is, a large quantity of research material in one place.

However there has been increasing concern with preserving the collections for future generations of researchers whilst providing wider and enhanced access to the scholars of today.

To ease the task of finding relevant journal articles, through complex searching techniques and enhancing research output which other disciplines take for granted the Library began a process of discovery to realise the possibility of creating an electronic resource for Irish scholars.

The first thought was to create a bibliographic database but further discussions centered on full text provision. Opinion was sought from the academic community on a JSTOR 'like' project which received enthusiastic response.

Contact was established with JSTOR which led to encouraging talks. A

proposal was submitted to the JISC Digitisation Programme. Relationships were also established with other research institutions in Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland. In January 2007 funding of £620,000 was granted and work began on 1st February 2007.

The initial task was to fine tune the journal selection and meet with JSTOR's Legal Counsel. In February a publishers meeting was held at the Royal Irish Academy in Dublin. Digitisation also began at this time. Discussions concerning licenses and agreements followed between the JISC, JSTOR and Queen's University and these were concluded in July 2007.

The Business/ Academic model

Queen's University and JSTOR will create the resource with the guidance of an international academic panel. The licensor of each journal will agree a moving wall with JSTOR. The hard copy is supplied from Queen's University Special Collections to the Centre for Data Digitisation and Analysis, also at Queen's, where it will be scanned. Full OCR will be carried out on the images and title history and guidelines compiled. All the data is passed to JSTOR where detailed metadata is taken care of, the journal is stored as part of the Irish Collections archive and made available to the scholarly community through the JSTOR platform. The collection will be free in the UK and Ireland while subscriptions will be levied by JSTOR on the international community. This facilitates JSTOR maintenance. At the same time, there is a revenue sharing option whereby the publisher / licensor receives revenue from JSTOR based on the number of pages submitted to the archive and the number of subscriptions to the Irish Studies Collection, which in this case will be from outside the UK and Ireland. The moving wall is maintained by JSTOR after February 2009 when Queen's completes its role in the project. This means JSTOR will add volumes year on year. It is argued that just as the moving wall protects a journal's current subscriptions, at the same time these subscriptions could increase due to wider circulation and consequent exposure of the journal through the online archive.

Content selection

The criteria employed to select the journals comes from two sources, Queen's Special Collections and JSTOR. Special Collections' criteria are based on consultation patterns and site usage statistics. As a specialised unit it has more direct contact with users making it easy to detect and monitor usage of and

feedback about materials. In addition, academic recommendations were sought both locally and internationally. Finally, the establishment of an international academic advisory panel provides guidance to ensure the selection is balanced across the disciplines.

JSTOR's selection criteria are concerned with how long the journal has been in existence, the number of institutional subscribers, citation analysis and the recommendations of experts. Many of the Irish titles selected do not easily meet all these criteria. For example, many were never circulated outside Ireland and others have ceased publication. Consultation with academics internationally has been sought to ensure the titles are worthy. Peer reviewed titles are of considerable importance as is the reputation of the journals at their time of publication and since.

Copyright and license

Focusing on the periodicals, a title history is compiled for each journal title. This task includes the identification of the licensor. JSTOR will contract directly with them for rights to include their titles in the JSTOR archive both in the UK and internationally.

JSTOR and Queen's University will own the images and associated data and will use them to make the for the Irish Collection available online. Essential to all of the agreements and licensing is consideration of and agreement with the JISC's terms and conditions of grant.

The title history will also serve to establish whether the title is in copyright. If it is, then the licensor, usually the publisher, needs to be identified. If found the journal is invited to participate. If not found, the title is assessed rigorously and treated as an orphan. If the journal is not in copyright, the journal begins its journey through the digitisation process.

To summarise the licence, the licensor is granting the rights to Queen's University and JSTOR to create a fully searchable archive of their journal, which will be delivered through the JSTOR platform. The journal becomes part of JSTOR's Irish Collection and will be maintained and updated. The licensor is agreeing to free access in UK and Ireland and subscription based access outside these regions.

Copyright is retained by the licensor while JSTOR and Queen's University have control of the publication archive. The scanned images and associated data are the property of JSTOR and Queen's University. It is important to note that this is a non exclusive world wide license so the licensor can participate in other digitising programmes. Finally, preservation and distribution is assured through the JISC, JSTOR and Queen's University agreements.

Technical challenges

The project is not without technical challenges. There is a considerable volume of images to be processed and JSTOR image standards are very high. Post-printing annotations must be removed which is labour intensive but necessary and most importantly possible.

Historical journals present their own individual difficulties. Print and paper quality varies so titles can be fragile. Variations in spelling need to be dealt with, for example the long 's' of the 19th Century text.

Very detailed metadata is required, not just at journal and issue level, but article level including editorials, book reviews, notices and announcements.

Reference Linking will also be implemented so that articles link from one to another within and where possible outside JSTOR.

Why the project works

There has always been a strong belief in this project, a natural drive to find a way to make it happen. The financial climate and our plans fell into place at the same time.

JSTOR's ethos; a not for profit organisation, openness to ideas, openness to work with new partners, has created a valuable relationship of mutual benefit. Our relationships are based on high regard for and trust in respective parties. Along side this are the funding opportunities available in the UK, in this case HEFCE and the JISC. Without this, alternative funding options may have necessitated a very different and less favourable business model.

We have a fully working sustainable technical solution in place with JSTOR.

The resource will not become dated in functionality. It will be updated with the rest of JSTOR's databases.

The project also works because the content is chosen by academics for academics across the disciplines. It will provide basic research materials such that scholars do not need to change the way they work. A model suggested by the British Academy.

Ongoing developments and the future

The Library and CDDA at Queen's look forward to continued collaboration with JSTOR. As more information is added to the resource it will be increasingly important to be able to perform complex searching of the archive. We are mindful of the semantic web and the value of being able to search by place, person and subject.

This resource will be a test bed for a project with University College Berkeley to explore better ways of managing searches of web-based resources. One of the conditions of funding is to demonstrate a step-change in Irish Studies research.

As a result Queen's University will work with leading US institutions including University College Berkeley, Stanford, Indiana University, Purdue University Indianapolis.

The project is infinitely extensible and we are committed to advancing an Irish Studies research agenda through international collaborations and access to core resources.

It is hoped that on realising the possibilities, others will feel encouraged to embrace similar projects specific to their institutions, resources or regions.

FIVE YEARS ON FROM FLYING THE NEST, HERON IS STILL GOING STRONG

Helen Bartlett, Copyright manager, Heron.

Heron evolved from JISC's eLib² programme, when a call was put out for a project that would facilitate the movement from paper-based short loan collections in higher education libraries, to a more efficient electronic method of delivery. The project was required to involve a commercial partner, and to be financially self-sufficient by the end of the funded period.

The University of Stirling, together with Napier and London South Bank Universities put forward a successful bid that included Blackwells Retail and Information Services as their commercial partner; and in 1998 'Higher Education Resources ON-demand', or 'HERON'³ was launched, with five universities across the UK participating in a pilot service the following year.

The main remit of the project was to:

- Develop a national database and resource bank of electronic texts in order to widen access to course materials and improve the quality of learning throughout higher education in the UK
- Collaborate with rightsholders and representative bodies to remove blockages in copyright clearance and to determine appropriate fee levels and conditions for the digital age
- Offer opportunities to universities and colleges to market their own learning resources

To this end, HERON offered subscribing universities a service that would:

- obtain copyright permissions for materials that they requested for digital use,
- produce a PDF file of the requested material (including a coversheet with bibliographic and licence details),
- store a copy of the PDF for future licensed use.

At the start of the project, permissions were sought directly from publishers and other rightsholders on a case by case basis, using templates designed by staff in the previous eLib project based at the University of Stirling - SCOPE⁴. Shortly after the start of the HERON project, the Copyright Licensing Agency⁵ (CLA) was also used to obtain permissions.

Initially, a user interface for collecting requests from the universities was designed by Blackwells. However, this was dropped in favour of an interface designed and built by project staff at Napier University which was fully integrated with the systems that HERON staff used to manage the permissions and digitisation processes.

The marketing of institutionally-owned learning resources was investigated at London South Bank University, and it was decided that the issues involved were found to be too complex to be addressed within the project.

At the same time as HERON was launched, the CLA also launched their first digitisation licence for Higher Education. Working together with the CLA, HERON was able to use the CLA's new transactional licence to obtain permissions where requested titles were covered, and approached rightsholders directly for permission where the CLA licence fell short. HERON was also given 'Trusted Repository' status by the CLA, enabling any digital file created under licence from the CLA to be archived for future licensed use.

By the end of the initial three year project, over 40 universities and higher education colleges were subscribing to HERON, and an archive of digitised materials was established. However, the project had not become self-sufficient. JISC agreed to provide funding for a further year while an 'exit strategy' was put in place. During this year, Blackwells withdrew, and the project was run by the three founding universities who tried to secure a future for HERON.

After negotiation, HERON was acquired by Ingenta⁶ (now a division of Publishing Technology plc) in March 2002, providing continuity of service to the subscriber base which had grown during the year to 50 universities and higher education colleges in the UK. The 'Project' tag was dropped, and since the service was now open to subscribers beyond the higher education sector, the acronym was dropped to become simply 'Heron – a division of Ingenta'.⁷

With the support of Ingenta, direct permissions licences were negotiated with publishers, allowing the permissions process to be streamlined further for the titles nominated by participating publishers. The first publisher licence was signed in late 2002.

Since very early in the project, Heron's customer interface (HERONweb) was designed and maintained by Heron at Napier University. This has been developed in consultation with subscribers to provide them with a flexible but intuitive request management system. In 2003 one customer asked if it was possible for it to include information about work that was being done

¹ <http://www.jisc.ac.uk/>
² <http://www.ukoln.ac.uk/services/elib/>
³ <http://www.heron.ac.uk/>
⁴ <http://www.heron.ac.uk/SCOPE/index.htm>
⁵ <http://www.cla.co.uk>

internally as well. Therefore, in 2003 PackTracker was launched to provide a management resource for internal clearance and scanning/copying work, which also interacts with HERONweb.

By mid 2005 over 70 educational institutions in the UK and Ireland were subscribed to Heron. HERONweb was used throughout, and PackTracker continued to roll out to new subscribers. On 1st August 2005 the CLA introduced a trial 'blanket' digitisation licence, and announced that the old transaction licence would be phased out by 31st July 2006. The new licence introduced a requirement to report digital usage twice a year, had similar extent limits to the photocopy licence (e.g. one chapter or 5% of a book could be scanned), but only covered 'UK-published' materials – specifically excluding the US publishers that participate in the photocopy licence. Licensees could retain files indefinitely, and share them with other licensees, but the new licence did not allow for any central storage of digital files outside of the licensed higher education institutions.

The HERONweb and PackTracker services were both modified to meet new user requirements under this licence. As an additional service, and at no extra cost, HERONweb users now have the option of getting Heron to check the provenance of the title – i.e. whether the publisher is based in the UK. PackTracker has had a reporting module added to enable checking and automatic generation of a usage report that is compliant with the CLA's requirements. PackTracker users can also block requests under the CLA licence for publishers that are excluded from the CLA licence, and if they request more than one extract from the same title for the same course, these are flagged up to be checked for extent limits. PackTracker also provides look-ups of bibliographic records from COPAC and the Library of Congress, enabling fast checking of recorded book extents. Both systems allow subscribers to request new cover-sheets for existing CLA-licensed files, in case course names change, or the material is adopted by another course.

Heron also produced a structure for sharing CLA-licensed files between different institutions. However, there has been no demand for this function, since the vast majority of re-use is internal - e.g. for successive student enrolments.

While most subscribers administer their scanned material centrally, the new CLA licence has also encouraged others to de-centralise their services and allow each school or department to administer their requests. To this end, PackTracker can be enabled to allow each school to work separately, whilst a central administrator can do the reporting of all CLA-licensed usage.

Although some of the Heron subscribers have chosen not to sign the CLA's trial licence and continue to require both copyright clearance and digitisation services, many requests to Heron are now for digitisation only, under the CLA licence. However, demand for Heron's copyright services continues to be driven by the increasing number of requests for material that fall outside the CLA licence. Heron has also signed its first subscriber from mainland Europe, to add to the list of subscribers who do not use the CLA licence by choice. In addition, more use is being made of Heron's scanning service outside of the CLA licence - both for material to which the subscribers own the rights, and for use by visually impaired students.

As the use of digital materials has evolved within the higher education sector, Heron has grown and adapted with the market and continued to fulfil the original remit of facilitating more efficient electronic methods of delivery. Heron's user-group has grown in size and the active participation of its members ensures that future services will be tailored to their requirements. Thus, as the needs of higher education institutions continue to change, Heron plans to evolve with them.

REPOSITORIES AND COPYRIGHT: MAJOR HURDLE OR MINOR OBSTACLE?

Morag Greig, Advocacy Manager (Enlighten), University of Glasgow

m.greig@lib.gla.ac.uk

Introduction

Since the development of Glasgow University's institutional repository, Enlighten, repository staff have had an important role to play in advising academic staff on copyright issues relating to deposit. In addition, they have built up useful experience in contacting a range of publishers on behalf of academics. This article will outline the main issues encountered and also consider some of the wider issues relating to copyright and repositories.

Repositories and copyright at Glasgow

Glasgow's institutional repository service, Enlighten, encompasses a number of individual repositories set up to hold specific types of content. This article will concentrate on the ePrints Service, which holds published material such as journal articles, conference proceedings, monographs and book chapters. Other publication types such as theses, working papers and technical reports also fall under the Enlighten umbrella, but as these are generally unpublished and copyright is held by the author they do not usually pose any copyright related problems.

Authors who want to deposit their publications have two options – self-deposit or mediated deposit carried out by repository staff. In both cases repository staff check the publisher's policy on deposit in institutional repositories before any publications are made publicly available. In most cases authors have indicated that they would prefer repository staff to do this checking – they often feel that they do not have the knowledge to interpret publisher's copyright agreements. Searching the SHERPA-Romeo database of publishers copyright policies (<http://www.sherpa.ac.uk/romeo.php>) is much easier now that the range of publishers has been expanded and it is possible to search by journal title, but authors are still anxious for help in this area.

Copyright and journal articles

In the early days of repositories many publishers did not have a policy on deposit in repositories, or were unwilling to give permission for this. This has changed significantly, so that most of the major publishers are now much better informed

about open access and repositories, and have developed a policy on what authors are permitted to do in this area. This has come about as the profile of open access has been raised, and publishers have recognised that it is sensible to develop a policy. It is now much easier to establish if a publisher will permit deposit of a journal article in a repository. More encouragingly, the majority of publishers now permit this, usually on the basis that only the author's own final manuscript can be used, and sometimes with the additional condition of an embargo period. From a practical point of view, in most cases the requirement for authors to sign a publisher's copyright agreement does not prevent them from depositing in a repository. However, while this hurdle has been successfully overcome, the need for authors to deposit their own final copies of articles rather than the published PDF is still a major problem. Many authors who are keen to deposit have not been able to do so because they have not kept a suitable version of their papers. Authors have indicated that it is difficult for them to produce a copy that is the same in all respects as the published version, as unless they take the time to maintain a copy that incorporates all changes following reviewing and editing they are generally not able to acquire a suitable copy from their publisher. In cases where authors are not the corresponding or first author they may only have a copy of the version originally submitted to the publisher. Also, in cases where authors would like to make older articles available they may not have kept any copy other than the 'official' publisher PDF. Finally, some authors have pointed out that their own version may consist of several different files of e.g. text, images and diagrams, which were then assembled by the publisher. It is therefore critical for repository managers and their colleagues to stress the importance to authors of keeping a version of their articles that is as close as possible to the publisher version, and to deposit this as soon after publication as possible. Various UK projects such as Versions (<http://www.wise.ac.uk/library/versions/>) and VALREC (<http://valrec.eprints.org/>) are providing much needed information on this important area for repositories, but in practical terms it is the author who is the key player here.

Copyright and other publication types

Establishing whether or not journal articles can be deposited in a repository is relatively straightforward, and generally not too time consuming, even if a small number of publishers need to be contacted directly. However, establishing if non-journal material can be deposited is much more time consuming. Conference papers can pose problems if it is not entirely clear who is in a position to give permission for their deposit. This is often the case if a paper has been published by conference organisers rather than by a publisher. Unless a conference has taken place fairly recently it can sometimes be difficult to

establish the relevant person to contact, particularly if the organisation of the conference is carried out by different people each year. In this situation it may be best to ask the author to suggest the most appropriate person to contact, as they are more likely to know this.

In the case of books or book chapters, publishers do not tend to be willing to adopt a standard policy in relation to deposit in repositories. The agreements signed by authors are much less likely to indicate what authors can do with respect to repositories than journal copyright agreements. Whether publishers are likely to grant permission will depend on a variety of factors, including the date of publication, whether the book is still in print or not, and whether there is an electronic version of the material available commercially. In nearly all cases repository staff at Glasgow will contact the publisher before making any book-related material available. Responses from publishers have been more favourable than might have been expected, particularly where the request is for a chapter rather than an entire book to be deposited. Most publishers request that full details of publication are included, and some ask that details of where the printed book can be purchased are provided. Some publishers have been very positive in their replies, and have even provided details of additional books they publish by Glasgow authors that could be made available in the repository. However, some publishers have indicated that material can only be made available in the repository upon payment of a fee, and some smaller publishers have indicated, unsurprisingly, that they would not give permission, as they feared it would have a negative impact on their sales. Some publishers do not reply at all, despite several e-mails.

Making books and book chapters available in the repository has been an encouraging development, and many authors are much more excited about making this type of material available than about making journal articles available. This is particularly true if a book is out of print, but lecturers still want to recommend it to their students.

Two anecdotes relating to books in the repository are worth mentioning. The most popular item in the repository is a short book which was out of print, and which was scanned by the author and deposited in the repository with the permission of the authors (<http://eprints.gla.ac.uk/2081/>). The book was deposited in the repository in August 2005, and since then has been downloaded more than 22,000 times, more than three times more than any other item in the repository. Another book where copyright was held by the author has also proved popular, and the publishers have now decided to make it available as a commercial electronic book. This posed an interesting situation, as

the publishers requested the author to withdraw it from the repository. While normal policy is not to withdraw items from the repository, it was felt in this case that to refuse this request would be to deny the author potential revenue from the sale of the e book, and so it was agreed with the publisher that it would be acceptable for one chapter from the book to continue to be made available. Additional flexibility may be required when dealing with book material.

Wider issues

A number of bodies and individuals have campaigned for authors to take more interest in the rights relating to their work, and to try and retain copyright wherever possible. Some academic institutions have considered the possibility of claiming copyright in academic publications so that their academics cannot sign away copyright. Author license templates such as the JISC-SURF License to publish (<http://copyrighttoolbox.surf.nl/copyrighttoolbox/authors/licence/>) have been developed, although some publishers will not currently accept these. While these are important developments on the road towards authors gaining more control over their own work, publisher copyright agreements are no longer the main stumbling block in getting authors to deposit in institutional repositories. The challenge is still in persuading authors to deposit in repositories in the first place, and to see deposit as a natural part of their day to day work.

O! SHE DOTHT TEACH THE TORCHES TO BURN BRIGHT: HOW JULIET CAN HELP AUTHORS AND REPOSITORY ADVOCATES

*Jane H Smith, SHERPA Services Development Officer
jane.h.smith@nottingham.ac.uk*

Background

Institutional open access repositories are becoming more common throughout the world, and increasingly form a significant part of central research communication strategies. According to OpenDOAR, in the UK there are currently 79 institutional repositories spread across 65 institutions, the majority of which are universities (1). Some institutions have more than one repository, some have subject specific repositories, and others have separate repositories for e-theses and e-prints. Many if not all of the UK universities who do not currently have a repository are at some stage in the process of developing them.

Institutions use their repositories to help disseminate the results of research carried out by their academics and post-graduate students. The work deposited could take the form of journal articles, doctoral theses or other works relating to the research of the institutions. Some institutions may also include teaching resources and literature relating to the institution.

If your institution has yet to develop a repository, authors can store their articles in The Depot (2, 3). If your institution subsequently decides to create their own repository, the articles stored in The Depot that correspond to your authors can be readily ingested into the local site. SHERPA are investigating whether or not funding agencies and publishers will accept this form of deposit, and will be displaying this information on RoMEO and JULIET.

Repositories and Funding Agencies

In addition to the rise of institutional repositories, research funding agencies for example the Wellcome Trust, have started to introduce policies that either require or encourage their grantees to retain the copyright to their publications where they result from work funded by the agency. These so called funders mandates then require the deposition of these publications in appropriate repositories; such as an institution's own. As a result of these mandates authors increasingly have to consider whether a particular journal's

publisher to whom they wish submit an article is compliant with their funder's mandate. If not, then by necessity they will have to seek to publish with one which does comply.

A few funders will allow authors to choose journals that do not comply with their mandates, as long as the author consults the funder on this matter before publication and can persuade them that the journal in question is the best place for the publication of their research.

One question remains to be tested extensively in this arena – what happens if an author flaunts their funding mandate and publishes within a non-compliant journal? Action from the funding agencies may not be immediate, but likely to occur at the time of next grant application. However, with most mandates less than a year old, this has yet to be tested in practice.

JULIET & Funding Mandates

JULIET is a service provided by SHERPA (4). Its mission is to provide a brief summary of each funding agency's policy on self-archiving of the published research they have funded. Each entry covers the requirements and details:

- Whether archiving is mandatory or encouraged,
- What should be deposited
- Within what time frame this deposit should take place
- Where articles should be deposited
- Any conditions attached to this deposit.

In this way authors and repository administrators can readily understand the mandate requirements without immediately reading the detailed policies.

The service currently holds the policies of 25 funding agencies from around the world, including 15 from the UK. Science and medicine research funders have lead the way in this drive for self-archiving of their funded research. However, several agencies that also fund research into humanities are following suit, and include funders of social science research, such as the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC). Notably of the UK Research Councils, only the Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council (EPSRC) and the Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC) do not have finalised policies, when they do we will update their entries in JULIET accordingly. JULIET is updated on a regular basis with any changes to the policies and websites listed.

Although the funding agencies listed on JULIET, are currently biased towards the UK, this is a global issue, with the USA's National Institute of Health (NIH) being one of the first agencies to develop a policy. Currently their policy is to encourage authors to submit their articles to PubMed Central; however this is currently under review. Most recently, the Schweizerischer Nationalfonds zur Förderung der Wissenschaftlichen Forschung (SNF) in Switzerland have released a policy that will come into effect on the 1st September.

RoMEO & Retained Copyright

If an author wishes to find a quick summary of their agency's policy then it is recommended that they check JULIET directly. However, if an author is interested in eliciting if the journal they would like to publish in is compliant with their funders requirements, then it is more appropriate to make use of JULIET's companion service RoMEO (5).

RoMEO provides a searchable list of publishers' general policies on self-archiving, and currently covers over 300 publishers (5). In addition to the publisher's general policy, RoMEO lists a short summary of which funding agency requirements each publisher's policy meets. This is done via the section Mandated OA to indicate with a tick or a cross if the publisher policy is compliant with particular funder's requirements. Each funder's initials provide a direct link to their corresponding JULIET entry. This provides another route for authors to see whether the publisher of the journal they are interested in is compliant with their grant conditions.

Deposit

RoMEO and JULIET working together can aid authors to meet with the requirements of both their funding agency and the publisher of their journal article. Authors may not always be able to retain copyright to their articles, but should at least be able to ensure that the journal they publish in allows them to self-archive in an appropriate repository.

Using information provided by JULIET changes the status of advocates within an institution, from advocating the use of the repository in a vacuum, to presenting the use of a repository as a solution to an academic's needs. For example, JULIET can also be used by repository staff to highlight the funding requirements to research staff, and what help the repository staff can provide to help academics comply. This advocacy can help to populate institutional repositories with the articles funded by the agencies listed.

The Future

As a result of CURL funding, SHERPA are set to expand the JULIET service over the next few months, to include funding agency policies on open access data archiving. These new entries will follow a similar format to those already listed for journal publication. This will enable authors to view and compare both article and data policies of their funding agencies on one site. It is our belief these crucial services will continue to assist authors in the free sharing of their research data with colleagues globally, in turn stimulating new research and the advancement of human knowledge.

RoMEO and JULIET accept contributions to amend, update existing entries or to add new entries. Both services are greatly assisted by the support that they receive from their user communities. Please do feel free to suggest information or new entries for either service. A suggestion form and contact details are available on the relevant websites.

1. OpenDOAR <http://www.opendoar.org/> [accessed 30/07/07]
2. The Depot <http://depot.edina.ac.uk/> [accessed 01/08/07]
3. Open access through the Depot, Hubbard, B. ALISS Quarterly, 2 (3). April 2007
4. JULIET <http://www.sherpa.ac.uk/juliet/> [accessed 30/07/07]
5. RoMEO <http://www.sherpa.ac.uk/romeo.php> [accessed 30/07/07]

IPR AND MULTIMEDIA IN INSTITUTIONAL REPOSITORIES: LESSONS FROM THE MIDESS PROJECT

Lesley Pitman

Librarian and Director of Information Services, UCL School of Slavonic and East European Studies Library, UCL Library Services.

The MIDESS project (Management of Images in a Distributed Environment with Shared Services) was funded under the JISC Digital Repositories Programme 2005-07 and started work in June 2005. The aim of the project was to report on issues relating to the management of multimedia content in digital repositories, with an emphasis on collaboration between repositories. The partners were the University of Leeds Library, the University of Birmingham Library, the LSE Centre for Learning Technology, the UCL School of Slavonic and East European Studies Library, and the CURL Task Force on Digital Content Creation and Curation; the LSE, Birmingham and Leeds all implemented and populated repositories as part of the project. This article summarises the workpackage on IPR issues that was led by UCL SSEES Library and also reports on a small practical application to share digitised audio-visual content between the LSE and UCL SSEES Library that came about as a consequence of the work package.

The Library at the UCL School of Slavonic and East European Studies became involved in the MIDESS project largely because of its interest in managing audio-visual material. The Library has been recording satellite and domestic television broadcasts for many years and has developed a unique research collection of recorded material on all aspects of Central and Eastern Europe and Russia. Some of this material was recorded under the ERA licence; the rest was done under the exceptions for educational purposes allowed by the law as it was broadcast abroad and is not covered by a licensing scheme. UCL Library Services has also been active over recent years in implementing digital repositories. The MIDESS project gave us the opportunity to combine the two interests and to understand more fully how IPR would influence the uses to which we could put multimedia content in our repositories.

Although the workpackage on IPR ran for only six months in 2006 issues relating to IPR were inevitably an influence on the project from the beginning. One of the first activities in 2005 was a "User Requirements Analysis", which surveyed academic and support staff in partner institutions. The purpose was two-fold: to establish a list of multimedia content for possible inclusion in the

new repositories, and to identify any issues that might cause concern to potential depositors. The results were encouraging in one way, in that an intriguing and potentially very useful range of material was identified: fine art images, music recordings and medical images (including slides and x-rays), all from Birmingham and Leeds; dialect recordings from the Leeds School of English; textile designs from the Leeds Textile Museum; digitised manuscripts from Special Collections; e-learning and training videos and videos of lectures from the LSE Library, Birmingham and Leeds. Less encouraging was the general lack of awareness of potential IPR problems, or where there was awareness, the feeling that the whole problem was simply too complex and would make it too difficult to go ahead at all. Generally the support staff were more aware of IPR issues than the academic staff, as one might expect, but one third of support staff still showed little or no awareness of IPR in relation to the type of multimedia they might be managing in an institutional repository. Alongside this there was a general sense that sharing this material (often tucked away inaccessibly in academic departments or held on local PCs) would be potentially very useful to other teaching and research staff.

Work started on the IPR workpackage in the summer of 2006, and a project officer, Mary Cordiner, was employed at UCL SSEES Library to work for the equivalent of three months full time, although the work was to extend until Christmas of that year. Her first task was review the international legal framework for IPR, and to make contact with other projects working in similar areas, of which there were quite a few. To establish the scope of the report she needed to review the results of the User Requirements Analysis and draw up a list of the different types of content to consider. This list quickly made it apparent that the IPR issues would be complex and would extend well beyond copyright. There were obvious questions of data protection and confidentiality in relation to some of the material, most particularly the medical images, but also images collected during anthropological research abroad, and other rights in question potentially included design rights and trademarks. The rights in material created by employees of HEIs depended on the IPR policy of the employer. Many of these are currently being rewritten, and the national picture is not uniform, so identifying the rights owner of a lecture might not be easy. The databases created by the project would potentially generate their own database rights. Life-cycle issues were also important, as some content could potentially change format several times, initially moving from analogue to digital, and then needing to be converted over the years to keep up with technical changes in institutional repositories. It was equally important to understand and make clear the potential rights of end users: could students and staff reuse any of this content and if so, in what ways?

The final report, now available on the MIDESS project website,ⁱ incorporates the results of all this preliminary work in a way which we hope will be useful to anyone setting up their own institutional repository and having to advise academic and support staff. It begins with the legal framework, summarising relevant legislation and licensing schemes. The bulk of the report then comprises a series of case studies, using real examples from the MIDESS partners. These attempt to identify all the issues that repository administrators should take into account when considering whether to accept each category of material for their repository, and what restrictions, if any, to place on access. The next section deals with best practice, including risk management, checking rights, record keeping, licensing (including the various flavours of creative commons), agreements with depositors, and policies for reuse of material. This section cannot be prescriptive as institutional attitudes to some of these issues will vary. This is particularly true of risk management, where each institution would have to decide on a case by case basis the level of risk they are prepared to accept. Some will be happy to use notice and take down policies where they believe that the risk is low; others will only be prepared to reuse material where they are entirely confident of all the rights involved. Finally, the appendices include tables listing the duration of copyright for different types of media, sample questions to depositors to use, sample warnings to end users, and an extensive set of references to other work and other projects. The report starts and ends with an important warning: it does not constitute legal advice and should not be used as the last word on the issue. Instead it is really intended to be a starting point, pointing repository administrators in the right direction and reassuring them that these problems are not insuperable.

The process of working on the report proved very useful to all the project partners as it helped to clarify what can often be a very complex area, and of course we all learnt a great deal about the strengths of each partner's collections. Towards the end of the project this was to have a practical application of immediate use to the LSE and to UCL SSEES. The LSE was looking for recordings of broadcast material on the Cold War to support a taught course, and UCL SSEES Library happened to have the items they wanted, and more, in our audio-visual collection, recorded some years ago on VHS. From working on the project we knew that there would be no legal problems digitising them and including them in repositories at UCL and at the LSE, so long as we were careful. All the recordings were made under the ERA licence, so they could be held and made available in any format we wished, and moved from one format to another. There were two serious restrictions: they could not be transmitted electronically between institutions, and they could

not be used by people who were not staff and students of the university that held them. In practice this meant that although the recordings only had to be digitised once (at UCL SSEES Library) the digital copies had to be transported to the LSE by more traditional means – fortunately it is not far to walk. They are then loaded separately into the two repositories, and could be made available to staff and students of both institutions separately from the separate institutional repositories. Current licensing restrictions mean that at present they cannot be made accessible off campus. Work is being completed on integrating the rights information for the rights owners and the end users into the metadata, and a short report will be produced summarising our work at the end.

In many ways the lessons of the MIDESS project as a whole were that most of the IPR issues could be tackled if a considerable amount of care was used, and the risks managed. It proved possible to host a great deal of very varied material in the various repositories, although much of it is restricted to use on campus or needs to be behind an authentication system. Making the rights clear to all parties is of paramount importance. Another important lesson was that the whole area of IPR is one where the law changes regularly, and it is not possible to have the last word on the subject. As we worked on the MIDESS report through the summer of 2006 a national consultation was being carried out on the whole issue of IPR in the digital age, and the result of this was the Gowers' Reviewⁱⁱ, which appeared simultaneously with the final draft of the MIDESS report in December 2006. That makes many far reaching recommendations on IPR, the most relevant to repository development being those concerned with format shifting, orphan works, and distance learning. Some changes in British and EU legislation are expected as a consequence over the next few years. Generally speaking these will make life easier for those managing repositories, although it is also worth noting that Gowers recommends increasing the penalties for digital infringements of IPR. The issues are still complex and likely to remain so. The conclusion of the MIDESS report identifies growing problems caused by digital rights management schemes that block uses allowed by law, and by licensing schemes that impose long term restrictions by rights owners on the content of repositories. It concludes thus: "Various reviews and publications have pointed to the potentially damaging effect of copyright laws on research in the humanities and social sciences and the loss of a valuable archive of sound recordings. Go carefully!"

ⁱ Intellectual property issues in institutional and cross-institutional multimedia repositories (Final report MIDESS WP7). Mary Cordiner. http://www.leeds.ac.uk/library/midess/IPR/Report_finalversion.pdf

ⁱⁱ Gowers' Review of Intellectual Property. HMSO 2006. Available at http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/media/6/E/pr06_gowers_report_755.pdf

LIBRARIES, SOCIAL SOFTWARE AND DISTANCE LEARNERS: THE ADVENTURES OF LASSIE

Dr Jane Secker, London School of Economics and Political Science.

Introduction

Everyone seems to be talking (or blogging) about web 2.0 or social software at the moment. Not a day goes by when there isn't a new story about the social networking site Facebook, (<http://www.facebook.com/>) or a company buying space in Second Life (<http://www.secondlife.com/>). Librarians and libraries are certainly no different and the web 2.0 phenomena has achieved a tremendous momentum with our professional organisation CILIP opening offices in Second Life and encouraging the groups to set up blogs. There have also been a number of recent publications on implementing web 2.0 technologies in libraries, such as Phil Bradley's *How to Use Web 2.0 in your Library* (<http://www.zimbio.com/How+to+use+Web+2.0+in+your+library>) and Meredith Farkas *Libraries and Social Software*. (<http://www.sociallibraries.com/>)

Background

A team based at the University of London and led by Dr Jane Secker are currently working on the LASSIE (Libraries and Social Software in Education) project (<http://cltlse.ac.uk/Projects/LASSIE.php>) <http://elearninglse.ac.uk/blogs/socialsoftware/> to explore how social software might enhance the distance learners' experience of libraries. The project recently published a literature review (http://cltlse.ac.uk/Projects/LASSIE_lit_review_draft.pdf) and found the library world is full of people exploring how these technologies might be used. Librarians are keen bloggers and in the US many libraries are using blogs for news stories and to keep their website looking fresh. See for example Madison-Jefferson County Public library, (<http://mjcpl.org/?s=Library-Buzz>) Ohio University Library Business Blog (<http://www.library.ohio.edu/subjects/businessblog/>) and Kansas State University library blogs. (<http://ksulib.typepad.com/>).

In a more revolutionary move in some libraries, user generated content, such as book reviews and comments is being added to the library catalogue. See for example Hennepin County Library (<https://catalog.hclib.org/ipac20/ipac.jsp?session=117557C45YE78.21337&profile=elibrary#focus>) and the University of Huddersfield (<http://webcat.hud.ac.uk/>) which is allowing students to rate books.

Over the next few months the LASSIE team is carrying out a number of small projects to explore how particular tools might enhance the learning experience of real distance learning students. As part of the project a citing and referencing screencast (http://www.lse.ac.uk/library/lmskr/citing_referencing.htm) has been developed, the team is also using the social bookmarking tool del.icio.us (<http://del.icio.us/>) to collect useful resources and exploring CiteULike (<http://www.citeulike.org/>) and H2O Playlists (<http://h2obeta.law.harvard.edu>) to present reading list information. The team have also set up a LASSIE blog (<http://elearninglse.ac.uk/blogs/socialsoftware/>) for anyone interested in keeping up to date with developments in this area.

LASSIE will continue her adventures until December 2007 when a final report will be made available from the project website. (<http://cltlse.ac.uk/Projects/LASSIE.php>)

Library 'patrons' are being encouraged to subscribe to a variety of RSS feeds to keep up to date with library news and acquisitions to the library catalogue and electronic resources. MIT Libraries maintain a list of RSS feeds available from their site. (<http://libraries.mit.edu/help/rss/>) Meanwhile, closer to home London School of Economics and Political Science, have developed a Training website which uses RSS technology, and has a feed that is being incorporated into the VLE, Moodle and the institutional portal. (<http://traininglse.ac.uk/>)

LEARNING 2.0 : 23 LIBRARY THINGS

Heather Dawson, LSE Library

This brief article will review the contents of a free online website developed as an online training course by the Public Library of Charlotte and Mecklenburg Community considering ways in which it might be applied in an academic library setting.

Background.

The 23 things website Learning 2.0 program (<http://plcmcl2-things.blogspot.com/>) was designed by Helene Blowers, PLCMC Technology Director, with the support and assistance of several staff and is loosely based upon Stephen Abram's article, 43 Things I (or You) might want to do this year (Information Outlook - Feb 2006) and the website (<http://www.43things.com/>). It is a self paced learning programme the aim of which is to encourage exploration of Web 2.0 and new technologies by PLCMC staff by directing staff to new tools (that are freely available on the Internet) and encouraging them to complete 23 self-discovery exercises.

Although designed for an American based public library context its clear design serves as an excellent introduction to new web 2.0 tools for UK information workers from all sectors.

I was first alerted to it in early 2007 and have since used it to update my own skills. Although unlike the original course attendees I did not receive an MP3 player for my efforts!

The course is freely available at: <http://plcmcl2-things.blogspot.com/>. It is divided into a number of separate sections each of which deal with a separate type of resource (e.g. blog, wiki). It provides links to free examples where you can download the software and see good examples of it in use. The examples used do not imply any prior technical knowledge and the course can be dipped into at various points when you have some spare time. Simple activities are suggested to record progress. These could easily be adapted by staff trainers or staff development groups to act as an incentive to learners. The site has numerous links to examples of these including blogs and other free web 2.0 courses set up in the USA and Europe.

The course begins with some general introductions about the purpose of lifelong learning and tips from successful adult learners. It then proceeds with some introductions to blogs. It encourages users to set up their own example. This is something I have been involved in with Intute <http://www.intute.ac.uk/> where you can view our examples at: <http://www.intute.ac.uk/socialsciences/blog/>

I was lucky in that the technical aspects were already set up. However, recently I have been learning how to link to audio and visual (video content). One of the main problems of course with this is the organisation of time. Do not under-estimate the dedication it needs to maintain a steady stream of comments. Often I have done my work in batches, but this doesn't really work with a blog as you need to add small regular updates to maintain interest. The other issue is style. As a librarian I have often been encouraged to adhere to a formal style of writing, rather than the more chatty tone adopted by many bloggers. There is also the worry that too much informality may not be appropriate on a work based project. A library blog may have a broader role in communicating about the service in general rather than presenting an individual's opinions. This is not an issue I have resolved myself. Over time from reading other examples I have found that I have tended to make my postings more personalised, but it is a question of reaching a balance as at the same time I need to make it clear that as it appears on the intute website it does represent an organisation.

Week 3 deals with picture sharing using the example of Flickr. <http://www.flickr.com/> while this site is now fairly well known, this part of the course does have some interesting examples of how people have used the resource creatively.

Week 4 covers RSS feeders. Many of the examples are based on Bloglines rather than the Google Reader however, I did find it useful to explore some of the examples it gave. In particular, it directed me to the bloglines search <http://www.bloglines.com/search> which I had not used before which is a really quick and easy way to find sites with RSS feeds, academic and some very non-academic resources!

Week 5 deals with image generating tools. This is a really fun aspect of the course as the first section gives some suggestion of sites which have free image generating software. Have hours of fun playing around creating labels and your own book covers to send to friends! On a more serious note it also introduced me to a site called Rollyo <http://www.rollyo.com/> where you are invited to roll your own customised search engine. This would be really useful if you have a few large sites that you regularly use and check. Although the examples given mainly concentrate on leisure and entertainment interests you can create one on any topic. The course shows some examples that search public domain e-books and special library collections. I attempted to create a system to deal with a few sites relating to international security and terrorism which I regularly visit and it seemed to give quite good quick results.

Week 6 deals with tagging. It has a large section on delicious <http://del.icio.us/> with a podcast and lots of examples of websites and articles to give you inspiration on the possibilities. As a result I tried to develop my own page to support media and communications students at the LSE. This is currently under development but will be more widely launched and publicised for the autumn term 2007. You can view the example at <http://del.icio.us/heatherdawson>. My aim was to communicate with students on their own domain, a site which I knew they regularly used. At the same time I also wanted to use it to promote LSE library resources. I also saw that it had great current awareness potentials as I could use it to highlight the increasing amount of full text free media related resources I discovered on the web. My initial reservations were that many examples I viewed on the site seemed very confusing. This may be a result of my own lack of awareness of new technology, but at the same time I could see that the tagging or indexing terms on many examples were used confusingly or inconsistently. There were instances where one word tags such as england, uk did not summarise the content, also where plurals such as labour party and parties had not been grouped together although they were obviously related. As a result I tried to be far more rigorous in the tags I used. I wanted to highlight a separate library section to promote our fee based databases, many of which are more wide ranging than the free web resources. I then linked through to the e-library where more information on passwords and coverage could be found than it was possible to put on the limited fields offered by delicious. I then tried to highlight particular types of information such as government departments and free image databases which I identified from reading lists as key to the academic courses studied. Finally I set about creating a public awareness section which I could use to highlight the most recent documents. I had to manipulate the wording on this as I wanted to attract the attention of the reader and make sure that they filed near the front of the page. After experimenting I found that the quickest and shortest way to do this was to label it good reads with the month. I could then enter a very brief summary of the title and content. To one used to library cataloguing rules this in itself was an innovation. In some cases I was quite disappointed to note that I couldn't post a PDF file directly to delicious I had to link at a higher level to the home page. However it is proving a quick and effective way to key up to date.

Week 7 focuses upon wikis. I found this section useful in highlighting their potential values. There are some particularly good examples of how they have been used in American Public libraries and ALA conferences. From these I was inspired to learn how to use an LSE example. <https://gabriel.lse.ac.uk/twiki/bin/view/Projects/WebHome> This was initially set up by IT project staff to manage access issues relating to Library password

protected resources. However, we had continued to post notes and documents in public email folders where they were often difficult to locate as they were down several levels of the hierarchy. It was also difficult for staff to work on these collaboratively. Learning how to use a wiki meant that I could liaise and work with a staff member in the serials department on a shared spreadsheet listing the URLs of both ejournals and other e-databases on the same file where previously they had been recorded separately.

Finally, after a section on free word processing sites, the course moves to consider podcasting. Although I had used some of these before, I found the tutorials here to provide some good background information on the technology which covers both searching and locating suitable podcasts on the Internet and the technology associated with setting up one of your own. In particular I found it useful to explore the podcast directories. Many of these focus upon entertainment and leisure interests, but I did find the Yahoo search did retrieve a number of US based politics news programmes. <http://podcasts.yahoo.com/> which I had not discovered by other means. The course also taught me how to create RSS news feeds from these onto my own personalised web page.

While some of the aspects were not new to me I did find many innovations that I could easily and enjoyably follow in my own spare time. Several other sites created by UK information professionals which offer a similar service include Phil Bradleys page I want to: <http://www.philb.com/iwantto.htm>. Phil is a well known advocate for new technologies. Recently he gave an inspirational presentation on the possibilities of web 2.0 for Librarians at Umbrella 2007. *Practical uses for web 2.0 in a library environment*. This can be viewed online via the slide share website <http://www.slideshare.net/Philbradley/umbrella2007/>. The I want to section of his home page is filled with an ever growing list of suggestions and tips for things you might want to do online. These range from photo sharing to shopping and presentations. The previous article on the LASSIE project also provides much inspiration on this theme. Visit the project for a blog by researchers exploring the issue with links to many of the most influential blogs and websites. <http://elearning.lse.ac.uk/blogs/socialsoftware/>

LIBRARIANS AGAINST PLAGIARISM: HOW IMPERIAL COLLEGE LONDON IS USING PRS AND ACTIVE LEARNING TO COMBAT THE CUT AND PASTE GENERATION.

Ruth Harrison and Julia Garthwaite, Liaison Librarians,

Imperial College London Library

Plagiarism is becoming a significant problem in the education sector and an increasing number of cases are being reported, not limited to higher education. There are various factors attributed to this growth – widespread use of the internet for coursework research; the seemingly commonly-held belief that online information is free to use without acknowledgement; the simplicity of the cut-and-paste method when using the internet; different education cultures; and the lack of structured teaching of referencing skills to combat plagiarism.

At ICL the aim is for all students to become information literate. The College definition of information literacy (IL) underlines the importance of the ability to ethically use information, and developing an understanding of the legal issues surrounding it. As librarians increasing deliver IL programmes at all levels the question therefore is that when teaching IL skills to students is it also the librarian's responsibility to help the students understand what plagiarism is and how to avoid it (as opposed to the university's responsibility)?

Imperial College London Library has run an online information literacy programme for over 3 years - Olivia: Online Virtual Information Assistant - aimed at first year undergraduates, but also used with a number of MSc taught course students. A pre-course survey conducted within Olivia to establish students' existing levels of understand of IL issues such as plagiarism, finding quality information, referencing, and so on, has provided us with the knowledge that most students can supply a basic definition of plagiarism. Commonly this has been expressed as either copying another's work, or passing another's work off as your own; what the survey responses do not indicate is the skills students have to combat plagiarism. We feel it is important to focus on these, and the benefits of not plagiarising, rather than simply telling the students that plagiarism is wrong (a 'bad thing' as one respondent to the survey wrote).

One of the key modules within Olivia focuses on plagiarism: what it is, and how to avoid it. Traditionally our teaching approach to plagiarism was to deliver a lecture on the types of plagiarism, the benefits of not plagiarising, and the skills required to avoid plagiarism, i.e. paraphrasing, accurate referencing and so on. This is supported by the Olivia unit which is available for students 24/7. However, we know that plagiarism is not an exciting subject, and to enliven and

involve the students in the teaching sessions, in autumn 2006 we introduced an active learning approach. This includes discussion exercises, the use of a traditional presentation, and a Personal Response System (PRS or more commonly known as 'clickers') to test the students' understanding of plagiarism.

The PRS was used to ask students 12 questions after they'd received a presentation on plagiarism types, and how to avoid it, and had taken part in a discussion exercise about plagiarism penalties. Whilst somewhat chaotic, the students very enthusiastically took part (the first student to get their response in for each question won chocolate which proved an effective incentive), and feedback was that the PRS was a successful method. The results of the questions were not displayed during the teaching session, but emailed to the students afterwards with accompanying feedback. Across 2 groups of engineering students, common problems could be identified, such as comprehending the distinction between paraphrasing, and quotations, and the correct use of using 'free' online information within their work.

The plagiarism teaching session ends with a showing of a DVD, produced in conjunction with RADA which follows a fresher through successful completion of his degree, postgraduate research and first employment, emphasising the importance of his own work and expression of his own ideas in achieving these goals. Copies of the DVD can be requested from r.e.harrison@imperial.ac.uk

At Imperial, the Library feels strongly that our role in anti-plagiarism teaching should continue, particularly as an appreciation and respect of academic work is key to the ethical use of information, a key IL competency. The attraction of anti-plagiarism teaching to academic departments has proved so strong that Olivia is now incorporated into 75% of all undergraduate courses at Imperial. In addition the popularity of such teaching has encouraged further developments including a unit within PILOT, the Library's postdoctoral online anti-plagiarism programme, which helps staff understand why students plagiarise, how to spot it and help them avoid it.

For further information please contact r.e.harrison@imperial.ac.uk or j.garthwaite@imperial.ac.uk.

IBSS UPDATE

The International Bibliography of the Social Sciences (IBSS) is the essential online resource for social science and interdisciplinary research. IBSS includes over 2.5 million bibliographic records relating to the four core social science subjects of anthropology, economics, politics and sociology.

IBSS is funded by the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) and has been produced by The London School of Economics and Political Science (LSE) since 1989. IBSS covers over 2,800 current social science journals from every region of the world, plus an additional 500 journals which are indexed on an irregular basis. In addition to printed journals IBSS also indexes electronic journals. Journal coverage includes articles, reviews, research notes, responses and short essays.

As a result of funding from the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC), access to IBSS online is available free of charge via Ovid for users at UK HE/FE institutions, research institutes recognised by the ESRC and UK central government departments. Users should contact the Library at their own institution for details about how to access IBSS.

Access to IBSS for UK commercial and for all non UK institutions is available on subscription via CSA and Ovid. Users should contact the Library at their own institution for details about how to access IBSS.

New IBSS support materials are available for the new academic year. We have produced a new user guide "Using IBSS for dissertations" and have updated all other IBSS leaflets and produced them in more user-friendly formats, as described below. Two online tutorials about searching and using results on IBSS via Ovid Gateway are available on our website

New Using IBSS for dissertations - A guide for final year undergraduate and taught postgraduate students with tips on searching for and managing references and including a useful checklist
<http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/IBSS/pdf/IBSS%20Dissertation%20leaflet.pdf>

New Online tutorials - Two new online tutorials about using IBSS via the Ovid Gateway platform - the first is about searching on IBSS and the second about viewing and using results. Available from mid September.
<http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/IBSS/>

Updated

IBSS leaflet - gives a brief overview of IBSS coverage and benefits to users

http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/IBSS/pdf/IBSSleaflet_final.pdf

Updated

IBSS poster

http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/IBSS/pdf/IBSSA3poster_final.pdf

Updated

IBSS subject guides for anthropology; economics; politics; sociology; policy studies and social policy; European studies; international relations

http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/IBSS/pdf/IBSSSubj_Anthro_final.pdf

http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/IBSS/pdf/IBSSSubj_Economics_final.pdf

http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/IBSS/pdf/IBSSSubj_Politics_final.pdf

http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/IBSS/pdf/IBSSSubj_Politics_final.pdf

http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/IBSS/pdf/IBSSSubj_Sociology_final.pdf

http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/IBSS/pdf/IBSSSubj_European.pdf

http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/IBSS/pdf/IBSSSubj_UKHE.pdf

Updated

IBSS quick tips for Ovid Gateway interface - a brief guide on using IBSS via Ovid

http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/IBSS/support/supp_training_UKHE.htm

Existing version

IBSS quick tips for SilverPlatter WebSPRS interface - a brief guide on using IBSS via SilverPlatter

http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/IBSS/support/supp_training_UKHE.htm

If you would like a supply of printed leaflets to display in your Library or to circulate to social science students and researchers, the materials are available free of charge and can be ordered using our online order form

<http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/IBSS/address/form.htm>

In order to encourage use of IBSS you may like to provide links from your website to some or all of the following resources which are available on the IBSS website:

- user guides and support materials (as described above)
http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/IBSS/support/supp_training_UKHE.htm
- case studies and sample searches which demonstrate how to search IBSS effectively
<http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/IBSS/searching/default.htm>
- lists of journals covered by IBSS - both by subject and A-Z list
<http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/IBSS/about/coverage.htm>

Please do contact me if you have any queries.

Jane Ferguson, Marketing Manager
International Bibliography of the Social Sciences
The Library, London School of Economics and Political Science
London WC2A 2HD
Tel: 020 7852 3529
Email: j.i.ferguson@lse.ac.uk
www.ibss.ac.uk