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Abstract
In an effort to eliminate redundancies in thesis and dissertation cataloging at the University of Arkansas, a working group was devised to create a semi-automated workflow. This new, multi-departmental workflow eliminates redundancies, allowing us to provide better access to the intellectual endeavors of the scholars on our campus. This paper describes the experience of the collaboration within multiple library departments and departments across campus; acknowledges the importance of library and campus collaboration with examples of success and advice from the literature; and emphasizes clear and consistent communication, meeting user needs, and streamlined and innovative workflows.
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INTERDEPARTMENTAL COLLABORATION ON ELECTRONIC THESES AND DISSERTATIONS

Redesigning Workflows to Enhance Access
Background Information

- Redundancies in the metadata creation
- Breakdown in communication between departments involved
- Lack of procedural documentation
- Outdated Graduate School Student Forms
Background Information (continued)

- A working group was formed that included:
  - Head of technical services
  - Head of monographs acquisitions
  - Head of monographs cataloging
  - Institutional repository coordinator
  - University archivist

- Problem solving
  - Stylesheets for XML files
  - Harvesting from the IR
COMMUNICATION
Communication Practices Overview

- Who we stay in contact with and how we do that
- Results of this communication – new forms for students
- Some lessons learned…the hard way
Who to communicate with? How to do that?

Some questions to ask
- Who is involved in the ETD process?
  - Just the library or departments within the library?
  - Libraries and graduate school?
  - Do your students create content with patents? Might need a Technology Commercialization unit or managers (TCM).
  - Anyone else? Make sure decisions go up the chain of command.
- What is the best way to keep those groups in contact?
  - Email?
  - Face-to-face meetings?
  - Project management tools?
  - A combination?

http://creative.artisantalent.com/improve-office-communication/
Without good communication

Before...

- What is a technology commercialization manager (TCM)?
- What do they do for our students?
- What exactly does the Graduate School do with ETDs?
- Do they just handle paperwork?
- Who talks to ProQuest???
- They had questions about the library and the IR too!
Results of good communication continued

▪ After...
  ▪ Better awareness
    ▪ Of each other and each other’s tasks
    ▪ Of the path of an ETD at our institution
    ▪ Of other issues that had never been communicated outside of departments
  ▪ New documentation for students
    ▪ A new IP form
    ▪ A new general form
      ▪ With permission for libraries to use birthdates in creation of NARs

**More on the forms later**
Lessons Learned

- Talk to EVERYONE about what you are doing.
  - Please do **not** do what I did... **Run it up the chain!!!**

- IR Permissions
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROQUEST</th>
<th>SCHOLARWORKS@UARK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open Access Publishing Plus</strong> – Search engine access to metadata, full paper is downloadable. (ProQuest charges a fee for this setting)</td>
<td>Search engine access to metadata, full paper is downloadable. (No charge)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Traditional Publishing</strong> – Search engine access can be selected, full paper downloadable only from the ProQuest database.</td>
<td>Search engine access to metadata, full paper is downloadable. Can be a good alternative to ProQuest Access Plus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do not delay release</strong> – Search engine access to metadata can be selected, no embargo has been applied. Full paper will be available, in either Open Access or Traditional, above, immediately after ProQuest has added the information.</td>
<td>Search engine access to metadata, full paper is downloadable and will be available immediately after ScholarWorks@UARK has added the information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delay release</strong> – Embargo has been applied – Search engine access to metadata can be selected, metadata available through ProQuest database, full paper is not available for download for a limited time.</td>
<td>Embargo has been applied – Search engine access to metadata, full paper is not available for download for a limited time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Never available</strong> – indefinite embargo has been applied – metadata is available through ProQuest database, no search engine access to metadata, full paper is never available for download.</td>
<td>Indefinite embargo has been applied – No search engine access to metadata, full paper is never available for download.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lessons Learned (continued)

- Not everyone has the same knowledge you do.
  - Use plain language.
  - If you *do* use jargon, be sure to explain it.
Workflow Chart - detail

1. Student prepares document using Graduate School guidelines.
2. Student sends forms to Grad. School & uploads document to ProQuest.
3. Graduate School Reviews/Advises of changes needed.
4. Changes? (Decision box)
   - Yes: Student edits & re-submits.
   - No: Proceed to next step.
Thesis/Dissertation Submission Form

Name:

Student ID: Email:

Date of Birth: Country of Citizenship: Phone Number:

Degree & Program: Month & Year of Graduation:

Title:

Who would like to use your birth date to create your personal name authority record.

Does this meet your approval? Yes No

Was Research Committee Review Required?*

Disability Committee (Restrictant DNA) Yes No Approval:

Animal Care and Use Committee Yes No Approval:

Institutional Review Board (Human Subjects) Yes No Approval:

Library Subject Headings: Under what subject headings would you expect us to treat your manuscript in a library catalog?

Statement of Understanding: I verify that the file has been carefully proofread and that all content, spelling, punctuation, and page numbering have been thoroughly checked. I understand that my paper will be archived through microfilm and the institutional repository, http://digital.library.unt.edu, according to the policies of the University. I agree to the terms of the copyright statement:

By my signature, I certify that I have read and agree with the above statement.

Signature of Student:

By signing below, I verify that all of the above information is correct and that I have reviewed this thesis/dissertation for format and content. I also verify that it contains no plagiarized materials.

Signature of Thesis/Dissertation Director:

Signature of Department Head or Graduate Coordinator:

Graduate School Use Only

This is to verify that the Graduate School has checked this thesis or dissertation and that it conforms to the requirements as specified in the Guide to Theses and Dissertations.

Thank you.

Signature of Graduate School Representative Date (Manuscript Approved by Graduate School):

Revised: 3/1/2018

intellectual property disclosure (notification of invention)

Student Name:

Surname/Last: First: Middle Initial:

ID Number: Degree: Program:

Thesis/Dissertation Title:

Note: For purposes of this form, "Invention" does not include original works, such as a piece of music, poetry, etc. For information about inventions and the University’s patent and copyright board policy: 210.3 (techventures.unc.edu).

Please check the appropriate line below.

This thesis/dissertation does contain an invention of commercial interest. The student must inform the appropriate technology commercialization unit and obtain the appropriate signature.

For the University of Arkansas, Technology Commercialization Office (techventures.unc.edu): 479-373-3006

*Technology Commercialization Manager: Date:

I hereby grant permission to the University of Arkansas to publish my thesis or dissertation if the appropriate technology commercialization unit does not receive an invention disclosure describing the intellectual property in my thesis or dissertation within one year of the date hereof.

Student Name:

Department:

Email:

Thesis/Thesis Director:

Email:

Program Chair/Graduate Coordinator:

Email:

This form is required for all students submitting a master's thesis or doctoral dissertation and must be submitted to the Graduate School with the final copy of the thesis or dissertation.

Revised: 9/2017
IR workflow details
IR workflow details (cont.)
Workflow Chart – detail

Library informs Graduate School

Monographs harvests IR metadata; uploads to Sierra

Use Connexion to add OCLC number, LCSH & LCC

Export to Sierra

IR edits XML files & uploads to repository

ETD available to public!
Harvesting set-up

- Server Address: http://scholarworks.uark.edu/do/oai/
- Set Name: publication-eld
- Metadata Type: qdc
- Crosswalk Path: C:\Bepress\XSLTStylesheets\DebsXSLTETUDsFinal.xsl
- Start: 2018-04-01
- End: 2018-04-12
Workflow Chart
Statistics

- **Overall**
  - Time needed for ETDs in the past
    - Approx. 30 minutes to an hour per thesis or dissertation from start to finish.
  - Time currently being used
    - Approx. 10 to 30 minutes per thesis or dissertation from start to finish.

- **Specifics**
  - **IR**
    - To create a combined file of 13 records and edit the file for upload takes about 1 hour and 25 minutes.
  - **Harvesting**
    - To harvest 146 records takes 2 min. 33 sec. from start to finish.
  - **Subject analysis**
    - Application of LCSH & LCC usually takes between 10 and 30 minutes.
Next Steps

- IR
  - XML files

- Monographs cataloging
  - Batch uploading – data sync collections
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