RUCORE ENHANCEMENTS FOR OPEN ACCESS POLICY IMPLEMENTATION
based on RULAC OA Policy Implementation Working Group recommendations
prepared by Jane Otto and Laura Mullen
rev. December 8, 2013

1. RUcore Faculty Deposit Portal & Web Presence

Provide a completely new look, and possibly new name, and web address directly under Rutgers, as
 follows:

Rationale: A revamp of the faculty deposit interface is probably the single most important
recommendation. A new look and possibly new brand (within RUcore) would help launch the new
policy, and offer an appealing model to expected participants. Removal of libraries from the domain
name conveys the idea this is an institutional, not a library, initiative. In general, the website should be
modeled on DASH, in terms of content, navigability, browsing, searching, limiting (filtering), and
sorting. Faculty insist the interface be top notch; "can't be A-minus; it has to look attractive." Most of the
proposed enhancements are standard in many repositories.

Faculty are very keen to have a browse functionality with logical breakdowns so that users aren't asked to
"pull terms out of the air." This type of easy browsing would also serve other collections; for example,
the ETD collection would be well served by the browse by academic unit. This new array of search
options should also be much more visible than RUcore's current Search Faculty Collections options.

STATUS: Some content developed; those metadata specs required to enable recommended record
displays have been written and approved.

1. Revise basic bibliographic record display (individual record, search results, and complete record
    displays)
    a) Parse journal citation metadata sufficient to configure individual displays, prospectively and
       retrospectively
    b) Use color, bold, and italics to increase readability of brief record display (cf. DASH)
    c) Revise genre/format terms (e.g., research, journal article, book) and make them more prominent
    d) Prominently display NISO version terms
    e) In the record and results list, add 'Link to Published version'; cf. DASH (and do a search in
       PubMed Central and use 'Limits' to limit search to author manuscripts. Note how records display
       in multiple hits list (i.e., Journal title followed by 'author manuscript' with published version on
       next line).

Rationale: Faculty have asked that the display be more readable, feature the most important information
most prominently, and look more like a repository and less like a library catalog. It should be more
densely packed with familiar displays (i.e. standard citations), less "artsy" and have less white space.

Status: Parsing of journal citation metadata (1.a) requires steps (i)-(vi):
    i.   Determine how metadata should be parsed. An imperfect but workable solution to parsing
         journal citation metadata was developed by G. Agnew, approved by the Metadata Working
         Group, and reviewed by Software Architecture. (The solution allows journal citation displays
         but is not flexible enough to support export, printing, etc., of citations or bibliographies in
         multiple standard displays like APA, MLA, Chicago Manual of Style, etc. The ideal solution
         was deemed prohibitively expensive to implement.) **[COMPLETE]**

ii. Based on (1), configure the Partner Portal tool (initially, in test) to enable application of the changes. **[IN PROCESS]**

iii. Manually edit metadata in test records and apply reconfigured display **[IN PROCESS]**

iv. Configure the Partner Portal tool in production **[NOT STARTED]**

v. Revise metadata on existing deposits **[NOT STARTED]**

vi. Configure the portal using the Partner Portal tool **[NOT STARTED]**

vii. Revise the metadata mapping which occurs when data from the Faculty Deposit form is inherited into the WMS, to ensure proper metadata prospectively; cf. (16) **[NOT STARTED; PART OF THE *MULTIPLE VERSION SPECIFICATIONS FOR FACULTY DEPOSITS*; MAPPING OF VERSION AND JOURNAL CITATION METADATA SCHEDULED FOR RELEASE 7.4]**

viii. Revise the Faculty Deposit application profile to document proper metadata input prospectively, given the new mapping **[NOT STARTED; PART OF THE *MULTIPLE VERSION SPECIFICATIONS FOR FACULTY DEPOSITS*; SCHEDULED FOR RELEASE 7.5]**

ix. Revise genre/format terms in faculty deposit module (from which metadata in the system is inherited) **[NOT STARTED]**

x. Configure WMS to support NISO version metadata (cf. Multiple Version Specifications for Faculty Deposits, no. 4) **[NOT STARTED; SCHEDULED FOR RELEASE 7.4]**

xi. Determine best method, and workflow, to link to published version **[NOT STARTED]**

2. Enhance Faculty Deposit portal searching and display
   a) Follow DASH model of providing search box (with link to advanced search) with Browse options below; cf. http://dash.harvard.edu/community-list
   b) The link to each type of browse search should open up to the browsable list, with A-Z bar across top; cf. DASH author browse at http://dash.harvard.edu/browse?type=author (however, remove order and Results pulldowns; order should be descending and results should be as many as reasonably possible. Exception: For title browse, present the default brief display, sorted by title; cf. DASH title browse at http://dash.harvard.edu/browse?type=title
   c) Provide the following Browse searches:
      ▪ Authors [not Names]
      ▪ Titles
      ▪ Keywords
      ▪ Schools with Departments (hierarchical; cf. DASH Communities & Collections browse, but instead of subcategories of articles, student papers, etc., the subcategories would be the departments. For schools, enter the name in direct order, e.g., Camden School of Business. In contrast, enter names of department under the significant word, and drop "Department of." In other words, follow the DASH model for browsing FAS Departments at http://dash.harvard.edu/browse?type=department.
      ▪ Schools
      ▪ Departments
      ▪ By issue date
      ▪ By submit date
      ▪ Most popular [i.e. most downloaded]
      ▪ Recently added [exclude ETDs from this browse, if ETDs are included in the faculty deposit portal)
   d) Provide the following search box pulldowns:
      ▪ Full text (to include full bib record + actual full text of the article)
      ▪ Author (not name)
      ▪ Title
      ▪ Keyword (not subject)
      ▪ Abstract (not description)
      ▪ Issue Date (lacking issue date, go to create date, copyright date, etc.)

- Submission date
- Department
- School
- Advisor (if ETDs included)
- Committee member (if ETDs included)
- DOI

e) Provide the following limits:
- School or department
- Publication type (dissertations [includes theses], articles, conference proceedings, etc.; should match deposit form list, and in same order)
- Add checkbox: ☐ include embargoed articles

f) Provide the following sort options:
- Most recent (by default: issue date; lacking issue date, go to create date, copyright date, etc.). Articles should not display in reverse chronological order of input.
- Title
- Relevance (only include if >x number of hits)

Rationale: Faculty are clear that without a better search and retrieval interface, comparable to their favored repositories, the system will not be used and their colleagues will not participate.

Status: Not started

3. Enhance Faculty Deposit web page content
   a) Logo at upper left
   b) Scope statement at top (in one or two sentences, with 'more' link) [cf. http://www.escholarship.org]
   c) Mega-menus in tab format across the top
      - Search & Browse
      - About
      - My account
      - Research Services
      - FAQs (for faculty deposit)
      - Help
      - Deposit your work
   d) Search box, link to advanced search, and browse lists at top of right-hand navigation bar
   e) DEPOSIT YOUR WORK button
   f) A box featuring the policy with 'Learn more' link to the OA policy page [cf. center block at http://www.escholarship.org].
   g) Link to videos about open access and the policy [cf. http://www.escholarship.org and http://www.escholarship.org/about_meet_kelty.html]
   h) Social media links
   i) Graphic
   j) Statistics (using graphic evoking global reach) [cf. http://dash.harvard.edu]
   k) Revolving list of recent submissions ("Articles by Rutgers authors") [exclude ETDs]
   l) Featured works
   m) "This week's most downloaded works" link

   Rationale: Faculty are clear that without richer content, comparable to their favored repositories, the system will not be used and their colleagues will not participate.

Status: Not started, although some content (e.g., About, FAQs, Help, OA policy text is developed and will be provided by the Working Group)

4. Enhance navigation:

- Allow navigation to previous and next record
- Change default number of Results per page to 100 or more, not 10 (this is a simple configuration change)

Status: Appears to be complete; navigation to previous/next records is now in place, and default number of search results is configurable

5. Provide a form and process to collect statements about how article was used or how the service is useful (with optional info about user and/or article), for display on web page; cf. DASH.

Status: Not started

2. Harvesting

Harvard and MIT, among others, regularly harvest from open access repositories; no further permission is required, since the resources are already open access. We need to enable harvesting of records from other open access repositories. It requires more research in some cases, to develop the mechanics of harvesting, for example, working out sorting protocols to facilitate identification of Rutgers content. MIT can provide more counsel in this area.
   a) Discuss with MIT, UC, and others
   b) Investigate requirements with individual repositories, beginning with arXiv, PubMed, SSRN, etc.
   c) Begin implementing, repository by repository

Rationale: In presentations to faculty, particularly in disciplines with a strong open access culture, the most frequently asked question is "Why do I have to deposit twice?"

Status: This has been discussed with the Harvard Open Access Project, and we were referred for further discussion to MIT.

3. Enable dark deposits, including open metadata with dark deposits

Rationale: This is in line with Policy Implementation best practices as described by Harvard Open Access Project. Part of the purpose of an institutional repository is to keep a record of institutional scholarship. Support for dark deposits supports the message that faculty should always deposit their new work. Dark deposit allows for immediate deposit, since rights to make articles available can change over time. For seven reasons why repositories should allow dark deposits, see Stuart Shieber, "The importance of dark deposit," *The Occasional Pamphlet,* March 12, 2011:
http://blogs.law.harvard.edu/pamphlet/2011/03/12/the-importance-of-dark-deposit/

Status: Not started

4. Enable dynamic bibliography feature

This is the "Dan Fishman proposal," which provides users a simple URL which executes a dynamic search of their articles in RUcore, reported out as an exportable, shareable bibliography.

Rationale: This service offers authors a link to a dynamic bibliography of deposits, which they can post on webpages, on their email signatures, etc. This provides obvious benefits to faculty and an incentive to deposit scholarship. Further, it is a way to draw readers to the repository, which can up its rankings in Google searches.

Status: This was discussed and assignments made at a July, 2012, meeting. Much of the ground work on this has been done, but journal citation metadata must be parsed before programming can be completed.

5. Include cover page with every faculty deposit

Rationale: This identifies the version deposited in the repository, and its relationship to other versions. The existence of multiple versions is one of faculty's biggest concerns about the policy, and this helps to mitigate that concern.

Status: Cover pages have been drafted and approved. Software Architecture Working Group has approved the specs and assigned this to RUcore Release 7.4. Retrospective addition to existing deposits has not yet been addressed (see 6 below).

6. Retrospectively add cover page and DOI to every existing deposit

Rationale: This identifies the version deposited in the repository, and its relationship to other versions. The existence of multiple versions is one of faculty's biggest concerns about the policy, and this helps to mitigate that concern.

Status: Not started; no. 8 in the *Multiple Version Specifications for Faculty Deposits*; scheduled for Release 7.5.

7. Create a reporting mechanism to enable deans to request bibliographies of their schools' deposits

Rationale: Key to building participation is the idea that deans can promote the work of their schools, and demonstrate to University Administration their schools' scholarly contributions.

Status: Not started

8. Create a reporting mechanism to track deposits chronologically and by academic unit

Rationale: This will enable the Libraries and the University to document measurable outcomes of promoting the Open Access policy and the institutional repository.

Status: Unknown; this may already be in place, according to correspondence with Software Architecture Working Group chair, 11/24/13.

9. Implement OrcidIDs

Harvard is about to incorporate the ORCID ID into DASH, and recommends asking for ORCID IDs at the point of ETD submission. Note: this requires coordination with the LDAP database.

Rationale: The ORCID ID provides a unique and persistent digital identifier to distinguish an author from every other author, supports automated linkages between authors and their professional activities, and helps to ensure an author or researcher's work is recognized. Many authors are beginning to register for their unique ORCID identifiers, and the system should be able to accept it. It is important to capture it now, even if the repository can't do anything with it other than store it and make it searchable. That way, when greater functionality becomes available, the ID is there.

Status: Not started

10. Provide notifications

   a) to repository staff when an embargo ends (so that postprint can be added to the record for the preprint)
   b) to depositor when the deposit is successfully completed
   c) to depositor when a newer version has been added
   d) to author when his or her work appears as the most downloaded article

Rationale: Notifications to depositors increase confidence in the system and build good will, to encourage further deposits.

Status: Not started

11. Revise workflows to enable clear linking to the published version's full citation, with live link to DOI (cf. above under Displays)

Note the required workflow would include notification (to repository staff) of publication, and addition of metadata (DOI, pagination) for an existing deposit.

Rationale: The existence of multiple versions is one of faculty's biggest concerns about the policy, and this helps to mitigate that concern.

Status: Not started

12. Provide a "Request a Copy" button and "View all Versions" link

Rationale: **"**The Request a Copy" button allows repository end users to obtain a copy of an article when it has been embargoed or is a dark deposit. The "View all Versions" link generates a display of the complete version history. These two functionalities together form Item (6) in the *Multiple Versions Specification for Faculty Deposits*.

Status: Specifications have been drafted and approved; Software Architecture Working Group has assigned these to Release 7.5.

13. Provide a My Account page modeled on arXiv

Status: Specs for a My Account functionality were assigned within the Cyberinfrastructure Steering Committee, and drafted by R. Marker and J. Deodato, April, 2013. Unknown if arXiv was reviewed as a model. Listed on RUcore release time as scheduled for Release 7.3 and 7.4 (Jan./Feb. 2014 and Late Spring 2014).

14. Revise Usage Statistics displays

   a) Fix statistics on the 'Deposit Your Work' page; they are incomprehensible and are differ significantly from those provided on the individual record display, in terms of number of downloads, and location of downloads
   b) Remove Views statistics and simplify display accordingly
   c) Consider a line graph (with options for cumulative and annual citation statistics) display, such as that provided by Microsoft Academic search.

Rationale: This is one of the most important and appreciated of all repository functionalities, according to the literature and responses received in presentations, due to its ability to demonstrate impact for the purpose of promotion and tenure.

Status: (1) has been reported as a bug. (2) has been requested and is on the Dec. 10 CSC agenda for discussion. (3) not started.

15. Revise Faculty Deposit form pages

1. Make it clear that grad students can deposit
2. See Appendix 1 for other changes

Rationale: Although the policies page makes it clear that grad students can deposit, many will never visit that page, and the opening screen for 'Deposit your work' says "Rutgers University faculties are invited ..." The inclusion of grad students is an innovative part of our policy so there should be no ambiguity. The deposit form has not been systematically revisited for some time, and could benefit from streamlining.

Status: Proposed changes have been drafted, but not yet discussed outside the Working Group.

16. Revise metadata mapping from the Faculty Deposit application to WMS

Metadata is mapped from the Faculty Deposit form (completed by depositor) into the WMS, where it is edited for subsequent ingest (with the article itself) into RUcore. Changes to the form will require changes to the mapping, which in turn has repercussions for the Faculty Deposit application profile (see below).

Rationale: Accurate mapping from the form to the WMS reduces the amount of metadata keying, to ensure efficient, consistent, accurate metadata.

Status: Not started; mapping of version and journal citation metadata scheduled for Release 7.4.

17. Create Faculty Deposit application profile

Rationale: An application profile documenting how metadata should be input helps to ensure metadata is consistent and conforms to recommended displays. The current application profile covers all journal articles, and does not take into account metadata mapped in from the Faculty Deposit form, or other unique characteristics of faculty deposits. It also should be revised in light of requested changes to displays and workflows (see 1.1, 16, etc., above).

Status: The current application profile has been reviewed; revision is dependent on changes to the deposit form (see 15 above), and how that maps to WMS (see 16 above). Questions about genre/form terms, and how they appear, both on the form, and in final record displays, are still to be resolved (I.1 above).

18. Flesh out "Open Access Policy" webpage

Include
- information on policy
- generic presentation
- FAQs about the policy
- updates/progress reports (timeline)
- list of presentations (past and upcoming)
- "Request a presentation" button
- video
- contact info

Rationale: Rutgers scholars will want information about the policy before participating.

Status: Virtually all content (except the video, scheduled for discussion Dec. 13, 2013) is in place, and ready for discussion with webmaster.

19. Search engine crawling

    a) Ensure Rucore is configured to support search engine crawling in accordance with JISC InfoNet recommendations and Google Webmaster Guidelines

    b) Verify search engine crawling is consistently implemented across collections in Google and Google Scholar

    c) Document and convey (to all WMS managers) workflow for ensuring new collections are implemented and configured correctly.

Rationale: This ensures that collections are discoverable in Google and Google Scholar.

Status: Not started (some of this work has been done, but not systematically).

20. Resolve issue of netID requirement for deposit

Rationale: Access to the RUcore deposit form requires netID authentication. Not all Rutgers scholars falling under the policy have a netID; therefore they are turned away by the system, or must request manual deposit, which they don't necessarily know to do.

Status: Not started

21. Establish and publicize clear policies re: RUcore staff making deposits required by funders

Rationale: RUcore staff have the capability to make funder-required deposits on behalf of authors, but this service has not been formalized or offered.

Status: Not started. L. Mullen and J. Otto plan to meet with Y. Zhang and R. Marker to discuss this issue (November 26, 2013).

22. Fix existing bugs

Status: A list of existing bugs is being compiled. For example, "deposit in process" indicator (circle) goes on indefinitely with no indication the process has been completed.

23. Add Export Citation feature like that found on publisher platforms

Rationale: This is a useful standard feature offered by many repositories.

Status: Not started

24. Enable marking of records to allow emailing, printing, exporting, etc.

Rationale: This is a useful standard feature offered by many repositories.

Status: Not started

25. Fix Share feature

Rationale: This feature is glitchy. The format of the emailed record is clunky. Cryptic terminology ("Do Not Track"; "Sign in") appears, and the Yahoo link is partially covered up with some screen resolutions.

Status: Reported via Contact Us but not raised to the level of a bug.

26. Revise the RUcore home page

- Review the page's organization into "Faculty," "Search by Collection," "Collaborations," and "Search"
- Don't rely on mouseover text to define Digital Collections, Scholarly Materials, and Research Data; people don't read it

Rationale: Faculty reports that the organization of the home page into "Faculty," "Search by Collection," "Collaborations," and "Search" is confusing, and information under each is not necessarily appropriate (for example, Deposit your work under Faculty).

Status: Not started

27. Provide a "Submit correction" button

Rationale: This allows users to submit corrections or add a new version. For example, see DASH's button to 'Contact administrator regarding this item (to report mistakes or request changes)'

Status: Not started

28. Ensure PIRUS compliance

Rationale: Compliance with the (evolving) PIRUS and PIRUS2 standards for sharing traffic data will prevent the dilution of traffic numbers at the several repositories. Cf. Harvard Open Access Project's "Implementing a Policy" document at http://cyber.law.harvard.edu/hoap/Implementing_a_policy. For more information on PIRUS and PIRUS2 standards, see: http://www.jisc.ac.uk/whatwedo/programmes/pals3/pirus.aspx and http://www.cranfieldlibrary.cranfield.ac.uk/pirus2/tiki-index.php

29. Remove ETDs from Faculty Deposit portal (tentative pending Working Group discussion)

Appendix 1. Proposed Changes to Faculty Deposit Form Pages

PROPOSED REVISION	General	Progress bar	Depositing my work	Assign permission/choose account	IP Rights	Description of work
Revisit first paragraph: not limited to faculty (use scholars, including grad students); not an invitation (should mention policy). Don't use preserved; mention crawled by google. RUcore staff will research the rights for you.			x			
Revise and streamline NetID info			x			
Delete first paragraph below the box.			x			
Delete last sentence on the page			x			
Revise heading (should match link; "Deposit your work"). Is 'deposit' the right word?			x			
Remove the word 'login' under the heading			x			
Revisit wording, esp. change "IP Rights" to "Deposit agreement"		x				
Streamline the first paragraph				x		
Delete 2nd paragraph				x		
Change link at bottom to "Continue" or "Next"				x		
Revise the first paragraph					x	
Revisit title and subtitle					x	
Rewrite last paragraph (delete first sentence, streamline 3rd sentence etc.)					x	
Janice has to supply agreement language					x	
Link to FAQs			x	x	x	x
Remove titles/subtitles when redundant with progress bar			x	x	x	x

PROPOSED REVISION	General	Progress bar	Depositing my work	Assign permission/choose account	IP Rights	Description of work
Remove 'refereed' and 'non-refereed' qualifiers from article; this is covered by 'peer reviewed.'						x
List categories in alphabetical order with 'other' categories at the end.						x
Why separate categories for Book, Bibliography (book), and Edited book						x
Add box for DOI, in section asking for other journal citation info						
Clearly state turnaround time (currently it is buried deep within the deposit process) (look at Harvard, CDL, UCSF forms, etc., first)	x					
Allow attachments from the deposit form, for example, for permissions documented in correspondence (look at Harvard, CDL, UCSF forms, etc., first)	x					
Provide more info on what happens when depositor chooses an embargo period on the deposit form. Ramifications or required follow-through at embargo expiration aren't self-evident, and could raise many questions in the mind of the depositor. And what if the publisher asks for 12-month embargo but author is submitting six months in? (look at Harvard, CDL, UCSF forms, etc., first)	x					

Appendix 2. Summary of Enhancements

Enhancement	Deadline	Release with date	Already scheduled in that release
SCHEDULED RUCORE RELEASE	3/4/2013	7	API for OAI-PMH
SCHEDULED RUCORE RELEASE	5/22/2013	7.1	• Install Fedora 3.6.2 on staging • Testing of R7.0 on staging • PHP, service pack and Iselon firmware upgrades • Post-release update of "legacy" objects to sha-256 checksums

SCHEDULED RUCORE RELEASE	7/31/2013	7.2	• DOI implementation specification (API spec complete)
			• UI for landing page (spec complete)
			• FD features
			   o html upload (spec complete)
			   o Ordering of author names
			• Djvu java applet for the Yearbook portal
			• Region added as Hierarchical-Geographical selection in WMS
			• Post-release updating of legacy objects with DOIs

SCHEDULED RUCORE RELEASE	9/16/2013	7.2.1	Bugfix release
SCHEDULED RUCORE RELEASE	10/24/2013	7.2.2	Yearbook release (provide jpeg page turner)
SCHEDULED RUCORE RELEASE	11/15/2013	7.2.3	Bugfix release
I.1.a.i-iii Revise record displays in test system, to parse journal citations	12/2/13	n/a	
SCHEDULED RUCORE RELEASE	12/31/2013	7.2.4	Bugfix release for the WMS timeout problem
19.c. Document and convey (to all WMS managers) workflow for ensuring new collections are implemented and configured correctly.	1/1/2014		
I.1. OA Policy Implementation WG review test displays incorporating parsed journal citation metadata and NISO version terms.	1/31/14	n/a	
20. Resolve issue of netID requirement for deposit	2/1/2014		
21. Establish and publicize clear policies re: RUcore staff making deposits required by funders	2/1/2014		

SCHEDULED RUCORE RELEASE	2/28/2014	7.3	• User account specification o Services (analytic, view list, view stats, deposit, notifications/alerts, etc) o Registration – create and edit profiles o Interaction with faculty deposit o Initial community capability• View List specification (part of user accounts)• Authentication/authorization for user accounts• Optimality (ROA) authentication/authorization to enable upload of resources• Update integrity checking/validate object• Use of Clam to virus scan the file system on all servers
18. Flesh out "Open Access Policy" webpage	4/1/2014		
5. Include cover page with every deposit	5/31/14	7.4, Late spring, 2014	
SCHEDULED RUCORE RELEASE	5/31/2014	7.4	• EADs – ingest and generation of the finding aid • User Account Features • Submission UI and architecture for Optimality • WMS File handling, validation and metadata extraction (with exif, media tools) • MP4 container and support for Wowza (incl. an Analytic update) • Threaded discussion for Analytics • Content models – add new ones, update picklist • Versioning (items #3, 4, and 5 from J. Otto specification) • IP restriction capability (e.g. for limiting ETDs to Rutgers) • Google video sitemap with thumbnails • Virus scanning for WMS, FD, dlr/EDIT and openETD
15. Revise Faculty Deposit form pages	6/1/2014		

17. Create Faculty Deposit application profile	8/1/2014		
SCHEDULED RUCORE RELEASE	8/31/2014	7.5	• EADs – WMS automatic ingest of resource objects/creation of DAOs• WMS – support for external relationships (rels-ext)• Versioning for articles• DOIs at the file level• Faculty service enhancements (dynamic bibliography, stats updates, etc)• Content models – retroactively update CMs to reflect new list• RUetd-WMS update• Schema for technical, source, and rights metadata• Still images (jpeg2000) in analytics• Update of discontinued content models to the approved list• Faceted browsing • Jpeg 2000 and page turner • Upgrade of dynamic SOLR indexing using the partner portal code (moved from 7.3)
I.1. Revise bibliographic record displays, including changes to font, revision of genre/format terms, and link to published version	9/1/14		
I.1. Send revised bibliographic record displays out for review	9/1/14	n/a	
I.2.a,b,c Provide search box with specified Browse options and A-Z bar	9/1/14		
I.2.d Provide specified search box pulldowns	9/1/14		
I.2.e Provide specified search limits	9/1/14		
I.2.f Provide specified sort options	9/1/14		
I.3 Enhance Faculty Deposit web page content	9/1/14		
16. Revise metadata mapping from the Faculty Deposit application to WMS	9/1/2014		

22. Fix existing bugs. For example, "deposit in process" indicator (circle) goes on indefinitely with no indication the process has been completed.	9/1/2014		
I.1 Finalize revised bibliographic record displays for soft rollout	12/31/14		
3. Enable dark deposits, including open metadata	12/31/14		
4. Enable dynamic bibliography feature	12/31/14		
7. Create a reporting mechanism to enable deans to request bibliographies of their schools' deposits	12/31/14		
8. Create a reporting mechanism to track deposits chronologically and by academic unit	12/31/14		
9. Implement OrcidIDs	12/31/14		
10.a. Provide notifications to repository staff when an embargo ends (so that postprint can be added to the record for the preprint)	12/31/14		
10.b. Provide notification to depositor when the deposit is successfully completed	12/31/14		
10.c. Provide notifications to depositor when a newer version has been added	12/31/14		
10.d. Provide notifications to author when his or her work appears as the most downloaded article	12/31/14		
11. Revise workflows to enable clear linking to the published version's full citation, with live link to DOI (cf. above under Displays)	12/31/14		
12. Provide a "Request a Copy" button and "View All Versions" link	12/31/14	7.5, Late summer, 2014	
14.a. Fix statistics on the 'Deposit Your Work' page; they are incomprehensible and are differ significantly from those provided on the individual record display, in terms of number of downloads, and location of downloads	12/31/14		
14.b. Remove Views statistics and simplify display accordingly	12/31/14		
14.c. Consider a line graph (with options for cumulative and annual citation statistics) display, such as that provided by Microsoft Academic search.	12/31/14		

19.a. Ensure Rucore is configured to support search engine crawling in accordance with JISC InfoNet recommendations and Google Webmaster Guidelines	12/31/14		
19.b. Verify search engine crawling is consistently implemented across collections in Google and Google Scholar	12/31/14		
25. Fix Share feature	12/31/14		
26. Revise the RUcore home page	12/31/14		
27. Provide a "Submit correction" button	12/31/14		
29. Remove ETDs from Faculty Deposit portal (tentative pending Working Group discussion)	12/31/14		
SCHEDULED RUCORE RELEASE	12/31/2014	8	• WMS – support for SWORD protocol • OJS export using SWORD • OpenETD export using SWORD • WMS linking to ontologies • Migrate to Fedora 4.0
I.5. Provide a form and process to collect statements about how the article was used or how the service is useful	3/1/15		
13. Provide a My Account page modeled on arXiv	3/1/15		
23. Add download citation feature like that found on publisher platforms	3/1/2015		
24. Enable marking of records to allow emailing, printing, exporting, etc.	3/1/2015		
28. Ensure PIRUS compliance	3/1/2015		
2.a. Harvesting - discuss with MIT, UC, and others (CSC, etc.)	?		
2.b. Investigate requirements with individual repositories	?		
2.c. Begin implementing, repository by repository	?		
6. Retrospectively add cover page and DOI to every existing deposit	9/31/14	7.5, Late summer, 2014	

Appendix 3. RUcore Release Summary with Target Dates

DRAFT
RUcore Release Summary – Specifications and Target Dates (R7.x)

1. **Release 7.0 – Large Files, Complex Objects, Faculty Deposit (Released, March 4, 2013)**
   Specifications
   - File Configurability - Complete
   - File hierarchy/structural map - Complete
   - Fedora checksums – Complete
   - Background ingest with alerting - Complete
   - Download statistics for the Faculty Portal - Complete
   - Faculty Deposit User Interface (more enhancements) - Complete
   - Complex object User Interface – download zip for object or select files from a directory display(see structural map specification) – Complete
   - API for OAI-PMH

2. **Release 7.1 – Upgrade to Fedora 3.6.2 (Released – May 22, 2013)**
   - Install Fedora 3.6.2 on staging
   - Testing of R7.0 on staging
   - PHP, service pack and Iselon firmware upgrades
   - Post-release update of "legacy" objects to sha-256 checksums

3. **Release 7.2 – URL/DOI release (Code freeze-May 20, Released – July 31, 2013)**
   Specifications
   - mss3 to RUcore migration – complete
   - DOI implementation specification (API spec complete)
   - Dynamic field indexing with SOLR - complete
   - UI for landing page (spec complete)
   - FD features
     - html upload (spec complete)
     - Ordering of author names
   - Djvu java applet for the Yearbook portal
   - Region added as Hierarchical-Geographical selection in WMS
   - Post-release updating of legacy objects with DOIs

4. **Release 7.2.1 – Bugfix release (Code freeze – August 23, 2013, Released –September 16, 2013)**

5. **Release 7.2.2 – Yearbook release (Code freeze – September 23, 2013, Released – Oct. 24)**
   - Provide jpeg page turner

6. **Release 7.2.3 – Bugfix release (Code freeze – October 28, 2013, Release target –Nov. 15, 2013)**

7. **Release 7.2.4 – Bugfix release for the WMS timeout problem**

8. **Release 7.3 –User Accounts release (Code freeze-December 13, Release Target – January/February 2014)**
   Specifications
   - User account specification
     - Services (analytic, view list, view stats, deposit, notifications/alerts, etc)
     - Registration – create and edit profiles

- o Interaction with faculty deposit
- o Initial community capability
- View List specification (part of user accounts)
- Authentication/authorization for user accounts
- Optimality (ROA) authentication/authorization to enable upload of resources
- Update integrity checking/validate object
- Use of Clam to virus scan the file system on all servers

9. **Release 7.4 – EADs, ROA submission, MP4, Wowza, etc. (Code freeze-Spring, 2014, Release Target – Late Spring)**

   Specifications
   - EADs – ingest and generation of the finding aid
   - User Account Features
   - Submission UI and architecture for Optimality
   - WMS File handling, validation and metadata extraction (with exif, media tools)
   - MP4 container and support for Wowza (incl. an Analytic update)
   - Threaded discussion for Analytics
   - Content models – add new ones, update picklist
   - Versioning (items #3, 4, and 5 from J. Otto specification)
   - IP restriction capability (e.g. for limiting ETDs to Rutgers)
   - Google video sitemap with thumbnails
   - Virus scanning for WMS, FD, dlr/EDIT and openETD

10. **Release 7.5 – EADs, Versioning, Faceted browsing, jpeg 2000, etc. (Code Freeze Summer, 2014, Release Target – Late Summer)**

    Specifications
    - EADs – WMS automatic ingest of resource objects/creation of DAOs
    - WMS – support for external relationships (rels-ext)
    - Versioning for articles
    - DOIs at the file level
    - Faculty service enhancements (dynamic bibliography, stats updates, etc)
    - Content models – retroactively update CMs to reflect new list
    - RUetd-WMS update
    - Schema for technical, source, and rights metadata
    - Still images (jpeg2000) in analytics
    - Update of discontinued content models to the approved list
    - Faceted browsing
    - Jpeg 2000 and page turner
    - Upgrade of dynamic SOLR indexing using the partner portal code (moved from 7.3)

10. **Release 8.0 – Support for SWORD Protocol (Code Freeze - TBD, Release Target – TBD)**

    - WMS – support for SWORD protocol
    - OJS export using SWORD
    - OpenETD export using SWORD
    - WMS linking to ontologies
    - Migrate to Fedora 4.0

rcj – 11/07/2013
posted to Sakai Nov. 19, 2013