

Building an Institutional Repository at the University of Health and Allied Sciences in Ghana



Presented by: **Fred Kwaku Hayibor**
MIT 6 (16384424)

*Principal Library Assistant at University
of Health and Allied Sciences (UHAS),
Ghana.*

fhayibor@uhas.edu.gh

Capstone UP Carnegie Conference, 24 – 30 March, 2019



UNIVERSITEIT VAN PRETORIA
UNIVERSITY OF PRETORIA
YUNIBESITHI YA PRETORIA
Denkeleers • Leading Minds • Dikgopolo tsa Dihalefi



Outline

- Background and Purpose
- Methods
- Results
- Discussion & Conclusions
- Readiness/Feasibility Scorecard
 - Implication for Project Success
- Impact
- Future Work



UNIVERSITEIT VAN PRETORIA
UNIVERSITY OF PRETORIA
YUNIBESITHI YA PRETORIA
Denkeleers • Leading Minds • Dikgopolo tsa Dihalefi



2

Background and Purpose

Institutional Repositories (IRs) are being deployed by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) to showcase intellectual output.

A significant number of IR projects by HEIs have failed.

This study investigated the availability of well-known critical success factors to assess the feasibility of implementing an IR at the University of Health and Allied Sciences (UHAS) in Ghana.

Methods

- Qualitative approach
- Case-study design.
- Stratified purposive sampling (*decision makers & content providers strata*).
- Semi-structured interviews were used to collect data.
- Review of relevant documents.
- Data were thematically analysed.
- Six IR critical success factors drawn from the literature and objectives of the study were set aside as a priori themes.
- A scorecard was used to summarise and visualize the results based on weighted means that emphasized the importance of each IR success factor in the UHAS context.

Results

Nine major themes emerged from the data:

1. Executive support
 2. User acceptance
 3. Policy
 4. Marketing and promotion
 5. Organizational culture
 6. Resources
 7. Stakeholder perceptions of the IR
 8. Researcher motivation
 9. The library as an agent of change
- } *a priori themes*

Discussions & Conclusions

- High support for the IR initiative by both decision makers and content providers motivated by different expectations.
 - Decision makers – exigent requirement for university ranking.
 - Content providers – an integrative platform providing current information and tools for research and learning management.

Discussions & Conclusions (continued)

- Moderate knowledge of IRs among stakeholders in UHAS.
- Mediated deposit and open access mandate crucial to IR sustainability (Singeh et al. 2013; Xia 2007).
- Self-motivated faculty.

Singeh, F.W., Abrizah, A. & Karim, N.H.A., 2013. What inhibits authors to self-archive in Open Access repositories? A Malaysian case. *Information Development*, 29(1), pp.24–35. Available at: <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0266666912450450>.

Xia, J., 2007. Assessment of Self-archiving in Institutional Repositories: Across Disciplines. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 33(6), pp.647–654.



UNIVERSITEIT VAN PRETORIA
UNIVERSITY OF PRETORIA
YUNIBESITHI YA PRETORIA
Dinetseni • Leading Minds • Dikgopiso ka Dinetseni



7

Discussions & Conclusions (continued)

- Low level of policy awareness and compliance among researchers.
- Slow uptake technology among UHAS faculty.
- Low library visibility .

– “if you build it, they will come” (Wesolek & Royster 2016:59)

Wesolek, A., & Royster, P. (2016). Open Access Policies: Basics and Impact on Content Recruitment. In B. B. Callicott, D. Scherer, & A. Wesolek (Eds.), *Making institutional repositories work* (p. 360). West Lafayette, Indiana: Purdue University Press.



UNIVERSITEIT VAN PRETORIA
UNIVERSITY OF PRETORIA
YUNIBESITHI YA PRETORIA
Dinetseni • Leading Minds • Dikgopiso ka Dinetseni



8

Discussions & Conclusions (continued)

- Inadequate resources:

“No, the university is not ready, not at the moment; financially, technical infrastructure, no-no... with this bad network that we have here ... look, even switches to route Internet we don't have...” ~ DM-1

“It [IR] becomes a white elephant without a good Internet system but it also doesn't mean that we should sit down and fold our arms and say that we don't have Internet... send a proposal and let Senior Management make an informed decision...” ~ CP-1

Readiness/Feasibility Scorecard

| # | Theme (Critical Success Factor) | Mean Score | Weight (%) | Weighted Mean (%) |
|---------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|----------------------|
| Overall Feasibility Score | | 4.40 | | 55% |
| 1 | Executive support | 0.50 | 30% | 15% |
| 2 | User acceptance | 0.50 | 15% | 7.5% |
| 3 | IR policy | 0.63 | 5% | 3.15% |
| 4 | Resources | 0.17 | 5% | 0.85% |
| 5 | Organizational culture | 0.47 | 10% | 4.7% |
| 6 | IR marketing & promotion | 0.00 | 5% | 0% |
| 7 | Stakeholder perception of the IR | 0.17 | 5% | 0.85% |
| 8 | Researcher motivation | 1.00 | 20% | 20% |
| 9 | The library as an agent of change | 0.50 | 5% | 2.5% |

Implication for Project Success

- 55% score shows IR is feasible at UHAS but the key factors for success are unbalanced, and need to be improved.
- Factors scoring below 50% of assigned weight require more serious attention.

| | | | |
|------------------------------------|------|-----|-------|
| 4 Resources | 0.17 | 5% | 0.85% |
| 5 Organizational culture | 0.47 | 10% | 4.7% |
| 6 IR marketing & promotion | 0.00 | 5% | 0% |
| 7 Stakeholder perception of the IR | 0.17 | 5% | 0.85% |

Impact

- Policy review
- Personal capacity to contribute to the discourse on scholarly communication reform
- Professional networking and development
- Ethical gatekeeping

Future Work

- Standardize scorecard through a Delphi study to create a standard questionnaire for IR feasibility studies.
- Follow up studies to describe implementation process and current state of the UHAS repository.

Thank you

Questions?

fhayibor@uhas.edu.gh

