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Historically, attention to grey literature in the academic library was focused on external collections – documents produced by government agencies or research centres. Little, if any, systematic attention was paid to the grey literature that was produced on university campuses. The advent of the Web, while bringing more interest to grey literature in general did not change this situation much. However, the trend toward the creation of institutional repositories has caused a considerable shift in interest. The formalization of collecting, processing, and integrating academic institutional grey literature should be critical to the mission of the University, regardless of format, and regardless of the existence of an active institutional repository. This chapter reviews a study on academic grey literature from earlier in the decade and provides an updated perspective.

5.1 Introduction

In the academic environment, there is an extraordinary emphasis on peer-reviewed, formally published literature. This makes sense to the teaching faculty, as their careers, in a ‘publish or perish’ environment, depend on this publishing model. Professors are evaluated, tenured (or not), and promoted based, to a great extent, on their output of peer-reviewed publications in high impact journals. Thus, it also makes sense that they lead their students to believe that this is the only literature worthy of consideration for inclusion in research papers, and by extension, this is the primary literature that academic libraries invest energy into, when developing collections. Another reason why grey literature has mostly been treated as ‘other’ by academic libraries, is simply because of a lack of familiarity. In general, this is not a subject dealt with in formal library training. Excellent cases have been made for inclusion in an LIS curriculum (Gelfand, 1998; Aina, 1998), and headway has been made in this area only recently (Farace et al., 2008).

Historically, when grey literature (other than theses, dissertations, and conference proceedings) was intentionally collected, it was most likely collections of external reports, those produced by government agencies or research institutes. In
some libraries these collections were housed as stand-alone collections, whereas in others, they may have been integrated. As more and more of these reports have now been digitized, and as current ones are ‘born digital’, the issues around physical integration diminish, but the issues around collection, processing, and integration into a library’s holdings remain. While this is a worthy discussion, the focus of this chapter is on the grey literature produced within the university itself, though much of what is presented here could be applied to the management of external collections as well.

So the question is, if the commercially published journal literature is of such prime importance to those in the academy, would people at universities be engaged in the production of grey literature, and if so, why? And if they are, does the library collect it, and if so, how? This question was investigated in a study done some years ago at Portland State University (PSU), in Portland, Oregon (USA) (Siegel, 2004).

5.2 Review of Study and Outcomes

The study encompassed two different assessments, one was an investigation of the scholarly grey literature produced on the PSU campus, and the second was an assessment of how well we were providing bibliographic access to this body of literature. The survey instrument used to gather the initial information is given in Appendix 1.

The results of the study can be briefly summarized as follows:

1. Institutional grey literature was being, and had been produced on campus for quite a long time.
2. The library holdings included an assortment of these reports, and it could be inferred by the holdings that the library had catalogued whatever had been given to them.
3. There was no coordinated effort for the collection of these reports.
4. Grey literature was being produced on campus in virtually every discipline, with most of it coming from the social sciences.
5. The majority of the grey literature was coming from Centres and Institutes on campus.

Small but significant amounts of grey literature were also emanating from academic departments.

There was no collection development policy regarding institutional grey literature, and no established protocol for acquiring or cataloguing this material. This begged the question that if university libraries are asked to collect, catalogue, and house grey literature collections that are externally produced, though of interest to the primary and secondary clientele of the library, then shouldn’t they prioritize the collection of that which is produced by the home institution? Since it cannot be anticipated that some ‘other’ university will be interested in collecting all that is produced on one’s campus, is it not important that university libraries
capture as much of this locally produced scholarly literature as possible, regardless of format?

The reluctance of some academic colleagues to embrace the importance of this was overcome, in part, by providing a clearly articulated definition and scope of exactly what types of documents would be of interest. Almost every paper on grey literature cites the widely accepted definition: “that which is produced on all levels of government, academics, business and industry in print and electronic formats, but which is not controlled by commercial publishers”, yet for any project, this definition must be refined in a way that makes sense for the scope of the project. For our university, and our early foray into formally addressing grey literature, the refined operative definition became: that which is produced BY faculty or staff IN the university, FOR THE PURPOSE of sharing scholarly information with others. This definition precluded the consideration of many things produced in academia which would be more appropriate to a university archive, or which would be seen as ephemeral, or which would open up the infinite realm of student produced literature. As is true of most universities, theses, dissertations, and conference proceedings were already being systematically collected and cataloged, so they were not of special concern in this case.

As a result of this study and of advocacy on this issue, it was concluded that if material is worth collecting and worth cataloging, then it should be as easily located as anything else held by the library. To that end, the library made some positive changes. We enhanced the roles of the subject selectors, in addition to their liaison relationships along departmental fund lines, by assigning liaison relationships to each Centre and Institute on our campus. It became part of one’s collection development duties to maintain an awareness of any reports produced by these units and to collect them (whether in print or electronic) and get them into the cataloguing pipeline. To avoid uneven collecting practices, we added a page to our collection development policy manual that outlined criteria for grey literature selection and acquisition. The additional policy statement is shown in Appendix 2.

The next step was to provide for integration into the normal workflow. The initial study and reporting of results had been effective in getting ‘buy-in’ from both the cataloguing department and the subject selectors (liaisons), and together, we worked out a protocol for getting the materials into the acquisition and cataloguing workflow. After assigning each Centre and Institute to a subject selector, we then needed to identify a point of contact on the other end, who would keep us each appraised of any technical reports or other grey literature that was being produced. We created ‘packets’ of forms as something to use for making initial contact. Additional forms were posted on the library’s website.

The forms allowed the contributing unit to submit materials to us – if they were print materials, they attached the form; for digital materials, the form had space for all pertinent information. The form also allowed for contribution of potentially useful metadata by the submitting unit. The instructions that went with the forms contained the collection development statement and the caveat that not everything submitted would necessarily be accepted. The form then allowed for
review and either approval or rejection by the subject selector, and space for date tracking. A generalized version of these forms and instructions are given in Appendices 3a and 3c. Appendix 3b is the protocol that was given to each of the librarians who were tasked with collecting this material.

5.3 An Evolving Environment

For those of us with longstanding interests in grey literature, the advent of the Web simply gave us a new tool for managing, disseminating, and increasing the visibility of this literature. Prior to this development, few librarians showed much interest, but then the Web created the ultimate in grey literature – millions of ephemeral websites. The late 1990’s saw several massive efforts launched at cataloguing the web, both the visible and the invisible. This seemed ironic, especially because the people who wanted to embark on this ambitious task, were often the same ones who did not see any point in dealing with paper based grey literature. Eventually this contradiction, observed by many of us (“Isn’t the Web just a huge pile of grey literature?”), was explicitly articulated by Pace (2004). As time passed, the overly ambitious, and really impossible task of cataloguing the entire Web was thankfully abandoned. However, whether one is dealing with digital or print formats, wherever they exist, it gets back to the necessary step of articulating definition and scope of what it is that we want in our collections, physical and virtual. This sentiment is echoed in the 2006 paper by Pavlov (2006), in which he argues that the increased presence of grey literature on the web should not keep us from being actively engaged in the traditional activities of collection, archiving, and dissemination.

As the attentions of academic librarians were increasingly engaged in dealing with ways to combat the scholarly communication (SC) ‘crisis’, the idea of institutional repositories (IRs) gained traction. While not a panacea, this was at least one way in which academic institutions could ensure access to the scholarly output of their own campuses. Of course the biggest barrier to populating these burgeoning repositories was a primary aspect of the SC crisis itself, the lack of ownership of copyright by the authors of the research. As more and more scholars are now negotiating for posting rights to their published research papers, it is becoming easier to populate IRs with formally published materials.

However, in looking for ways to quickly populate repositories, since an unpopulated repository would be a hard sell to scholars, IR project managers, more often than not associated with libraries, developed a sudden interest in institutional grey literature. While the concurrent education of faculty regarding authors’ rights was in process, we could meanwhile be collecting materials that did not have sticky copyright issues attached to them. A perfect example of this newfound interest in grey literature for the purpose of getting an IR off the ground is discussed in two related papers by Souloff et al. (2005) and Bell et al. (2005).
The Souloff paper discusses a study done with the help of the subject librarians at the University of Rochester who were found to “…have a depth of knowledge about the grey literature used in their own disciplines that is extensive, hard won, and valuable.” One of the primary purposes of the study was “…to identify the departments and disciplines that are most likely to be early contributors [to the IR].” In this initiative, the authors see the IR as an important tool for “…disseminating the grey literature produced within the university by our own scholars.”

The Bell article goes on to discuss the widening role of library liaisons, in this case, to help populate the repository. In the article previously cited Siegel (2004), the case was also made for this widening role for library liaisons, however, the purpose was not to populate any particular discovery tool or archive, but indeed to provide access to material that previously had little or no bibliographic access – institutional academic grey literature.

While I will not make the argument that institutional grey literature does not belong in a repository, I will make the argument that I made before the advent of IRs, which is that institutional grey literature should still be collected by university libraries and fully integrated into the library catalogue, whether or not they are also deposited in repositories. Several of the articles cited in the following discussion will, I believe, reinforce this view.

One advantage of the trend of populating IRs with grey literature is that studies, such as that done by Schöpfel & Stock (2009) can be conducted whereby analysis of different types of repository content and usage are looked at. In addition to finding that half of the open archives in France were owned or hosted by institutions of higher education, and that 67% of these higher education archives showed (by design) a strong academic interest in increasing the visibility of the institutions’ scientific production – they also report for one particular archive, the IFREMER archive, while containing twice as much white material as grey, that the grey material was downloaded on average seven times more often.

What this underscores is the age-old observation, that grey literature is indeed useful for research; what it illustrates is that if access is provided, it will be used. In their conclusion, the authors observe that adequate bibliographic control, and therefore access, for grey literature in the open archives that they surveyed was lacking. So this gets back to the argument of exactly how access should be provided. With federated searching of repositories available, through such programs as OAIster or Google Scholar, one could argue that indeed repositories are the place for institutional grey literature, with the caveat that metadata standards could use some improvement.

Some of you will recall that when the Internet came along, there were those who argued that we no longer needed libraries. With IRs on the rise, one could argue that we do not need to include grey literature in our catalogues, as IRs will now be the logical home for them. Conclusions to the contrary can also be drawn. Unless and until repositories are completely integrated with our catalogues, they will stand as separate discovery tools. Repositories, other than those that are being designed more as ’collaboratories’ (the minority), really serve the purpose of an
institutional archive of scholarly digital output, similar to how an article repository, such as JSTOR, preserves access, but is less useful as a primary search engine for discovery than is a comprehensive subject database.

The primary discovery tool for what a university library owns, or has access to, is the library catalogue, and it can be argued that this is the place where institutional grey literature must be catalogued and integrated. Note above the mention of scholarly digital output. Just as all commercial publications are not published digitally, neither is all grey literature. Though this argument may fall flat in the reality that MOST currently produced grey literature is indeed born digital, it would take significant effort and resources to digitize all of the existing grey literature that indeed, should be captured, collected, acquired, catalogued, etc.

In another article, Kargbo (2005) cogently argues the value of grey literature collections to the mission of the university. However, he uses that argument as a means for leveraging more funding and staffing. Rightly, he argues that the value in grey literature lies not in its usefulness as instructional tools, but in its potential for research. The article also notes “there is a bewildering profusion of technical activities associated with such materials…” I would posit that there is no need for this bewildering profusion, if we can simply adopt the attitude that this is material that needs to be catalogued and integrated just like any other material. And in doing so, the discrete argument for additional staffing and funding for dealing with a separate body of literature vaporizes. The point is made that “…there should be no barriers in dealing with this type of collection in academic libraries.” And that librarians “…should be proactive in dealing with this type of literature in the respective institutions.”

In the theoretical portion of the paper previously cited by Pavlov, there is discussion of the supply side of grey literature in the post-modern context. He points out the trend that by now we should all be aware of - that of the commodification of scientific information. Due to this trend, there is a lack of funding for the kinds of scientific research that historically has produced grey literature. He concludes that because of these trends, scientific grey literature in particular requires extra attention for funding of collection, archiving, and dissemination (i.e. for libraries) precisely because the anti-scientific post-modern market paradigm pushes us away from this.

So, while both of these articles argue for increased funding, the pragmatic approach would be a model that strongly considers integration, in order to reduce or remove the above-mentioned barriers. As long as we define this material as ‘other’ and in need of being kept as separate collections, we perpetuate this problem. While indeed, cataloguing of grey literature will involve a lot of original cataloguing, by contributing this metadata to bibliographic utilities, it will only need to be done once, and subsequent cataloguers will be pleasantly surprised to find that they only need to add holdings information. The fact that doing so may increase the general workload, and thus an increase in cost, is not lost, it simply becomes subsumed in any negotiations for adequate funding and staffing for the library, to carry out its mission. It seems that this will be more effective, especially in lean
economic times, as activities seen as ‘special projects’ are generally the first to be eliminated.

5.4 Some Comments on Integration

We have been in a place for awhile where library users would prefer ‘one stop shopping’ – all resources available through a single interface, and while good arguments can be made for having different interfaces for optimal retrieval of different types of resources, there is no doubt that we are heading in a unified interface direction. Interestingly though, we are doing this multi-directionally – enhancing catalogues with access to journal literature, more journal databases indexing books, repositories including multi-media, etc. It is clear that integration enhances the richness of any resource. What we will be left with in the end is anybody’s guess. Integration across institutions and countries is also critical to developing a richer environment for comprehensive retrieval.

Dijk et al. (2008) describe a national program in the Netherlands, DAREnet, which integrates digital academic repositories across the country. It includes ALL universities, whereby all of the publicly funded research is deposited as well as all of the national scientific research organizations. This is their ‘green route’ to open access publishing. To further enhance the portal to Dutch scientific research, DAREnet is now being integrated into NARCIS (the National Academic Research and Collaborations Information System), which provides multi-layered information about national scientific research – thus creating a national union database which will allow for in-context searching of publications. And ultimately, this system will be linked into the DRIVER project – the Digital Repository Infrastructure Vision for European Research, a project that so far has eleven European countries on board.

The DRIVER project is described further in a paper by Vernooy-Gerritsen et al. (2009). The stated aim of the DRIVER project is to create an interoperable, trusted, and long-term repository infrastructure for the European community. The article looks at this project from the perspective of three stakeholders – the authors, the institutions, and information users. As of 2008, the paper reports, nearly half of the universities in Europe have implemented an Institutional Research Repository (IRR), as defined as those ‘containing research output from contemporary researchers’ – a refinement in definition which sets these apart from archives and heritage collections. In an analysis of the content of the repositories, it was found that overall, 33% of the items in the IRRs were full-text records, and within this 33%, 62% of the records are grey literature (theses, proceedings, working papers, etc.).

This evidence supports the claim made earlier in this paper, that grey literature is indeed the ‘low hanging fruit’ for populating repositories. Also in this paper, there is a brief discussion regarding the pros and cons for the variable workflows in play for deposit. Grey literature is often referred to as ‘fugitive literature’
or ‘the stuff that falls through the cracks’. It seems ironic, that these widespread efforts to develop infrastructures to help capture this literature would have such disjointed workflow for collection development, thus allowing whole new ways to lose these important documents. So, though this clearly is a temporary hurdle facing this particular project, it brings to light the importance of having a well-documented workflow for the collection of institutional grey literature.

Whether or not something similar to the Portland State template is adapted for catalogue integration or for repository deposit, the point is to have a protocol for workflow that involves the assignment of metadata, some collection development vetting process, and pathways for problem resolution. At the same time, an integrated process that does not place undue demand for an increase in funding or staffing, is less likely to be a target for ‘cuts’ in lean economic times.

European initiatives, at least compared to those in the United States (U.S.), seem to grow from a general culture, and specifically, a scientific and academic culture of centralization. The highly integrative model that we see in the DRIVER project, and the smaller projects that feed into it, are natural outcomes of this culture, and can work exceedingly well in countries and continents where scientific research is more centralized.

In the U.S., the world of research is far more fragmented. It could still be fairly far into the future before all of the scientific research conducted in the U.S. - in the universities, national research institutes, state agencies, etc. will share a common portal for discovery. Realizing the power and feasibility of such projects though, will hopefully fuel efforts at any level and any opportunity for integration.

Currently, the most widely used bibliographic utility in the U.S. is OCLC, where the front-end union catalogue product is known as WorldCat. A trend that we are currently experiencing is the integration of academic library catalogues with WorldCat, thus giving us the ‘WorldCat Local’ product as our home catalogues. As we move in this direction, we begin seeing the integration that users have been asking for – that of books and journal articles that previously needed to be searched via separate portals or discovery tools.

While article coverage is far from comprehensive with this product, it does belie a trend, the direction of which is obvious. In order for an item in the local catalogue to be included in the WorldCat Local catalogue, it must however have a linking identifier, in this case, an OCLC number. OCLC numbers are assigned to items as they are catalogued into the utility. Thus, grey literature which is deposited into repositories, but NOT properly catalogued into the system, meaning for most of us, OCLC, will be lost from this opportunity for discovery.

In a project described by a group of veterinary librarians (Jaros et al., 2008), a contemporary case is made for the preservation of relevant grey literature that was NOT born digital, that is very valuable to the profession and study of veterinary medicine, and that is in danger of being lost. The article echoes the argument previously made, that there must be “vigilance in collecting and preserving the output of home colleges and institutions”, in spite of any prescient knowledge as to whether the value of any given document will be transitory or permanent. This article also expresses the problems encountered when holdings are not reflected in
a union catalogue, such as OCLC, and agrees that the retrieval of that which has NOT been added to a union catalogue requires extraordinary time, effort, and vigilance that most cannot afford.

An additional observation made in the original Portland State article (Siegel, 2004), but one that bears repeating is that the establishment of policies and protocols for handling institutional grey literature puts a library in a far better position to take on additional grey literature collections that may be appropriate to the University, but that also may not be widely collected or maintained, such as community-based grey literature collections that are relevant to the mission of the university.

5.5 Summary and Conclusion

To summarize the points made in this chapter:

1. The collection of scholarly institutional grey literature in academic environments should be critical to the mission of the institution, and should be articulated in collection development policies of the library.
2. A comprehensive assessment of the grey literature being produced (both quantity and sources) at any institution is advised.
3. Protocols, procedures, and responsibilities should be delineated and integrated into established workflows and position descriptions. It is recommended that these include a vetting process, to ensure consistency with other collection development guidelines.
4. By inclusion into the mission, grey literature should not be treated as an ‘appended’ collection – integration is key to the maintenance of consistent treatment through variable economic times.
5. Sufficient studies have shown that when academic grey literature is made available to scholars, it is utilized, fairly heavily.
6. The increased presence of grey literature on the Web is not a reason to forego efforts of comprehensive collection, cataloguing, and dissemination.
7. To optimize discovery, interoperability should be a key factor in determining whether to ‘locate’ grey literature in the library catalog, an institutional repository, or both.

To paraphrase something expressed in the Vernooy-Gerritson (2009) article: Ideally, what we are all trying to move toward is a system of scholarly communication that functions cohesively and at a higher level – the level of ‘infusion’, borrowed from the IT management literature and defined by Cooper & Zmud (1990) as “increased organizational effectiveness…obtained by using the IT application in a more comprehensive and integrated manner to support higher level aspects of organizational work.”

The more that we can leverage the technology, while at the same time paying attention to mission and solid workflow to accomplish the mission; and the more we pay attention to maximizing the benefit to ALL of the stakeholders – the more
we bring the scholarly communication system to a higher level of support for high level research. It is to this end, that so many innovations are directed toward, but putting energy ONLY into disaggregated pieces of the system will not achieve this. Our entire scholarly information infrastructure needs to move toward integration in every way possible.
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Appendice 1

Survey Instrument

[Date]

Library Survey for Scholarly Grey Literature

We at the ______ library are interested in publications produced by your department, program, school, center, or institute. We are seeking scholarly or technical reports produced by regular faculty or staff, which are published here at ____ and intended for limited distribution. This would include conference papers that have been published in full proceedings of meetings, but which the library may not have acquired.

If time and funds permit, we would like to collect this material and add it to the library collection so that it will be available to students and researchers. Please note that we ar NOT interested in materials of an ephemeral nature (e.g. brochures, newsletters, administrative notes or memos, etc.), or in materials written by students or interns.

We would appreciate it if you could take a few minutes to fill out this questionnaire. Please see the reverse side for examples of appropriate items. Thank you for your assistance.

1. Name, title, and e-mail address of person completing the survey:
2. What is the name of your department, school, program, center, or institute?
3. Do you produce any reports of the type described?     Yes     No
   If so – could you please give us the titles and authors of individual reports, or, the title of the series and an estimate of how many separate items there are within the series?
   (use a separate page if necessary)
4. Do these exist in paper format, electronic, or both? paper   electronic    both
5. For the ones that exist in paper, would you be willing to donate 1 copy of each report to the library?   Yes   No
6. For the ones that are electronic, would you be interested in working out an arrangement with the library to create access to them?    Yes   No
7. Please list a contact person willing to coordinate obtaining these reports from your department:
8. Any comments you would like to share with us?

Thank you very much for taking your time to help us with this project. Please return to your library liaison or to [project coordinator’s name, contact info and deadline date].
Appendice 2

Collection Development Policy Statement
V. Institutional Scholarly Grey Literature: It is within the mission of the library to capture, preserve, and make available the scholarly output of the institution. To this end, the library will attempt to acquire technical reports and other scholarly publications produced by PSU Departments, Programs, Centers, and Institutes. These materials will be cataloged and added to the collection, whether in print, electronic, or both. Criteria for selection is as follows:

Authorship: The primary author(s) should be PSU faculty or staff

Content: The content should be such that a person doing scholarly research might choose to cite the work

Publication: The item would generally not be published commercially, but would have been produced in a quantity intended for limited external distribution.

Examples: Technical reports, reports of studies, conference papers that have been published in full proceedings of meetings, but which the library may not have acquired.

Examples of what NOT to collect: Materials of an ephemeral nature (e.g. brochures, newsletters, administrative notes or memos, workshop notes, course schedules, etc.); materials written by students or interns.
Appendice 3a

**GREY LITERATURE SUBMISSION FORM**
(top section to be completed by person submitting document to library)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of Document</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject keywords</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(optional)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the author PSU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>staff or faculty?</td>
<td>Yes ____ No ____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publishing body</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e.g. Department,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of pages or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URL if electronic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(if submitting in both</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forms, please provide</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>both)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person to contact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if we have questions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(name, phone and/or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e-mail required)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this document</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>published some-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>where else? If so,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>where?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Protocol / Procedure for acquiring [institution name] produced scholarly grey literature for the library

Selectors will be supplied with ‘starter packets of forms to be given to their department, centre, institute, etc. liaisons. The web address for getting more forms will also be given.

The person submitting the document to the library will fill out the top part of the form and will submit the form and paper document (if any) to their subject librarian.

The subject librarian will review the document in the context of the collection development policy statement (see below) and will either accept or reject the submission.

If rejected, the librarian will return the form to the unit /person that submitted it with an explanation.

If accepted in a physical format, the librarian will initial and date the form and send both the form and the document on to Acquisitions, who will create a record and then forward it to Cataloguing.

If accepted in web format only, the librarian will initial and date the form and forward the form directly to Cataloguing.

The Cataloguing department will continue past practices of classifying the document according to subject and will catalogue the document as they would anything else. The information provided on the form is meant to be helpful but not prescriptive.

Information seen as useful to possible future problem resolution will be transferred from the form to an internal note in the item record.

### Appendix 3b

**NOTES FOR LIBRARIANS**

Protocol / Procedure for acquiring [institution name] produced scholarly grey literature for the library

Selectors will be supplied with ‘starter packets of forms to be given to their department, centre, institute, etc. liaisons. The web address for getting more forms will also be given.

The person submitting the document to the library will fill out the top part of the form and will submit the form and paper document (if any) to their subject librarian.

The subject librarian will review the document in the context of the collection development policy statement (see below) and will either accept or reject the submission.

If rejected, the librarian will return the form to the unit /person that submitted it with an explanation.

If accepted in a physical format, the librarian will initial and date the form and send both the form and the document on to Acquisitions, who will create a record and then forward it to Cataloguing.

If accepted in web format only, the librarian will initial and date the form and forward the form directly to Cataloguing.

The Cataloguing department will continue past practices of classifying the document according to subject and will catalogue the document as they would anything else. The information provided on the form is meant to be helpful but not prescriptive.

Information seen as useful to possible future problem resolution will be transferred from the form to an internal note in the item record.
The Cataloguing department will retain a file of the completed forms for 2 years, at which point the retention issue will be re-evaluated.

**Collection Development Policy on Institutional Scholarly Grey Literature**
(adopted [date]):
It is within the mission of the library to capture, preserve, and make available the scholarly output of the institution. To this end, the library will attempt to acquire technical reports and other scholarly publications produced by [institution name] Departments, Programs, Centers, and Institutes. These materials will be cataloged and added to the collection, whether in print, electronic, or both. Criteria for selection is as follows:

1. Authorship: The primary author(s) should be [institution name] faculty or staff.
2. Content: The content should be such that a person doing scholarly research might choose to cite the work.
3. Publication: The item would generally not be published commercially, but would have been produced in a quantity intended to limited external distribution.

Examples of what to collect are technical reports, reports of studies, conference papers that have been published in full proceedings of meetings, but which the library may not have acquired.

Examples of what NOT to collect are materials of an ephemeral nature (e.g. brochures, newsletters, administrative notes or memos, workshop notes, course schedules, etc.); materials written by students or interns.

**Appendix 3c**

Notes for Units Submitting Documents to the Library

Thank you for helping us to collect this valuable material. The policy under which we add materials (other than traditional books, journals, conference proceedings, etc.) is as follows:

Collection Development Policy on Institutional Scholarly Grey Literature
(adopted [date]):

It is within the mission of the library to capture, preserve, and make available the scholarly output of the institution. To this end, the library will attempt to acquire technical reports and other scholarly publications produced by [institution name] Departments, Programs, Centers, and Institutes. These materials will be cataloged and added to the collection, whether in print, electronic, or both. Criteria for selection is as follows:

1. Authorship: The primary author(s) should be [institution name] faculty or staff.
2. Content: The content should be such that a person doing scholarly research might choose to cite the work.
3. Publication: The item would generally not be published commercially, but would have been produced in a quantity intended for limited external distribution.

Examples of what to collect are technical reports, reports of studies, conference papers that have been published in full proceedings of meetings, but which the library may not have acquired.

Examples of what NOT to collect are materials of an ephemeral nature (e.g. brochures, newsletters, administrative notes or memos, workshop notes, course schedules, etc.); materials written by students or interns.

Please use the forms that you have been given (more available from the library website) to accompany your submission. Please submit the form and if applicable, the paper document to your library liaison. The document will be reviewed by your subject librarian, who will either accept or reject the item. If you do not receive the form back, then you can assume that the item has been accepted. We will keep the form on file and soon you will see an entry in our catalog to the document. Thanks again. If you have any questions about this program or process, feel free to contact your subject librarian or ____________, Grey Literature Coordinator [contact info given here].