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Demographics

n = 161

Location of Participating Institutions

- International: 27%
- South: 22%
- West: 17%
- Midwest: 17%
- North: 17%

Institutions with ETD Programs

- International: 46
- West: 32
- Midwest: 32
- South: 42
- North: 32

Bar chart showing the distribution of institutions with ETD programs across different regions.

Legend:
- Yes
- No
- No, but
How do institutions manage their ETDs?

- Campus Repository: 66%
- External State Rep.: 13%
- External Vendor: 13%
- Other: 8%

Who oversees the campus repository or ETD database?

- Office of Research: 90%
- Library: 4%
- Campus IT: 1%
- Other: 5%
Software Most Used by Institutions

- BePress: Digital Commons: 12%
- CONTENTdm: 12%
- ETD-db: 12%
- Eprints: 8%
- VTLS: Vital: 4%
- Locally Developed: 2%
- DSpace: 43%
- Ex Libris: DigiTool: 1%
- Other: 1%

Do you report ETD usage statistics on your web site?

- Yes
- Looking into it
- No
Are your institution’s ETDs publically available?

- None are OA
- Some are OA
- All are OA

Bar chart showing:
- I'nat'l
- US
Does your institution temporarily limit ETDs to university-only access?

Yes

No
Why does your institution limit ETDs to university-only access?

Bar chart showing the reasons for limiting ETDs. The chart compares 'US' and 'Int'l' categories. The reasons include:
- Authors
- Publishing
- Patent
- Faculty
- Copyright
- Creative Works
- Uncomfortable
- Other
- Sensitive/confidential
- Mandate/Policy

The chart indicates that 'Authors' is the most common reason for limiting ETDs in both 'US' and 'Int'l' categories, with 'Int'l' having a slightly higher percentage than 'US'.
Does your institution have embargoed ETDs?

- All embargoed
- Some embargoed
- None embargoed
Why does your institution embargo ETDs?

- Copyright
- Creative works
- Faculty concerns
- Sensitive/confidentiality
- Patent concerns
- Publishing issues
- Authors' wishes

US  vs  Int'l
Does your institution have a “preservation plan” for its ETDs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th></th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>US</td>
<td>I'nat'l</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
General Comments

- “Institutional lethargy/fear/lack of understanding how technically easy this is”
- “Challenges are both technical and administrative”
- “OA is an ongoing area of real confusion and lack of consensus on this campus”
- “We are beginning to question the practice of automatically sending full text to ProQuest.”