Introduction
The Framingham State University Digital Commons Repository was founded in 2013 – 2014. The repository is a hybrid of the scholarly writing of Framingham State University faculty, digitized archival materials, photographs of university events, teaching materials, other university ephemera, and collections of materials solicited from the community. In the 4-5 years since the establishment of the repository a number of staffing changes have taken place.

Timeline of Repository Staff Changes
- 2013 - 2014(ish) – Repository launched – Staffing consists of Emerging Technologies and Digital Services Librarian
- 2014(ish) – Part-time digital repository coordinator hired
- Jan 2015 – Digital Repository Coordinator turn-over
- Jul 2015 – Part-time Digital Repository Assistant hired
- May 2017 – Part-time Digital Repository Assistant leaves
- July 2017 – Emerging Technologies and Digital Services Librarian turn-over
- Dec 2017 – Part-time Digital Repository Assistant hired

The turn-over of both the Emerging Technologies and Digital Services Librarian and part-time Digital Repository Assistant positions threw the workflow of the repository into chaos. Projects slowed down, or were abandoned entirely. These slow-downs were caused by two key issues:

- A lack of a clear workflow
- A lack of project documentation

Literature Review
Digital repositories and institutional repositories are generally viewed as different. The DCC (2006) defines a digital repository as: “Digital Repositories offer a convenient infrastructure through which to store, manage re-use and curate digital materials.” Crow (2002) defines an intuitive repository as: “Institutional repositories – digital collections that capture and preserve the intellectual output of university communities”. This poster investigates repositories in a more general sense, so will just use the term “repository”.

There is no shortage of literature on best practices in repositories. These best practices describe digitization, file formats, metadata, etc. The Computer History Museum’s 2012 practices manual and the Library of Congress’s recommended file formats are just two examples. The slow-downs in the FSU Digital Commons Repository were not due to a lack of adherence to best practices, but a lack of a clear workflow.

Madsen & Oleen (2013) observed a “dearth of literature” on repository workflows. Since this observation, there have been a few publications and presentations, but the “dearth of literature” still exists. Two examples of recent publications are, Whipperman & Whitebloom (2017) “Speedy workflows for faculty assisted submissions” and Whipperman’s (2016) single slide on the lifecycle of a project in the University of Pennsylvania Scholar Commons. Both Madsen & Oleen (2013) and Whipperman & Whitebloom (2017) discuss workflows for traditionally published scholarly materials. However, many repositories contain more than just traditionally published scholarly materials. Our workflows must be flexible enough to include a diversity of materials.

Repository Workflow
To develop an item agnostic workflow Madsen & Oleen’s (2013) workflow (see fig 1) was consulted. Developing an item agnostic workflow was important to allow for flexibility to work with items of varying formats and collections of varying size. Whipperman’s (2016) repository project workflow includes the faculty consultation process, but for a variety of reasons this was left out of the item agnostic workflow.

The item agnostic repository workflow (fig 2) follows an item or collection submitted to the repository through the stages of permissions, the process(es) the item or collection must go through to be uploaded, how the item/collection fits in the repository structure, the upload of the item/collection, and metadata. Outreach/promotion are also included in the cycle because examples of successful repository projects are used to promote the repository to faculty.

Discovering Our Workflows
Our workflows must be flexible enough to include a diversity of materials.

Documentation Inspiration: Lab Notebooks
A “lab notebook” consisting of a checklist of the different stages of the item agnostic workflow was implemented in January 2018. It was not an immediate success. To make a repository “lab notebook” to track projects in the repository. A repository “lab notebook” can communicate the status of a project, the permissions needed and copyright status of a project, the file naming conventions used for a project, and the location of the files for a project.

Repository Lab Notebook: Successes and Failures
A “lab notebook” consisting of a checklist of the different stages of the item agnostic workflow was implemented in January 2018. It was not an immediate success. To make a repository “lab notebook” to track projects in the repository. A repository “lab notebook” can communicate the status of a project, the permissions needed and copyright status of a project, the file naming conventions used for a project, and the location of the files for a project.
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