

## *Chapter Eight*

# **Navigating the Political Waters of Open Access Publishing in Libraries**

Carol Ann Borchert, Charlene N. Simser, and  
Wendy C. Robertson

In recent years, many libraries have forayed into the world of open access (OA) publishing. While marking a major shift in the mission of libraries to move from providing access to content to generating and creating content themselves, it still involves the same basic values regarding access to information. The environment has changed, and libraries are adapting with new approaches and new staff skills to promote these fundamental values. The authors selected nineteen libraries and conducted phone interviews with a specific list of questions, encouraging discussion about how each library approached being a publisher. This chapter examines the politics and issues involved and makes recommendations for defining our roles in this new territory. The authors highlight the approaches various libraries have taken—and the challenges faced—in selecting a platform, writing a business plan, planning for preservation, educating researchers about OA publishing, working with a university press, marketing, and navigating staff training issues. The chapter concludes with recommendations for areas of focus and future research.

As libraries enter into the world of publishing—either formally, by hosting journals, books, and conference proceedings, or informally, by adding grey literature and manuscripts to their repositories—librarians have discovered that the landscape is rife with political issues at the institutional level. For many academic libraries, the mission has moved from passively providing access to content to actively producing it. Numerous considerations beyond workflows, staff, and budgets must be addressed. This chapter examines some of the potential pitfalls through a qualitative survey of nineteen

libraries involved in open access publishing. Topics covered include working with associated university presses, selecting a platform, preserving content, moving from print to online, training staff, embargoing content, setting boundaries with various stakeholders, educating faculty and authors, and other issues pertaining to establishing our roles in this new territory.

## BACKGROUND AND LITERATURE REVIEW

In the past decade, the literature in this area has evolved, becoming particularly active in the past few years. As early as 2008, Hahn commented, "The question is no longer whether libraries should offer publishing services, but what kinds of services libraries will offer" (Hahn 2008, 7). In 2014, Steele called for libraries "to move from being a passive recipient of scholarship to engaging in a more active role in hosting and supporting scholarly publishing on their campuses" (Steele 2014, 256). Indeed, publishing services are becoming quite prevalent, particularly in the university environment. Several authors have noted that in some libraries, the move toward publishing has been prompted by the realization that university faculty produce the scholarly content, then give it to publishers, who in turn charge the libraries to repurchase the content produced at their own universities (Chavez 2009, 5; Phillips 2010, 7; Suber 2012, 38). Over time, publishing materials via the library could reduce costs for the library community as a whole while increasing access to scholarly material (Skinner et al. 2014).

Libraries connect individuals with the information they need—in any format—and assess the quality of resources. However, because the general public has traditionally so closely equated books and libraries, the advent of the Internet challenged librarians to communicate their continued relevancy and value to patrons. With so much material available online, patrons seem to believe everything they need is freely available through Google. Supplementing that free content with the high-quality material librarians have always tried to purchase is one way in which we are adapting to this new online world. If patrons do expect everything to be available for free online, however, we should ensure that they are still getting what they need by providing better free content ourselves. As Willinsky notes, "Open access is not free access" (Willinsky 2006, xii). The hardware and software necessary to produce this content costs money and consumes hours of librarian, staff, editor, and author time; nevertheless, it is something our faculty need from us. "Library-based publishing programs are pragmatic responses to evident needs, not services in search of clients. . . . Library publishing is not a movement so much as a development" (Hahn 2008, 24).

This development can be quite expensive, and support for publishing operations really needs to come from the top. In their Ithaka Report, *Univer-*

*sity Publishing in a Digital Age*, Brown, Griffiths, and Rascoff explain, “Senior administrators must provide strong leadership and embrace the fact that in this digital era, publishing, broadly defined, is a centrally important activity of any university” (Brown, Griffiths, and Rascoff 2007, 5). Rather than a university-wide mandate, however, Emery and Stone suggest that a consistent message promoting open access across the community would be a more effective way to get constituents on board with the library’s OA publishing efforts (Emery and Stone 2014, 83). Mullins discusses the need for deliberate sustainability planning once a library’s publishing program has matured; at that point, instead of during the initial phases, the library typically begins seeking additional sources of funding (Mullins et al. 2012, 16). Vinopal suggests that in order to get the most out of the institution’s investment, “it is important to identify the intended audience, define the scalability and sustainability goals, and select tools, services, and projects strategically to meet these goals” (Vinopal and McCormick 2013, 34).

Welzenbach, on the other hand, states that this process of identifying the library’s needs and priorities is often the biggest challenge for library publishing operations (Welzenbach 2013, 149). Identifying what we need and where to focus our efforts can be difficult. Librarians are service oriented, and we want to please our communities, but we have limited resources with which to do so. Staffing continues to be an issue, and because many libraries started publishing with part-time pieces of existing staff, making the argument to hire additional people with specialized expertise can be daunting. Administrators believe the current model is working now, not realizing what functions are lacking or lagging or how our current funding levels restrict services. Welzenbach mentions the labor-intensive process, sometimes involving years of discussion, just to launch a new journal—and then, in some cases, the journal may never publish at all (148). Mullins explains that the demand for both traditional publishing services, like layouts and copyediting, and more innovative, interactive publishing models, involving more media, a less linear narrative, or the ability to make comments and host discussions, are “expanding the types of expertise required and straining resources further” (Mullins et al. 2012, 13). Editors often desire the same level of service they have received from commercial publishers, but many libraries simply do not have the expertise or funding needed to fulfill those expectations. Thankfully, Long and Schonfeld report, “many libraries (especially those at doctoral institutions) are placing greater emphasis on increasing staffing in special collections and building repository- or publishing-related services for faculty members” (Long and Schonfeld 2014, 27). The plethora of job openings posted on professional email lists in 2015 indicates that this is indeed the case.

Some libraries have a relationship with their university’s press. Watkinson and Newton discuss some of the challenges of such a collaboration, the

first of which is evaluating whether the library might be undermining “the idea of a university press” with its own publishing efforts (Watkinson and Newton 2010). Brown explains that the library understands faculty as users of information, whereas the university presses understand them as authors (Brown, Griffiths, and Rascoff 2007, 36). This difference can, however, lead to some fruitful collaborations. For example, Utah State University (USU), the USU Press, and the University of Colorado Press entered into a triangular collaboration to provide content. After an initial period of paid access, content became openly accessible in USU’s repository. Spooner and Wesolek report, “We find no evidence that the open access presence of these books in the IR contributed to a decline in sales of the books measured. We attribute this lack of negative impact to our choice to embargo the books during their frontlist period” (Spooner and Wesolek 2013, 175). Wayne State University also had a positive partnership experience between the university press and library on journal publishing, and Neds-Fox, Crocker, and Vonderharr report that this relationship has “proved essential in running a successful operation” (Neds-Fox, Crocker, and Vonderharr 2013, 158).

In addition to managing publishing activities, educating faculty and students on scholarly publishing and digital literacy is another challenge facing librarians. Dawson conducted a survey asking why faculty did not make their works OA and found that contributing factors, in order of prevalence, were the cost of article processing fees, concerns regarding journal quality, and lack of knowledge about open access (Dawson 2014, 10). Similarly, Gould found that “researchers are wary of submitting articles for review without some sense that the journal is tenure worthy” (Gould 2011, 120). The misconception that OA journals are not peer-reviewed has hampered some faculty’s willingness to publish in these venues. Zhao expresses concern that librarians have promoted open access and advocated for institutional repositories at the expense of helping researchers to develop scholarly publishing literacy (Zhao 2014, 13). Librarians have been discussing information literacy for years, but Zhao outlines the knowledge and skills needed for scholarly publishing literacy, including managing one’s own rights as an author and recognizing key indicators of OA journal quality (11). Perhaps helping researchers to develop these skills should become a significant part of the library’s mission.

Skinner et al. examine the history of publisher training and discuss how librarians can build capacity through training and professional development. They found that “no existing graduate-level training program adequately prepares practitioners for the full range of theoretical, practical, and organizational issues involved in publishing” (Skinner et al. 2014). The authors particularly highlight planning for sustainability of publishing operations. “Planning for sustainability, which includes tasks such as identifying revenue streams and writing a business plan, was frequently cited as a major training

gap” (ibid.). These high-level administrative skills are not necessarily taught in graduate programs in the context of library publishing.

Library publishing is still a relatively new field, and there is much to do and learn. As we will see in the following pages, librarians have implemented a variety of solutions in a number of political environments to move open publishing efforts forward at their institutions.

## METHODOLOGY

In order to examine these issues in more detail, we culled basic information about thirty-two libraries from the *2015 Library Publishing Directory*, including publishing platform, year publishing began, and number of titles published (Library Publishing Coalition, n.d.[b]). We also consulted the Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education to determine each institution’s size, geographic region, and whether it was public or private (Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education, n.d.). Using this information, we sought to include a variety of libraries, ranging from established library publishers to smaller and/or newer libraries in the publishing field. Nineteen libraries were ultimately selected for contact, including eight at institutions that had university presses as of June 2015 (see table 8.1).

We developed a list of fifteen open-ended questions to ask an identified contact at each library (see the appendix). The questions focused on advocacy, managing editor expectations, staffing and funding of the publishing department or unit, and decision-making with regard to business plans. Each contact received the questions and a brief introduction before we conducted the phone interviews. The library contacts were assured that their responses would be aggregated, with no attribution of quotes or identification of specific institutions beyond the summarized results. The phone interviews took place in June and July 2015 and lasted forty-five to sixty minutes.

In order to delineate the parameters of this chapter, we had to determine how to define the terms “publishing” and “politics.” The Library Publishing Coalition (LPC) defines library publishing as

the set of activities led by college and university libraries to support the creation, dissemination, and curation of scholarly, creative, and/or educational works. Generally, library publishing requires a production process, presents original work not previously made available, and applies a level of certification to the content published, whether through peer review or extension of the institutional brand. (LPC n.d.[a])

We have largely used this definition when considering these issues. This means that this chapter focuses on more “traditional” forms of publishing, such as journals and books, rather than other activities such as posting faculty

**Table 8.1. Institutions Interviewed**

<b>Name of Institution</b>	<b>Carnegie Classification</b>	<b>Date Pub. Started</b>	<b>University Press</b>
Boston College	Research Universities (high research activity)	2006	None
Claremont Colleges	Research Universities (high research activity)	2006	None
Columbia University	Research Universities (very high research activity)	1997	Separate from library
East Carolina University	Doctoral/Research Universities	2007	None
Emory University	Research Universities (very high research activity)	1994	None
Grand Valley State University	Master's Colleges and Universities (larger programs)	2008	None
Kansas State University	Research Universities (high research activity)	2007	None
Macalester College	Baccalaureate Colleges—Arts & Sciences	2004	None
Oregon State University	Research Universities (very high research activity)	2006	Separate from library
Pacific University	Master's Colleges and Universities (larger programs)	2010	None
Purdue University	Research Universities (very high research activity)	2006	Part of library
Simon Fraser University	Public research university*	2005	None
University of Iowa	Research Universities (very high research activity)	2009	Separate from library
University of Massachusetts, Amherst	Research Universities (very high research activity)	2006	Separate from library
University of North Texas	Research Universities (high research activity)	2009	Separate from library
University of Pittsburgh	Research Universities (very high research activity)	1999	Separate from library
University of South Florida	Research Universities (very high research activity)	2007	None
Wake Forest University	Research Universities (high research activity)	2011	Separate from library

York University (Toronto)	Public research university*	2006	None
------------------------------	-----------------------------	------	------

\* The two Canadian institutions do not have Carnegie Classifications.

preprints or other repository content. None of the questions specifically addressed publication of electronic theses and dissertations as publication activities, though this would fall under the LPC definition.

As for politics, we focused mainly on internal forces that directly impacted the library and its ability to provide publishing services, rather than on forces coming from relationships outside the library. Though we initially intended to include information on university-wide politics, our definition actually narrowed because responses were focusing mainly on library influence, and there was little mention of politics at the college/university level or beyond. This chapter intentionally does not include topics from the larger political arena, such as whether open access will eliminate commercial publishing, how open access improves the human condition, or how open access to information affects the democratic process.

We compiled the answers from the various institutions to look for trends, issues, and challenges. Because the questions were open-ended, there was wide variety in the responses, and in some areas there were multiple libraries with completely unique answers. In the interest of aggregating the responses and maintaining the respondents' anonymity, we have focused here on overall trends in each of the areas discussed below, though we do occasionally discuss some of the individual responses that we found particularly relevant or interesting.

## SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND CHALLENGES

### Scope of Library Publishing

One often unspoken challenge is determining what, exactly, library publishing means; there is frequently a fine line in determining whether a library is the publisher or merely a host. Some respondents referred to their work as "hosting" content due to their noninvolvement in editorial aspects such as formatting, copyediting, and marketing. In some cases there is a publishing society, association, or department; in other cases, the library becomes the default publisher, absent another entity's involvement. Regardless, hosting still meets the LPC definition of library publishing. Making a publication part of an institutional collection and having publication-specific review is certification of the content, albeit not of a sort that is done explicitly by the library publishing unit. Library branding for interview respondents ranged from a simple statement of "hosted by the library" to a department-specific

logo. Having a consistent, nonintrusive statement is one way to provide an institutional connection and give the library credit for hosting and paying for the OA content, while allowing journals an independent look to clarify that the editors or publisher have editorial control of the content. One respondent noted, however, that they initially chose not to brand the journals published by their press with a library logo, fearing it might diminish the credibility and potential reputation of the content.

As noted in table 8.1, many of the nineteen libraries interviewed are at large research institutions. For most of the libraries, the push to publish either came from a faculty member or was library led; in a few cases it originated from a consortial relationship. In at least six cases, publishing was seen as a core mission of the library, included as part of a strategic plan, or supported by the library dean or directors.

The preponderance of libraries hosting fully OA journals was evident, but some respondents noted that they allowed embargoed content. Two libraries said they made philosophical decisions from the beginning to be wholly OA and not to host or publish any journal with embargoes or subscriptions. A couple of others declared that any new journals added could not have embargoes. Six respondents indicated that one or more of their journals offered subscriptions, which are managed by the journal editor rather than the library, with the subscription usually being for the print rather than the online version. A few libraries indicated a willingness to support or allow online subscriptions or embargoed content in the hopes of easing journals into fully OA publications.

Only two institutions reported that all of their journal content was born digital. The majority have moved their content to print plus online or online only. Issues encountered during the process of shifting content to an online format include the time involved in scanning, manually creating metadata, slow networks and scanning equipment, poor-quality scans, working with large file sizes or huge backfiles (one with issues dating back to 1863), meeting accessibility standards, or, for those with embargoes, maintaining the moving wall. Some editors still want print versions of their OA journals. In one case, the library experimented with doing the layouts, printing the journals, and mailing the issues (many of which went overseas), which proved time-consuming and expensive; it now refers editors requesting assistance with print copies to a list of print-on-demand services. In most cases, if the journal continues to be published in print, the editors use an outside party.

While most library publishing focuses on editorial oversight or publications by faculty within the institution, twelve respondents currently publish society publications. For the majority of those that do, a university affiliation with the society is required; libraries charging for services, on the other hand, do not tend to require such an affiliation. At least one university also publishes books authored by members of the local community.



## Funding

Little progress has been made since Brown, Griffiths, and Rascoff suggested in 2007 that money and support for publishing operations should come from the top down (Brown, Griffiths, and Rascoff 2007, 5). The majority of respondents reported no university-/college-level monetary support. The library typically covered all costs, though there were some exceptions. Other funding sources included various combinations of the Provost's Office, information technology (IT), grants, foundation accounts, on-campus scholarly or research groups, subscriptions or book purchases, charges for upgraded services, and author fees. In some cases, such funding is publication specific.

University administrators are often impressed that libraries offer publishing services for no additional effort or funding on their part, which might be one reason librarians do not typically advocate for further external funding. If libraries demand larger budgets to continue or improve these initiatives, will provosts and deans dim their enthusiasm or demand that the library publishing units turn a profit like a university press? Are we better off doing what we can with shoestring budgets? Nothing is free, including OA publishing; someone must pay for it, and in many cases that someone is the library, with its already strained resources. Offering free OA publishing to faculty often comes at the price of a lower level of service, combined with either a higher burden on faculty editors or further stress on the library's staff and budget or a combination of the two.

## Selecting a Platform

Interview respondents cited many different factors driving the selection of a platform for their libraries' publishing initiatives. Five stated that the lack of internal IT support or a desire to outsource the system drove the decision to select a hosted platform, and three specifically wanted an open source platform. One started with open source but migrated to a hosted system after several years in order to avoid uncertainties about consistent local IT support. Most institutions had not migrated from their original platforms unless there was an improved version available or the lack of IT support became an issue and forced a move. Many respondents reviewed several systems and chose one that best suited their publishing needs. Five institutions use multiple platforms depending on the material being published, such as CONTENTdm for image collections, Open Journal Systems (OJS) or Digital Commons for text-based items, and WordPress for alternative publishing models. At least one individual surveyed academic faculty about their publishing needs prior to selecting a platform. Other considerations included platforms' publishing capabilities, ease of use, cost, flexibility to allow front-end design, and ease in training staff without technical expertise. One respondent specifically

wanted a hosted solution so that their time could be devoted to outreach, education, and advocacy.

### University Presses

For the eight respondents with university presses, relationships between the library and the press are typically cordial but not often collaborative, as each is viewed as having a different mission. In one case, the university press is part of the library, and the two share a mission to disseminate scholarship, so the library publishing unit has an extremely close relationship with the press. In two cases, the library publisher is digitizing and/or hosting backfiles and out-of-print materials previously published by, and in collaboration with, the university press. Libraries also publish supplemental materials for the university press—such as maps, digital source materials, and datasets—that would not fit into a traditional book format. A press might pass projects to the library publishing unit if the project is outside the scope of the press's expertise. One of the more fruitful collaborations includes OA back content from the press in the library's publishing platform, allowing print-on-demand purchases for the press.

At four of the eight institutions with university presses, library publishing units offer enhanced services with associated charges, such as layout or xml conversion. Basic levels of service—providing a publishing platform under the institutional brand and some initial training for the editors—come at no charge. Two institutions specifically noted that fees for e-books are assessed on a cost-recovery-only basis, and one noted that this work is outsourced. Two institutions charge for hosting clients with no university affiliation. Currently, none of the institutions without university presses charge any type of fee to publish content.

When the university press and the library are separate, friction may exist because the press may be cautious about open access or view the library as a competitor for faculty output. The press may have concerns about its brand, wanting to ensure that other units within the university are not called a press—especially when, as in library publishing, the editors are responsible for ensuring the integrity of the content. University presses may also be reluctant to train so-called competitors to carry out publishing-related processes.

Despite these obstacles, some university presses and libraries do develop collaborative projects. Different funding models make finding such opportunities difficult. A university press is under pressure to produce some level of profit, or at least cover its own costs, whereas libraries are often funded in such a way that free publishing services are possible for editors, authors, and end users alike.

## Staffing

Most libraries did not start with specific staff hires for publishing operations. Rather, work was initially done part-time by an employee in an existing position to see how it developed; in some cases, that model has not expanded to include additional staff. New staff came later, if at all, based on duties that surfaced during work with the repository/OA publishing. Six institutions reported hiring new staff at inception, though often from a vacant line. Other institutions reassigned staff. New hires were selected based on their expertise; in three cases, professionals other than librarians were hired for their programming and editing expertise. Some libraries using OJS have hired systems and programming staff or have assigned tasks to existing IT staff, few of whom have a master's degree in library science. Several respondents reported successfully reassigning vacated positions to the publishing program, demonstrating library support. At eight of the interviewed institutions, publishing occurs in a separate, newly formed department. Most of the remaining institutions have wrapped publishing into an existing department or spread the responsibilities across multiple departments.

Staff members appear to have little or no resistance or resentment regarding publishing efforts in the library. In fact, they express excitement to be doing something new and different at a time when other processes have been automated and collections budgets have shifted toward electronic resources—two trends that have been reducing the staff time required for a variety of traditional tasks such as materials receipt, shelving, and binding. One respondent noted that if there is tension, it is because library publishing is new and different.

The majority of respondents indicated a desire to add to their existing publications and offer additional services, but a major barrier to this goal is inadequate staffing. Defining the level of service is paramount and is discussed in more detail below. Basic services may include nothing more than offering server space and maintaining the software, or it might also encompass providing an externally hosted space, initial setup, training, and ongoing troubleshooting. Similar projects, such as individual journals or conference proceedings, may require vastly different allocations of resources depending on the time and technical skills of the editor. Some journals run themselves, and some are very high maintenance, requiring additional staffing for a higher level of services. Local hosting using open source software generally requires additional technical support from programmers and system administrators. Libraries lacking IT support may choose external hosting, thus outsourcing the IT cost as part of vendor-provided services. Publications may also need graphic or web designers during the design and setup phase. All of these options still demand staff support in some fashion. Whether the library

offers basic or enhanced services, as publishing becomes more successful libraries may need to seek outside financial support for these tasks.

### **Training and Keeping Current with Developments**

Training tends to be in-house or self-taught. OJS has community-based forums and, like Bepress, has documentation and video tutorials available. Bepress offers online training sessions for both library staff and journal editors on using the back end of the editorial system. Sometimes staff are sent outside the library to learn specific skills at programs like the Bepress Repository Manager Certification Course or in courses on software programs like InDesign. Staff members may also be encouraged to participate in publishing organizations, including the Library Publishing Coalition or the Society for Scholarly Publishing.

Library publishing discussions are happening at many different conferences and venues, which both demonstrates the importance libraries are placing on publishing and presents a challenge for staff members choosing among several conference options. Technology changes—such as the introduction of the iPad or the development of standards like Schema.org that come from outside the library and publishing community—also impact library publishing. Even developments more closely aligned with libraries and publishing can occur in a variety of areas, making it extremely difficult for a small operation to learn about new trends and prioritize their inclusion in services.

### **Publishing Services**

There is little consistency regarding which services libraries offer beyond basic services such as initial setup and consultation on indexing and copyright issues. Some libraries offer more extensive services, sometimes with additional charges; others simply do not offer the more labor-intensive services. Most respondents use a memorandum of understanding (MOU) or a service agreement to outline the responsibilities of both parties clearly. Some library publishers outline costs so that book authors or journal editors can choose the level of service they want; alternatively, they might outsource all production work on a cost-recovery basis.

Layout for many OA publications is based on a basic template rather than a more complex format typical of traditional academic journals. The basic look may cause the journal to appear “cheap” in comparison to journals with professional layout designs, resulting in a perception of low quality despite rigorous peer review. Seven libraries provide some layout services, and three will do copyediting if they have time or student help. Copyediting is another specialized, time-consuming, and expensive service, but not offering it can

have the same result as a basic template design; if the editors are not careful copyeditors, small errors can lower the overall reputation of a publication. Given the time and expertise required for such specialized services, even libraries that offer them might only be able to do so for selected titles.

Most library publishers will request an International Standard Serial Number (ISSN) and submit Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ) applications, though in at least one case this is a value-added cost to the journal or author. Several libraries register digital object identifiers (DOIs) for articles, and bepress offers an enhanced service to register DOIs if the library is a CrossRef member. Requesting International Standard Book Numbers (ISBNs) is somewhat less common, possibly because the publisher needs to pay for the publisher-specific identifier. The lack of DOIs assigned to library-published content may be due largely to low staffing levels and training barriers. An additional issue is that acquiring DOIs for articles can be costly, particularly for a long run of journal backfiles at a library that freely offers the publishing platform and services to its constituents. Other services may include providing an HTML version or XML conversion, preservation in LOCKSS (Lots of Copies Keep Stuff Safe) or Portico, guidance on editorial board formation, or production workflow advice.

Responses indicate that pushing content to commercial indexing sources does not appear to be a common service. At least some of the major scholarly indexes require a license agreement after a title has been vetted by the index's editorial board. Even for fully OA titles, this requirement can be a major impediment to inclusion of library-published content in library-promoted and licensed databases; editors often do not have expertise in negotiating licenses with database vendors, and librarians may encounter resistance to such third-party contracts from their legal counsel.

Few respondents mentioned getting content into link resolvers, another important library-supported means for students and faculty to access content. Having publications listed in DOAJ can help with this problem, but now that DOAJ has stricter application requirements to ensure better quality of the journals listed on its site, the process has become more cumbersome.

Ensuring quality metadata at the article and book chapter level is another challenge. This particular issue was not raised by respondents, but it is an important part of library publishing. Creating quality metadata at a smaller publication unit is outside the traditional work of a cataloging department, but it requires the same skills, including attention to detail, adherence to standards, and subject analysis. Linked data is a growing area of interest in libraries, and in order for library publishing to be included in these efforts, metadata experts need to be included in the publishing process. Metadata from publishing units can be shared through a variety of mechanisms, such as the Open Archives Initiative Protocol for Metadata Harvesting (OAI-PMH) for inclusion in a discovery system, or structured in a specific manner on web

pages for inclusion in Google Scholar. Libraries may also wish to include metadata formatted according to Schema.org or specifically formatted to be pulled into citation systems. Typically, journal editors are responsible for their own metadata, with some libraries enhancing this data with default values and standard options for the editors or authors to use or even correcting metadata at the time of publication. However, library publishers may not consistently map this metadata in ways that facilitate all of its being aggregated or repurposed. Within the library, the metadata specialists are likely not in the publishing unit, so either work needs to pass to a different department, or relevant staff should be aware of the publishing metadata.

As new features become common for both commercial and large open access publishers, the expectations of editors and authors grow. For example, use of ORCID, a universal author identifier, as part of the submission process is beginning to take hold with large commercial journal publishers. None of the respondents, however, mentioned using ORCID, and commonly used publishing software does not yet support this feature.

No matter the level of service, managing editor expectations can be a problem. One respondent noted a misunderstanding with a journal about layout and copyediting duties and spent significant time discussing the issue with the journal's editors. Another noted that one potential client was scared off when they realized the amount of work they were expected to handle themselves. A clearly written MOU or a service agreement can circumvent many potential issues. Should the editors later indicate they expected a higher level of service, they can be referred back to the signed agreement, and any new services can be renegotiated. The scope of any new project and the responsibilities of both publishing staff and editors must be clearly defined.

## **Preservation**

Preservation and data backup in the responding libraries take many forms. Many libraries that do not have a formal preservation system in place hope to have one soon. Ten respondents use a combination of LOCKSS, Closed LOCKSS (CLOCKSS), Portico, MetaArchive, HathiTrust, and Private LOCKSS Networks. Three institutions are exploring options for LOCKSS or Portico; one institution recently signed with Portico. Several report that their university web crawlers capture content or that IT does local backups. For those using Digital Commons, bepress stores a backup of the content offsite. Others use cloud-based services, print copies of published e-books to add to the library collection, or send items to a state archive. Library administrators are generally supportive, but in many cases there is no financial ability or software system to cover costs and full levels of preservation. Those who do preserve report that their administrators view preservation as a critical, vital function.

Almost half of respondents do not engage in preservation beyond backing up files. Library publishing is often part of general preservation initiatives, and the robustness of such programs varies from institution to institution. A strong plan requires focused resources, and these costs can exceed the means of the publishing unit. Many libraries do not place the content they publish in a trusted digital repository, such as CLOCKSS, Portico, HathiTrust, or Scholars Portal. Trusted digital repositories are certified through a rigorous process to ensure their stability and longevity as preservation systems. There is a standard in place, ISO 16363:2012, that “defines a recommended practice for assessing the trustworthiness of digital repositories [and] . . . can be used as a basis for certification.” The Center for Research Libraries (CRL) has a Certification Advisory Panel in place to review and define such repositories.

### Writing a Business Plan

Very few responding libraries started their publishing endeavors with a business plan. In fact, only three had any sort of formal business plan or vision in place ahead of time. In most cases, the work evolved organically, and the library experimented initially to see if publishing was an endeavor worth pursuing. Some librarians indicated that they hoped to write something more formal to focus future efforts, now that publishing has proven successful. In at least one case, an advisory board provides direction, and in other cases, the publishing units rely on the library’s mission and vision to guide their work.

Business plans can be used as roadmaps for developing publishing operations. Some institutions are satisfied that the direction of library publishing is reflected in the library’s mission and vision statements. However, more so than a mission or vision statement, a business or strategic plan details the objectives of the publishing unit, estimates how many staff will be needed to accomplish these objectives (providing a rationale for hiring when needed), and could identify new sources of funding. A formal plan allows the library to assert more control over its publishing endeavors and future direction rather than simply reacting to outside forces—we are never immune from such forces, but this sort of structure provides a better framework for handling surprises. Unfortunately, writing a business plan requires specific expertise not typically taught in library schools. This topic could be added to the library school curriculum or offered as a postdegree workshop, as it could be helpful in other library settings as well.

### Promotion and Marketing

Libraries must take advantage of all possible marketing opportunities; while this is not an area in which we have historically excelled, we are learning.

Marketing and outreach, including educational activities, can be a challenge in terms of determining how to do it, finding the time, and having staff available to handle the resulting enthusiasm. Several respondents admit they do not do enough marketing, though they caution, "Be careful what you wish for." Promoting publishing services can be a double-edged sword. Library publishers must understand their capacity to deal with the potential outpouring of new clients. One respondent indicated she does not actively advertise; as a unit of one, she cannot manage the additional work this would generate. Another has had to disappoint potential faculty editors and turn down possible publishing opportunities. A third hopes to hire a new position that would include a focus on outreach. Once researchers fully realize the benefits of the services being offered, stemming their enthusiasm to prevent expectations from exceeding capacity can be difficult.

Libraries also need a mechanism in place to evaluate the quality of a publication idea and the readiness of its editors to commit the time they need to carry the project through to fruition. On the positive side, an increase in publications might lead to a more focused approach to services. At a minimum, many respondents now have service agreements or MOUs. Though many libraries seem to have started publishing with part of an existing position as an experiment, their resulting success proves it is a positive direction for library research services to take.

Because library publishing is new and different, many staff outside publishing or scholarly communications departments are not aware of the scope of the work it entails. The majority of respondents indicated a need for the library's publishing unit to share information with all library staff, discuss current issues and trends, and work on OA mythbusting, all in collaboration with other librarians already engaged in this outreach. If publishing is a strategic goal of the organization, all staff should feel comfortable talking about it with academic faculty, graduate students, administrators, and others. This goal requires a high level of education and political savvy in order for staff to feel comfortable. Some librarians attend faculty department or dean meetings or host workshops or other events to attract faculty. However, inserting library matters into an already packed meeting agenda or luring very busy faculty members out of their offices and into the library can be daunting.

### **Educating Researchers**

Respondents generally indicate that they have difficulty finding support for OA publishing from academic faculty. Though the faculty already involved in OA publishing are supportive, tenure and promotion (T&P) continues to be a block for involving faculty. Misconceptions that OA journals are not peer-reviewed persist, resulting in T&P committees' not weighing OA publi-



cations as heavily as traditional commercial publications. To help combat these misconceptions, we must do all we can to ensure that our titles meet basic expectations for a journal in the relevant discipline, so that scholars will recognize the quality of their content. Though many junior faculty are enthusiastic about publishing in OA outlets, the perceived T&P barrier can prevent them from utilizing such venues for their work. Senior and non-tenure-track faculty are more likely participants in OA publishing, because they are not under as much pressure to publish in core subscription journals with high impact factors in their field. On a hopeful note, with students, parents, and university administrators advocating for a reduction in textbook costs, one respondent noted the success of an OA textbook initiative that provides funds to faculty to cover some costs associated with publishing. This type of activity, along with OA funds now being offered by many institutions and the addition of federal mandates, may lead to more openness to OA among T&P committees.

Most respondents provide some amount of outreach or education on open access in general, including copyright, authors' rights, and predatory journals. Discussions on these topics often occur when a new publication is proposed and vetted but rarely occur for existing titles. Most libraries have not included any specific training on plagiarism, noting that faculty are well versed in this topic. Although faculty editors are aware of plagiarism issues, student editors may need additional education. Respondents generally seek opportunities to discuss the benefits of OA publishing with the members of their institutions, whether via departmental visits, regular meetings with stakeholders on campus, or social media. A few institutions reported hosting workshops for their own editors. Some institutions have subject liaisons with specific responsibilities for promoting OA, though this may be generic OA content rather than library-published materials. Liaisons or scholarly communications librarians who may be outside the publishing department educate in classroom settings or through one-on-one meetings. Some libraries have web pages, maintained by either the publishing staff or library liaisons, to cover these topics. A couple of libraries have created specific OA journal quality-indicator documents for their sites. Several note that education is often at the point of need for their journal editors. One respondent created a series of lunchtime information-sharing sessions with library staff. Others have regular meetings with their publications' editors, and some invite any faculty editor to attend and share experiences.

Some respondents note that academic faculty are both formally and informally involved in the library's efforts to speak about OA and publishing opportunities. Faculty members directly involved are big supporters of OA initiatives and can help battle misconceptions about the quality of such publications. Libraries market publishing activity by participating in OA Week activities and publicizing accomplishments through campus news, inter-

views, and brochures. Mandates for federal-grant-funded projects have caught faculty attention, providing opportunities for discussion, and the establishment of library-supported OA funds and conversations about or implementation of formal OA policies often lead to exchanges. Even graduate students' reporting downloads of their electronic dissertations can pique faculty interest.

Library workshops for the general campus, rather than specifically for authors or journal editors, often cover topics relevant to library publishing. For example, researchers need to be aware—and beware—of author fees. In some cases, the publications charging such fees are perfectly legitimate, and many libraries have established OA initiatives to help fund these types of publications. Authors need more information about predatory journals, and library publishers want to include this information in their education activities. With predatory journals wooing business from faculty and students, some researchers become entangled in a difficult publishing situation, feel coerced into paying high publication charges, or have difficulty removing their work from such sites. Such bad experiences can sour the idea of publishing in OA venues.

### **Advocacy**

Only a handful of respondents noted any advocacy beyond the library itself. Faculty participating as editors and/or authors in library publishing initiatives are excellent individual advocates, but advocacy for publishing must also be addressed at the university level. Publishing might be, rather than a direct strategic goal or part of the university's mission, a means—possibly one of many—to accomplishing a larger goal. By creating and publishing new content, rather than just making purchased content accessible, libraries can be full collaborative partners in the research and creative endeavors of the university. Institutions should specifically connect library publishing initiatives to university strategic plan themes (e.g., the larger goal of enhancing the research reputation of the university and focusing on undergraduate research and scholarship).

Three respondents mentioned the value of student journal publishing as a teaching opportunity, giving students the chance to experience the publication process—as authors, editors, or both. These publishing collaborations with academic faculty may take the form of journals that feature student scholarship and/or are managed by student editors. Library publishing can directly contribute to the educational goals of an institution and to students' overall success during and after their college careers.

We did not include questions on OA textbook initiatives or OA author funds, but at least three respondents mentioned how those initiatives contribute to expanded publishing opportunities and advocacy. In those cases, the

provost, the library, or the Office of Sponsored Research, or some combination of the three, provides funds to support OA author funds. OA textbooks written by faculty may be funded through the university's student senate, provost, or library. Because the basic ability to afford textbooks can sometimes be the factor determining whether a student stays in school, these initiatives support both university textbook affordability efforts and overall student success.

For some, publishing initiatives complement existing high-profile digital collections, building on existing and emerging strengths. Library publishers might specifically target faculty in strategic subject areas to encourage and promote new OA publications. Publishing can also target emerging interdisciplinary programs that may not have an existing journal in which to publish.

Librarians tend to be the leading advocates for university-wide OA policies. OA policies can advance knowledge, applying it to improve society and the human condition, which is the aim of research in every field of study. Public institutions with missions to disseminate their output to citizens of their respective states—or even worldwide—may discover the benefits of an OA policy. Library publishing units are an important part of such advocacy and may lead these efforts.

Showcasing and exploring OA initiatives raises awareness of the library publisher's role in the academy, which may lead to increased support from academic faculty and administrators. Tying our role as publisher to the university's overall mission and goals provides better leverage for requesting additional resources to continue to expand OA publishing, which is of value not only to the overall research community but to the university's efforts specifically. By enhancing the university's research reputation, showcasing the research efforts conducted there, and contributing directly to teaching efforts and student success, the library solidifies its place at the core of the university.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

Because each library's publishing operation is uniquely staffed, funded, organized, and focused, with so little standardization, it is difficult to provide concrete suggestions on managing such different environments. However, as a result of the conversations with respondents and an examination of the challenges that library publishers are facing, several general recommendations surfaced:

*Write a business or strategic plan.* A business or strategic plan can establish goals and objectives, focus publishing efforts, outline a marketing plan, and make the case for better staffing or funding.

*Work with library colleagues on outreach.* Librarians in public services have the faculty contacts and relationships that can help with education and advocacy. All staff in the library who have contact with faculty and researchers should be comfortable discussing scholarly communications issues when opportunities arise.

*Involve the metadata specialists.* Staff and librarians in technical services need to be aware of library publishing, ensure it meets standards, and include it in their planning. Metadata specialists can make sure that the metadata in the publishing arena is complete and consistent to facilitate searching and discovery.

*Continue to educate researchers.* Establish standards for scholarly publishing literacy. Work with faculty to explain the quality of OA publications and increase their awareness of and literacy in topics such as authors' rights, copyright, plagiarism, and predatory publishers. This education should be the responsibility of everyone in the library, not just one or two people who focus on scholarly communications.

*Preserve content in trusted digital repositories.* There are multiple ways to preserve content, but long-term preservation should be done in a trusted digital repository. Smaller institutions lacking the resources to preserve their content individually could work through consortia or larger community efforts.

*Manage editor expectations.* Because libraries are not commercial publishers and our funding and staffing levels are very different, editors need to be aware from the beginning of the process that their workload will be substantially higher than with a commercial journal and that the library offers a different level of service. Having frank discussions with editors and carefully outlining expectations for both parties can establish good boundaries and avoid future problems.

*Meet professional publication standards.* We can support peer review, but are we equipped at current staffing levels to support HTML versions of articles, PDF/A formats, DOI reference linking, standards for structure and metadata, or pushing content into major indexes? These items go well beyond the editors' expertise and need to be addressed. Libraries should work collaboratively so that more publications meet these standards and quality publications are ensured.

*Tie OA publishing efforts to the university's mission and goals.* The university's administrators need to understand the relevance of publishing to the institution's overarching goals. This understanding will be key in the library's efforts to acquire further funding for staff and other resources.

Organizations such as the LPC, Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL), and NASIG, as well as individual leaders in library pub-

lishing, are forming communities of practice that will be invaluable to new and existing library publishing units; we hope to see best practices documents created and shared through these organizations. Jill Emery and Graham Stone have started working on Open Access Workflows in Academic Libraries, which has the potential to help librarians outline and standardize best practices for managing OA publications (Emery and Stone, n.d.). Cooperative training of library publishing staff members by other institutions can increase the ability of library publishing units to meet the expectations of professional publications.

### FUTURE RESEARCH

Were we to conduct this investigation again, we would better define what is considered a publication as part of the introductory information given to interview contacts. Discussions of general repository efforts bled into the interview conversations because many respondents are working in both publishing and repository work, which are similar but not always the same. Better defining what we meant by “publishing” might have helped narrow that discussion. Additional work should also focus on OA textbooks, funds for author processing charges, and university-wide OA policies. We did not ask specifically about nontext publishing, such as videos, audio files, or data, which would also be areas for further study.

Building on Zhao’s outline of scholarly publishing literacy (mentioned in the “Background and Literature Review” section of this chapter) could help librarians focus their education efforts when working with researchers. A how-to document for writing a business plan oriented to library publishing rather than to corporate settings would be beneficial. OA publishing is still a relatively new area of librarianship, and there is much work to be done before libraries can settle on standards of service to our constituents.

### CONCLUSION

Politics—at least internal politics—seems to be mostly on our side, except when related to funding/staffing and tenure/promotion. Deans and some provosts perceive OA publishing as a good idea, but many libraries continue to run publishing operations on a shoestring budget with no business plan in place. The majority of respondents publish works edited by scholars specifically affiliated with their own universities, even when the publisher is a society or association. Universities often tout their own faculties’ contributions to the scholarly literature as a measure of prestige. Though some of the library publishers report receiving monies from sources other than the library, the incorporation of publishing efforts into strategic or business

plans—at both the library and university levels—could eventually lead to increased financial support at the university level. The challenge is to provide evidence that the library is a partner in the research process from start to finish. Library publishing supports scholarship and scholars. We as librarians must show how this activity aligns with the library and university missions and do our best to add unique scholarship and niche materials to the body of worldwide knowledge.

## APPENDIX: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Kevin Smith of the Duke University Libraries is editing a volume for Rowman & Littlefield focusing on open access and how the movement toward open access is impacting library services. We are writing a chapter for this volume examining the political aspects of open access publishing in libraries. The information collected from these questions will be aggregated in the chapter discussion, and respondents will not be identified by name or institution.

1. Give us some background on how you started publishing OA journals, monographs, textbooks, and/or conference proceedings, including your reasons for delving into OA publishing. [and ask about any gaps in the spreadsheet]
2. How did you advocate for this new endeavor? What level of university support did you have?
3. Is there a university press at your institution? If so, what level of cooperation or collaboration is there between the library and the university press?
4. Did you write a business plan ahead of time? If so, which groups of stakeholders were involved in developing that?
5. Did you hire new staff for this work, retrain existing staff, or some of both? Was there any tension about moving staff around and/or adding in a new level of work? Did you do training in-house or send people off-site? Did you hire nonlibrarians specifically for their different skills?
6. In what department do publishing operations occur? Is this a newly formed department/unit/center or part of an existing one?
7. How are you funded? Is this part of the library budget or a separate fund? Do you charge journal hosting and/or author fees?
8. What were your considerations in choosing a platform? Are you on the same platform you started with, and if not, why did you change?
9. How is your content being preserved? Has the library or university been supportive of preservation costs and efforts?

10. Do you embargo content or provide subscriptions? Please explain the reasoning either way.
11. Are you publishing materials from societies or other entities or just directly from faculty? Has this been a conscious decision on the part of the library to include or restrict this?
12. Has OA publishing been well received by faculty? What steps have you taken to communicate your activity with them?
13. Have you moved print titles to online titles? Are the titles still published in print or only online? Are there any additional issues that arose from this move?
14. How have you managed editor expectations? What kinds of “extra” services are you providing? (such as layouts, copyediting, copyright assistance)
15. Do you educate authors and editors about issues such as predatory OA journals, processing and publication fees, plagiarism, copyright, and Creative Commons licenses?

## REFERENCES

- Brown, Laura, Rebecca Griffiths, and Matthew Rascoff. 2007. *University Publishing in a Digital Age*. New York: Ithaka. <http://sr.ithaka.org/sites/default/files/reports/4.13.1.pdf>.
- Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education. N.d. [http://carnegieclassifications.iu.edu/lookup\\_listings/institution.php](http://carnegieclassifications.iu.edu/lookup_listings/institution.php).
- Chavez, Todd. 2009. “Why We Do It—the University of South Florida Tampa Library’s Commitment to Open-Access Publishing.” *Studia UBB Geologia* 54, no. 1. <http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/geologia/vol54/iss1/art1>.
- Dawson, Diane. 2014. “The Scholarly Communications Needs of Faculty: An Evidence Based Foundation for the Development of Library Services.” *Evidence Based Library and Information Practice* 9, no. 4. <http://ejournals.library.ualberta.ca/index.php/EBLIP/article/view/21764/17771>.
- Emery, Jill, and Graham Stone. 2014. “Introduction to OAWAL: Open Access Workflows for Academic Librarians.” *Serials Review* 40, no. 2. doi: 10.1080/00987913.2014.924307.
- . N.d. OAWAL: Open Access Workflows for Academic Libraries. <https://library3.hud.ac.uk/blogs/oawal>.
- Gould, Thomas H. P. 2011. “Protocols and Challenges to the Creation of a Cross-Disciplinary Journal.” *Journal of Scholarly Publishing* 42, no. 2. doi: 10.1353/scp.2011.0002.
- Hahn, Karla L. 2008. *Research Library Publishing Services: New Options for University Publishing*. Washington, DC: Association of Research Libraries. <http://www.arl.org/storage/documents/publications/research-library-publishing-services-mar08.pdf>.
- Library Publishing Coalition. N.d.(a). “About Us.” <http://www.librarypublishing.org/about-us>.
- . N.d.(b). *Library Publishing Directory 2015*, edited by Sarah K. Lippincott. Atlanta: Library Publishing Coalition. [http://www.librarypublishing.org/sites/librarypublishing.org/files/documents/lpc\\_dir\\_2015lpc.pdf](http://www.librarypublishing.org/sites/librarypublishing.org/files/documents/lpc_dir_2015lpc.pdf).
- Long, Matthew P., and Roger C. Schonfeld. 2014. *Ithaka S+R US Library Survey 2013*. New York: Ithaka. [http://www.sr.ithaka.org/sites/default/files/reports/SR\\_LibraryReport\\_20140310\\_0.pdf](http://www.sr.ithaka.org/sites/default/files/reports/SR_LibraryReport_20140310_0.pdf).
- Mullins, James L., et al. 2012. *Library Publishing Services: Strategies for Success*. Washington, DC: SPARC. [http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/purduepress\\_ebooks/24](http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/purduepress_ebooks/24).
- Neds-Fox, Joshua, Lauren Crocker, and Alicia Vonderharr. 2013. “Wayne State University Press and Libraries: A Case Study of a Library and University Press Journal Publishing

- Partnership." In *Library Publishing Toolkit*, edited by Allison Brown et al. Geneseo, NY: IDS Project Press. <http://opensuny.org/omp/index.php/IDSProject/catalog/book/25>.
- Phillips, Linda L. 2010. "Coming Home: Scholarly Publishing Returns to the University." In *Transforming Research Libraries for the Global Knowledge Society*, edited by Barbara I. Dewey. Cambridge, UK: Chandos. [http://works.bepress.com/linda\\_phillips/8](http://works.bepress.com/linda_phillips/8).
- Skinner, Katherine, et al. 2014. "Library-as-Publisher: Capacity Building for the Library Publishing Subfield." *Journal of Electronic Publishing* 17, no. 2. doi: 10.3998/3336451.0017.207.
- Spooner, Michael, and Andrew Wesolek. 2013. "Content and Collaboration I: A Case Study of Bringing an Institutional Repository and a University Press Together." In *Library Publishing Toolkit*, edited by Allison Brown et al. Geneseo, NY: IDS Project Press. <http://opensuny.org/omp/index.php/IDSProject/catalog/book/25>.
- Steele, Colin. 2014. "Scholarly Communication, Scholarly Publishing and University Libraries. Plus Ça Change?" *Australian Academic and Research Libraries* 45, no. 4. doi: 10.1080/00048623.2014.950042.
- Suber, Peter. 2012. *Open Access*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. <https://mitpress.mit.edu/books/open-access>.
- Vinopal, Jennifer, and Monica McCormick. 2013. "Supporting Digital Scholarship in Research Libraries: Scalability and Sustainability." *Journal of Library Administration* 53, no. 1. doi: 10.1080/01930826.2013.756689.
- Watkinson, Charles, and Mark Newton. 2010. "The Benefits of Collaborative Marketing at Purdue University Libraries/Press." Presentation, SSP/ARL "Partnering to Publish" Seminar, Washington, DC, November 10. <http://www.arl.org/storage/documents/publications/partnering-to-publish-watkinson-nov2010.pdf>.
- Welzenbach, Rebecca A. 2013. "The Human Factor in Sustainable Journal Publishing Partnerships." In *Library Publishing Toolkit*, edited by Allison Brown et al. Geneseo, NY: IDS Project Press. <http://opensuny.org/omp/index.php/IDSProject/catalog/book/25>.
- Willinsky, John. 2006. *The Access Principle: The Case for Open Access to Research and Scholarship*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. [https://mitpress.mit.edu/sites/default/files/titles/content/9780262512664\\_Download\\_the\\_full\\_text.pdf](https://mitpress.mit.edu/sites/default/files/titles/content/9780262512664_Download_the_full_text.pdf).
- Zhao, Linlin. 2014. "Riding the Wave of Open Access: Providing Library Research Support for Scholarly Publishing Literacy." *Australian Academic and Research Libraries* 45, no. 1. doi: 10.1080/00048623.2014.882873.