



10-2016

Open Access and closed minds? Collaborating across campus to help faculty understand changing scholarly communication models

Elizabeth Price

James Madison University, price2el@jmu.edu

Leslie Engelson

Murray State University, lengelson@murraystate.edu

Candace K. Vance

Murray State University, cvance4@murraystate.edu

Rebecca Richardson

rdrichards72@gmail.com

Jeffrey Henry

Murray State University, jhenry@murraystate.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.murraystate.edu/faculty>



Part of the [Scholarly Communication Commons](#), and the [Scholarly Publishing Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Price, E., Engelson, L., Vance, C., Richardson, R., & Henry, J. (2016). Open access and closed minds? Collaborating across campus to help faculty understand changing scholarly communication models. In K. Smith & K. Dickson (Eds.), *Open access and the future of scholarly communication: Policy and infrastructure* (pp. 67-84). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

This Book Chapter is brought to you for free and open access by Murray State's Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty & Staff Research and Creative Activity by an authorized administrator of Murray State's Digital Commons. For more information, please contact msu.digitalcommons@murraystate.edu.

Chapter 4: Open Access and closed minds? Collaborating across campus to help faculty understand changing scholarly communication models

By Elizabeth Price, Leslie Engelson, Candace Vance, Rebecca Richardson, Jeffrey Henry

Open Access (OA) continues to play a major role in the rapidly changing and complex system of scholarly communications. Librarians, whose day-to-day jobs typically consist of outreach, education, and collection development, possess an advantage in discerning the lay of this perplexing land, because they regularly interact with authors and publishers. Since it is often unclear which departments or administrators on campus would entertain questions or issues about OA, institutions run the risk of reacting to problems instead of preventing them.

Awareness drives change, compelling universities to anticipate and address issues before they become problematic. Where to start? Initiatives are wide-ranging—from establishing an OA funding pool to creating an institutional repository, from educating faculty about how to negotiate favorable licensing terms to offering informed copyright advice. Librarians are often tasked with these undertakings and made responsible for raising awareness and helping shape their institutions' OA policies and strategies.

This chapter is a case study discussing the successes, setbacks, and resistance university librarians met when initiating an OA outreach project at Murray State University (MSU), a four-year, public master's level institution with recently added doctoral programs. It will describe our efforts to gauge attitudes toward OA on campus, communicate realities where misconceptions dwelled, and influence change across disciplines and administration.

Our interest in scholarly communications originated in November 2013 when several of us had a journal article accepted for publication and were faced with a decision regarding access to our published article: publish through the traditional route, or use an OA option. Our natural inclination was to choose the gold OA route, because it offered immediate dissemination to the widest audience. Unfortunately the article-processing charge presented an obstacle, because the university did not have an institutional funding pool for OA publication. When we approached our dean for the funds, he graciously agreed to provide them, on the condition that we use the knowledge gained to spearhead an OA discussion with the provost and campus community.

This experience led to questions about how fellow faculty members across campus handle this issue. Where are they finding the funds to publish OA? Do their departmental administrations support OA? Does the university administration support OA? What are attitudes toward OA across campus? Each question led to more questions, until we finally had to ask ourselves if we were qualified to tackle this particular project, and if so, how?

Literature review

In addition to education and outreach, librarians are tasked with collecting, consuming, and providing access to scholarship, so it stands to reason that we are positioned to initiate a conversation on campus regarding OA and the evolving landscape of scholarly communications. Del Toro, Mandernack, and Zanoni surveyed academic library directors/deans at medium, small, and very small Carnegie Classifications of Institutions of Higher Education, and 34% of respondents said they addressed issues related to scholarly communication in their library's strategic plan or mission statement. Most libraries initially become involved with scholarly

communications via an institutional repository, and nearly a third of the respondents have either a librarian or a staff member in charge of scholarly communication issues.¹

Assessing Open Access Needs

OA initiatives will have different “personalities” depending on the research climate and administrative priorities on individual campuses.² Librarians should begin to develop their programs only after they have assessed the scholarly communication landscape at their institutions. Surveys distributed to faculty are the most commonly used method to measure awareness and potential opportunities for outreach at individual institutions.³ The surveys need not yield statistically valid samples to be useful. Laughlin-Dunker failed to procure a statistically valid sample from her survey at Chapman University because of poor timing, technical problems, and a lack of marketing. Nevertheless, she still was able to extract ideas for future faculty education programs: using the faculty’s own vocabulary to discuss OA concepts; creating alliances with offices that handle undergraduate research and grant writing on her campus; and emphasizing usage data, citation counts, content examples, and case studies from existing repositories.⁴

Other methods have been used to measure awareness at individual institutions, including focus groups;⁵ brown bag and departmental meetings;⁶ environmental scans;⁷ and interviews with faculty about their attitudes and practices related to scholarly communication.⁸

Waller, Revelle, and Shrimplin employed Q methodology, a research method used to study human subjectivity, to assess faculty viewpoints about a series of OA opinion statements. They identified three groups: Evangelists, who believe information should be as widely and freely available as possible; Pragmatists, who generally support OA but are not willing to pay to

achieve it or pass up prestigious publishing opportunities in favor of it; and Traditionalists, who feel that the current publishing model is fine and that all who need access to scholarly materials already have it. The authors felt that Pragmatists were the group to target most actively, and that their concerns could be addressed by providing assistance with depositing their work into repositories and with paying OA fees. Identifying where faculty fall among these three types can shape how librarians structure outreach efforts.⁹

Outreach

Once the need has been established, outreach can begin. An institutional repository (IR) is one of the more common methods used to engage faculty in OA; OpenDOAR listed 470 IRs in the United States as of October 18, 2015.¹⁰ Among medium, small, and very small academic libraries, Del Toro, Mandernack, and Zanoni reported more than half in their sample already manage an IR or are in the process of implementing one.¹¹ After IRs, many libraries attempt outreach through the celebration of International Open Access Week (OA Week), which was first held in October 2009.¹² Johnson surveyed small and medium-sized colleges about their participation in OA Week celebrations from 2009-13. Among the libraries surveyed, 42% had participated in an OA Week celebration at least once during those five years. Among respondents, the percentage of participating libraries grew from 12% in 2009 to more than 75% in 2013, with faculty education most frequently cited as the reason.¹³ Several institutions specifically detailed the planning and outcomes of OA Week celebrations. These celebrations included panel discussions, speakers/lectures, and/or workshops.¹⁴ However, some institutions had examples of different activities utilized during their OA Week celebrations. Oregon State University Libraries incorporated an “elevator speech contest” where library staff members were

given cards with OA information and some talking points about OA and were encouraged to speak with patrons about the topics when possible. The staff members who participated were eligible for a prize.¹⁵ Florida State University Libraries' OA week efforts included an "Upload-A-Thon" to boost faculty submissions to their IR, as well as targeting select student organizations to endorse "The Student Statement on the Right to Research."¹⁶

Usually, librarians use OA Week as just one of many tools to increase awareness. Another specific tool is passing -- or attempting to pass -- an OA policy, mandate, or resolution.¹⁷ Creating LibGuides, websites, or blogs is often part of this process.¹⁸ Beaubien and Eckard detailed how their library developed and published on the library website a list of positive and negative quality indicators to help faculty evaluate OA journals.¹⁹ Other libraries try to reach faculty by inviting speakers, hosting symposia, or assembling panels on scholarly communication topics,²⁰ and these speakers can be a joint effort by multiple institutions.²¹ Bazeley, Waller, and Resnis used a librarian-facilitated Faculty Learning Community (FLC) to address scholarly communication, sharing their findings with the university community,²² and Cryer and Collins focused on authors' rights by providing "boilerplate" language for negotiated license agreements to help secure rights for self-archiving.²³

An emerging option for outreach is library participation or management of OA publishing funds to help authors cover article-processing charges (APCs). Waugh reviewed 30 universities with OA publishing funds and found that 27 of them were sponsored entirely or in part by their university's library.²⁴ Monson, Highby, and Rathe surveyed ten librarians involved in the management of OA funds at small or medium-sized institutions, and noted that these libraries tended to be the "bellwethers, leaders ahead of the curve."²⁵ Lara surveyed global librarians and

found that almost 25% of respondents said they are a potential source of funding for their faculty's OA publishing efforts.²⁶

Most discussion of OA advocacy focuses on special events or entirely new initiatives. Mullen discussed practical ways OA advocacy can be implemented into the daily workflow of front-line librarians. Those steps include adding quality OA materials to library catalogs, discovery systems, research guides, and databases; self-archiving and publishing OA within the library science discipline; hosting institutional repositories; establishing OA funds that authors can use to cover article processing charges (though she notes that this type of outreach is still in the early adopter phase); and identifying quality journals by monitoring citation analysis tools.²⁷

Framework of our Open Access Initiative

Numerous libraries have attempted to advocate for OA publishing, and each library has tailored its programming to what is most receptive to its individual campus climate. This case study will discuss our efforts in four areas: implementing internal shifts, cultivating strategic alliances, gathering knowledge via a survey, and reaching out to faculty with different programs.

Implementing internal shifts

Prior to our initiative in the academic year 2014-15, any OA opportunities or advocacy on campus were done on an ad-hoc and individual basis. Policies did not exist at either the university or college/department level to provide guidance, nor did any dedicated resources exist. In fact, our scholarly communication work group, organized informally among interested librarians with faculty status from the public and technical services areas of the university libraries, had no specific mission to frame or direct us, making this entire OA initiative a wholly

grassroots, organic effort. Library leadership supported our work group, but did not officially recognize it as a university or departmental committee.

In early 2014, several of us participated in an American Library Association webinar on OA, as well as the Association of College and Research Libraries' Scholarly Communication Roadshow. Both events inspired discussion of various ways to initiate a conversation with faculty about OA, including the development of an institutional repository, because encouraging faculty to explore green OA options required a digital commons to house them. Research showed that 11 of the 19 universities identified as our benchmark institutions by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) had developed some type of IR by Spring 2014. Additionally, three of the eight other Kentucky state institutions had well-developed IRs, with two others investigating options for building one. This evidence gave legitimacy to the need for an IR at MSU and was later used to influence administrator support.

Knowing that an IR might be on the horizon, an examination of the libraries' own policies and perceptions regarding OA was in order. This examination partly stemmed from a need for future content for a repository, but it also followed that the libraries would need to "practice what they preached." The libraries' *Faculty Handbook* did not reflect support for OA, but that problem could be resolved easily through an amendment. Other libraries' resolutions were examined, and a proposal was presented to the library faculty committee in Spring 2014. The amended wording encouraged—but did not mandate—publishing OA, depositing in repositories, and being more aware of authors' rights; it was approved unanimously in July 2014. The adopted statement reads:

In support of the changing landscape of scholarly communication, Library Faculty are encouraged to publish in open access format and to deposit into a repository when appropriate. In addition, Library Faculty are advised to retain their author's rights if feasible.²⁸

Cultivating strategic alliances

Even before examining internal knowledge and policies, one librarian took advantage of the work that the university's Research Policy Committee (RPC) was doing to assess the research climate at MSU. She was able to include five new questions in a recurring institutional survey the RPC was using. These new questions sought to determine faculty familiarity with and use of OA publishing, and how they felt about OA fees. The questions were:

- How familiar are you with open access publishing?
- Have you had any papers published in an open access journal?
- How scholarly/reliable do you view open access journals to be?
- Compare the value of a paper published in an open access peer-reviewed journal to the value of a paper published in a traditional peer-reviewed journal in the tenure process. Is the open access peer-reviewed paper... significantly more valuable, slightly more valuable, the same, somewhat less valuable, or less valuable.
- Who should pay the fee required to publish in some open access journals?

The survey was open to all faculty in early 2014. Ninety-one of the 427 faculty responded, with 81%-96% of them answering the questions about OA. The survey revealed a need for an open access outreach initiative, as 46% of responders knew little to nothing about OA publishing. A vast majority of the responders had not had any of their scholarly work published in OA publications and they viewed peer-reviewed OA articles as having less value in

the tenure process than those published using traditional publishing models. When the librarian serving on the RPC brought the results back to the work group, we realized the questions asked were not granular enough to reveal faculty knowledge, opinion, and practices regarding OA publishing and a more detailed survey would be necessary before starting any large scale campaign.

Our work group next met with the dean of libraries and the director of public services to discuss strategies for connecting with faculty in meaningful ways in order to close the gap between the myths and the realities of OA, as well as initiatives to help faculty publish more openly. We decided to meet with the institution's associate provost for graduate education and research, along with our dean and the director of public services, to discuss the feasibility of creating an IR and/or a funding pool to allow researchers to pay for OA publication. The main outcome of the meeting was the identification of several goals that formed the backbone of the MSU OA initiative:

- Meet with the deans to discuss OA issues, with the ultimate goal of giving a presentation to each college's or department's tenure and promotion committee;
- Write up an OA Policy proposal to be endorsed by the Research Policy Committee (RPC) for inclusion in the University *Faculty Handbook*;
- Schedule copyright workshops for each college or department; and
- Investigate implementation of an IR, including a possible consortial effort with the other libraries in the state to alleviate funding concerns.

The associate provost made several suggestions about what information was most persuasive to him, while emphasizing that faculty often cannot be forced into changes they do not support. Ultimately, this meeting helped us understand that (1) faculty acceptance of OA

publishing must not be mandated or directed by administration, nor should it be seen as strictly a library initiative, and (2) educating MSU faculty about OA issues is an important responsibility that the university libraries' faculty can and should take on. No other office or department was specifically addressing those needs for our campus community. The underlying hope in this effort was that, as faculty developed a better understanding of OA publishing, they would be more accepting of OA in the tenure and promotion process.

The first major outreach effort of the initiative was a presentation to the deans' council in July 2014. The presentation focused on institutional repositories, OA advantages for researchers, how to evaluate journals, and the potential need for publication funding pools. Most of the deans had already wrestled with OA issues, and their response to the work group's presentation was overwhelmingly positive. They recommended we make similar presentations to other campus groups, especially the university's tenure and promotion committees. The dean of libraries reported that the other deans on the council often referenced the OA information in their discussions throughout the academic year.

This positive experience was somewhat mitigated by difficulties in working through the RPC to amend the *Faculty Handbook*. Although at first reluctant, the RPC eventually recommended an amendment supporting OA to the Faculty Senate. However, the Faculty Handbook Committee disappointingly failed to move on the RPC's recommendation. Ultimately, the proposal died in committee for lack of a motion to consider it.

Based on discussion with faculty who attended that meeting, it appeared that members of the Faculty Handbook Committee were responding to the proposal based on some of the common myths and misunderstandings of OA publications. Near the end of the 2014-15 academic year, the RPC asked the Faculty Senate if our OA work group could present to that

body about OA for future consideration of adopting an Open Access Policy. At the time of publication, this presentation had not yet been scheduled.

Gathering knowledge: Survey

Before expanding efforts beyond the associate provost, deans' council and RPC, we needed baseline information about OA awareness on campus. We adapted Taylor & Francis's 2014 Open Access survey²⁹ as the instrument for this assessment. After removing questions about region and current professional status to reflect the demographics of the smaller survey population, we added several other questions in order to get a better sense of faculty's opinions and knowledge about copyright, licenses, authors' rights, and OA funding. The survey was open to the 427 instructional faculty from September 3-19, 2014, falling between traditionally busy times at the beginning of the semester and mid-terms. We distributed a link to the survey, hosted on Survey Monkey, via the university's campus-wide faculty email list, posted a call for participation in the university's weekly electronic newsletter on three consecutive Fridays, and sent two reminder emails to faculty to encourage higher response rates.

The survey drew 84 responses, nearly 20% of the faculty population. Responses indicated confusion about open access concepts. We intentionally did not include definitions on the survey in order to learn about faculty's prior knowledge, but that decision may have been a mistake. In one question, 98.4% of respondents said they had published in a journal where a subscription was needed to access the final version of the article, but 87.1% said they had published in gold OA, and 82.3% said they had published in green OA. This self-reported data does not confirm trends we have seen on campus. When considering the confusion about this particular topic, we felt results of this question were not accurate, but highlighted misconceptions that needed

addressing. Almost 40% of respondents felt that OA journals were of lower quality than subscription journals, and more than half (51.5%) did not know whether their departments would help with OA publishing charges.

In our minds, the survey was the first big outreach effort to campus, an attempt to get OA on faculty radars. At least three faculty members who were confused by the survey reached out to us with questions about the definitions of key OA concepts and the possible implications of our interest in OA publishing. One exchange with a faculty member via email concluded, “I am curious about where this is going. Does this signal a move away from the databases that I find to be incredibly helpful in my research? If so, I vote an emphatic ‘NO’!!!?” We viewed this dialogue as a beneficial outcome of our survey.

Reaching out to faculty

Incorporating insight into faculty attitudes into the next outreach effort, we selected the university’s inaugural celebration of OA Week in October 2014 as the venue for addressing representatives of the tenure and promotion committees. Programming for the week intended to demonstrate that the OA initiative is a legitimate part of the worldwide academic and scholarly discussion, and not simply an effort by local librarians. Events for this week included:

- Two presentations that covered an overview of OA: one open to the entire campus, the other restricted to representatives of the university and college tenure and promotion committees.
- One workshop on identifying predatory OA publishers/journals.
- One workshop on measuring scholarly impact, including online tools available

- One guest speaker presenting about authors' rights: Dr. Dwayne Buttler, Evelyn J. Schneider Endowed Chair of Scholarly Communications at the University of Louisville.

Attendance was underwhelming. No one outside the library attended the campus-wide open access overview, and only two people outside the library attended the guest speaker's presentation. The other two workshops drew only a single attendee between them.

In contrast, the presentation to the departmental and college tenure and promotion committee members attracted more than 20 faculty. Questions demonstrated interest in, as well as misunderstandings around, OA issues and scholarly publishing in general. One comment about journals' budgets being entirely supported by advertisements demonstrated a lack of what Jeffrey Beall has described as "scholarly publishing literacy."³⁰

Before they left, we asked faculty members to fill out a four-question post-event survey. The nine submitted provided helpful information for charting our future directions. Authors' rights was the most frequently mentioned topic in response to the prompt, "What is the most significant thing you learned today?" Among the responses:

- "Learned what you mean by OA."
- "Definition of open access. Difference in OA and IR."
- "Material presented on the various ways journals obtain rights from us, as authors."
- "What open access means, that open access does not mean low quality, sources to consult about journals (impact factor search, SJR)"
- "How to add appropriate language to our department tenure/promotion policy, especially regarding payments and peer review."

Seven of the nine attendees indicated that the librarians were effective or very effective in presenting the information. One suggested that a discussion of OA journals within specific disciplines would have been more beneficial, while another indicated that the presentation had not examined the pitfalls of OA extensively enough.

Our work group met with several other librarians shortly after OA week ended and discussed several ways to improve, including marketing and focusing more on authors' rights. Other specific measures included creating a faculty fellowship program to cultivate ambassadors outside the libraries, having workshops related to open access throughout the semester, repeating the information for the tenure and promotion committees before classes started in either January or August, and developing a daylong or half-day program to target new faculty.

Next, our focus turned toward getting the information to specific populations on campus. In preparation for these discussions, the dean of libraries recommended developing a list of OA scenarios pulled from actual situations on the MSU campus, such as funding of article-processing charges, limited access to articles published in journals that were too expensive for the library to purchase, depositing articles in subject repositories, and determining the impact factor of an OA journal. As the basis of the presentation, the scenarios proved effective in helping faculty and administration to consider their implications. A member of our work group presented to the department chairs in the College of Business and the rest of the council of department chairs (which was also attended by our president's senior adviser).

Amid our educational campaign and discussions with faculty about OA publishing, MSU's first-year president inaugurated a Strategic Initiatives Plan determining goals and strategies in the areas of Academic Excellence; Student Success; Scholarship, Research, and Creative Activity (SRCA); and Community Engagement. A member of the work group spoke

briefly to the SRCA committee in support of one of the committee's objectives, which was eventually approved: "Design a plan to increase funding for open-access publishing needs and an institutional research repository."³¹

The series of individual presentations culminated with a one-on-one session with the provost. He encouraged us to share the information more widely with campus, and so we created a series of five videos from the presentation, each focusing on an aspect of OA: an overview and brief history, paying to publish, funding issues, authors' rights, and institutional repositories. We also created a LibGuide³² to serve as a companion to the videos; it contains linked to OA resources and information, including tools for finding and evaluating OA journals. The provost's office also shared the videos through a campus-wide email. While acknowledging the right of each college or department to set their own standards for academic publication for tenure and promotion decisions, he affirmed that the Office of the Provost would honor their determination of a journal's quality and merit, whether OA or not.

In Spring 2015, we closed out our initial OA campaign by offering two workshops, in conjunction with the Faculty Development Center (FDC), that were focused specifically on authors' rights. The two workshops on authors' rights provided through the FDC were well attended (13 total) with attendees giving positive feedback. One faculty member came with a contract from a publisher that included language about rights that he did not understand. Another faculty member withdrew her submission to a particular journal based on the restrictive language in the publisher's agreement, which she researched after she attended the presentation. Both faculty appreciated the information they received from the workshop that enabled them to make more discerning decisions.

We used several communication media to inform faculty about presentations, workshops, and resources available to them. These included enlisting the support and endorsement of deans and chairs, as well as using flyers, tweets, blog posts,³³ Facebook posts, news releases to the campus-wide electronic newsletter, and information on the website and calendar for the FDC.

Discussion

Assessing the effectiveness of these outreach programs was difficult. Many institutions measure attendance for speakers, workshops, or other events, or count uploads to or downloads from an IR. But are those quantifiable measures true reflections of what any initiative, including ours, actually accomplished? Wright contends “[t]he questions ‘What do we value?’ and ‘What can we measure?’ are not necessarily one and the same.”³⁴ Librarians at her institution were pleased to find the faculty engaged in more conversations about OA issues. Although unquantifiable, she felt this outcome made her outreach efforts a success. Inclined to agree, we noticed a rise in faculty awareness and dialogue about OA issues on campus.

Conversations arose having to do with clarification of terminology, concerns over the quality of OA publishing, the need for an IR when there are existing successful subject repositories, and questions about who is responsible for OA fees. Surprisingly, one faculty member brought up an unanticipated effect of OA on peer review: as a reviewer for a traditional publication that became OA, he was asked for a quicker turn-around time for reviewing manuscripts, much to his consternation. This interchange indicates that OA issues are fluid, as it continues to be a developing form of scholarly communication that librarians can help faculty navigate.

Wright recommended several other opportunities for assessment: more detailed attendance demographics to identify and customize outreach for interested departments; tracking faculty publication outlets by access and license to pinpoint trends; and using alt-metric services to measure scholarship.³⁵

One improvement on our initiative could have come at the beginning of the project with the initial literature review. We looked online at what other schools were doing in areas specific to our personal interests: institutional repositories, advantages to researchers, evaluating journals, publication funding pools, etc. Well-versed in the benefits of each of those components, we did not extensively review how other libraries had put them together to launch an entire OA educational campaign. With journals such as *Evidence Based Library and Information Practice* and *The Journal of Librarianship and Scholarly Communication*, there is a growing body of literature addressing the specific concerns of OA proponents. We might have avoided some of our missteps had we heeded outreach advice given by previous researchers.

A specific example of this shortcoming would be in the instrument used to gauge faculty understanding of OA. This project altered a survey that Taylor & Francis had distributed to their authors; since this survey was tailored to the concerns of publishers, it was probably not the best instrument for our faculty. Although we received valuable insight that helped shape our efforts, a survey more similar to what Kocken and Wical used would have been better suited to the faculty at our medium-sized institution.³⁶

An unexpected issue stemmed from the demographics gathered in the survey. The survey requested department, rank, years of experience, and gender. Piecing these bits of data together would have enabled us to identify respondents, cancelling out our efforts to have an anonymous pool. Initially we wanted to discover whether specific departments, age groups, or

tenured/untentured individuals felt more comfortable with OA. What it enabled us to discover is that almost half of the respondents (47%) on this particular demographic question identified as belonging to the College of Business (the principal investigator was the liaison to the College of Business at the time the survey was administered). This problem could be addressed by including all liaison librarians in the project (four out of seven participated) and by requiring all liaisons to promote the survey equally.

Survey results indicated respondents did not truly understand OA, or were confused about the concepts or questions presented. In analyzing the responses, we felt similarly to Dawson, who concluded from her survey that faculty have a high level of basic awareness of OA, but “more detailed knowledge [is] lacking - and it is this detailed knowledge which may be necessary to enable researchers to actually follow through and make their publications open access.”³⁷ The confusion of the faculty prompted us to focus seminars in the fall semester on facilitating a basic understanding of OA and how it could benefit both the individual and the university. Unfortunately, based on the lack of attendance, this was not an approach that resonated with faculty. The spring seminars intentionally did not include the phrase “open access,” an apparent trigger for opposition and misunderstanding.³⁸ Instead the sessions were marketed using phrases such as “authors’ rights” and “institutional repository,” both topics that intrinsically are associated with OA publishing. The spring sessions also benefited from greater self-marketing and promotion by the presenter, offering the seminars on multiple days and in different time slots to accommodate faculty schedules, and promoting and presenting the seminars in conjunction with the FDC.

Other factors that might have resulted in lower attendance in the fall were the lack of a campus-wide marketing campaign to faculty, OA Week falling during academic advising on our

campus, a failure to engage specific faculty advocates, and a general attitude of disengagement among faculty toward all campus initiatives during the fall semester of the 2014-15 academic year.

While the survey was a good first step, speaking with faculty in small focus groups to find out their actual concerns about OA would have revealed where the gaps in understanding lie, as well as the best vocabulary and approach to make our outreach efforts more effective. Additionally, this action would have been more inclusive of faculty and less librarian-driven. Unintentionally, our communication may have also come across as condescending. For example, one librarian used this line in a biography sent out campus-wide, “Her research interests include emphasizing the libraries' role in experiential learning and educating faculty about open access publishing.” Corbett actually warned against these type of missteps, “Rather than assuming that faculty know very little and/or are unwilling to make changes in their publishing practices,” we should remember, “education on scholarly communication must be a two-way street.”³⁹ Mischo and Schlembach noted this comment by one faculty member concerning the library’s role in the OA movement: “Librarians should not be telling us where to publish. They can better help us by addressing the growing number of low-quality journals and helping to eliminate them.”⁴⁰ Gauging attitudes on campus is critically important to the success of any OA or scholarly communication outreach program. Librarians may need to consider methodologies more respectful of both parties’ agendas.

Another key effort that was less successful than we had hoped was our quest for a statement encouraging OA publishing in the university’s *Faculty Handbook*. Although we achieved this change at the department level within the libraries, our university-wide efforts met unexpected barriers at the administrative level. The idea is tabled indefinitely until the climate is

more conducive. The circumstances are unique to our institution, but it can be viewed as comforting to other librarians that some barriers to initiatives can be unpredictable and uncontrollable. Sometimes, the timing simply is not right. Recognizing when those situations arise and patiently waiting for a more favorable opportunity is a significant component of any outreach campaign.

The loose organization of our scholarly communication work group had both positive and negative effects. Our informal standing allowed flexibility and nimbleness in our goals, individual priorities, and strategies; these traits were incredibly beneficial to a fledgling initiative. We each were able to work on the parts we preferred and contribute to the project when our regular responsibilities permitted. However, it also meant that we often lacked mechanisms for accountability as well as initiative, which a designated leader could have provided. Neither of these drawbacks was significant enough to impede our progress, but they did cause hardship at times.

Despite frustration with low participation at the beginning of the initiative, gradual increase in interest has led to planning for continued outreach through the creation of a Scholarly Communications Librarian position, an institutional repository, and an endowment for a funding pool to pay for OA publication fees. Our work group for this case study is now the foundation for a university-recognized Scholarly Communications Committee with participation from the University Libraries, Research Policy Committee (RPC), the Committee on Institutional Studies and Research (CISR), and the Provost's Office. This committee will be chaired by the Scholarly Communications Librarian. It has been tasked with developing plans for workshops and meetings to assist faculty with understanding the issues involved in scholarly communication.

An additional project emphasizes the OA viewpoints and experiences of non-library faculty through a series of videos titled “The Buzz on Open Access.”⁴¹ We also plan to survey faculty again during the 2015-16 academic year.

Future outreach includes offering workshops year round. Our intention is to plan one signature event during OA Week that will complement other workshops on OA-related topics throughout the year. We likely will continue to avoid the “open access” label until future surveys and interactions reveal that our educational efforts have removed the negative connotation. We also plan to work through the FDC, RPC, the CISR, and the Office of Sponsored Programs to target researchers in specific disciplines. In particular, the partnership with the FDC will allow us to work on programming for new faculty who might be more receptive towards fitting OA into their research agendas and tenure paths.

Planned outreach includes additional training on open access to all library staff, because OA issues affect the institution as a whole, not just library faculty.⁴² We also plan to broaden outreach and educational opportunities beyond faculty to target staff throughout the university and students at both the graduate and undergraduate level. Our initiative ignored both of these populations; yet students are especially important because their generation “will either facilitate the transformation of scholarly communication...or [ensure] the system changes only incrementally.”⁴³

Conclusion

Even though the original OA outreach initiative has concluded, the work has only begun at Murray State University. Publishing in academic journals is a necessity for MSU faculty who wish to obtain tenure. With the changing environment of scholarly communication and the

growth of OA, we started a conversation about how those changes will affect our campus. This dialogue revealed many misconceptions among faculty about OA and provided outreach opportunities to help dispel the myths. We learned that we need to focus more on specific aspects of OA. This realization led to the development of seminars on more specialized facets of OA as well as a Scholarly Communications Librarian position—someone who can organize, synthesize, and provide continuous outreach activities.

Because of the initial lackluster response to open access programming and the negative response to initiatives from some faculty, we thought that faculty were closed minded in regard to OA publishing. However, after interactions with individual faculty and some positive responses to OA-related presentations, we realized that the lack of receptiveness was based more on misunderstandings about OA issues, faculty's lack of connection between OA opportunities and their scholarly publishing needs, and the arrogance and presumptuousness of the librarians in our approach to faculty. It was easy for us to place the fault on others who we felt were being closed-minded, but perhaps it was our minds that were closed. We will continue to position ourselves as allies and resources for our campus community without pushing an agenda on faculty or administrators. With this adjustment to our attitudes and goals, we hope that our university collectively will increasingly embrace OA opportunities.

Notes

¹ Rosemary Del Toro, Scott Mandernack, and Jean Zaroni. 2011. "Evolution of Scholarly Communication: How Small and Medium-Sized Libraries are Adapting." In *Declaration of Interdependence: The Proceedings of the Association of College and*

Research Libraries Conference, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, March 30-April 2, 2011, 153-60.

² Hillary Corbett. 2009. "The Crisis in Scholarly Communication, Part I: Understanding the Issues and Engaging your Faculty." *Technical Services Quarterly* 26, no. 2: 130. doi: 10.1080/07317130802268522.

³ William H. Mischo and Mary C. Schlembach. 2011. "Open Access Issues and Engineering Faculty: Attitudes and Practices." *Journal of Library Administration* 51, no. 5-6: 432-54. doi: 10.1080/01930826.2011.589349; Gregory J. Kocken and Stephanie H. Wical. 2013. "'I've Never Heard of It Before': Awareness of Open Access at a Small Liberal Arts University." *Behavioral & Social Sciences Librarian* 32, no. 3: 140-54. doi: 10.1080/01639269.2013.817876; Diane Dawson. 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: 4-28; Kristin Laughtin-Dunker. 2014. "Assessing the Scholarly Communication Attitudes and Practices of Faculty: Lessons from a 'Failed' Survey." *Journal of Librarianship and Scholarly Communication* 2, no. 3: 1-13. doi: 10.7710/2162-3309.1164; Zheng Ye Lan Yang and Yu Li. 2015. "University Faculty Awareness and Attitudes Towards Open Access Publishing and the Institutional Repository: A Case Study." *Journal of Librarianship and Scholarly Communication* 3, no. 1: 1-29. doi: 10.7710/2162-3309.1210.

⁴ Laughtin-Dunker, "Assessing the Scholarly Communication," 1-13.

⁵ Martin P. Courtois and Elizabeth C. Turtle. 2008. "Using Faculty Focus Groups to Launch a Scholarly Communication Program." *OCLC Systems & Services*:

International digital library perspectives 24, no. 3: 160-66. doi:

10.1108/10650750810898192.

⁶ Deborah Ludwig. 2010. "Open Access at the University of Kansas: Toward a Campus Initiative." *College & Research Libraries News* 71, no. 7: 360-84.

⁷ Micah Vandegrift and Gloria Colvin. 2012. "Relational Communications: Developing Key Connections." *College & Research Libraries News* 73, no. 7: 386-89.

⁸ Bonnie JM Swoger, Sue Ann Brainard, and Kimberly Davies Hoffman. 2015. "Foundations for a Scholarly Communications Program: Interviewing Faculty at a Small Public Liberal Arts College." *Journal of Librarianship and Scholarly Communication* 3, no. 1: 1-20. doi: 10.7710/2162-3309.1219.

⁹ Jen Waller, Andrew Revelle, and Aaron K. Shrimplin. 2013. "Keep the Change: Clusters of Faculty Opinion on Open Access." In *Imagine, Innovate, Inspire: Proceedings of the Association of College and Research Libraries Conference*, Indianapolis, Indiana, April 10-13, 2013, 181-82.

¹⁰ OpenDOAR. "Proportion of Repositories by Country: Worldwide." Last modified October 18, 2015.
<http://www.opendoar.org/onechart.php?cID=&ctID=&rtID=&clID=&lID=&potID=&rSoftWareName=&search=&groupby=c.cCountry&orderby=Tally%20DESC&charttype=pie&width=600&height=300&caption=Proportion%20of%20Repositories%20by%20Country%20-%20Worldwide>.

¹¹ Del Toro, Mandernack, and Zanoni, "Evolution of Scholarly Communication," 154.

¹² Nick Shockey. 2015. "International Open Access Week."

<http://www.openaccessweek.org/events>.

¹³ Paula C. Johnson. 2014. "International Open Access Week at Small to Medium US Academic Libraries: The First Five Years." *The Journal of Academic Librarianship* 40, no. 6 (2014): 626-31. doi: 10.1016/j.acalib.2014.07.011.

¹⁴ Bette Rathe, Jayati Chaudhuri, and Wendy Highby. 2010. "Open Access Advocacy: Think Globally, Act Locally." *Collaborative Librarianship* 2, no. 3: 162-168; Emma Cryer and Maria Collins. 2011. "Incorporating Open Access into Libraries." *Serials Review* 37, no. 2: 103-107. doi: 10.1016/j.serrev.2011.03.002; Andrea A. Wirth. 2011. "Incorporating Existing Library Partnerships into Open Access Week Events." *Collaborative Librarianship* 3, no. 4: 197-204; Rebecca K. Miller, Kyrille Goldbeck DeBose, Nathan Hall, Purdom Lindblad, Allison Scripa, Julie Speer, and Philip Young. 2013. "Promoting Universal Knowledge for All: Open Access Week 2012 at Virginia Tech." *Virginia Libraries* 59, no. 2; Andrea M. Wright. 2013. "Starting Scholarly Conversations: A Scholarly Communication Outreach Program." *Journal of Librarianship and Scholarly Communication* 2, no. 1: 1-9. doi: 10.7710/2162-3309.1096

¹⁵ Wirth, "Incorporating Existing Library Partnerships," 200.

¹⁶ Micah Vandegrift, Josh A. Bolick, and Nina Rose. 2013. "Open Access Week 2013 Final Report." *Library Faculty Publications*, Paper 9 (2013): 1-7; "The Student Statement on the Right to Research." *The Right to Research Coalition*. Accessed September 24, 2015. <http://www.righttoresearch.org/about/statement/>.

¹⁷ Tim Hackman. 2009. "What's the Opposite of a Pyrrhic Victory? Lessons Learned from an Open Access Defeat." *College & Research Libraries News* 70, no. 9:

518-538; Ada Emmett, John Stratton, A. Townsend Peterson, Jennifer Church-Duran, and Lorraine J. Haricombe. 2011. "Toward Open Access: It Takes a 'Village'." *Journal of Library Administration* 51, no. 5-6: 557-579. doi: 10.1080/01930826.2011.589345; Miller, Jonathan. 2011. "Open Access and Liberal Arts Colleges: Looking Beyond Research Institutions." *College & Research Libraries News* 72, no. 1: 16-30.

¹⁸ Duncan, Jennifer, William Walsh, Tim Daniels, and Joe Becker. 2006. "Issues in Scholarly Communications: Creating a Campus-wide Dialog." *The Serials Librarian* 50, no. 3-4: 243-248. doi: 10.1300/J123v50n03_06; Corbett, "The Crisis in Scholarly Communication," 125-134; Rathe, Chaudhuri, and Highby. "Open Access Advocacy." 162-168.

¹⁹ Sarah Beaubien and Max Eckard. 2014. "Addressing Faculty Publishing Concerns with Open Access Journal Quality Indicators." *Journal of Librarianship and Scholarly Communication* 2, no. 2: 1-11. doi: 10.7710/2162-3309.1133

²⁰ Theodora A. Bakker and Marcus A. Banks. 2009. "Scholarly Communication Initiatives at Georgetown University: Lessons Learned." *OCLC Systems & Services: International digital library perspectives* 25, no. 1: 60-66. doi: 10.1108/10650750910931931; Cryer and Collins, "Incorporating Open Access," 103-107; Wright, "Starting Scholarly Conversations," 1-9.

²¹ Wirth, "Incorporating Existing Library Partnerships," 197-204.

²² Jennifer W. Bazeley, Jen Waller, and Eric Resnis. 2014. "Engaging Faculty in Scholarly Communication Change: A Learning Community Approach." *Journal of Librarianship and Scholarly Communication* 2, no. 3: 8. 1-13. doi: 10.7710/2162-3309.1129.

²³ Cryer and Collins, "Incorporating Open Access," 106.

²⁴ Laura Waugh. 2012. *UNT Libraries: Open Access Fund Research Report*.

Denton, TX: University of North Texas.

<http://digital.library.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metadc111007/>

²⁵ Jane Monson, Wendy Highby, and Bette Rathe. 2014. "Library Involvement in Faculty Publication Funds." *College & Undergraduate Libraries* 21, no. 3-4: 325. doi: 10.1080/10691316.2014.933088.

²⁶ Kate Lara. 2015. "The Library's Role in the Management and Funding of Open Access Publishing." *Learned Publishing* 28, no. 1: 5. doi: 10.1087/20150102.

²⁷ Laura Bowering Mullen. 2011. "Open Access and the Practice of Academic Librarianship: Strategies and Considerations for 'Front Line' Librarians." In *Proceedings of 32nd IATUL Conference*, Warsaw, Poland, May 29-June 2, 2011, 1-8.

²⁸ Murray State University Libraries. 2009. *Faculty Handbook*. Murray, KY: Murray State University. 8.

²⁹ Will Frass, Jo Cross, and Victoria Gardner. 2014. *Taylor & Francis Open Access Survey*. London: Taylor & Francis/Routledge.

<http://www.tandf.co.uk/journals/explore/open-access-survey-june2014.pdf>.

³⁰ Jeffrey Beall. 2012. "Predatory Publishers and Opportunities for Scholarly Societies." Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association meeting, Washington, D.C., November 8-10, 2012, 1-5.

<http://eprints.rclis.org/18044/1/AERA%20paper%202.pdf>.

³¹ Murray State University. 2014. *Achievement, Endeavor, and Hope: Murray State University Strategic Plan 2015-2022*. Murray, KY: Murray State University. 18. <https://www.murraystate.edu/strategic-initiatives-plan/strategic-plan-draft.pdf>.

³² Murray State University Libraries. 2015. "Scholarly Communication." Last modified October 15, 2015. <http://libguides.murraystate.edu/openaccess>

³³ Rebecca Richardson. 2014. "What Rights Do You Have?" *Waterfield Humanities and Social Sciences* (blog). October 23. <https://waterfieldhumanities.wordpress.com/2014/10/23/what-rights-do-you-have/>.

³⁴ Wright, "Starting Scholarly Conversations," 7.

³⁵ Ibid.

³⁶ Kocken and Wical, "'I've Never Heard of It Before,'" 140-54.

³⁷ Dawson, "Scholarly Communications Needs," 16.

³⁸ Jill Cirasella. 2013. "Teaching about Open Access Without Saying 'Open Access'." *OpenAccess@CUNY* (blog), March 14. <https://openaccess.commons.gc.cuny.edu/2013/03/14/teaching-about-open-access-without-saying-open-access/>

³⁹ Corbett, "The Crisis in Scholarly Communication," 130.

⁴⁰ Mischo and Schlembach, "Open Access Issues," 448.

⁴¹ Murray State University Libraries, "Scholarly Communication."

⁴² Corbett, "The Crisis in Scholarly Communication," 125-34.

⁴³ Johnson, "International Open Access Week," 630.

Bibliography

- Bakker, Theodora A., and Marcus A. Banks. 2009. "Scholarly Communication Initiatives at Georgetown University: Lessons Learned." *OCLC Systems & Services: International digital library perspectives* 25, no. 1: 60-66. doi: 10.1108/10650750910931931.
- Bazeley, Jennifer W., Jen Waller, and Eric Resnis. 2014. "Engaging Faculty in Scholarly Communication Change: A Learning Community Approach." *Journal of Librarianship and Scholarly Communication* 2, no. 3: 8. 1-13. doi: 10.7710/2162-3309.1129.
- Beall, Jeffrey. 2012. "Predatory Publishers and Opportunities for Scholarly Societies." Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association meeting, Washington, D.C., November 8-10, 2012, 1-5. <http://eprints.rclis.org/18044/1/AERA%20paper%202.pdf>.
- Beaubien, Sarah, and Max Eckard. 2014. "Addressing Faculty Publishing Concerns with Open Access Journal Quality Indicators." *Journal of Librarianship and Scholarly Communication* 2, no. 2: 1-11. doi: 10.7710/2162-3309.1133.
- Cirasella, Jill. 2013. "Teaching about Open Access Without Saying 'Open Access'." *OpenAccess@CUNY* (blog), March 14. <https://openaccess.commons.gc.cuny.edu/2013/03/14/teaching-about-open-access-without-saying-open-access/>.
- Corbett, Hillary. 2009. "The Crisis in Scholarly Communication, Part I: Understanding the Issues and Engaging your Faculty." *Technical Services Quarterly* 26, no. 2: 130. doi: 10.1080/07317130802268522.

-
- Courtois, Martin P., and Elizabeth C. Turtle. 2008. "Using Faculty Focus Groups to Launch a Scholarly Communication Program." *OCLC Systems & Services: International digital library perspectives* 24, no. 3: 160-66. doi: 10.1108/10650750810898192.
- Cryer, Emma, and Maria Collins. 2011. "Incorporating Open Access into Libraries." *Serials Review* 37, no. 2: 103-107. doi: 10.1016/j.serrev.2011.03.002.
- 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: 4-28.
<https://ejournals.library.ualberta.ca/index.php/EBLIP/article/view/21764/17771>.
- Del Toro, Rosemary, Scott Mandernack, and Jean Zaroni. 2011. "Evolution of Scholarly Communication: How Small and Medium-Sized Libraries are Adapting." In *Declaration of Interdependence: The Proceedings of the Association of College and Research Libraries Conference*, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, March 30-April 2, 2011, 153-60.
- Duncan, Jennifer, William Walsh, Tim Daniels, and Joe Becker. 2006. "Issues in Scholarly Communications: Creating a Campus-wide Dialog." *The Serials Librarian* 50, no. 3-4: 243-248. doi: 10.1300/J123v50n03_06.
- Emmett, Ada, John Stratton, A. Townsend Peterson, Jennifer Church-Duran, and Lorraine J. Haricombe. 2011. "Toward Open Access: It Takes a 'Village'." *Journal of Library Administration* 51, no. 5-6: 557-579. doi: 10.1080/01930826.2011.589345.
- Frass, Will, Jo Cross, and Victoria Gardner. 2014. *Taylor & Francis Open Access Survey*. London: Taylor & Francis/Routledge. <http://www.tandf.co.uk/journals/explore/open-access-survey-june2014.pdf>.

-
- Hackman, Tim. 2009. "What's the Opposite of a Pyrrhic Victory? Lessons Learned from an Open Access Defeat." *College & Research Libraries News* 70, no. 9: 518-538.
<http://crln.acrl.org/content/70/9/518.short>
- Kocken, Gregory J., and Stephanie H. Wical. 2013. "'I've Never Heard of It Before': Awareness of Open Access at a Small Liberal Arts University." *Behavioral & Social Sciences Librarian* 32, no. 3: 140-54. doi: 10.1080/01639269.2013.817876.
- Lara, Kate. 2015. "The Library's Role in the Management and Funding of Open Access Publishing." *Learned Publishing* 28, no. 1: 5. doi: 10.1087/20150102.
- Laughtin-Dunker, Kristin. 2014. "Assessing the Scholarly Communication Attitudes and Practices of Faculty: Lessons from a 'Failed' Survey." *Journal of Librarianship and Scholarly Communication* 2, no. 3: 1-13. doi: 10.7710/2162-3309.1164.
- Ludwig, Deborah. 2010. "Open Access at the University of Kansas: Toward a Campus Initiative." *College & Research Libraries News* 71, no. 7: 360-84.
<http://crln.acrl.org/content/71/7/360.short>.
- Miller, Jonathan. 2011. "Open Access and Liberal Arts Colleges: Looking Beyond Research Institutions." *College & Research Libraries News* 72, no. 1: 16-30.
<http://crln.acrl.org/content/72/1/16.short>.
- Miller, Rebecca K., Kyrille Goldbeck DeBose, Nathan Hall, Purdom Lindblad, Allison Scripa, Julie Speer, and Philip Young. 2013. "Promoting Universal Knowledge for All: Open Access Week 2012 at Virginia Tech." *Virginia Libraries* 59, no. 2.

-
- Mischo, William H., and Mary C. Schlembach. 2011. "Open Access Issues and Engineering Faculty: Attitudes and Practices." *Journal of Library Administration* 51, no. 5-6: 432-54. doi: 10.1080/01930826.2011.589349.
- Monson, Jane, Wendy Highby, and Bette Rathe. 2014. "Library Involvement in Faculty Publication Funds." *College & Undergraduate Libraries* 21, no. 3-4: 325. doi: 10.1080/10691316.2014.933088.
- OpenDOAR. "Proportion of Repositories by Country: Worldwide." Last modified October 18, 2015.
http://www.open_doar.org/onechart.php?cID=&ctID=&rtID=&clID=&lID=&potID=&rSoftWareName=&search=&groupby=c.cCountry&orderby=Tally%20DESC&charttype=pie&width=600&height=300&caption=Proportion%20of%20Repositories%20by%20Country%20-%20Worldwide.
- Mullen, Laura Bowering. 2011. "Open Access and the Practice of Academic Librarianship: Strategies and Considerations for 'Front Line' Librarians." In *Proceedings of 32nd IATUL Conference*, Warsaw, Poland, May 29-June 2, 2011, 1-8
<http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/iatul/2011/papers/34/>.
- Murray State University Libraries. 2009. *Faculty Handbook*. Murray, KY: Murray State University. 8.
- Murray State University. 2014. *Achievement, Endeavor, and Hope: Murray State University Strategic Plan 2015-2022*. Murray, KY: Murray State University. 18.
<https://www.murraystate.edu/strategic-initiatives-plan/strategic-plan-draft.pdf>.

-
- Murray State University Libraries. 2015. "Scholarly Communication." Last modified October 15, 2015. <http://libguides.murraystate.edu/openaccess>.
- Rathe, Bette, Jayati Chaudhuri, and Wendy Highby. 2010. "Open Access Advocacy: Think Globally, Act Locally." *Collaborative Librarianship* 2, no. 3: 162-168.
<http://www.collaborativelibrarianship.org/index.php/jocl/article/viewFile/99/65>.
- Richardson, Becky. 2014. "What Rights Do You Have?" *Waterfield Humanities and Social Sciences* (blog). October 23.
<https://waterfieldhumanities.wordpress.com/2014/10/23/what-rights-do-you-have/>.
- Shockey, Nick. 2015. "International Open Access Week."
<http://www.openaccessweek.org/events>.
- Swoger, Bonnie JM, Sue Ann Brainard, and Kimberly Davies Hoffman. 2015. "Foundations for a Scholarly Communications Program: Interviewing Faculty at a Small Public Liberal Arts College." *Journal of Librarianship and Scholarly Communication* 3, no. 1: 1-20.
doi: 10.7710/2162-3309.1219.
- "The Student Statement on the Right to Research." *The Right to Research Coalition*. Accessed September 24, 2015. <http://www.righttoresearch.org/about/statement/>.
- Vandegrift, Micah, and Gloria Colvin. 2012. "Relational Communications: Developing Key Connections." *College & Research Libraries News* 73, no. 7: 386-89.
<http://crln.acrl.org/content/73/7/386.short>.
- Vandegrift, Micah, Josh A. Bolick, and Nina Rose. 2013. "Open Access Week 2013 Final Report." *Library Faculty Publications*, Paper 9 (2013): 1-7. Accessed August 23, 2015.
http://diginole.lib.fsu.edu/library_faculty_publications/9.

-
- Waller, Jen, Andrew Revelle, and Aaron K. Shrimplin. 2013. "Keep the Change: Clusters of Faculty Opinion on Open Access." In *Imagine, Innovate, Inspire: Proceedings of the Association of College and Research Libraries Conference*, Indianapolis, Indiana, April 10-13, 2013, 181-82.
http://www.ala.org/acrl/sites/ala.org.acrl/files/content/conferences/confsandpreconfs/2013/papers/WallerRevelleShrimplin_Keep.pdf.
- Waugh, Laura. 2012. *UNT Libraries: Open Access Fund Research Report*. Denton, TX: University of North Texas. <http://digital.library.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metadc111007/Wirth>,
- Andrea A. 2011. "Incorporating Existing Library Partnerships into Open Access Week Events." *Collaborative Librarianship* 3, no. 4: 197-204.
<http://collaborativelibrarianship.org/index.php/jocl/article/viewFile/150/115>.
- Wright, Andrea M. 2013. "Starting Scholarly Conversations: A Scholarly Communication Outreach Program." *Journal of Librarianship and Scholarly Communication* 2, no. 1: 1-9. doi: 10.7710/2162-3309.1096.
- Yang, Zheng Ye Lan, and Yu Li. 2015. "University Faculty Awareness and Attitudes towards Open Access Publishing and the Institutional Repository: A Case Study." *Journal of Librarianship and Scholarly Communication* 3, no. 1: 1-29. doi: 10.7710/2162-3309.1210.