Leveraging OA, the IR, and Cross-Department Collaboration for Sustainability: Ensuring Library Centrality in the Scholarly Communication Discourse on Campus

Steve Brantley, Todd A. Bruns, and Kirstin Duffin

Introduction

More than halfway into the second decade of the 21st century, academic libraries are becoming more integrated in the scholarly life of their faculties than ever before.[1] Important trends in scholarly communication, such as transitioning from subscription journals to open access journals, increasing amounts of "born digital" data and creative works, the growing importance of protecting one's intellectual property rights, and keeping digital scholarship organized, managed, and preserved, are all areas where academic scholars and researchers require support services and assistance. Librarians are natural partners to provide these services.

While the need for scholarly communication support increases, declining circulation numbers and the tenacious user perception that "everything" is free online have eroded the idea of the library as the foundation and center of academic intellectual pursuit.[2] In response to this crisis, academic libraries have shifted rather deftly into a culture of assessment and sought

to demonstrate their impact on user populations, perhaps most notably with ACRL's own "Assessment in Action" project.[3] But if the notion (among faculty as well as students) of "going to the library for research" has been displaced by Google, questions arise about how and where and in what capacity libraries and librarians fit into the scholarly communication ecosystem of our institutions. There is no question that libraries and librarians continue to have an essential and fundamental role in the creation, production, description, dissemination, and discovery of knowledge, but the visibility of this role is dangerously diminished. We are victims of our own success: As we have strived successfully to remove barriers and make information access as easy and seamless as possible for the end user, we have disappeared from view and erased our intermediary footprint in the process of research and knowledge creation. All the progress we make to minimize the steps users must take between the discovery of information and their access to re-

Steve Brantley is Associate Professor and Head of Reference Services, Film Studies and Media Bibliographer and Liaison to Communication Studies, Eastern Illinois University e-mail: jsbrantley@eiu.edu; Todd A. Bruns is Assistant Professor and Institutional Repository Librarian, Liaison to the School of Technology, Eastern Illinois University, e-mail: tabruns@eiu.edu; Kirstin Duffin is Reference Librarian, Liaison to Biological Sciences, Chemistry, and Geology/Geography, Eastern Illinois University, e-mail: kduffin@eiu.edu

stricted and/or licensed information, we step closer to becoming the professionals behind the curtain. The work we do behind the scenes in metadata, collection development, web development, authority control, license negotiation, resource curation, and much more, deliver end results that our users need and value, but that they no longer recognize as being connected to anyone, much less the librarians.

This is where the twain meet. Just as user perceptions of the need for traditional library services seem to be shrinking, the increasing complexity of scholarly communication in the world of digital scholarship in the 21st century calls for a proactive librarian and engaged librarianship that is embedded in and responsive to the scholarly life of our disciplinary faculty. Many institutions have begun developing library services geared toward scholarly communication support. Librarians with responsibilities as subject liaisons in particular (whether they are full-time liaisons or share these responsibilities with other library work) have been tasked with adding scholarly communication support to their skill sets.

These programs have been introduced in a variety of ways. One such program requires the liaisons to conduct environmental surveys of the scholarly communication environment in their respective departments, such as what was done at the University of British Columbia,[4] shifting the focus of liaison work away from the "library-centric" (the collection) toward the "scholar-centric" (engagement and outreach).[5] Another program trains liaison librarians to understand authors' rights, as was undertaken at Oregon State University libraries.[6] Tools to support digital scholarship, such as the California Digital Libraries DMPTool (Data Management Plan, https://dmp.cdlib.org/) have been established, and librarians have been at the forefront of determining new ways to support the scholarly communication and digital scholarship needs of their faculty.

At Eastern Illinois University (EIU), a Carnegie classification *Master's L University* (awarding at least 200 master's degrees annually), the campus library (Booth) has begun a program of integrating library services into the scholarly communication and digital scholarship environment of the academic departments. This program has involved ongoing scholarly communication training for the subject liaison librarians, the identification of service areas needed in individual academic departments, the promotion and marketing of new services, and the proactive engagement with faculty and departments as the opportunities arise whether anticipated or not.

Literature Review

Offering support for scholarly communication is a recent and growing trend in academic libraries, and most of the reported developments have been published in the past five years. Much of the focus of the development of these new library services has focused on repurposing liaison librarian duties, although the initial approaches taken have varied from institution to institution. Oregon State University emphasized in-depth training of liaison librarians to handle a very basic question faculty often have: the rights of authors related to copyright and intellectual property.[7] OSU librarians were taught to become experts in managing their own author's rights before offering the same services to faculty for whom they are liaison. At the University of Colorado at Boulder, the decision was made to first conduct a needs assessment of librarians to determine where their knowledge and skills in scholarly communication were strong and where they needed preparation.[8] This needs assessment was self-reported and revealed that most librarian discomfort with scholarly communication support was related to data management. The need for practical, hands-on training was identified as a potential solution to address this issue.

Two institutions implemented wide-ranging changes to their liaison librarians' workflows. The University of British Columbia focused heavily on liaison librarians conducting environmental scans of the digital scholarship world of their disciplines.[9] These scans included interviews with discipline faculty about their research, a method that works to improve understanding of the digital scholarship of the discipline in general, as well as reveal opportunities for libraries to provide support services. At the University of Minne-

sota a systems approach was employed, where liaison duties were directly and formally altered: traditional duties such as reference desk hours and managing departments were replaced with requirements for educating their faculty on scholarly communication issues and promoting the institutional repository.[10] This method proved valuable for several reasons. It reinforced the seriousness and commitment of the institution to the new services, revealed areas of resistance to the new methods, and allowed for the creation of a "Scholarly Communications Collaborative" in which participants were able to share resources and support.[11] Similar to the University of Minnesota approach, The University of Alberta Libraries have incorporated written expectations into librarians' yearly reviews that allow for experimentation in new directions without needing to immediately amend position descriptions. Job expectations in the area of scholarly communication for science and technology liaisons, for example, include participation in training activities improving their awareness of scholarly communication issues and practices.[12]

A heavy emphasis on service to faculty has been identified as a key factor to success.[13] All of the methods thus far described in the literature ultimately have the goal of introducing scholarly communication support services that benefit the faculty. Scholarly communication support services appear to be widely supported among faculty,[14] however whether these services become successfully embedded in the digital scholarship of the disciplines has yet to be confirmed.

Early Movements to Support Scholarly Communication at EIU

Developing new library services to support scholarly communication at EIU has been an organic process. Two major projects were undertaken in 2010 that formed the foundation of additional future services: the creation of an institutional repository (The Keep, http://thekeep.eiu.edu) and the formation of the Booth Library Scanning Center, a first step toward the development of a more fully realized Digital Scholarship Center. The repository is built on the Berke-

ley Electronic Press Digital Commons platform and includes the Selected Works module. This allows for faculty to have individual pages that highlight their scholarship. The Scanning Center features three Fujitsu flatbed scanning stations and is staffed by seven to ten student employees, supervised by two civil service staff. The center is available for on-demand digitization of faculty work, scanning archival and university documents, and has also been used to assist community organizations with digitization projects. The civil service staff were repurposed from previous duties that involved processing print periodicals. Over time, budget constraints have forced the cancellation of the majority of print journals, thus, staff time from periodicals was available and reallocated to support campus digital scholarship.

Since the establishment of The Keep in 2010, it has grown significantly. As more faculty, students, and community members utilize the service, more library resources have been allocated to supporting scholarly communication needs. While the repository as a whole is still overseen by the IR librarian, other librarians have assumed supporting responsibilities: The librarian for special collections cataloging and metadata manages the digitization and uploading of EIU master's theses (http://thekeep.eiu.edu/theses/), providing quality metadata records to these highly used documents. The Head of Library Technology Services (LTS) has provided programming and technology support for feature "add-ons" for the repository, such as embedded video slideshows of historical Theatre Department Productions (an example can be seen here http://thekeep.eiu.edu/productions_1940s/18/). The Head of LTS is also working with the IR librarian and Biological Sciences faculty to develop what will be the first significant biological specimens collection digitally preserved and archived in an institutional repository. This type of cross-department collaboration is becoming more essential as the scholarly communication needs of faculty and their academic departments increase campus-wide, and as scholars recognize librarians as having the skills to assist these needs.

In recent months, the Dean of Library Services communicated to librarians the need for greater engagement with the teaching faculty. Subject liaisons were tasked with increasing and improving their relationships with their academic departments. One result of this call to action was collaboration between the IR librarian and the Head of Reference to develop a plan for training liaison librarians in scholarly communication support skills. This next step in the evolution of scholarly communications support on the EIU campus is likely to reap substantial benefits for both the academic departments and the campus library.

Training the Trainers: Creating Scholarly Communication Coaches

The first formal program in scholarly communication support undertaken at EIU was the training of liaison librarians in scholarly communication skills. The goal was to help them become, in a phrase coined by authors Brantley and Bruns, "scholarly communication coaches"[15] to the faculty researchers in their departments. The program developed as a hybrid of the systems method utilized at the University of Minnesota[16] and the environmental scan methods employed at the University of British Columbia.[17] The environmental scan involved analyzing the department's programs (e.g. student journals and research fairs), the academic field's point of view on open access (via scholarly societies), and preeminent sources of publication (e.g. major journals and discipline repositories). Information was collected on department faculty participation in online scholars' networks like Academia.edu and Research Gate, as well as any faculty "early adopters" that were already participating in the EIU institutional repository.

In the Scholarly Communication Coach training, the environmental survey is combined with providing the librarians a scholarly communication support service "tool kit." Educating the liaisons on important resources useful to their faculty, the tool kit includes resources such as the aforementioned DMPTool, Sherpa/RoMEO (the database of publisher copyright policies & self-archiving http://www.sherpa.ac.uk/ro-

meo/), and Jeffrey Beall's List of Predatory Publishers (http://scholarlyoa.com/publishers/). These tools assist with fielding the most common questions asked by faculty, including questions regarding research data management and how to select or manage publisher's copyright permissions. The tools also help bring faculty awareness to predatory open access journal publishers. In addition to the environmental scan and tool kit, librarians attended training sessions on author's rights, intellectual property, Creative Commons licensing, digital publishing, and similar awareness-building tutorials. These training sessions enhance liaison librarians' abilities to address faculty questions about potential sources of publication, the availability of open access options for increasing scholar visibility and impact, and the growing acceptance of alternative means of measuring impact such as altmetrics.[18]

The intended goal in creating a Scholarly Communication Coach role for subject liaison librarians was to enable a layer of digital-scholarship "first responders," steeped in the scholarly communication support service needs of their subject areas. At an institution the size of EIU (8500 FTE), this is not a simple endeavor, considering that many subject liaisons support multiple departments and sometimes entire colleges. Additional duties include some combination of reference work, cataloging, collection development, instruction, and serving as a department head. In order to keep current and build the librarians' facility in handling and advising on scholarly communication issues, annual assessment exercises are planned that will inform future activities at a two-fold level. First, assessment exercises determine the level of contact with faculty researchers that the librarian has accomplished in a year's time, and secondly, annual reviews of the state of scholarly communication in their discipline will refresh liaison librarians' understanding of the developments and changing needs for digital scholarship.

"Training the trainers" was the first step in establishing scholarly communication and digital scholarship support services. Once subject librarians became informed Scholarly Communication Coaches, avenues were explored to engage academic departments

in these new library services, with an emphasis on demonstrating the benefits of participation.

Marketing the Service: Celebrating Success while Identifying Needs

Engaging campus faculty and raising awareness of scholarly communication support services being offered in the library included individual and department consultations in a wide variety of formats. The institutional repository librarian utilized features and reports of EIU's The Keep IR platform, Digital Commons, and developed service reports specific to departments and individual scholars. These reports featured three sections. First, the current activity and success of the department in the repository were highlighted. The IR librarian created download reports emphasizing participating faculty successes, including screenshots of world maps showing the international exposure faculty papers had achieved by inclusion in the repository. These download statistics also highlighted graduate theses, journals, and special collections associated with the department. Faculty with particularly high download counts were identified and celebrated. Reports from the Digital Commons Network (DCN)—a large open access resource comprised of repositories organized by discipline and sub-discipline, which combines all of the nearly 600 IRs worldwide that utilize the Digital Commons platform—were also included in marketing to departments. Additionally, EIU faculty that appeared on the DCN's Most Popular Authors and Most Popular Papers monthly top ten downloads lists were also highlighted.

The second section of the individual or departmental service report identified areas where scholarly communication support had not yet been utilized. One such area was student journals published by the department. By migrating to the Digital Commons platform, student journals could gain significant advantages, including increased visibility and platform flexibility, over their existing hosting method. Another potential area for growth was the repository's event community template, in which documents and artifacts from significant departmental events can be preserved and presented. Storage and exposure of archival and historical works of importance to the department was a third area promoted.

Using the repository to support re-accreditation purposes was also exploited to promote the new scholarly communication services. The Keep was used during EIU's NCA[19] Self Study exercise, both as a means of storing and presenting documents for the self study, and as part of the self study itself in the generation of reports demonstrating faculty research impact. This experience provided insight as to how scholarly communication support services could benefit individual departments during their re-accreditation efforts.

To further market the IR's services, subject librarians created library research guides that included links to discipline-specific resources in the Digital Commons Network. Librarians searched discipline-specific commons for OA research articles to add to subject guides, course guides and bibliographies created for instructional purposes. In doing so, the librarians exemplified research behavior that places the repository resources into the early stages of the research process. This models the idea for faculty and students that the repository and DCN are not simply "end result" storage places for their scholarship, but also rich sources for articles, potential collaborators, open educational resources, and other works supported by the repository platform that could be valuable to their research.

The third section of the service report was a general listing of library support services. This section included offering the set up and hosting of e-journals, support for copyright and intellectual property control, formatting and posting of documents to the repository on behalf of the faculty member, and other services. A key feature of this section was a sample support letter generated by the IR librarian intended for inclusion in faculty performance review portfolios. The support letter highlights the faculty member's successes in the repository, such as download counts and appearances in the DCN Most Popular Authors top ten lists.

Combining the celebration of success and the marketing of new support services aligns with the philosophy of Paul Royster, Coordinator for Scholarly

Communication at the University of Nebraska Libraries, who believes that the institutional repository should be characterized and operated as a service to the faculty.[20]

The IR and Scholarly Communication in the Sciences: A Tale of Two Departments

Faculty in the biological sciences and chemistry departments at EIU are active in research and publishing. Yet of these two productive departments, only one has faculty who fully embrace the services of the IR, while the other has limited faculty involvement. According to the 2012 Ithaka S+R U.S. Faculty Survey, a minority of faculty make their research available through an institutional repository.[21] Faculty in the sciences, as compared to other disciplines, are less likely to deposit pre-print or published versions of their work in an institutional repository.[22] Scholars may be cautious about the sources through which they are making their work available.[23] It should be celebrated, then, that at EIU over 90% (20/22) of tenured and tenure-track faculty participate in the IR. These scholars clearly understand the merits of making their work accessible through this resource. The chemistry department, on the other hand, has been slow to engage with EIU's IR. Currently 40% (6/15) of tenured and tenure-track faculty participate, with two of these faculty members signing on within the last year.

Why is there such discrepancy between departments, especially considering that biology and chemistry faculty are frequent collaborators on research projects? In a summary of research on the topic, the main impediments to faculty involvement with IRs include: a lack of awareness, understanding or interest; perceived risk, such as threats of plagiarism or being scooped; and disinterest due to lack of mandate or peer participation.[24] Addressing these concerns, as well as learning the unique apprehensions of this chemistry department, is a first step in meaningfully advocating the merits of the IR and OA more broadly to this localized population. It is not true that chemistry, as a discipline, is opposed to archiving in institutional repositories. Across seven institutions, chemists were among the most likely to archive in an IR, compared to physicists, economists, and sociologists.[25] Clearly, this is an opportunity for growth in relations between EIU's library and chemistry department.

As access to the traditional subscription-based journals continues to dwindle, an issue that is affecting both of these departments at EIU, faculty engagement in the OA movement seems imminent. While this is bearing out in the biological sciences, in chemistry there is ever-stronger pushback each year, as another subscription journal must be cut on account of unsustainable cost. Publishing in well-known journals and journals with a high impact factor is greatly esteemed by many of our chemistry faculty. The value of making their research freely available through the IR is unrecognized and perhaps not understood. Illinois's Open Access to Research Articles Act (110 ILCS 61/) may serve as the catalyst for change among our chemistry faculty. Future work by the sciences liaison will entail a faculty survey, which will help the library address the needs of the chemists while promoting the services of the IR. The effect of this work will include increased awareness of the value of the library to these scientists within the university and beyond.

Grabbing Opportunity: Making Use of Expected and Unexpected Events

An important element of moving library services into the digital scholarship of academic departments is to jump at opportunities as they are presented. The August 2013 passage of the State of Illinois's "open access law" (110 ILCS 61/) required the creation of a campus task force charged with drafting a policy for the creation of open access to research produced by EIU faculty. Campus conversations around this topic provided opportunities for increasing faculty awareness of open access and intellectual property rights. The draft policy was successfully presented by the IR librarian at the EIU Faculty Senate and unanimously endorsed. The faculty senate presentation prompted a dozen faculty members to begin participating in the repository.

Another opportunity for marketing and promotion of the IR and scholarly communication support services presented itself when EIU was asked to serve as a pilot school for the distribution of a survey of faculty digital scholarship needs and habits designed by the Digital Commons Network. The survey included questions about the digital content that faculty use and produce in their research and teaching, the digital content their students produce, what digital content the faculty consider to be the most important, and with what content they need the most help to manage and promote.

A benefit of being members of the pilot, the IR librarian distributing the survey received all the data from participating EIU Faculty. The survey provided Berkeley Electronic Press (the producer of the Digital Commons Network) with information to guide feature developments for future software releases, but it was also a rich source of information about areas where the library could offer scholarly communication support services, as well as target individuals with specific assistance. For example, a history professor indicated on the survey that he was in possession of a previously unknown and rare dataset that he wanted to digitize and make available worldwide but was unsure of the best way to do so. An English professor asked for help in making her students' works more widely available. Other previously unknown faculty needs that were brought to light by the survey included the desire for a way to present multi-media and interest in the ability to host a journal. Having access to the survey data accelerated the process of embedding library services into the digital scholarship of the responding faculty members.

Occasionally, unexpected opportunities arise that can result in new partnerships or the discovery of units within the institution working toward similar or related ends. For example, the call for survey participation piqued the interest of a cross-departmental faculty group who promote and foster research and teaching methods in the Digital Humanities. They requested access to the survey findings, feeling that the data could inform the direction of their efforts. This presented both an opportunity to further embed library scholarly communication support services in the humanities and a possibility for cross-department collaboration.

Conclusion

We live in a world in which search is dominated by Google at every level of scholarship, and library users are largely unaware of the work that goes into making access to information as smooth and free of barriers as possible. Because of this, perceptions from students, faculty and administrators about libraries may include that library services are becoming anachronistic and secondary to the scholarly practices of our faculty and students. Yet if we look at the behavior and practices of digital scholarship in the academy, it becomes apparent that there is a large and growing need for intensive library support services for scholarly communication. Faculty are struggling to understand the myriad copyright and intellectual property policies demanded of them from publishers, funding agencies and their own institutions. They are trying to avoid predatory publishers, while simultaneously seeking out new research resources in the face of cancelled journals, and they are seeking the means by which they can preserve and present their scholarship effectively and efficiently. These faculty are very much in need of librarian support and assistance.

If our professional activities focus on engagement and the active pursuit of service opportunities, today's librarians can become integral to scholars' research. By drawing attention to the growing wave of open access scholarship and demonstrating the increasingly complex requirements associated with being an active and influential scholar in the digital age, librarians can use tools like institutional repositories and innovative service plans to reassert libraries and librarians as the indispensable heart of their institutions' scholarly activities.

Notes
1. Diane Dawson, "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 (2014): 4-28.

2. Kevin Guthrie and Ross Housewright, "Repackaging the Library: What Do Faculty Think?" *Journal of Library Administration* 51, no. 1 (2010): 81-82.

3. "Assessment in Action: Academic Libraries and Student Success," accessed February 15, 2015, http://www.ala.org/acrl/AiA.

4. Joy Kirchner, "Scholarly Communications: Planning for the Integration of Liaison Librarian Roles," *Research Library Issues* 265 (August 2009): 22-28.

5. Anne R. Kenney, "Leveraging the Liaison Model: From Defining 21st Century Research Libraries to Implementing 21st Century Research Universities," *Ithaka S+R* (2014): n.p.

6. Andrea A. Wirth and Faye A. Chadwell, "Rights Well: An Authors' Rights Workshop for Librarians," *Libraries and the Academy* 10, no. 3 (2010): 337-54.

7. Ibid.

8. Megan M. Bresnahan and Andrew M. Johnson, "Assessing Scholarly Communication and Research Data Training Needs," *Reference Services Review* 41, no. 3 (2013): 413-33.

9. Joy Kirchner, "Scholarly Communications," 22-28.

10. Kara J. Malenfant, "Leading Change in the System of Scholarly Communication: A Case Study of Engaging Liaison Librarians for Outreach to Faculty," *College & Research Libraries* 71, no. 1 (2010): 63-76.

11. Kara J. Malenfant, "Leading Change," 67.

12. Tim Klassen (Head of the Science and Technology and Winspear Business Libraries, University of Alberta), email message to the authors, February 15, 2015.

13. Paul Royster, "The Advice Not Taken: How One Repository Found Its Own Path" (presented at Open Repositories 2014, Helsinki, Finland, June 11, 2014).

14. Diane Dawson, "Scholarly Communications," 12.

15. J. Steve Brantley and Todd Bruns, "Scholarly Communication Coaches" (presented at the Illinois Association of College and Research Libraries Conference, Oak Brook, Illinois, March 21, 2014), http://works.bepress.com/todd_bruns/39.

16. Diane Dawson, "Scholarly Communications," 12.

17. Joy Kirchner, "Scholarly Communications," 22-28.

18. Brian Kelly, Nick Sheppard, Jenny Delasalle, Mark Dewey, Owen Stephens, Gareth Johnson, and Stephanie Taylor, "Open Metrics for Open Repositories" (presented at the 7th International Conference on Open Repositories, Edinburgh, Scotland, July 9-13, 2012).

19. NCA is the North Central Association of the Higher Learning Commission, an accrediting agency.

20. Paul Royster, "Advice Not Taken."

21. Ross Housewright, Roger C. Schonfeld, and Kate Wulfson, *Ithaka S+R US Faculty Survey 2012* (2013): 60, http://sr.ithaka.org/research-publications/us-faculty-survey-2012.

22. Ibid.

23. Aaron Lercher, "A Survey of Attitudes about Digital Repositories among Faculty at Louisiana State University at Baton Rouge," *The Journal of Academic Librarianship* 34, no. 5 (2008): 413.

24. Denise Troll Covey, "Recruiting Content for the Institutional Repository: The Barriers Exceed the Benefits," *JODI: Journal Of Digital Information* 12, no. 3 (2011): 4.

25. Jingfeng Xia, "Assessment of Self-archiving in Institutional Repositories: Across Disciplines," *The Journal of Academic Librarianship* 33, no. 6 (2007): 651.

Bibliography

Association of College and Research Libraries. "Assessment in Action: Academic Libraries and Student Success." Accessed February 15, 2015. http://www.ala.org/acrl/AiA.

Brantley, J. Steve and Todd Bruns. "Scholarly Communication Coaches." Presented at Illinois Association of College and Research Libraries Conference, Oak Brook, Illinois, March 21, 2014. http://works.bepress.com/todd_bruns/39.

Bresnahan, Megan M., and Andrew M. Johnson. "Assessing Scholarly Communication and Research Data Training Needs." *Reference Services Review* 41, no. 3 (2013): 413-33.

Covey, Denise Troll. "Recruiting Content for the Institutional Repository: The Barriers Exceed the Benefits." *JODI: Journal Of Digital Information* 12, no. 3 (2011): 1-18.

Dawson, Diane (Dede). "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 (2014): 4-28.

Guthrie, Kevin, and Ross Housewright. "Repackaging the Library: What Do Faculty Think?" *Journal of Library Administration* 51, no. 1 (2010): 77-104. doi:10.1080/01930826.2011.531643.

Housewright, Ross, Roger C. Schonfeld, and Kate Wulfson. *Ithaka S+R US Faculty Survey 2012*. [New York]: ITHAKA, 2013. http://sr.ithaka.org/research-publications/us-faculty-survey-2012.

Kelly, Brian, Nick Sheppard, Jenny Delasalle, Mark Dewey, Owen Stephens, Gareth Johnson, and Stephanie Taylor. "Open Metrics for Open Repositories." Presented at the 7th International Conference on Open Repositories, Edinburgh, Scotland, July 9-13, 2012.

Kenney, Anne R. "Leveraging the Liaison Model: From Defining 21st Century Research Libraries to Implementing 21st Century Research Universities." *Ithaka S+R* (2014): n.p.

Kirchner, Joy. "Scholarly Communications: Planning for the Integration of Liaison Librarian Roles." *Research Library Issues* 265 (2009): 22-28.

Lercher, Aaron. "A Survey of Attitudes about Digital Repositories among Faculty at Louisiana State University at Baton Rouge." *The Journal of Academic Librarianship* 34, no. 5 (2008): 408-15.

Malenfant, Kara J. "Leading Change in the System of Scholarly Communication: A Case Study of Engaging Liaison Librarians for Outreach to Faculty." *College & Research Libraries* 71, no. 1 (2010): 63-76.

Royster, Paul. "The Advice Not Taken: How One Repository Found Its Own Path." Presented at Open Repositories 2014, Helsinki, Finland, June 11, 2014.

Wirth, Andrea A., and Faye A. Chadwell. "Rights Well: An Authors' Rights Workshop for Librarians." *Libraries and the Academy* 10, no. 3 (2010): 337-54.

Xia, Jingfeng. "Assessment of Self-archiving in Institutional Repositories: Across Disciplines." *The Journal of Academic Librarianship* 33, no. 6 (2007): 647-54.