2015

# Creating Policies for Library Publishing in an Institutional Repository: Exploring Purpose, Scope, and the Library's Role

Kelly Riddle
*University of San Diego*, the_k_rid@yahoo.com

# Creating Policies for Library Publishing in an Institutional Repository: Exploring Purpose, Scope, and the Library's Role

## Description, Abstract, or Artist's Statement

This paper aims to explore questions and concepts encountered when developing policies for an institutional repository with a library publishing component. The author describes how publishing needs and library vision shape institutional repository policies, and demonstrates that the repository's guiding policies are determined by the repository's purpose and scope. Policies for institutional repositories with publishing components will vary across institutions depending on the intended purpose of the repository, scope of publishing activities and institutional context. The article is useful for those just exploring library publishing with repositories and those looking to revamp their policies to accommodate this new use, the paper explores theoretical and practical questions about this new use of repositories.

**Creating Policies for Library Publishing in an Institutional Repository: Exploring Purpose, Scope, and the Library's Role**

**Introduction**

Institutional repositories were first developed in an effort to reclaim previously published scholarship at individual institutions. More recently, libraries have begun exploring in-house publishing activities to further scholarship at an institutional level. Because open access repositories and library publishing are both aimed at lowering barriers to content, and because repositories provide a platform for access and preservation of scholarly content, it seems natural that the use of repositories be expanded and adapted to accommodate library publishing. Practical considerations for doing so, however, emerge when writing policies for the repository and its publishing program. Many repositories operate under policies that do not account for this broad and more complex use. Though preservation of and access to previously published content remain primary activities, library publishing in repositories requires a more complex engagement with questions about the purpose, scope, and the library's role in administering content, access and preservation policies. Writing these policies requires conversations about the purpose of the repository and where the policies should fall along various spectrums to best satisfy campus needs and the ideal library role in publishing activities. The following paper examines a mid-sized university's engagement with these questions about roles, responsibilities, and spectrums as the repository manager drafted policies for an institutional repository with a publishing component.

**Background**

While institutional repositories began as storehouses and access points for previously published scholarship, in recent years they have turned taken on a host of other identities. They are increasingly used as the primary or sole publication platform for electronic theses and dissertations and to manage the workflows for these publications (Clement & Rascoe, 2013). They have been expanded to include all manner of research data (Wise, Spiro, Henry & Byrd, 2007). Even digitized archival material has found a place in repositories, with some institutions with affiliated publishing houses making the repository a component of print-on-demand initiatives (Using, 2013).

Some identified publishing as a repository function over ten years ago (Crow, 2002), and this purpose has become increasingly common. The technology of repository platforms provides an infrastructure that accommodates publishing activities without prohibitive drains on the time and resources of repository administrators. Digital Commons by bepress comes with the tools to administer many types of publishing (including peer-reviewed journals with robust editorial teams) out of the box (Bankier & Perciali, 2008, Daly & Organ, 2009). In most cases, the technology for library publishing in repositories has become increasingly accessible. More and more libraries are beginning to offer these services, and many through their existing institutional repositories (Mullins, et al., 2012).

Though repository technologies increasingly afford libraries the ability to publish original material such as peer-reviewed journals, grey literature, university publications, conference proceedings, undergraduate research outputs, and a host of other types of content, whether they should do so, perhaps to the neglect of their original purpose, remains up for debate (Kennison, Shreeves, & Harnad, 2013). Increasingly, however, libraries are

interested in publishing and interested in using their repositories to do so (Mullins, et al., 2012).

**Institutional Context**

It is in this environment that University of San Diego began planning for a new institutional repository in 2012. The possibilities provided by a library publishing program were attractive to the library as a way to educate faculty and staff about the ongoing scholarly communications crisis while providing a platform and service that could help alleviate this very problem. The policy development process began before the platform for the repository was selected. The library formed a committee to look at the library and institutional environment and make recommendations on the direction for digital material at the institution. This committee was composed of librarians and technologists and, in June of 2013, published an internal report summarizing ongoing and potential digital initiatives at the university and charting a path for the future IR. The report included a detailed examination of several potential repository platforms, including open source solutions, an environmental scan of potential repository content, and recommendations for a new position for a librarian who would manage the repository and oversee other digital initiatives in the library.

The environmental scan proved to be a crucial step in repository policy development and the first engagement with questions of scope for the repository and its publishing program. USD's environmental scan proved that the university had a good amount of diverse material in need of greater access, preservation solutions, and an easy-to-navigate central location. This material included "traditional" repository content (previously published scholarship), but also included existing digital collections, undergraduate research deliverables, and materials being published in print or digital format by various centers and institutes on campus. The environmental scan also unearthed another type of content: content that did not yet exist or that existed in other formats, but which might find a home in a repository should the library develop the resources to support it. This content included electronic theses and dissertations, an undergraduate literary magazine, and the proceedings from university lecture series. This research, which took a kitchen sink approach, not only informed the development of a broad content policy and autonomy for faculty and staff publishing in the repository, but also informed the selection of the repository platform itself.

For institutions just exploring the idea of an IR or a publishing program, as was the case at USD, identifying the types of content being produced on campus can help in selecting a repository platform and later becomes key when developing policies. The committee recommended bepress' Digital Commons repository platform as most suitable for the institution partially because of its capabilities as a publishing platform that could accommodate a wide range of types of publications. Conversations with stakeholders across campus revealed a need for an extensive library-led publishing program, and the committee that conducted the environmental scan selected a platform that met these needs and began conversations with a wide variety of campus stakeholders interested in publishing.

In the first months of work as repository manager, I continued these conversations with both disciplinary faculty and administrators of various centers and programs about their needs and the ways in which the IR might fill those needs. These conversations would later inform my drafts of IR policies and identified a crucial need for a policy on roles and responsibilities. This element was missing from the IR policies in place at many of the other institutions I looked to for reference, and these policies by and large did not call out library publishing as an explicit role of the repository. As I began drafting policies for the repository

and its publishing program, I first grappled with its purpose and the potential scope of the IR.

**Examining Repository Purpose and Publishing Scope**

The environmental scan and conversations with stakeholders on campus revealed that the library intended to create a repository with purposes beyond those of "traditional" IRs, and it was established early on that library-led publishing would be one of the repository's main functions. The purpose would not only be to archive previously published scholarship, but to serve other needs of disciplinary faculty as well as to serve centers and institutes by publishing and housing material related to institutional memory. These broad purposes informed the development of broad content policies. The library's environment, including factors such as the roles of employees who would manage the repository, the existing technology infrastructure, and the surrounding institutional environment all affected the ways in which the repository would be used, and these considerations informed the development of access and preservation policies that emphasized the autonomy of the library's publishing "clients."

It is also useful to think about the scope of content a library publishing program will engage with before beginning to draft policies. Different kinds of library publishing services require different kinds of expertise and levels of commitment from the library and from users. A peer-reviewed journal, for example, might have an editorial board with a fast rate of turnover, requiring much more detailed planning for administrative logistics than might be necessary for something like an alumni magazine published by an institutional office. Some users might not need much more than a platform, while others might call for services such as help with layout. The library should establish its ideal levels of scope in accordance with its clearly defined purpose in order to create a useful set of policies and a successful publishing program.

**Developing the Policies**

Policies guide how the repository will be used and how this use will evolve, and are a distillation of the stakeholders' thinking about the purpose and scope of the repository. Administering a library publishing program through an institutional repository adds complexity to what might be run-of-the-mill guidelines for content, access, and preservation because using the platform to create content rather than merely collect and provide access to previously published content means that not all types of content are the same. Library publishing introduces a greater degree of responsibility for content from the library, and the policies should engage with this responsibility.

There are many guides to repository policy development in existence, and many revolve around on questions to ask about the content, how it will get into the repository, and what will happen to it once it is there. Such guides are required reading for those developing policies, as are the repository policies of other institutions. For some of the policies I consulted as I drafted the IR policies for University of San Diego, please see the bibliography. Guidelines tend to cluster into three areas in the majority of publicly available IR policy documents: these are content guidelines, access policies, and preservation policies. For policies that administer a repository publishing program, the three main policy elements are required, but in drafting policies for [INSTITUTION's] repository, I discovered the addition of a policy describing roles and responsibilities for everyone engaged with the repository's services (librarians, technologists, contributors, editors) becomes crucial.

Content guidelines or policies govern what sorts of material are eligible for inclusion in at IR and who is eligible to submit that material. Access policies outline which users are able to access content and might state under what circumstances restricting access to content is appropriate. Preservation policies provide assurance that material in the repository will be protected for future access, often giving an overview of the backup and preservation mechanisms in place and providing some indication of what will happen to the material in the event of the termination of the repository. Together, these should form a practical expression of the purpose and scope of the repository and its services.

While a robust publishing program will have procedural documents (such as memoranda of understanding), the policies for the repository that serves as the platform for the administration, access, and preservation of publications should take the purposes of publishing programs into account for the primary repository policies. Policies for repository services that include a library publishing program guide how the library allocates resources toward such a program and provide a further level of understanding for potential journal editors, university administrators, and others who wish to take advantage of this library service. Including publishing services in the main policy document indicates that the library has committed to publishing. Including them marks a base from which the library can expand in a rapidly changing environment.

## Content Policies

Content policies are often meant to ensure the relevance and quality of material deposited. Many IR policies insist that work be finished, that it be scholarly in nature, and that only university affiliates are eligible to submit content to the repository. When repurposing a repository to accommodate publishing activities, however, such requirements might be quite limiting depending on the planned scope of the program.

Placing content policies on a spectrum of inclusiveness can help librarians and other stakeholders express and define the IR's purpose and scope. Content policies should fall somewhere on a spectrum of broad inclusivity to a narrow focus, perhaps in a number of areas. The policy might require the material to be connected to the institution only tenuously, or it might set stricter requirements. The content policy should define how scholarly content must be for inclusion. To accommodate something like a peer-reviewed journal, the content policy should consider how closely the journal will be tied to the university; questions such as "Will the editor be required to be a faculty member at the institution?" might be helpful when thinking about where a repository's policies will fall on a spectrum of inclusivity. Other questions that help define a position on this spectrum involve the types of content that will be published. Will the library publish data sets associated with articles? Will it only publish scholarly journals, conference proceedings, and monographs administered by affiliated faculty, or will it also produce non-scholarly publications of campus centers and institutes? What does it mean for such work to be "complete," and who is eligible to submit it?

Conversations about the content policy should also take into account what the current staffing, time, and other resources are like, including the capabilities of the repository software. If any of these resources are limited, it might make sense for a library to have a more limited content policy for publishing in the IR. Perhaps the software has the capability to move many of technical responsibilities of publishing a journal to the editorial board. By passing some of the responsibilities for content management to others, the repository administrator can manage a wider variety and a greater volume of content and the content policy can be expanded.

At USD, the answers to content policy questions were found in conversations with disciplinary faculty and administrators of centers and institutes, as well as the environmental scan conducted by the digital initiatives committee. The scan issued by the committee included a wide range of material, but practical considerations such as limited employee resources might have made taking an "everything-but-the-kitchen-sick" approach impractical. One method considered to limit drains on resources was a content policy that excluded non-scholarly publications. Such publications don't fall within the historical purposes of repositories, and it would have been easy to exclude them. However, given prior discussions about the purpose and scope of the IR, the proposed content policy is a generous one. The policy provides opportunities to include material from across the university, even if the potential publication is not a peer-reviewed journal. Publications such as university lecture series are a key piece of institutional memory, an articulated purpose of USD's repository and library publishing efforts. This generous content policy allows for publication of content that may bring more visitors to the site. This allows users, including faculty who may be looking for a publication vehicle for a project, to see the full abilities of the repository through various content types.

**Access Policies**

Institutional repositories have been built on the concept of "open." When repurposing a repository for publishing, however, the question of access becomes much more complex. Requiring all of the repository's publications to be open access may turn away potential content contributors, but including a large number of subscription-based publications or restricted material complicates the purpose of the repository. Again, stakeholders should discuss the end goals for the repository and the publishing program and balance those against their institutional context when starting to think about an access policy. Is openness something that the library is willing to negotiate?

It might be helpful to think of the access policy as one answer to questions about where the IR and publishing program fall on a spectrum of autonomy for those publishing in the repository. Policy makers should weigh campus culture heavily when making this decision. Requiring all content, including publications, to be completely openly available might be a viable option, but a policy that gives users more control over their publications and content is more likely to attract users at many institutions. If this is a consideration, the policies might find a balance between making content accessible and providing enough opportunity for customization to attract contributors who might like to administer a publication through it. A publishing program is, after all, a service, and a willingness to give editors control over whether to, say, charge a subscription fee for some publications may attract more users. On the other hand, the library might use an open access requirement as an opportunity for outreach and education about the open access movement and scholarly communications issues and emphasize the greater reach that an open access publication can have.

For USD, some of the first shaping of the proposed access policies came when discussing a pilot electronic thesis and dissertation program at the university. A committee made up of faculty representing graduate programs, university administrators, and librarians, began to talk about using the repository as a publishing platform for ETDs. While the practicalities of this program remain in flux, the conversations about the levels of access for the university's first library-published ETDs was helpful in gauging the attitudes toward access to content in the repository in general. In USD's case, the proposed access policies for the repository publishing program emphasize the role of the content contributor in

deciding to make material openly available. To write policies for a set of services most likely to be useful to our institution, we listened closely to faculty members' ideas about how a publishing program should work and incorporated that thinking into the policies, which attempt to educate IR users on the benefits of open while meeting them where they are with regards to controlling both their work and publications administered through the IR. The amount of control that access policies guarantee to users regarding their own work extends to publications users publish in the IR.

**Preservation Policies**

Preservation policies involve considerations about active curation and have implications for the futures and sustainability of publishing programs administered through IRs. Unlike content and access policies, which must set clear expectations before any content is deposited, preservation policies must anticipate issues far into the future. Libraries might consider whether the capacity for responsible preservation (which involves documented plans, preservation metadata, and technology infrastructure) affects what they publish in the first place. A preservation policy might be placed on a spectrum of simple backup services to comprehensive preservation solution, and on a spectrum of preservation for all the materials in the repository to a more actively curated prioritization of some of the materials. Where the preservation policy falls on these spectrums depends on the infrastructure available at the institution. The preservation policy can be expanded as the institution and the library are able to take a more studied and comprehensive approach to digital preservation. If the preservation policy cannot support comprehensive long-term preservation for all of the materials in the repository, the library might be more selective in what it chooses to publish, and faculty and staff should take the policy into account as they decide whether publishing in the repository is right for them.

While USD's drafted content policy is generous, the preservation policy might help establish limits on publishing content, as it states that the infrastructure for long-term preservation by the library does not yet exist. Using the repository to publish a wide variety of material does not mean it should be a dumping ground for material that someone might need at some point later, especially given limited resources for preservation and active curation. However, in talks with those interested in publishing in the IR, librarians emphasize that publishing in an IR enables the proliferation of copies of a publication, an important component in digital preservation. At USD, the platform itself provides a layer of security for content, and the preservation policy mentions this component. Finally, preservation policy encourages regular review of the material in the repository, including the published material, and fits in with the larger preservation efforts of the library and the institution.

**Roles and Responsibilities**

A statement on roles and responsibilities is crucial for a library publishing program administered through an IR. Such a statement embodies the purpose and scope of the repository and publishing program in practice. It guides the ways in which content, access, and preservation policies are drafted and revised. The statement makes clear the responsibilities the library takes on when providing its technology and its publishing services to users. It allows the editors of journals, the administrators responsible for institutional publications, or the campus organizations publishing original material, to know what parts of the publishing process they themselves will be responsible for when they come to the IR for publishing services.

To draft a policy on roles and responsibilities, it is helpful to revisit questions about where the IR and its publishing program fall on various spectrums: from inclusive to selective, from library control to autonomy by content contributors, and from curated to comprehensive preservation and management. The roles and responsibilities statement answers questions about the extent to which publishing for the library involves providing a platform or providing other services such as creating metadata (a typical function for even repositories without publishing programs) or layout and design of publications (a more unusual function of libraries that publish content in repositories). It also provides a base from which the program might expand.

At USD, one of the institutes on campus approached the library regarding publishing the materials from its annual lecture series. In previous years, this publication this has been a handsome and highly decorative printed publication that included a transcript of the lecture and photos of the speaker. We discovered that the institute was searching for not only a platform for a digital publication to replace the printed version, but also a set of services that included designing the layout and look of the publication. We were able to show representatives what the publication might look like *in* the repository, but couldn't commit to help with the design of the document itself. Layout and design might be functions of a more robust library publishing program if the demand exists. Libraries should use the roles and responsibilities statement to state in general or specific terms what "publishing" means for that particular institution.

This statement also guides the activities of the repository administrator. When expanding a repository to accommodate library publishing, defining this role becomes increasingly important. One of the key roles for USD's repository administrator is to seek out new types of content. This means that the benefits of documents like an environmental scan become part of the regular operation of the repository. This helps ensure that the publishing services the library is offering through the repository are answering the needs of the institutional community.

**Conclusion**

As of this writing, USD's repository policies are still making their way through the library and university administration, but those responsible for the library publishing program are already thinking about the next iteration of the policies. Policies for library publishing in an IR require monitoring to make sure they are providing the highest quality services for faculty and staff publishing material in the IR. Librarians will adjust the policies to accommodate new publishing needs and new repository capabilities. This is one role the library is keen to play: we are looking for new purposes for the IR all the time. The discussions that took place and examples of situations that had practical implications for policies at University of San Diego can inform discussions on the decisions of scope, purpose, and policies at other institutions looking to administer a publishing program through an institutional repository.

Many of the questions that surround the expansion of repositories to include library publishing involve balance: between user autonomy and library-led guidelines, between freedom of contributors to preserve content and freedom of users to access content, between library control and user control. For libraries wishing to add publishing to their repository services, talking about the role that each stakeholder must play in the development and use of the repository ensures that the library offers users the services that they need most. For our institution and for others, the needs of faculty and staff at an

institution are the most important consideration when developing policies for a repository and a publishing program.

**Bibliography**

Armstrong, M. (2011). We're all in this together: supporting the dissemination of university research through library services. *Proceedings of the Charleston Library Conference.* Charleston, SC. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.5703/1288284314938

Bankier, J. & Perciali, I. (2008). The institutional repository rediscovered: what can a university do for open access publishing. *Serials Review 34*(1), 21-26.

Chan, L. 2004. Supporting and enhancing scholarship in the digital age: the role of open access institutional repositories. *Canadian Journal Of Communication, 29*(3). Retrieved from http://cjc-online.ca/index.php/journal/article/view/1455

Clement, G. P. & Rascoe, F. (2013). ETD management and publishing in the ProQuest system and the university repository: a comparative analysis. *Journal of Librarianship and Scholarly Communication 1*(4):eP1074. http://dx.doi.org/10.7710/2162-3309.1074

Crow, R. (2002). *The case for institutional repositories: A SPARC position paper.* Washington, D.C.: Scholarly Publishing & Academic Resources Coalition. Retrieved from http://sparc.arl.org/sites/default/files/ir_final_release_102.pdf

Daly, R. & Organ, M. (2009). Research online: Digital Commons as a publishing platform at the University of Wollongong, Australia. *Serials Review 35*(3). Retrieved from http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0098791309000586.

Jones, R. (2004), DSpace vs. ETD-db: choosing software to manage electronic theses and disserations. *Ariadne* 38.

Kennison, R., Shreeves, S. L., Harnad, S. (2013). Point & counterpoint: the purpose of institutional repositories: Green OA or beyond? *Journal of Librarianship and Scholarly Communication* 1(4):eP1105.

Lippincott, S. (ed.). (2013). *Library Publishing Directory.* Atlanta, GA: Library Publishing Coalition.

Lynch, C. A. (2003). Institutional repositories: essential infrastructure for scholarship in the digital age. ARL: A Bimonthly Report, 226 (February 2003), 1-7. Retrieved from http://www.cni.org/wp-content/uploads/2003/02/arl-br-226-Lynch-IRs-2003.pdf

Lynch, C. A. & Lippincott, J. K. (2005). Institutional repository deployment in the United States as of early 2005. *D-Lib Magazine, 11*(9).

Mullins, J. L., Murray-Rust, C., Ogburn, J. L., Crow, R., Ivins, O., Mower, A., Nesdill, D., Newton, M. P., Speer, J., & Watkinson, C. (2012). *Library Publishing Services: Strategies for Success: Final Research Report.* Washington, DC: SPARC.

Royster, P. (2007). Publishing original content in an institutional repository. *Faculty Publications, UNL Libraries.* Paper 126. Retrieved from http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libraryscience/126

Thomas, S. Policies. *About DSpace at MIT.* Retrieved from http://libguides.mit.edu/content.php?pid=456907&sid=3741704

University of California eScholarship. eScholarship: submissions & appropriate content. Retrieved from http://escholarship.org/help_submissions.html

Using Print-On-Demand to Liberate Faculty. (2013, June 25). Retrieved from http://blog.digitalcommons.bepress.com/2013/06/25/using-print-on-demand-to-liberate-faculty/

Ware, M. (2004). Institutional repositories and scholarly publishing. *Learned Publishing 17*(2), 115-124.

Wise, M., Spiro, L., Henry, G., & Byrd, S. (2007). Expanding roles for the institutional repository. *OCLC Systems & Services 23*(2), 216-223.

Selection of Repository Policies Consulted
*Digital Commons at Loyola Marymount University and Loyola Law School.* Retrieved from
http://digitalcommons.lmu.edu/faq.html
NCSU Libraries. *Contribute content to the Scholarly Publications Repository.* Retrieved from
http://www.lib.ncsu.edu/repository/spr/contribute.html
Pepperdine University Libraries. *Content submission policies and guidelines.* Retrieved from
http://digitalcommons.pepperdine.edu/pepperdine_digital_commons_policy.pdf
*Purdue e-Pubs: Policies and help documentation.* Retrieved from
http://oldsite.lib.purdue.edu/repositories/epubs/about.html
Thomas, S. *About DSpace at MIT: Policies.* Retrieved from
http://libguides.mit.edu/content.php?pid=456907&sid=3741704
UO Libraries. *Policies and guidelines for Scholar's Bank.* Retrieved from
http://library.uoregon.edu/diglib/irg/SB_Policies.html

## Appendix
### University of San Diego Institutional Repository Policies DRAFT

**Statement of Purpose**
The purpose of the University of San Diego Institutional Repository is to collect, preserve, publish and share work and publications produced by members of the University of San Diego community.

**Content Guidelines**
Content eligible for inclusion in the repository should support research, pedagogy, and/or institutional memory at the University of San Diego. Faculty, staff, and students of the University of San Diego are eligible to submit content. Works must be complete. The institutional repository provides a platform to host publications such as peer-reviewed journals, student publications, and publications of institutes and centers on campus.

Examples of content appropriate for the repository include previously published faculty publications, electronic theses and dissertations, student publications, publications of university centers and institutes, peer-reviewed journals, instructional resources, and university archival material.

**Access Policy**
Repository content, including publications, is openly accessible by default, but embargoes or other types of restricted access are available to contributors. Contributors should work with the library to determine the appropriate access levels for content and publications and to put such controls in place.

**Rights**
The contributor must be willing and able to grant University of San Diego a non-exclusive license in perpetuity to preserve and distribute the submission via the repository. This license includes permission to convert the submission to other formats to ensure preservation and to retain more than one copy of the submission for preservation purposes.

Copyright for a work is retained by the copyright holder(s) and is not transferred to the libraries or to the University of San Diego.

**Roles and Responsibilities**
University of San Diego is responsible for identifying university and research content eligible for inclusion in the repository. The library manages the day-to-day activities of the repository, including processing material for inclusion, providing metadata to promote discovery and access, and complying with standards and best practices related to preservation.

Content contributors are responsible for ensuring that submissions are complete and of quality suitable for publication. Unfinished work is not eligible for inclusion in the repository. Contributors must obtain permission to use third party copyrighted material in their submissions.

**Preservation Policy**
Submissions to the repository will be retained indefinitely. Repository content is maintained by bepress through regular on-site and off-site backups. University of San Diego is currently unable to maintain copies of repository content for backup and preservation.