

2019

Scholarly Publishing Literacy at the University of South Florida Libraries: From Advising to Active Involvement

Chelsea Johnston
University of Florida

Jason Boczar
University of South Florida, jboczar@usf.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarcommons.usf.edu/tlib_facpub

 Part of the [Library and Information Science Commons](#)

Scholar Commons Citation

Johnston, Chelsea and Boczar, Jason, "Scholarly Publishing Literacy at the University of South Florida Libraries: From Advising to Active Involvement" (2019). *Tampa Library Faculty and Staff Publications*. 21. https://scholarcommons.usf.edu/tlib_facpub/21

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Tampa Library at Scholar Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Tampa Library Faculty and Staff Publications by an authorized administrator of Scholar Commons. For more information, please contact scholarcommons@usf.edu.

JLSC

ISSN 2162-3309 | JLSC is published by the Pacific University Libraries | <http://jls-public.org>

Volume 7, General Issue (2019)

Scholarly Publishing Literacy at the University of South Florida Libraries: From Advising to Active Involvement

Chelsea Johnston & Jason Boczar

Johnston, C. & Boczar, J. (2019). Scholarly Publishing Literacy at the University of South Florida Libraries: From Advising to Active Involvement. *Journal of Librarianship and Scholarly Communication*, 7(General Issue), eP2310. <https://doi.org/10.7710/2162-3309.2310>

This article underwent semi-anonymous peer review in accordance with JLSC's peer review policy.



© 2019 Johnston & Boczar. This open access article is distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

Scholarly Publishing Literacy at the University of South Florida Libraries: From Advising to Active Involvement

Chelsea Johnston

Scholarly Repository Librarian, University of Florida; Library Operations Coordinator, University of South Florida

Jason Boczar

Digital Scholarship & Publishing Librarian, University of South Florida

INTRODUCTION Successful open access (OA) publishing in libraries requires careful guidance and organization. Support and services offered vary depending on available resources as well as the robustness of a library's publishing program. **DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAM** This article describes the connection between publishing services and scholarly publishing literacy through examples from the University of South Florida (USF) Libraries. The USF Libraries' OA publishing program includes journals, textbooks, conference proceedings, and more. Our program balances advocating for open access with advising for actions that serve our partners' goals. This invites trust, sustainable relationships, and opportunities for new work. **NEXT STEPS** At the USF Libraries, more work must be done to formally assess our efforts. Our program will also explore new ways to support the ethical standards expected of libraries by pursuing stronger policies on diversity and inclusion. Using everyday work to demonstrate best practices is a manageable way to strengthen scholarly publishing efforts. We hope to continue growing our services, empowering our partners, and exploring our roles as advisors and advocates.

Received: 03/07/2019 Accepted: 10/31/2019

Correspondence: Jason Boczar, University of South Florida Libraries, 4202 E. Fowler Ave., Tampa, FL, 33620, jboczar@usf.edu



© 2019 Johnston & Boczar. This open access article is distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

INTRODUCTION

The open access (OA) movement has been critical in creating opportunities for libraries within publishing. Open access aligns with many values intrinsic to librarianship, such as defending easy access to information, providing materials for the public good, and promoting social responsibility (American Library Association [ALA], 2006). As the OA movement continues to evolve, librarians are uniquely positioned to provide guidance. With preparedness and flexibility, we can make the most of shifting practices in scholarly communication for our patrons, our institutions, and ourselves.

This article will briefly review open access from the perspective of libraries working as academic publishers, as well as suggest concrete actions we can take to further the movement. We will share ways that the University of South Florida (USF) Libraries have strengthened their publishing program, focusing efforts on using our program to talk about general topics in scholarly publishing. Our work is framed around the concept of scholarly publishing literacy, which, as defined by Zhao (2014), seeks to incorporate the analysis of publishing through a digital scholarship and information literacy framework. We believe that library publishing is a unique initiative that reimagines campus partnerships with the library as a service center. This article will provide examples of initiatives at the USF Libraries that demonstrate how libraries can use publishing and open access to support stakeholders on campus and across the world.

When collaborating with partners outside the library, we seek to learn about new disciplines and research work while providing information about trends in scholarly publishing. Each consultation supports a different goal. In every situation, we practice balancing advising and advocacy as librarians. This balance can be applied to other library practices by demonstrating how to meet external partners where they are, providing relevant and nuanced assistance and instruction.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Transformation of the OA Movement

The OA movement gives publishers, authors, and readers the power to promote worldwide access, encouraging a wider reach for research and information. Traditionally, academic journals have required paid subscriptions for print or electronic access. This creates academic inequity, as individuals and institutions who cannot afford subscriptions must do without, compromising the currency of their research. OA publishing provides an alternative structure. Peter Suber's widely used definition describes open access as "digital, online, free

of charge (gratis OA), and free of needless copyright and licensing restrictions (libre OA)” (Suber, 2012, p. 175). It is worth noting that even well-intentioned attempts at OA will not be without barriers. Cost, as well as lack of expertise or access, can limit the effectiveness of technological solutions. While OA may not be the ultimate solution to access, it provides a foundation for work that reframes the narrative.

OA content is constantly being created, organized, and shared. “The State of OA: A Large-Scale Analysis of the Prevalence and Impact of Open Access Articles” used oaDOI to study the OA status of 100,000 articles retrieved from three sample sets: Crossref DOIs, Web of Science DOIs, and Unpaywall DOIs. They found that 27.9% of the articles retrieved in the Crossref-DOIs sample, 36.1% of the WoS-DOIs sample, and 47.0% of the Unpaywall-DOIs sample were open access (Piwowar et al., 2018). This data, while not without limitations, provides one example of the volume of open content.

Libraries are strong contributors to this volume as they explore roles within publishing. Most library publishing activities are done by academic or research libraries. The 2019 edition of the Library Publishing Directory lists 135 colleges and universities, largely from North America, with a dedicated publishing program (The Library Publishing Coalition Directory Committee, 2019). However, OA publishing is not limited to academic libraries. Public libraries have also begun publishing programs, with a focus on self-publishing, local authors, and community engagement (Conrad, 2017). There are many characteristics of libraries that translate well to publishing roles. As Isaac Gilman argues in “The Evolution of Scholarly Communications Programs,” the growth of academic libraries into publishing is a natural evolution from their more traditional roles as advocates and experts. In fact, libraries are optimal candidates for OA publishers, as they already possess “the knowledge, skills, and resources to effectively manage, preserve, and make accessible collections of scholarly work” (Gilman, 2013, p. 9). Furthermore, OA publishing directly supports many of the core values outlined in the ALA’s Core Values of Librarianship, such as guarding access to information and supporting democratic use and reuse of resources (ALA, 2006). Whatever the motivation, library publishing programs are growing, particularly at institutions that can offer dedicated staff and resources.

Libraries and Open Access

The position of managing the university’s institutional repository (IR) gives libraries an advantage as publishers. As Heather Joseph points out in “Next Steps for IRs and Open Access,” as a platform, IRs help “broadly demonstrate the scientific, social, and economic value of the research, and rais[e] the visibility and prestige of the institution as a whole” (Joseph, 2015, p. 323). IRs have a long history of supporting OA, starting with Cornell

University's arXiv, one of the early precursors to the modern IR. arXiv is a subject-specific repository that launched in 1991 to provide free online access to preprint versions of articles from faculty in physics and mathematics, encouraging immediate publication and long-term preservation (Callicott, Scherer, & Wesolek, 2015). This was a factor in moving the concept of a repository from a storage facility to an active partner in preservation and publication. Since then, IR features have grown to include functionalities like download and usage reports, interactive readership maps, metadata enhancement, and batch importing or exporting.¹ The growth of repository services further encourages library publishing, as libraries can take advantage of an existing service that provides a way “to manage, provide access to, and preserve new forms of digital scholarship otherwise at risk, to nurture innovation in forms of scholarly communication, and to facilitate the preservation and reuse of evidence underlying scholarly work” (Lynch, 2015, p. xi).

Future OA publishing efforts should take care to include diverse perspectives. There are many reasons beyond ethical motivations, although those in themselves are crucial. Diverse viewpoints help prevent a potential “feedback loop in scholarship that privileges and publishes the majority voice, which is often white and male,” as Charlotte Roh summarizes in “Library Publishing and Diversity Values: Changing Scholarly Publishing through Policy and Scholarly Communication Education” (Roh, 2016). There are a number of ways OA publishers can support diversity. Library-supported publishing efforts can seek out publications that feature underrepresented voices, such as Iowa State University Digital Press' *Journal of Critical Thought and Praxis* and the University of Massachusetts Amherst's *Landscapes of Violence*. Librarians can also advocate for diversity efforts by encouraging editors to pay attention to equal opportunities across editorial boards, and by using research guides and workshops to inform faculty and students of issues surrounding diversity and equality in scholarly publishing (Roh, 2016). Libraries can also publicly define their own principles, as the USF Libraries did with [Scholar Commons' Diversity and Inclusion Statement](#). Action is imperative. As Roh states, inclusion is core to why we publish: “Library publishing allows new voices to find their way into disciplinary conversations, reach new audiences, both academic and public, and impact existing and emerging fields of scholarship and practice in a transformative way” (Roh, 2016, p. 83). Publishers, no matter their size, have the power to impact perspectives, work, research, and scholarship. Using this power to create equitable space for underrepresented voices has the potential to transform the OA movement as well as publishing.

¹ USF uses Digital Commons, which provides all of the functionalities listed. Most major IR platforms provide some type of download statistics and metadata enhancement. Institutions must identify distinct needs and requirements for their most effective platform.

While technology has evolved, we are still grappling with some issues from the early days of the OA movement. In Rob Kling and Geoffrey McKim's 1999 article "Scholarly Communication and the Continuum of Electronic Publishing," the authors describe concerns like "legitimacy of electronic publishing and electronic journals; [and] whether electronic publishing will reduce overall costs, expand access to documentary materials, and in that sense democratize" (Kling & McKim, 1999, p. 890). Consistent reliable communication was believed to achieve optimal quality and effectiveness of electric scholarly communication and remain an emphasis of current library publishing programs. Similarly, the basic components of a successful scholarly publishing program haven't changed. In "Reforming Scholarly Publishing and Knowledge Communication: From the Advent of the Scholarly Journal to the Challenges of Open Access," Ana Maria Ramalho Correia and José Carlos Teixeira provide an overview of scholarly publishing history from scholars' works in the early seventeenth century to the burgeoning OA movement in the early 2000s. Ramalho Correia and Carlos Teixeira (2005) observed that the success of the movement would depend on the creation of responsibly managed institutional repositories, open discussion of the advantages of publishing open access, new methods of assessment, and author support. However, as OA collections have grown in complexity and creativity, so have repository options. With digital collections expanding beyond traditional IR platforms, strategies such as reducing and consolidating platforms and collections, migrating multiple collections to a single platform, and implementing cross-platform discovery tools are central considerations of successful IR management (Coalition for Networked Information [CNI], 2017). New opportunities for OA repositories will continue to emerge. A 2017 report from the Confederation of Open Access Repositories (COAR) encouraged a reimagining of the repository's mission and management, "making it more research-centric, open to and supportive of innovation, while also collectively managed by the scholarly community" through "a wider array of roles and functionalities . . . enabled through new levels of web-centric interoperability" (Confederation of Open Access Repositories [COAR], 2017).

DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAM

The USF Libraries' first OA publication was the journal *Numeracy*, which began publishing in 2007. Over a decade later, we host a publishing program that includes journals, textbooks, conference proceedings, and more. All publications are open access. Our program provides many opportunities for us to practice and promote scholarly publishing literacy, from explaining the differences between Creative Commons licenses to discussing marketing methods to exploring strategies for sustainable OA publishing.

At the USF Libraries, publishing activities are run through the department of Digital Scholarship Services (DSS). DSS has 11 full-time employees with a director, 3 faculty members,

and 7 staff members. One faculty member and two staff work with publishing services. GIS and copyright support services are also offered by our department. DSS manages the Libraries' Digital Collections, which consists of reformatted materials from Special Collections and innovative offerings such as original 3-D images. DSS also manages Scholar Commons, USF's institutional repository, which houses our OA publications. DSS created Scholar Commons on the bepress platform Edikit before becoming an early adopter of Digital Commons.

Currently, through Scholar Commons, DSS publishes 21 OA journals in fields from genocide studies to speleology to strategic security. To better support these projects, the DSS publishing team has made an effort to incorporate scholarly publishing literacy principles into our services. The following sections detail examples of our efforts.

The DOAJ Seal: Inviting Conversations on Quality

There must be clear and trusted methods for determining the quality of publications. OA publications have introduced new indicators of quality. With journals at the USF Libraries, we often find ourselves discussing measures like impact factors, which are often considered markers of reputation and quality. At the USF Libraries, we try to frame impact factors as one tool of many that can be used to inform decisions about journal quality. The Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ) provides another potential tool with the DOAJ Seal. The Seal is not intended to represent a journal's editorial standards or academic quality, but rather to highlight journals with generous and clearly stated policies for open access, use/reuse, and authors' rights. Clear definitions and distinctions are key. An impact factor is "a measure of the frequency with which the 'average article' in a journal has been cited in a particular year or period" (Garfield, 1994). The DOAJ Seal "is awarded to a journal that fulfills a set of criteria related to accessibility, openness, discoverability, reuse and author rights" (DOAJ News Service, 2015), and is part of a wider attempt to outline transparency, openness, and best practices in scholarly publishing (COPE, DOAJ, OASPA, & WAME, 2018). It's important to emphasize that these measures involve different evaluation standards for different goals. These discussions require nuance, as impact factor measures can often be contrary to open access. However, these important conversations encourage deeper work toward distinguishing indicators of publishing standards.

At USF, we recommend all our journals work toward publishing practices that would position them to receive the DOAJ Seal. It can be an excellent guide for journal editors who want to encourage best practices within open publishing. To receive the DOAJ Seal, a journal must meet seven requirements:

1. use DOIs as permanent identifiers

2. provide DOAJ with article metadata
3. deposit content with a long-term digital preservation or archiving program
4. embed machine-readable CC licensing information in articles
5. allow generous reuse and mixing of content in accordance with a CC BY, CC BY-SA or CC BY-NC license
6. have a deposit policy registered with a deposit policy registry
7. allow the author to hold the copyright without restrictions (Directory of Open Access Journals, 2019).

Again, the quality being evaluated through these criteria is not the research being performed or published by the journal. Rather, the DOAJ Seal is an indicator of the transparency of a journal's editorial practices. The criteria for the Seal can be used to analyze any journal, regardless of whether it is indexed in DOAJ. Measuring the consistency of a journal's publishing practices can be a subjective way to assess quality. This is particularly useful, as open access journals are constantly battling the notion that they are of lesser quality than traditional journals. Internal factors of the open access publishing movement also come into play, such as the impact of predatory publishers on the legitimacy of open access (Beall, 2013; Beaubien & Eckard, 2014; Bohannon, 2013; Stratford, 2012). There are also other mechanisms to help provide researchers with ways to identify quality journals, such as [Think.Check.Submit](#).

Conversations about the DOAJ Seal are common with our journals at the USF Libraries. Most editors understand impact factors or other traditional modes of journal evaluation but are less familiar with new types of evaluations and how they may be relevant to open access journals, particularly journals hosted through a university library. Throughout the process of applying to DOAJ or obtaining the DOAJ Seal, libraries are able to help journals achieve a recognizable signifier of academic quality while delving into larger issues of quality in scholarly publishing.

Creative Commons: Instruction to Implementation

One way publishers can ensure author rights while empowering open use is to use Creative Commons licenses. Creative Commons (2011) aims “to provide a free, public, and standardized infrastructure that creates a balance between the reality of the Internet and the reality of copyright laws.” Understanding Creative Commons and the larger issues it represents is crucial to helping patrons effectively and legally incorporate research and helping librarians promote open publishing opportunities.

At the USF Libraries, we recommend that journals adopt a Creative Commons license but leave the final decision to the editors. There are many reasons that editors may adopt Creative Commons licenses: to show their support of OA, to protect works while encouraging broader use, due to outside factors, or some combination. In one example, the editors for *Genocide Studies and Prevention* (*GSP*) were submitting the journal for inclusion in DOAJ. They saw that Creative Commons licenses are preferred by DOAJ and required for the Seal. At the time, *GSP* did not use Creative Commons. Authors granted the right to the journal to distribute, display, and archive their work. Switching to a Creative Commons license had been discussed previously by the Editorial Board, but they found it difficult to agree on an appropriate timeline. The DOAJ application became a convenient time to revisit the discussion. First, the *GSP* editors wanted guidance for understanding the different licenses and the adoption process. The USF Libraries offered assistance explaining Creative Commons licenses—what they are, how they work, the differences between the licenses, and why the concept of Creative Commons is so important—and providing general suggestions for which license would be best based on *GSP*'s specific publishing goals and practices.

For background, we recommended that the editors review the Creative Commons licenses (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>). We explained that these licenses allow authors to retain copyright of their work and work legitimately within traditional copyright, and are typically implemented in the USF Libraries' journals with a click-through agreement that precedes each submission. We reiterated that nearly every Creative Commons license requires attribution (BY). This last bit of information seemed to ease some of the editors' concerns that using Creative Commons licenses might open up the possibility that *GSP* articles could be legitimately and legally reproduced and claimed as someone else's work. With a better understanding of Creative Commons, the editors were ready to adopt a license. They reviewed the licenses and, after discussing with the *GSP* Editorial Board, decided which license best served the journal. The editors were also responsible for informing key stakeholders, including authors with submissions in progress. The USF Libraries updated the journal's policies page to include information about the license and created a default rights statement for future articles' submission agreements.

After some consideration, the *GSP* editors decided that using a more open license that also might help the journal qualify for the DOAJ Seal would serve the journal better than a more restrictive license. They adopted a CC BY-NC 4.0 as of Volume 10, Issue 2 in 2016. The click-through agreement was changed to match other journals on Scholar Commons using a CC BY-NC license. There were no reported problems updating the website or informing authors. Readers were able to identify which articles were CC BY-NC licensed on the individual article pages. Overall, the experience was successful. It was also a valuable re-

minder to keep conversations open and accessible, even with established journals. Providing information, being available for questions, and allowing partners to proceed at their own pace gives us flexibility to act as advocate or advisor, depending on the situation.

From DOIs to Download Statistics: Technical Expertise for Library Staff and Journal Editors

Publishing requires varying levels of technical expertise. In print publishing, this includes layout, copyediting, production, printing, distribution, and marketing. Electronic and open access publishing also require these tasks, although they take slightly different forms. For example, the print-ready version of an open access publication is published and made live online instead of being physically printed and distributed. Either way, the technical requirements of publishing must be completed by people with experience. Often, these functions are not included in publishing platforms' default offerings, so library publishing programs must consider the advantages of offering these services through in-house staff or outsourcing to experts. When initially started, Scholar Commons' publishing platform (bepress) did not include layout, copyediting, production, or marketing in its cost of service,² so many technical requirements of publishing are services provided by the USF Libraries. Not only does this keep us knowledgeable about the publishing landscape, but it also enables us to work with faculty in different capacities throughout the publishing process.

One of our standard offerings for open access journals is providing digital object identifiers (DOIs). DOI registration for journal articles and other types of information such as data sets is performed by DSS staff using Crossref. Since this aspect of publishing is done behind the scenes and does not directly involve the editors, some editors are unaware of how DOIs work and what their function is. In contrast, as the ones involved with the technical work of registration, staff are experts at understanding DOIs and their value as persistent identifiers. By asking what a DOI is and why their journal needs them, an editor showed us the importance of explaining the more technical parts of the publishing process. Teaching the editor about DOIs in turn makes the editor better able to explain what they are to other editors, peer reviewers, and authors.

Another area of technical expertise that is handled by our department is tracking and analyzing download statistics. While download statistics are readily available for all authors of journal articles, it can be challenging to understand and determine the impact

² In 2012, bepress began offering their DC Publishing Service: <https://www.bepress.com/a-new-service-from-bepress-dc-publishing-services/>.

of virtual scholarship. This was demonstrated when a *Numeracy* article, “Lewis Carroll and Mathematical Ideals of John Allen Paulos: Review of *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland* (1865) and *Through the Looking-Glass, and What Alice Found There* (1871),” received more than a hundred downloads over just a few days. The editor-in-chief and author discovered that John Allen Paulos himself had tweeted about the article, generating buzz among his followers and resulting in higher-than-usual downloads for the article. The USF Libraries took this opportunity to remind the *Numeracy* editor-in-chief about the possibility of applying Altmetric badges to articles. By introducing an alternate way to analyze article reach, we invited a conversation about the more traditional ways of tracking virtual scholarship downloads. The author of the *Numeracy* article was particularly curious about how download statistics are calculated. We explained that strategies differ depending on who is hosting the materials (for instance, bepress automatically provides usage and download statistics). We also gave him information about Google Analytics to apply to his personal websites. The author was grateful for the insights into the use of virtual scholarship and the suggestions for applying this newly understood skill to future publications.

Working with Altmetrics: A Tool for Analyzing Impact

There are many different ways that research can be evaluated. Altmetrics is a relatively recent supplement to standard download and usage statistics, a new way to consider the impact of an article outside of more traditional metrics such as the Journal Impact Factor (JIF). A simple way to understand altmetrics is to consider how researchers communicate with one another. Before the popularity of social media, most discussions of articles, data sets, and other publications would be in person, through informal and formal meetings and groups. Alternately, research works could be discussed online through less immediately public mediums such as email. The influence of these discussions was not easily tracked. In his Altmetrics Manifesto, Jason Priem explains how those informal conversations can now be tracked with current technology: “That hallway conversation about a recent finding has moved to blogs and social networks—now, we can listen in” (Priem, Taraborelli, Groth, & Neylon, 2010). Since conversations about research have moved online, we can now track who is talking and what they are talking about.

Journal editors and individual authors alike can benefit from altmetrics. An author can see if their research has been shared or discussed on social media and potentially include this information in their tenure and promotion dossier. In a similar way, editors can see if the articles in their journal are being shared on social media. This is important for editors because, aside from the quality and accuracy of its content, the success of a journal is tied to the widespread discussion and citations of its articles. Using altmetrics can help editors

evaluate the impact of their journals and create strategies for marketing and promotion. A feature of the Digital Commons platform is the inclusion of Altmetric badges that can be attached to any article with a DOI. Before PlumX was a default addition to Digital Commons repositories, the USF Libraries decided to add Altmetric badges on items on Scholar Commons. It was as simple as sending a request to bepress. However, we did not want to initiate the functionality to our journals without consulting the journals' editors. We wanted to approach this conversation holistically: explaining what altmetrics is, why it could benefit their journal, and ensuring they knew we were available for any questions or concerns.

We initiated conversations with our journal editors. An initial email contained information about altmetrics, what the Altmetric service offered to the journal, and what the editors would have to do to implement the feature. Many editors opted in immediately. Others were reluctant to add the Altmetric badge, requiring further conversations about potential implications. Even after further conversation, some editors were not persuaded. Only seven of the journals on Scholar Commons include the Altmetric badge. However, these discussions helped us begin conversations about altmetrics and, to a greater degree, how articles and journals are evaluated. We believe this made the entire effort a success.

LESSONS LEARNED

Scholarly Publishing Literacy and Outreach

Considering the changes in scholarly publishing and the increase in library-led publishing, librarians assume a new area of responsibility: scholarly publishing literacy. Day-to-day obstacles provide opportunities for scholarly publishing literacy outreach. This encourages the development of new methods of publishing.

The USF Libraries actively embrace scholarly publishing literacy practices to help our publishing partners with immediate problems while providing information on long-term issues like the process and role of open access. Similarly, we can educate our colleagues about different aspects of scholarly publishing. Together, we can experiment with new publication trends and models. Sharing information and exploring new work are small steps we can take every day toward larger goals in scholarly publishing.

By exploring scholarly publishing literacy outreach strategies that intersect with digital scholarship and information literacy (Zhao, 2014), we chip away at barriers of access and understanding in publishing. We can also create strong publishing partners. At the USF Libraries, our relationships with publishing stakeholders involve many different areas of

scholarly publishing and digital scholarship. The work we do in scholarly communication informs literacy methods that can be shared with colleagues, such as liaison librarians, though more in-depth assessment activities are needed to fully realize these possibilities.

When we build relationships with editors and help them practice scholarly publishing literacy skills, we are creating knowledgeable advocates for the open access movement. This is important, as librarians are often forced to be flexible in assuming different roles with different groups across campus. When faculty can speak to one another about their experiences with open access, it transfers the burden of advocacy from the librarian to faculty members' peers. As noted by Emmett et al. (2011) when speaking about their work passing an open access policy, "the open access movement represents a political and social change process comprising outreach, deliberations, information sharing, education, and negotiations, to identify and solve problems of limited public access to scholarship" (p. 569). Educating, advising, and working in partnership with faculty is the best way for libraries and librarians to inch the open access movement forward. Personal approaches to scholarly publishing encourage an informed and trusting community of practice.

Advising vs. Advocacy

Within librarianship, there is a demanding balance between advising and advocacy. It is not uncommon for librarians working in the scholarly communication field to be advocates for open access. As is evidenced by documents like the NASIG Core Competencies for Scholarly Communication Librarians, even if a scholarly communication librarian is not an advocate, they must harbor a "deep knowledge of the Open Access movement and its impact on the scholarly publishing landscape, digital preservation, relevant metadata schemata and standards, copyright, and the development and implementation of organizational and institutional open access policies" (NASIG, 2017). The OA movement brought scholarly communication librarianship to the forefront. Scholarly publishing existed well before the creation of scholarly communication library positions, which have emerged primarily over the past few decades. The growing trend of librarians moving into roles of OA advocacy caused the influx of scholarly communication librarians.

Libraries' OA advocates have to make a careful distinction between advocacy and advising. Even the most enthusiastic advocate must acknowledge that there are impediments to full-scale uptake of open access within academia, such as misconceptions on the quality of OA publications, the issue of predatory journals, and traditional evaluation protocols in the tenure and promotion process. These examples stem from many different places, from tenure and promotion committees to commercial publishing interests. While it is important for librarians to advocate for open access, it is also important to consider the needs of our patrons. To help faculty advance their career, we may need to shift away from advocacy.

That may mean suggesting publication avenues behind a paywall that a tenure and promotion committee may expect, or being flexible with what materials faculty can contribute to the IR. Advising may be better suited than advocacy to these situations. Advising means providing information that is in the researcher's best interest at that moment. This might be different than what a librarian thinks is the ideal option. This balance between movement advocacy and situational advising requires work, but we've found the results to be worth the effort. At the USF Libraries, consultations related to scholarly publishing explore solutions for our patrons. Serving their interests first invites trust and encourages researchers to see librarians as partners, building future allies.

Advising is compatible with advocating. Through advising, librarians can gain a comprehensive understanding of a researcher's needs, goals, and challenges. Librarians can then better understand situations where advocating for open access would be more appropriate, perhaps by introducing examples of quality library-published scholarly materials in a researcher's area of expertise. This invites further collaboration that could include open access options—a more stable and sustainable long-term outcome.

Preparing for the Future

It is an exciting time for library publishing. Opportunities abound for new projects in new forms with new collaborators. What will support us in future endeavors are our mistakes from previous efforts. Each time we work through a new obstacle related to scholarly publishing literacy, we gain experience that can be applied to our next project. Working with editors unfamiliar with Creative Commons was challenging at first. However, now we include Creative Commons discussions in early stages of projects to help editors and authors consider these concepts from the start. We have worked with editors who are solely focused on the goal of getting an impact factor, to the point that other analysis metrics are ignored. We now know that conversations about journal impact should be approached holistically, with emphasis on traditional (impact factor) and newer (altmetrics) measures. When previous publications were uploaded to our repository without much direct communication with their authors, we missed an opportunity to teach faculty about permissions issues and author rights. Moving forward, we can incorporate these conversations into our workflow, setting projects up for success and enlisting enthusiastic, knowledgeable partners for future collaborations.

Taking actions based on what worked and improving future decisions based on what didn't helps us constantly improve and strengthen our publishing program. Our definition of publishing is constantly changing. To ensure success, projects require stability through careful planning throughout the research life cycle. Understanding the scholarly publishing

landscape encourages us to explore new publishing outlets and opportunities. To support these explorations, scholarly publishing literacy should be a core tenet of library services, integrated into formal outreach and informal conversations.

NEXT STEPS

Digital Scholarship Services at the USF Libraries is committed to scholarly publishing literacy. To this end, there must be a continued emphasis on literacy from all employees at the USF Libraries. Literacy in scholarly publishing and scholarly communication must take place throughout the library, at all levels and in all departments. This is not an area that should be solely relegated to reference librarians, liaison librarians, or other roles traditionally in charge of information literacy efforts.

Assessment needs more careful observation. Can you assess scholarly publishing literacy instruction in the same way as traditional information literacy? Not necessarily. Traditional assessment of information literacy often involves a survey instrument given to students after an information literacy course. The nature of scholarly publishing literacy at the USF Libraries necessitates a different approach. Most of our scholarly publishing literacy efforts take place outside traditional courses. Faculty and editorial board members, our target demographic for scholarly publishing literacy efforts, are too busy to attend a formal workshop. Additionally, the exact needs of faculty members depend on their department, position, and research interests. This makes it challenging to structure a lesson in a group setting. Instead, information sessions are more spontaneous, taking place when and where they're needed. Subsequently, assessment follows the same informal approach, taking the form of casual check-ins to determine if needs were met or if additional assistance is required.

Other next steps involve discussions with editors on other aspects of publishing, such as ethical considerations of diversity and privacy. Informed by the Library Publishing Coalition Ethical Framework Task Force's (2018) "Ethical Framework for Library Publishing, these steps include actions like creating a framework for journal editors and helping them draft statements on dedication to topics of diversity, academic freedom, and accessibility. These issues are being faced by all publishers. Publishers, editors, and authors working with open access should see themselves as forerunners in these ethical topics of publishing, especially when they originate within the academy.

There is incredible potential for how library publishing can support our academic communities. With trusted and wide-ranging areas of staff expertise, libraries engaged in publishing and open access initiatives have the opportunity to shape the way that quality scholarly output is created and shared. First, we must ground our expectations and understand our

respective situations. From there, we can imagine new initiatives, work through issues, and collaborate to grow stronger. To achieve our potential in a constantly changing landscape, education and literacy should remain a consistent focus. We believe that libraries share responsibility for all types of information literacy, including scholarly publishing literacy. The success of libraries' open publishing efforts depends on the transformation of scholarly publishing literacy services from supplementary to central.

REFERENCES

- American Library Association. (2006). Core values of librarianship. Retrieved from <http://www.ala.org/advocacy/intfreedom/corevalues>
- Beall, J. (2013). The open-access movement is not really about open access. *tripleC*, *11*(2), 589–597. <https://doi.org/10.31269/triplec.v11i2.525>
- Beaubien, S., Eckard, M. (2014). Addressing faculty publishing concerns with open access journal quality indicators. *Journal of Librarianship and Scholarly Communication*, *2*(2), eP1133. <https://doi.org/10.7710/2162-3309.1133>
- Bohannon, J. (2013). Who's afraid of peer review? *Science*, *342*(6154), 60–65. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.342.6154.60>
- Callicott, B., Scherer, D., & Wesolek, A. (2015). Introduction. In B. Callicott, D. Scherer, & A. Wesolek (Eds.), *Making institutional repositories work* (pp. xv–xxvi). West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt1wf4drg.4>
- Coalition for Networked Information. (2017). Rethinking institutional repository strategies: Report of a CNI Executive Roundtable held April 2 & 3, 2017. Retrieved from <https://www.cni.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/CNI-rethinking-irs-exec-rndtbl.report.S17.v1.pdf>
- Committee on Publication Ethics, the Directory of Open Access Journals, the Open Access Scholarly Publishers Association, and the World Association of Medical Editors. (2018). *Principles of transparency and best practice in scholarly publishing*. Retrieved from <https://oaspa.org/information-resources/principles-of-transparency-and-best-practice-in-scholarly-publishing/>
- Confederation of Open Access Repositories. (2017). Next generation repositories. Retrieved from <https://www.coar-repositories.org/activities/advocacy-leadership/working-group-next-generation-repositories/>
- Conrad, K. M. (2017). Public libraries as publishers: Critical opportunity. *Journal of Electronic Publishing*, *20*(1). <https://doi.org/10.3998/3336451.0020.106>
- Creative Commons. (2011). The power of open. Retrieved from <http://thepowerofopen.org/>

Directory of Open Access Journals. (2019). Information for publishers: What is the DOAJ Seal of Approval for Open Access Journals (the DOAJ Seal)? Retrieved from <https://doaj.org/publishers#seal>

Directory of Open Access Journals News Service. DOAJ Seal is now live on the site [Blog post]. (2015, June 11). Retrieved from <https://blog.doaj.org/2015/06/11/doaj-seal-is-now-live-on-the-site/>

Emmett, A., Stratton, J., Peterson, A. T., Church-Duran, J., & Haricombe, L. J. (2011). Toward open access: It takes a “village.” *Journal of Library Administration*, 51(5–6), 557–579. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01930826.2011.589345>

Garfield, E. (1994). *The Clarivate Analytics Impact Factor*. Retrieved from <https://clarivate.com/essays/impact-factor/>

Gilman, I. (2013). The evolution of scholarly communication programs. In I. Gilman (Ed.), *Library scholarly communication programs* (pp. 3–14). Oxford, UK: Chandos Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1533/9781780633831>

Joseph, H. (2015). Next steps for IRs and open access. In B. Callicott, D. Scherer, & A. Wesolek (Eds.), *Making institutional repositories work* (pp. 323–328). West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt1wf4drg.3>

Kling, R., & McKim, G. (1999). Scholarly communication and the continuum of electronic publishing. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science*, 50(10), 890–906. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1097-4571\(1999\)50:10%3C890::AID-ASI6%3E3.0.CO;2-8](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1097-4571(1999)50:10%3C890::AID-ASI6%3E3.0.CO;2-8)

Library Publishing Coalition Ethical Framework Task Force. (2018). *An ethical framework for library publishing, version 1.0*. Atlanta, GA: Educopia. <https://doi.org/10.5703/1288284316777>

Lynch, C. (2015). Foreword: A few reflections on the evolution of institutional repositories. In D. S. Burton, B. Callicott, & A. Wesolek (Eds.), *Making institutional repositories work*. West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt1wf4drg.3>

North American Serials Interest Group. (2017). NASIG core competencies for scholarly communication librarians. Retrieved from https://www.nasig.org/site_page.cfm?pk_association_webpage_menu=310&pk_association_webpage=9435

Piowar, H., Priem, J., Larivière, V., Alperin, J.P., Matthias, L., Norlander, B., . . . Haustein, S. (2018). The state of OA: A large-scale analysis of the prevalence and impact of open access articles. *PeerJ*, 6, e4375. <https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.4375>

Priem, J., Taraborelli, D., Groth, P., & Neylon, C. (2010). Altmetrics: A manifesto. Retrieved from <http://altmetrics.org/manifesto>

Ramalho Correia, A. M., & Carlos Teixeira, J. (2005). Reforming scholarly publishing and knowledge communication. *Online Information Review*, 29(4), 349–364. <https://doi.org/10.1108/14684520510617802>

Roh, C. (2016). Library publishing and diversity values: Changing scholarly publishing through policy and scholarly communication education. *College and Research Libraries News*, 77(2), 82–85. <https://doi.org/10.5860/crln.77.2.9446>

Stratford, M. (2012, March 4). “Predatory” online journals lure scholars who are eager to publish. *Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/article/Predatory-Online-Journals/131047/>

Suber, P. (2012). *Open access*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. <https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/9286.001.0001>

The Library Publishing Coalition Directory Committee (Ed.). (2019). *Library publishing directory 2019*. Atlanta, GA: Library Publishing Coalition.

Zhao, L. (2014). Riding the wave of open access: Providing library research support for scholarly publishing literacy. *Australian Academic & Research Libraries*, 45(1), 3–18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00048623.2014.882873>