

A Resonant Message: Aligning Scholar Values and Open Access Objectives in OA Policy Outreach to Faculty and Graduate Students

Jane Johnson Otto

Scholarly Open Access Repository Librarian, Rutgers University

INTRODUCTION Faculty contribution to the institutional repository is a major limiting factor in the successful provision of open access to scholarship, and thus to the advancement of research productivity and progress. Many have alluded to outreach messages through studies examining faculty concerns that underlie their reluctance to contribute, but *specific* open access messages demonstrated to resonate most with faculty have not been discussed with sufficient granularity. Indeed, many faculty benefits and concerns are likely either unknown to the faculty themselves, or unspoken, so the literature's record of faculty benefits and perceptions of open access remains incomplete at best. **DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAM** At Rutgers University, we have developed a targeted message that both addresses these unspoken/unknown concerns and benefits and speaks to the promise and inevitability of open access in a changing scholarly communication landscape. This paper details that message and its rationale, based on a critical review of the literature currently informing outreach programs, in order to provoke further discussion of specific outreach messages and the principles underlying them. **NEXT STEPS** A robust scholarly communication organization, open access policy advisory board, expanded outreach, and sustained momentum will be critical to ensuring success with measurable outcomes. Metrics used to evaluate both OA policy implementation efforts and institutional repositories should be reevaluated in light of the governing objectives of open access outreach efforts and tools. It is hoped that a reassessment of the message and the metrics will better align both with the true promise and prerequisites of open access.

Received: 07/09/2016 Accepted: 11/23/2016

Correspondence: Jane Johnson Otto, Technical and Automated Services, Libraries Technical Services Building, 47 Davidson Road, Piscataway, NJ 08854-5603, jjotto@rutgers.edu



© 2016 Otto. This open access article is distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

INTRODUCTION

The goal of the Open Access movement, as described by Stevan Harnad, is to maximize research uptake, usage, and impact (Harnad, 2010). In so doing, open access advances research productivity and progress, bringing benefits to researchers, their institutions, the research itself, and society (Self-Archiving FAQ, n.d.). Open access is also a growth area for libraries. The SPARC¹ triumvirate of open access, open education, and open data can bring relevance to libraries in a time when the perceived value of printed books in bricks and mortar facilities is diminishing.

Open access is moving forward. Originating in part as a response to the serials crisis, the open access movement has generated vast changes to the scholarly communication landscape. The first institutional mandates were introduced in 2003 and 2004, and today there are hundreds of policies on record. The National Institutes of Health's public access policy, first proposed by Congress in 2004, was adopted as a "mere request or encouragement" in 2005, strengthened into a mandate in 2008 (Suber, 2012), and by 2013 NIH was instituting penalties for non-compliance (Van Noorden, 2014). Owing to the OSTP Public Access Memo of 2013 (Executive Office, 2013), the number of funders requiring open access to funded research is on the rise. Institutional repositories have been growing in number;² researchers are increasingly able to discover repository contents using tools like Google Scholar, and ORCID iD is showing great promise for disambiguating scholars and collocating their works. Emerging tools that advance and interact with scholars and repositories are increasingly being developed and bought up by publishers committed to identifying new business models to replace the old.³

Despite changes on many fronts, one perennial fact remains: faculty participation is key to the success of open access (Covey, 2011). Yet evidence is repeatedly produced to demonstrate resistance on the part of faculty to contributing their scholarship to their

¹ SPARC (the Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition, <http://sparcopen.org/>) is an international alliance of academic and research libraries which promotes open access to scholarship; it was developed by the Association of Research Libraries. (Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition, n.d.)

² Jain (2010) listed 413 repositories in North America in September, 2009, and 433 six months later (as cited in Dubinsky, 2014, p. 4). In October, 2013, Dubinsky (2014) found 515 repositories in North America, and today (July, 2016), the number stands at 581.

³ See, for example, Elsevier's acquisition of Mendeley (2013) and SSRN (2016). "Elsevier has been pursuing a strategy of reducing the share of its revenues coming from content and increasing the share coming from analytics and other services, as its chairman Y.S. Chi described clearly at the Research Library UK conference in 2014." (Schonfeld, R.C., 2016, May 17)

institutional repositories (Mark & Shearer, 2006; Jantz & Wilson, 2008; Salo, 2008; Covey, 2011; Cullen & Chawner, 2011). The literature reports that faculty are unaware of the repository or misunderstand its role, lack technical skills, perceive OA scholarship as inferior in quality, or have concerns about copyright, multiple version proliferation, plagiarism, workload, or their publishers. Some library studies blame inertia (Ferreira, M., Baptista, A. A., Rodrigues, E., & Saraiva, R., 2008; Harnad, n.d., as cited in Swan & Brown, 2004, p. 224). Other negative factors reported include faculty age, lack of self-archiving experience, and disciplinary cultural diversity. Often, negative factors and positive factors coincide; one person's motivator is another person's barrier.⁴

Much of this information on faculty resistance is based on surveys of faculty that are apparently meant to inform or serve as the basis for outreach messaging and programs. Yet a careful review of this literature reveals flaws. Nearly 15 years of surveys repeatedly asking many of the same OA-related questions generate faculty responses that at first glance seem largely repetitive, but on closer inspection, seem varied, illogical, conflicting, and confused. Morris and Thorn's excellent survey (2009) broke new ground by asking faculty for significant detail in their responses; in so doing the authors exposed a startling degree of confusion as to the very definitions of open access, self-archiving, and institutional repositories, and thereby cast a shadow over many published faculty survey findings that preceded and followed. In the end, Covey's succinct summary of some common faculty comments on self-archiving rings true: Don't know about it; don't understand it; not interested; too risky; don't have to; nobody else is (Covey, 2011).

Virtually all of the library studies in this area beg the question, "Have these stakeholders been fully informed?" In fact, research repeatedly shows that faculty resistance to OA and self-archiving and a lack of understanding or awareness go hand in hand (Yang & Li, 2015; Creaser, 2010; Swan & Brown, 2004; Swan & Brown, 2005). Peter Suber (2012) puts it very simply: "the largest obstacle to OA is misunderstanding. The largest cause of misunderstanding is lack of familiarity, and the largest cause of unfamiliarity is preoccupation. Everyone is busy" (p. x). A compelling message is required, one that provides a clear picture of open access and self-archiving in the context of universal open access objectives; it should take into account the shifting scholarly communication landscape and anticipate an evolution in faculty attitudes. The bottom line is, "the primary reason that scholars publish is to make their research findings widely available for others to read and

⁴ For example, self-archiving takes less time than sending out copies of an article on request, but checking publisher policies "takes too long" (Covey, 2011, p. 11). Kim (2011) found that age was negatively associated with self-archiving (p. 1909) whereas Cullen and Chawner (2011) found rates of deposit were higher in older age groups (p. 467).

build upon” (Swan & Brown, 2005, p. 23). Happily, this coincides with the objectives of open access.

Many have called for more and better outreach programs, and the time is ripe for a more in-depth look at effective faculty outreach messages within those programs: messages on open access, institutional open access policies, self-archiving, and repositories. This article is meant to fill a gap in the literature by detailing the particulars of the specific open access outreach message delivered at one university: Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey. Secondarily, through a critical review of the literature, it offers a rationale as to why this particular approach might be effective.

The author makes no claim that the outreach message described here is better than any other; even evidence of its own efficacy remains, for the most part, unavoidably anecdotal. The Rutgers University Open Access Policy covers roughly 15,000 scholars across four chancellor-led units in campuses across the state, including scholars in Rutgers Cooperative Extension county offices in all 21 New Jersey counties. Of these 15,000 scholars, the author and her Libraries colleagues have spoken to several hundred individuals, perhaps a thousand at most. The Rutgers OA message is delivered in a number of different venues, many of which cross disciplines (new faculty orientations, deans’ councils, outreach tables at faculty dining halls, etc.), so we cannot correlate upticks in deposits by department or individual; because presentations are frequent and ongoing, neither can we correlate OA leads or inquiries to presentations.

Additionally, many factors impact the degree of faculty engagement with open access and the level at which faculty choose to contribute content to an institutional repository. For example, the Rutgers institutional repository, RUcore, was launched in 2007, and since that time, repository functionalities have improved, new services have been offered, a new website was launched, an open access policy was passed and went into effect, outreach strategies and materials were developed, a communication plan was put in place, and outreach efforts intensified. Finally, the Rutgers OA outreach message changed over time. The initial and ongoing message for several years originated in the technical services area, was primarily intended for content recruitment, and emphasized the repository and preservation. Later, in the early stages of the University Senate’s open access policy initiative, a new message was developed. This time, as leaders of a Senate policy initiative, the faculty librarians sought to inform audiences about open access and open access policies so as to elicit questions and concerns that might be addressed and mitigated before the Policy came to a vote on the Senate floor; there was no attempt to recruit content for the repository. The Senate’s Open Access Policy resolution passed in fall, 2012, and the University president signed off on it in February, 2013. Then commenced an implementation planning phase of over a year

during which the IR's scholarship portal SOAR (Scholarly Open Access at Rutgers) was developed (itself a platform for promotion), along with additional publicity materials and strategies. Outreach presentations were less frequent during this period, and the older technical services-driven messaging continued to be conducted occasionally. In mid-2014 we began gearing up for a January 1, 2015 "soft launch" of SOAR, with a more active outreach program, including recruitment of content from Libraries faculty (primarily to confirm the system was working optimally) and later departmental faculty. Around this time the older messaging was halted and the entire outreach program was centralized and coordinated to ensure that a single unified message would be delivered university-wide. This message is meant to increase understanding of open access and to encourage compliance with the Rutgers Open Access Policy, to the extent possible. Its character is reflected not only in its content but in its tone, which is never evangelistic but always positive: "it's all good." For more details on the later phases of the Rutgers outreach program (from the introduction of the open access initiative in the Senate through the implementation planning phase), see Mullen and Otto (2014, March and 2015, March), discussed in more detail in the literature review. The open access policy message delivered today, part of an OA outreach program that commenced in earnest September 1, 2015 (the date the Open Access Policy went into effect), is the focus of this paper.

Before proceeding, and especially in light of previous ambiguities, it would seem useful to set forth a few definitions. For the purposes of this discussion, **Open Access (OA)** is *free online access to peer-reviewed research journal articles* (Harnad, 2015) *and similar scholarship*. An **institutional repository (IR)** is a *digital archive of the intellectual product created by the faculty, research staff, and students of an institution and made available open access* (Crow, 2002, p. 16). **Self-archiving** is the *act of depositing the full text of peer-reviewed research journal articles and similar scholarship, with some metadata, into an institutional repository by the paper's author or an author-assigned designee (such as an administrative assistant or graduate student)*. It does not include entry into the IR via automated harvesting or manual upload, processing, and ingest by library staff. Self-archiving is also known as "green Open Access" (Harnad, 2015). In this paper, the terms **Outreach** and **Outreach programs** refer to libraries' systematic, often comprehensive, efforts to provide information on open access to the university community, and particularly to faculty and other scholars, in hopes of increasing engagement with open access and/or contributions to the institutional repository. That part of an outreach program that has a primary emphasis on solicitation of scholarly papers for the IR is **content recruitment**. **Outreach message** refers to the specific content, language, and tone of the communications offered through outreach programs.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Outreach Programs

Numerous authors have discussed strategies for increasing IR uptake, and many recommend an outreach program for open access or an OA policy implementation. Almost nothing has been said, however, on the specific message to be disseminated. As early as 2005, Bell, Foster, and Gibbons were proposing new outreach strategies based on a small study of faculty across disciplines. The authors entered the project thinking to offer faculty a “simpler way” to provide secure storage, preservation, cataloging, retrieval, and delivery, in other words, what librarians “do best.” Instead they discovered that these terms do not connote value to faculty. Nonetheless a number of their findings still ring true today: outreach librarians must be able to speak confidently in understandable terms, be prepared to answer any questions that might arise, and realize that the information most critical for faculty to know will likely be the information they fail to ask about. There must be a trained cadre of liaisons to consistently deliver a standard, accurate, and “field-tested” message; and that message should *speak directly to faculty members’ highest hopes*. Perhaps most importantly: faculty will not participate in what they do not understand. Interestingly, their findings are based on faculty observation and interviews, and not on a survey; however, like many writing on outreach and open access, Bell et al. (2005) put a particular focus on the institutional repository. Mercer, Rosenblum, and Emmett (2007) focused on various methods for content recruitment and IR promotion, including gathering of feedback through relationship building with authors and communities, early adopter focus groups, presentations to academic units and governing bodies, use of ambassadors and liaisons, one-on-one consultations with faculty, “train the trainer” workshops, a one-stop shop website, and continuing assessment. Although it describes a thoughtful outreach program that remains valuable today, the paper does not detail the actual outreach message. Jones, Andrew, and MacColl (2006) discuss IR advocacy and content recruitment strategies based on Rogers’ *Diffusion of Innovations* theory; they suggest developing a baseline survey of research material already available on institutional web pages, various venues for raising awareness, targeted content recruitment, etc. Gierveld (2006) took a comprehensive marketing and communications approach to institutional repositories. Noting that IRs are “not developed in response to a market demand,” she discusses repositories in the context of the four P’s of marketing and the eight P’s of social marketing,⁵ and in particular, the product (the IR) and its promotion using a four-strand communication approach of profiling, pull, push, and consultation strategies. Ferreira et al. (2008) described a four-pronged strategic plan developed by University of Minho to

⁵ Social marketing is marketing that attempts to influence ideas, attitudes and/or behaviors for the greater good (non-smoking campaigns, for example).

create a successful IR, with the first component being “develop a promotional plan for the repository and open access in general” (Measures to Increase Adoption section, para. 3). However, the article took a broader view and did not describe specifics of the outreach message itself. Cryer and Collins (2011), in discussing librarians’ potential roles in open access landscape development, suggested several opportunities and venues for outreach, but did not delve into the specifics of any outreach message. Vandegrift and Colvin’s 2012 short paper has a similar focus and includes broad recommendations for developing a scholarly communication program, but very little about the specific message, other than passing mention of authors’ rights and soliciting publications for the IR. Ramirez and Miller (2013) presented some marketing basics and offered case studies, with analysis, from several universities marketing IRs on their campuses, but again nothing was said about the specific messages employed. Confederation of Open Access Repositories (COAR) (2013) offers sustainable practices for populating repositories in the form of an eight-point program that starts with advocacy. Recognizing that “at the forefront of advocacy efforts is the message,” the authors propose “the message that resonates with almost all audiences”: *repositories* increase exposure and visibility (emphasis added). The report offers a general framework for an advocacy message and, among other things, recommends continually articulating the benefits and responses to common objections in researchers’ own language.⁶ As we shall see, this is a common theme (although often implicit) in the literature. Mullen and Otto (2014) document as a case study the Rutgers experience in passing an OA policy resolution and discuss elements of their outreach message with recommendations (notably, to remove the focus from libraries, IRs, and the serials crisis and place it “squarely on those issues most important to faculty”). They note the value of moving the conversation forward incrementally while building consensus over time and suggest the importance of tone: “friendly research-backed discussion” addressing misinformation while suggesting “easy staff-assisted workflows,” along with a constant reminder that open access at Rutgers will happen “to the extent possible.” A year later Mullen and Otto (2015) reported on the communication plan and outreach program that followed passage of the policy as part of an implementation planning phase, but do not discuss the specific message in detail. Perhaps the work providing the best guidance as to message is Peter Suber’s comprehensive *Open Access* (2012), in that it provides the rich background that furthers understanding of OA, but also strikes a particular positive tone of openness and optimism that may be key to an effective OA message.⁷

⁶ Foster & Gibbons (2005) also speak to the disconnect between terminologies used by librarians and those used by faculty, and Palmer, Teffeu, and Newton (2008) cite the need to translate “IR jargon” (p. 18).

⁷ As just one example, he favors the term ‘open access’ over ‘barrier-free access’ because he wants to emphasize the positive and not the negative (p. 4).

In summary, there are few articles on OA outreach per se and almost nothing about the outreach message itself. However, much has been said or implied about outreach messaging in the literature on IRs, content recruitment, and faculty perceptions of OA and IRs. The following section reviews some of this literature, examining common methodologies and themes, as well as their implications for an effective outreach message.

What Drives the Outreach Message? A Critique of the Literature

Much of what has been written on outreach messaging is embedded in articles about content recruitment for the IR and particularly works seeking to gauge faculty perceptions of open access topics through surveys. Although surveys were certainly conducted much earlier, Nabe's 2010 *Starting, Strengthening, and Managing Institutional Repositories: a How-To-Do-It Manual*, in its marketing and recruitment chapter, explicitly recommended that librarians learn about their audience via a formal assessment, "most likely a survey" that (among other things) would identify perceptions of the IR service, benefits of the IR, and aspects of the IR that do not appeal to the contributor pool (p. 63-64). The recommendation to use these faculty-perceived benefits/obstacles as the basis of an outreach message is sometimes explicit (as with Nabe and the COAR report mentioned earlier), but often implicit. Whichever the case, a closer look at dozens of these surveys reveals certain patterns and a number of flaws.

First, open access is a complex topic and not well understood by academics, yet many surveys fail to define the term.⁸ In a single survey instrument, survey authors often include questions on a variety of OA topics, including green OA, gold OA, OA journals, OA publishing, funder OA policies, "a journal's open access policy" (Banks & Persily, 2010), and OA mandates, then ask faculty to quickly check off their perceptions of "open access." Particularly confusing are surveys that equate open access publishing with self-archiving (Miller, 2006, p. 107), conflate "open access journals" and "open access literature" (Yang & Li, 2015, p. 22), describe repository deposit as a form of OA publishing (Yang & Li, 2015, questions 6 and 22), consider website postings (individual or departmental) a form of self-archiving (Miller, 2006, p. 107; Kim, 2010), or call the NIH public access policy a "modified form" of open access publishing (Banks & Persily, 2010). Kocken & Wical (2013) allowed faculty respondents to use their own definitions of OA in replying to their survey; they found that none of the faculty-provided definitions "came close" to the Budapest Open Access Initiative (BOAI); "the majority of respondents displayed only a limited understanding of the topic" and "more than 30% of respondents were unable to provide even a basic definition" (p. 145).

⁸ For example, Kocken & Wical (2013). Not all published studies append the actual survey, but the questions and the answer options themselves often belie the fact that the term's meaning is unclear, perhaps even to the authors.

Second, a majority of these surveys are based largely on earlier surveys or findings and repeat many of the same questions (for example, “What are barriers to self-archiving?”) and answer options (“Don’t know the deposit process,” “Repository would have low prestige,” etc.). In so doing they fail to account for the evolving scholarly communication environment. As that environment changes, faculty attitudes can shift, more self-archiving options become available, many old barriers no longer apply,⁹ and new reasons to self-archive come to light. By continually recycling older surveys as models, librarians reinforce the earlier findings, even to the point of “confirming” perceived barriers to self-archiving that have become fallacious or obsolete. Emmett, Stratton, Peterson, Church-Duran and Haricombe (2011) noted that many of the issues raised by faculty were simply “misunderstandings of basic points” that could be addressed through carefully crafted responses (p. 562). Some of the most commonly cited obstacles to self-archiving were never really obstacles at all; anxiety about the technical aspects of the deposit process, concerns about ‘quality’ issues, worries about intellectual property rights, and copyright infringement were cited as early as 2001 (Pinfield, 2001; Pinfield, 2003, as cited in Swan & Brown, 2004, p. 224). Shortly thereafter Swan and Brown (2004) noted, “none of these issues constitute real barriers” (p. 224). It’s not clear, then, why librarians would continue to discuss them with faculty. Serving up lists of so-called self-archiving “barriers” could alienate uninformed faculty who in other contexts and with more information might well embrace open access and its prerequisites. Librarians presenting these barriers could also inadvertently place themselves on the defense, attempting to rebut arguments against open access that could easily be preempted by simply promoting the broad objectives and inevitability of open access and answering concerns as they arise.

Third, a “significant emotional overtone” has been observed in many OA discussions (Brown, 2010, p. 112), and biases of one sort or another can creep into survey questions and response options. In their survey of academics’ awareness of the NIH public access policy and “the open access movement,” Banks and Persily (2010) found that despite their best efforts to vet the questions and avoid leading or suggestive language, “the wording of the questions may have inadvertently influenced the results” (p. 256).

Perhaps most importantly, as Schonfeld and Housewright have noted (2010), “substantive change to the scholarly communication system is ... unlikely to be driven by faculty attitudes alone; cultural and process changes at the highest level of the university will be needed to realign incentives and institute broad reform” (p. 26). Cultural and process changes beyond

⁹ For example, in 2013 faculty were still being asked if they were using the IR for searching, or referring students to it, even though Google Scholar is now the means to search across repositories (Singh, F. W., Abrizah, A., & Karim, N. H. A., 2013, p. 29, 30).

the university, such as the OSTP Public Access Memo of 2013, will also come into play. Faculty members cannot be expected to lead transformative change in scholarly communication (Schonfeld & Housewright, 2010, p. 33), and librarians might wish to look beyond faculty perceptions of OA in crafting their outreach message. One place to start might be one of the earliest formal statements of the benefits of self-archiving, found amongst the Web pages of the Budapest Open Access Initiative:

Maximizing public access to research findings maximizes their visibility, usage and impact, maximizes research dissemination, application and growth, and hence research productivity and progress. Thus it brings benefits to researchers and their institutions (in terms of prestige, prizes, salary, and grant revenue), to the research itself, and to society (Self-Archiving FAQ, n.d.)

Finally, the library literature in this area tends to focus on the institutional repository. As evidenced in the literature review, content recruitment in particular is often discussed in terms of promoting the institutional repository instead of promoting open access. For example see Phillips, Carr, and Teal (2005, p. 302) (libraries are the ideal proponent to “promote University repositories”), Foster and Gibbons (2005, para. 7) (research has “caused a complete rethinking of how we should explain and promote our IR”), Mercer et al. (2007) (“a multifaceted approach to promote a university repository”), and Covey (2011, abstract) (“marketing the institutional repository”). One paper describes the librarian’s outreach role in part “to communicate the mission of the repository to faculty” (Palmer, Tefteau, and Newton, 2008, p. 16). More specifically, benefits of open access are often described to faculty as benefits of the institutional repository. A typical view is “The three most essential benefits [to an IR] are increased access, more visibility, and better preservation” (Nabe, 2010, p. 68). Foster and Gibbon’s heavily cited 2005 article on improving content recruitment for institutional repositories never once mentions the term “open access.”

This library-centric approach may not play well to faculty, who don’t know what an institutional repository is and, arguably, don’t care. Creaser (2010) reported significant faculty ignorance of IRs and what they do. Morris and Thorn’s 2009 survey found a startling number of faculty who could not distinguish a repository from a web page, publisher, licensed collection (such as JSTOR), or search service (e.g. Elsevier’s Scopus). Several respondents named Wikipedia as a repository. When asked to name the three repositories they had most recently searched, nearly a third of respondents (31.25%) named references that were not repositories at all.

“Institutional repository” is a “somewhat clumsy and uninspiring” term (Nabe, 2010, p. 65) that implies a system designed to support the needs of the institution rather than authors (Foster & Gibbons, 2005); Jantz and Wilson (2008) suggested changing the name to one that

suggests a connection to scholarship. Many have noted that faculty express little interest in the IR (Foster & Gibbons, 2005; Jantz & Wilson, 2008), and no wonder. To some, ‘repository’ implies that work goes in but does not come out (Covey, 2011 p. 9). The repository is merely a tool to facilitate open access, and not an end in itself to be defended or promoted to faculty. When librarians speak to faculty about “institutional repository benefits” instead of “open access benefits,” they may be missing an opportunity to speak to the array of things valued by faculty (i.e. positive motivators) that coincide with the principles of universal open access to scholarship. A focus on the repository can divert focus from the overall governing objective of open access, turning the outreach message into a reactive appeal (by libraries for content) rather than a proactive call to arms to reform scholarly communication and advance research.

DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAM

At Rutgers University, we have crafted a succinct and targeted message for talking to faculty about open access, the Rutgers open access policy, and the IR’s scholarship portal, SOAR (Scholarly Open Access at Rutgers), always discussing the three topics hand-in-hand.¹⁰ Our primary objective has been to fully inform faculty so that they were motivated to make the open access choice, whether that was to endorse a policy about to be proposed, or (later) to contribute to the repository once the policy was in effect. Rather than take the role of flag-waving evangelists, we intended, in the words of Thomas Jefferson, to present “the common sense of the subject, in terms so plain and firm as to command their assent” (Jefferson, 1825).

Over the course of the open access initiative, between fall 2011 and the time of this writing, Laura Bowering Mullen and the author (a pairing of public services and technical services librarians, respectively) have led systematic communication and implementation efforts, speaking with hundreds of faculty and others about open access, the policy, and (once it was developed) SOAR. The message, even as it evolved, sustained from the start a level of consistency that essentially rendered it a form of branding. The targeted, focused message was delivered in multiple modes, including print, email, and PowerPoint presentations,

¹⁰ Our message was shaped in large part by science librarian and open access specialist Laura Bowering Mullen, and honed by four years of presentations (delivered by her and the author) about open access to hundreds of faculty, as well as graduate students, staff, alumni, and administrators, from 2011 to the present. Mullen’s 2010 monograph *Open Access and its Practical Impact on the Work of Academic Librarians* provided a nuanced discussion of the attitudes, behaviors, and requirements of librarians in this changing scholarly communication environment. It anticipated many of the changes and convergences now occurring in scholarly communication, as well as their impacts on all aspects of the library profession, and the need for librarians to take a more active role in all areas of open access that will affect academic libraries.

but always featuring the same content from the same people, the same faces, with the same contact information. The presentations were as much about listening as about talking. We welcome and enjoy engagement, positive or negative, and tell our audiences so; even negative engagement is preferable to none.¹¹ As we gained experience, the message was continually honed and perfected based on audience responses and, as expected, these evolved over time. We became experts in gauging the “feel of the audience,” and while responses often came in the form of questions following a presentation, we were also rigorous observers of subtle changes in attitude evidenced by facial expression, attentiveness level, body language, and actions.¹² Audience receptions were carefully analyzed in regular post-mortems that immediately followed each event; we would talk about what worked and what didn’t, bouncing ideas off one another from our respective positions on either side of the house. We well knew that faculty awareness and support of open access were highly variable and that OA experts and supporters were most likely a minority. It surprised us therefore when we experienced consistently positive faculty responses, even when we had initially walked into a “cold” crowd marked by indifference, skepticism, or opposition. In scores of presentations occurring after passage of the policy, and in all in-person communications,¹³ it is no exaggeration to say that faculty responses have been almost universally positive, not necessarily at the point we walked into the room, but certainly by the time we left. We realized that our experience at Rutgers varied significantly from the experiences reported by peers at other institutions and in the literature, and we therefore began to more closely analyze our message. In addition, as we attempted to make our outreach program scalable, we held open access “drop-ins” with subject liaisons to discuss the message, and we ultimately began working with a new communications officer about our outreach materials. These last two activities in particular brought home the facts that our message was extremely specific, purposeful, and intentional; that we believed we understood why it resonated; and we were becoming protective of our every last turn of phrase. That realization was the genesis of this paper.

The 18-Point Rutgers Open Access Policy Message

The Rutgers open access outreach message is usually delivered as a 12- to 15-minute

¹¹ This approach is nicely stated in JISC Repositories Support Project (RSP) (n.d.): “Take opportunity to talk about open access models and issues. An overly evangelical approach can be counterproductive. It is important to listen and respect other points of view; go for the long game.”

¹² For example, when a faculty member initiated and completed a deposit while we were talking, it was thought to be a good sign.

¹³ Examples of in-person communications include one-on-one consults with faculty, meetings with Research Office staff, and new faculty orientations.

“boilerplate” PowerPoint presentation that can be adjusted for length as necessary or to include details targeted to a specific discipline or audience (students, faculty, chairs or deans).¹⁴ It begins by telling the origins of the policy (at Rutgers and in context), defines open access, then goes on to show SOAR and its features, how the policy works, the policy’s innovation (the inclusion of graduate students), benefits to various constituencies, and concludes by pointing to the availability of various implementation models.¹⁵

A careful analysis of the message reveals 18 discrete elements or points,¹⁶ many of which are expressed “not in so many words” but in a way that furthers understanding of the big picture and resonates with listeners. Once dissected into its component parts, it is evident that the message directly addresses very few of the faculty concerns about self-archiving reported in the literature. Several of the points address concerns unspoken by faculty (e.g., resistance to change) or reveal benefits (heretofore unknown to the audience) embodied in select abstract concepts such as innovation, transformation, momentum, and convergence. Virtually all of the 18 points are stated in positive terms and infused with a general tone of “it’s all good.” The key points are enumerated immediately below, with elaboration to follow. They are listed not in order of importance; rather the order indicates how the message is rolled out, building upon itself to make a coherent and compelling case in a matter of minutes.

1. This is a university policy.
2. This policy is not imposed by the administration but was initiated by colleagues.
3. This policy is the same one in force at prestigious research institutions such as Harvard, MIT, University of California, Duke, Rice, Caltech, and others.
4. Relative to the vast Internet, a subscription journal looks somewhat limiting.

¹⁴ This message is included, with some variations, in all presentations, be they to faculty, early career researchers, the Research Office, administrators, or outside groups. The core message, though, is targeted at the individual expected to contribute scholarship to the repository under the policy, and this is the message that is the focus of this paper. The same message elements are used in other outreach venues (tables at events such as new faculty orientations, or in locales frequented by constituents such as the faculty dining hall), but these events are less formal and can include online demos of SOAR and other resources.

¹⁵ “Implementation models” is our term for compliance methods.

¹⁶ To be clear, the distillation into 18 points, as well as much of the analysis of the Rutgers Open Access Policy message included here, was developed after the fact, and for this paper.

5. We are in a time of transformation and convergence, on an accelerating trajectory forward.
6. A new and exciting research ecosystem is emerging, with the Open Access Policy and (its implementation via) SOAR comprising the central kernel or core that makes it all possible.
7. The Open Access policy and SOAR go hand-in-hand.
8. Our institution is in the forefront.
9. Open access means global reach, and this can be demonstrated graphically.
10. Open access is inevitable.
11. The territory is new, but not alien; we're on solid ground.
12. We are part of a larger community.
13. Open access means benefits for you, your academic unit, and the University.
14. Open access brings visibility, impact, legacy, and recruiting of the best faculty, students, researchers, and donors.
15. There is no cost to you.
16. Open access and SOAR allow you to create your own personal or departmental narratives.
17. Open access and the policy are flexible and accommodating.
18. It's all good.

Elaboration of the 18 Points

1. This is a university policy. We have found that to a whole lot of people, this actually matters. Every faculty member and employee signs a contract stating s/he will follow university policy, and this one is no different than any other. Perhaps to those with research as a central responsibility, a policy about research receives

particular attention. We typically show a slide of the written policy as it appears in the University Policy Library, noting when it was entered there and that it is now in effect. This also demonstrates that the policy is not long and complicated; it is just a brief statement of why and how we'll be doing what we're doing. The Policy is one of three handouts brought to every presentation. The others are our double-sided one-page OA fact sheet (printed on green paper for "green OA") and our "Five Easy Steps" bookmark showing the simplicity of the deposit process; the latter was produced by popular demand.¹⁷

2. This policy is not imposed by the administration but was initiated by colleagues. The opening slide of our presentation, showing the University Senate voting its near-unanimous affirmation of the Senate resolution, brings home the point that the policy was brought to the faculty (and graduate students) by their peers. While our commentary merely mentions the Rutgers policy's origins in the Senate as a simple historical fact, the real message here is that the policy is not a top down directive from the University administration, but rather a product of shared governance and academic freedom. The Rutgers Senate is not comprised exclusively of faculty, but has an inclusive membership of faculty, students, staff, alumni, and administrators, including deans. This composition is not the norm, but here it means that whether you're a graduate student, faculty member, or administrator, this was recommended by your peers. In fact, the inclusion of graduate students in the policy was the brainchild of a graduate student, who happened to represent alumni in the Senate and the OA Policy Senate Subcommittee. Indeed, alumni exhibited great enthusiasm for the policy throughout the Senate campaign, pointing to increased visibility for the University and a new tool to recruit top faculty, students, researchers, and donors. Members of the original Senate Subcommittee that developed the open access policy report and resolution included grad students, faculty, including distinguished (senior) faculty, alumni, and deans. (The University's Open Access Policy Implementation Working Group, formed after passage of the resolution, had the same composition, but without the deans; members of both groups are named on our fact sheet.) At Rutgers, a significant number of researchers are technically categorized as staff rather than faculty, so we were careful in crafting the policy to use the term scholar, where possible, to describe those falling under the policy, so as to include *all* University researchers.

¹⁷ Both the Policy handout and the fact sheet are available from the SOAR home page at <http://SOAR.rutgers.edu>, or directly at <http://policies.rutgers.edu/sites/policies/files/50.3.17%20-%20current.pdf> and <http://www.libraries.rutgers.edu/RutgersOAFactsheet.pdf>

3. This policy is the same one in force at prestigious research institutions such as Harvard, MIT, University of California, Duke, Rice, Caltech, and others. There is a subtle difference between this statement and any overt suggestion that participation will enhance the University's prestige. As others have pointed out, "a desire to enhance an institution's prestige ... is most certainly not a motivating factor for repository participants" (Thomas & McDonald, 2007, para. 4). Nonetheless, we have noted a competitive streak in some faculty, particularly when their department vies with a neighboring rival for the top spot in national rankings; these faculty perceive that increased visibility through open access may offer a competitive edge. For this slide (depicting a half dozen university logos alongside that of COAPI, the Coalition of Open Access Policy Institutions), we often mention recently passed "Harvard-style open access policies similar to ours." This tells the audience that this is an area of growth; Rutgers is a leader; our scholars are being kept "in the loop"; and open access is advancing with momentum. This particular slide is less about why the faculty should participate, and more about why these other institutions already do. It places the policy in context while providing a segue into the issue of visibility and impact for scholars, and how that impact can be demonstrated, in our case, through graphical usage statistics, just one feature offered by SOAR.

4. Relative to the vast Internet, a subscription journal looks somewhat limiting. We make this point on our slide entitled "What is Open Access?" which cites Peter Suber's time-tested definition of OA literature: "Open-access (OA) literature is digital, online, free of charge, and free of most copyright and licensing restrictions" (Suber, 2004). This slide makes two additional points, also credited to Suber; first: "What makes it possible is the Internet and the consent of the author or copyright holder" (Suber, 2004). There is a stark contrast between the "silo" of a discrete print or even electronic article in a subscription journal and the reach possible through the vast network of an unwallled Internet. As the presentation progresses it also becomes clear to the audience that the Internet enables discovery at the article level, rendering the journal package less important. Second, this slide reminds the audience "in most fields, scholarly journals do not pay authors, who can therefore consent to OA without losing revenue" (Suber, 2004). This is the first allusion to authors' rights, and a hint that authors can have a say in the ultimate disposition and dissemination of their own work. We conclude by noting there are many definitions of open access, but that the purpose of the Rutgers policy is to get our scholarship out on the Internet quickly, to a worldwide audience, thus increasing our visibility and impact. We follow this slide with one depicting a gold road ("publish in an open

access journal”) and a green road (“self archive in a repository”). We note these are the two ways to make open access happen, and the Rutgers Open Access Policy uses the “green road.” This is the presentation’s only mention of open access journals.¹⁸

5. We are in a time of transformation and convergence, on an accelerating trajectory forward. We make this point first with a slide showing the logos of numerous federal agencies, most of which are on Rutgers’ list of its top 20 funders. We briefly summarize the 2013 White House Executive Directive on Public Access that requires the results of taxpayer-funded research (both articles and data) be made freely available to the general public. The Directive applies to any federal agency with 100 million dollars or more in annual R&D expenditure, and the following slide’s list of agencies “Under the Executive Directive,” by way of a long list in small print, graphically illustrates the extent of the mandate. Rutgers is a member of both the Association of American Universities and the Association of Public and Land-grant Universities (APLU). For an audience of administrators, we add a slide showing the memorandum sent to senior research officers at AAU and APLU universities suggesting how they might prepare to meet the new funder requirements and ensure compliance (Droegemeier, K., Marchase, R., & McCullough, R., 2015).¹⁹ (Because federal research grants are made to the university, the institution incurs a contractual obligation when it accepts the grant, and thereby assumes some risk.) Although we don’t mention it in our presentations, this memo helpfully points out that “most research libraries are actively working on these issues”; “librarians may be able to assist”; and includes references to information about Harvard-style open access policies. Together with the earlier slide on our university “Peers in OA Policymaking,” these funder mandate slides convey the message that we are in a time of transformation marked by a convergence of social actions by institutions, funders, and scholars like ourselves who are taking charge of our publications and sharing them with the world.

¹⁸ Mischo and Schlembach (2011) noted that failure of the University of Maryland OA policy can be attributed in part to faculty confusion as to green and gold OA (p. 434).

¹⁹ This memorandum, dated August 19, 2015, was sent by Kelvin Droegemeier (Vice President for Research, University of Oklahoma), Richard Marchase (Vice President for Research & Economic Development, The University of Alabama at Birmingham), and Richard McCullough (Vice Provost for Research, Harvard University), in coordination with John Vaughn (Senior Fellow, AAU), Michael Tanner (Vice President for Academic Affairs, APLU), and Prue Adler (Associate Executive Director, Federal Relations and Information Policy, ARL).

6. A new and exciting research ecosystem is emerging, with the Open Access Policy and (its implementation via) SOAR comprising the central kernel or core that makes it all possible. One theme underlying our presentation is the *future*; we like to speak not just of what *is*, but of what is *possible*. This might be as simple as moving from mention of peer-reviewed journal articles as the focus of SOAR, to other possibilities, such as book chapters. We may also include a slide that graphically depicts SOAR as the hub of a wheel, with spokes leading to other parts of the research ecosystem, such as grants, patents and IP, citation analysis & metrics, and an array of tools, for research data management, scholarly productivity assessment, professional networking and collaboration, and SOAR tools and features. While graphically depicting the centrality of SOAR, this slide is also an effort to in some sense speak to “faculty as innovator” and to the promise of the future, thus echoing the recommendation of Bell et al. (2005) to create an outreach message that speaks directly to faculty members’ highest hopes.

7. The Open Access policy and SOAR go hand-in-hand. This is the slide that fully introduces SOAR. We explain that we’ve developed a portal into the institutional repository (RUcore) specifically to implement the Rutgers OA policy, and that we continue to develop and enhance this portal as we speak; “SOAR is a service of RUcore.” This again conveys the message that we are in the midst of changing and growing; we are moving forward and not standing still. (We add parenthetically that those familiar with RUcore know it for its comprehensive collections of electronic theses and dissertations (ETDs), digitized special collections, research data, etc., but that SOAR’s focus is scholarship.) This is one of only two brief mentions of the term “institutional repository” and exists only to clarify the relationship to SOAR. We make it a point to never walk through the website or the deposit process, as this can doom any dynamic presentation. We bill SOAR as a “one-stop shop” for everything one needs to know about open access and the policy, a place to deposit one’s work and to see what Rutgers colleagues are doing. We are aware that external traffic and referrals dominate repository usage and are careful not to suggest that anyone other than their Rutgers colleagues is actually searching for Rutgers scholarship in SOAR. In fact we are explicit that SOAR is not a silo; it is “crawled by Google” and we know that most download requests to repositories come in via search engines (Bhat, 2010, p. 110). We also know that many of our scholars already upload their works to disciplinary repositories such as PubMed Central, SSRN or arXiv, and we anticipate the question, “Must I deposit twice?” Therefore we state up front that SOAR simultaneously makes Rutgers scholarship available on the Internet, and “gathers it in one place”; this was a clear directive from the OA Policy Senate Subcommittee: neither subject reposi-

tory deposit nor publication in an open access journal can stand in for deposit in the IR. (Of course it is also the case that the license invoked with a Harvard-style (permission-based) policy predates a publisher contract, so the publisher's contract is subject to the prior (university) license. Thus a Harvard-style policy enables more deposits and facilitates funder and institutional compliance.²⁰ This level of granularity and complexity, however, is something we typically avoid with faculty.) Like Harvard's DASH or University of Michigan's Deep Blue, SOAR gathers scholarship by institution, just as subject repositories gather it by discipline; this allows us to talk about opportunities for cross-departmental collaborations, as well as the fact that high visibility of all Rutgers scholarship through SOAR helps with recruitment of the very best students, faculty, and donors. Beyond that, the question presents an opportunity to mention institutional trust and legacy, since sustainability has always been an issue for subject/disciplinary repositories and preprint servers. The recent acquisition of SSRN by Elsevier points to the potential instability of subject repositories and reinforces that authors might be well-advised (open access policy or not) to deposit papers in SOAR in addition to any subject repositories. Our final point on this slide is that SOAR and the policy are primarily intended for journal articles, conference proceedings, and similar scholarship. Depending on the audience, we may get a question later about other types of materials, such as working papers for economics, or book chapters for social sciences. Our answer is "yes." Send us what is considered the scholarship for your discipline. If you have other kinds of works you'd like to add, we can usually accommodate them in the larger RUcore, if they are outside the scope of SOAR. In other words, "send us what you've got and we'll take care of it."

8. Our institution is in the forefront. Rutgers was early to the open access movement in several respects. Although we don't mention it in current presentations, there was a time when we pointed to our long-standing and now familiar ETD mandate and the University's endorsement of FRPAA as early precedents for the open access policy then being proposed. Rutgers' was the first system-wide OA policy passed in North America, and continues to be one of the largest implementations (based on number of people subject to the Policy, 15,000). Prior to the Rutgers Senate vote, there were few public AAU institutions we could name with a university-wide comprehensive Harvard-style open access policy, other than University of Kansas, which was the first with that distinction (Emmett et al., 2011, p. 563). (When the University of California also passed a system-wide

²⁰ For an excellent explanation of the power of a permissions-based policy, see Duranceau and Kriegsmann (2013, p. 86-87).

policy a few months after ours, it was very helpful to be able to point to that as well.) Perhaps most importantly, the Rutgers Open Access Policy was the first university-wide policy in the world to include graduate students. As we strive to optimize graduate student participation with all of the details that might entail, we recognize this as a unique new opportunity to put Rutgers on the map, and ask listeners' assistance as we develop ways to further engage this group of early career researchers. Finally, we anticipated the growing importance of data as an open access issue; we spoke in terms of the entire article "package," including supplementary materials, and invite authors to link their published supplementary materials with their publications in SOAR. The nature of the interest in the supplementary data has surprised us a little. We expected some authors would wish to deposit their data, but discovered our service extended beyond that provided by publishers. For example, one author, for an article on intermittent chemoprevention of colon cancer, had produced a video showing a computer simulation of cell dynamics. Although his publisher routinely publishes supplementary material on its own platform, it could not host a video of that size; he was able to post it in the institutional repository instead, and add its DOI to the manuscript prior to submission. Similarly, a professor of botany had authored a work describing and illustrating numerous species of gentians she had recently discovered in South America. The publisher included only small black and white reproductions of her original botanical drawings, and she has requested we make available high-resolution versions of the full color large format artworks; these can then be linked from the accepted manuscript in SOAR.

9. Open access means global reach, and this can be demonstrated graphically.

It is well-established that open access allows a work to be used and cited more and we point people to The Open Access Citation Advantage Service, formerly the OpCit project, to discover studies on citation advantage for open access articles (SPARC Europe, n.d.). At Rutgers, SOAR's article-level metrics show downloads by country in tabular and graphical form. As an example, we offer up a sample pie chart (chosen more-or-less at random) wherein fewer than half the downloads originate in the United States; the others originate from Slovakia, Indonesia, Ukraine, People's Republic of China, and elsewhere. This shows the audience in a concrete way the global reach afforded to one article by open access, through SOAR. We know from our own experience there are faculty OA advocates who hold "a fundamental belief in the concept of open access," and that those from other countries can be "particularly cognizant of the value of open access materials for academic institutions with fewer resources for library materials," many of which are outside the U.S. (Palmer, Tefteau, and Newton, 2008, p. 23). Rutgers

is recognized for its cultural diversity, and this is a point of pride (Rutgers, 2016a and 2016b). In addition to global reach, open access increases availability generally. Although we don't explicitly mention it in presentations, it often arises in the Q&A that open access to scholarship benefits faculty and graduate students not just as *authors* of the information, but also as *consumers*. In 2005, Swan and Brown found that only 10% of surveyed faculty said they have easy access to all the articles they need; more than a third of researchers are left wanting when it comes to the literature they need (p. 13). In some cases, authors can't even access their *own* work because their institution has no subscription; continuing cuts to library budgets may exacerbate this situation.

10. Open access is inevitable. Harnad has said, “the only thing standing between us and universal OA is author keystrokes” (Poynder, 2010, p. 40), and that does appear to be the case. Indeed, open access and/or self-archiving have been termed inevitable by a number of authors (for example, Harnad, 2000; Morrison, 2007; Lewis, 2012; Wolpert, 2013; Self-Archiving FAQ, n.d.) and survey respondents (Swan & Brown, 2005, p. 81). In our presentation, we suggest that inevitability arises from convergence: open access, global reach, advancement of research, institutional and departmental objectives, and scholars' own self-interest are now aligned.

11. The territory is new, but not alien; we're on solid ground. This theme in the presentation is really about finding places of comfortable familiarity out there on the leading edge. Number one: “Publish in the journal of your choice.” For departmental presentations, we work with the departmental liaison to customize three discipline-specific slides showing faculty how the open access policy plays out with one of their own disciplinary journals: we identify for that journal the impact factor and publisher, note the publisher's article processing charges (if any), where it is distributed, whether Rutgers subscribes, who has access to it, who has no access, publisher accommodations for “open access” (including how that is defined and what it costs), the publisher's self-archiving policy and the additional visibility self-archiving provides—at no added cost. There is also the fact that our university is in the company of leading research universities with similar OA policies, complying with funder public access mandates similar to that of NIH. Midway through the presentation we show a slide that juxtaposes familiar subject repositories (PubMed Central, SSRN, arXiv) with major institutional repositories, including our own. In keeping with our general philosophy of “it's all good” (see below), we typically add that “these two types of repositories work well together and depositing in both is fine.” Institutional repositories are faculty's “best hope

for increased visibility of their scholarship and for preserving their research that may become orphaned by technological advances” (Jantz & Wilson 2008, p. 194) or the disappearance of individual disciplinary repositories. We don’t generally invoke the word “preservation”; as Foster and Gibbons (2005) noted, faculty wish to “ensure that documents are persistently viewable or usable” but that they did not associate the term “digital preservation” with that wish (p. 4). However we do tell our audiences that “depositing your article in SOAR ensures access over time, because SOAR migrates your work to new formats as the old ones go away; a permanent copy of your deposited paper will always be available”; this is particularly important for works never formally published. Finally, we always mention the familiar DOI that SOAR assigns to every article, noting too that we point to the publisher version for the benefit of those with access to the subscription. In these ways, we draw the link between the familiar (peer and aspirant universities, subject repositories, scholars’ own publishing practices) and the new (the open access policy and SOAR).

12. We are part of a larger community. Having already established our peers in open access policymaking and policy implementation, we let faculty know that we regularly meet with our colleagues at these peer and aspirant institutions, and remain actively involved with COAPI, the Coalition of Open Access Policy Institutions. This demonstrates that we are not operating in a vacuum; we are talking with others implementing similar policies, and make our implementation decisions in regular consultation with other experts, based on best practices.

13. Open access means benefits for you, your academic unit, and the University. The summary of open access benefits comes toward the end of the presentation, at a point when we believe the case has already been made. We have already shown that we’re riding a wave that’s taking us into a new research environment, on the recommendations of our peers in Rutgers shared governance and in the distinguished company of other major research institutions meeting funder mandates. SOAR is crawled by Google and expands access to scholarship to a worldwide audience of all interested readers and researchers; you continue to publish in your journal of choice and deposit in SOAR at no cost to you; the deposit process is simple and easy; SOAR staff researches permissions so you don’t have to; the majority of publishers are fine with it; you can link your supplementary data. Once your publisher accepts your manuscript, just shoot a copy over to SOAR. Each paper in SOAR has a cover sheet that clearly identifies the version, tells readers how to cite it, and links to the Version of Record on the publisher’s website where applicable; readers are directed to the publisher’s final version, and

only those who are denied access will look at the Accepted Manuscript. SOAR offers a personalized bibliography link to all your works in SOAR that you can post wherever you'd like. Post your paper in SOAR and see how people around the world are downloading your work; open access gives you an edge. Now we summarize key benefits on two slides: the first lists benefits for faculty and graduate students: Disseminate your research sooner; reach more readers & researchers; foster cross-disciplinary and trans-disciplinary collaborations; get permanent links (DOIs) to use wherever you like; increase citation/research impact; ensure access over time. For academic units, participation in the open access policy and SOAR provides more visibility for faculty and graduate student scholarship; increases exposure of scholarly output within and across Rutgers academic units, to fellow researchers, the general public, and to prospective students, faculty, and donors. Finally, SOAR statistics enable creation of a compelling departmental narrative.

14. Open Access brings visibility, impact, legacy, and recruiting of the best faculty, students, researchers, and donors. The cases for greater visibility, impact, and recruiting have already been made, as described above. The way that open access can ensure an enduring legacy is reflected in two parts of the message: the references to gathering Rutgers scholarship in a single place (the institutional legacy), and the way SOAR (or more precisely, the institutional repository) ensures access over time (the scholar's own legacy).

15. There is no cost to you. This means no money exchanged, no mandated APC, no cost in time to check publisher permissions, or to deposit the work. Deposit is simple and easy; there is an easily remembered URL (SOAR.rutgers.edu) and a simple and easy form.²¹ In fact we avoid the term "form" with its negative connotations, and ask only that faculty give us "a couple of pieces of basic information."²² In the literature and in our own experience, the concern over publisher permission repeatedly arises as a disincentive to self-archiving. Although a Harvard-style (permissions-based) open access policy does not require

²¹ Carr, Harnad, and Swan (2007) estimate 40 minutes per year for a highly active researcher to input metadata. At Rutgers, several authors have demonstrated that a dozen or so articles can be deposited, with metadata, in as few as 15 minutes. We also accommodate deposit by proxy.

²² In fact, three pieces of information are required on the form: title, date, and type of publication. Our deposit process is linked to the university's authentication/authorization system, so that sign-on populates the system with name, affiliation, and ORCID. We find that most depositors give us much more information while they're at it, typically abstract, keywords, journal citation, and whether or not peer-reviewed. This is consistent with findings by Yang and Li (2015, p. 10) that faculty see it as their own responsibility to provide abstract and keywords to the repository metadata.

publisher permission or the honoring of publisher embargoes, we continue for now to honor publisher policies, and find some authors prefer that approach. We also look for every way to integrate deposit into existing workflows. Although we continue to explore our options for harvesting content from disciplinary repositories and elsewhere, at Rutgers we are looking for a behavioral change: deposit by authors or their designees at point of acceptance for publication. “Paper accepted? Shoot a copy over to SOAR.” Finally, the message of “no cost to you” implicitly references the gift culture that permeates scholarly publishing, as described by Suber, 2012 (p. 38). Digital anthropologists for many years have used the term ‘gift economy’ to explain how information sharing spurred the early growth of the Internet (Veale, 2003). “University professors have a long tradition of giving away their research results in exchange for access to those of their colleagues” (Nielsen, 2000) and dominated the web’s early days with this “circle of gifts” (Veale, 2003, abstract). Gifting of good academic work is a low-risk means to “demarcate yourself in your discipline, announce your research interests, claim your interest, and establish ownership over your idea” (Tschider, 2006, Gifting in academia section, para. 3); it promises significant returns (“compensation”), most notably in the form of reputation, recognition, and feedback (Kircz, 1996, cited in Tschider, 2006, Gifting in academia section, para. 3) through increased exposure and visibility. Authors writing for “impact rather than money” (Suber, 2012, p. 16) offer a gift to readers, through an act that is “both self-interested and somewhat altruistic” (Tschider, 2006, Defining ‘gifting’ section, para. 3). In short, open access means a gift given and a gift received.

16. Open access and SOAR allow you to create your own personal or departmental narratives. This point was discussed earlier as a benefit to academic units. We do not present statistics as another means of reporting productivity to University administration, an idea rejected by many of our faculty. Rather, we talk about download statistics and user demographics in terms of “global reach” and their value in helping individual authors and academic units “create their own narratives.” What is the breadth of your scholarship? Where are your readers, and how is that significant? Where are there opportunities for interdisciplinary collaborations? Grant opportunities? Such narratives can be incorporated by faculty into their promotion/tenure actions or into departmental marketing and publicity efforts; we let the listeners decide.

17. Open access and the policy are flexible and accommodating. This message really alludes to the accommodation (by the open access movement and the open access policy itself) of disciplinary differences. “The most important factor

in understanding the open access movement from a holistic perspective ... is that all of it hinges on disciplinary differences in scholarly communication. There can be no broad-brushed approach, and success will come by libraries and institutions fostering change discipline by discipline” (Mullen, 2010, p. 164). The focus is on peer-reviewed journal articles, conference proceedings, and similar scholarship, but SOAR is intended for all scholarship, and the author decides what to send to SOAR, based on what is considered the scholarship of his or her discipline. This is not just a phenomenon for the sciences; there is something for everyone. We recognize that all disciplines are different, and we can work with that. Our implicit message to all disciplines is that “open access and the policy are working for you, to the extent possible.” Despite studies suggesting that arts and humanities researchers are less engaged with repositories and open access generally (Cullen & Chawner, 2011), early responses from Rutgers faculty told us that support for open access crossed disciplines and that arts and humanities could be a growth area. (We see some convergences between our OA efforts and our digital humanities initiatives, and sense we are gaining traction with this audience; a targeted symposium for this group is in the works.) This is consistent with findings that “the Arts and Humanities disciplines may be the most fertile disciplines for University-sponsored initiatives in scholarly communication” (*Faculty Attitudes*, 2007, p. 2). These fields lack the robust and long-standing disciplinary repositories and funder mandates found in the sciences; thus there are fewer options for open access, and the issue of “redundant deposit” doesn’t apply. Beyond the issue of disciplinary differences, flexibility is arguably one of three keys to a successful open access policy implementation, along with acknowledgement of the changing scholarly communication landscape and evolving faculty attitudes toward open access. Wherever possible we offer options. For example, we accommodate a variety of implementation models. Scholars can self-deposit or designate a depositor; the proxy might be an administrative assistant assigned by the academic unit (where resources permit it), or it might be a research assistant assigned by the individual. The unit might require SOAR deposit for all works listed in annual reports or offer other incentives to participation. The Rutgers OA Policy implementation calls for the school or department to decide how best to implement the policy within the unit. This addresses compliance at some level, but primarily is meant to acknowledge that different units have different needs and resources. It also lends a feeling of autonomy, and effectively addresses the occasionally asked question, “What happens if I don’t comply?” The answer is, “Your department may care.” In fact, we never employ terms like ‘mandate’ or ‘compliance’; issues with these terms are well known (Suber, 2012; Emmett et al., 2011, p. 569; Fruin & Sutton, 2016, p. 482). Instead we might say, “Under the policy we are expected to ... ”

or “The policy stipulates that faculty and graduate students shall . . .” The Rutgers open access policy, like any typical Harvard-style policy, allows an opt-out for any particular article on request, although we mention this in presentations only in response to specific compliance questions during Q&A. We allude to flexibility in numerous ways: upload your article with a bit of metadata, and we’ll add the rest; we will send you a DOI and you can distribute that wherever you’d like: on your CV, your website, social media, wherever; your choice. Do you want to update your paper with another version? We manage multiple versions very well, but always point to the Version of Record (VoR) on the publisher’s website. Do you have other materials you’d like to add to SOAR? Contact us; we can accommodate all kinds of materials outside the scope of SOAR.

18. It’s all good. We state everything in positive terms, with proactive, rather than reactive or negatively framed statements. For example, our message about where to publish is not *The OA Policy does not limit where you can publish*. Rather, it is *Publish in the journal of your choice*. Occasionally a question arises to which the obvious answer is a negative. In such cases we offer open-ended responses to indicate things are in flux, we are flexible; we are looking at alternatives and moving forward. For example, when asked by authors if they can just deposit in their subject repository and bypass SOAR, our answer would never be a literal “no.” Rather, we let people know that we are looking to automated solutions, and we hope to facilitate contributions in future, perhaps pulling from repositories. We welcome feedback and recommendations. “We’d be happy to talk with you more” is a common refrain, along with the message, “open access works.” We avoid anything that would raise hackles, yet we invite all engagement, negative or positive. The underlying theme is, the landscape is complex; we’re on top of it; we continue to explore solutions, we will keep you posted.

A departmental faculty meeting presentation is roughly 12 minutes long, and we are generally granted a few additional minutes for questions and answers. During these lively Q&A sessions, we may expand on our points, address any concerns, and occasionally we stand by as departmental faculty themselves affirm OA benefits for us. Naturally we are often asked about topics we deliberately avoided, and these questions, along with others (sometimes unanticipated), are simply taken and answered as they come. Typical audience questions, along with our responses, can be found at our FAQ page: <http://SOAR.rutgers.edu/faq>.

The 18 points of the Rutgers message can be distilled into these concepts: obligation, autonomy, prestige, expansiveness/reach, inevitability, anticipation, leadership/innovation,

empirical data, familiarity, community, shared benefits, visibility, impact, legacy, gift, creativity, flexibility, and reward.

Maximizing the Effectiveness of the Message

Beyond the message, we believe that presenters must be very well informed and able to present complex information in easily digestible form, in a very few minutes; have the ability to anticipate questions and address them in an accessible manner, maintain a listening tone in a nuanced discussion, be open to all discussion (pro and con); and utilize librarians with complementary skills working side by side and providing consistent leadership and messaging throughout. Our avoidance of evangelism is evident both in content and tone. We are neither promoters nor enforcers; we simply convey the fact of the Policy and a picture of the OA landscape as it stands; we deliver the facts, answer questions, and facilitate.

As previously noted, certain terms and topics are verboten. We have never used the words “mandate,” “require,” or “compliance” in association with our open access policy. We say very little about preservation, and nothing about the serials crisis. To emphasize the place of open access within the broader institutional mission, we distance the OA initiative from the Libraries as much as possible, to the point that we removed library affiliations from early presentations, and removed ‘libraries’ from the SOAR URL. The institutional repository is mentioned only to contextualize SOAR (as a “portal into” and “service of” RUcore) or to compare it (as a point of reference) to disciplinary repositories with which many faculty are familiar and to which many are favorably inclined. It is always interesting to see what sparks attention in the presentation, and we remain flexible, readily removing anything we begin to perceive as a non-starter. When we get follow-up questions on a topic, we pay attention; it means something, and in future we might want to expand on that topic or emphasize it more. ORCID is an example of this.²³ Conversely, a point that fails to generate further discussion raises a red flag; perhaps it is not of interest.

Every time we deliver our presentation, we are aware of audience diversity and know that no single message will have universal appeal; rather, some will respond to one element of the message and others to another. Some of our most rewarding moments in these presentations are when faculty disagree amongst themselves and challenge one another on one of our points, debating the primacy of a particular journal or the global availability of

²³ The University Senate recently passed a resolution to implement ORCID University-wide, and implementation planning is moving forward.

scholarship.²⁴ Further, between disciplines and even within a single discipline, motivating factors vary considerably. As Emmett et al. (2011) have noted, “the suite of concerns ... to be addressed” is “diverse and complex” (p. 569). We hope to present something for everyone.

NEXT STEPS

Rutgers and the University Libraries are in the process of change. The university has transitioned to a Responsibility Center Management (RCM) system, with the libraries designated as a cost center; this means that the Libraries will need to demonstrate value to their customers: the chancellors, provosts, deans, chairs, and faculty. The Libraries themselves are undergoing organizational restructuring under a new Vice President for Information Services and University Librarian, and we anticipate that faculty librarians, as advisors to the University Librarian, will have an increasing influence on issues of import. As part of this process, Libraries faculty and administrators are exploring the possibility of a new and more stable scholarly communication organization, for greater effectiveness in this area. All of these changes impact the Libraries’ operations and priorities, and we will face challenges moving ahead. Ensuring success with measurable impact will require us to sustain momentum through these transitions, continuing presentations for faculty and graduate students, participating in graduate student “boot camps”, and incorporating the OA Policy requirement into the University’s new faculty and graduate student orientation packets. A top priority for the open access policy implementation initiative is the establishment of an Open Access Policy Advisory Board to ensure that policy implementation and SOAR development recommendations continue to be driven by faculty and graduate students (as they have been thus far) in line with the university mission, institutional and Libraries strategic plans, and within the parameters of other Libraries priorities and available resources. A topical, compelling message requires continuous reassessment and revision, and the processing of deposits (which are increasing in number) must keep pace. Rutgers is now moving forward with a University-wide ORCID iD implementation as part of the Big Ten Academic Alliance (BTAA; formerly the Committee on Institutional Cooperation, or CIC) consortium; the Libraries are expected to take a major role in the ORCID iD outreach; and a newly revitalized outreach program may well emerge from that effort, perhaps by folding ORCID information into the OA policy/SOAR message. We set a priority on measurable outcomes, for depositors (largely via usage statistics), the repository,

²⁴ Particularly in our earlier days of outreach, we observed an attitude reported by the University of California survey (*Faculty Attitudes*, 2007): “faculty appear to believe that nearly all published materials eventually appear online ... and are accessible to almost anyone on the Internet” (p. 5); more than a few times we were told “those that need to see my research, can.”

the Libraries, and Libraries personnel. Regular, automated, email notification to authors of usage statistics would be helpful to have, as would an administrative module to help us to efficiently gauge and report out progress. Finally, we will continue to seek solutions for faculty already depositing in their disciplinary repositories, streamlining workflows and addressing “statistics dilution” concerns even as we work for behavioral change of SOAR deposit on acceptance of manuscript. We expect that by keeping an eye and ear on numerous fronts, engaging depositors, and improving services, we will continue to find faculty investing in open access.

CONCLUSION

Open access is evolving and moving forward within the broader and shifting scholarly communication landscape and along with it, faculty attitudes about it. Nonetheless, faculty remain resistant to self-archiving, even as scholars’ contributions to the institutional repository continue to be a vital prerequisite to universal open access to research output. While many have called for more and better outreach programs to address this problem, little has been said about the specific message to be delivered. The literature reveals a tendency amongst librarians to market the institutional repository instead of open access itself, to focus on faculty-perceived OA/IR benefits and concerns, and perhaps to define outreach messaging in these terms. It might well be argued that many faculty benefits and concerns are likely either unknown to the faculty themselves or unspoken, so that they cannot form a viable core of an effective outreach message. There is no question that faculty lack an awareness and understanding of open access concepts and issues. Lack of awareness might have any number of causes, including lack of communication overall, ineffective communication methods, choice of outreach venues, etc. (*Faculty Attitudes*, 2007, p. 7). This author posits that a game-changing OA outreach message will first be clear about what open access means. It will speak to scholars’ highest hopes and to the promise and inevitability of open access, aligning its core principles with faculty values such as leadership, innovation, creativity, intellectual progress, and legacy. If universal open access is to be achieved, librarians might well eschew library-centric approaches and over-reliance on faculty perceptions of self-archiving and repositories, and shift the focus outward, to the governing objectives of universal open access, the academic and institutional missions, and the advancement of research and societal good.

This will also allow librarians to expand the conversation to “research impact, funder requirements, citation analysis, new alternative citation metrics, institutional reporting, and more” (Mullen & Otto 2015). Further discussion and, most importantly, metrics to support or refute this view, would provide valuable contributions to the field. Until more data is in, the jury is out. It is the author’s hope that this paper will provoke further

discussion of specific outreach messages and the underlying principles and values informing them, and that librarians will revitalize efforts to motivate full participation by scholars in the open access movement, in order that intellectual output can be made openly available to all.

REFERENCES

- Banks, M. A., & Persily, G. L. (2010). Campus perspective on the National Institutes of Health public access policy: University of California, San Francisco, library experience. *Journal of the Medical Library Association*, 98(3), 256-259. <https://doi.org/10.3163/1536-5050.98.3.015>
- Bell, S., Foster, N. F., & Gibbons, S. (2005). Reference librarians and the success of institutional repositories. *Reference Services Review*, 33(3), 283-290. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/00907320510611311>
- Bhat, M. H. (2010). Interoperability of open access repositories in computer science and IT: An evaluation. *Library Hi Tech*, 28(1), 107-118. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/07378831011026724>
- Brown, D. J. (2010). Repositories and journals: Are they in conflict?: A literature review of relevant literature. *Aslib Proceedings*, 62(2), 112-143. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/00012531011034955>
- Carr, L., Harnad, S., & Swan, A. (2007). A longitudinal study of the practice of self-archiving. Working paper. Retrieved from <http://eprints.soton.ac.uk/id/eprint/263906>
- Confederation of Open Access Repositories (COAR). (2013). Incentives, integration, and mediation: Sustainable practices for populating repositories. Retrieved from <https://www.coar-repositories.org/activities/repository-content/sustainable-practices-for-populating-repositories-report/>
- Covey, D. T. (2011). Recruiting content for the institutional repository: The barriers exceed the benefits. *Journal of Digital Information*, 12(3). Retrieved from <https://journals.tdl.org/jodi/index.php/jodi/article/view/2068>
- Creaser, C. (2010). Open access to research outputs: Institutional policies and researchers' views: Results from two complementary surveys. *New Review of Academic Librarianship*, 16(1), 4-25. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13614530903162854>
- Crow, R. (2002). The case for institutional repositories: A SPARC position paper. Washington, D.C.: SPARC. Retrieved from: <http://www.arl.org/sparc/IR/ir.html>
- Cryer, E., & Collins, M. (2011). Incorporating open access into libraries. *Serials Review*, 37(2), 103-107. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.serrev.2011.03.002>
- Cullen, R., & Chawner, B. (2011). Institutional repositories, open access, and scholarly communication: A study of conflicting paradigms. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 37(6), 460-470. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2011.07.002>

Droegemeier, K., Marchase, R., & McCullough, R. (2015, August 19). Memorandum on university compliance with federal public access policies. Retrieved from <https://www.aau.edu/WorkArea/DownloadAsset.aspx?id=16539>

Dubinsky, E. (2014). A current snapshot of institutional repositories: Growth rate, disciplinary content and faculty contributions. *Journal of Librarianship and Scholarly Communication*, 2(3). <https://doi.org/10.7710/2162-3309.1167>

Duranceau, E. F., & Kriegsman, S. (2013). Implementing open access policies using institutional repositories. In P. Bluh, & C. Hepfer (Eds.), *The institutional repository: Benefits and challenges* (pp. 81-105). Chicago, IL: American Library Association.

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>

Executive Office of the President, Office of Science and Technology Policy. (2013). Memorandum for the heads of executive departments and agencies. Retrieved from https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/microsites/ostp/ostp_public_access_memo_2013.pdf

Faculty attitudes and behaviors regarding scholarly communication: Survey findings from the University of California. (2007, August). Retrieved from <http://osc.universityofcalifornia.edu/2007/08/report-on-faculty-attitudes-and-behaviors-regarding-scholarly-communication>

Ferreira, M., Baptista, A. A., Rodrigues, E., & Saraiva, R. (2008). Carrots and sticks: Some ideas on how to create a successful institutional repository. *D-Lib Magazine*, 14(1/2). <https://doi.org/10.1045/january2008-ferreira>

Foster, N. F., & Gibbons, S. (2005). Understanding faculty to improve content recruitment for institutional repositories. *D-Lib Magazine*, 11(1). <https://doi.org/10.1045/january2005-foster>

Fruin, C., & Sutton, S. (2016). Strategies for success: Open access policies at North American educational institutions. *College & Research Libraries*, 77(4), 469-499. <https://doi.org/10.5860/crl.77.4.469>

Gierveld, H. (2006, October 30). Considering a marketing and communications approach for an institutional repository. *Ariadne*, 49. Retrieved from <http://www.ariadne.ac.uk/issue49/gierveld/>

Harnad, S. (2000). E-knowledge: Freeing the refereed journal corpus online. *Computer Law & Security Report*, 16(2), 78-87. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0267-3649\(00\)88298-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0267-3649(00)88298-9)

Harnad, S. (2010). No-fault peer review charges: The price of selectivity need not be access denied or delayed. *D-Lib Magazine*, 16(7/8). <https://doi.org/10.1045/july2010-harnad>

Harnad, S. (2015). Optimizing open access policy. *The Serials Librarian*, 69(2), 133-141. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0361526X.2015.1076368>

- Jantz, R. C., & Wilson, M. C. (2008). Institutional repositories: Faculty deposits, marketing, and the reform of scholarly communication. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 34(3), 186-195. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2008.03.014>
- Jefferson, T. (1825, May 8). Letter to Henry Lee. Retrieved from <http://www.nlnrac.org/american/declaration-of-independence/primary-source-documents/jefferson-to-lee>
- JISC Repositories Support Project (RSP). (n.d.) Undermines traditional journal publishing. Retrieved from <http://www.rsp.ac.uk/grow/advocacy/issues/traditional-publishing>
- Jones, R., Andrew, T., & MacColl, J. (2006). *The institutional repository*. Oxford: Chandos. <https://doi.org/10.1533/9781780630830>
- Kim, J. (2010). Faculty self-archiving: Motivations and barriers. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 61(9), 1909-1922. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.21336>
- Kim, J. (2011). Motivations of faculty self-archiving in institutional repositories. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 37(3), 246-254. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2011.02.017>
- Kocken, G. J., & Wical, S. H. (2013). "I've never heard of it before": Awareness of open access at a small liberal arts university. *Behavioral & Social Sciences Librarian*, 32(3), 140-154. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01639269.2013.817876>
- Lewis, D. W. (2012). The inevitability of open access. *College & Research Libraries*, 73(5), 493-506. <https://doi.org/10.5860/crl-299>
- Mark, T., & Shearer, K. (2006, August). Institutional repositories: A review of content recruitment strategies. *World Library and Information Congress: 72nd IFLA General Conference and Council*. Seoul, Korea.
- Mercer, H., Rosenblum, B., & Emmett, A. (2007). A multifaceted approach to promote a university repository: The University of Kansas' experience. *OCLC Systems & Services: International Digital Library Perspectives*, 23(2), 190-203. <https://doi.org/10.1108/10650750710748496>
- Miller, R. M. (2006). *Readers' attitudes to self-archiving in the UK*. Retrieved from <http://eprints.rclis.org/8413/>
- Mischo, W. H., & Schlembach, M. C. (2011). Open access issues and engineering faculty attitudes and practices. *Journal of Library Administration*, 51(5-6), 432-454. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01930826.2011.589349>
- Morris, S. & Thorn, S. (2009). Learned society members and open access. *Learned Publishing*, 22(3), 221-239. <https://doi.org/10.1087/2009308>
- Morrison, H. (2007, January 25). Stop fighting the inevitable and free funds for OA!. Retrieved from <http://poeticeconomics.blogspot.com/2007/01/stop-fighting-inevitable-and-free.html>

- Mullen, L. B. (2010). Open access and its practical impact on the work of academic librarians. Oxford: Chandos. <https://doi.org/10.1533/9781780630229>
- Mullen, L. B., & Otto, J. J. (2014, March). Open access policymaking: Roles for academic librarians as “change agents” in research institutions. *Qualitative and Quantitative Methods in Libraries (QQML)*, 1, 295-307. Retrieved from http://www.qqml.net/papers/March_2014_Issue/3115QQML_Journal_2014_BoweringMullenJohnsonOtto_295-307.pdf
- Mullen, L. B., & Otto, J. J. (2015, March). The Rutgers Open Access Policy: Implementation planning for success. *Qualitative and Quantitative Methods in Libraries (QQML)*, 4, 207-217. Retrieved from www.qqml.net/papers/March_2015_Issue/4121QQML_Journal_2015BoweringMullenandOtto_207-217.pdf
- Nabe, J. A. (2010). *Starting, strengthening, and managing institutional repositories: A how-to-do-it-manual*. New York, NY: Neal-Schuman Publishers.
- Nielsen, Jakob. (2000, December 24). *The Web in 2001: Paying customers*. Retrieved from <https://www.nngroup.com/articles/the-web-in-2001-paying-customers>
- Palmer, C. L., Teffeau, L. C., & Newton, M. P. (2008, August). Identifying factors of success in CIC institutional repository development: Final report. Retrieved from <http://www.btaa.org/docs/default-source/reports/palmeretalmellonreport.pdf>
- Phillips, H., Carr, R., & Teal, J. (2005). Leading roles for reference librarians in institutional repositories: One library’s experience. *Reference Services Review*, 33(3), 301-11. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00907320510611339>
- Pinfield, S. (2001). How do physicists use an E-print archive? Implications for institutional E-print services. *D-Lib Magazine*, 7(12). <https://doi.org/10.1045/december2001-pinfield>
- Poynder, R. (2010). Interview with Stevan Harnad: A prophet whose time has come. *Information Today*, 27(2), 1-40. Retrieved from <http://www.infotoday.com/it/feb10/Poynder.shtml>
- Ramirez, M. L., & Miller, M.D. (2013). Approaches to marketing an institutional repository to campus. In P. Bluh, & C. Hepfer (Eds.), *The institutional repository: Benefits and challenges* (pp. 13-52). Chicago, IL: American Library Association.
- Rutgers. (2016a). We are diverse. Retrieved from <http://rutgers.edu/about/we-are-diverse>
- Rutgers. (2016b). National rankings. Retrieved from <http://rutgers.edu/about/national-rankings>
- Salo, D. (2008). Innkeeper at the roach motel. *Library Trends*, 57(2), 98-123. <https://doi.org/10.1353/lib.0.0031>
- Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition. (n.d.). In *Wikipedia*. Retrieved from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Scholarly_Publishing_and_Academic_Resources_Coalition
- Schonfeld, R. C. (2016, May 17). Elsevier acquires SSRN. Retrieved from <https://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2016/05/17/elsevier-acquires-ssrn/>

- Schonfeld, R. C., & Housewright, R. (2010). Faculty survey 2009: Key strategic insights for libraries, publishers, and societies. Retrieved from http://www.sr.ithaka.org/publications/?fwp_top_authors=23334&fwp_paged=2
- Self-archiving FAQ for the Budapest Open Access Initiative (BOAI). (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.eprints.org/openaccess/self-faq/#institution-create-Archive>
- Singeh, F. W., Abrizah, A., & Karim, N. H. A. (2013). What inhibits authors to self-archive in open access repositories? A Malaysian case. *Information Development*, 29(1), 24-35. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0266666912450450>
- SPARC Europe. (n.d.). The Open Access Citation Advantage Service. Retrieved from <http://sparceurope.org/oaca/>
- Suber, P. (2004). *A very brief introduction to open access*. Retrieved from <http://legacy.earlham.edu/~peters/fos/brief.htm>
- Suber, P. (2012). *Open access*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Swan, A., & Brown, S. (2004). Authors and open access publishing. *Learned Publishing*, 17(3), 219-224. <https://doi.org/10.1087/095315104323159649>
- Swan, A., & Brown, S. (2005). Open access self-archiving: An author study. Retrieved from <http://cogprints.org/4385/>
- Thomas, C., & McDonald, R. H. (2007). Measuring and comparing participation patterns in digital repositories: Repositories by the numbers, part 1. *D-Lib Magazine*, 13(9/10). <https://doi.org/10.1045/september2007-mcdonald>
- Tschider, C. (2006). Investigating the public in the Public Library of Science: Gifting economics in the internet community. *First Monday*, 11(6). <https://doi.org/10.5210/fm.v11i6.1340>
- Van Noorden, R. (2014). Funders punish open-access dodgers. *Nature*, 508(7495), 161. <https://doi.org/10.1038/508161a>
- Vandegrift, M., & Colvin, G. (2012). Relational communications. *College & Research Libraries News*, 73(7), 386-389. Retrieved from <http://crln.acrl.org/content/73/7/386.short>
- Veale, K. (2003). Internet gift economies: Voluntary payment schemes as tangible reciprocity. *First Monday*, 8(12). <https://doi.org/10.5210/fm.v8i12.1101>
- Wolpert, A. J. (2013). For the sake of inquiry and knowledge: The inevitability of open access. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 368(9), 785-787. <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMp1211410>
- Yang, Z., & Li, Y. (2015). University faculty awareness and attitudes towards open access publishing and the institutional repository: A case study. *Journal of Librarianship and Scholarly Communication*, 3(1). <https://doi.org/10.7710/2162-3309.1210>